

# North and East Midlands Route Strategy Evidence Report Technical Annex April 2014



## Document History

### Technical annex to North and East Midlands route-based strategy evidence report

Highways Agency

This document has been issued and amended as follows:

Version	Date	Description	Author	Approved by
1	February 2014	Draft for comment	Sarah Garland	Victoria Lazenby
2	April 2014	Final version	Sarah Garland	Andrew Butterfield

## Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Part A Supporting evidence</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>A1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>5</b>
A1.3 Route description.....	5
<b>A2 Route capability, condition and constraints</b> .....	<b>6</b>
A2.1 Route performance .....	6
A2.2 Road Safety .....	9
A2.3 Asset Condition.....	11
A2.4 Route Operation .....	11
A2.5 Technology .....	12
A2.6 Vulnerable Road Users.....	12
A2.7 Environment.....	12
<b>A3 Future considerations</b> .....	<b>13</b>
A3.2 Economic development and surrounding environment.....	13
A3.3 Network improvements and operational changes .....	17
A3.4 Wider transport networks .....	17
<b>A4 Key challenges and opportunities</b> .....	<b>18</b>
A4.2 Timescales.....	18
A4.3 Stakeholder priorities .....	18
A4.4 Operational challenges and opportunities.....	18
A4.5 Asset condition challenges and opportunities .....	18
A4.6 Capacity challenges and opportunities .....	18
A4.7 Safety challenges and opportunities .....	18
A4.8 Social and environmental challenges and opportunities .....	18
<b>Part B Stakeholder engagement</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>B1 Stakeholder workshops</b> .....	<b>29</b>
B1.1 Engagement events.....	29
B2.1 Stakeholder event invitees.....	30
B3.1 Stakeholder event attendees .....	37
B4.1 Note-taker’s sheets from the engagement events .....	41
<b>Part C Bibliography</b> .....	<b>131</b>

<b>C1</b>	<b>Sources for stage 1 evidence report .....</b>	<b>132</b>
C1.1	Chapter 2.....	132
C1.2	Chapter 3.....	132
C1.3	Evidence received from stakeholder workshops.....	133

## **Tables**

Table A4.1	Schedule of challenges and opportunities	19
------------	--	----

## **Part A Supporting evidence**

## **A1 Introduction**

### **A1.3 Route description**

This section is intentionally blank

## A2 Route capability, condition and constraints

### A2.1 Route performance

50 busiest sections on the route

RoadLinkReference	RoadLinkDescription	On Time Reliability - Percentage Vehicle Miles On Time	On Time Reliability National Rank (out of 2497 road links - rank 1 has lowest OTRM score)
AL3302	A52 between A6464 and A6514 (AL3302)	43.5%	4
AL3301	A52 between A6514 and A6464 (AL3301)	48.7%	9
AL3499	A46 between A1133 and A1 (AL3499)	52.1%	17
AL2979	A38 between A6 and A61 (AL2979)	53.9%	20
AL2159	A52 between A6007 and A6464 (AL2159)	55.3%	26
AL2017	A500 between A34 and M6 J16 (AL2017)	55.6%	31
AL1147	A500 between A527 and A34 (AL1147)	56.7%	38
AL1146	A500 between A34 and A527 (AL1146)	57.1%	41
AL1037	A500 between M6 J16 and A34 (AL1037)	57.8%	45
AL3494	A46 between A617 and A1 (AL3494)	59.1%	58
AL2158	A52 between A6464 and A6007 (AL2158)	59.4%	65
AL2177	A52 between A6005 and A52 (AL2177)	59.7%	66
AL2151B	A52 between A6007 and M1 J25 (AL2151B)	59.7%	67
AL2031	A500 between A50 and A52 (AL2031)	60.0%	74
AL2065	A50 between A518 and A518 (AL2065)	60.7%	94
AL2023	A500 between A527 and A527 (AL2023)	60.8%	99
AL3495	A46 between A1 and A617 (AL3495)	61.2%	106
AL1140	A500 between A527 and A53 (AL1140)	61.2%	107
AL1085B	A52 between M1 J25 and A6007 (AL1085B)	61.3%	111
AL2042	A50 between A50 and A500 (AL2042)	61.3%	114
AL1087	A52 between A6005 and A6096 (AL1087)	62.2%	134
AL2010	A46 between A6 and A607 (AL2010)	62.6%	144
AL3498	A46 between A1 and A1133 (AL3498)	62.8%	150
AL467	A46 between A50 and M1 J21A (AL467)	62.8%	153
AL1086	A52 between A6096 and A6005 (AL1086)	63.3%	177
AL2112	A38 between A52 and A5111 (AL2112)	63.5%	182
AL3298	A52 between A453 and A453 (AL3298)	63.5%	183
AL2037	A500 between A34 and A519 (AL2037)	63.6%	189
AL1132	A500 between A52 and A50 (AL1132)	63.6%	190
AL2146	A52 between A5111 and A6005 (AL2146)	63.8%	195
AL2043	A50 between A500 and A50 (AL2043)	64.0%	208
AL1020	A46 between A5630 and A50 (AL1020)	64.2%	218
AL1018	A46 between A50 and A5630 (AL1018)	64.2%	220
AL1138	A500 between A53 and A527 (AL1138)	64.4%	226
AL2034	A500 between A52 and A52 (AL2034)	64.4%	229
AL1143	A500 between A527 and A527 (AL1143)	65.4%	282
AL2134	A38 between A61 and M1 J28 (AL2134)	65.5%	291
AL2029	A500 between A52 and A52 (AL2029)	65.7%	298
AL2142	A52 between A6005 and A5111 (AL2142)	65.8%	307
AL2071	A50 between A515 and A515 (AL2071)	66.0%	315
AL1109	A50 between A5007 and A520 (AL1109)	66.0%	326
AL2124	A38 between A6 and A52 (AL2124)	66.0%	327
AL2103	A38 between A516 and A5111 (AL2103)	66.1%	333
AL3297	A52 between A453 and A453 (AL3297)	66.3%	349
AL1124	A500 between A519 and A34 (AL1124)	66.7%	375
AL3299	A52 between A453 and A60 (AL3299)	66.8%	380
AL3812	A500 between A53 and A5006 (AL3812)	66.9%	396
AL2111	A38 between A5111 and A52 (AL2111)	67.1%	403
AL1633	A52 between A6005 and A453 (AL1633)	67.1%	405
AL2116	A38 between A61 and A6 (AL2116)	67.1%	408

50 links with highest proportion of freight on the route

RoadLinkReference	RoadLinkDescription	Goods vehicles (>5.2m long) as a proportion of all traffic	Goods Vehicle Rank (out of 1977 road links - rank 1 has highest Goods traffic proportion)	Flow_Bin1 vehicles (<5.2m long) as a proportion of all traffic	Flow_Bin2 vehicles (5.2m to 6.6m long) as a proportion of all traffic	Flow_Bin3 vehicles (6.6m to 11.6m long) as a proportion of all traffic
AL2075	A50 between A511 and A516 (AL2075)	26%	265	74%	7%	7%
AL2976B	A50 between A518 and A522 (AL2976B)	25%	289	75%	5%	6%
AL2069B	A50 between A522 and A518 (AL2069B)	24%	323	76%	5%	6%
AL2070	A50 between A515 and A515 (AL2070)	24%	330	76%	6%	6%
AL2133	A38 between M1 J28 and A61 (AL2133)	22%	413	78%	8%	6%
AL3494	A46 between A617 and A1 (AL3494)	21%	461	79%	6%	6%
AL2017	A500 between A34 and M6 J16 (AL2017)	21%	475	79%	5%	6%
AL1116	A50 between A5035 and A5007 (AL1116)	20%	525	80%	9%	5%
AL2037	A500 between A34 and A519 (AL2037)	20%	541	80%	6%	5%
AL2121	A38 between A52 and A6 (AL2121)	20%	553	80%	5%	5%
AL3495	A46 between A1 and A617 (AL3495)	20%	590	80%	5%	6%
AL2132	A38 between A61 and A610 (AL2132)	20%	594	80%	6%	5%
AL1037	A500 between M6 J16 and A34 (AL1037)	19%	614	81%	5%	6%
AL1159	A38 between A610 and A61 (AL1159)	19%	633	81%	6%	5%
AL1124	A500 between A519 and A34 (AL1124)	19%	640	81%	5%	5%
AL2979	A38 between A6 and A61 (AL2979)	19%	664	81%	6%	5%
AL1153	A38 between A610 and A61 (AL1153)	19%	666	81%	6%	6%
AL1155	A38 between A61 and A610 (AL1155)	19%	678	81%	5%	6%
AL2134	A38 between A61 and M1 J28 (AL2134)	19%	685	81%	5%	6%
AL2103	A38 between A516 and A511 (AL2103)	18%	701	82%	5%	5%
AL2104	A38 between A5111 and A516 (AL2104)	18%	729	82%	5%	5%
AL3498	A46 between A1 and A1133 (AL3498)	18%	730	82%	7%	5%
AL3499	A46 between A1133 and A1 (AL3499)	18%	745	82%	7%	5%
AL1112	A50 between A521 and A520 (AL1112)	18%	748	82%	5%	5%
AL1301	A46 between A6006 and A606 (AL1301)	18%	758	82%	6%	5%
AL2124	A38 between A6 and A52 (AL2124)	18%	759	82%	5%	5%
AL3296	A453 between A50 and A52 (AL3296)	18%	773	82%	4%	5%
AL3295	A453 between A52 and A50 (AL3295)	18%	775	82%	4%	5%
AL2016	A46 between A6006 and A607 (AL2016)	18%	778	82%	6%	5%
AL1117	A50 between A5007 and A5035 (AL1117)	17%	794	83%	6%	5%
AL2031	A500 between A50 and A52 (AL2031)	17%	812	83%	5%	5%
AL2116	A38 between A61 and A6 (AL2116)	17%	816	83%	5%	5%
AL1302	A46 between A606 and A6006 (AL1302)	17%	847	83%	5%	5%
AL2013	A46 between A607 and A607 (AL2013)	16%	871	84%	6%	5%
AL3311A	A52 between A1 and A46 (AL3311A)	16%	872	84%	5%	5%
AL3312A	A52 between A46 and A1 (AL3312A)	16%	885	84%	5%	5%
AL1122	A50 between A50 and A5035 (AL1122)	16%	889	84%	6%	4%
AL2056	A50 between A520 and A521 (AL2056)	16%	891	84%	4%	4%
AL2043	A50 between A500 and A50 (AL2043)	16%	906	84%	5%	5%
AL2042	A50 between A50 and A500 (AL2042)	16%	907	84%	5%	4%
AL3441A	A46 between A1133 and A1434 (AL3441A)	16%	918	84%	5%	5%
AL466	A46 between M1 J21A and A50 (AL466)	16%	919	84%	5%	5%
AL1025	A46 between A6 and A5630 (AL1025)	16%	922	84%	6%	5%
AL2012	A46 between A607 and A607 (AL2012)	16%	924	84%	5%	5%
AL2028	A500 between A5006 and A53 (AL2028)	16%	927	84%	6%	4%
AL2034	A500 between A52 and A52 (AL2034)	16%	941	84%	5%	5%
AL3304	A52 between A6011 and A606 (AL3304)	15%	1004	85%	5%	5%
AL3812	A500 between A53 and A5006 (AL3812)	15%	1009	85%	5%	5%
AL1143	A500 between A527 and A527 (AL1143)	15%	1021	85%	4%	4%
AL1147	A500 between A527 and A34 (AL1147)	15%	1021	85%	4%	4%



Table 2.2 – 50 least reliable journey-time locations on the route 2012/13

RoadLinkReference	RoadLinkDescription	AADF vehicles per day	AADF National Rank (out of 2475 road links - rank 1 is the busiest)
LM512A	M42 between M42 J7 and M42 J7a (LM512A)	64,694	109
LM1052A	M6 Toll between M42 J8 and M6 Toll T1 (LM1052A)	63,958	117
LM518A	M42 between M42 J8 and M42 J9S (LM518A)	63,958	117
LM511A	M42 between M42 J7a and M42 J7 (LM511A)	50,125	361
LM1053A	M6 Toll between M6 Toll T1 and M42 J8 (LM1053A)	46,350	430
LM517	M42 between M42 J9 and M42 J8 (LM517)	46,350	430
LM1518	M42 between M42 J9S and M42 J9 (LM1518)	34,139	769
LM515	M42 between M42 J10 and M42 J9 (LM515)	33,794	786
LM516	M42 between M42 J9 and M42 J10 (LM516)	33,712	793
AL2698	A46 between A452 and A45 (AL2698)	30,279	885
AL2699	A46 between A45 and A452 (AL2699)	29,987	907
AL140B	A46 between A452 and A429 (AL140B)	28,852	956
AL137B	A46 between A429 and A452 (AL137B)	28,821	958
LM493	M42 between M42 J11 and M42 J10 (LM493)	28,298	982
LM494	M42 between M42 J10 and M42 J11 (LM494)	27,883	995
AL2701	A45 between A46 and A46 (AL2701)	27,499	1,013
LM920	M69 between M69 J3 and M69 J2 (LM920)	27,357	1,019
LM921	M69 between M69 J2 and M69 J3 (LM921)	27,063	1,029
AL1270	A38 between A5121 and A5132 (AL1270)	27,015	1,032
AL1661	A45 between A46 and A46 (AL1661)	26,973	1,037
AL2586	A42 between M42 J11 and A511 (AL2586)	26,684	1,050
LM917	M69 between M6 J2 and M69 J1 (LM917)	26,404	1,063
AL1012	A42 between A511 and M42 J11 (AL1012)	26,069	1,078
LM916	M69 between M69 J1 and M6 J2 (LM916)	25,984	1,082
AL1269	A38 between A5132 and A5121 (AL1269)	25,901	1,089
AL135	A46 between A4177 and A429 (AL135)	25,211	1,118
AL2738	A46 between A429 and A4177 (AL2738)	25,183	1,121
AL2983	A42 between A511 and A453 (AL2983)	24,726	1,147
AL1007	A38 between A5121 and A513 (AL1007)	24,584	1,155
AL2079	A38 between A50 and A5132 (AL2079)	24,387	1,164
AL994A	A38 between A5192 and A5206 (AL994A)	24,376	1,166
AL2078	A38 between A5132 and A50 (AL2078)	24,325	1,169
AL1016	A42 between A453 and A511 (AL1016)	24,079	1,194
LM919	M69 between M69 J1 and M69 J2 (LM919)	23,965	1,200
LM918	M69 between M69 J2 and M69 J1 (LM918)	23,603	1,225
AL996A	A38 between A5206 and A5192 (AL996A)	23,567	1,227
AL2740	A46 between M40 J15 and A4177 (AL2740)	23,532	1,235
AL1287	A42 between A453 NEbound and A453 NEbound (AL1287)	23,442	1,239
AL1001	A38 between A5127 and A513 (AL1001)	23,115	1,261
AL1000	A38 between A513 and A5127 (AL1000)	23,092	1,265
AL1286	A42 between A453 SWbound and A453 SWbound (AL1286)	22,971	1,270
AL2739	A46 between A4177 and M40 J15 (AL2739)	22,699	1,287
AL2713	A46 between A428 and M6 J2 (AL2713)	22,596	1,297
AL1004	A38 between A513 and A5121 (AL1004)	22,360	1,313
AL2710	A46 between M6 J2 and A428 (AL2710)	22,341	1,314
AL2706	A46 between A428 and A45 (AL2706)	21,951	1,340
AL2705	A46 between A45 and A428 (AL2705)	21,667	1,353
AL2671	A45 between A452 and M42 J6 (AL2671)	21,629	1,358
AL153B	A5 between A51 and M42 J10 (AL153B)	21,613	1,360
AL154B	A5 between M42 J10 and A51 (AL154B)	21,510	1,372

## A2.2 Road Safety

Table 1 Collision rates (per 100 million vehicle-miles) in the RBS

Route	Collision Rates											% Diff to 05-09 average
	05-09 Average Baseline	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	
A38*	23.3	30.6	27.1	30.6	25.7	25.5	25.2	20.1	20.3	18.9	18.8	-19%
A453	47.1	49.0	47.1	57.5	44.0	49.5	44.2	49.7	47.9	41.7	40.0	-15%
A46*	23.7	28.4	26.1	21.3	23.8	26.4	24.8	21.9	21.9	16.5	16.6	-30%
A50	17.3	18.5	18.4	18.9	16.1	19.0	19.3	15.4	16.9	17.0	15.9	-8%
A500	33.1	32.1	34.8	46.5	35.2	33.3	40.1	25.9	32.5	23.9	32.4	-2%
A5111	19.4	40.4	44.9	49.4	40.9	12.5	20.6	4.1	20.8	20.8	23.0	19%
A52	41.2	45.7	40.4	47.9	46.7	38.0	43.9	38.0	39.5	35.4	36.8	-11%
A6	40.1	31.0	56.6	41.3	33.2	50.5	61.4	27.0	31.2	24.3	36.5	-9%

\*Rate for entire road length, which extends beyond this RBS.

Table 2 KSI casualty rates (per 100 million vehicle-miles) in the RBS

Route	KSI Casualty Rates											% Diff to 05-09 average
	05-09 Average Baseline	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	
A38*	2.6	4.6	3.2	5.7	2.6	3.4	3.0	1.6	2.3	2.4	1.7	-35%
A453	10.0	11.4	6.7	17.7	4.4	11.8	9.1	17.0	8.0	7.0	7.1	-30%
A46*	4.7	7.5	7.5	4.5	5.1	5.3	4.8	4.5	3.8	2.2	3.5	-26%
A50	2.2	2.1	2.5	1.9	2.6	3.1	2.6	1.1	1.7	2.0	2.2	1%
A500	3.1	4.5	2.2	6.0	2.4	0.5	5.2	3.5	3.4	1.6	3.5	15%
A5111	2.5	9.0	0.0	11.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	-100%
A52	7.9	9.9	10.7	10.4	12.9	6.0	6.0	6.3	8.1	5.5	5.6	-29%
A6	7.9	4.4	0.0	7.3	8.3	0.0	15.3	11.6	3.9	0.0	0.0	-100%

\*Rate for entire road length, which extends beyond this RBS.

Table 3 Road user group analysis of casualties

User Group	A50 (excl. Stoke)		A50 (Stoke only)		A500	
	Casualties	Difference from base	Casualties	Difference from base	Casualties	Difference from base
Car occupants	73	-7%	60	18%	112	26%
Goods vehicle occupants	14	27%	1	-72%	7	-6%
Powered two wheeler riders & passengers	8	48%	4	0%	6	25%
Pedal cyclists	3	7%	2	100%	0	-100%
Pedestrians	0	-100%	6	150%	1	-44%
Child network users (Aged 1-15)	4	11%	4	18%	11	175%

Young network users (aged 16-19)	5	-36%	10	16%	9	-40%
Elderly network users (aged 70+)	3	-46%	5	213%	2	-23%

Baseline is an average of casualty figures from 2005-2009

Table 4 Cluster sites

Location	Type	Action/Comment
A38 Allestree-Findern	KSI	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A38 Birchwood Lane	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A38 Ripley	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A38 Somercoates	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A38 Watchorn	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A38/A516 Rough Heanor	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Carholme to Birchwood	KSI	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Cattlemarket	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Hill Holt Farm	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Hobby Horse Interchange	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Hykeham	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Margidunum	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Newark – Farndon	PJ/KSI	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Saxondale	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Swinderby	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Wanlip	KSI	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Widmerpool	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A46 Winthorpe	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A50 Castle Donnington	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A50 Merge/Diverge W of Meir Roundabout	U	2012/13 Study
A50/A500	U	Pinch Point Programme 2 scheme design starts April 2013
A50/A515 Sudbury	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A50/A518/A38 Hartshay	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A500 Merge/Diverge N of A50 Jct	U	Pinch Point Programme 2 scheme design starts April 2013
A500 Merge/Diverge N of Etruria Roundabout	U	2011/12 study – proposed Tranche 3 Pinch Point Programme
A52 Bardills Island	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Bingham	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Church Lane, Muston	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Clifton Bridge	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Dunkirk	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Nottingham Knight	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Sandiacre	KSI	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Stragglethorpe	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Thoresby Road	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Wheatcroft	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52 Wollaton Road	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A52/A453 Clifton Lane	KSI	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A6 Thurlston Island	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14

M1 Jct 25 (A52)	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
-----------------	----	-------------------------------------

Note: Problem Junction (PJ), KSI from Area 7. Unspecified (U) from Area 9.

Table 5 LNMS schemes 2012/13 onwards

Route	Project Title	PIC	KSI	Scheme Cost	Proposed completion	Comments
A52	A52 Bardills to Spondon KSI	127	28	£171,192	2014	3.8 PIC / year - 250 over assessment period
A52	A52 Dunkirk Roundabout	8	0	£68,907	2014	0.4 PIC /year 29
A46	A46 Carholme safety	9	0	£149,139	2013	1.4 PIC - 76
A46	A46 Skellingthorpe Roundabout safety	21	0	£90,254	2013	0.39 PIC -22
A38	A38 Queensway RSA4	9	0	£66,801	2013	0.4 PIC / year -22
A52	A52 Saxondale - Barrowby RSA4	6	3	£63,966	2013	0.52 PIC / year - 29
A52	A52 Sherwin Arms	29	4	£99,999	2016	1.51 PIC / year -33
A38	A38 Markeaton (pinch point scheme)	45	0	£2,755,884	2015	1.42 PIC - 77
A38	A38 Little Eaton(pinch point scheme)	52	3	£2,886,720	2015	2.72 PIC / year 148
A50	A50 (M1) WB Lockington (MP 72/8-72/3) Environmental	0	0	£54,504	2013	0
A50	A50 Route safety Improvements	91	8	£681,512	2014	Predicted annual collision saving of 9.0
A500	A500 Speed management	0	0	£250,000	2014	0
A46	A46/M5 junction 9 Ashchurch (pinch point scheme)	35	1	£1,651,753	2015	Predicted annual collision saving of 1.0
A50	A50/A500 Sidaway (pinch point scheme)	64	3	£787,935	2015	Predicted annual collision saving of 6.5

Table 6 Primary partners in road safety

	Business Drivers	Car Occupants	Child Passengers	Commercial Vehicles	Cyclists	Driving for Work	Motorcyclists	Older drivers	Pedestrians	Tire safety	Young drivers
Staffordshire Safer Roads Partnership					Y		Y	Y		Y	Y
Nottingham Road Safety Partnership					Y		Y		Y		
Derby and Derbyshire Road Safety Partnership	Y			Y	Y		Y				Y
Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership		Y					Y				Y

### A2.3 Asset Condition

This section is intentionally blank

### A2.4 Route Operation

This section is intentionally blank

## A2.5 Technology

Route	asset type	asset count	From Geog	To Geog	distance in km	assets per km
A50	Midas Out Stations	0	Due to referencing system on A roads Geog addresses are not available to calculate asset count per KM or road			
	Message Signs	0				
	Signals	0				
	Ramp Metering	0				
	Phones	37				
	CCTV	0				
A500	Midas Out Stations	0	Due to referencing system on A roads Geog addresses are not available to calculate asset count per KM or road			
	Message Signs	0				
	Signals	0				
	Ramp Metering	0				
	Phones	9				
	CCTV	0				
A46 (M1 Jct 21A MP 159/9 to A46/A57 Jct Saxilby Road)	Midas loop arrays	0	A46/M1 Jct 21A MP 159/9	A46/A57	56	0.00
	Message Signs	7				0.13
	Signals	5				0.09
	Ramp Metering	0				0.00
	CCTV	0				0.00
A50, A52, A453 (junction with A50 to junction with M1) the first asset on the A50 starts from the A50/A518 Jct Derby Road to the M1 Jct 24 MP 185/4.	Midas loop arrays	0	A50/A518	M1 Jct 24 MP 185/4.	115.7	0.00
	Message Signs	3				0.03
	Signals	6				0.05
	Ramp Metering	0				0.00
	CCTV	0				0.00
A38 (junction with A5 first asset starts from the A38/A5121 Jct Derby Road to A50)	Midas loop arrays	8	A38/A5	A50	21	0.38
	Message Signs	8				0.38
	Signals	0				0.00
	Ramp Metering	0				0.00
	CCTV	1				0.05

## A2.6 Vulnerable Road Users

This section is intentionally blank

## A2.7 Environment

This section is intentionally blank

## A3 Future considerations

### A3.2 Economic development and surrounding environment

The source for this information is referenced in the Bibliography within Part C.

LEP	Development Type	Scale by 2021	Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
<b>Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire</b>	Housing	78,830 dwellings	All, excluding A46, A500, eastern section of A52 and western sections of A50. Only northern stub of A38 is in Bolsover.
	Economic	176,509 jobs	
<b>Leicester and Leicestershire</b>	Housing	38,949 dwellings	Southern section of A46 borders 3, and passes through 1 district. Small sections of A50 and A453 in north of North West Leicestershire.
	Economic	42,678 jobs	
<b>Greater Birmingham and Solihull</b>	Housing	55,096 dwellings	Small section of A50 around Uttoxeter.
	Economic	154,819 jobs <sup>+</sup>	
<b>Greater Lincolnshire</b>	Housing	54,388 dwellings	Northern section of A46. Eastern stub of A50 near Grantham.
	Economic	69,656 jobs	
<b>Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire</b>	Housing	42,373 dwellings	A50 and A500. Significant sections of both roads only in Stoke-on-Trent.
	Economic	88,061 jobs	

Note: All economic growth figures are for the entire Core Strategy/Local Plan period.

<sup>+</sup> Figure excludes Solihull (figure unknown)

Location of Development	Development Type	Scale by 2015	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031	Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
<b>Nottinghamshire</b>					
<b>Ashfield</b>	Residential	825 units	9,127 units	1,301 units <sup>1</sup>	M1 J26-28
	Commercial	100ha+ over plan period			
<b>Gedling</b>	Residential	1,082 units	3,484 units	1,794 units	M1 J26-27, A46/A52, A46/A6097
	Commercial	10ha over plan period			
<b>Bassetlaw</b>	Residential	704 units	2,112 units	2,464 units	A1/A614/B6045 Blyth Junction, A1 Twyford Bridge
	Commercial	79.5-92.5ha over plan period			
<b>Broxtowe</b>	Residential	553 units	2,584 units	2,762 units	M1 J25-27
	Commercial	15ha over plan period			
<b>Erewash</b>	Residential	921 units	2,469 units	2,448 units	M1 J25
	Commercial	20ha (approx) over plan period			
<b>Nottingham City</b>	Residential	1,800 units approx	6,300 units approx	8,275 units approx	M1 J26, A52
	Commercial	12ha over plan period			
<b>Newark and Sherwood</b>	Residential	1,235 units	6,940 units	4,087 units	A46/A1
	Commercial	22.3ha			
<b>Mansfield</b>	Residential	1,150 units	3,900 units	3,000 units	M1 J28-29
	Commercial	74ha over plan period			
<b>Rushcliffe</b>	Residential	1625	4475	3300	A46, A453, A52
	Commercial	57,000sqm Office, 20ha industrial			
<b>Derbyshire</b>					
<b>Bolsover</b>	Residential	578 units	1,949 units	3,206 units	M1 J28-30
	Commercial	50.94ha over plan period			
<b>Chesterfield</b>	Residential	1,058 units	2,394 units	4,037 units	M1 J29, 29A, 30
	Commercial	79ha over plan period			
<b>Amber Valley</b>	Residential	955 units	2,387 units	1,638 units	A38 Coxbench Junction
	Commercial	75ha over plan period			
<b>Derbyshire Dales</b>	Residential	988 units <sup>14</sup> 16ha over	1,048 units	877 units	

	Commercial	plan period			
<b>High Peak</b>	Residential Commercial	4090 up to 2021 35ha+ over plan period			
<b>South Derbyshire</b>	Residential Commercial	962 units 69ha over plan period	2,476 units	1,428 units	A38/A52 Markeaton Junction, A38/A61 Little Eaton Roundabout, A38/A511, A50/A514, A50/A38
<b>Derby City</b>	Residential Commercial	1,063 units 185ha over plan period	5,585 units	2,759 units	A38A52 Markeaton Junction, A38/A61 Little Eaton Roundabout and A50
<b>North East Derbyshire</b>	Residential Commercial	524 units 50ha over plan period	1,572 units	2,620 units	
<b>Greater Birmingham and Solihull</b>					
<b>Birmingham</b>	Residential Commercial	20200 50ha	To 2021		
<b>Lichfield</b>	Residential Commercial	5655 by 2021 (av. 435pa) 9000 jobs over plan period			
<b>Solihull</b>	Residential Commercial	6500 by 2021 (av. 500pa) Unspec.			
<b>Cannock Chase</b>	Residential Commercial	4543 by 2021 86ha			
<b>Tamworth</b>	Residential Commercial	3175 to 2021 38ha	Over plan period		
<b>Redditch</b>	Residential Commercial	3358 av. To 2021 55ha	Over plan period		
<b>Bromsgrove</b>	Residential Commercial	3684 av. To 2021 28ha	Over plan period		
<b>Wyre Forest</b>	Residential Commercial	3000 av. to 2021 44ha	Over plan period		
<b>Leicestershire</b>					
<b>North West</b>	Residential	693 units	3,914 units	4,295 units	A42 J13, M1 J22



<b>Leicestershire</b>	Commercial	164ha over plan period			
<b>Harborough</b>	Residential	681 units	2,499 units	1,880 units	M1 J19
	Commercial	4,200 jobs over plan period			
<b>Hinckley and Bosworth</b>	Residential	776 units	3,023 units	2,648 units	A5 Longshoot and Dodwells Junction
	Commercial	40-45ha over plan period			
<b>Blaby</b>	Residential	1,027 units	3,069 units	3,011 units	M1 J21
	Commercial	68ha over plan period			
<b>Charnwood</b>	Residential	1,341 units	5,957 units	4,976 units	M1 J21-23, A6/A46, Hobby Horse Roundabout
	Commercial	13,400 jobs over plan period			
<b>Leicester City Council</b>	Residential	3,021 units	8,585 units	6,903 units	A46/A6
	Commercial	10ha+ over plan period			
<b>Melton</b>	Residential	1924	1086		A52 (small section). A46 borders west
	Commercial	1300 over plan period			
<b>Staffordshire</b>					
<b>East Staffordshire</b>	Residential	302 units	4,679 units	5,217 units	A50
	Commercial	30ha over plan period			
<b>Staffordshire Moorlands</b>	Residential	490 units	1,888 units	1,720 units	A50
	Commercial	18ha over plan period			
<b>Newcastle-under-Lyme</b>	Residential	601 units	1,752 units	1,293 units	A50/A500
	Commercial				
<b>Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent joint</b>	Residential	6257/13500 over plan period			A50/A500
	Commercial	112/220 over plan period			
<b>South Staffordshire</b>	Residential	3850	Over plan period		
	Commercial	14ha			
<b>Stafford</b>	Residential	11523	Over plan period		
	Commercial	25ha			
<b>Lincolnshire</b>					
<b>Central Lincolnshire (Lincoln, North Kesteven and West Lindsey)</b>	Residential	8933 to 16/17 210ha over	9652 to 21/22		A46

	Commercial	plan period			
<b>South Kesteven</b>	Residential	10509 to 20/21			A52 (end, around Grantham)
	Commercial	205ha over plan period			

### **A3.3 Network improvements and operational changes**

This section is intentionally blank

### **A3.4 Wider transport networks**

This section is intentionally blank

## **A4 Key challenges and opportunities**

### **A4.2 Timescales**

This section is intentionally blank

### **A4.3 Stakeholder priorities**

This section is intentionally blank

### **A4.4 Operational challenges and opportunities**

This section is intentionally blank

### **A4.5 Asset condition challenges and opportunities**

This section is intentionally blank

### **A4.6 Capacity challenges and opportunities**

This section is intentionally blank

### **A4.7 Safety challenges and opportunities**

This section is intentionally blank

### **A4.8 Social and environmental challenges and opportunities**

This section is intentionally blank

**Table A4.1 Schedule of challenges and opportunities**

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
<b>Network Operation</b>	A46 North of Leicester M1 J21	Variable Message Signs (VMS) need to be better utilised to reduce burden on nearby towns when there is an incident on the SRN.	No	X			✓	✓		
	A500	Congestion at peak times could be alleviated with better traffic information/VMS	Yes	X			✓		✓	
	Route-wide	No current data on incident duration, challenge to understanding requirements for technology and operational needs	Yes	X	X		X			
	A52	Performance issues with this section and limited technology to inform road users and understand real time traffic conditions	Yes	X	X		X			
<b>Asset Condition</b>	All	Need to ensure that the SRN is properly maintained. Pavement is reaching the end of its design life – there is a need to coordinate maintenance works with improvement schemes both in region and between regions.	Yes	X			✓			✓
	A52 Nottingham	Significant sections will reach end of its design life by 2021.	Yes		X		X			
	A38 Derby	Significant sections will reach end of its design life by 2021. Important route locally which also have performance issues	Yes		X		X			
	A46 near Lincoln	Significant sections will reach end of its design life by 2021.	Yes		X		X			

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	Route-wide	Aging drainage asset typically experienced on this route	Yes		X		X			
<b>Capacity</b>	Newark, A1 / A46 Newark Triangle	A total of 7-8,000 dwellings and 80-90ha of employment land across 3 sites in Newark will be provided in the Newark Urban Area. Land South of Newark has planning consent for 3,150 dwellings and 50ha of employment land and it is anticipated planning applications will be received for the other 2 sites in the near future. Current pinch points exist; 3 key roundabouts on A46 bypass E of Newark. No obvious solution: dualling would be near impossible due to geographic constraints.  Delay, people avoid Newark. Adverse impact on trade and business	Yes	X	X		✓			✓
	A453	Leicestershire County Council have concerns about the impacts the A453 upgrade will have on Kegworth (and possibly other areas in NW Leicestershire).	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A52, Nottingham	Less flexibility in East Nottingham to accommodate traffic/road users than West Nottingham as fewer road links. West is better served by the vision of trying to improve Transport (has the tram etc). East is the challenge, but there are opportunities to develop the East.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	Area-wide	Very few choices of route E-W and low total capacity. Some meeting points between E-W and N-S movements don't work efficiently.	Yes		X		✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	A46 Lincoln	An eastern bypass would relieve congestion in the area	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A50 East of Stoke	Unreliable journey times; delays on important trunk route.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A52 / A453	<p>Lots of development E of J25 on A52; new journeys will treat the A52 as local distributor rather than strategic link.</p> <p>OD data required – how do people actually use the network? It may technically be strategic, but locals will consider it a standard link.</p> <p>A453 has a mixed function. There needs to be a way to influence passenger choice to improve efficiency of the network – ie separating local and strategic journeys.</p> <p>People don't trust the strategic network, eg those who use it once a month will avoid a section with a bad reputation and increase pressures on local roads. The network overall has poor resilience and reliability.</p>	Yes	X			✓			✓
	All+	Employment is needed ASAP, so the SRN shouldn't constrain anticipated growth. Growth more regionally outside of this region needs to be accounted for as they will impact on this route.	Yes	X			✓		✓	

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	A38, Derby. Toyota – J28	Key N-S movement with major congestion. Grade separation is planned in addition to pinch point schemes. Will unlock a lot of development land.  Impacts on local land planning issues. Pattern of development around Derby will change significantly if problem junctions are solved.	No	X			✓		✓	
	A38 / M1 J28	Junction operating at capacity at peak times.	Yes	X			✓			✓*
	A50 / M1 J24	There is a lot of development planned for Leicester which will affect the A50. There is a freight terminal planned for the area. The bypass is part of these plans. The airport has minimal impact on junction 24 in terms of passengers having to use the junction.	Yes	X			✓		✓*	
	A52 Nottingham Enterprise Zone	The development of the Enterprise Zone (Boots) directly loads onto the A52 and modelling shows massive impacts on the A52 which would need addressing. This also results in access issues for the Nottingham Boots Enterprise Zone.	No		X		✓		✓	
	A52 / A453, SE Nottingham	Large residential development SE of Nottingham will contribute to even larger peak traffic levels. How will the existing network cope? Clifton Bridge (A453) to Bingham (A46) – number of junction capacity issues. Likely to worsen as considerable development proposed in the area.	Yes		X	X	✓			✓

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	A52 Nottingham between Priory Island and QMC	A52 between Priory Island and QMC is a major bottleneck; there is a constant increase in journey times due to the congestion and buses are getting slower and slower which in turn makes the bus less attractive as an alternative to the car. The congestion levels result in the bus experience ruined between the University & QMC. It doesn't feel right that there is no bus priority. There is no evidence of it getting better despite some extra lanes in places and traffic lights on the roundabout.	Yes	X			✓			✓
	A52 between Bingham and Gamston	There is a constant increase in journey times due to the congestion and buses are getting slower and slower which in turn makes the bus less attractive as an alternative to the car. Increased housing in the area will only add to the problem – increased demand will bring more problems and delay. The Radcliffe roundabout is a pinch point and slows everything down. Extra development is only going to make things worse too as increased housing will increase demand and car use.	Yes	X			✓			✓
	South Derby A50, M1 J24, A38 Derby junctions	Large amount of development is going to impact on these routes and junctions. This project has already been put forward to the HA but has been delayed.	Yes	X	X	X	✓			✓
	A38 / A50 junction	Background traffic growth, particularly with the introduction of Strategic Rail Freight Interchange – speculate 3,000 – 6,000 more jobs.	No			X	✓	✓		
	A500 / M6 junctions	Getting on and off at junctions, especially A500 with M6 is difficult, leading to a constraint on economic development around the A500	Yes	X			✓		✓	



	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	All	Existing employers such as Jaguar Land Rover and JCB will provide the most significant growth in jobs. The RBS needs to cover existing employers particularly those that use/rely on the strategic network for access to their supply chain.	Yes	X		X	✓		✓*	
	A50 Rocester	Rocester junction is not adequate for future growth. Concern that there is no strategy for A50.	Yes		X	X	✓			✓
	Hobby Horse Roundabout (A46)	This roundabout has capacity issues which will be exacerbated by development pressures. This could also affect the performance of the Leicester Outer Ring Road.	No	X			✓	✓		
<b>Safety</b>	A50 / M1 J24	There are issues at M1 junction 24 for cyclists - accidents have occurred.	Yes	X			✓		✓*	
	A38 Derby	Key issue for cyclists - more crossings are needed in the area. There is the start of a good cycle network around the airport, this needs adding to. There is the potential to link into Derby as well.	No	X			✓			✓
	A50	Accidents caused by short slip roads. This creates traffic delays/congestion as the incidents are managed by local police, not HA traffic officers	No				✓	✓		
	A38 to M1 junction 28	In the top 250 ranked cluster sites nationally	Yes				X			
	A46 Hobby Horse junction, Leicestershire	In the top 250 ranked cluster sites nationally	Yes				X			
	A52 near M1 junction 25	In the top 250 ranked cluster sites nationally	Yes				X			
	A50/A500, Stoke-on-Trent	In the top 250 ranked cluster sites nationally	Yes				X			

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
<b>Social and environment</b>	A46	<p>There are issues relating to water quality; most of the water issues/ flooding come from the carriageway, not from flooding of surrounding rural area. Issues with drainage and ditches on highways.</p> <p>Maintenance is very poor, with no treatment of water, not even primary treatment, leading to the quality and quantity of water coming off the carriageways being sub standard.</p>	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A500 / A50 Stoke	<p>The route carries circa 50% of through traffic.</p> <p>The route severs the Stoke conurbation, as there are limited crossing points and limited opportunities for sustainable modes</p>	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A453	Upgrade of A453 will hopefully reduce congestion on A52 and improve access/links. However, it delivers more traffic into sensitive areas.	Partial	X			✓		✓*	
	Nottingham	Air quality in Nottingham is poor due to traffic congestion. 2 Air quality management areas; one at Dunkirk close to A543/A52. Dualling of the A453 will bring further reduction in air quality.	Yes.		X		✓	✓		
	A50 South Derby	The introduction of more residential development will impact on the road capacity. Development planned next to SRN, will be highly impacted by noise.	No			X	✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	A52 Wollaton	Significant report on the latest Derby Road development suggested increasing the width of pavements for pedestrians and improving cycling in the congested areas around University and Wollaton Park. This raised with the HA the problem of balancing traffic flow with those who travel in other ways and help to reduce traffic flow yet the document was ignored by the HA – more bothered about cars, discourages different modes of travel.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A52 Dunkirk	There is a current noise issue around Dunkirk which needs addressing	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	All	Flood risk map shows flooding issues to be a lot less extensive than the Environment Agency have ascertained. Need to improve forward planning of maintenance to address environmental damage caused by flooding at bridges and culverts. Night maintenance has improved network performance. Need to consider Water Framework Directive when planning new roads. Possible need for new drainage technology	Yes	X	X	X	✓		✓	
	A46 North of Leicester	Temporary crossovers for maintenance have led to reduction in infiltration and therefore flood issues actually caused by 'maintaining' the network	No	X			✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
Other	All	Need alignment with Emerging Strategic Economic Plans (showing priorities for growth up to 2021) currently being produced by LEPs? In addition, Area Action Plans in Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Solihull and for the Stratford Road. These are based on the LDFs, update key areas of development. In East Staffordshire new developments plans are being added/approved in the near future.	No	X	X	X	✓	✓		
	Nottingham	Development should be planned to account for trip generation and access without requiring major new investment – use the current network more efficiently.	No	X			✓	✓		

## **Part B Stakeholder engagement**

## B1 Stakeholder workshops

### B1.1 Engagement events

Stakeholder engagement events for the route based strategies were undertaken on a geographical (LEP area) rather than route basis. Therefore, there were three stakeholder events held by the Agency relating to the North and East Midlands route;

- Derby and Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire (D2N2) and Greater Lincolnshire, on 16 September 2013, at Crowne Plaza, Nottingham
- Coventry and Warwickshire and Leicester and Leicestershire, on 24 September 2013 at Warwick University
- Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Stoke and Staffordshire and Black Country, on 20 September 2013, at Maple House, Birmingham

Stakeholder workshop	Relevant route based strategy	Section of route covered
D2N2 and Greater Lincolnshire	North East Midlands	A50 (Uttoxeter to M1) A52 (Derby to A1) A46 (Melton Mowbray to Lincoln) A6 A453 A38 (Derby to M1)
	South Midlands	A38 (Burton Upon Trent to A50)
	London to Scotland East	M1 (from between junction 24a and 25 to between 29a and 30)
	London to Leeds	A1 and A1(M) (from near Grantham to Harworth)
	South Pennines	A628 (Derbyshire) A180 A160 M180 M181
Leicester and Leicestershire and Coventry and Warwickshire	North and East Midlands	A46 (M1 to Melton Mowbray) A50 (M1 to junction 1)
	South Midlands	M69 M45 M42/A42 (junction 7 to M1) A5 (M1 to Mancetter) A45 A46 (from near Stratford upon Avon to Coventry)

	London to Scotland East	M1 (junction 19 to between junction 24a and 25)
	London to Scotland West	M40 (near to Banbury to Birmingham Box)
	Felixstowe to Midlands	M6 (from M1 to Birmingham Box)
Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Stoke and Staffordshire and Black Country	North and East Midlands	A500 A50 (M6 to Uttoxeter)
	South Midlands	A5 (from A449 to Mancetter) A449 A38 (A5 to A50)
	London to Scotland West	M40 Birmingham Box M6 (Birmingham Box to junction 16)
	Midlands to Wales and Gloucestershire	M54

## B2.1 Stakeholder event invitees

### D2N2 and Greater Lincolnshire

Stakeholder group	Invitees	Organisation
<b>LEP</b>	David Ralph	D2N2 LEP
	Ursula Lidbetter	Greater Lincolnshire LEP
	John Whyld	Boots enterprise zone
<b>Local Government</b>	David Pick	Nottinghamshire County Council
	David Jones	Nottinghamshire City Council
	Geoff Blisset	Derbyshire County Council
	Steve Hunt	Nottingham City Council
	Peter Goode	Nottinghamshire County Council
	Nigel Brien	Derby City Council
	Andrew Pritchard	East Midlands Councils

	Warren Peppard	Lincolnshire County Council
<b>Local authorities</b>	Mark Sturgess	West Lindsey District Council
	John Latham	Lincoln City Council
	Semantha Neal	East Lindsey District Council
	Andrew McDonough	North Kesteven District Council
	Steve Lumb	Boston Borough Council
	Ian Yates	South Kesteven District Council
	Michael Braithwaite	Central Lincolnshire Joint Planning Unit
		South Holland
	Jason Longhurst	North Lincolnshire District council
	Marcus Asquith	North East Lincolnshire
	Andrew Gibbard	Derby City Council
	Nicola Sworowski	South Derbyshire
	Steve Birkinshaw	Erewash Borough Council
	Derek Stafford	Amber Valley Borough Council
	James Arnold	North East Derbyshire District Council
	Richard Bryant	Chesterfield Borough Council
	David Bishop	Nottingham City Council
	David Rowen	Bassetlaw District Council
	Colin Walker	Newark and Sherwood District Council
	Martyn Saxton	Mansfield District Council
Peter Baguley	Gedling Borough Council	
Steve Dance	Broxtowe Borough Council	
Julie Clayton	Ashfield Borough Council	
Susan Harley	Rushcliffe Borough Council	



	James Arnold	Bolsover District Council
	Dai Lerner	High Peak Borough Council
	Paul Wilson	Derbyshire Dales District Council
<b>Strategic Traffic generators</b>	Rachel Wilson	Lincolnshire Strategic Transport Board
	Martin Szakal	Grimsby & Immingham Port
	Ms Colleen Hempson	East Midlands Airport
<b>Passenger Transport groups</b>	David Astill	Nottingham City Transport
	Chris Deas	Nottingham Express Transit
	Rik Thomas	RAC Foundation
	Keith Shayshutt	Trent and Barton
<b>Local Freight Groups</b>	Frank Taylor	Road Haulage Association - Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire
	Sally Gilson	FTA - Leicestershire
<b>Local Chamber of Commerce</b>	George Cowcher	Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce
	Simon Beardsley	Lincolnshire Chamber of Commerce
<b>Emergency Services</b>	Heidi Duffy	Nottinghamshire Police
	Matt Pickard	Derby and Derbyshire Road Safety Partnership
	Chief Superintendent Russ Hardy	Lincolnshire Police
<b>Countryside/Environmental Groups</b>	Nigel Lee	Nottingham Friends of the Earth
	Dorothy Skrytek	Derby Friends of the Earth
	John Lomas	Peak District National Park Authority
	Jane Scott, RABO East Midlands	British Horse Society
<b>Vulnerable Road User Groups</b>	Bettina Lange	EMTAR
	Ian Alexander	CTC Derby and Burton
	Tim Newbery	CTC Lincolnshire
	Hugh McClintock	Pedals

	Terry Scott	Nottinghamshire branch of the Cyclists' Touring Club
	Matt Easter	Sustrans East Midlands
<b>Motorway Service Areas</b>	Matthew Stringfellow	Trowell (M1)
	Sarah Pilling	Tibshelf (M1)
<b>Other government departments</b>	Joshua Fox	Department for Transport
	Fiona Keates	Environment Agency
	Maria Hallam	Department for Business Innovation and Skills

## Coventry and Warwickshire and Leicester and Leicestershire

<b>Stakeholder group</b>	<b>Invitees</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>LEP</b>	Andy Rose	Leicester & Leicestershire LEP
	Alan Cockburn	Coventry & Warwickshire LEP
<b>Local Authorities</b>	Adrian Hart	Warwickshire County Council
	Mike Waters	Coventry City Council
	Robert Weeks	Stratford on Avon District Council
	Dorothy Barratt	North Warwickshire Borough Council
	Karen McCulloch	Rugby Borough Council
	Dave Barber	Warwick District Council
	Ashley Baldwin	Nuneaton and Bedworth Council
	Sarah Hines	Nuneaton and Bedworth Council
	Paul Sheard	Leicester County Council
	Bill Cullen	Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council/A5 Forum
	Rob Back	Blaby District Council
	Beverley Jolly	Harborough District Council
	Mark Wills	Leicester City Council
Christine Marshall	Melton Borough Council	

	David Hughes	North West Leicestershire
	Ben Wilson	Oadby and Wigston Borough Council
	Richard Bennett	Charnwood Borough Council
	Alan Franks	Nuneaton and Bedworth Council
<b>Passenger Transport groups</b>	Kenneth Treadaway	RAC Foundation
	Chris Hodder	The British Motorcyclist Federation
	Marie-Pilar Machancoses	Centro Area Manager Coventry and Solihull
<b>Local Freight Groups</b>	Sally Gilson LLTG	Freight Transport Association
	Ann Morris	Road Haulage Association - Warwickshire
<b>Strategic traffic generators</b>	Trevor Barnsley	Coventry Airport
	Colleen Hempson	East Midlands Airport
	Adrian Young	Fosse Park
	Brian Reid	Mira Technology
	Chris Lewis	Prologis
<b>Local Chamber of Commerce</b>	Angela Tellyn	Coventry & Warwickshire Chamber of Commerce
	Martin Traynor	Leicestershire Chamber of Commerce
	John Merison	North West Leicestershire Chamber of Commerce
<b>Emergency Services</b>	Phil Moore	Warwickshire and West Mercia Police Safer Partnership Group
	Adrian Sharp	West Midlands Fire Service
	Andy Hickmott	Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service
	Graham Compton	Leicestershire Police Headquarters
<b>Countryside/Environmental Groups</b>	Tim Atkinson	Coventry Friends of the Earth
	Terry Kirby	FOE
	John Fenlon	South Warwickshire Environmental Association
	Gerard Kells	Warks CPRE
	Jane Scott, RABO East Midlands	British Horse Society
<b>Vulnerable Road User Groups</b>	George Riches	Coventry Cyclists' Touring Club

	Edward Healey	Sustrans West Midlands
<b>Motorway Service Areas</b>	David Blackmore	Corley (M6)
	Saied Faghiri	Warwick (M40)
<b>Other government departments</b>	Ian Smith	Department for Business Innovation and Skills
	Joshua Fox	Department for Transport
	Fiona Keates	Environment Agency

## Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Stoke and Staffordshire and Black Country

<b>Stakeholder group</b>	<b>Invitees</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>LEP</b>	Andy Street	Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP
	Craig Jordan	GBSLEP Planning/Lichfield DC
	Stewart Towe	Black Country LEP
	Peter Davenport	LEP Partnership Manager
	Ron Dougan	Stoke on Trent & Staffordshire LEP
<b>Local Authorities</b>	Stephen Hughes	Birmingham City Council
	Ann Osola	Birmingham City Council
	Stephen Brown	Cannock Chase District Council
	Andy O'Brien	East Staffordshire Borough Council
	Diane Tilley	Lichfield District Council
	Mark Rogers	Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
	Matthew Bowers	Tamworth Borough Council
	Laura Shoaf	Black Country Director of Transport
	Mark Corbins	Walsall Council
	Richard Banner	Walsall Council
	Paul Sheehan	Walsall Council
	Jan Britton	Sandwell Council
	Simon Warren	Wolverhampton City Council

	John Polychronakis	Dudley Metropolitan Council
	Jonathan Dale	LTB Vice Chair
	John Sellgren	Newcastle under Lyme - Chief Executive
	Michael Dunphy	Bromsgrove District Council
	Steve Winterflood	South Staffordshire Council
	Nick Bell	Staffordshire County Council
	John van de Laarschot	Stoke on Trent City Council
	Peter Price	Stoke on Trent City Council
<b>Passenger Transport groups</b>	Rik Thomas	RAC Foundation
	Maria-Pilar Machancoses	Centro Area Manager Coventry and Solihull
<b>Local Freight Groups</b>	Sally Gilson, Policy Manager – Midlands FTA	Freight Transport Association
	Nick Payne, Midlands and West	Road Haulage Association
<b>Local Chamber of Commerce</b>	Jerry Blackett	Birmingham Chamber of Commerce
	Chris Plant	Chase Chamber of Commerce
	Marilyn Castree	Lichfield and Tamworth Chamber of Commerce
	Margaret Corneby	Black Country Chamber
	Sara Williams / Jane Gratton ACEO	North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry
	Chris Plant	Solihull Chamber of Commerce
	Colin Bell	GVA Planning, Development and Regeneration
<b>Emergency services</b>	Inspector Derek Roberts	Central Motorway Police Group
<b>Countryside/Environmental Groups</b>	Gerard Kells	CPRE
	Adam McCusker	Foe

	Edward Healey	Sustrans
	Jane Scott, RABO East Midlands	British Horse Society
	Kevin Chapman	West Midlands Campaign for Better Transport
<b>Strategic transport groups</b>	Michelle Thurgood	Birmingham Airport
	Janis Homer	NEC Group
	James Hodson	Director Midlands Expressway Limited
	Ian Chambers	Network Rail
<b>Other government departments</b>	Joshua Fox	Department for Transport
	Fiona Keates	Environment Agency
	Andrea Whitworth	Department for Business Innovation and Skill

### B3.1 Stakeholder event attendees

#### D2N2 and Greater Lincolnshire

Break out group	Delegates name	Initials	Organisation
Blue	Jim Seymour	JS	D2N2 LEP
Blue	Steve Hunt	SH	Nottingham City Council
Blue	Andrew Mutter	AM	Newark and Sherwood District Council
Blue	Bettina Lange	BL	East Midlands Transport Activists Roundtable (EMTAR)
Blue	Kam Khokhar	KK	Highways Agency
Blue	Dan Bent		Facilitator
Blue	Jonny Browning		Note-taker
Green	Peter Goode	PG	Nottinghamshire County Council
Green	Jamie Douglas	JD	Representing Andrew Bingham MP
Green	Richard Groves	RG	South Derbyshire
Green	David Hoskins	DH	Environment Agency
Green	Toni Rios	TR	Highways Agency
Green	Graham Powell		Facilitator
Green	Tom McNamara		Note-taker
Orange	David Jones	DJ	Nottinghamshire County Council
Orange	Keith Shayshutt	KS	Trent and Barton
Orange	Joelle Davis	JD	Bassetlaw District Council
Orange	Peter Briggs	PB	Pedal
Orange	Maria Hallam	MH	BIS
Orange	Cyril Day	CD	Highways Agency

Orange	Sravani Vuppala		Facilitator
Orange	Mia-Jade Thornton		Note-taker
Red	Richard Wills	RAW	Greater Lincolnshire LEP
Red	Nigel Lee	NL	Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Red	David Pick	DP	Nottinghamshire County Council
Red	Julie Clayton	JC	Ashfield District Council
Red	Joshua Fox	JF	DfT
Red	Ian Bates	IB	Nottingham Chamber of Commerce
Red	Adrian Slack	AS	Highways Agency
Red	Graham Fry		Facilitator
Red	Abigail Finch		Note-taker
Yellow	Andrew Pritchard	AP	East Midlands Councils
Yellow	Geoff Blisset	GB	Derbyshire County Council
Yellow	Stephen Bray	SB	Gedling Borough Council
Yellow	James Lowe	JL	Sustrans
Yellow	Scott Nicholas	SM	Chesterfield Borough Council
Yellow	Rik Thomas	RT	RAC foundation
Yellow	Dave Lynch	DL	Highways Agency
Yellow	Tim McCann		Facilitator
Yellow	Amie Coleman		Note-taker

## Coventry and Warwickshire and Leicester and Leicestershire

Break out group	Delegates name	Initials	Organisation
Blue	Mike Waters	MW	Coventry City Council
Blue	Ken Treadaway	KT	RAC foundation
Blue	Chris Slack	CS	Vectos - on behalf of Fosse Park Shopping Centre
Blue	Bill Cullen	BC	A5 Partnership and Hinckley and Bosworth District Council
Blue	Fiona Keates	FK	Environment Agency
Blue	Sarah Garland	SG	Highways Agency
Blue	Jenny Oakes		Facilitator
Blue	Abigail Finch		Note-taker
Green	Paul Sheard	PS	Leicestershire County Council
Green	Chris Lewis	CL	Prologis
Green	Ross Middleton	RM	Rugby Borough Council
Green	Vicky Allen	VA	British Horse Society
Green	Paul Tebbitt	PT	Charnwood Borough Council
Green	Ian Smith	IS	BIS
Green	Dave Lynch	DL	Highways Agency
Green	Graham Fry		Facilitator
Green	Darren Abberley		Note-taker
Orange	Adrian Hart	AH	Warwickshire County Council
Orange	Martyn Traynor	MT	Leicestershire Chamber of Commerce
Orange	Graham Compton	GC	Leicestershire Police

Orange	Terry Kirby	TK	Friends of the Earth
Orange	Tim Andrews	TA	Environment Agency
Orange	James Sharma	JS	MIRA Ltd
Orange	Neil Hansen	NH	Highways Agency
Red	Paul Harris	PH	Stratford-upon-Avon District Council
Red	Rhys Williams	RW	Road Haulage Association
Red	Sarah Hines	SH	Nuneaton and Bedworth Council
Red	George Riches	GR	Coventry CTC
Red	Adrian Johnson	AJ	Highways Agency
Red	Phil Moore	PM	Warwickshire and West Midlands Police
Red	Graham Stevenson		Facilitator
Red	Amie Coleman		Note-taker

## Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Stoke and Staffordshire and Black Country

Break out group	Delegates name	Initials	Organisation
Orange	Richard Banner	RB	Black Country representative
Orange	Philip Somerfield	PS	East Staffordshire Borough Council
Orange	Maria-Pilar Machancoses	MPM	Centro
Orange	James Hodson	JH	Midlands Expressway Ltd
Orange	Paul Leighton	PL	Walsall Council
Orange	Ormindar Bharj	OB	Highways Agency
Orange	Peter Hardy		Facilitator
Orange	Andrew Rattan		Note-taker
Blue	Ann Osola	AO	Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP and Birmingham City Council
Blue	Guy Benson	GB	Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council
Blue	Sally Gilson	SG	Freight Transport Association
Blue	Bhanu Dhir	BD	Black Country Chamber of Commerce
Blue	Andrea Whitworth	AW	BIS
Blue	Patrick Walker	PW	South Staffordshire Council
Blue	Adrian Slack	AS	Highways Agency
Blue	Alan Bain		Facilitator
Blue	Jan Gondzio		Note-taker
Red	Peter Davenport	PD	Staff & Stoke LEP
Red	Austin Knott	AK	Stoke-on-trent City Council
Red	Gerard Kells	GK	Campaign for Rural England
Red	Gary Masters	GM	NEC group
Red	Lisa Maric	LM	Highways Agency
Red	Elizabeth Boden	EB	Lichfield District Council
Red	Danny Lamb		Facilitator
Red	Oliver McLaughlin		Note-taker



---

Yellow	Mark Corbin	MC	Walsall Council
Yellow	Adam McCusker	AMC	Friends of the Earth
Yellow	Ann Morris	AM	Road Haulage Association
Yellow	Will Spencer	WS	Staffordshire County Council
Yellow	Rosemary Williams	RW	Bromsgrove District Council
Yellow	Andy Butterfield	AB	Highways Agency
Yellow	Sarah Loynes		Facilitator
Yellow	Derek Jones		Note-taker
Green	John Morgan	JM	Cannock Chase District Council
Green	Amrik Manku	AM	Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
Green	Laura Shoaf	LS	Black Country Director of Transport
Green	Colin Bell	CB	GVA
Green	Will Heyes	WH	Birmingham Airport
Green	Fiona Keates	FK	Environment Agency
Green	Matt Taylor	MT	Highways Agency
Green	Lee White		Facilitator
Green	Anthony Hogan		Note-taker

**B4.1 Note-taker's sheets from the engagement events**

Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>D2N2 Greater Lincolnshire</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>16/9/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Dan Bent</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Jonny Browning</b>		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
Newark	There are three major growth points, highlighted in the core strategy to the south of Newark. Planning consents have been given for significant development for the next 15+ years, 8-9,000 dwellings, 40ha of employment land. The largest site ('Land south of Newark'? – JB), 2 <sup>nd</sup> site planning application expected by end of the year. Opportunity exists for investment and contribution to infrastructure. Current pinch points exist; 3 key roundabouts on A46 bypass E of Newark. No obvious solution: duelling would be near impossible due to geographic constraints. Flow on A1 Whinthorpe junction very high, expensive solution proposed in past, but seems to have gone quiet. Junction needs to be looked at for Newark to function properly.  Farndon/Cattlemarket/Brownhills (A1) roundabouts all inter-dependent, need to be looked at together.	Capacity / Operational		>		Developments shown on 'Anticipated Growth' D2N2 NE map. Congestion / delay visible around Newark, excl A46 (no data available).		AM	4	
General	The location of other key growth areas / employment sites / growth points needs to be identified and captured. Assessment needs to be made on how quickly they can be brought on stream. Employment is needed ASAP. Need to also take into account growth areas outside of this workshop, as they impact on the region, eg Sheffield, Birmingham.  Strong links between Chesterfield and Sheffield constrained by M1	N/A	>			Key sites identified on 'Anticipated Growth' maps		SH, AM	5  3	

M1 Jct 26-25 (S-bound)	Stretch is at a standstill during AM peak, affects the A52 into Nottingham too. J26 (A610) has huge congestion issues as well. 4 lanes into 3 causes bottleneck.  M1 J23a-J25 pipeline scheme, ATM will be key also.	Capacity / Operational	>			Can be seen on congestion maps – delay (mins)		AM: evidence base for A52 congestion on Newark&Sherwood DC website, can provide if required	KK	1
General	Evidence of ‘Peak Car’ traffic has been declining since before the recession. Need to challenge assumption of link between economic development and traffic. DfT predictions out of date: Assume 40% growth over 20 years.  Model assumptions do account for some local variations and local adjustments. Older datasets show unrealistic growth	N/A	>						BL	3
Impacts of public transport	Nottingham tram lines 2+3 will have an impact on the trunk road network.  Plans for improvement to Lincoln-Newark-Nottingham-Derby rail line will reduce road demand for E-W trips. Scheduled improvements to signalling will improve line performance and connectivity.  Further connectivity to Birmingham will improve the situation also.	Capacity / Operational	>						BL	2
Access to Derby / Nottingham	Bulk of jobs / residents are in Derby / Nottingham, therefore is a key issue. Better planning required to aid business. Key issue is reliability and resilience: Can plan and accept reliable congestion, but unexpected / variable issues will discourage investment in area. Can no longer depend on the strategic network. Poor planning of greater issues. The Derby / Nottingham agglomeration should have better connectivity to allow settlements to feed off each other: can't currently interact to extent they should. Versatility in accessibility will help spread the congestion thinner, instead of concentrating at existing pinch points.  Upgrade of A453 will hopefully reduce congestion on A52 and improve access/links. However, it delivers more traffic into sensitive areas. Balance needed. Furthermore, more traffic just channelled onto Nottingham ring road, which already has issues.	Operational	>			Environment map.			JS	4
									SH	
									BL	

<p>East-West links very poor</p>	<p>Much of Nottingham-Leicester traffic now using A46 due to improvements. Added pressure on Eastern section of A52. Highlights lack of E-W options.</p> <p>EW more important locally, but neglected. Improvements will reduce local traffic on M1, thus reducing issues there and re-affirming it's role as a strategic, not local link.</p> <p>Conflict between strategic and local trips, eg manufacturing. Goods to market and supply chain Nottingham / Derby important, but distribution is nationwide. New trips for Curries national distribution based near Newark has lead to increased movements from Grimsby ports and E-W movements whereas other distributors are based closer to M1 and require better N-S links.</p> <p>Piecemeal improvements can add challenges – eg Mansfield bypass was improved so more E-W traffic encouraged along it, but A617 towards Newark is dreadful, and worsening due to improvements elsewhere.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Y</p>															<p>AM</p> <p>BL</p> <p>AM</p> <p>AM</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Role of strategic network</p>	<p>Lots of development E of J25 on A52; new journeys will treat the A52 as local distributor rather than strategic link.</p> <p>OD data required – how do people actually use the network? It may technically be strategic, but locals will consider it a standard link.</p> <p>A453 – what is it's function? Is there a way to influence passenger choice to improve efficiency of network?</p> <p>People don't trust the strategic network, eg those who use it once a month will avoid a section with a bad reputation and increase pressures on local roads. The network overall has poor resilience and reliability.</p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>Y</p>								<p>3 Cities (Nottingham / Derby / Leicester) + Eastern Delivery of Sustainable Transport System reports show most movements are self-contained not around wider corridors. M1 multi-modal study showed most trips were local - BL</p>	<p>KK</p> <p>BL</p> <p>JS</p>	<p>11</p>						
<p>Physical Geography</p>	<p>Difficult to provide new links due to geography, eg major rivers such as Trent. Anything radical will require new bridges.</p> <p>Development should be planned to account for trip generation and access without requiring major new investment – use the current network more efficiently.</p>	<p>Environment</p>	<p>Y</p>								<p>EM councils looking at economic data beyond land use, with Nottingham Trent Business School – Will Rossiter</p>	<p>AM</p> <p>BL</p>	<p>0</p>						
<p>Derby – A38 to Toyota, J28</p>	<p>Key N-S movement with major congestion. Grade separation is planned in addition to pinch point schemes. Will unlock a lot of development land.</p> <p>Impacts on local land planning issues. Pattern of development around Derby will change significantly if problem junctions are solved.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Y</p>									<p>KK</p> <p>JS</p>	<p>7</p>						

<p>Traffic management</p>	<p>Better instant management of incidents – not closing the whole road or majority of lanes so readily, and better setup and knowledge of diversion routes. Improve communication of delays so alternate arrangements can be made further in advance.</p> <p>Improved diversions of non-trunk roads will avoid problems backing up onto strategic network, eg A617 closures due to flooding. Similar system to motorway diversion signs required.</p> <p>Not enough VMS on A1 – too much focus on M1. Diversions could be more flexible, and could tell people further away, or before their journey commences.</p>	<p>Operational / Safety</p>	<p>&gt;</p>						<p>JS / AM</p> <p>AM</p> <p>KK</p>	<p>4</p>
---------------------------	---	-----------------------------	-------------	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------------	----------

N.B. One dot placed on the network itself; on A46 between Newark and Lincoln.

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>D2N2 Greater Lincolnshire</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>16/9/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Dan Bent</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Jonny Browning</b>		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.	
<b>Network Management:</b> Smarter management, route information, incident information, better use of current network. Resilience planning – solve issues in distribution of traffic when something goes wrong. Mainly M1/A1 and related diversion routes.	Operational	SH – Is a quick win, relying on very little investment. If people are informed, better decisions can be made. AM – Lack of strategic route resilience has a huge impact on local roads, both during the incident, and increased flows on local roads as the user cannot ‘trust’ the reliability of the strategic network. AM – Improve relationship/planning with public transport. For example, there is no point in widening a road just as a new public transport link/scheme is coming online. JS – Clarify/influence role of the M1. Should be used as a national link instead of for local journeys. AM – Nottingham/Derby have regular, predictable congestion, whereas around Newark after an incident on M1/A1 there are huge problems which aren’t predictable. A real cost can be attributed to congestion, not just irritation		More VSM, for example on A1.  Possibilities for using big data: AM has contact with O2, who own datasets of anonymous travel patterns from Wi-Fi/Bluetooth user data. Distribution companies will have real freight routes
<b>Employment Sites / Growth Points / Economic Growth:</b> How to optimise employment quickly, and what infrastructure is required. How to assess issues. Area wide.	N/A	AM - Use forward projection instead of backwards to identify issues before they cripple the network. SH – How to assess priorities; use business case approach instead to identify investment opportunities and to support areas. BL – Reducing need to travel by encouraging development where jobs are needed/skills are located.		

<p><b>Network Development:</b> Improving the network and connectivity at a regional level to improve performance</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>SH, BL, AM – E-W corridor needs improving to help support area development and reduce strain on N-S, nationally important links.</p> <p>JS – A52/M1 cross is focal point for the area, key for access into Nottingham and Derby, E-W links, HS2, Airport.</p> <p>AM – Very poor links to Manchester / Birmingham – E-W links need to extend beyond D2N2 boundaries.</p> <p>AM – A15 very poor quality route, lots of freight – difficult to overtake</p>	<p>Links with network management</p>	
<p><b>Better Dialogue:</b> Communicate better with developers, other organisations, councils to ensure everyone knows what is going on, more efficient plans can be made.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>AM - Level crossing in Newark regularly creates queues that back up onto the strategic network. A solution can be found when working alongside Network Rail to suit both parties.</p> <p>All – communication with local authorities and developers to integrate new development with improved infrastructure, to best use the existing network, and ensure problems are solved before they arise and cripple the network.</p>	<p>Links with network management</p>	

Breakout Session 1: What are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name:</b>	<b>Route Based Strategies Nottingham Workshop: Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire and Greater Lincolnshire.</b>	<b>Date: 16/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group:</b> <b>GREEN</b>	<b>Peter Goode (PG) – Notts County Council</b> <b>Jamie Douglas (JD) – Andrew Bingham MP’s Office</b> <b>Richard Groves (RG) – South Derbyshire District Council</b> <b>David Hoskins (DH) – Environment Agency</b> <b>Toni Rios – Highways Agency</b>
<b>Group Facilitator:</b> <b>Graham Powell</b>	<b>Note-taker:</b> <b>Tom McNamara</b>			

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
<b>A1</b>	Incident duration. Feedback from councillors. Perception is that incidents on the A1 seem to have more impact than on M1 and elsewhere.  There is a need to develop evidence for the impact and duration of incidents - full closure/one lane closure etc.	Operational/Safety /Capacity	x			No	Feedback from Councillors? A1+ incident logs	PG	1	
<b>A1</b>	Police periodically close the A1 and do not tell anyone, so these closures are not reflected in HA evidence.	Operational	x			No	A1+ incident logs	PG		
<b>A1</b>	When trunk roads are affected by incidents, they often have to fully close, pushing traffic elsewhere.	Capacity/Operational	x			No	A1+ incident logs	JD	1	
<b>Overall</b>	Total Casualties map does not show severity.	Safety	x			No	Accident stats and stats 19 data	PG		
<b>A6 Spur</b>	Surprised A6 Spur is a hotspot for casualties given that it is a new road.	Safety	x			Yes		RG	1	



<b>A52</b>	Lots of accidents, but at slower speeds. Maybe they are less severe – Feels like this should be reflected, but isn't with the current absolute accident figures.	Safety/Operational	x			No	Accident stats and stats 19 data		PG	
<b>M1 (Junc 27-29)</b>	Perception that many accidents on here are weather related (snow/rain/fog). At present the maps are not addressing the causes of the accidents.	Safety	x			No	Accident stats and stats 19 data		DH	3
<b>Overall</b>	Maybe accident figures are skewed as in poor weather conditions some roads are closed, pushing traffic/accidents onto other roads.	Safety / Operational	x			No	A1+ Closure/Incident data?		JD	
<b>M1, South of the area covered by the workshop</b>	Heavy traffic on the network leading into the D2N2 area.	Capacity	x			No	Will be shown on adjacent area maps.		RG	2
<b>A52 SE of Nottingham</b>	Large residential development will contribute to even larger peak traffic levels. How will the existing network cope?	Capacity		x	x	Yes			PG	1
<b>A52 SE of Nottingham</b>	Less flexibility in East Nottingham to accommodate traffic/road users than West Nottingham as fewer road links. West is better served by the vision of trying to improve Transport (has the tram etc). EAST is the CHALLENGE, but there are opportunities to develop the East.	Operational / Capacity	x	x	x	Yes			PG	1
<b>M62 and A628</b>	2 trans-Pennine routes. M62 – already RED (delays map) A628 – Completely unsuitable for the traffic (Freight/HGVs) – it is not suitable to be a trunk road and traffic levels are only getting higher on here.	Capacity / Operational / Safety / Environment	x			Yes			JD	6

<p><b>South Derby A50 M1 J24 A38 Derby Juncts.</b></p>	<p>Large amount of development is going to impact on these routes and junctions</p>	<p>Capacity</p>		<p>×</p>	<p>×</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>RG</p>	<p>7</p>
<p><b>Overall</b></p>	<p>Is 3 hour peak time, averaged by direction, reasonable and truly representative?  Suggest HA show information for narrower peak (i.e. 8-9 and 5-6) and by direction. Also, the peak hr delays, not just speeds.  DELAY and to how many vehicles is the KEY, not speed</p>	<p>Capacity/Operational</p>	<p>×</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>Review journey time data and show it more relevantly.</p>	<p>JD / PG</p>	
<p><b>A38/A50 Junc</b></p>	<p>Background traffic growth, particularly with the introduction of Strategic Rail Freight Interchange – speculate 3,000 – 6,000 more jobs.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>			<p>×</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>It is in the planning stage, but will be available somewhere</p>	<p>RG</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><b>M1 J25</b></p>	<p>HS2 station between Derby and Nottingham. Obvious traffic increase. Trunk road will become a local distributor.  Opportunity for development in the area alongside the introduction of HS2, maybe take the Tram further out of Nottingham.  HS2 line forms a barrier, possibly creating pinch point of traffic crossing from east to west.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>			<p>×</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Information should be or become available – planning applications etc</p>	<p>JD / PG</p>	
<p><b>Overall</b></p>	<p>Think about the purpose of trunk roads. Often they act as local distributors as well as forming the strategic network. Need for a Balance. LOCAL vs STRATEGIC</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>×</p>	<p>×</p>	<p>×</p>	<p>Not really</p>		<p>PG</p>	<p>2</p>

<b>M180 Isle of Axholme</b>	EA have identified an area of flood risk that is not on maps – from EA strategy in the area.  Big opportunity to ensure when highways are modified to adhere to new drainage standards and not refurbish in line with existing (old) standards.  If not done, it may bring the EA into conflict with the Water Framework Directive (WFD).	Environment				No	EA research. <a href="mailto:enquires@environment-agency.gov.uk">enquires@environment-agency.gov.uk</a>  Isle of Axholme information – Flood Risk Management Strategy.	Not published fully on website yet.	DH	4
<b>A38, Derby</b>	Surprised that the A38 isn't worse on delay map. The perception is that at peak times it is very badly affected.	Capacity				Yes – but questioning it.			RG	2
<b>A50 South Derby</b>	The introduction of more residential development will impact on the road capacity. Noise impact areas.	Environment				Some developments are shown			RG	3
<b>A1 North of Newark.</b>	Flood areas	Environment				No	Comparison with EA flood risk prediction maps - EA website.		DH	2
<b>Overall</b>	Trunk roads might degrade more quickly if the road is used as an alternative to motorways, by goods vehicles etc. Road use has changed, have the design of roads? Does end of 'design life' necessarily mean it needs replacing? The pavement condition map isn't actually showing that at the moment, its showing end of design life which isn't the same.	Asset Condition				Not properly - Questioning it	Show actual pavement condition from surveys – AOne+		JD	
<b>Overall</b>	Better planning is needed, to ensure roads don't all come to end of design life at same time.	Asset Condition				Yes			PG	
<b>A1</b>	Parts of the A1 are most probably in better condition than reflected on maps, given the change in use of some sections i.e. the introduction of grade-separated junctions.	Asset Condition				No – That is the issue.	Show actual pavement condition from surveys – AOne+		JD	
<b>Overall</b>	Don't consider road improvements in isolation, consider as a 'package'									2

<b>A1/A46 Newark Triangle –</b>	Delay, people avoid Newark. Adverse impact on trade and business	Capacity	×	×	×	Not properly			PG	2
<b>M1 J25</b>	Concern about delays, due to insufficient capacity.	Capacity	×			Yes (delay maps)			PG	3
<b>Tintwistle – A628</b>	Houses 4 feet from the road. Peoples front doors opening onto the traffic, HGVs, commuter traffic. It's not safe, and A628 is not fit for this purpose.	Safety Environment Capacity	×	×		Maps (delay, ave speed, casualties and operation)			JD	2
<b>Glossop A628 –</b>	Terrible delay problems. Peak begins at 615am, takes 90mins+ to get 4 miles to the motorway. 2 Lanes converge to one, choking traffic. Impacts on commuters, businesses, students/parents, everyone essentially. A628 not suitable for this traffic.	Capacity Safety	×	×		Maps (delay, ave speed, casualties and operation)			JD	1

## Breakout Session 2: What should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name:</b>	<b>Route Based Strategies Nottingham Workshop: Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire and Greater Lincolnshire.</b>	<b>Date: 16/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group: GREEN</b>	<b>Peter Goode (PG) – Notts County Council Jamie Douglas (JD) – Andrew Bingham MP’s Office Richard Groves (RG) – South Derbyshire District Council David Hoskins (DH) – Environment Agency</b>
<b>Group Facilitator:</b> <b>Graham Powell</b>	<b>Note-taker:</b> <b>Tom McNamara</b>			

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</b> Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b> Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	<b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b> Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other	<b>Raised by</b>
Reduce overall delay on the network. Reducing the 'cost of delay' is KEY – <b>M1, A628, A50, A38</b>	Capacity / Operational	Overall economic benefit to the area as a whole. Considering as a whole will hopefully ensure 'fairness'.	Conflict with local priorities. One area might be detrimentally affected for the 'greater good'. Issues might be caused as a knock on effect when dealing with, arguably, a worse problem elsewhere.  Might cause local economic disadvantages, could displace trade and/or business. Allegedly Newark suffers from this 'too much traffic getting into Newark let's just go to Notts instead' – anecdotal.		PG
Planning Growth. Address planned and future growth in order to best serve it – <b>Overall</b>	1.Capacity 2.Asset Condition				RG
The perceived detrimental effect of improving the strategic network and reducing the 'cost of delay' has on local feeder roads/areas – particularly business/high streets. –	All	Adverse impact on trade on feeder routes to improved roads			PG

<b>Overall</b>					
<b>A1/A46 Newark Triangle</b> – Delay, people avoid Newark.	All	Adverse impact on trade			PG
Don't consider roads in isolation, consider as a 'package'	ALL				ALL
Improving a trunk road could suck in traffic and affect the local network. – <b>Overall</b>	Capacity				
<b>Glossop A628</b> – Terrible delays. Peak begins at 6.15am, takes 90mins+ to get 4 miles to the motorway.  2 Lanes converge to one, choking traffic.	Capacity Safety	Impacts on commuters, businesses, students/parents, everyone essentially.  A628 not suitable for this traffic.	High priority for the area. The trade-off might be, by increasing capacity you encourage more traffic, which will in turn encourage business in the area. (possibly from other local economies)		JD
<b>Overall</b> – New standards used in all drainage associated with not only new but renovated/maintained roads.	Asset Condition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If the WFD is not adhered to it will become a legal issue for the Environment Agency.</li> <li>2. The footprint of these higher capacity roads is going to be higher, so drainage infrastructure needs to align to this.</li> <li>3. If it is considered alongside improvements, not as a separate task, savings can be made. This will take collaboration between departments, i.e. environment/transport.</li> </ol>	Trade off is the increased initial outlay, given the finite resources of the Highways Agency. But a look at the bigger picture might give this increased speeding more justification.	Consider holistic look at road improvement, which include new drainage standards for larger footprint highways.	DH
Congestion, very busy at peak times. <b>A50 - South Derby, M1 J24</b>	Capacity	Housing developments planned. Growth in both residential use and commuters from these developments, negative impact on capacity.			RG
<b>Tintwistle – A628</b> Houses 4 feet from the road. Peoples front doors opening onto the traffic, HGVs, commuter traffic.	Safety Environment Capacity	It's not safe, and A628 is not fit for this purpose.		An A628 Bypass. Taking most heavy freight traffic away from these towns along the A628	JD

<b>Nottingham near the University.</b> The cycle network is not continuous, there is a break in it – discourages cyclists.	Safety (perception maybe)			Link up the cycle routes to better serve the University and South Nottingham.	PG
<b>D2 Roads.</b> Currently there is a pilot scheme banning HGVs from travelling in the outside lane of trunk roads at peak times on some roads. Maybe this could be rolled out across more D2 roads.	1 Capacity 2 Operational	They cause severe delays, being stuck behind a speed limited HGV.	Seek European evidence.	HGV ban in the outside lane.	DH
<b>Glossop A628.</b> Improvements are needed ahead of growth. There is no room for more traffic on the network, so developments are opposed by residents.	Capacity				JD
<b>A52 West of Nottingham cycle route.</b> Must consider non-motorised road users.	Asset Condition Operational	Consensus it was a priority.			ALL

Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Midlands D2N2Lincs</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>16/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Orange</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Sravani Vuppala</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Mia-Jade Thornton</b>		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises supporting (name, org) to provide evidence by	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					



<p>A52 Nottingham between Priory Island and QMC</p>	<p>Congestion issues – the A52 between Priory Island and QMC is a major bottleneck which has not been solved by the HA. There is a constant increase in journey times due to the congestion and buses are getting slower and slower which in turn makes the bus less attractive as an alternative to the car. The congestion levels result in the bus experience ruined between the University &amp; QMC. It doesn't feel right that there is no bus priority. There is no evidence of it getting better despite some extra lanes in places and traffic lights on the roundabout (which I personally feel make the congestion worse – PB). This is a major problem that goes back a long time.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>×</p>			<p>Yes</p>			<p>Keith Shayshutt (KS)/ Peter KS</p>	<p>13</p>
<p>A52 between Bingham and Gamston</p>	<p>Congestion issues here also. There is a constant increase in journey times due to the congestion and buses are getting slower and slower which in turn makes the bus less attractive as an alternative to the car. Increased housing in the area will only add to the problem – increased demand will bring more problems and delay.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>				<p>Yes</p>			<p>Briggs (PB)</p>	<p>8</p>

A57 around Worksop	District wide transport assessment identifies specific pinch points at roundabouts along the A57 and A1 around Worksop. Improvements needed along the stretch back to the A1 although the specific problem is the Worksop area.	Capacity	×				District wide transport assessment by WYG.	Joelle Davis (JD), Bassetlaw District Council	JD	11
A1 at Harworth Bircotes	There are specific junctions around Harworth that have been identified as pinch points within the district wide transport assessment. 80 hectares of employment is planned within the core strategy near these junctions and this needs bearing in mind going forward	Capacity	×	×	×		District wide transport assessment by WYG.	Joelle Davis, Bassetlaw District Council. JD also stated that she would send through more work on detailed specific development sites that has not yet been published.	JD	11
Radcliffe Roundabout (also known as Gamston roundabout – A52/Radcliffe Road)	The Radcliffe roundabout is a pinch point and slows everything down. Extra development is only going to make things worse too as increased housing will increase demand and car use!	Capacity	×			Yes			KS	
Network wide (with reference to A52 and A453)	Core strategies include very large residential and employment developments which will impact on the road network and there needs to be careful thought about how the HA will deal with issues. For example there are very large residential and employment developments which will impact on the A52/A453 corridor South of Nottingham.	Capacity		×	×				David Jones (DJ) / PB	4

A38 Little Eaton and A38 Markeaton Roundabout	The Little Eaton roundabout is a massive problem island which causes major delays due to congestion and queuing. The Markeaton roundabout is also a major pinch point with congestion being particularly awful coming out of the city (there is not an issue going into the city).	Capacity	×			Yes			KS
M1 Junction 28	Junction 28 has been recently improved and the motorway is now great, but there is a massive issue with congestion in the area surrounding the junction particularly on A38 which needs to be dealt with.	Capacity	×			Yes			DJ
Nottingham Bridges	An absolute pinch point within Nottingham are the bridges – cause major problems and I hope that in the future there will be a new bridge.	Capacity	×						PB
Network Wide	Significant issue with the speed limits on roads within the D2N2 area, Sections of roads have less and less logical speed limits and it is a challenge for the HA to have a clearer strategy to let motorists know the speeds of roads easily.	Operational	×						PB

A47	Along the A47, supermarket lorries go 40mph along a 60mph road which has the consequence of massive queues for cars on the network, which leads to cars overtaking the supermarket lorries.	Safety	✗							KS	
Network Wide	There is a challenge of how lorries will be in the future – will the size of lorries change and become heavier and longer? How will these lorries effect traffic flow and infrastructure requirements as HGVs damage roads, and with more Distribution Centres opening within the area this could be a major challenge.	Operational		✗	✗					PB	
M1 either side of widened section (J25-28)	When the M1 goes down to 3 lanes coming into Nottingham city the traffic comes to an absolute standstill. There are the same congestion issues coming out of the city too, with traffic coming to a standstill as soon as the M1 goes back to 3 lanes.	Capacity	✗		Yes					DJ	
M1	The M1 is not far off capacity now never mind in the future – it won't be fit for purpose in 10 years unless improved	Capacity								PB	

A52 (Enterprise Zone)	The development of the Enterprise Zone (Boots) directly loads onto the A52 and modelling shows massive impacts on the A52 which would need addressing. This also results in access issues for the Nottingham Boots Enterprise Zone.	Capacity	×	×	×		Evidence of the modelling will be available soon, and there will be planning applications soon too.		DJ	4
Network Wide (Strategies)	Previously each council/LEP were isolated and now interested in the interaction between both LEPs and HA in terms of stimulating economic development. It is necessary to link HA improvements to LEPs – HA should keep D2N2 and Greater Lincs informed and vice versa. Strategies need to be joined up in order to ensure strategic economic development is aligned.	Operational							Maria Hallam (MH) / DJ	8
Derby Road	Significant report on the latest Derby Road development suggested increasing the width of pavements for pedestrians and improving cycling in the congested areas around University and Wollaton Park. This raised with the HA the problem of balancing traffic flow with those who travel in other ways and help to reduce traffic flow yet the document was ignored by the HA – more bothered about cars, discourages different modes of travel.	Society & Environment	×				Recent report on Derby Road		PB	3

Network wide (advanced stop lines)	Cyclists cannot avoid cycling on HA roads at some point. There needs to be more clarity on when advanced stop lines will be used as they are not implemented everywhere and so the HA needs a more organised and proactive approach to how and when they will be used. For example, the council refused to put advanced stop lines in where Beeston Tesco is. They should also be coloured as this makes them more visible and accessible, and there needs to be more consistency on how they are enforced.	Operational	×						PB
A38	The A38 is reaching the end of its life and therefore needs maintaining/replacing. Important to note that any issue on route diversion due to maintenance etc is a major issues for buses.	Asset Condition				Yes			
A52 Dunkirk	There is a current noise issue around Dunkirk which needs addressing.	Society & Environment	×			Yes			KS/JD
A52 Beeston	Motorbike noise disturbs me constantly by the A52 Beeston. Disturbance by motorbike noise often occurs along the major arterial routes in/out of Nottingham	Society & Environment	×						JD
			×						PB

East of Nottingham	There is a general problem with accessing any of the East Coast from Nottingham.	Capacity							DJ DJ	
Network Wide	The construction of HS2 will cause major disruption and issues for the road network around the area.	Capacity								

## Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Midlands D2N2Lincs</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>16/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Orange</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Sravani Vuppala</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Mia-Jade Thornton</b>		

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
---	--	--	--	--



A52 Derby Road	Capacity	<p>The congestion is a major issue and journey times are getting longer and longer. Bus lanes should be implemented but not sure what we can do as the road sort of queues and works unofficially as 2 lanes already and there is still this issue. This section needs revisiting by the HA. (DJ/KS/PB)</p>		<p>Adding Capacity (although it is stated that respondents are not sure if this could happen and how to tackle this issue). Another solution could be improving the J24/A453 junction as this is a real pinch point and if improved this could lead to a shift of traffic away from the A52 (KS).</p>
Access to the Boots Enterprise Zone	Operational	<p>Access to the Enterprise Zone is a key priority which needs to be argued strongly on the economic development of the site. (DJ)</p>		
Network wide – infrastructure to support Core Strategies	Capacity	<p>The impacts on the road network of proposed developments have not been looked at from one Core Strategy to another and this could lead to issues – there therefore needs to be a link to LEPs and HA infrastructure improvements and also between the LEPs as it is crucial to have infrastructure in place to support the growth set out within each Core Strategy. (DJ)</p>		
Accidents on A1 near Worksop	Safety	<p>Accident map shows a section of the A1 near Worksop in red indicating a large number of accidents – it is therefore a priority to address the cause of the accidents, as there is also a knock on impact if roads are closed due to accidents on the flow of traffic on other roads in the network (e.g. Elkesley). (JD)</p>		

Network wide maintenance of roads on the HA Network	Asset Condition	The maintenance of the roads on the HA network is a key priority both in the short term and long term as it is necessary to ensure the network is of good quality and runs as efficiently as possible. (DJ)	There is a trade off between maintaining the current roads and building new roads.	
Congestion management issues in the D2N2 area	Capacity	Congestion is a major issue and it is therefore necessary to manage congestion as efficiently as possible. There has been a HA pinch point bid for a system for D2N2 and HA to collaboratively work together and divert traffic along LA roads/HA roads when there are accidents/diversions and vice versa. A strategic Congestion Management Scheme would not only involve incident response but also daily demand management and planned maintenance.(DJ)		
HGV distribution on the network (with reference to Harworth)	Operational/ Condition	Asset The main cause of wear and tear on the network is lorries and so the heavier they get the worse the roads get. Within the Harworth area employment development includes distribution centres so HGV distribution should be a priority to ensure the condition of the roads is maintained at a good standard (KS/JD)		
Funding for infrastructure (network wide)	Asset Condition	There is a potential concern as to where the funding is coming from for local infrastructure projects (JD). It is in all our interests that there is more certainty relating to HA funding to enable adequate planning (PB).		

<p>Location specific infrastructure improvements - funding</p>	<p>Asset Condition</p>	<p>It is important to ensure that the road network performs efficiently not only on a strategic level but also a local level. We have noted that it is important to also plan ahead. In order to plan ahead we must spend money on junctions that might become pinch points due to development, but how can we justify this? We also need to note the relative development and impacts on the road network. (JD)</p>	<p>How is it justified spending money on a junction where congestion might be an issue in the future after development against a junction where congestion is already an issue? Trade off between dealing with present problems and future problems, but necessary to ensure infrastructure is in place before development. More detailed trajectories should be able to provide better figures of build up so it should be easier to identify areas where pressure will develop in the future.</p>	
<p>Network wide – non-motorised users</p>	<p>Society &amp; Environment</p>	<p>It is vital that non-motorised users are adequately considered on the HA network to ensure that the HA does not discourage non-motorised forms of transport (PB).</p>		

Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>D2N2 &amp; Greater Lincolnshire</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>16/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Red Team</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Graham Fry</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>A. Finch</b>		<b>Page 1</b>

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
J26-28 M1 & A38 trunk road connection	Junctions operating at capacity at peak times. Northbound carriageway particularly a problem and junction 28 / A38 suffering from congestion.  M1 J25-28 widening has resolved the capacity issue on the M1 but junction capacity issues remain.	Capacity	X			Partly - Vehicle hours delay shows up on M1 and A38 mainline but no information on the local network at M1 junctions which also have problems.	N/A	N/A	JC	14
Newark A46	A46 is vital to the prosperity of Lincolnshire. Lack of penetration makes linking pinch points important to Greater Lincolnshire LEP (GL LEP). Newark is constrained by single carriageway.  Currently A46 junctions at Newark are under pressure although the road link appears to cope. Future development will put it all under pressure.	Capacity	X	X		Yes – Delay and speed maps indicate a problem but delay problem appears worse on A46 (A1- Lincoln) which is dual carriageway. This appears erroneous.	N/A	N/A	RAW	8
A52 south and east of Nottingham	Considerable stress on A52 now with problems on the trunk road spilling onto local roads. Clifton Bridge (A453) to Bingham (A46) – number of junction capacity issues. Likely to worsen as considerable development proposed in the area.	Capacity		X		Yes – Delay map show problems, particularly on A52 Gamston to A46.	-	-	DP	7

Junction 25 M1	If HS2 station located here more pressure could be put on the junctions. Impact on SRN of reactive development following HS2 stations.	Capacity			X	Yes – Delay map shows problems on the A52 in vicinity of proposed HS2 station.	Not an issue at present as some uncertainty over future of HS2 – so time for evidence to be gathered.	N/A	JF	1
----------------	--	----------	--	--	---	--	---	-----	----	---

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
A453/A52	Air quality in Nottingham is poor due to traffic congestion. 2 Air quality management areas; one at Dunkirk close to A543/A52. Duelling of the A453 will bring further reduction in air quality.	Society & Environment		X		Yes - Environment Map shows air quality issues in Nottingham, including A52.	Data available from the City's environmental department.	-	NL	2
Grantham Southern Relief Road	Provision of a new GS junction on the A1 is hard to achieve for a developer and this challenge can discourage business investment.	Connectivity/ Facilitating Development	X			N/A	N/A	N/A	RAW	
General	Maintenance – Need to ensure that the SRN is properly maintained.	Asset Condition	X			Yes	N/A	N/A	All	9
A1	Previous improvements to A1 have done their job in the area but capacity problems still exist to the north of the region which could become problematic.	Capacity		X		Yes – some problems Delay Map in Doncaster/ Pontefract area.	N/A	N/A	RAW	1

M180 / M18	Access to Humber ports need improvement (planned for 2015). Immingham - capacity ok but there is an enterprise zone around it which could be putting pressure on the SRN.  Rail network can't take the freight so any new container traffic will have to go on the SRN. Possible future problem for the M180/M18 routes.	Capacity		X		No significant issues evident at present on Delay Map.	-	-	RAW	2
South Nottingham	Severance to cyclists and pedestrians where urban area meets SRN.	Safety, Society & Environment	X			-	-	-	DP	3

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
A52 (Derby to Nottingham)	Surplus to requirements as part of the SRN? De-trucking could be welcomed by the Councils. Road is a higher priority locally than strategically but not managed locally.	Operational	X			N/A	-	-	DP	
A38 through Derby	Safety issues.	Safety	X			Yes.	N/A	N/A	NL	
Markham Vale Enterprise Zone	Connectivity issue at the moment. Could be a capacity issue later on if enterprise zone is successful.	Connectivity / Capacity		X		No.	See their RGF bid available online.	N/A	JF	1
SRFI Proposals	Road access could be difficult and delay proposals being implemented at M1 J24 and A38/A50 areas.	Connectivity/ Facilitating development		X		Yes.		Through engagement with developers.		

East-West	Very few choices of route E-W and low total capacity. Some meeting points between E-W and N-S movements don't work efficiently.	Capacity & Route choice.		X		Yes (A52 only E-W route) and at M1 J28, M1 J25 and M1 J24.	-	-	RAW	3
-----------	---	--------------------------	--	---	--	--	---	---	-----	---

## Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>D2N2</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>16/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Red Table</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Graham Fry</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>A Finch</b>		<b>Page 4</b>

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Poor surfaces/ No specific location identified	Maintenance	Need to maintain what you have before investing in the new.	Key Priority	
National > Sub-regional hierarchy. M1 - A38/M1 J28, A1 – north of D2N2 Sub Regional: A52 – numerous junctions (A543-A46) A46 Newark M180 Other M1 junctions	Capacity	Certain roads of national significance M1 & A1 so should be top-priority. Constraints to national network have knock on effects elsewhere.  Priority should be by route function.	If HA can get key routes sorted there will be more winners economically than if priority is given to the smaller trunk roads. However, working on this principal means routes on the periphery won't get support.  National/periphery trade-off.	
Opportunity Value - Markham Vale Enterprise Zone, Newark A46 and Grantham A1.	Connectivity/ Facilitating Development	Make improvements/connections to key areas/ strategic employment sites to bring about future opportunity.	Supporting Development V Operational V Capacity – Increase priority for facilitating strategic developments.	
East to West linkages - M180	Capacity / Operational Balancing capacity & reliability	Food economy is important to D2N2 area. "20% of food manufacturing is done in SE Lincolnshire so distribution and journey time reliability is key" (RAW)		
Supporting transport hubs	Capacity / Connectivity	Economic importance of transport hubs e.g. SRFI's, airports and ports. Therefore HA	Supporting Development V Operational V Capacity – Increase priority for facilitating strategic developments.	



	Balancing capacity & reliability	need to prioritise the linkages to the SRN for these sites – Proposed SRFIs, Immingham Port and EMA.		
--	----------------------------------	--	--	--

Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Nottingham Workshop</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>16/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Yellow Group</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Tim McCann</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Amie Coleman</b>		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge  Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
Grimsby to Lincoln corridor	This is a key freight route. The A46 and A15 are not trunk roads but they are key routes. There are particular issues on the A15 as it is not suitable for freight vehicles. There are also plans for growth around Lincoln, will lead to more congestion	Capacity and safety	✓			Not part of HA network	None provided		AP	1
A38 3 Junctions project through Derby	This project has already been put forward to the HA but has been delayed	Capacity	✓			HA already have the evidence/ study	No additional evidence provided		GB	9
M1 East to West movements	A study was conducted on the movement of traffic from North to South on the M1. It was found that a large majority of the problems were caused by East to West movements. These East to West movements should be considered as part of the RBS study	Capacity, Safety, Operational	✓			HA already has evidence in the form of multi-modal study	No additional evidence provided		AP	2
A6211 to A612 East Of Nottingham	A new route which has been developed to accommodate growth in the area. Will allow 1900 new homes to be built. A key site for development, will allow growth in the area. Will provide an additional crossing over the river Trent. Waiting on approval from Nottinghamshire County Council.	Society		✓		Not part of HA network	None provided		SB	7
Link to the A46 around Lincoln	An Eastern bypass would relieve congestion in the area – preliminary discussion have been started with the Council	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – low average speed, high casualties, poor pavement and high vehicle delay hours	None provided		SB	1

South of Derby	Opportunities for development – houses, industrial estates ect	Society		✓	No	None provided		GB	0
A50/M1 Junction 24	Is the A50 at capacity? There are not many junctions along the A50; there are issues with linking up to it. There are issues at M1 Junction 24 for cyclists - accidents have occurred. There is a lot of development planned for Leicester which will affect the A50. There is a freight terminal planned for the area. The bypass is part of these plans. The airport has minimal impact on junction 24 in terms of passengers having to use the junction.	Capacity/ Safety	✓		Yes - high vehicle hours delay shown on maps	None provided		SB, GB and JL	5
M1	Key issues: 1) Service-ability of the M1 for essential and routine maintenance causes problems 2) The current management of disruption when the M1 is closed due to an accident	Asset condition/ Operational	✓		Yes - poor pavement conditions on some sections of M1	None provided		GB	0
M1	Use of M1 for short trips around Nottingham - used as an outer ring road	Capacity	✓		Yes - vehicle hours delay	None provided		SB	1
M1 Junction 29A	2000 new homes are planned for the area - this will put more pressure on the junction	Society/ Capacity		✓	Yes - vehicle hours delay	None provided		SM	5 (on two post it notes)
M1 Junction 28	A multi-module study has shown that a grade separated junction is required at M1 Junction 28	Capacity	✓		HA already has evidence in form of multi-modal study	No additional evidence provided		GB	5
M1 ramp metering	Ramp metering on the M1 causes problems for local junctions – blocking back etc		✓		No – other junctions not on The HA's network	None provided		GB	1
M1 Junction 24	Congestion	Capacity	✓		Yes - low average speed at the junction, high vehicle hours delay	None provided		SB	0
A38 Derby	Key issue for cyclists - more crossings are needed in the area. There is the start of a good cycle network around the airport, this needs adding to. There is the potential to link into Derby as well	Safety	✓		Yes - High number of casualties in the area	None provided		JL	8

Lincoln Newark Trent Nottingham	-The train service along this route should be improved to reduce some of the pressure on the road network. Quicker/ more frequent trains should be introduced. Freight could then travel by train rather than by road	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes - high vehicle delay hours	None provided		AP	1
A453	The work on the A453 will alleviate some of the problems on the A52 from the motorway	Capacity	✓			Yes - low average speed, high vehicle hours delay	None provided		SB	0
A1 - Grantham	There have been a series of accidents on the A1 near Grantham which have caused issues due to the re-routing of traffic onto other roads in the area. The re-routing strategies need to be improved. Accidents need to be dealt with quicker	Safety/ Operational	✓			Yes - medium number of casualties	None provided		AP	0
A52/ A1 Grantham	-The A52 is de-trunked before the A1. HGV's pass through small towns which is unsafe. The HGV's frequently hit the 2 low railway bridges (A607 and A52). Causes problems on roads and railway line. Also unsafe for cyclists who use the route.	Safety/ Operational/ capacity	✓			No	None provided		AP	0
Grantham Newark Lincoln infrastructure	-The infrastructure which links to the trunk road needs improving	Operational/ asset	✓			No – off the HA network	None provided		AP	0
The whole network	The impact of housing development on key routes (local and strategic roads)	Society		✓		No	None		GB	0
The whole network	There should be more scope to address pinch points	Capacity/ Operational	✓			No	None		GB	0

The whole network	<p>Various other studies have already been conducted into these issues. Route management strategies for North Derbyshire seem to have been forgotten about.</p> <p>The HA need to look at the previous evidence which has been gathered on the existing issues on the network. The previous studies should be acknowledged when looking at the Route Based Strategies (RBS)</p>		✓			NA	NA		GB	0
Lincoln	<p>Lincoln has grown and will carry on growing over the next few years. Introducing more trains on the rail network will alleviate some of the problems on the roads in the area. It would also take some of the HGV's off the routes</p>	Capacity/ Operational	✓			No	None provided		AP	0
The whole network	<p>Capacity Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The network functions reasonable well in the region in terms of capacity</li> <li>- The main issues are with junctions</li> <li>- Need to improve the capacity of the junctions</li> </ul> <p>A number of sites have introduced Ramp Metering, this causes issues at surrounding junctions</p>	Capacity	✓			No	None provided		GB	0
Cycle Schemes	<p>Cycling schemes/ routes should be built into the routes based strategy scheme as they do not cost much in comparison to the cost of the overall scheme</p>	Safety/ Social and Environment		✓		No	None provided		JL	0

## Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Nottingham Workshop</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>16/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Yellow Group</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Tim McCann</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Amie Coleman</b>		

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? Why? Are there any trade- offs?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group <b>*Not in order of priority</b>	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.	Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Transport to support growth - Local authorities need time to gather evidence on how improving infrastructure will support growth in the area	Society	Help the economy to grow	Very important priority	New roads will facilitate growth/ houses/ industrial estates/ jobs
Prioritize schemes which deliver jobs effectively and sustainable	Society	Help the economy to grow	Very important priority	
A38 Derby Junctions Scheme (including cycle infrastructure)	Capacity	Issues with congestion in the area. There were plans to improve the 3 junctions, these have been put on hold due to the process which the HA follows (AP)	Important because this area has been a problem for a long time	
M1 Junction 24 - A453	Capacity/ safety	Issues with congestion at this junction. There is a lack of safe cycle routes - needs improving (JL and SB)	Important because the congestion causes the issue. Cyclist could be injured/ killed if safe routes are not provided	
Build cycle improvements into all schemes	Society/ Safety	Cycle schemes can be delivered relatively easily in comparison to road schemes (JL)	Improve safety for cyclists, encourage more people to cycle, reduce issues on the road network	
A15	Capacity/ Operational	Should be made a major route, used by freight to deliver food (AP and SB)	Should be improved so as to reduce the number of vehicles using other, less suitable routes	
A1	Safety/ Capacity	Used by freight, particularly bad crossing points in terms of safety (AP). It could be used as an access to London if it was improved, would alleviate traffic on other roads (SB)	Safety issues - should be improved to prevent injuries/ deaths	
A60	Operational	No longer a strategic trunk road, should be reverted back to one (SB)		

More transparency in terms of how transport schemes are prioritised and funded (including RBS process)		Local authorities need to understand what the process is for getting schemes passed so they can lobby the right people (SM)	Important priority for local authorities	
Role of the HA - do not become insular				
DaSTS reports already shows evidence for the issues in particular areas	Capacity	Issues already raised should take priority		

## Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

Workshop Name		Coventry and Warwickshire, and Leicester and Leicestershire		Date:			24/09/13		Breakout Group		Blue Team	
Group Facilitator		Jenny Oakes (JO)		Note-taker			A. Finch				Page 1	
Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received		
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021							
A5	Emerging as a key economical route which is already operating at capacity, and will be even more so from future development. A large amount of new development is planned along the corridor with direct access onto the A5.	Capacity The pinch point scheme to be delivered by 2015 will only provide enough capacity for 2-3 years.	X			Yes – Vehicle Hours Delay	The A5 Strategy, by the A5 Partnership, provides a good evidence base. This proved helpful with the Pinch Points work.  DaSTS Study demonstrates the corridors economic importance.	Bill Cullen, HBBC	BC	2		
A46 & M69	Growth plans will put a considerable strain on this section of the SRN. Requires a study similar to the A5. Approx. 21-22,000 houses proposed in the Coventry area.  A46 is a strategic cross country route that's inadequate for the load it's currently taking. Particular issues exist between Alcester and Stratford due to a lack of capacity.  M69 improvements have linkages to key development priorities.	Running capacity at	X	X	X	Yes – Vehicle Hours Delay	Coventry Core Strategy? Developments shown on HA maps underestimates amount of development planned around Coventry.		MW & KT	11 for A46  4 for M69		



Workshop Name		Coventry and Warwickshire, and Leicester and Leicestershire		Date:			24/09/13		Breakout Group		Blue Team	
Group Facilitator		Jenny Oakes (JO)		Note-taker			A. Finch				Page 2	
Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received		
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021							
The two A45/A46 junctions	The TGI and Walsgrave islands around Coventry could undermine the existing investment that's being made on A46 improvements. They are the only at-grade junctions remaining along the corridor and are therefore pinch points on the network. They were not put forward for pinch point funding due to enormous costs.	Capacity/ Safety	X			Yes – Vehicle Hours Delay & Safety map			MW			
M42 corridor	Major capacity issues on M42. HS2 and the big allocation of development in the future close by will put greater pressure on this already struggling road. A46 will have a role in relieving the M42 but is under pressure itself.	Capacity.	X			Yes – Vehicle Hours Delay			BC	11		
Gaydon J12 M40	4,500 new houses proposed for Gaydon which the road system will not be able to cope with.	Capacity			X	-	Stratford Revised Core Strategy	-	KT			
M54 – linkages to M6 Toll	Link required from M54 to M6 toll to reduce traffic on M54 and improve access to the underutilised M6 Toll but controversial with district authorities.	Capacity	X			-	-	-	MW			

Workshop Name		Coventry and Warwickshire, and Leicester and Leicestershire		Date:		24/09/13		Breakout Group		Blue Team	
Group Facilitator		Jenny Oakes (JO)		Note-taker		A. Finch				Page 3	
Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received	
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021						
M6 Toll	Underutilised but the alternative SRN (particularly the M42, M6 & M54) is generally operating over capacity. Although the toll road is not under the HA remit, if M6 Toll was priced to attract more traffic it would alleviate a lot of the problems the HA face on the SRN, therefore affecting future HA strategies and spend.  Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council looking into the M6 Toll issue and its one of the joint LEP priorities.	Operational	X			Yes – Speed map and Vehicle Hours Delay map	Regional Logistics Study for West Midlands has been commissioned (2012) by a consortium of authorities in the West Midlands. Possible evidence base for issues on the SRN in the area.	-	BC & MW	5	
M1 J21 – J21a	Pinch Point delivery by March 2015 but won't address all congestion problems between J21 and J21a. Pinch Point scheme is a short term fix not long term solution.  Safety hazard. Southbound traffic getting off onto M69 blocking back on M1. Signalisation has improved things but still issues remain. Also the link is short between 21-21a which results in significant weaving.	Capacity & Safety	X			Yes –Vehicle Hours Delay map	-	-	CS  MW	4	
General	Water pollution – Outfalls of non permitted discharge not included on HA maps but can be a risk depending on what water bodies they flow into.						FK will provide Environmental Agency maps showing the priority areas of non permitted discharge.		FK		

Workshop Name		Coventry and Warwickshire, and Leicester and Leicestershire		Date:		24/09/13		Breakout Group		Blue Team	
Group Facilitator		Jenny Oakes (JO)		Note-taker		A. Finch				Page 4	
Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received	
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021						
A5 Dodwells & Long Shoot junctions	Capacity and safety issues along this stretch of the A5. As above Pinch Points not necessarily going to fix the problem. Dualling is needed to increase capacity and improve safety.	Capacity & Safety	X			Yes –Vehicle Hours Delay, Speed and Safety map	-	-	BC	10	
A46 outside of Stratford	More segregation for cyclists required to improve safety. Pedestrian and cycle crossings near Stratford are an issue.	Safety	X			Safety map	See Stratford Core Strategy for issues. Well documented evidence in the Route Management Strategy (RMS).	-	KT MW		
A38 Burton to Lichfield	Good off road cycle route but very stop-start in nature. Cyclists are poorly catered for at junctions so cyclists tend to go along the A38 mainline which presents a safety issue and can reduce traffic speeds. Cycle network needs to be better coordinated and less disruptive.	Safety	X			Safety map	-	-	FK		
M6 Jnc 2-4	Heavy usage. Lots of local hopping on and off. Also new engine plant for Jag/Land Rover near I54 will use M6 for delivering to Solihull.	Capacity	X								

M1, M6, A5 and A38	Emergency Route Planning - When incidents occur on M1 & M6 they impact on the A5 and bring Hinckley to a grinding halt. Flooding of the Trent can result in the closure of several parts of the A38. Can alternative routes be planned?	Operational	X			-	-	-	BC	5
--------------------	---	-------------	---	--	--	---	---	---	----	---

Route-based strategies stakeholder events

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	Coventry and Warwickshire, and Leicester and Leicestershire		<b>Date:</b>	24/09/13	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Blue Table</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	Jenny Oakes (JO)		<b>Note-taker</b>	A Finch		<b>Page 5</b>
<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b> Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	<b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b> Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.		Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other	
A5 Dodwells junction & A5 - Atherstone to M42 junction	Capacity	Two key blockages on the A5 which should be priority following on from the Pinch Point improvements so that there is a seamless improvement to the whole route. Capacity / safety improvements (probably dualling) required by 2018.  Dodwells is also a priority for Environmental Agency as there are water quality issues around the area. A water body close by is failing due to road run off. EA to be considered in any improvements to this junction.	Emerging as a key route for supporting economic growth.  A string of logistics companies along the A5 who are being and will continue to be impacted on.		Environmental Agency to be considered for any improvements to the Dodwells junction.	
TGI (Binley Junction) and Walsgrave Islands, A444 and	Operating close to	Top priority for Coventry City Council in order to deliver growth. Economic case for				

A428 Toll Bar scheme will move issues up to these junctions.	capacity.	this is from DaSTS study.  Fixes required before 2021.		
M1/M69 J21	Safety	Safety hazard due to blocking back to mainline and weaving to J21a.		
Stratford – Alcester A46/A435 single carriageway with safety and speed issues.	Capacity and Safety	Low priority.	Lengthy route hence expensive solutions so low on priority list, as several of the other SRN issues could be addressed for the same money.	
M6 Toll efficiency and link with M54	Capacity	Will make a big difference in alleviating problems on the SRN if more traffic used the toll road and link road provided with the M54.	Politically sensitive and the M6 Toll would have to be more financially attractive to traffic for a direct link from the M54 to be beneficial.	
Need to focus priorities to where job growth will take place and to parts of the economy that are doing well e.g. Mira Enterprise Zone on A5.	Delivering growth.	Safeguarding our economic outturn for the future.		
Priorities should also be governed by housing growth areas. Accident areas tend to correlate well with these areas.		.		
Emergency routing.	Capacity	Some emergency routes place increased pressure on an already congested network which results in standstill.	Better communication between HA and LHA required.	

## Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

Workshop Name		Cov/Warks and Leics/Leicestershire LEP's			Date:	24/09/13		Breakout Group	Green	
Group Facilitator		Graham Fry			Note-taker	Darren Abberley				
Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
SRN-wide	Lorry parking and the location and availability of lay-bys is becoming an increasing issue. Lay-bys on the SRN are being used increasingly by HGV drivers to take rest breaks which they are required to take by law. However the HGV's often become a target of anti-social behaviour.	Society and Environment	X			No	Lorry parks may not be attractive economic investments but a truck stops has recently been expanded on the A5 – this wouldn't have been done if not worthwhile. Similar facilities are required in other areas.  Northampton lorry parking study provides evidence of the issue in that County.	N/A	CL	0
A5	The road acts as a barrier and a 'Berlin Wall' between the Leicestershire and Warwickshire border. The route presents a number of difficulties for non-motorised users to use and cross.	Safety/Society and Environment	X			No	Anecdotal evidence e.g. lack of verges for horse riders.	N/A	VA	3
A5	Lots of development is proposed along this corridor. Especially at Rugby Radio station and Rugby Gateway. These are highlighted on the RBS maps but the figures are too low at the Rugby Radio station site (6,200 homes and 31 hectares of employment land are proposed for this site). This will put further pressure on the link.	Capacity/Operational		X	X	Yes (but figures inaccurate).	Data provided in the 'Rugby Radio Station Additional Information Guide' document.	Hard copy version of document provided at the workshop with further documentation to follow should it be available.	RM	1

A5	There has been a lack of investment on this link and there is large variation in the standard of the link. For example, from Hinckley to Tamworth the link suffers from congestion issues which are likely to be exacerbated (with development growth) in the future.	Capacity/Asset Condition/Operational	X	X	×	Yes	Possible information available from LCC – LLITM forecast year outputs.	N/A	PS	1
M1 J21-J21A	The M1 SB between M1 J21a and J21 at peak times is a crucial congestion hotspot. Long distance traffic often avoids it and uses the local road network which creates associated problems. The motorway is a link of national importance and its poor performance can have detrimental impacts upon the national and regional economy. J21's poor performance also threatens Leicester's ability to attract inward investment. Also issues associated with noise and air quality.	Capacity/Safety/Operational/Society and Environment	X			Yes	South West Leicester and Leicestershire Study	N/A	PS	10
M1 J23	Growth in Loughborough and Shepshed will impact on M1 J23; congestion will be experienced, particularly during university semesters	Capacity/Operational		X	×	Yes	N/A	N/A	PS	

M1 J24	<p>M1 J24 is a nationally important part of the M1 as it links to the A50 and A453 routes. and with the airport and SRFI in close proximity. On top of this, it is an important gateway for Nottingham and Derby. However the junction suffers from congestion, it has not been improved and with a large amount of development proposed for the area, its performance will continue to deteriorate.</p> <p>A pinch point scheme is scheduled at this junction for Summer 2014. This will change the way traffic on the A50 EB enters the M1 SB. A new carriageway will be created through the junction. However Leicestershire County Council does not think that these measures are sufficient in the long term.</p>	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	Yes	N/A	N/A	PS	5
A45	Development growth – Prologis Ryton Site A and Site B (SW of Coventry) are missing from the growth plans; development traffic from these sites will exacerbate congestion on the A45 link.	Capacity/ Operational/		X	X	No	Evidence provided by CL, a commercial developer from Prologis	N/A	CL	1
A5 Longshoot and Dodwells	The A5 at Hinckley currently suffers from congestion. There is a plan in place for new traffic signals and a widening of the approaches at Dodwells roundabout as well as changes to the Longshoot junction. However Leicestershire County Council (LCC) does not think that these measures are sufficient in the long term. A long term strategy for improvement is needed as it is crucial to growth in Hinckley and Nuneaton. Need to maximise ability to secure developer funds.	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	No	Evidence gathered by LCC through the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model (LLITM), Transport Trends Report, NMP Congestion Plan 2026, DfT Transport Innovation Fund Congestion Study in the East Midlands.	N/A	PS	6



A453	Currently suffers from congestion. There is a scheme planned to upgrade a section of the A453 between the M1 and A52 by widening the urban section and upgrading the rural section to become a dual carriageway. However LCC have concerns about the impacts this will have on Kegworth (and possibly other areas in NW Leicestershire).	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	No	Modelling work for NWLDC Core Strategy and for the SRFI	N/A	PS	0
Catthorpe Interchange (M1, M6, A14)	Development pressures in this area will affect the performance of this junction – but should be resolved by the current major scheme.	Capacity/ Operational		X	X	Yes	N/A	N/A	RM	0
M6 J1	Development pressures in this area will affect the performance of this junction.	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	Yes	N/A	N/A	RM	5
M6 J2-4	Current congestion in this area leads to instability, unreliable journey times and traffic diverting onto the LRN, creating congestion issues on the local road links.	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	Yes	N/A	N/A	IS	1
M6 Toll	Under-utilised and tolls discourage use, exacerbating congestion on the M6.	Operational	X			No	Published traffic information for M6 Toll.	N/A	CL	7
Connections to A45 WB and M45 WB from A5 around M1 J18	Local concerns about the prevalence of HGV's on the LRN, due to the poor accessibility of the M45 WB.	Safety/ Asset Condition/ Operational	X			No	N/A	N/A	CL	1

Roundabout on A46 SW of M40 J15.	Concerns about the roundabout's safety, which was built as part of the J15 Improvements. The roundabout is too small, badly aligned and dangerous.	Safety	X			No	Anecdotal evidence	N/A	CL	5
M42 J6	The junction is in the heart of the country so is nationally significant. However it suffers from congestion and will continue to do so with the level of growth allocated for this area. This would make journey times unreliable and could have a negative impact on the economy.	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	Yes	N/A	N/A	IS	1
M42 J9	Potential development near this junction and to the west, in and around Curdworth will cause congestion at this junction.	Capacity/ Operational		X	X	No	Birmingham City Council	N/A	CL	1
A42 J13	The nearby A511 is a growth corridor which would increase congestion at this junction. Strategic improvements are required to alleviate this pressure. A strategy to secure developer contributions is needed.	Capacity/ Operational		X	X	Yes	N/A	N/A	PS	1
Hobby Horse Roundabout	This roundabout has capacity issues which will be exacerbated by development pressures. This could also affect the performance of the Leicester Outer Ring Road. Associated air quality issues.	Capacity/ Operational/ Society and Environment	X	X	X	No	N/A	N/A	PS	2
General	Vulnerable road users have difficulties crossing/using the SRN	Safety	X			No	Anecdotal evidence	N/A	VA	10

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

Workshop Name	Cov/Warks and Leics/Leicestershire LEP's	Date:	24/09/13	Breakout Group	Green
Group Facilitator	Graham Fry	Note-taker	Darren Abberley		
<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</b>  Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	<b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other	
M1-congestion in vicinity of M1 J21 and M1 J24	Capacity/Operational/Safety	PS- It is a top priority due to the airport, SRFI, three cities being in close proximity. It is a nationally important route; if journey times are unreliable, this could have detrimental impacts on the economy. Also, if nothing is done, then the LRN will become a 'rat run' creating associated problems on this network.	PS- Junction improvements may create other implications on the LRN, including accessibility issues to the SRN.		
General – viewing the network as a whole and not individual links/junctions	Capacity/Operational	CL -Viewing the UK as a whole and identifying what is needed for the SRN at a nationwide level should be the starting point e.g. A46 v M42 routes. VA- Focusing on individual junctions/links can move the problems elsewhere, rather than eradicating them.	PS – It is difficult to assign priorities as the network should be considered holistically.		
A46	Capacity/Operational	CL- Strategic improvement to A46 could relieve the M42 and M5 which currently experience congestion.			

General – vulnerable users have difficulties crossing/using the SRN	Safety	VA- Non-motorised vehicles have difficulty/feel unsafe using the SRN. However, in line with the agenda for more sustainable modes of transport to be used, these road users should be encouraged.	An increase in the number of crossing points could have impacts on congestion on the SRN.	VA- The Vulnerable Users Crossings Improvement Programme from 2003 should be revisited.
M6 Toll	Capacity/Operational/	CL- Taking the M6 Toll back into public ownership. This would make it toll free and thus more attractive to road users – helping to relieve M6 congestion and support economic growth in the Midlands region.	CL- This would relieve pressures on the M6 and make better use of the network.	IS- This solution is unlikely to happen.
A5 Longshoot and Dodwells	Capacity/Operational	PS – Improving the performance of this section of the SRN is crucial to securing growth in Hinckley and Nuneaton.		PS- Need a long term strategy for improvement and maximise ability to secure developer contributions.
M45- spare capacity	Capacity/Operational	CL- This link currently has spare capacity and so better use could be made of it which could help to alleviate pressures on other, more congested sections of the SRN.		Target employment growth around this area.
General- timescales/lessons to be learnt	Capacity/Operational	VA- Getting schemes deliverable over the next 5 years is the priority. CL- the timescales are too short. A thorough, unbiased prioritisation of schemes cannot happen in the allocated timeframe. The priority should be to take time and make sure to get things right rather than being under pressure to deliver within the time period. Lessons should be learnt from M1 J19. The current junction was completed on an ad hoc basis and so still suffers from problems.	Schemes need to be delivered within the time frames otherwise promises will not be met.	

Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name:</b>	<b>Route based strategies Nottingham Workshop: Leicester, Leicestershire, Coventry and Warwickshire.</b>	<b>Date: 24/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group:</b>	<b>Orange</b>
<b>Group Facilitator:</b>	<b>Note-taker:</b>			
<b>Sarah Guest</b>	<b>Tom McNamara</b>			

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
<b>Overall</b>	Flood risk map shows flooding issues to be a lot less extensive than the Environment Agency have ascertained.	Environment	x	x	x	Provided some evidence including some for Nottingham workshop	Can and will provide more. Contact the EA for more if needed.	TA		
<b>A5 around MIRA</b>	Shows red on the pavement life cycle map, but it has recently been resurfaced.	Asset condition	x					JS		
<b>Overall</b>	Most flooding is not water course related (i.e. flooding of river floods carriageway) MAINLY run-off from the highway network.	Environment Asset condition	x					TA		
<b>A46 North Warwick of</b>	Sheer amount of run-off is flooding the immediate area. In cold weather this is freezing.	Safety Environment Asset condition	x					TA		
<b>M1 J21</b>	Major issue for the police and other emergency services, on the motorway and adjacent junctions. 5 to 6 miles of tail backs southbound and congestion accessing Leicester northbound.	Safety Capacity	x	x	x			GC		

<b>M1 J21</b>	Weaving on/off the M1 to access the services causing safety issues	Safety (RTCs) Capacity	×	×	×				GC	3
<b>M1 J23/24 Also J21/22</b>	Lots of development proposed in the wider area which will exacerbate already congested junctions.  Business/enterprise park in Loughborough - growth 6000+ jobs	Capacity		×	×				MT	6
<b>Overall</b>	Up to 2021, the focus should be on existing problems that will only get worse beyond 2021 without intervention.		×	×	×				AH	
<b>A5/A47 Junc</b>	Heavy congestion - there was talk of a flyover - something needs to be done as this congestion leads to 'rat runs' developing through towns e.g. Higham On The-Hill	Capacity Society Environment Safety	×						TK	
<b>A5 Leicester/ Warwick</b>	MIRA / Dodwells developments introducing additional traffic.	Capacity							GC	
<b>M1</b>	Undertaking maintenance without causing traffic problems - when is the maintenance going to take place? At night? Seems like there is a lot to do in the next 3 to 4 years.		×	×					GC	
<b>Bridges throughout the network</b>	Electrification of the rail network is going to take place in the future. Are we/HA using this opportunity to change bridges which will have to undergo transformation for electrification?  Which Bridges need doing?	Asset condition Operational			×				MT	
<b>Bridges throughout the network cont.</b>	Highly problematic dealing with Network Rail (got to get in early) Need to think about this <u>now</u>	Asset condition	×						GC	

<b>A14</b>	Market Harborough grinds to a halt when there is ANY issue on the A14.  Incidents seem to be frequent - is there a way to manage the effect on surrounding towns if there is a problem on the SRN?  Keeping one lane operational during incidents might help.	Capacity Operational Safety	×						TK	
<b>Overall</b>	MT asked about models, how good they were now and is there cooperation between authorities.  AH indicated that cross county council cooperation was used in the area to develop meaningful accurate models	Capacity	×						MT AH	
<b>A42</b>	A42 is used like a motorway but should be brought is not motorway standard. Difficult to use by the emergency services, also the addition of development in the area. 2 lanes bring the associated constraints; The Police have had ongoing concerns over safety on the A42.	Safety Capacity Operational	×	×					GC	3
<b>A46 Stratford to Alcester</b>	The A46 is only two lanes and carries a lot of traffic - not really suitable as Strategic Road Network.	Safety Capacity	×						AH	2
<b>M45</b>	Very quiet, under used. Could lead to speeding due to low vehicle numbers.	Safety	×						AH	
<b>M40 J12</b>	Potential new settlement near to Stratford-Upon -Avon	Capacity			×				AH	

<b>A46</b>	<b>LEP Priorities</b> Coventry and Warwickshire. East of Coventry A428 TGI Junc. Need to keep the existing network attractive to businesses – so need to keep the M40/M42/M6 moving. Avoid restricting movement from the East to the rest of the Midlands.	Capacity		×	×				AH	
<b>M42 Corridor</b>	HS2 will bring further congestion on the M42 as will investment in business along the corridor, is there the option to use another corridor on the SRN? Suggests using the A46/M69 down M5 as opposed to the M42.	Capacity Operational			×				AH	3
<b>M69 and Overall</b>	Inadequate strategic signing.	Operational	×						GC	1
<b>All e.g. backing up of the A46</b>	Lack of coordination between the HA and Highway authority schemes. Different operators? Doing their own little bits. Due to road works Nottingham is currently a no-go zone. Leicester has different works all around the ring road causing congestion. Also UTILITES companies pitch in with their works.	Safety (mainly because people speed up after the congestion) Operation	×						TA MT	0
<b>All</b>	There doesn't seem to be a shortage of money, so we can expect to see lots of work to improve the network, so these improvements need to be balanced with the pain of works on the network short term. Can't be done over night, there need to be an acceptance and plan for a period of disruption.	Operation Capacity		×	×				AH	



<b>M1 J21 Asda Island in Enderby</b>	There was some coordination between HA and the Emergency services and other Highway Authorities. – picking up on point raised earlier by TA and MT.	Operational Asset condition	×						GC	0
<b>M1 Corridor Loughborough</b>	Developments are building right up to the M1. The Noise from the motorway is an issue, despite people choosing to live there.	Environment (Noise) Society	×	×	×				GC	1
<b>A5 – along the whole route</b>	Severance for Pedestrian and cyclists trying to cross the corridor. Particular problem for pedestrians.	Safety Operational Society	×						AH	5
<b>Overall</b>	Has any thought been given to Autonomous vehicle use in the future? Sparked a debate on the length of time for road investment strategies. Length of a parliament vs. 50 years (China)	Capacity Safety			x				JS MT	1
<b>A46 North Leicester of M1 J21</b>	Variable Message Signs (VMS) need to be better utilised to reduce burden on nearby towns when there is an incident on the SRN. 'No route onto the M69' – not good enough when A46 closed There is an opportunity to use signs in conjunction with contingency plans when SRN is affected by incidents. Such contingency planning could help prevent the development of rat runs through small towns.	Operational Capacity	×						AH	1

<b>M1 A46</b>	<p>Water quality</p> <p>Most of the water issues/ flooding come from the carriageway, not from flooding of surrounding rural area. Issues with drainage and ditches on highways.</p> <p>The claim is that these are maintained, but in reality maintenance is very poor. No treatment of water, not even primary treatment, leading to the quality and quantity of water coming off the carriageways being sub standard.</p> <p>If HA are seen to be doing nothing to move forward and deal with this issue it can damage reputation but also if water quality diminishes it could have legal implications.</p>	Environment	×					Will try and find information in specific areas where this has taken place and been documented.	TA	1
<b>A14 Market Harborough</b>	<p>The 'Diversion Route Plan' needs to be kept up to date. Otherwise towns like Market Harborough get swapped by traffic leaving the SRN.</p> <p>There is the consensus that spontaneous incidents will have this affect and that it is unavoidable, but for planned works it is considered unacceptable.</p>	Operational Capacity	×						GC	1
<b>Shepshed M1 J23</b>	2500 more houses, not 500 as shown on the maps from core strategy data.	Capacity		×		Maps don't reflect what MT claim			MT	
<b>M1 J24 South Derby and Notts</b>	<p>Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is going to create 6000 jobs with related car and freight journeys.</p> <p>Want reassurances this is being considered.</p>	Capacity	×	×		Not on map (maybe because not in area covered by this workshop)			MT	
<b>General Maintenance</b>		Operational								4

<b>A46 North of Leicester</b>	Temporary crossovers for maintenance have led to reduction in infiltration and therefore flood issues actually caused by 'maintaining' the network	Environment Operational	×						TA	1
<b>A46 / A428</b>	Junction will become a problem once Toll Bar is sorted out	Capacity		×					AH	4
<b>A46 Stanks Junc</b>	Starting to queue back onto the main carriageway of the A46, will get worse with further developments.	Capacity	×						AH	3
<b>A46 Leek Wootton / Kenilworth</b>	Localised flooding caused by run-off from adjacent fields.	Environment Safety	×						AH	
<b>A47 / A5</b>	Dodwells Bridge. Development pressures from sustainable urban extensions at Barwell and Earl Shilton.	Capacity Safety	×	×					TK	4
<b>A5 near Dordon</b>	Floods during sharp rainfall intensity periods.	Safety	×						JS	2
<b>M6 Toll</b>	Spreading strategic traffic more evenly between the existing routes and the M6 Toll would improve the operability and congestion on A5/M6.  Suggestion is 'De-toll' it to encourage better use.		×						AH	5
<b>A5 / MIRA Redgate junction</b>	MIRA major development will cause increased problems.	Safety Capacity		×					TK	4

## Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name:</b>	<b>Route based strategies Nottingham Workshop: Leicester, Leicestershire, Coventry and Warwickshire.</b>	<b>Date: 24/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group:</b>	<b>Orange</b>
<b>Group Facilitator:</b>	<b>Note-taker:</b>			
<b>Sarah Guest</b>	<b>Tom McNamara</b>			

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other	<b>Raised by</b>
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.		
<b>A5 corridor. From Daventry to Tamworth including the anticipated Rail Freight interchange.</b>	Capacity				TK
<b>What is the purpose of the A5? Not considered a strategic corridor.</b>	Operational	A5 is important because it links areas of economic growth in the 'local' area. i.e. Coventry, Warwick and Leicester. Not the entire strategic road network.  Economic development of area depends on the A5 functioning – it is a major employment area, MIRA etc.  It has got to be made fit for purpose.		Find out what the HA consider the function of the A5 is.  Maybe devolve control of the A5 from HA to local authorities?	AH
<b>Trunk roads are the main problem in the area.</b>	Operational Capacity	Trunk roads are the priority as Motorways are not considered to be a problem (with the exception of M42)			AH

<b>M1 J21</b>	Capacity	Long term problem. Growth projections in the area are significant, thought needs to be given to considering this predicted growth.			TK AH
<b>M1 J23/24</b> <b>24 – Airport</b> <b>23 – Equally as bad</b>	Capacity Operational	This will need attention. It is going to be very important in opening up investment for the area and attracting business.			GC
<b>M6 Toll</b> <b>Empty because it is overpriced.</b>	Capacity Operational	The A5/WM conurbation is suffering from capacity issues that could be eased by vehicles using the M6 Toll, but pricing structure discourages most use.	Money. Presumably 100's of Millions to acquire from the private sector, given there is probably 30-35 year concession left on it.  Benefits for the A5, and cheaper than building a new one.  It is a Government issue though, not a HA one.	De-toll it. Government buy it.	AH
<b>Leicester – Nuneaton –</b> <b>Coventry – Warwick –</b> <b>Stratford – Evesham</b>	Operation Capacity	This is the spine of the area, the backbone of the local/regional economy and needs transport infrastructure to match.			AH
<b>A46</b> <b>Toll Bar maybe cause a problem north of it</b> <b>Pushing problems along the network, not dealing with them</b>	Capacity	It is a priority to consider all of the developments together, because there is a danger of just pushing the problem along the routes to the next junction/pinch point.			AH
<b>A46/A426 TGI Junction</b>	Capacity	Will become an issue when A46 Toll Bar improvement is finished and traffic is unblocked and flows to this junction..			TK
<b>Stratford to Alcester Road</b>	Capacity Safety	Single winding carriageway not suitable for strategic road network. If this road does become more frequently used with anticipated development growth (and as a link from M1 to M5, it needs to be made fit for that purpose.		Dual Carriageway	AH
<b>Congestion at Junctions in Warwick area eg Stanks Junction</b>	Safety Capacity	Starting to see queuing onto the carriageway, which is a safety issue too. HA vs County councils, there is a need for joined up thinking/cooperation.			AH

<b>Maintenance</b> <b>A46 North of Leicester</b> <b>Major resurfacing resulting in the removal of the verge for cross overs. Rising flood risk (less infiltration)</b>	Safety Environment Asset condition	This problem was created by the actions taken to maintain the carriageway. investment should not be creating problems.			TA
<b>Strategic Signage</b>	Operational	This should be straight forward to implement, and because it is an easy way to improve capacity it should be prioritised. There is a plan in place for diversions – use VMS to implement it more readily/effectively?  Could be used to help stop huge congestion issues in local towns.		Make better use of VMS	GC
<b>A5</b> <b>Been forgotten about because the suspicion is that HA don't see it as a strategic route.</b>	Capacity Operational	Perception that HA does not consider that the A5 has a strategic role, but it has a vital role to play in the local/regional economy - so this needs to be addressed.		Devolve responsibility from the HA to local authorities. At least make the HA declare what they see what its function is.	HA

## Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Warwick University</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>24/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Red Group</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Graham Stevenson</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Amie Coleman</b>		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge  Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
Nuneaton	3000 new homes are being built to the North of Nuneaton. They are not included on the development map. This development will have a significant impact on the A5. There are 7900 homes planned within Nuneaton and Bedworth by 2028	Society and Capacity			✓	Yes - the A5 has High Vehicle Delay hours and low average speeds	None provided		SH	2
Rugby	7000 new homes and 3 schools are planned for Rugby 'Mast' development	Society and Capacity		✓		No - not within the area of consideration at this engagement event	None provided		PM	0
Gaydon	4000 dwellings planned adjacent to junction 12 of the M40, Gaydon. Junction improvements planned for the area. Planned start date 2018, completion 2040.	Society and Capacity		✓	✓	No – but developments included in development plan	None provided		PH	0
A5 Hinckley/ Nuneaton section	Problems with congestion which will only get worse with future development. The A5 is impacted due to many industrial areas, supermarkets etc. Also if the M6/ M1 are closed all of the traffic is diverted to the A5. Improvements are required from The Longshoot junction to the M69. Junction improvements are already planned for the area (SH)	Capacity and Operational	✓			Yes - this section of the A5 shows high vehicle delay hours, low average speed and a high number of casualties	None provided		RW	0

A5	The A5 is needed for freight vehicles as it is a major route. If congestion was eased along the A5 it would allow freight to make deliveries quicker, would also reduce environmental impact due to queuing freight vehicles	Capacity, operational environment	safety, and	✓		Yes - sections of the A5 show high vehicle delay hours, low average speed, a high number of casualties and poor pavement quality	None provided		RW	0
A5 Hickley	Low railway bridge - HGV's hit the bridge, causing problems on the network and railway. Is there a possibility of lowering the road in the area as large freight vehicles currently have to go through villages to avoid the low bridge (RW)? There is currently a strategy in place to put more signs before the bridge to warn freight vehicles (AJ)	Safety and operational		✓		No	None provided		SH & RW	1
A45/ A46 - Tollbar End	There are issues on the A45 and A46 for cyclists. The current Toucan crossings on the A46 in Coventry cause delays for cyclists and are not safe as motorists ignore the red lights. The Tollbar End junction improvement scheme should improve safety for cyclists (PM)	Safety		✓		No	None provided		GR	2
A46 Stratford-Upon-Avon	There have been a number of accidents involving cyclists, signs have been introduced to raise awareness of cyclists	Safety		✓		No - would be useful to show the number of casualties per cyclist on a separate map rather than total casualties per billion vehicle miles (GR)	None provided		PM	0
A46 Stratford-Upon-Avon	There is a change in lane widths between Alcester and Stratford, the carriageway reduces to a single lane. The single carriageway causes problems for drivers who get stuck behind large HGV's.	Capacity and Operational		✓		Yes - a section of the road shows high vehicle delay hours and medium average speeds	None provided		PH	0
A46 Stratford-Upon-Avon	Two employment sites are planned on the A46 on the Northern edge of Stratford-upon-Avon. Two 18 hectare sites have been set aside for development. The planned start date for both sites is 2018, completion 2030				✓	✓	No	None provided	PH	0



A46 Stratford-Upon-Avon	Need a traffic management on the A46 such as the use of traffic lights at peak times	Capacity	✓			Yes - a section of the road shows high vehicle delay hours and medium average speeds	None provided		PH	4
A5 North of Coventry	There are crossing issues for cyclists in this area. Need a segregated solution to keep cyclists safe	Safety	✓			No	None provided		GR	0
M6 Junction 3 to 4	It costs the economy if HGV's have to wait for incidents to be cleared. The M6 junctions 3 to 4 are a key issue area. Toll charges on the M6 should be lifted to enable it to be used as a diversion route after an incident has occurred	Safety, Operational and Capacity	✓			No	None provided		RW	2
A46 Stratford-upon-Avon and Alcester Junctions	Congestion issues especially during the morning peak - improvements needed	Capacity	✓			Yes - high number of casualties at the junction	None provided		PH	2
Coventry airport	The airport could expand - will cause problems on the network	Capacity			✓	No	None provided		PM	0
Ricoh Arena/ other event holders	Large events cause issues on the network. Event organisers need to better plan for large events and how they may affect the SRN. There are plans to introduce a train station at the Ricoh arena to ease the traffic around the stadium (SH). The Ricoh blocks the SRN, A444 and Nuneaton Bypass.	Safety, Operational and Capacity	✓			No - one off events	None provided		PM & SH	0
A46	The A46 has quickly developing potholes which cause problems for all road users	Safety and asset condition	✓			Yes - some sections show poor pavement quality	None provided		PM	0
Hinckley to Nuneaton	The potential impact of the MIRA upgrade is a concern. At peak times the A5 is busy the busses get re-routed and leave villages along the A5 isolated	Capacity, operational and society	✓			Yes - the A5 has High Vehicle Delay hours and low average speeds	None provided		SH	1
Hinckley to Nuneaton to Atherstone	Desire locally to cycle Hinckley to Nuneaton to Atherstone	Society and environment	✓			No	None provided		SH	1
Junction 12 and 15 of the M40	Issues with capacity, could managed motorways be introduced?	Capacity	✓			No	None provided		PM	3

North of Nuneaton	There is an Air Quality Management Area in place	Society and environment	✓			No	None provided		SH	3
Trunk roads	Crossings across trunk roads cause the most issues for cyclists (GR). Some roads are just not suitable for cyclists as they are too dangerous. Cyclists want to be on the road, need more safety implications. Want people to cycle but safety issues.	Safety	✓			No	None provided		GR & PM	0
The whole network - specifically the A5 between Rugby and Dordon	There needs to be more suitable rest areas provided for HGV's. The lay-bys are often overloaded, particularly on the A5. Magna Park off the A5 uses clamping enforcement which means that drivers park in the entrance to the park, this causes issues (RW)	Safety	✓			No	None provided		PM & RW	2
The whole network	If diversions are in place need to ensure that they are suitable for HGV's e.g. Height and weight restrictions	Safety and operational	✓			No	None provided		RW	2
The whole network	Safety cameras don't work. They aren't affective if they aren't working. The signing for the cameras needs to be consistent	Safety and Operational	✓			No	None provided		PM	1
The whole network	In some places the most direct route for cyclists between trip generators is not along HA roads but the only right of way is along HA roads. So an alternative to improving cycling conditions on the HA roads would be the construction of a cyclist/pedestrian road on a more direct route; would require the HA to "think outside the box".	Safety and social	✓			No	None provided		GR	3
The whole network	The HA need better incident management procedures. Need the right resources in the right place. Need better planned diversion schemes. Currently it can take up to 1.5 hours to close a section of the motorway. Require the following: ISU's, Screens, resources, information on diversions and de-briefs after an incident	Safety and Operational	✓			No	None provided		PM	2

The whole network	Need to promote road user awareness. Need to explain to the public how to use systems such as managed motorways as there is evidence that motorists are using the hard-shoulder even when the scheme is not in place (signs switched off)	Safety and Operational	✓			No	None provided		PM	2
The whole network - specifically Nuneaton	Cycle lane segregation will encourage more people to travel by bike rather than using the car; it would also reduce congestion and improve air quality. There is currently an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) around Nuneaton. Reducing the number of cars using the network in this area would improve the air quality (SH). Just using a white line to segregate cyclists from vehicles does not make them safe. Wish to promote cycle and HGV awareness (RW)	Capacity, safety, operational, society and environment	✓			No	None provided		RW	6
The whole network	Incidents on the network cause most of the issues. Enforcement tries to prevent incidents. All lane running prevents police using the hard shoulder and so more platforms are required	Safety and Operational	✓			No	None provided		PM	1
The whole network	There are concerns amongst the Police about turning the lights off on the motorways	Safety	✓			No	None provided		PM	0
Additional comments	There has been good investment in the infrastructure in the area, particularly the introduction of the managed motorways on the M6. Managed motorways improve safety and capacity.	Safety, Operational and Capacity	✓						PM	-
Additional comments	Junction 15 of the M40 (Bridge Island) has been improved greatly and reduced queues	Capacity	✓						PH	-

## Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Warwick University</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>24/09/13</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Red Group</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Graham Stevenson</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Amie Coleman</b>		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Is there any trade- offs?</b>	<b>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</b>
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group <b>*Not in order of priority</b>	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.	Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Wherever there is a major change to a section of the network the HA need to include segregated lanes for cyclists. For example at roundabouts cyclists currently have to use drop kerbs - not ideal (GR)	Safety and society	If a better cycle network is provided then it will encourage more people to use it as a mode of transport	Important as it will improve safety for cyclists	Could provide underpasses or bridges for cyclists at nodes as these are the most difficult part of a route
The A5 corridor, particularly through the North of Nuneaton. Problems: Congestion, Safety, Air Quality Management (SH). When an incident occurs on the motorway there is additional congestion on the A5 due to traffic been diverted. The A5 is only 1 lane wide (per direction) in some areas and so it cannot cope with the additional traffic. The congestion often results in trucks sitting in queues which causes environmental issues (RW)	Capacity, Safety and environment	There are a number of issues on the A5 which need to be resolved as they effect a large number of road users (commuters, freight and cyclists)	One of the most important priorities for the group	
Safety - need to continue to make roads safer as high impact accidents have a knock on effect on the rest of the network (diversions). Need to educate road users on signs, managed motorways etc. More safety cameras need to be introduced. Areas of particular concern: Capthorpe junction, M6 junction 2, M42/M6 Toll merge, M40 junction 15 (PM).	Safety	Important as better safety levels on the network will reduce accidents	One of the most important priorities for the group	

<p>A46 between Alcester and Stratford - single carriageway causes congestion. Do not want to see it duelled from an environmental point of view (PH) however something needs to be done about the congestion.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Need a method to ease congestion on the A46 as current levels are not acceptable</p>	<p>Important to ease congestion on the road</p>	<p>Need a traffic management scheme on the A46 such as the use of traffic lights at peak times</p>
<p>A46/ A3400 Bishopton Hill island - there is a 5 lane roundabout planned to ease congestion. This junction is critical to the function of Stratford-upon-Avon</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Need a method to ease congestion on the A46 as current levels are not acceptable</p>	<p>Important - plans are already in place</p>	

## Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Birmingham</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20/09/2013</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Alan Bain</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Jan Gondzio</b>		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
M6 J15,16,17 Stoke	Getting on and off at junctions, especially A500(T) with M6 is difficult, leading to a constraint on economic development around the A500	Operational / Capacity	X			Yes - Peak hour speeds		GB	4	
M6 J13-19	Delays to trade traffic	Operational	X				Freight company journey times, e.g. from DHL	SG	2	
A50 east of Stoke, towards M1	Unreliable journey times; delays on important trunk route	Operational	X					SG	1	
M5/M6 interchange	Unpredictable journey times and delays due to insufficient capacity affect all users	Capacity	X					SG, AO, BD	4	
A500(T)	Lack of safe and secure stopping points/lay-bys for HGVs / freight Trucks are stuck in traffic just before they are due a break.	Safety	X					SG, BD	2	
M6	Sufficient capacity to allow development around M6	Operational	X		X		BCC: city mobility action plan – March 2014 LEP models: economic (KPMG) and transport	AO		
M6 / M6 Toll	M6 Toll empty while M6 congested	Operational	X					BD	10	

A5 to A38	Single carriageway on journey to M1 causes delays (See Delay Map)	Capacity	X			Yes - Delays		BD	BD	2
Black Country	Poor accessibility to/from the SRN across Black Country, e.g. journey time/distance to get onto M6 from Dudley	Operational	X						BD	1
Black Country	Business relocating outside Black Country because of congestion	Society	X					BD	BD	
i54, M6 North	Need to improve accessibility once Jaguar Land Rover plant open	Capacity		X					BD	11
Featherstone, M54-M6 link	Potential transport impact of strategic employment sites in the vicinity	Society					Study ongoing		PW	3
Whole network	Need to provide additional information to drivers to let them know where to stop if there is congestion up ahead on the network	Safety	X			n/a			SG	
Whole network	Need to ensure there is network resiliency and efficiency optimisation of the strategic/local routes. Incidents on the strategic network have knock-on effects elsewhere. The appropriate use of technology (e.g. VMS) could be provided	Operational							AO	
North Staffordshire	Need to manage the impact on the local non-strategic road network and consequences of blockages in North Staffs/ South Cheshire	Operational							GB	2
M6 J10a-6	Delays and unreliable journey times due to congestion and mix of traffic e.g. HGVs	Operational							BD	3
Whole network	Need to manage general capacity on motorways	Operational							AO	2
A5	Concerns about safety record	Safety							GB	2

M6 J8 and J7 to South	Insufficient capacity at motorway junctions	Capacity							SH	1
General	Impact of poorly maintained roads on truck tyres	Asset condition							BD	
Whole network	Congestion creates delays for freight traffic and this creates problems for HGV drivers – they cannot drive longer than the legal times	Operational							BD	
M6 / M42	<p>The LEPs' Strategic Economic Plan will have a major impact on growth and employment. This will require highway capacity, particularly on the strategic routes/junctions</p> <p>Key site is UK Central – the M42/Solihull corridor in the vicinity of M42 J5 and J6 and M6 J4</p> <p>Birmingham City Centre enterprise zone is major growth area and will affect traffic growth</p>						<p>Birmingham Mobility Action Plan outputs / analysis</p> <p>Birmingham Development Plan modelling / analysis</p> <p>Solihull MBC work on UK Central</p> <p>Birmingham Airport Surface Access work – SDG study</p> <p>Work being undertaken for GBS LGF investment packages</p> <p>GBS LTB KPMG economic development work</p> <p>Cross-LEP strategic connectivity work</p>		AO	



## Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Birmingham</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20/09/2013</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Alan Bain</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Jan Gondzio</b>		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
<p>Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.</p>	
<p>Need to identify the appraisal criteria</p> <p>Need to identify strategic movements</p> <p>Consider the interaction between road and rail for long-distance travel</p> <p>Identify which issues are short-term (e.g. peak) vs those that are all-day</p> <p>Timescale of priorities (which are short-term vs long-term on a scale up to 2030)</p> <p>i54 / JLR / M54</p>	<p>All</p> <p>Operational</p>	<p>Need to consider what journey purposes/trips are high value and then what trips to prioritise e.g. commuting vs freight traffic</p> <p>Local trips are easier to re-route while e.g. freight can't be diverted</p>	<p>Challenge in the long term/trade off between commuting and freight traffic. What should have priority? Do they have the same value?</p> <p>Pinch-point schemes / quick wins need to keep future strategic objectives in mind but can be a good start in improving delays.</p> <p>Is there a trade-off between short term solutions that tackle congestion and answering the long term structural problems of rising car-use for example.</p>	

<p>Integration/inter-connectivity across road and rail to get goods from train to shop via road</p>		<p>Short term priority (pre 2021)</p> <p>Long term priority (post 2021)</p> <p><b>Further comments raised in discussion:</b></p> <p>Do accidents have large knock-on effect on development – should safety be put first?</p> <p>Cost of traffic congestion estimated to cost economy £4.3 billion per year (CEBR?)</p> <p>Highway management structure/processes to help economic growth</p> <p>For business to operate, you need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Freight movement</li> <li>- Business travel ease</li> <li>- Access to pools of people</li> <li>- Reliability of journey times</li> </ul> <p>Need to assess delivery risk of projects</p> <p>Need to consider how to prioritise for different timescales with available funds</p>		
---	--	--	--	--

## Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Black Country, Stoke and Staffs</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20<sup>th</sup> September 2013</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Red</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Danny Lamb</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Oliver McLaughlin</b>		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
Network-wide	Are the traffic growth forecasts accurate enough to inform future strategies?	Capacity		x	x			GK		
Network-wide (related to supply chain)	Does the RBS process adequately understand the needs and locations of current major employers?  Most of the future jobs growth will come from existing employers such as Jaguar Land Rover and JCB. The RBS evidence needs to cover existing employers particularly those that use/rely on the strategic network for access to their supply chain.	Capacity	x		x	Yes	More evidence can be provided by LAs and LEPS e.g. Stoke City Deal report	PD	5	
Junction 15 (M6)	Traffic can be delayed and create unreliable journey times. Route management should be more focused on problem areas. There is a need for VMS to tell people to avoid M6 J15 when there are problems	Operational	x					PD		

A38 Lichfield Burton	Traffic delays create unreliability. There is a need for VMS/better traffic information to inform people about problems on the A38 so they can avoid the area or choose an alternative route/time.	Operational	x						EB	
M6 Toll	Under utilised due to prices. Suggestion that casualties on the A5 may relate to HGVs not using the toll due to pricing	Capacity Safety	x				Enquiry into M6 toll – reports being produced.  Long term evidence already available.		EB/ AK/ PD	5
A50/A500 North	The route carries circa 50% of through traffic.  The route severs the Stoke conurbation, as there are limited crossing points and limited opportunities for sustainable modes	Safety  Society	x				Vulnerable users study (Stoke City Council/Sustrans)		AK	
M42 J6	Runs at 98% capacity and is often gridlocked. Not seasonal – remains constant. Concerns for future Solihull Gateway/Airport expansion.	Capacity	x				Anecdotal evidence from NEC; Arup study/gateway research		GM	3
Stafford	Growth plans for 10,000 houses will create additional transport demand. It is unlikely all the residents will work in Stafford so this will add pressure to the strategic network during peak periods for commuting traffic	Capacity		x					GK	
Birmingham	Need to address the impact that high levels of transport movements have on noise/air quality/ light pollution	Society & Environment	x				CPRE Studies; CPRE study demonstrated level of light pollution, this has not been updated for 8 years		GK	
A5	Perception that poor highway standards create HGV accidents at junctions	Safety	x						PD	

A38	Lack of slip roads can create safety issues.	Safety	x			Yes	Local Authority accident data		AK	
A50	Accidents caused by short slip roads. This creates traffic delays/congestion as the incidents are managed by local police, not HA traffic officers	Safety	x			Yes – accident data displayed on map/			AK	
Lichfield Trent Valley Station	Potential for people to shift to under-utilised rail mode. Better information could direct users to station.	Capacity	x						PD	
A500	Congestion at peak times could be alleviated with better traffic information/VMS	Capacity/Safety/Operational	x				North Staffs connectivity study		PD	5
M6 Junction 6-10	Traffic is diverted onto the local highway network during the peak hours due to congestion on M6	Capacity	x						PD/ AK	6
Key routes M6, M6 Toll, M42, M54, A38, A50	<p>There is a common challenge across the network to provide more/better/reliable/real time information about incidents and delays on the strategic routes.</p> <p>The consequences of congestion affect a wide range of issues including journey time reliability which has a knock on effect on business activity.</p> <p>It also adversely affects air quality with vehicles stuck in traffic.</p> <p>Opportunity to prioritise HGV movements.</p>		x							

A38 Fradley. HGVs queuing on to carriageway	Capacity Issues at junction with Fradley – HGVs queuing on to carriageway	Capacity	x							2
General	Adopted and emerging Core Strategies should be included in evidence base.				x	Yes				
General	HS2 may provide some opportunities for mode shift in some places and this could alleviate pressure on the HA network. But some areas will be marginalised/disadvantaged.						KPMG HS2 report			AK

## Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Black Country, Stoke and Staffs</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20<sup>th</sup> September 2013</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Red</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Danny Lamb</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Oliver McLaughlin</b>		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	<b>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</b>
Better traffic management in Staffordshire/Stoke City Deal locations This includes better information/VMS/incident management to reduce congestion and improve journey time reliability on A38/A500/A50	Safety  Capacity	Access to jobs – current and future employment e.g. JCB. Everyone in agreement	Priority is to deal with current issues to enable businesses to support the economy	Controlling flow and increasing safety
M42 Gateway/UK Central is very important for supporting local economy, including M42 J6	Capacity	Need for economic growth in area can be supported at NEC/Airport/Solihull. GM		
Strategic road network through Birmingham	Maintenance	Asset management neglected over long period.		
To reduce congestion and improve reliability/resilience there is a need for better incident management/reliable real time traffic information/VMS and more traffic officers	Operational  Safety	Whole group agreed this is a priority – to keep the routes running and reducing adverse impacts of congestion/delays		

M6 Toll underutilisation		Distribution of HGVs needs to be managed in order to increase safety/relieve congestion. All in agreement	Increasing the patronage of the M6 Toll will help alleviate many of the other issues detailed above.	Can toll for HGVs be reduced?
Need to encourage more people to change travel behaviour and mode shift off the strategic routes	Capacity	Expansion of the strategic network will encourage more road users. Mode shift will help to reduce congestion and pollution issues. GK		



## Route-based strategies stakeholder events

## Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Birmingham</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20<sup>th</sup> September 2013</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Yellow</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Sarah Loynes</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Derek Jones</b>		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
A50 JCB Uttoxeter and growth on A50 corridor generally	Rocester junction is not adequate for future growth. Concern that there is no strategy for A50. Not all employment sites are shown on HA map	Capacity		x	x	No	Scheme funding report	WS to provide scheme funding report. JCB can provide evidence	WS	8
A5 Staffordshire Area	Single carriageway sections create congestion	Capacity	x			Yes	A5 Strategy	HA has this document (Ominder Bharj)	WS	
Major employment sites; I54 in South Staffs, Alton Towers, JCB	RBS needs to take account of future plans for economic growth	Capacity		x	x	Yes	-	-	WS	
Motorway sections	Need to address the impact of noise on local residents due to the volume of traffic travelling on the motorway	Society & Environment	x			No	-	-	MC	
M5 J1 & J2. M6 J9 & J10	Need to address the consequences of congestion at these junctions	Capacity	x			Yes	Report re M6 Toll Free Lorry Trials	Ann Morris – Road Haulage Association	AM	

A49 Improvement Opportunity	The A49 could provide an opportunity to relieve traffic issues on M6	Capacity	x			No	-	-	AM	
Black country route approach to M6 J10	The area is already heavily congested and future development opportunities are likely to impact further on the road network	Capacity	x	x	x	No	-	-	AM	1
A50	To improve safety there is a need to close lay-bys	Safety	x			No	-	-	AM	
All; and in particular the M6	Need to improve air quality, therefore need to reduce congestion. Air quality needs research and monitoring	Society and Environment	x			Yes	-	-	AM C/M C	10
M6 J10, J9, J8, M5 J1, J2.	Traffic congestion and slow speeds affect public health issues (air quality). M6 creates severance and air quality issues on the east side of the M6 section	Capacity and Society and Environment	x	x	x	Yes- some	Information re growth and jobs and air quality action plan	Mark Corbin – Walsall Council	MC	
M5 J6	Need to accommodate development growth in Bromsgrove and Redditch	Capacity and Society and Environment		x	x	Yes - some	Transport Network Analysis and Mitigation Report (Halcrow/WCC May 2013); Air Quality Reports, AQMA M42 J1, AQMA Town Centre	Rosemary Williams – Bromsgrove District Council	RW	
M42 closures and diversion routes	Diversion routes cause issues on A38 on local road network	Capacity	x			Yes - some	Transport Network Analysis and Mitigation Report (Halcrow/WCC May 2013); Air Quality Reports, AQMA M42 J1, AQMA Town Centre	Rosemary Williams – Bromsgrove District Council	RW	
M6 corridor	Need to address the impacts on Enterprise Zone and future job creation in the area; employment growth and housing growth	Capacity		x	x	Yes	-	-	MC	3
A38 Fradley	Inadequate substandard junction at Fradley Village	Safety	x			No	A38 Pell Frischmann Modular Road Report	Held by HA – Ominder Bharj	WS	

Area Wide	Strategic network diversion routes impact on the local roads – need to consider how diversions should work in future	Capacity	x			No	-	-	MC	
M6 J15-J16	ATM will be provided in the surrounding sections why not this section?	Operational		x		No	-	-	WS	
A5 AQMA Bridgetown (Cannock)	The issues could have been resolved by the proposed HA pinchpoint scheme, but it was not taken forward. AQMA concerns remain	Society and Environment	x	x	x	No	-	-	WS	1
ATM Areas	Need to improve the relationship between ATM and local road network - sudden changes in signage type and understanding of this	Operational	x			No	-	-	MC	
ATM Areas	Public do not understand ATM so their driving behaviour causes congestion	Operational	x			No	-	-	AM	
ATM Areas	Need to consider and manage the effect of ATM on local roads and traffic volumes	Capacity	x			No	-	-	MC	
ATM Areas	Need to manage ATM. When signs are left on 'for no reason' this causes unnecessary congestion. Signs need to be reset faster	Operational Capacity	x			No	-	-	AM	
All Motorway	Need to manage the disruption created by continued roadworks	Operational	x			No	-	-	AM	
Bilston	Bilston Urban Village missing from map	Other	x			No	-	-	AM	

M6 J9/J10	Economic activity and general access to area is adversely affected by congestion	Capacity	x			Yes	-	-	MC	7
M6 Elevated Sections	Noise on elevated motorway sections of M6	Society and Environment	x			No	Noise Mapping	Mark Corbin – Walsall Council	MC	
Bromsgrove Area SRN	Air Quality Issues	Society and Environment	x			No	Air Quality Report	Rosemary Williams – Bromsgrove District Council	RW	
All Areas	Safety can be improved with concrete central reservations	Safety	x			No	-	-	AM	
A5 Cannock Area	Need to address safety issue	Safety	x			Yes	Year 2009 Staffordshire County Council Report	Will Spencer- Staffordshire County Council	WS	
M6T	M6T could provide more capacity and relieve congestion if it was not tolled/changed ownership	Capacity	x			No	-	-	AM C	
M6T	M6 experience congestion as the M6T is under utilised	Capacity	x			Yes	-	-	WS	1
All HA routes	Opportunity for HA to act in relation to the provision of electric charging points	Society and Environment	x	x	x	No	-	-	AM C	
M6 J15 Stoke	Safety Issue	Safety	x			Yes	-	-	WS & AM	
M5/M42 Bromsgrove Area	SRN capacity needs to facilitate growth. Site are still to be allocated (e.g. for 2500 homes)	Capacity		x	x	No	-	-	RW	
M5/M6 to west of Birmingham	Would congestion on M5/M6 be alleviated with the provision of a western relief road?	Capacity	x			Yes – in terms of existing capacity issue	-	-	AM	

M42 J1.	Problems on motorway means that traffic diverts through Bromsgrove along A38 southwards to rejoin M5 at M5 J5. This causes local congestion and air quality issues	Capacity Environment	x	x	x	Yes – in terms of existing capacity issue	-	-	RW	6
M5 J1 & J2	Need to address the adverse impacts of congestion at these junctions i.e. delays, unreliable journey times	Capacity	x	x	x	Yes	-	-	AM	3
Birmingham Motorway box	To support the activity and performance of the West Midlands the Motorway Box should run freely	Capacity	x	x	x	Yes – in terms of existing capacity issue	-	-	AM	2

## Route-based strategies stakeholder events

## Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Birmingham</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20<sup>th</sup> September 2013</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Yellow</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Sarah Loynes</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Derek Jones</b>		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be.	Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
M6 J10	Capacity	Development Growth – Enterprise Zones aspirations and poor existing situation re delays	MC – but noted importance of other issues as well	Needs large scale improvement
A5 in Staffordshire	Capacity Safety	Growth aspirations	Based on evidence presented in Staffordshire Area – WS	
Birmingham Motorway Box	Capacity	Affects performance of whole region	AM	
A50 Uttoxeter	Capacity Safety	JCB Growth Aspirations	Based on evidence presented in Staffordshire Area – WS	
M42 J1. Problems on motorway means that traffic diverts through Bromsgrove along A38 southwards to rejoin at M5 J5. This causes local congestion and air quality issues	Capacity	Likely to be exacerbated by significant future growth i.e. Bromsgrove 7000 homes, Redditch 7000 homes, Birmingham 30,000 homes (shortfall).  Bromsgrove is 90% greenbelt, an attractive place to live and located centrally for business. This creates pressures for development	RW	

A5 Cannock Area	Safety	Significant safety issues to be resolved	AMC	
M6 J9	Safety	Pedestrian safety - school crossing route	MC	
M5 J1/J2	Capacity	Current capacity issues to be exacerbated by growth	MC/AM	
M6 J15-J16, for continuity should be ATM	Safety	For continuity/safety as is a 'missing link' of ATM	AM	
Resurfacing in urban areas to be prioritised to reduce road noise to receptors	Safety	Priority to urban areas as greater number of receptors	MC	

## Breakout Session 1: what are the key challenges for the routes?

<b>Workshop Name</b>	<b>Birmingham</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>20<sup>th</sup> September 2013</b>	<b>Breakout Group</b>	<b>Green</b>
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	<b>Lee White</b>	<b>Note-taker</b>	<b>Anthony Hogan</b>		

Relevant RBS	Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
				Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
North and East Midlands	A50 JCB Uttoxeter and growth on A50 corridor generally	Rocester junction is not adequate for future growth. Concern that there is no strategy for A50. Not all employment sites are shown on HA map	Capacity		x	x	No	Scheme funding report	WS to provide scheme funding report. JCB can provide evidence	WS	8
South Midlands	A5 Staffordshire Area	Single carriageway sections create congestion	Capacity	x			Yes	A5 Strategy	HA has this document (Ominder Bharj)	WS	
London to Scotland West Midlands to Wales and Gloucestershire	Major employment sites; I54 in South Staffs, Alton Towers, JCB	RBS needs to take account of future plans for economic growth	Capacity		x	x	Yes	-	-	WS	
All	Motorway sections	Need to address the impact of noise on local residents due to the volume of traffic travelling on the motorway	Society & Environment	x			No	-	-	MC	
London to Scotland West	M5 J1 & J2. M6 J9 & J10	Need to address the consequences of congestion at these junctions	Capacity	x			Yes	Report re M6 Toll Free Lorry Trials	Ann Morris – Road Haulage Association	AM	
London to Scotland West Midlands to Wales and Gloucestershire	A49 Improvement Opportunity	The A49 could provide an opportunity to relieve traffic issues on M6	Capacity	x			No	-	-	AM	
London to Scotland West	Black country route approach to M6 J10	The area is already heavily congested and future development opportunities are likely to impact further on the road network	Capacity	x	x	x	No	-	-	AM	1
North and East Midlands	A50	To improve safety there is a need to close lay-bys	Safety	x			No	-	-	AM	
London to Scotland West	All; and in particular the M6	Need to improve air quality, therefore need to reduce congestion. Air quality needs research and monitoring	Society and Environment	x			Yes	-	-	AMC/MC	10



London to Scotland West	M6 J10, J9, J8, M5 J1, J2.	Traffic congestion and slow speeds affect public health issues (air quality). M6 creates severance and air quality issues on the east side of the M6 section	Capacity and Society and Environment	x	x	x	Yes- some	Information re growth and jobs and air quality action plan	Mark Corbin – Walsall Council	MC	
Birmingham to Exeter	M5 J6	Need to accommodate development growth in Bromsgrove and Redditch	Capacity and Society and Environment		x	x	Yes - some	Transport Network Analysis and Mitigation Report (Halcrow/WCC May 2013); Air Quality Reports, AQMA M42 J1, AQMA Town Centre	Rosemary Williams – Bromsgrove District Council	RW	
South Midlands	M42 closures and diversion routes	Diversion routes cause issues on A38 on local road network	Capacity	x			Yes - some	Transport Network Analysis and Mitigation Report (Halcrow/WCC May 2013); Air Quality Reports, AQMA M42 J1, AQMA Town Centre	Rosemary Williams – Bromsgrove District Council	RW	
London to Scotland West	M6 corridor	Need to address the impacts on Enterprise Zone and future job creation in the area; employment growth and housing growth	Capacity		x	x	Yes	-	-	MC	3
South Midlands	A38 Fradley	Inadequate substandard junction at Fradley Village	Safety	x			No	A38 Pell Frischmann Modular Road Report	Held by HA – Ominder Bharj	WS	
All	Area Wide	Strategic network diversion routes impact on the local roads – need to consider how diversions should work in future	Capacity	x			No	-	-	MC	
London to Scotland West	M6 J15-J16	ATM will be provided in the surrounding sections why not this section?	Operational		x		No	-	-	WS	
South Midlands	A5 AQMA Bridgetown (Cannock)	The issues could have been resolved by the proposed HA pinchpoint scheme, but it was not taken forward. AQMA concerns remain	Society and Environment	x	x	x	No	-	-	WS	1
London to Scotland West	MM Areas	Need to improve the relationship between MM and local road network - sudden changes in signage type and understanding of this	Operational	x			No	-	-	MC	

London to Scotland West	MM Areas	Public do not understand MM so their driving behaviour causes congestion	Operational	x			No	-	-	AM	
London to Scotland West	MM Areas	Need to consider and manage the effect of MM on local roads and traffic volumes	Capacity	x			No	-	-	MC	
London to Scotland West	MM Areas	Need to manage MM. When signs are left on 'for no reason' this causes unnecessary congestion. Signs need to be reset faster	Operational	x			No	-	-	AM	
All	All Motorway	Need to manage the disruption created by continued roadworks	Operational	x			No	-	-	AM	
London to Scotland West	Bilston	Bilston Urban Village missing from map	Other	x			No	-	-	AM	
London to Scotland West	M6 J9/J10	Economic activity and general access to area is adversely affected by congestion	Capacity	x			Yes	-	-	MC	7
London to Scotland West	M6 Elevated Sections	Noise on elevated motorway sections of M6	Society and Environment	x			No	Noise Mapping	Mark Corbin – Walsall Council	MC	
London to Scotland West Birmingham to Exeter	Bromsgrove Area SRN	Air Quality Issues	Society and Environment	x			No	Air Quality Report	Rosemary Williams – Bromsgrove District Council	RW	
All	All Areas	Safety can be improved with concrete central reservations	Safety	x			No	-	-	AM	
South Midlands	A5 Cannock Area	Need to address safety issue	Safety	x			Yes	Year 2009 Staffordshire County Council Report	Will Spencer-Staffordshire County Council	WS	
South Midlands	M6T	M6T could provide more capacity and relieve congestion if it was not tolled/changed ownership	Capacity	x			No	-	-	AMC	
South Midlands	M6T	M6 experience congestion as the M6T is under utilised	Capacity	x			Yes	-	-	WS	1
All	All HA routes	Opportunity for HA to act in relation to the provision of electric charging points	Society and Environment	x	x	x	No	-	-	AMC	
London to Scotland West	M6 J15 Stoke	Safety Issue	Safety	x			Yes	-	-	WS & AM	
London to Scotland West Birmingham to Exeter	M5/M42 Bromsgrove Area	SRN capacity needs to facilitate growth. Site are still to be allocated (e.g. for 2500 homes)	Capacity		x	x	No	-	-	RW	
London to Scotland West	M5/M6 to west of Birmingham	Would congestion on M5/M6 be alleviated with the provision of a western relief road?	Capacity	x			Yes – in terms of existing capacity issue	-	-	AM	
London to Scotland West	M42 J1.	Problems on motorway means that traffic diverts through Bromsgrove along A38 southwards to rejoin M5 at	Environment	x	x	x	Yes – in terms of existing capacity issue	-	-	RW	6

		M5 J5. This causes local congestion and air quality issues									
London to Scotland West	M5 J1 & J2	Need to address the adverse impacts of congestion at these junctions i.e. delays, unreliable journey times	Capacity	x	x	x	Yes	-	-	AM	3
London to Scotland West	Birmingham Motorway box	To support the activity and performance of the West Midlands the Motorway Box should run freely	Capacity	x	x	x	Yes – in terms of existing capacity issue	-	-	AM	2

**Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?**

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?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities. Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
M6 J10	Capacity	Development Growth – Enterprise Zones aspirations and poor existing situation re delays	MC – but noted importance of other issues as well	Needs large scale improvement
A5 in Staffordshire	Capacity / safety	Growth aspirations	Based on evidence presented in Staffordshire Area – WS	
Birmingham Motorway Box	Capacity	Affects performance of whole region	AM	
A50 Uttoxeter	Capacity / safety	JCB Growth Aspirations	Based on evidence presented in Staffordshire Area – WS	
M42 J1. Problems on motorway means that traffic diverts through Bromsgrove along A38 southwards to rejoin at M5 J5. This causes local congestion and air quality issues	Capacity	Likely to be exacerbated by significant future growth i.e. Bromsgrove 7000 homes, Redditch 7000 homes, Birmingham 30,000 homes (shortfall). Bromsgrove is 90% greenbelt, an attractive place to live and located centrally for business. This creates pressures for development	RW	
A5 Cannock Area	Safety	Significant safety issues to be resolved	AMC	
M6 J9	Safety	Pedestrian safety - school crossing route	MC	
M5 J1/J2	Capacity	Current capacity issues to be exacerbated by growth	MC/AM	
M6 J15-J16, for continuity should be ATM	Safety	For continuity/safety as is a 'missing link' of ATM	AM	
Resurfacing in urban areas to be prioritised to reduce road noise to receptors	Environment	Priority to urban areas as greater number of receptors	MC	
Need to increase use of M6T	Capacity	Everyone in group in agreement	No other viable solution to Midland congestion - seems ludicrous to have the infrastructure in place but not use it	

## **Part C Bibliography**

## **C1 Sources for stage 1 evidence report**

### **C1.1 Chapter 2**

Area 7 Asset Management Plan 2012-13 v1\_2 (Post allocation).

Midlands regional safety report, April 2012

Environmental Information system (EnvIS) - contains environmental data supplied by Service Providers, the HA and other third parties and displayed in the Highways Agency Geographical Information System (HAGIS). The data within EnvIS identifies the asset, location, condition and broad management requirements. EnvIS is divided into the following environmental topics:

- Landscape
- Nature Conservation and Ecology
- Water
- Cultural Heritage
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Waste and Material Resources

### **C1.2 Chapter 3**

East Midlands airport Sustainable Development Plan 2013-14, [www.eastmidlandsairport.com/developmentplan](http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/developmentplan).

Ashfield Local Plan Publication 2013 (scale up to and including 2024)

Gedling Borough Council Update of 5 year Housing Land Supply Assessment 2013

Broxtowe Borough Council Housing Land Availability 2013 (scale up to and including 2028)

Erewash Core Strategy Submission Version (scale up to and including 2028).

Nottingham City Council Housing Land Availability 2012 (scale up to and including 2028).

Newark and Sherwood Allocations and Development Management DPD (scale up to and including 2026)

Mansfield LDF Seventh Annual Monitoring Report (scale up to and including 2026)

Rushcliffe core strategy, publication version march 2012

Bolsover Local Plan Strategy

Chesterfield Borough Council; Adopted Local Plan

Land Supply and Trajectory in Amber Valley Borough (scale up to and including 2026)

Derbyshire Dales Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft (scale up to and including 2028)

High Peak Local Plan Preferred Options

South Derbyshire District Council: Assessment of 5 year Housing Supply (scale up to and including 2026)

Derby City Council Preferred Growth Strategy (scale up to and including 2028)

North East Derbyshire Local Plan Housing Target

Lichfield Local Plan Strategy

Solihull Local Development Framework

Cannock Chase Local Plan

Tamworth Local Plan

Redditch Draft Local Plan No. 4

Bromsgrove District Plan Submission Version

Wyre Forest Core Strategy

North West Leicestershire Core Strategy with Proposed Changes.

Harborough Core Strategy (scale up to and including 2028).

Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy (scale up to and including 2026)

Blaby Core Strategy DPD (scale up to and including 2029).

Charnwood Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft (scale up to and including 2029)

Leicester City Council Core Strategy (scale up to and including 2026).

Melton Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2031). Withdrawn as unsound.

East Staffordshire Borough Council Pre-Submission Local Plan 2013

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council Revised Submission Core Strategy (scale up to and including 2026)

Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council SHLAA 2012/13 (scale up to and including 2026)

Newcastle-under-lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Strategy Adopted

Stafford New Local Plan Publication document

Central Lincolnshire Core Strategy (up to 2031).

South Kesteven Core Strategy (adopted)

Grantham Area Action Plan, South Kesteven Annual Monitoring Report 2011-12 and the Housing Strategy 2013-2018

### **C1.3 Evidence received from stakeholder workshops**

D2N2 and Greater Lincolnshire

Evidence title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	RBS Routes
Flood maps	Environment	-Flood maps showing flood zones, flood	-London to Scotland

	Agency	storage areas, flood defences and the areas benefitting from flood defences (individual maps for Derby South, Newark and Grantham, Nottingham and Newark, Newark and Lincoln, North Lincolnshire and North Nottinghamshire)	East -North and East Midlands -South Midlands -London to Leeds (East) -South Pennines
Headline issues within the EA remit that apply to Highways Development	Environment Agency	-Flood risk is broadly referred to. -It is recommended that the Water Framework Directive and Water Quality is included in HA's list of EIA scoping topics. -Highways construction must not make the waterbody status worse and mitigation should be installed to alleviate pollution risks associated with construction works. -Protection and development of natural fisheries environment is one of EA's key priorities – actions for their protection are set out in the document.	N/A
Ashfield DC Local Plan Publication Document Summary Leaflet (August 2013) + Policies Map	Ashfield DC	-Provides a summary of the Local Plan Publication Document (which AECOM provided a response to on 20/09/13). -The summary document briefly sets out the content of the Local Plan, including vision and objectives, strategic policies and area-based strategic policies specifically in Hucknall, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and rural villages. -The map highlights the locations of the policies set out in the summary document.	- London to Scotland East
NCC average speed data	Nottingham City Council	-8 maps displaying average speed data in the Newark and Nottingham City Centre areas for AM and PM peaks.	- North and East Midlands - London to Leeds East
DCC – URS Trans-Pennine Connectivity Study Final Draft Issue 2 (August 2012)	Jamie Douglas ( <a href="mailto:Jamie.Douglas@parliament.uk">Jamie.Douglas@parliament.uk</a> )	-Evidence provided with regards to the economic benefit of improved transport links between Manchester and Sheffield.	-South Pennines
Bassetlaw Site Allocations	Bassetlaw Council	-Provides detailed information regarding the housing trajectory for Bassetlaw from the	-London to Leeds East

		period 2014-2028 which is split across several different strategic sites.	
--	--	---	--

## Leicestershire and Coventry and Warwickshire

Evidence Title	Evidence source	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
Headline issues within the EA remit that apply to Highways Development + maps	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Flood risk is broadly referred to.</li> <li>-It is suggested that the Water Framework Directive and Water Quality is included in HA's list of EIA scoping topics.</li> <li>-Highways construction must not make the waterbody status worse and mitigation should be installed to alleviate pollution risks associated with construction works.</li> <li>-Protection and development of natural fisheries environment is one of EA's key priorities – actions for their protection are set out in the document.</li> </ul>	-EA did/do not know where work is being proposed and so did not provide specific details with regards to the SRN.	N/A
Leicestershire County Council: Evidence for the RBS stakeholder event	Leicestershire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Sets out the transport evidence base for Leicestershire.</li> <li>-Provides an overview of major committed developments in Leicestershire and required associated improvements to the SRN.</li> <li>-Describes and reviews committed improvement schemes to the SRN.</li> <li>-Sets out district wide studies in Leicestershire.</li> <li>-Provides a brief synopsis of LLITM.</li> </ul>	-All of the content makes direct reference to the appropriate section of the SRN.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-London to Scotland East</li> <li>- North and East Midlands</li> <li>- South Midlands</li> </ul>
Leicestershire County Council: County developments map	Leicestershire County Council	-A map displaying housing developments with more than 100 dwellings and employment development areas across the county. It is colour coded to show	-The location of the site allocations in relation to the SRN can be seen on the map, although it is black and white with no labels so is not completely clear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-London to Scotland East</li> <li>-North and East Midlands</li> </ul>



Evidence Title	Evidence source	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
		applications, appeals, SUE sites known and committed developments.		-South Midlands
Leicestershire County Council: Congestion map	Leicestershire County Council	-A map showing congestion levels in the Leicestershire/Nottingham /Derby areas.	-Congestion levels are displayed by a differential symbology on the SRN (and other roads) so it relevant to the SRN. However, congestion on the M1/M69 is not shown.	-London to Scotland East  -North and East Midlands  -South Midlands
Leicestershire County Council: Stress map (2026)	Leicestershire County Council	-A map showing a congestion plan of the county in 2026 shown as a Stress (AADT/CRF)%	-Little data is displayed on the SRN (most is positioned on the LRN).	-London to Scotland East  -North and East Midlands  -South Midlands
Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan: Preferred Options (Part 1&2)	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	The Local Plan/Core Strategy for the borough, running until 2028. Details anticipated housing and employment development in the borough.	One development, North of Nuneaton in particular is adjacent to the A5. General growth within the borough may have mixed impacts on the SRN.	-Felixstowe to Midlands
Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan: Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	Details infrastructure required to support anticipated development. Background to key connections commuting patterns, and traffic issues and trends.	Nuneaton has submitted A5/A47/B4666 Longshoot / Dodwells junction improvements to LTP3. County council have identified 16 highway-related improvements required if full extent of northern expansion (SHS4) development is completed (3 affecting A5. One further general aspiration affecting M6 J3).	-Felixstowe to Midlands  -London to Scotland West
Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan: Proposal Map	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	Detailed map of anticipated developments in the borough, along with proposed infrastructure improvements.	Highlights M6 J 3, and A47 junctions with A5. Highlights housing site SHS4's proximity to A5 (3,000 dwellings). County council have identified 16 highway-related improvements required if full extent of development is completed (3 affecting A5, 1 aspirational).	-Felixstowe to Midlands  -London to Scotland West
North Warwickshire Core Strategy:	North Warwickshire	The core strategy of North Warwickshire borough	Significant housing development planned in Atherstone & Mancetter and	-Felixstowe to Midlands

Evidence Title	Evidence source	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
Submission Version	Borough Council	from 2006 until 2028.	Dordon (A5), and Coleshill (A446).	- South Midlands
North Warwickshire Site Allocations Plan: Preferred Options	North Warwickshire Borough Council	The site allocations plan for North Warwickshire. Used as an evidence base for the Core Strategy, above.  Covers Employment, Housing and retail sites.	Details the following development options (that have a potential SRN impact):  Employment (any size): -Dordon, 31ha (A5) -Atherstone, 6.9ha (A5)  Housing (>200 units): -Atherstone & Mancetter, 600 units (A5) -Polesworth & Dordon, 440 units (A5) -Coleshill, 275 units (A446)	-Felixstowe to Midlands  - South Midlands
North Warwickshire [Additional information from email, DB 03/10/13]	North Warwickshire Borough Council	Other potential development sites: -Grendon – appeal for further 85 units. -Atherstone - pre-application for additional 400 units. -Employment sites, especially around M42 Js 9&10.	May impact on SRN if any come to fruition.	-Felixstowe to Midlands
Warwickshire LTP 2011-2026	Warwickshire CC	The third Local Transport Plan for Warwickshire. Has background details on local transport in the county and future key proposals. Details strategy delivery of: congestion, land use and transportation, road safety, highway maintenance, intelligent transport systems. Finally, implementation plan up to 2015.	-Notes absence of long term strategy for A5. Report to be drafted in collaboration with HA.  -Details many of the SRN improvements currently being planned by the HA: A5 junctions/improvements, M6 junctions, A46 Stratford-Alcester, M40 J 14, A45 junctions, A46 junctions, A45-A46 underpass.  -Quality Bus Corridor along A5 from Altherstone-Tamworth.  -Many major developments shown around Rugby, including Radio Tower SUE, Gateway SUE and DIRFT will affect SRN.  -Congestion strategy (p159) will impact on SRN directly and	-Felixstowe to Midlands  -London to Scotland West  -South Midlands

Evidence Title	Evidence source	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
			indirectly. -No major schemes listed in plan to affect SRN up to 2015.	
A Strategy for the A5 (December 2013).	Warwickshire CC Produced by A5 Transport Group, in conjunction with local government and HA.	Analysis of issues and potential solutions of the A5 in terms of local and national policy. Summarises development proposals along its route. Outlines the strategy and intended role of A5 up to 2026.	Details issues experienced along the A5, and potential developments along the route that may affect its operation. Includes phasing information. Strategy up to 2026 (from p40) especially relevant. Action plan outlines issues, responsibilities, costs and anticipated timescales of key improvements required.	-South Midlands
Warwick District Council Local Plan: Revised Development Strategy	Warwick District Council	Revised development strategy (June 2013) for Warwick DC, details site allocations for the local plan.	Development SE of Kenilworth (Thickthorn) adjacent to A46. Development S of Warwick, and between Warwick and Leamington Spa close to M40 (J14).  Development of 500 dwellings at Whitnash. No direct impact on SRN.	-London to Scotland West  -South Midlands
Stratford on Avon: extracts from Intended Proposed Submission Core Strategy	Stratford on Avon District Council	Extracts from the Intended Proposed Submission Core Strategy, endorsed by the Council in July 2013.	Details developments in Stratford on Avon that have an impact on the A46	- South Midlands
Stratford-upon-Avon District Council – Strategic Transport Assessment October 2012	Warwickshire County Council	Evaluation of 5 development scenarios (Options E&F from Core Strategy) for development across the district, and the impact on the local and strategic road network. Scenario 2 (Option F) is preferred strategy (wider dispersal of development).  (STA S-PARAMICS Modelling Report contains information relevant only to Startford-upon-Avon).	Impacts measured on: -M40 J12-14 -M40 J14-15 -A46 Stratford Northern bypass -A46 between Marraway and M40 J15 -A46 Warwick Bypass.  % growth (approximate additional vehicle movements) of each scenario: -Scenario 1: 1-2% (100-150), 1-2% (100-150), 8-9% (100), 3-4% (150), 3% (150). -Scenario 2: 1-2% (100-150), 1-2% (100-150), 6% (100), 2%	-South Midlands  -London to Scotland West

Evidence Title	Evidence source	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
			<p>(100), 2% (150).</p> <p>-Scenario 3: 4% (300), 2% (200), 6% (100), 4% (150), 3% (150).</p> <p>-Scenario 4: 23-25% (2,100), 8-10% (1,050), 7% (100), 13-14% (500), 8-9% (450).</p> <p>-Scenario 5: minimal, minimal, minimal, 8-9% (300), 4% (200).</p> <p>Details interventions that would be required under each scenario on the SRN.</p>	
<p>Warwickshire County Council</p> <p>Stratford-on-Avon Strategic Transport Assessment</p> <p>Phase 2 Modelling Report June 2013</p>	Warwickshire County Council	<p>Testing of two approaches to housing allocation; South East Stratford SUE and Stratford Regeneration Zone (SRZ) or New Settlement at Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath (GLH) (M40 J12).</p> <p>Expected sizes (dwellings/employment): SUE - 2,750/8ha, SRZ – 700, 25ha, GLH – 5,000/18ha. Includes expected mitigations as part of each approach.</p>	<p>Details impacts on the local Stratford area, including A46, and M40 J12-13.</p> <p>General network stats only are detailed for Stratford. Fairly similar results between comparison and with SUE and SRZ and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Journey times with GLH development reduced in 2028 scenario on M40.</p>	<p>-South Midlands</p> <p>-London to Scotland West</p>
<p>Stratford-on-Avon Strategic Transport Assessment Phase 2</p> <p>Studley Scenario Analysis</p>	Warwickshire County Council	Modelling of impacts of proposed development at Studley.	PARAMICS model does not reach to SRN (closest is M42 J2/3), but discusses development planned in Studley.	(London to West Scotland)

## Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Stoke and Staffordshire and Black Country

Evidence Title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	RBS Route
Black Country LEP Input: Route 3. London to Scotland West	Black Country LEP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overview of investment in the road network around M6 J10 (Route 3).</li> <li>- Description of significant growth areas at Wolverhampton North i54 and Walsall Darlaston (Enterprise Zones) and a broad reference to their impacts on the road network.</li> <li>- Economic costs of delay between M6 J10a and M5 J3.</li> <li>- Proposed solution to mitigate problems at M6 J10 (capacity increase).</li> <li>- Air pollution a significant problem along the M6. Could be reduced through a reduction in congestion.</li> <li>- Future route requirements – Black Country LEP received Strategic Outline Cases for Major Scheme funding of M6 J10 and M5 J2.</li> <li>- M6 J10 RBS timescales.</li> <li>-M5 J1 and J2 traffic counts provided.</li> </ul>	-London to Scotland West
The Black Country Enterprise Zone	Black Country Enterprise Zone	- Advertisement brochure for the Black County Enterprise Zone (which includes 19 sites for development).	-London to Scotland West-Midlands to Wales and Gloucestershire
A38 Corridor STS Study Modular Scheme Development Report	Lichfield District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The study aims to determine how to accommodate the traffic demand arising from the anticipated growth in Lichfield/East Staffordshire through the identification an affordable and deliverable transport strategy.</li> <li>-Describes how the A38 suffers from serious congestion and safety issues which, in some sections, are double the national average.</li> <li>-An assessment of current arrangements and proposed interventions to deal with forecast conditions is made.</li> <li>-Maximising efficient operations of the A38 through a combination of Intelligent Transport Systems and Influencing Travel Behaviour, delivered in a series of 10 components, with the overall outcome of the A38 becoming a Managed All Purpose (MAP) road.</li> </ul>	-South Midlands
Action Plan	Lichfield District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The document sets out an action plan for the A5 from A449 Gailey (Staffordshire) to the A508/A422 Old Stratford (Northamptonshire)</li> <li>-Some of the schemes set out are corridor-wide such as pedestrian and cycle</li> </ul>	-South Midlands

		<p>improvements.</p> <p>-Others (most) are more specific, such as 'A5/A449 Gailey Junction Improvements'. These schemes are accompanied with a cost, delivery mechanism and responsibility.</p>	
RBS Regional Evaluation Sheet	Staffordshire County Council	-The document provides feedback on the RBS event. The stakeholder found the event useful, understands the purpose of RBS and how it will be delivered.	N/A
Transport and social justice	Sustrans	-A report which sets out the advantages of enhancing and promoting public transport and walking/cycling facilities at the expense of large capital investment road infrastructure improvement projects.	N/A
Locked out: transport poverty in England	Sustrans	<p>-Highlights the issue of 'transport poverty' in England with more struggling with the financial demands of car ownership.</p> <p>-The report argues that the lack of practical alternatives (such as adequate public transport links/facilities) is forcing people to choose between debt (through owning a car despite challenging financial circumstances) and social exclusion.</p> <p>-It has a map showing the varying degrees of transport poverty across England.</p> <p>-It sets out ways of tackling the issue such as improving public transport facilities and making them affordable the entire cross-spectrum of the population.</p>	N/A
Sustrans contribution to HA report	Sustrans	<p>-Identifies barriers to active travel, including poor quality of local environment, lack of information, lack of skills or confidence.</p> <p>-Hard and soft measures are set out which are recommended to be implemented in order to enhance walking and cycling facilities and promote these modes of travel.</p>	-London to Scotland West
Major employers along SRN	Staffordshire County Council	-A map showing the locations of key employment sites, who regard the network as part of their supply chain. These include automotive, aerospace, advanced manufacturing and ceramics industries.	<p>-London to Scotland West</p> <p>-Midlands South</p> <p>-Midlands to Wales and Gloucestershire</p>
Letter to HA regarding RBS	South Staffordshire Council	<p>-Supports the principle of a M6/M54/M6 Toll Link Road in order to reduce traffic impact on villages, particularly at Featherstone. No movement on this project since 2006.</p> <p>-Supportive of Concept C (as proposed by the HA) which is displayed in a diagram at the end of the letter.</p>	<p>-London to Scotland West</p> <p>-Midlands South</p> <p>-Midlands to</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Highlights capacity issues at A449 and A5 which could have a detrimental impact on economic growth.</li> <li>-The Council is in the early stages of assessing the feasibility of a Strategic Employment Site at Royal Ordnance Factory, Featherstone. Could be issues with access to the site from the SRN which would need to be explored in Stage 2 of the study.</li> </ul>	Wales and Gloucestershire
A strategy for the A5 2011-2026, A449 Gailey (Staffordshire) to A45 Weedon (Northamptonshire)	Lichfield District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Sets out a clear way forward regarding the future role and investment priorities in the A5 over the next 15 years.</li> <li>-Describes how the strategy for the A5 has been prepared in the context of national and local policy.</li> <li>-Sections of the A5 are currently under pressure (particularly around Cannock, Tamworth, Lichfield, Nuneaton/Hinckley and Magna Park) and these problems will be exacerbated by planned growth. Development at Rugby Radio Station and DIRFT are likely to particularly increase congestion on the A5.</li> <li>-Development proposals along the route of the A5 from Daventry to South Staffordshire are set out.</li> </ul>	-Midlands South
Lichfield Core Strategy: Preferred Option Test Modelling Final Report	Lichfield District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-A technical assessment (using VISSIM) of how the A5 and the A38 would respond to ever-increasing pressures from background growth and from the potential impact of new development in Lichfield as a result of LDF policies.</li> <li>-The SRN is tested across different scenarios; Do Nothing, Do Minimum, Do Something.</li> <li>-The report also assesses how any detrimental impact on the SRN could be allayed through identified and tested mitigation measures.</li> <li>-HA and LDC are in agreement that improvements will be required to the A5 and A38 in order to offset additional development traffic.</li> </ul>	-Midlands South
Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy Traffic Impact Assessment	Stoke-on-Trent City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The report details the traffic impact assessment of proposals set out in the N-U-L and S-O-T Core Spatial Strategy (through the use of the North Staffordshire Transport Model Phase III).</li> <li>-The results show that significant proportions of the highway network in North Staffordshire are already approaching or at capacity, resulting in traffic growth being severely constrained.</li> <li>-Concludes that further work is required to be undertaken in order to identify a package of transport measures to manage future travel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-London to Scotland West</li> <li>-Midlands South</li> </ul>



		demands and ensure that the network operates at an acceptable level in the future.	
North Staffordshire Connectivity Report Stage 1 Report	Stoke-on-Trent City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Outlines key base evidence used to inform proposals and potential interventions.</li> <li>-Identifies key challenges in North Staffordshire in relation to the way the transport system impacts on the economy of the sub-region.</li> <li>-Existing travel patterns with the urban area are detailed (Chapter 4).</li> <li>-Existing transport network operation and existing problems discussed in detail + looks at future problems (Chapter 5).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-London to Scotland West</li> <li>-North and East Midlands</li> </ul>
North Staffordshire Integrated Transport Study Final Report (2005)	Stoke-on-Trent City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Examines transport in North Staffordshire at sub-regional and conurbation level.</li> <li>-Identifies key travel and transport issues.</li> <li>-Develops and appraises a set of strategy options.</li> <li>-Identifies mechanisms for implementation</li> <li>-Final output is the production of an integrated transport strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-London to Scotland West</li> <li>-North and East Midlands</li> </ul>
Email correspondence	Stoke-on-Trent City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Key issues and challenges to the SRN are discussed. Congestion issues likely to constrain demand for travel which will impede the economic regeneration of the conurbation.</li> <li>-Discusses planned changes to the transport network and major developments which may have a significant impact on the trunk road network.</li> <li>-Key opportunities are considered, namely the Etruria Valley development, with the A500 expected to yield significant benefits as a result of the highway improvements required to facilitate the construction of the site.</li> <li>-Other sources of evidence is provided list including the A50/A500 Route Utilisation Report, North Staffordshire Integrated Transport Study, North Staffordshire Connectivity Study Stage 1 Report, North Staffordshire Transport Model and the Vulnerable User Study.</li> <li>-Austin also recommends that the focus of the RBS study should be on improving the A50 and A500, in particular: A500 between Porthill and Etruria grade-separated junctions. A50/A500 grade-separated junction. M6 J15/A500/A519 junctions. These are considered to be the main</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-London to Scotland West</li> <li>-North and East Midlands</li> </ul>

		constraints on the operation of the SRN within North Staffordshire and a constraint on economic regeneration.	
--	--	---	--

---

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

© Crown copyright 2014.

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](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

This document is also available on our website at [www.highways.gov.uk](http://www.highways.gov.uk)

If you have any enquiries about this document email [ha\\_info@highways.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ha_info@highways.gsi.gov.uk) or call **0300 123 5000\***. Please quote the Highways Agency publications code PR157/13

\* 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 Birmingham Job number M130520