

Solent to Midlands Route Strategy Evidence Report Technical Annex

April 2014



Document History

Solent to Midlands route-based strategy technical annex

Highways Agency

This document has been issued and amended as follows:

Version	Date	Description	Author	Approved by
0 6	13/12/13	Begins at v0.6 to mirror the supported version of the main document.	C Jacobs	Andrew Stoneman
3 1	31/1/14	Amended with comments and to follow main document restructure	Surinder Bhangu	Simon Jones
5	4/4/14	Amended for consistency with RBS evidence report	Surinder Bhangu	Simon Jones

Table of Contents

A	Report evidence	4
A1	Introduction	4
A1.1	Background	4
A1.2	The scope of the stage 1 RBS evidence report	4
A1.3	Route description	4
A2	Route capability, condition and constraints	5
A2.1	Route performance	5
A2.2	Road safety	6
A2.3	Asset condition	6
A2.4	Route operation	7
A2.5	Technology	8
A2.6	Vulnerable road users	8
A2.7	Environment	8
A3	Future considerations	9
A3.1	Overview	9
A3.2	Economic development and surrounding environment	9
A3.3	Network improvements and operational changes	12
A3.4	Wider transport networks	12
A4	Key challenges and opportunities	13
A4.1	Overview	13
A4.2	Capacity challenges and opportunities	13
A4.3	Asset condition challenges and opportunities	13
A4.4	Capacity challenges and opportunities	14
A4.5	Safety challenges and opportunities	14
A4.6	Social and environmental challenges and opportunities	14
A4.7	Conclusion	14
B	Stakeholder feedback	15
B1	Responses from “breakout 1”	15
B1.1	South East events	15
B1.2	South East Midlands LEP event	25
B1.3	Dorset LEP event	43
B2	Breakout Session 2 feedback	52
B2.1	South East events	52
B2.2	South East Midlands LEP event	54
B2.3	Dorset event	62

B3	Additional session – Oxford	66
C	Bibliography.....	68
C1	Introduction	68
C1.1	Background.....	68
C1.2	The scope of the stage 1 RBS evidence report.....	68
C1.3	Route description	68
C2	Route capability, condition and constraints	68
C2.1	Route performance	68
C3	Future considerations.....	69
C3.1	Overview	69
C3.2	Economic development and surrounding environment	69
C3.3	Network improvements and operational changes	69
C3.4	Wider transport networks	69

A Report evidence

A1 Introduction

A1.1 Background

- A1.1.1. No evidence required.
- A1.1.2. No evidence required.
- A1.1.3. No evidence required.
- A1.1.4. No evidence required.
- A1.1.5. No evidence required.
- A1.1.6. No evidence required
- A1.1.7. No evidence required.
- A1.1.8. No evidence required.
- A1.1.9. No evidence required.
- A1.1.10. No evidence required.

A1.2 The scope of the stage 1 RBS evidence report

- A1.2.1. No evidence required.
- A1.2.2. No evidence required.
- A1.2.3. No evidence required.
- A1.2.4. No evidence required.
- A1.2.5. No evidence required.

A1.3 Route description

- A1.3.1. Figure 1 provided by the Agency and route lengths recorded in Highways Agency spreadsheet: 'Network Evidence Report Data 7th November 2013'.
- A1.3.2. Commentary on Figure 1.
- A1.3.3. Commentary on Figure 1.
- A1.3.4. <http://www.bournemouth.gov.uk/PlanningBuildings/Planning/Policy/Consultations/TransportInfrastructureinSouthEastDorset.pdf>
- A1.3.5. Commentary on Figure 1.
- A1.3.6. Commentary on Figure 1.
- A1.3.7. Commentary on Figure 1.
- A1.3.8. Commentary on Figure 1.

- A1.3.9. Document supplied by Oxfordshire County Council at the Stakeholder Event held at Oxford Town Hall, 11th October 2013.
- A1.3.10. Commentary on Figure 1
- A1.3.11. No evidence required.

Figure 1 Provided by Highways Agency graphics team

A2 Route capability, condition and constraints

A2.1 Route performance

- A2.1.1. Highways Agency spreadsheet: 'Network Evidence Report Data 7th November 2013'.
- A2.1.2. See A2.1.1.
- A2.1.3. No evidence required.

Table 2.1 data, see A2.1.1.

- A2.1.4. No evidence required.
- A2.1.5. See A2.1.1.
- A2.1.6. Analysis of Highways Agency TRaffic Database
- A2.1.7. Analysis of Highways Agency TRaffic Database
- A2.1.8. See A2.1.1.
- A2.1.9. No evidence required.
- A2.1.10. Table 2.2 data.

Table 2.2 data, see A2.1.1.

- A2.1.11. Table 2.2 data.
- A2.1.12. Statistics from the 'The Highways Agency's Quarterly Network Performance Report', for the first quarter of 2013.
- A2.1.13. Based on Figure 2.1
- A2.1.14. Based on Figure 2.1
- A2.1.15. Based on Figure 2.1
- A2.1.16. Based on Figure 2.1
- A2.1.17. No evidence required.
- A2.1.18. No evidence required.
- A2.1.19. Based on Figure 2.2

A2.1.20. Based on Figure 2.2

A2.1.21. Based on Table 2.1, Table 2.2, Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2

Figure 2.1 Based on diagram based on “Route Based Strategies – network performance peak speeds” maps from Oxford, Basingstoke and Northampton events.

Figure 2.2 Based on diagram “Route Based Strategies – network performance delay” maps from Oxford, Basingstoke and Northampton events.

A2.2 Road safety

A2.2.1. No evidence required.

A2.2.2. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/strategic-framework-for-road-safety>

A2.2.3. Accident statistics can be found at: <http://data.gov.uk/dataset/road-accidents-safety-data>

A2.2.4. See A2.2.3

A2.2.5. See A2.2.3

A2.2.6. See A2.2.3

A2.2.7. See A2.2.3

A2.2.8. No evidence required.

A2.2.9. Commentary on Figure 2.3

A2.2.10. Commentary on Figure 2.3

A2.2.11. Commentary on Figure 2.3

FIGURE 2.3 based on “Route Based Strategies – network performance safety” maps from Oxford, Basingstoke and Northampton events.

A2.3 Asset condition

A2.3.1. No evidence required.

A2.3.2. No evidence required.

A2.3.3. No evidence required.

Carriageway Surface

A2.3.4. No evidence required.

A2.3.5. No evidence required.

- A2.3.6. Information on carriageway condition for the RBS was provided by the NIU in the form of maps presented at the stakeholder events. Information on A43 extracted from Area 7 Asset Management Plan 2012-13 v1_2
- A2.3.7. Area 7 Asset Management Plan 2012-13 v1_2
- A2.3.8. No evidence required.
- A2.3.9. Area 3 Asset Management Plan v2

Structures

- A2.3.10. Strategic road network performance specification 2013-15 (Pages 17 & 18):
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/185684/performance-specification-2013-15.pdf

Other key asset issues for routes

- A2.3.11. Area 3 Asset Management Plan v2

A2.4 Route operation

Incident management

- A2.4.1. No evidence required.
- A2.4.2. “Across the whole network, the Highways Agency Traffic Officer Service responds to around 20,000 incidents each month” – **This statement is in the original template file.**
- A2.4.3. No evidence required.
- A2.4.4. TMD Network Coverage – September 2013, HA Media Services
- A2.4.5. No evidence required.
- A2.4.6. No evidence required.
- A2.4.7. ‘Route Based Strategies – National Average Lane Impact Duration Motorways Only’ data is from the National Traffic Management Directorate (TMD)

Flooding

- A2.4.8. No evidence required
- A2.4.9. No evidence required.
- A2.4.10. Source: Environment Agency Flood Mapping – Flood Risk mapping:
<http://watermaps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiyby.aspx?topic=floodmap#x=523770&y=186810&scale=5>
- A2.4.11. Managing Agent comment

Severe Weather

- A2.4.12. Highways Agency Severe Weather Plan 2013-14

A2.5 Technology

- A2.5.1. No evidence required.
- A2.5.2. No evidence required.
- A2.5.3. No evidence required.
- A2.5.4. Data on the technology assets was received from Capita for Areas 3, 4 and 5 under the South East TechMac, South West TechMac, Eastern TEchMac and the M25 DBFO contracts. This TehMAC data was plotted on GIS using XY coordinates and then the clusters of technologies were then identified for the this RBS.

A2.6 Vulnerable road users

- A2.6.1. No evidence required.
- A2.6.2. Taken from <http://www.nationaltrail.co.uk/>
- A2.6.3. Inspection of Ordnance Survey maps
- A2.6.4. Taken from <http://www.sustrans.org.uk/ncn/map/national-cycle-network>
- A2.6.5. Taken from <http://www.sustrans.org.uk/ncn/map/national-cycle-network>
- A2.6.6. Feedback from Stakeholder Event at Oxford Town Hall, 11th October 2013

A2.7 Environment

- A2.7.1. No evidence required.

Air quality

- A2.7.2. No evidence required.
- A2.7.3. No evidence required.
- A2.7.4. DEFRA Air Quality Management Areas map: <http://aqma.defra.gov.uk/aqma/maps.php>

Cultural heritage

- A2.7.5. Taken from <http://www.magic.gov.uk/>

Ecology

- A2.7.6. No evidence required.
- A2.7.7. Taken from <http://www.magic.gov.uk/>
- A2.7.8. Taken from <http://www.magic.gov.uk/>

Landscape

- A2.7.9. No evidence required.
- A2.7.10. Taken from <http://www.magic.gov.uk/>
- A2.7.11. Taken from <http://www.magic.gov.uk/>

Noise

- A2.7.12. No evidence required.
- A2.7.13. No evidence required.
- A2.7.14. No evidence required.
- A2.7.15. Source: DEFRA 'Important Areas' maps (noise):
<http://archive.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/noise/environment/actionplan/locations.htm>

Water pollution risk

- A2.7.16. Maps produced for RBS workshops

A3 Future considerations

A3.1 Overview

- A3.1.1. No evidence required.
- A3.1.2. No evidence required.

FIGURE 3.1, Various sources including Table 3.1, Table 3.2 and Table 3.3

A3.2 Economic development and surrounding environment

- A3.2.1. No evidence required.
- A3.2.2. Commentary on Table 3.1

Table 3.1 data

Row Labels	Sum of Housing by 2021	Sum of Housing by 2031	Sum of Jobs by 2021	Sum of Jobs by 2031
Enterprise M3	15040	12487	15303	8396
Addlestone urban area	868	74	872	0
Aldershot Urban Extension	2250	2250		
Area 3 - The Low Weald , NE Horley	710	0	0	0
Area 3 - The Low Weald, NW Horley	1570		0	0
Chertsey urban area	203	317	0	0
East of Basingstoke	450	450		
Egham and Englefield Green urban area	391	87	626	42
Farnborough Town Centre			450	450

Former DERA site, Longcross	516	884	6820	3103
Land at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford	300	1331	0	0
Land south of Ash Lodge and east of Manor Road, Ash	685	0	0	0
Land west of Fairlands, Guildford	0	519	0	0
Land within and adjacent to Slyfield industrial estate, Guildford	0	1000	0	0
North East Hook	250	250		
North of Popley Fields	450			
Princess Royal Barracks, Deepcut, Surrey Heath	1200		0	0
Queen Elizabeth Barracks	435	435		
Razors Farm	480			
Royal Holloway University of London, Egham and Englefield Green	1000	1500	1833	2750
Sheerwater Redevelopment	500		0	0
The Elmsleigh Centre & adjoining land, Staines	65	0	947	0
Woking Town Centre	1412	768	2299	1257
Woking Town Centre & Butts Rd/Poole Rd Employment Area	0	0	1456	794
Canterbury	1305	2622	0	0
Oxfordshire LEP	16088	0	7330	0
Banbury Canalside	1050	0	0	0
Bankside	1092	0	0	0
Bicester Business Park	0	0	0	0
Bicester Gateway	0	0	0	0
Blackbird Leys	0	0	3720	0
Carterton (policy CS7)	0	0	0	0
City Centre	0	0	0	0
Crab Hill	1500	0	0	0
Didcot West	3200	0	0	0
East Bicester	0	0	0	0
Employment Land West of M40	0	0	0	0
Former RAF Upper Heyford	1000	0	0	0
Graven Hill	0	0	0	0
Hanwell Fields	900	0	0	0
Hardwick Farm, Southam Rd	0	0	0	0
Headington	1595	0	500	0
Kingsmere (South West Bicester) - Phase 1	1631	0	0	0
Ladygrove East	670	0	0	0
Land at Barton	0	0	0	0
Land north of Range Road	0	0	0	0
land South of Park Road	350	0	0	0
Market Place Mews Expansion	0	0	0	0

Monks Farm	750	0	0	0
North East Bicester Business Park	0	0	0	0
North West Bicester Eco-Town	0	0	0	0
Northern Gateway	200	0	0	0
South West Bicester Phase 2	0	0	0	0
Summertown	0	0	3110	0
Thame Cattle Market	0	0	0	0
Valley park	2150	0	0	0
West End	0	0	0	0
Witney (policy CS5)	0	0	0	0
Solent	24790	19890	21255	23005
Alton	275	275	0	0
Ampress Park			185	185
Barton Farm	1300	700		
Boorley Green	700	700		
Bushfield Camp			1750	1750
Chestnut Avenue	650	650		
Christchurch Road			685	685
City Centre	3050	3050	3500	3500
Coldeast Hospital	125	125		
Cracknore Industrial Estate			495	495
Daedalus	2575	175		1750
Dunsbury Hill Farm			1015	1015
East of Caird Avenue			370	370
Eastleigh River Side			4500	4500
Embankment Way			110	110
Fareham Town Centre	175	175	400	400
Gosport Waterfront	350	350	1935	1935
Hardley Industrial Estate			685	685
Hoe Lane	150	150		
Horndean	375	375	1075	1075
Horsea Island	250	250		
Hythe Marine Park			495	495
Lymington & Pennington	455	455		
Marchwood Industrial Park			110	110
MDA	300	300		
New Milton	325	325		
North Fareham	3750	3750	0	0
North Whiteley	1750	1750		
Petersfield			0	0
Port Solent	250	250	185	185
Ringwood	210	210		
Royal Hospital	150	150		
Sandleheath Industrial Estate			110	110
Tipner	625	625	675	675

Totton & Eling	480	480		
West of Waterlooville	1700	700	0	0
Whitehill Bordon	2000	2000	2750	2750
Whitenap	650	650		
Winchester Town Centre	1000	100	225	225
Woodcroft Farm	170	170		
Woodhouse Lane	500	500		
Canterbury	500	500		
Thames Valley Berkshire	14445	14810	12171	3100
Amen Corner (South), Binfield	725	0	2163	0
Arborfield Garrison SDL	2470	3120	0	0
Berkshire Brewery	0	0	2900	2900
Former TRL, Crowthorne	1000	0	0	0
Heart of Slough	1425	0	3208	0
Land at Warfield	1200	1000	100	0
Land north of Manor Farm	550	550	0	0
Newbury Racecourse	1500	1500	100	100
North of Wokingham SDL	1283	1373	0	0
Sandleford	200	2000	0	0
Slough Trading Estate	0	0	3600	0
South of the M4 SDL	2172	2502	0	0
South of Wokingham SDL	1645	2490	0	0
Worton Grange	275	275	100	100
Grand Total	70363	47187	56059	34501

A3.2.3. No evidence required.

A3.2.4. No evidence required.

A3.3 Network improvements and operational changes

A3.3.1. (Pinch Point Schemes): DfT, Strategic road network performance specification 2013-15 (pages 19-21):
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/185684/performance-specification-2013-15.pdf

A3.3.2. No evidence required.

Table 3.2 Declared pipeline schemes The 2013 Spending Review and subsequent report from HM Treasury Investing in Britain's Future.

A3.4 Wider transport networks

A3.4.1. No evidence required.

Table 3.3 Data from: HM Treasury: Investing in Britain's Future, June 2013. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/209279/PU1524_IUK_new_template.pdf

A4 Key challenges and opportunities

A4.1 Overview

A4.1.1. No evidence required

A4.1.2. No evidence required

Timescales

A4.1.3. No evidence required

A4.1.4. No evidence required

Stakeholder Priorities

A4.1.5. No evidence required

A4.1.6. Information reported in section 4 of the Stage 1 evidence report was derived from the evidence and discussion in sections 2 and 3 of the Stage 1 evidence report and alongside further information resulting from the engagement events, reported in the engagement event report listed in section B1 of this Technical Annex.

A4.1.7. Evidence is taken from Appendix C in main report

A4.1.8. Evidence is taken from Appendix C in main report

A4.2 Capacity challenges and opportunities

Information reported in section 4 of the Stage 1 evidence report was derived from the evidence and discussion in sections 2 and 3 of the Stage 1 evidence report and alongside further information resulting from the engagement events, reported in the engagement event report listed in section B1 of this Technical Annex.

Where used, the Highways Agency Road Users' Satisfaction Surveys were found at:

<http://www.highways.gov.uk/about-us/listening-to-our-customers/satisfaction-surveys/>

A4.3 Asset condition challenges and opportunities

Information reported in section 4 of the Stage 1 evidence report was derived from the evidence and discussion in sections 2 and 3 of the Stage 1 evidence report and alongside further information resulting from the engagement events, reported in the engagement event report listed in section B1 of this Technical Annex.

Where used, the Highways Agency Road Users' Satisfaction Surveys were found at:

<http://www.highways.gov.uk/about-us/listening-to-our-customers/satisfaction-surveys/>

A4.4 Capacity challenges and opportunities

Information reported in section 4 of the Stage 1 evidence report was derived from the evidence and discussion in sections 2 and 3 of the Stage 1 evidence report and alongside further information resulting from the engagement events, reported in the engagement event report listed in section B1 of this Technical Annex.

Where used, the Highways Agency Road Users' Satisfaction Surveys were found at:

<http://www.highways.gov.uk/about-us/listening-to-our-customers/satisfaction-surveys/>

A4.5 Safety challenges and opportunities

Information reported in section 4 of the Stage 1 evidence report was derived from the evidence and discussion in sections 2 and 3 of the Stage 1 evidence report and alongside further information resulting from the engagement events, reported in the engagement event report listed in section B1 of this Technical Annex.

Where used, the Highways Agency Road Users' Satisfaction Surveys were found at:

<http://www.highways.gov.uk/about-us/listening-to-our-customers/satisfaction-surveys/>

A4.6 Social and environmental challenges and opportunities

Information reported in section 4 of the Stage 1 evidence report was derived from the evidence and discussion in sections 2 and 3 of the Stage 1 evidence report and alongside further information resulting from the engagement events, reported in the engagement event report listed in section B1 of this Technical Annex.

Where used, the Highways Agency Road Users' Satisfaction Surveys were found at:

<http://www.highways.gov.uk/about-us/listening-to-our-customers/satisfaction-surveys/>

A4.7 Conclusion

Conclusions are drawn from the evidence and discussion presented within the report and in reference to Oxfordshire County Council (2013) *A34 Oxfordshire Route Based Strategy Draft V1.2*.

B Stakeholder feedback

B1 Responses from “breakout 1”

B1.1 South East events

Event	Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?
				Already	2018-	After		
Basingstoke	M3 J9 (M3/A34)	Capacity issues - access to ports, economy, RBS and Network Rail strategies for freight - holistic approach	Capacity/Operational	X				
Basingstoke	M3 J9 to M27	Operationally poor, requires managed motorway	Operational	X				
Basingstoke	Southampton	Critical in terms of growth @ ports in Soton - Automotive industry - links to continent and beyond	Capacity/Operational	X	X			
Basingstoke	M27 J10	Westbourne Strategic Site	Capacity		X	X		
Basingstoke	A31 Ringwood	Reduces to 2 lanes capacity issue particularly during peak tourist season	Capacity	X				
Basingstoke	M27 J5	Growth/Airport Employment site in Eastleigh Docks - Future Development pressures	Capacity		X	X		
Basingstoke	A31	Development at Bournemouth Airport will lead to congestion issues. Up to 10k jobs proposed	Capacity			X		
Basingstoke	Specific junctions where bottle necks occur	A303 Mere, A3 Guildford, A3/M25 Junction 10, M3 J9 Winchester, M27 Junction 5-7, A27 Chichester to Worthing, A31 Poole, M3 J4 & J4a, A331 & A327 (congestion as result of M3 congestion), A30/A331 corridor impact on M3	Capacity	x				
Basingstoke	A31 North of Poole	Capacity north of Poole / Bournemouth - development permitted through MOU assumed dualling Ameys Ford - Merley	Capacity		x			
Basingstoke	A31 Ringwood New Forest	Westbound capacity New Forest A31 due to constraint at A31 Ringwood A31 / A338	Capacity	x				
Basingstoke	M27	Junction hopping on A27 for SRN and local traffic. 50% of traffic on M27 travels just 1-4.	Capacity	x				
Basingstoke	M27 and M3 at Southampton	Large freight, cruise and automotive growth at Port of Southampton - if increased would add significant growth to an already constrained network.	Capacity	x	x			
Basingstoke	A34 / M3	Critical bottleneck for the Solent economy.	Capacity	x				
Basingstoke	Gosport	Access to Enterprise zone at Gosport	Capacity	x	x			
Basingstoke	M27 Junction 10/11	New housing (6,000 house as Welbourne)	Capacity		x			

Basingstoke	Generic	Focus on key bottlenecks in area (M3/M25, A34/M3 J9, A331, A334, A27, A32, A31, A338 and others)	Capacity	x	x			
Basingstoke	Generic	Looking at growth areas and supporting with infrastructure (M3 DERA, Wellborne, Dunsbury Hill Farm, Whiteley)	Capacity and safety		x			
Basingstoke	Generic	Strengthening the role of the International Gateway (air, sea, road, rail)	Capacity	x				
Basingstoke	M27 Southampton to Fareham, Ringwood, Southampton junction westbound and also M275 access to Portsmouth	M27 used more as a local road rather than strategic motorway (30% of traffic travels only 2 junctions) so improved management required and noise and AQ issues also need to be considered. Struggling to cope with major development areas in Eastleigh, Fareham and Winchester and economic growth corridor into Portsmouth.	Capacity	X	X	X		
Basingstoke	A31 West of Ringwood	Lack of capacity - in middle of development - Port of Poole & Bournemouth Airport - need duelling. Portsmouth corridor to the navel base requires reliant land side access for access to new port activity (Note link to City Deals)	Capacity	X	X	X		
Basingstoke	Generic	Needs to also be a focus on Travel Demand Management and the benefits this can have for the HA network	Society & Environment	X	X	X		
Basingstoke	Generic	Need to improve software controls on SRN - lots of falsely activated systems e.g. M24 Jct with M4 N'bound)	Operational	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	Recognise Economy to be an over-riding objective. The HA needs to ensure it doesn't object to development too quickly (issues at Guildford, Camberley, Woking)	Society & Environment	X				
Basingstoke	Generic and M27 particularly local access traffic (Jct 3 and M271)	Does Capacity exist to allow / enable network improvements. Capacity improvement works throw additional traffic onto local roads - so the HA can't influence this. There is a need to map growth and development effectively and to develop forecast network capacity info. We then need a strategy to accommodate the required growth taking into account Major development, LEPS and LA plans and access strategies particularly for Gateway functions and critical locations	Capacity/Asset Condition/Operational		X	X	EG Access to Southampton Airport strategy	
Basingstoke	M40 J9, M3 J9 and J8 S, & M3 between J4 and J2	General Capacity concern and need for widening. Increased Southampton port activity will also exacerbate problems	Capacity		X	X		
Basingstoke	Generic	Need to better consider design challenges and opportunities for capacity enhancement at the design phase in scheme development	Society & Environment	X				

Basingstoke	Generic & M3 J9	Scope for better use of ITS (Traffic England) - Can HA provide better real time info. for SRN? Note scope for this also creating capacity problems!	Capacity/Operational	X	X	X		
Basingstoke	Generic	Capacity constraints will be severely impacted by future development pressures in the corridor. What happens if there is insufficient money to address corridor needs?	Capacity		X	X		
Basingstoke	Generic	Current poor level of dialogue with network rail appears weak	Capacity/Operational	X				
Basingstoke	A31 New Forest and Ringwood	Requires a strategic look at limiting access and improving design. There are safety and capacity issues. Traffic is worse on Friday evenings and because of tourist traffic	Capacity/Operational	X				
Basingstoke	A27 & M27	Potential for managed motorway type solutions. Jumping hopping and local access issues are a problem. Access to be better controlled alongside local road investment	Capacity/Operational	X				Plenty of HA studies
Basingstoke	Generic & A3 Guildford and M27 J8 - Windhover	Need for investment in local road network - Note this is difficult to achieve when the LA's / HA have different remits and objectives. HA perhaps doesn't have LA concern with Economic issues - more with safety / reliability meaning they can end up blocking activity - consultation becomes difficult!	Operational/Society & Environment	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	Safety - needs a more strategic approach - need to understand why accidents / incidents happen rather than focus on operational issues - Better role for different solutions - average speed cameras (SPECS?)etc with these better advertised on the network and also used to manage capacity	Capacity/Safety/Operational/ Society & Environment	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	Do we maximise potential of managed motorways in controlling access?	Capacity/Operational	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	What happens with traffic during maintenance and construction. Impacts on local road network during these events are not adequately thought through	Operational	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	Managed Motorways result in additional capacity - Can this be used to manage local roads - Limit access to hard shoulder running so as not to overload local road network	Operational	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	Should money also be spent on demand management on major routes + travel planning & development control - Need to work with LAs / LEPS to also reduce junction hopping and control local access (focus on walking / cycling / demand management)	Capacity/Operational	X				

Basingstoke	Generic	ITS - solutions - need to co-ordinate around local national and European systems - currently there are too many specifications. There needs to be a common standard between LAs and HA. Is there also scope for a route checker for mobiles - like Train Tracker	Operational/Society & Environment	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	Network resilience - how does the network cope with severe weather / terrorist attack. Motorway closures cause severe delays on local roads	Safety/Asset Condition/Society & Environment	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	For planning - who is responsible for looking at regional / national planning data.	Asset Condition/Operational/Society & Environment	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	Disconnect between police and HA - poor lane discipline and driver behaviour reduces effective capacity - Scope for education campaigns and enhanced traffic officer role.	Operational	X				
Basingstoke	Generic	Soft Estate management - grass cutting is not happening / litter is an issue. This also makes the area less attractive for investors particularly on the gateways to economic centres	Society & Environment	X				
Basingstoke	A27 Farlington (Portsmouth Eastern road)	Sea wall investment and repair required. Also at M27 - A3M link risk of sea level rise	Asset Condition	X				See environment Agency Shoreline Mgt Plans
Basingstoke	Generic	Apprenticeship skills - need to look at scope for sustainable procurement and to build this into future contracts	Society & Environment					
Basingstoke	Generic	The Government owned approach for the HA should provide a platform for the HA to take a strategic approach on aggregated development / growth potential for a 10-30 year period - Need to support with a strategic development model?	Asset condition	X				
Basingstoke	M3 Junction 5 - Odiham - Hook	Can junction be designed to enable safe movements for NMUs. Generally the motorway act as as a barrier to sustainable modes						
Basingstoke		Need to seek opportunities for environmental enhancements. Environment data can be improved by 1) understanding the hierarchy of designations / statutory processes, and 2) integrating natural environment white paper concepts into interpreting data.						Help deliver Natural Environment white Paper - Lawton Concepts
Basingstoke	A34 / M3	Priority needed for economic traffic / HGVs. Journey times and reliability need enhancing						Port master plan
Basingstoke	Generic	Can the area MAC commissions be extended to get private sector money involved in asset replacement rather than a piecemeal approach to asset maintenance						

Reading	A34/M4	The emergency routes/diversion routes during incidents through West Berkshire have not been finalised.	Operational	x			NO	Planned diversion routes through West Berkshire
Reading	A34/M4	The HA policy noise reducing surfacing needs to be reviewed re Chieveley, East Ilsley and Compton	Society & Environment	x			NO	Areas known to be affected by West Berkshire Council
Reading	A34	Commitment required to sign HGVs along A34 and not along the A4074. SatNav databases/maps to be updated to include correct routes, real time updates for real time journey planning. Liaison with FMA, etc.	Operational	x			NO	Proposed HGV routing
Reading	A34	Delays along A34 around Oxford (towards the M40)	Capacity	x			NO	n/a
Reading	A34	Some bad junction slips off the A34 in West Berkshire between the M4 and northern district boundary	Safety	x			NO	List of bad slips
Reading	A34	Currently consists of two lanes only, with no hard shoulder. Any incidents result in congestion.	Operational	x			NO	n/a
Reading	A34	Currently consists of two lanes only, with no hard shoulder. This is a safety concern as there is nowhere to go in the event of a breakdown. Slip roads are too sharp.	Safety	x			NO	List of bad slips
Reading	A34 (Chieveley)	NMU issues: e.g. Chieveley junction (A34) - an east-west bridleway bridge had to be fought for (and obtained) by volunteers. The north-south cycle/walk way along the A34 was provided by the HA but is not attractive and is not used.	Society & Environment	x			NO	n/a
Reading	M4 Jct 13 (A34)	Did the predicted traffic demand projected for the junction following the improvements in 2000 materialise? Was the traffic demand under-estimated?	Capacity	x			NO	Current and projected traffic demand
Reading	A34	Local residents of villages are up in arms when traffic uses narrow rural lanes to avoid incidents/blockages on the A34. The solution is to upgrade the A34. The A34 is congested and is not "fit for purpose" - are the HA forecast traffic volumes accurate? These roads need to be modelled with the correct information.	Operational	x			NO	Complaints from residents
Reading	A34 Litchfield	Provide NMU crossing near Litchfield (along the A34) for Wayfarers Way, as an underpass/bridge/definitive Rights of Way route for a safe crossing point	Society & Environment	x			NO	Details of crossing point
Reading	A34 / A303	The northbound entry slip from the A303 onto the A34 presents a problem for HGVs, etc (Newbury bypass)	Safety	x			NO	Complaints/safety record

Reading	A34	Safety issue at short slip roads onto the A34 in Beedon/East Ilsley area	Safety	x				NO	Complaints
Reading	A34	North-south link is very limited and problems are spread across the local Berkshire network. Height and weight restrictions only limit certain routes (e.g. Gore Hill), and places like Hungerford are severely affected. The issues in Oxford relate to the fact that it cuts the city in half and forms part of its ring road - there is a lack of space for improvements.	Capacity	x				NO	Complaints
Reading	A34 Milton / Chilton	Impact of Science Vale major development on the A34 and M4, as well as the knock-on impact on local routes	Capacity		x			YES	
Reading	A34	Lack of lorry parking on the A34 between M4 and M40, resulting in overnight parking on local routes	Operational	x				NO	Complaints
Reading	A34	HGVs route from the A34 onto the A4074 through Reading as this is better than the SRN during peak times	Capacity	x				NO	Complaints
Reading	A34	LEP priorities need to address north-south links through Berkshire, as the current options are only the A34 or M25	Capacity	x				NO	n/a
Reading	A34	A34 southbound always appears to have an issue on a Friday afternoon	Operational	x				NO	n/a
Reading	A34	A34 near Oxford is very sensitive to roadworks, resulting in diversion through Reading	Operational	x				NO	n/a
Oxford	Generic - interfaces with A40, A45 and A44 (Growth Corridor)	Concern that the RBS do recognise the wider geographical context (this is being looked at a network level) and / or the role of public transport and cross boundary issues. Swindon to Midland links are significant and the A40-A34-M40 link seriously impacts at Witney. There is a parallel need to link this to EU funding / the Oxfordshire economic plan work but the timing isn't being co-ordinated with other work		X					
Oxford	Generic and A34 specific (North Oxford Business park) + A40 and M40	Local businesses are suffering as a result of unreliability of the network. A34 capacity is therefore becoming a constraint to growth. Businesses cite A34 and unreliability as the top barrier to growth		X	X	X			

Oxford	A34 Hinksey Hill	The junctions are affected by trips across the wider area / inter-regionally and we are tending to look at all this from a very local perspective. Transport interchange between the A34 / M40 / A40 is generally seen as a big problem affecting journey times. How do we get traffic off the A34 and better cater for E-W movements. We also need to plan for strategic movements and how all of this supports growth.		X	X	X		
Oxford	South Oxford	Bus operations are becoming increasingly unreliable because of congestion and PT use is more affected by Journey times. The predictability of journey times by bus between Science Vale (Abingdon , Didcot) into Oxford is a particular problem, with investment particularly needed on the A34 Hinksey Hill. Operator costs are also increasing		X				
Oxford	Generic	Incident response - small incidents create big problems across the network. The lack of capacity means there is no resilience as emergency vehicles cannot access incidents. Can lay-bys provide additional capacity?		X				
Oxford	Junctions with other roads (A34-M40 & A40) - impacts on Cherwell	The issue of catering for East - West traffic is critical. HGVs have no alternative but the A34 for access to M4 and M40. This is adversely affecting businesses that are mobile. The A34 also has issues with widening e.g. the viaduct and Hinksey and the Peartree junction for the Northern Gateway at Begbroke		X				
Oxford	A34 - Didcot	Oxford Bus runs a strategic Coach service from Heathrow Airport to Oxford and journey time is 90 minutes, however the route is unreliable, often because of M40 access to the M25. (Is there scope for bus priority) Connectivity to Heathrow from Didcot is also poor. M4 Access to Heathrow is also poor and unreliable due to lack of capacity issues		X				
Oxford	Generic	Local traffic particularly undermines the strategic nature of the A34. The southern link of the A34 (Milton to Chilton) is the only bit that doesn't run overcapacity		X	X	X		
Oxford	Generic	Public Transport cannot be developed as a viable alternative whilst the network is capacity constrained, and there is limited scope to provide additional capacity so bus priority seems difficult to achieve		X	X	X		

Oxford	Reading, Abingdon and Oxford	Access to key destinations is very poor . The impact of HGVs compounds this problem with the A34 catering for large volume movement between Southampton and the Midlands. For Abingdon North & South junctions - links between Harwell and Culham are key to innovation growth		X			
Oxford	A43	The A43 operates as a transfer route between the M40 and the M1, however it doesn't have effective VMS to enable this re-routing and regional management of diversion routes seems poor		X			
Oxford	A43	This is an important growth corridor (motorsport industry) that impacts on the M40 - A43 and A45. Junction 9, 10 represent a constraint on the growth of North Oxfordshire and the Motorsport Valley. There is also significant growth in South Northants. Towcester has no spare capacity and roundabouts are a problem. The junction with the A5 is also an issue.		X			
Oxford	Generic - Hinksey Hill (Chronic Congestion)	There is poor dialogue generally between the HA and the Midlands LAs. The substantial growth between Oxfordshire and the Midlands doesn't seem to be being recognised and development (housing and business) is being refused due to lack of capacity		X			
Oxford	General	Simultaneous roadworks on local roads and HA roads seems crazy (e.g. M40 and M4 disrupting London access) Why? Also why do road closures associated with roadworks take so long		X			
Oxford	A420 to Swindon and the junction with the A34	Development land in Oxford is very difficult to source. Swindon and other outlying development areas are generally seen as offering an opportunity for Oxfords overflow growth however note A420 links with the A34 are very poor with the junction requiring slip road configuration and safety improvements		X			
Oxford	Heathrow and Gatwick Links. Also link to Cambridge	Poor public transport and congestion (around Heathrow) is seen as a barrier for accessibility to these hubs. The junction with the M40 doesn't help this.		X			
Oxford	Oxford / Bicester / Milton Keynes.	All are seen as growth areas but limited (no?) Bicester is set to double in size. E-W rail means there are no connections		X			

Oxford	A34	A34 Cleansing - There is an issue of enabling access and road closure for the district to be able to fulfil its obligation to clear the verges and reservation		X				
Oxford	A34	Noisy roads - Various concrete sections and older sections are noisy		X				
Oxford	A34 / A40	Low standards of junctions are a contributory factor but this isn't always identified to be the case		X				
Oxford	A34	The role of the A34 is critical - it must have sufficient capacity to ensure traffic doesn't re-route onto the local roads network and to support the local growth needs whilst protecting key designations e.g. Oxford Meadows		X				
Oxford	A34	The fact that the A34 (between Hinksey Hill and Peartree) forms a part of the ring road (western bypass) means that pressures extend onto the rest of the ring road stifling local investment in east Oxford / Science vale etc. South Oxfordshire District Council and the Vale of Whitehorse are planning significant Economic growth at Science Vale area (Didcot, Wantage, Grove, Harwell and Milton Park) and the A34 at Milton interchange creates a bottleneck for E-W movement. Cambridge access is generally poor which is another barrier for innovation		X				
Oxford	A40 / A34	The interaction of these two roads is critical for e.g. Witney needs to attract investment and industry (it's a growth town) but there is no direct connection via the Peartree roundabout to cater for this leading to rat running and blocking back on the A40		X				
Oxford	A34 and towns abutting (Abingdon)	Need to ensure that the latest environmental controls / standards are applied and reflect traffic volumes. There is a need for environmental protection on the A34 that was built 40 years ago.		X				
Oxford	Generic / A34	Access is a major problem for NMUs and horses in particular. A34 capacity constraints mean there is traffic on local roads which impacts on NMUs		X				
Oxford	Generic	A lack of kerbside maintenance means that kerbs are now unusable forcing horses etc. onto the main roads. Also impacts negatively on drainage		X				

Oxford	Peartree to wendlebury	The hard shoulder was originally set up for NMUS and cyclists but is now hatched out so has become unusable		X				
Oxford	Generic	There has been significant government investment in Harwell and Culham (?)but a recent report indicates that the A34 is a potential congestion barrier to £1bn Oxford innovation economy			X			
Oxford	Generic / A34	10,500 dwelling are currently being built at Wantage and Didcot - This will exacerbate capacity issues on A34 and generally			X	X		
Oxford	Generic / A35	There is no real provision for Hard shoulder movement - This is an issue at Hinksey and Wolvercote where there is a long spread of peak hour traffic		X				
Oxford	M40 Junction 10	Longer term developments will need a different type of junction as the present one is too constrained		X				
Oxford	M40 Junction 9	Bicester Village needs improved access as it is a major visitor attraction		X				
Oxford	A34 Oxford	Include radical solutions to challenges such as new routes to avoid environmentally sensitive locations - Oxford Flood Meadow				X		
Oxford	M40 Junction 10	Development at Bicester, 6000 houses needs to be accommodated			X			
Oxford	A34	Congestion and unreliable journeys impacts on bus operations		X				
Oxford	A34 / A40	Junction is at capacity and causes delays		X				
Oxford	A34 West Oxford	The A34 runs within the urban area and is the source of constant noise		X				
Oxford	A34 West Oxford	Conflict between the strategic function and local function of the road in the urban area needs to be addressed		X				
Oxford	A34 West Oxford	Radical solutions may be required to address existing issues - it is the wrong road in the wrong place at the moment		X				
Oxford	A34 / A43	Investment in rail has reduced the volume of freight movements in this corridor, HA needs to capitalise on this opportunity		X				
Oxford	A34 Science Vale	Substantial investment in Science Vale Transit will change the nature of travel south of Oxford			X			
Oxford	A34 West Oxford and Botley	Air quality and noise from A34 impact on Botley and west Oxford		X				
Oxford	Chilton Interchange	Development planned in Didcot needs to have access to the SRN		X				
Oxford	Marcham Interchange	The next priority for pinch point schemes is Marcham			X			

Oxford	A34 Peartree	Other strategic routes in the county need to dovetail with the A34 e.g. A40 and A420.			X		
Oxford	General	Priority for investment should be based on the contribution to economic development such as			X		
Oxford	M4 / A34	Access to international hubs - Heathrow - is important for economic development of central Oxfordshire		X			
Oxford	M40 Junction 9	How will the HA assist delivering the eco-town and enterprise zone?		X			
Oxford	Milton Interchange	Development at Milton / Didcot needs access to A34		X			

B1.2 South East Midlands LEP event

<i>Location</i>	<i>Description of challenge</i>	<i>Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment</i>	<i>When does this issue become critical</i>			<i>Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?</i>	<i>If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?</i>	<i>Number of sticky dots received</i>
SRN wide General Comments	Growth information for Northamptonshire looks accurate but this needs to be the case across all regions so that where growth information is being taken into account in identifying priorities, it is reliable e.g. not based on previous RSS data.	Society and Environment	✓			No	N/A	

<p>A14, A45, A43 and A5</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p> <p>Solent to Midlands</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Lorry parking and the location and availability of lay-bys is becoming an increasing issue. Lay-bys on the A14 in particular and also the A45, A43 and A5 are used for overnight stops by HGV drivers. However the HGV's often become a target of anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>Society and Environment</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>Lorry parks may not be attractive economic investments and the government/HA need to consider taking a more proactive role in providing lorry parking facilities.</p> <p>Northampton CC's A14 Challenge and Summit work provides evidence of this and other issues in respect of the A14 (details forwarded post-meeting).</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>A14</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Delivery of housing and employment in Kettering East is dependent on the need for SRN infrastructure - a new junction (10a) and substantial new local road infrastructure (WEWA link to the A43 north of Kettering.</p>	<p>Growth/Society and Environment</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>Yes – on growth plans</p>	<p>Information produced in support of the Kettering East planning application and AECOM study work.</p>	<p>17</p>
<p>A14</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Future pressures on A14 between junctions 3 and 7 and at A14 J4 itself – from growth of Kettering and Corby and wider network growth.</p>	<p>Capacity/Operational</p>		<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>No (not a significant existing problem).</p>	<p>Study work associated with the Kettering Bypass widening scheme.</p>	<p>4</p>

A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	Some congestion already at A14 junctions 8 and 9 which will increase as a result of future development in the Kettering area and in Wellingborough and Northampton.	Capacity/ Operation	✓			No – maps concentrate on SRN only not on local roads at SRN junctions	Transport assessments associated with proposed developments and AECOM study work.	
A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	A14 not fit for purpose as a nationally important route over the longer term as much of the route in Northamptonshire and wider afield is only two lanes in each direction. Kettering Bypass widening may create problems east of Junction 9 where difficult to widen.	Capacity/ Operational			✓	No (not a significant existing problem except in some specific locations).	Study work associated with the Kettering Bypass widening scheme.	8
SRN wide including A1 General Comments Felixstowe to Midlands	A14 has good provision of ITS (e.g. VMS). However, limited alternative routes except A45. Other routes have limited ITS - better real time traveller information is required on all strategic routes.	Capacity/Safety/ Operational/	✓			NA	N/A	10
M1 J19 London to Scotland East	This junction is a major congestion point on the A14 – should be largely resolved by the current major scheme – but some key local movements will not be accommodated with adverse consequences for local roads and development. The operation of the improved junction and local network will need to be reviewed.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	Yes	N/A	
A45 Felixstowe to Midlands	Main issue on the A45 in Northamptonshire is congestion at Chowns Mill junction – affecting both the A45 (e.g. long queues westbound in the morning peak) and A6 route. Development growth will significantly increase congestion at this junction e.g.growth in Rushden area	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	Information from current HA scheme/ study work and NSTM.	13
A45 Felixstowe to Midlands	Accident problems on the A45 e.g. at Raunds.	Capacity/ Operational/	✓			Yes	N/A	
A45 Felixstowe to Midlands	Single carriageway section of the A45 between Stanwick and Thrapstone already has poor journey times and future pressures will increase congestion on this section of the A45.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	Yes	N/A	

<p>A45 Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Junction problems in Wellingborough/Rushden area e.g. at Turnells Mill and Wilby Way (PPP scheme at Wilby Way will come under future pressure from development growth).</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>		<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Current HA study work with input from NSTM.</p>	
<p>A45 Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>A45 causes severance in the Rushden and Stanwick areas.</p>	<p>Society / Environment</p>		<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Rushden Transport Study commissioned by ENDC, and Town Transport Strategies being produced by NCC. Destination Nene Valley Report</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>A45 Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Possible impact of Rushden Lakes development proposal – subject to SoS decision on Public Inquiry.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>		<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Transport Assessment for the development includes a significant improvement to the A45 Skew Bridge junction.</p>	
<p>A45 Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Heavy traffic volumes on A45 and its junction in the Northampton area causing flow breakdown on the A45 and congestion on local roads crossing the A45.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>HA study work (HA and local authorities have agreed the need for the A45 Northampton Growth Management Scheme to be delivered principally through developer contributions).</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>A5 London to Scotland East</p>	<p>A5 traffic through constrained historic Towcester causes air quality and other environmental problems. HA should consider addressing this through a Towcester Bypass possibly through a joint scheme with developer of Towcester South.</p>	<p>Society / Environment</p>		<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>2</p>

A43 Solent to Midlands	Existing congestion in Towcester at the Tove and Abthorpe roundabouts which will get worse as proposed growth takes place at Silverstone and Towcester. PPP scheme at Tove will help ease existing congestion but problems will build up in the future.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	HA PPP scheme modelling and Silverstone/Towcester modelling provides detailed information.	
A43, M40, M1 Solent to Midlands London to Scotland West London to Scotland East	Congestion at M40 J10 and section of A43 between M40 and Brackley and at M1 J15a.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	N/A	
A5 and M1 London to Scotland East	Air quality issues associated with A5 in Towcester and M1 in the Northampton area (J15 – J15a). AQMAs have been designated.	Society/ Environment	✓	✓	✓	Not evident on the HA maps	N/A	
General - Local Road Network – Strategic Links General Comments	The SRN network in Northamptonshire is part of a wider network which includes key strategic links which are administered by NCC. NCC has key priorities for improvements to the A509 (Wellingborough to Kettering), A43 (Northampton to Kettering), A45 (Daventry to Northampton) and WEAST rail bridge/Route 4. Also potential future problems on A6116 from growth in Corby. Schemes to improve these routes may assist the operation of the SRN and priority needs to be given to addressing issues relevant to both the HA and NCC.	Capacity/ Operational Society/ Environment Growth	✓	✓	✓	No	NCC Strategic Priorities and Northamptonshire Arc.	8
Overall General Comments	There are economic benefits to using/providing public transport routes; installing crossings at junctions etc.	Society Capacity	✓			No	None discussed	0
Overall General Comments	60% of journeys that are less than 5 miles are undertaken by car. If a shift to more sustainable modes is achieved for some of these, it would free up some space on the network for 'Economic Driver Vehicle trips'.	Capacity Society	✓			No		0

Hockliffe, A5 London to Scotland East	Congestion and road safety issues. Worries are connected to the 'de-trunking' of this section of the A5. After the A5/M1 link is completed there is concern that there will be more traffic at this point on the A5	Capacity Safety	✓	✓		This is an anticipated challenge	Traffic modelling forecasting suggests an increase in traffic at Hockliffe	2
M1, Junctions 9-11 London to Scotland East	A lot of traffic 'self-diverts' from the M1 to the A5, through Dunstable, if there is a problem on the M1. This has a detrimental effect on the town of Dunstable; noise/air quality. Increase in traffic with the introduction of the A5/M1 link of 14%	Capacity Society Environment Safety	✓			No	Traffic modelling forecasting suggests an increase at Dunstable	13
Leighton Buzzard, A5 London to Scotland East	Described as being 'imprisoned' by trunk roads and motorway. Little provision to cross these barriers for non-motorised road users. These roads don't provide for 'multi usage' i.e. pedestrians and cyclists.	Environment Society	✓			No	None discussed	0
Leighton Buzzard, A5 London to Scotland East	Growth in Leighton Buzzard will result in more stress on the A5 at Hockliffe	Capacity		✓	✓	Development growth maps indicate growth to the east of Leighton Buzzard which could generate additional traffic.	Not discussed	0
Hockliffe Junction A5 London to Scotland East	It is considered that there is an existing problem with A5 traffic and not solely local traffic using the network for local journeys.	Capacity	✓			Yes – Delays and average speeds demonstrate delay.	N/A	2*
North of Hockliffe (Woburn Rd Roundabout on A5) London to Scotland East	Road safety issues here.	Safety	✓			Is not on the maps, but the consensus is that the HA know about the problems here.	N/A	0

M1 Managed motorways London to Scotland East	When there is an incident, management and recovery is considered to be difficult (there is no hard shoulder so it is difficult to access incidents for emergency services). Major incidents cause a problem and the Highways Agency is refusing to authorise reverse flow traffic, which could ease some of the resulting congestion following an incident.	Operational Capacity	✓			No	Not discussed	8
M1 Junction 11A London to Scotland East	Once the M1/A5 Link is completed, there will be sufficient capacity for Highways Agency network. What about local traffic?	Capacity Operational	✓	✓		The HA are aware, but felt it needed to be highlighted.		0
A1/A421 Black Cat Roundabout Felixstowe to Midlands London to Leeds (East)	The junction is considered to be poorly laid out, with huge capacity issues in the AM and PM peak. The operation of the junction appears to favour one flow of traffic over others where there is also high traffic demand	Capacity Operational	✓			Delays are shown to some degree on the maps.	N/A	0
A1/A421 Black Cat Roundabout Felixstowe to Midlands London to Leeds (East)	The worry is that the signalisation/pinch point investment scheme will only 'buy time' with the projected development in the area. Consensus was that grade separation is required.	Capacity			✓	No	Not discussed	0
A1 South of Black Cat Roundabout 'The Bends' London to Leeds (East)	Massive safety concern. There is a high interaction between the SRN and local roads as well of bends in the road which increase accident potential. Growth scheduled, needs more capacity. Constraint on the network. Growth means there is the perception that more commuting is going to affect the ability of the A1 to serve Bedford's needs. Worry that dealing with problems in isolation will only push them up the corridor – to Bedford. How is the A1 going to be used?	Safety Capacity	✓	✓	✓	No – the maps do not show a predominate accident hotspot.	Not discussed	0

<p>A1(M) Junctions 6-8 London to Leeds (East)</p>	<p>If you ease the congestion along this section of the network, promoting the London to Leeds route, again, you risk pushing the problems up towards Bedford. There is a need for 'strategic thinking'</p>	<p>Capacity Operational</p>		✓	✓	<p>No</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Luton to Bedford. A6 Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Big barrier to movement between these places on the National Cycle Network (NCN). There is no way to cross the A421 to get onto the NCN in Bedford, North of the A6/A421 roundabout.</p>	<p>Safety Environment Society</p>	✓			<p>No</p>	<p>See right</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>New Bedford bypass. New A6 S of Bedford. Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Will increase the pressure on the A6 S of Bedford. A6/A421 junction is going to be a problem post 2021.</p>	<p>Capacity Environment (Noise)</p>		✓	✓	<p>No</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>M1 Junc 13 Exit on A421 London to Scotland East Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Very poor signage. Confusing if you are not familiar with it. Leads to people travelling in the incorrect lane. Lots of accidents are seen here (anecdotal)</p>	<p>Safety Operational</p>	✓			<p>Not known. Is it on accident statistics?</p>		<p>4</p>
<p>M1 Managed Motorways London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Some parts are not lit during the night. There is no hard shoulder meaning a broken down vehicle is exposed; this is a real safety problem.</p>	<p>Safety Operational</p>	✓			<p>No</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A5 (the section due for de-trunking) London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Drainage issues. There is the perception that maintenance on this section though Dunstable has been neglected due to its inevitable de-trunking in the near future.</p>	<p>Asset Condition Environment Operational</p>	✓			<p>No</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>13*</p>

Overall – Junctions General Comments	Junction design. Highways Agency appears to put ‘safety’ above everything, but this can cause severance, reducing accessibility for other road users. On top of this it is also considered to look ‘awful’ having metal railings up everywhere.	Society Safety	✓	✓	✓	No	Not discussed	0
Overall – Junctions General Comments	HA designs are always set to DMRB standards, whereas a lot of local authorities are using guidance such as the Manual for Streets, as a departure from DMRB standards in order to better serve the communities the junction serve/impact upon.	Society Safety	✓	✓	✓	No	Not discussed	0
A5 London to Scotland East	Road side barriers are along this as it runs through towns such as Dunstable and Hockliffe. These cause severance. The speeds are so low on these roads; it is hard to justify the resulting severance and barriers to crossing the network.	Society Safety	✓			No	Not discussed	2
A5 London to Scotland East	These barriers and other safety features, used in order to satisfy DMRB standards, often impact on the look of a town, which can be very important to the local economy.	Safety Society and Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	0
Dunstable – A5 London to Scotland East	Dunstable is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Worries over the effects that diverted traffic from the M1 onto the A5 has on the air quality in Dunstable.	Environment (AQ)	✓			No	Enquired as to whether the AQMA information is used to inform HA decisions and used as an evidence base for RBS.	13*
Milton Keynes Stadium A5 M1 Junctions 13-14 London to Scotland East	The stadium will be increasing capacity to 30k and will be facilitating daily events (rugby, football etc); it will be taking over the MK bowl. A leisure centre is also being built. This will cause movement issues especially on the A5. There are currently congestion issues around events. Additional growth and investment for residential and retail developments are planned	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	The growth map indicates that there will be substantial growth in Milton Keynes; however there are no specific details of growth at the stadium.	There was no discussion of evidence. .	17

A5 to Milton Keynes London to Scotland East	This is a high speed section of the route and there are usually serious incidents because of a lack of lighting and speed. There are also blind spots.	Operational/ Safety	✓	✓	✓	The safety map indicates that this section of road has a relatively high level of vehicle casualties.	N/A	5
M1 Junction 10 London to Scotland East	There are proposals for growth in Luton including employment in the town centre which could increase congestion over the wider network.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	The Key Growth map provides details of growth in Luton.	N/A	
A5 MK M1 Junctions 13-14 London to Scotland East	Proposals for residential and retail growth in Milton Keynes which will put pressure on the A5 and M1. MK is expected to grow from a population of 250k to 350k by 2031 and therefore there will need to be enough capacity on the roads. A key factor of this will be commuting which will be around 50k. Currently there are 53k commuters that come into MK from outside. Additionally, delegates felt that Junction 14 was already running at capacity and would not be able to cope with increases in traffic. Delegates also discussed issues exiting the M1 from the north and south at Junction 14 which form queues. This has been happening Southbound for quite some time. There are more issues at Junction 14 than at Junction 13.	All		✓	✓	The Key Growth map provides some details of growth in this area. Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	N/A	12 (Jn 14) 3 (Jn 13)
M1 Junction 15 and 15a London to Scotland East	Issues with queuing northbound and southbound exits from the M1.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	No further evidence discussed.	0
A421 Felixstowe to Midlands	Improvements on this route have pushed the problems further down. Delegates felt that the HA need to keep in mind that when making improvements, that changes will also need to be made further along the route.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes/No – the potential economic benefit of congestion relief map indicates that the north-eastbound section between M1 J13 and Bedford would have a moderate to high benefit of congestion relief. The peak hour speeds map does not indicate a low traffic speed problem.	No further evidence was discussed.	14

<p>A5 & M1 Link</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Delegates felt that the link would put pressure on this route further along.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>		<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A5/ A43 Towester</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Solent to Midlands</p>	<p>There are general congestion challenges in Towester. This has got much worse over the last two years, going north and south.</p> <p>There are also plans for growth around Towester and Silverstone.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>A5 Dunstable</p> <p>M1 Junction 11</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>There are plans for development in Central Beds, for example Houghton Regis where there are plans for 7k new homes which will link to the planned M1 Junction 11a.</p>	<p>All</p>		<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.</p> <p>The growth maps show some of the growth planned for this area.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>M1 Junction 10</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Around 75% of people travelling to the airport use this corridor. Furthermore, the majority of employment is in this area or in the town which is close to the airport. There are issues at the roundabout of this junction.</p> <p>There are proposals to increase the airport from 9.8 to 18 mppa by 2028</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>The Key Growth map provides details of growth in this area.</p>	<p>No discussion of evidence.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>M1 Junction 13 and 14</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Delegates discussed current issues with E/W routes (including A421 and A509) which cause problems at these junctions.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>		<p>Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>M1 Junctions 15-18</p> <p>A43</p> <p>A508</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>These junctions are close together. Queuing evidence needs to be gathered for the southbound carriageway in the AM peak from M1 Junction 21 down to 14. If there is an accident during peak time and the route is running to full capacity then queues sometimes go all the way back to Newport Pagnell. If there are issues then that motorists use the A43 and the A508 to avoid delays.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>		<p>Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A43 Towester</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Solent to Midlands</p>	<p>The Abthorpe Roundabout failed to get pinch point funding; however there are still issues on this roundabout.</p> <p>There are schemes planned to improve Towester but funding has not been agreed.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>		<p>The potential benefit of congestion relief map shows some of the highest potential benefits on the north-eastbound section of the A43 approaching the roundabout.</p>	<p>No discussion of further evidence.</p>	<p>6</p>
<p>M1 Junction 10-13</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Delegates felt that a managed motorway would relieve traffic from M1 junction 10-13 and</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>		<p>Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>General Comments</p>	<p>There are now far more heavy good vehicles on the motorway which adds pressure.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>		<p>N/A</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>M1 A5 Milton Keynes London to Scotland East</p>	<p>If there has been an incident on the M1 then there are huge delays on the A5. There are also issues when events are being held at the stadium.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>		<p>Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>M1 Junction 13 London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Delegates discussed congestion at this junction during peak times of the day.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>		<p>Yes – the safety on the network 2008-2011 map indicates that The M1 at J13 is a top 100 collision location (ranked 52). This may indicate that collisions are occurring at the junction however the cause is not known. The potential economic benefit of congestion relief map shows that there would be the highest level of economic benefit of congestion relief on the M1 either side of J13.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>M1 Junction 13-15a & Junction 15a-19 London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Issues with congestion and queuing northbound and southbound on these sections of the route.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>		<p>The potential economic benefit of congestion relief map shows that there would be the highest level of economic benefit of congestion relief on the M1 either side of J13.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>A5/A421 Junction</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>There is no lighting at this section of the route (around the Redmoor Roundabout).</p>	<p>Safety/ Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No evidence presented on the maps to indicate high collision rate on this section of the A5.</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>A45 / A509 (Wilby Way)</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>This junction is considered to be overloaded and suffering from congestion issues.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>The delay maps suggest that there is delay to the west of the junction; however the junction is not specifically included on the maps.</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A43 between Northampton and Kettering</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>This section of the A43 (as part of a longer section between Corby and Towcester) is considered to suffer from some of the worst congestion within the county. Whilst this section is not part of the HA's network there was a concern that if you improve this part of the route then this will just shift the problem elsewhere.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No – not part of the HA's network</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A14 in the vicinity of M1 Junction 19</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>There were concerns from the delegates that improvements at M1 Junction 19 could shift issues on the A14.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>M1 Junction 15</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>There is a concern that the current layout (dumbbell roundabout) is not sufficient for the volume of traffic at the junction. Delegates identified that there was a need for a double bridge at the junction going forward.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A5 route as a whole</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>There were concerns from the delegates that piecemeal upgrades on the A5 were not sufficient to support existing and forecast levels of traffic – the route needs completely upgrading.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However growth maps indicate significant growth is proposed in the vicinity of the A5.</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>M1 at Daventry</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>There are currently congestion issues on the M1 near Daventry. Delegates questioned whether there could be local road improvements here that could benefit the SRN.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>M1 and A5 between M1 junction 15A and 19</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>One delegate suggested that the A5 between M1 junction 15A and 19 should be de-trunked and that improvements should be focused on the M1.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>Evidence is one delegates experience and other delegates expressed concerns that this might not be feasible. In particular they raised the issue that this would potentially remove an alternative route should the M1 be experiencing problems.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A number of junctions and links on the A43 and A45 around Northampton</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Delegates identified that existing congestion at these junctions is constraining development within Northampton.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.</p>	<p>Richard Palmer (Northamptonshire Borough Council) indicated that there were some evidence reports to support this and that AECOM had prepared them.</p>	<p>15</p>
<p>A number of junctions on the M1 and A45 around Northampton</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>There is significant growth planned for Northampton (up to 2029) and these junctions need improvement to support development. The Northampton Growth Management Scheme has generated developer funding towards infrastructure schemes. Delegates questioned whether the HA could contribute to the Scheme?</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location. The growth map indicates a significant level of growth planned in and around Northampton.</p>	<p>Richard Palmer (Northamptonshire Borough Council) indicated that there were some evidence reports to support this and that AECOM had prepared them.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>A43 near Towcester</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Some delegates discussed the need for a Towcester Relief Road to take pressure off the town centre and A43.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there are some potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.</p>	<p>David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council) made reference to the Towcester Transport Study, which he suggested provided evidence to support a Relief Road.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A14 Junctions 3 – 7</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>This section of the A14 was identified as a particular congestion concern in the peak hours. A problem with weaving, due to the short distance between junctions, was also identified.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational / Safety</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there are some potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location. The safety map does not support the concern with weaving as it is not identified as a part of the network with safety concerns.</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>M1 Junction 17</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>It is not possible to make the movement from M1 southbound to M45 westbound or from M45 eastbound to M1 northbound. This means that vehicles have to use M1 Junction 18 and travel through Kilsbury and along local roads to access Banbury or Daventry. David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council) suggested that a link road here could open up a lot of growth.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>Daventry is identified as an area that could experience significant growth up to 2021 and beyond.</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates. Evidence of the number of vehicles that do / could make that movement was not provided.</p>	<p>0</p>

<p>M1 corridor southbound</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>This corridor experiences significant congestion in the AM peak (particularly 7.30 – 9am)</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and most delegates agreed that the corridor experiences congestion issues.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A14 corridor</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Delegates identified that the peak hours on the A14 can differ from the traditional peak, or there can be an additional mid-day peak, due to the high level of HGVs using the route to access / leave Felixstowe Port. Delegates suggested that this occurs westbound at M1 Junction 19 and consideration should be given to this when planning any improvements at the junction or on the route.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A14 at Corby</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Delegates commented that Corby is poorly connected to the SRN and where it does connect the junctions can be of poor quality</p>	<p>Operational / Society & Environment</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.</p>	<p>0</p>

B1.3 Dorset LEP event

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?
Region-wide	<p>3. East to West flows across Dorset are ok, but any diversions away from this are difficult due to a lack of suitable routes.</p> <p>Allocation of priorities is going to depend on the authority area, e.g. A31 or A35 could be seen as a priority.</p>	Operational		
Crossways, Portland, Miles Cross Junction and other areas	<p>4. Speculative development proposals continue to come forward.</p> <p>Difficult to plan for development over the next 30 years and to know what proposals will come forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At Crossways, a proposal for 1,000 holiday homes has come forward. - At Portland, there is a proposal for a major visitor attraction. - At Miles Cross junction, there is a proposal for 700 homes. 	Capacity	No	Important to liaise with the local authorities in order to understand which developments are proposed, and where.
Region-wide	<p>5. Local plan period is longer than 2015-21 timeframe. Need to plan for longer term development.</p> <p>Multi-phase developments are likely to continue to be bought forward post-2021 and it is important not to end dialogue at the end of the RBS's.</p>	Economic growth		
Study	<p>6. Possible knock on effect of improvements. Once one junction is improved, the problem may be moved elsewhere on the network.</p>	Operational		
Winterbourne Abbas	<p>7. Flooding issues at this location. Diversion routes are poor, and not always suitable for HGV's.</p> <p>Weather/climate change issues are only going to make this worse.</p>	Operational / Environment	No	HA should have evidence of flooding incidents and diversion routes.
Abbotsbury	<p>8. Tight routes around this area, not all suitable for HGV's.</p>	Operational		
Martinstown	<p>9. Last year held a record for flooding. Flooding here has the potential to effect the trunk road network.</p>	Environment		

Chideock	10. Air quality issue. Large vehicles climbing hills due to the topography of the area.	Environment	No	Area was previously given the opportunity to have a bypass, but couldn't agree locally. Some work has been done with the local MP.
A35 Villages	11. Severance issues due to trunk road going through villages.	Society	No	
Stadium Junction, Dorchester (part of Weymouth Relief Road)	12. Junction improvements have made it difficult for cyclists to cross the junction. Severance issues for cyclists at this junction.	Society		
Kingston Ponds, Stinsford	13. Not enough service areas. Trucks are making use of local car parks instead. Plans to dual stretch of the road to assist with capacity issues.	Capacity		
A31 (Mirley roundabout to A350 roundabout)	14. Changes from dual carriageway to single carriageway causes problems, including accidents.	Capacity / Safety	No	
Bere Regis to A350	15. Safety issue with a wall which has been constructed (vehicles impacting with the wall).	Operation	Yes	Although evidence is not published until verified by police, which means that wall may not be included in figures yet.
Candy Lane to A350, B3078	16. Very narrow stretch of carriageway, with overgrown trees either side. Because of tree branches over the carriageway, the carriageway doesn't defrost very well.	Operational		
A35 Miles Cross Junction	17. Lots of accidents, road closures and diversions. Drivers are frustrated by the countryside and speed up when they are able to.	Safety	Yes	
A31, Poole to M27	18. Capacity of single carriageway an issue. Key route as links port with the motorway.	Capacity		

A303	19. Only a small part is in Dorset, but has a big impact on the area. Problems with single carriageway sections. In particular, HGV's mounting the kerb in narrow sections.	Operational / Capacity		
Ringwood, A31	20. Capacity issues at single carriageway stretches. Acts as a pinch point in the area. Was a call for the A31 at Ringwood to be changed from 70mph to 50mph due to a fatality.	Capacity / Safety		
Amesbury to Merley/Poole	21. Congestion having an impact on growth, Influencing the 'City Deal' scheme. Having an effect on people working in Poole.	Capacity		
Stonehenge, A303	22. Stonehenge a bottle neck on the A303.	Capacity	No	
Broomhill, West of Bypass	23. A signal junction is proposed by the local council.	Operational		
Crown roundabout / East Road roundabout	24. Flooding last year (East Road to Texaco Garage). A resilience issue. Signals on the roundabout are causing queues along the network.	Environment		
Monkey's Jump roundabout / Poundbury, West of Dorchester	25. Improvements are planned. Lots of children use this junction (from Poundbury) to get to McDonald's. Potential safety issue.	Safety		
A35 Bridport	26. Severance issues around the Bridport junctions.	Society	No	
A350 Shaftesbury	27. Development planned at Shaftesbury and Gillingham	Capacity		
Ferndown	28. HGV's are still going through Ferndown and not using the bypass due to congestion.	Capacity / Operational		
The Dips	29. Topography an issue. Last year there was a fatal accident involving a towed caravan. Some stretches are not suitable for HGV's.	Operational		
Study	1. The planning data is inevitably out of date and does not reflect current local plan development.		No	

A31 near Bournemouth	2. The Bournemouth and Poole City Deal – if the bid is successful will seek to deliver development in excess of the Core Strategy allocations in a compressed timescale. Consists of 59ha of employment development at Bournemouth Airport, Holton Heath and Poole Harbour	Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	No	Documentation relating to the Governments City Deal initiative and specific documentation relating to the Bournemouth and Poole City Deal bid.
A35	3. Potential for mineral extraction. Potential for significant HGV traffic.	Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational	No	Dorset minerals and waste local plan
General	4. There is much more accident data than appears to be shown on the plans		No	
Stadium Roundabout, A35 Bridport and others.	5. Suppressed demand for walking and cycling due to lack of appropriate facilities to cross the SRN.	Safety / Operational / Society & Environment	No	
A31 Ashley Heath Interchange	6. Is an accident cluster site with a significant volume of traffic.	Safety	No	There is a study underway by the Chief Commissioner. The data informing the study will be available. The Police will be analysing data for common causation factors.
A31 Bere Regis to the A350	7. Traffic growth arising from new development. Additional traffic is likely to push existing traffic onto other routes	Capacity/Safety	No	This is an existing problem when congestion occurs. Safety on the SRN and local network is the main concern.
A31 Generally	8. The A31 is a constraint to development due to lack of capacity, unreliable journey times, delays, etc.	Capacity / Safety / Operational	No	Bournemouth and Poole City Deal. DfT (Ash Viladis?) is involved in the bid. What role has the HA had?

A35 Bridport	9. The A35 is a constraint to development due to the low/variable standard of the route.	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	
A303 Gillingham	10. The A303 is a constraint to development. 2,500 jobs proposed.	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	
A31 Ferndown to Bridport	11. Gridlocked sections of the route particularly during school holidays and weekends. Mainly caused by changes from 2 to 1 lanes.	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	
A31	12. Ability of SRN to accommodate Bournemouth airport traffic	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	Airport projections
A35	13. Lack of alternative routes suitable for use as diversions.	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	The A35 is a low standard route but parallel routes are of an even lower standard. Incidents on the A35 can result in traffic impacts in local villages as traffic tries to find alternative routes.
A35 Axminster	14. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	
A35 Bridport	15. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	
A35 Poundbury, Maxgate.	16. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	
Crossways	17. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	
Poole regeneration area	18. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	
Monkeys Jump	19. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Operational	Safety /	No	

A31 Wimborne	20. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Safety / Operational	No	
A31 Ferndown	21. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Safety / Operational	No	Ferndown Industrial Estate
A31 Poole	22. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Safety / Operational	No	Poole Regeneration area
Parley Cross	23. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Safety / Operational	No	
Rowshot Hill	24. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Safety / Operational	No	
A31 Amesford to Murley	25. New traffic from major development	Capacity / Safety / Operational	No	
Poole Port	26. New traffic from major development. Ability of SRN to support growth	Capacity / Safety / Operational	No	New manufacturing development needs ability to distribute. Area needs jobs and houses to contain population growth. Priorities are jobs and affordable housing.
General	27. Better use of traffic officers particularly during May to October.	Safety/ Operational	No	

<p>Various locations :- Stadium Roundabout Stinsford Roundabout Monkeys Jump Roundabout East Street Roundabout Bridport Crown Roundabout</p>	<p>28. Lack of suitable crossings and on carriageway facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Even recent improvement schemes fail to adequately consider NMU's. Junctions are often on established pedestrian/cycle routes and present a discontinuity in route standard.</p>	<p>Safety / operational</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Cyclist related accident rates are creeping up. Accident stats. Forecasts for cycle demand. A31/A35 used for cycle events. Dorset Police issue advisory's when consulted on cycling on carriageway. There is evidence of suppressed demand between Weymouth and Dorchester. This is a major housing/jobs linkage but with very few cyclists, far fewer than would be expected.</p>
<p>A35 Bridport (Askers)</p>	<p>29. Signage often obscured by fog</p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Serious incident. Dorset police are reviewing improvement measures at the location.</p>
<p>A35 Winterbourne Abbas</p>	<p>30. Flooding</p>	<p>Safety / operational</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>General</p>	<p>31. Road safety education</p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Dorset safe scheme Intelligence lead policing Streetwise Bike safe Road safe</p>

A31 north of Bournemouth (congestion)	3. This stretch of road is already congested, with large numbers of roundabouts slowing down the traffic. The junction at Canford Bottom is particularly bad, and is confusing even for local drivers. Planned growth at Bournemouth Airport (which is currently underused) and in nearby employment areas, will only exacerbate this problem.	Capacity	Yes	
A31 north of Bournemouth (speed limits)	4. There are too many different speed limits on this stretch of road, which is causing confusion for drivers. Can a speed strategy be put in place for the road as a whole? See also 11 below.	Society & Environment Operational	No	Presume that this can be evidenced fairly easily
Access to port of Poole	5. Maintaining good access to Poole is essential to the economic wellbeing of Dorset. The roads leading north from the town (particularly the A350) are not attractive to goods traffic, so lorries tend to head for the A31 to go north as well as east, putting extra pressure on this road. Any problems with the A31, therefore, have a big impact on the local economy.	Asset condition Capacity Society & Environment	No	
A31 / A35 traffic flow	6. There is a challenge across the county of how to keep traffic moving on the A31 and A35 with all the growth planned in southern Dorset. The Agency needs to think about how to keep the road flowing rather than clogging it up with more traffic lights.	Capacity Safety	Yes	
Bere Regis (split between route-based strategies)	7. What are the implications of splitting the route at Bere Regis? Could this lead to a different approach being taken on either side and would this be a good or bad thing?	Operational	Yes	
A35 around Dorchester	8. The junctions around Dorchester are already busy. Planned growth around the town will worsen congestion.	Capacity	Yes	
A35 around Bridport	9. Miles Cross junction is already busy and will become busier as new development is built. This junction creates big tailbacks all the way round Bridport, which hold up local commuters trying to get to work.	Capacity	Yes	
A35 (topography)	10. The A35 has several steep stretches which make the route difficult for lorries. Pollution, noise and the risk of accidents all increase as they struggle up the hills. This has become a particular problem since speed cameras were installed in certain villages.	Society & Environment	No	

A35 (speed limits)	11. Speed limits on this road appear to have been set for individual villages rather than for the road as a whole, leading to a piecemeal approach. Would it be possible to have one speed limit for the whole stretch, or at least a more co-ordinated approach? See also 4 above.	Society & Environment Operational	No	It ought to be possible to get a map of speed limits from the police
A35 (road markings)	12. The road markings have worn off in some locations and the suggestions was made that this could have contributed to a recent accident.	Safety Asset condition	No	
A37 north of Dorchester	13. Although this is not part of the SRN, most people see it as a trunk road, as it provides the main north-south link through the county. The Agency needs to work hand in hand with the County Council to ensure improvement works are co-ordinated and drivers are kept informed of hold-ups on both the A37 and A35.	Operational	No	
Countywide pinchpoints	14. There are a number of narrow stretches of road around the county which cause congestion and potential issues with safety. Is it better to keep these and have people drive slowly or remove them and have more free-flowing traffic? May come down to a question of community wishes versus economic development.	Capacity Safety Society & Environment	No	
Countywide seasonality	15. Traffic flows in Dorset are much higher in summer than in winter. Is there a business case for spending large sums of money on improving roads which are only congested for six weeks of the year?	Capacity	Yes	
Countywide technology	16. Can the Agency come up with a better way of letting drivers know when there are hold-ups ahead? At present, information received on smartphones and satnavs usually arrives too late for the driver to find another road.	Capacity Operational	No	Suggestion that this is already in place in Wales so could learn from the experience there

B2 Breakout Session 2 feedback

B2.1 South East events

Event	Description of Challenge/Location	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?
Basingstoke	M3/A34 J9	Capacity	Capacity constraint - access to ports from/to midlands - A34 key route for freight	
Basingstoke	M27	Operational	Junction hopping impacts on overall operation of network and strategic operations	
Basingstoke	A31		Development at Bournemouth Airport will lead to congestion issues. Up to 10k jobs proposed	
Basingstoke	Need to recognise that the SE gives the best investment returns for UK plc. and that there are pockets of deprivation	Society and Environment	Need to be able to justify investment relative to others parts of the country, particularly as current regional infrastructure is insufficient to meet know growth requirements	
Basingstoke	Integrated thinking must become a priority	Operational	Relevant for specific corridors / localities in particular e.g. Guildford	
Basingstoke	Reliability should be treated as an over-riding objective	Operational	Poor reliability represents a huge cost for businesses to absorb	
Basingstoke	There is a need to support City Deals		This will help to ensure the right networks and strategies (e.g. freight) are created	
Basingstoke	Service Level Agreements - Journey Time Reliability seems to be overriding issue	Operational	What will these be in RBS terms. Should priority be attached to journey times? (A Heathrow issue) or should we invest in end to end journey time (HS2)	
Basingstoke	Solent city in particular has poor east - west transport capacity - we need seamless travel	Capacity	Invest in sustainable modes for east west movement will have long term capacity and operational benefits	
Basingstoke	RBSs present an opportunity to prioritise spend on a corridor -		Is there scope to designate corridors and prioritise spend? - focus on maintenance / renewal, pinch points, driver behaviour / demand management . We must focus on what is deliverable in order to enable longer term transformation	
Basingstoke	Technical specification needs to be right around ITS	Capacity/Safety	Who should drive technology - government or industry. HA should define strategy requirements and then work with network operators to deliver	
Basingstoke	M3 J9 & M3 Jct 4-2 access	Capacity/Operational/Society & Environment	All important for e.g. access to Heathrow	
Basingstoke	Access to Portsmouth and Southampton	Capacity/Operational/Society & Environment	Need to prioritise this for enterprise zones - Frank Baxter has information	

Basingstoke	Wider safety benefits - how are these adequately captured. Need to also balance growth and safety considerations	Safety		
Basingstoke	A34 HGV Access to ports an important consideration	Capacity		
Basingstoke	There need to be better approaches to sharing intelligence about the network and joint working	Operational		
Reading	Drainage and Poor Weather effects - mainly and A34 issue	Operational	There are no alternative routes	
Reading	NMU crossings (e.g. Chieveley)	Society & Environment	Cycle lanes on the larger roads are not being used as they are too dangerous. There is community severance.	
Reading	Access to the North (A34 vs A404/M25)	Capacity		
Oxford	Dealing with congestion on the A34 / A40 junction	Capacity / Safety / Operational / Society and Environment	Currently very congested location with several strategic routes (national and county) all converging in one place. In the future it will unlock development opportunities	Very high
Oxford	Revise and rationalise M40 Junction 10	Capacity / Safety	Present layout is inefficient and leads to substantial delays. It constrains future developments	Very high
Oxford	Address the capacity and environmental impacts of the A34 in West Oxford with radical solutions	Capacity / Safety / Operational / Society and Environment	Very detrimental impacts of the wrong road in the wrong place cannot be addressed with minor changes to the existing layout so more radical options are required.	High
Oxford	A34 Congestion leads to traffic diverting onto local road system and causing problems esp. A40	Operational and Capacity		
Oxford	A general lack of E-W travel opportunities exists at A34 Junctions	Operational and Capacity		
Oxford	The emphasis in the short term needs to focus on delivery - probably of solutions within the existing corridor. Longer term solutions also need to be worked up	Operational and Capacity	Something must be done ASAP as a priority	
Oxford	Needs to be clear how the counties and Districts can support in developing a wider strategy	Operational and Capacity	The interaction of local and strategic traffic considerations is of paramount importance	
Oxford	A need to cater for strategic E-W movements particularly at A40 & A34 Junctions and the intersection with the M40	Capacity	There is a lack of E-W capacity and this is evident at key junctions	

B2.2 South East Midlands LEP event

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
A45 Chowns Mill junction – Traffic Congestion now and increasing with growth Felixstowe to Midlands	Capacity/Operational/ Growth	CW, KB and AL - General agreement that this is a very high priority owing to existing problems of congestion and need to support growth in the surrounding area.	AL – Worst congestion point on the A45 now that Wilby Way has a PPP scheme.	HA recognises this is a priority and is already undertaking preliminary design work in order to submit a bid for funding detailed design of an improvement scheme at the junction – but not yet clear whether this will adequately cater for growth.
Need to have a transparent methodology for assessing priorities – e.g. a matrix based prioritisation framework. This could be used to compare SRN priorities against NCC priorities. General Comment	Partnering	HRE – It will be important for the HA to demonstrate how it has identified priorities and that they are consistent with LEP/NCC priorities (and compare well against NCC priorities).	HRE – It is difficult to assign priorities as the network should be considered holistically.	
A14 Existing junctions around Kettering and new Junction 10a Felixstowe to Midlands	Providing SRN infrastructure to support growth	SR – Significant SRN infrastructure has been identified as essential to support growth of Kettering. Kettering Bypass widening is committed but A14 junction improvements at Junctions 8, 9 and 10 are also required as is a new Junction 10a. Developer funding cannot deliver all this infrastructure so it must be considered within the RBS approach.	Equal or higher priority with A45 Chowns Mill.	Solutions have been identified – this issue is funding and delivery.
A45 Junctions in Wellingborough/Rusden area Felixstowe to Midlands	Capacity/Operational/ Growth Society/ Environment	KB - Significant issues of existing congestion and future development pressures coupled with severance effect of the A45 for non-motorised trips between Rusden and Wellingborough areas.	Second A45 priority after Chowns Mill (A6) junction but severance issues a priority in their own right.	Existing PPP scheme at Wilby Way (A509) junction. HA already considering mitigation/improvement schemes at Skew Bridge and Turnells Mill Lane junctions.

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
A45 Northampton Felixstowe to Midlands	Capacity/Operational Growth	HRE - Breakdown in traffic flow already occurs on the A45 owing to high volume of traffic on mainline and at junctions. Also significant delays on local roads crossing the A45.	Important to have a strategy for managing future pressures on the A45 in the Northampton area. Local authorities support need for developer contributions to be used to address future impacts on the A45.	HA has identified the A45 Northampton Growth Management Strategy (NGMS) to be delivered principally through developer contributions.
A5 Towcester London to Scotland East	Capacity/Operational Society/ Environment	HRE - A5 traffic has severe impacts on Towcester and this issue needs to be given higher priority.	LAs are attempting to deliver a Towcester bypass through a SUE on the south side of Towcester. But this cannot deliver all the infrastructure needed to deliver an effective A5 bypass of Towcester.	Developer scheme for Towcester southern link road.
A14 Longer Term - fit for purpose issue Felixstowe to Midlands	Capacity/Operational	AL - Consensus that the A14 is a route of national importance and that its standard should reflect its importance. Sections of A14 west of J7 and east of J9 will not be able to cope in the future.	No discussion at the workshop on possible environmental issues of upgrading the A14 – just support for it to be a high standard route.	A14 Kettering Bypass widening scheme has started.
A14 Lorry Parking issue Felixstowe to Midlands	Operational Society/Environment	AL and HRE – Demand for lorry parking is evident on the A14 and something needs to be done to address the issue.	Has been a problem for some time and should be treated as a high priority.	Some developer interest in providing lorry parks but not considered sufficient.
Improving strategic links in the local road network General Comments	Capacity/Operational	Improvements to the local road network can help relieve pressures on the SRN as well as supporting local objectives	High priority for local authorities in the area.	Schemes listed in NCC Cabinet Report 19/06/2013.

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
Congestion on A5 in Dunstable (caused by 'self-diverting' traffic from M1) London to Scotland East	Capacity Operational	Gridlock in Dunstable, will make it less attractive for investment.	No trade offs were discussed.	When the congestion is not incident related is there an option to use VMS and Managed motorway signage to alert drivers to the fact that Dunstable is also busy, possibly discouraging vehicles from electing to use this route?
Bedfordshire East/West constraints Felixstowe to Midlands General Comments	Capacity		Considered 1 st long-term priority. (post 2021)	Not discussed
Identify problematic junctions on the A1. Assess the accessibility/severance in the Bedford/A1 area. London to Leeds (East)	Capacity Environment Social	Problems are known to exist along this stretch of the A1. An assessment is needed to prioritise and offer best solution to severance issues. It is important that in dealing with one junction on the A1 the problems aren't just pushed along to the next junction.	Considered 2 nd long-term priority. (post 2021)	Not discussed
Infrastructure issues at A1 Junctions London to Leeds (East)	Capacity Environment Social	These are existing issues which need addressing prior to growth coming forward	No trade offs were discussed.	Not discussed
Congestion in communities around Bedford. Accessibility for non-motorised road users. Felixstowe to Midlands General Comments	Capacity Social Environment	There is an existing deficit and an opportunity to influence travel behaviour through improvements	No trade offs were discussed.	Not discussed
Severance for Pedestrian and Cyclists at the A421/A6 junction. Felixstowe to Midlands	Social Environment	There is an existing deficit and an opportunity to influence travel behaviour through improvements	No trade offs were discussed.	Not discussed

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
M1 (managed motorway) – Post accident Operation. London to Scotland East	Operational Safety	This is an existing issue.	No trade offs were discussed.	Major incidents cause a problem and the Highways Agency are refusing to authorise reverse flow traffic, which could ease some of the resulting congestion following an incident.
Area Wide Freight Management General Comments	Capacity	Not discussed	No trade offs were discussed	Not discussed
A5 Hockliffe junction London to Scotland East	Capacity	Considered a priority because it is a 'strategic movements' issue, not predominantly caused by local traffic. Growth in Leighton Buzzard will contribute to an increase in problems at Hockliffe in the future.	Considered 3 rd long-term priority. (post 2021)	
M1 Junction 13 – Signage London to Scotland East	Operational Safety	Confusing if you are not familiar with the junction layout. Leads to people travelling in the incorrect lane. Lots of accidents are seen here (anecdotal observations)	No trade offs were discussed - however see right	Improve on-road signage. Regarded as a 'quick win' that could be addressed in the short term.
A5 – Around Kensworth London to Scotland East	Safety	Not discussed	No trade offs were discussed	Not discussed
M1 Junction 14 queuing/ congestion. Delegates felt that Junction 14 was already running at capacity. London to Scotland East	Capacity / Operational	There are plans for growth which could increase problems.	There was no discussion of trade-offs. Amongst the group, there was an impression that this was a higher priority challenge.	Not discussed

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
<p>A421</p> <p>Improvements on this route have pushed the problems further down. Delegates felt that the HA need to keep in mind that when making improvements that changes will also need to be made further along the route.</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	Capacity / Operational	Not discussed	There was no discussion of trade-offs. Amongst the group, there was an impression that this was a higher priority challenge.	Dualling on the A421 to improve traffic issues
<p>M1 Junction 13 peak time traffic</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	Capacity / Operational	There are plans for growth which could increase problems.	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Not discussed.
<p>M1 Junction 13-15a & Junction 15a-19</p> <p>Issues with congestion and queuing N&S on these sections of the route.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	Capacity / Operational	Issues with queuing N&S.	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Managed motorways at Junction 13-15a & Junction 15a-19
<p>A5/A421 Junction – there is no lighting along this route.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	Operational/ Safety	There are a number of incidents caused by the lack of lighting.	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Lighting
<p>A5 & M1</p> <p>Event congestion (MK Stadium)</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	Capacity / Operational	Lack of roadside information, e.g. VMS, causes additional congestion problems especially for those travelling in from outside the area.	There was no discussion of trade-offs. Amongst the group, there was an impression that this was a higher priority challenge.	VMS signage and real time information for events at MK. Real time info signs

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
<p>A43/ A5 Towester Issues</p> <p>There are general congestion challenges in Towester especially around the village of Stonebrew. This has got much worse over the last two years, going North and South</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Solent to Midlands</p>	Capacity/ Operational	There are plans for growth around Towester and Silverstone.	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Not discussed
<p>A5 Abthorpe Roundabout</p> <p>The Roundabout failed to get pinch point funding; however there are still issues on this roundabout.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Solent to Midlands</p>	Capacity/ Operational	There are schemes planned to improve Towester but funding has not been agreed	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Not discussed
<p>In the past there have been some mistakes made, in particular where the road provision has not matched that required to support growth.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	All	Delegates were keen that these mistakes were learned from during this process and that the highway network was of sufficient quality and had enough capacity to support growth proposals going forward.	This was a general point that was raised but limited discussion took place.	None identified
<p>A14 corridor between M1 junction 19 and Kettering – this is perceived to have the highest levels of congestion along this route.</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	Capacity / Operational / Safety	This was seen as the section of the A14 that was the most congested and weaving problems could cause safety issues. Delegates therefore considered that this section should be improved first.	As the A14 is a significant route through the area the successful operation of this was considered key.	None identified.

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
<p>M1 and A45 junctions around Northampton were identified as experiencing congestion and were currently constraining growth in the area.</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	Capacity	Northampton is identified as an area where significant growth is planned and without improvements to these junctions the growth may not be able to come forward.	This issue was discussed at great length in the workshop and due to the number of junctions that require improvement and the quantum of development proposed in Northampton this was considered a high priority.	Nothing was discussed in particular but AECOM understands that assessments have been undertaken to inform the Management Scheme.
<p>The M1 links and junctions around Daventry may not have sufficient capacity or be of sufficient quality to support development within Daventry.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	All	Daventry is an area identified for notable levels of growth and there were concerns that if improvements were not made to the M1 in this location that development may not come forward.	It was unclear how much of a priority this is but the access from M1 north to Daventry and vice versa was raised as a significant concern.	A link road was identified between M1 north and M45 west to ease pressure on the local road network. Solutions at other junctions / links were not discussed.
<p>There was some concern that any improvement schemes that come forward could displace problems to other sections of the network, rather than remove them completely.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	All	If the existing issues are only shifted to another section of the network then there could still be capacity issues that constrain growth.	This was not discussed in great detail but was raised on more than one occasion when discussing proposed improvements.	Suitable planning procedures need to be utilised to determine the potential wider impacts of improvements on the network.
<p>M1 junctions 13-19 – delegates were concerned about how long the widening along this section would provide sufficient capacity for existing and future traffic.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	Capacity / Operational	This section has recently been widened but delegates noted that there are still regular congestion problems in the peak hours. Therefore concerns were raised regarding the potential for the corridor to accommodate additional traffic in the future.	Although this concern was raised the delegates considered that further improvements at this stage were unlikely and therefore limited discussions took place.	Not discussed.
<p>There are problems entering and leaving the SRN at Northampton due to capacity issues.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	Capacity	Northampton is identified as a significant area for growth and these capacity issues could be constraining this growth.	Due to the growth planned within Northampton this was considered to be a relatively high priority.	Not discussed specifically but linked to the Northampton Growth Management Scheme.

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
<p>The delegates recognised that there are a number of pinch point funding schemes that were not allocated funding, for various reasons.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	All	There were concerns that the work that went into identifying and preparing these schemes would not be utilised in the RBS process. Repetitive or wasted work should be avoided.	A number of delegates considered that this was an important issue and were keen for previous studies undertaken to be considered.	N/A
<p>M1 corridor – need to remove strategic trips from the network and encourage other modes of transport.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	Capacity / Operational	There were concerns that there are not infinite levels of capacity on the M1 and that attempts should be made to shift existing and future traffic to alternative modes.	This was considered to be a relatively high priority.	The provision of a strategic park and ride site, potentially at Watford Gap, to shift longer distance car trips to bus or rail.
<p>There are current congestion issues on the A45 south of the A14.</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	Capacity	The A45 is a key route between Northampton and the A14 and therefore it is considered an important route on which to ensure congestion is limited.	This was the subject of a limited discussion in the group; furthermore some delegates thought it was of less concern than others.	Not discussed.
<p>There were concerns that the consultation between the HA and local authorities would not identify local schemes that can be linked to strategic improvements and provide greater benefits than large scale schemes alone.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	All	If strategic and local schemes are brought forward without consideration of the combined impacts then the greatest benefits from both schemes may not be realised.	Limited discussion on this priority took place within the group.	Not discussed.
<p>There are concerns going forward regarding the proportion of HGVs in the A14 traffic (thought to be up to 25% at certain times of the day).</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	Capacity / Operational / Safety	The reason for this to be considered a priority is due to how this affects the capacity, average speed and safety of the route.	This was not considered a high priority.	Longer / heavier HGVs or HGV convoys.

B2.3 Dorset event

When does this issue become critical?			Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.	Sticky dots
Already is	Before 2021	After 2021				
			<p>Must take a strategic approach to priorities.</p> <p>For example, issues with speed limits can be dealt with in the short term. Infrastructure improvements are likely to be more long term.</p>	Need to look at why fatalities are occurring and deal with these issues in the short term.	Where aquaplaning is occurring, could replace the carriageway in the short term.	
			<p>Accident blackspots must be the key priority. Need to look at why accidents keep happening in certain locations.</p> <p>Why wait for Route-based Strategies? Why can't issues be addressed now?</p> <p>Can there not be a separate pot to address safety? This is always going to be important.</p>			
			3. No real connection between Poole and Bournemouth, although this is the second biggest conurbation in the south west with a population of around 350,000.			
			<p>4. Must allow for development.</p> <p>Not as straight forward as just dividing between pre and post 2021. Some lead up time needed for example.</p>			•
			7. If flooding continues to occur at Winterbourne Abbas, something must be done, regardless of the Route-based Strategies.			
			12. Stadium Junction difficult to cross as a cyclist. Safety issues.			•• •
			13. Lack of service areas causing safety issues.		<p>Something needs to come into the planning process to allow for service areas on the network.</p> <p>Could Avenue roundabout park and ride scheme incorporate a service area?</p>	
			15. At Wyke, resurfacing was undertaken to stop accidents. Previously four vehicles hit a wall, but since the resurfacing there have been no accidents.			
			16. Overgrown trees at Candy Lane.			•

		18. Capacity of single carriageway from Poole to M27 is an issue.			••
✓		19. A303 is a priority, but it's acknowledged that this is unlikely to be sorted in the short term. The roads around the A303 also need improving, as they can't cope with HGV's, especially when cars are parked on the side of the road.			••
✓		20. At Ringwood, there are some small scale things which are impacting on safety and should be dealt with immediately. Key priority.	Where there have been fatalities, this should be a priority,		•
		21. Amesford to Mirley dualling planned for 2019. This links with development and the City Deal and is key to serving Poole. The intention of the City Deal is to double employment development at Bournemouth over the local plan period. The HA has been represented through the LTB. There needs to be a scheme to progress and a Business Case.			•• •
		25. Poundbury has had long standing consents for development. Monkeys Jump and some other Dorchester junctions need addressing, especially as this development comes forward.			
		26. Severance issues at Bridport.		Could be addressed by upcoming developments?	
✓		27. Developments are coming up at Shaftesbury and Gillingham. They will feed into the A303. Gillingham development is a priority as this begins in 2016.			
		1. Important to present correct information			
		2. Important to plan using current information			
✓		3. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓		4. Important to plan using current information			
✓		5. Important to plan using current information			
✓		6. Need to support growth of sustainable travel.			•
✓		7. Need to improve Road safety			
✓		8. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			•
✓		9. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			•
✓		10. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓		11. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			•
✓		12. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			

✓			13. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			14. Need to reduce the impact on local villages of incidents on the SRN.			
✓			15. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			16. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			17. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			• •
✓			18. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			19. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			•
✓			20. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			21. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			•
✓			22. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			23. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			24. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			25. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			26. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			• • •
✓			27. The SRN should not impede development. It should support economic growth.			
✓			28. Need to improve route operation outside the traditional mid-week AM and PM peak periods.			
✓			29. Need to support growth of sustainable travel.			•
✓			30. Need to improve road safety			•
✓			31. Need to reduce road closures / obstruction due to flooding			
✓			32. Need to improve road safety.	Road safety should be the main priority with road capacity as the second priority.		
✓	✓		1. The A303 serves a large part of Dorset, but only a very short stretch lies within the county. Because of this, there is a danger that issues on this road could be swamped by issues with the A31 and A35, which have a long run through Dorset. Giving this challenge a high priority will ensure the A303 gets the attention it deserves.	All the junctions on the A303 are outside Dorset so it will be hard to measure the impact of future improvements on the county. Nonetheless it is considered a high priority by all.		•

✓			2. A31 Ringwood to Bere Regis. It is important to avoid further serious accidents on this stretch.			••
✓		✓	3. A31 north of Bournemouth. This road is already congested and further planned growth will make it worse. Keeping the A31 open for business is vital to the county's economic wellbeing.	Will get even worse after 2021 if nothing is done.		••
✓			4. The confusion over speed limits may be contributing to accidents, some of which are serious.	Needs to be looked at alongside the capacity issue in 3 above.		
✓			5. Poole is an important economic driver for Dorset, so keeping it connected to the outside world has to be a priority.			•••
	✓	✓	6. Important for quality of life and economic development. Monkey Jump junction mentioned as a particular example.			
✓			7. Could have a big impact on the eventual measures taken forward in east and west Dorset.	More a matter for the HA than for stakeholders.		
✓	✓	✓	8. Road capacity around Dorchester is already a problem and proposed development will make it worse.			•••
	✓	✓	9. Development is coming soon, with a waste transfer station already on the cards. Any improvements need to be up and running in time for this planned growth.			
✓			10. It affects the quality of life in communities along the route.	We cannot do anything about the lie of the land, but there must be some simple solutions available. Less of a priority than the capacity issues mentioned elsewhere.	An air quality management area could be introduced.	

✓			11. A35 speed limits. Need to avoid confusing drivers and creating potential accident hotspots.			••
✓			12. Could help prevent accidents.	Could be actioned straightaway.		
✓	✓		13. North / south links need to be considered more of a priority than at present.	The Agency already speaks to Dorset County Council about such things so more of a reminder to keep doing this than a priority for investment in the network.		
✓			14. May or may not be a priority depending on the Agency's view of the locations concerned.	Needs to be looked at as part of a capacity and safety review for the A31 / A35 route as a whole.		
✓			15. This issue affects Dorset, Devon and Cornwall more than anywhere else.			
	✓		16. A general point not specific to Dorset.	Clearly an issue for some, but not within the scope of this exercise.	Suggestions included new apps for smartphones and satnavs.	

B3 Additional session – Oxford

Relevant RBS	Comments
Solent to Midlands	Science Vale is important development area with 8000 households and 14000 jobs planned. Evidence has been developed with OCC leading modelling work. Key issue is funding the required infrastructure - what can the RBS bring to the table?

Generic	RBSs maintenance schemes should include improving routes for NMUs. Awareness in the design team to begin planning for NMUs at the start helps deliver better schemes.
Generic	Schemes need to be sensitively designed to look usable - high fences are not good enough.
Solent to Midlands	The strategic housing requirement study will need to inform the RBS in the period beyond 2021.
Generic	What role do alternative modes have in the RBS. There needs to be some integration across the modes to make the most of the funds available.

C Bibliography

C1 Introduction

C1.1 Background

- a) *A Fresh Start for the Strategic Road Network*, Alan Cook, 24 November 2011
- b) *Roads Reform – A Fresh Start for the Strategic Road Network: Government Response and Feasibility Study Terms of Reference*, Department for Transport, 24 May 2012
- c) *Highways Agency Pilot Strategies*, Highways Agency, March 2013, (www.highways.gov.uk/publications/route-based-strategies)

C1.2 The scope of the stage 1 RBS evidence report

- d) This section is intentionally blank

C1.3 Route description

- e) *Route Map*, Highways Agency, 12 December 2013 (Appendix A in the Stage 1 Evidence Report)
- f) *Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T): Comprehensive Network & Core Network*, European Commission (ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/infrastructure)

C2 Route capability, condition and constraints

C2.1 Route performance

- g) Highways Agency spreadsheet: 'Network Evidence Report Data 7th November 2013'.
- h) *Strategic Road Network Performance Specification 2013 to 2015*, Department for Transport/Highways Agency, 28 March 2013
- i) *Engagement Event Mapping – Route-based Strategies – South East – South Network Condition – Peak Hour Speeds*, Highways Agency, 2013
- j) *Engagement Event Mapping – Route-based Strategies – South East – South Network Performance – Delay*, Highways Agency, 2013
- k) *Strategic Road Network Performance Specification 2013 to 2015*, Department for Transport/Highways Agency, 28 March 2013
- l) *Strategic Framework for Road Safety*, Department for Transport, 11 May 2011
- m) *Engagement Event Mapping - Safety on the Network 2008-2011*, Highways Agency, 2013
- n) *Area Asset Management Plan 2012-13 – Area 7*,
- o) *National Asset Management Plan 2013*, Highways Agency, 10 July 2013

- p) *National Average Lane Impact Duration*, Highways Agency, 2013 (www.trafficengland.com)
- q) *National Average Lane Impact Duration*, Highways Agency, 2013 (www.trafficengland.com)
- r) Email from Jason Gravell, Senior Consultant, Capita to Colin McKenna, Technical Director, Parsons Brinckerhoff dated 06/11/13 16:40.
- s) National Cycle Network Route Map, Sustrans (www.sustrans.org.uk/ncn/map)
- t) *Strategic Road Network Performance Specification 2013 to 2015*, Department for Transport/Highways Agency, 28 March 2013
- u) *Highways Agency Environment Strategy*, Highways Agency, 2010
- v) *Engagement Event Mapping*, Highways Agency, 2013
- w) Magic Interactive Mapping website (www.magic.gov.uk)
- x) Highways Agency Severe Weather Plan 2013-14

C3 Future considerations

C3.1 Overview

C3.2 Economic development and surrounding environment

- y) Local development frameworks for the relevant local planning authorities.

C3.3 Network improvements and operational changes

- z) Highways Agency Road Projects, Highways Agency (www.highways.gov.uk/roads)
- aa) 2013 Spending Review, HM Treasury, 26 June 2013
- bb) Investing in Britain's Future, HM Treasury and Infrastructure UK, 27 June 2013
- cc) National Infrastructure Plan 2013, HM Treasury and Infrastructure UK, 4 December 2013

C3.4 Wider transport networks

- dd) Investing in Britain's Future, HM Treasury and Infrastructure UK, 27 June 2013
- ee) National Infrastructure Plan 2013, HM Treasury and Infrastructure UK, 4 December 2013

If you need help using this or any other Highways Agency information, please call **0300 123 5000*** and we will assist you.

© Crown copyright 20??.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence: visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> write to the **Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**, or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document is also available on our website at www.highways.gov.uk

If you have any enquiries about this document email ha_info@highways.gsi.gov.uk or call **0300 123 5000***. Please quote the Highways Agency publications code PR171/13

* Calls to 03 numbers cost no more than a national rate call to an 01 or 02 number and must count towards any inclusive minutes in the same way as 01 and 02 calls. These rules apply to calls from any type of line including mobile, BT, other fixed line or payphone. Calls may be recorded or monitored.

Highways Agency media services Dorking Job number S130643