HIGHWAYS AGENCY

Safe roads, reliable journeys, informed travellers

London to Scotland East Route Strategy Evidence Report Technical Annex

April 2014

An executive agency of the Department for Transport

Document History

Technical annex to London to Scotland East 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

Tables

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

This section contains longer versions of Table 2.1 and Table 2.2 of the main report which show respectively the busiest sections of the route and the least reliable journey time locations.

There are approximately 2,500 links nationally on the strategic road network. Within Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.1 and**

Table **Error! No text of specified style in document.**.2, links ranked in the 250 busiest and least reliable respectively are listed.

Table A.3 provides the links of the route ranked in the 250 locations with the highest proportion of freight traffic.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.1 Sections of the route falling within 10% busiest on the strategic road network (SRN)**

Rank	SRN section	AADT	National Rank
1	M1 between M1 J7 and M1 J8 (LM253)	84,487	14
2	M1 between M1 J6A and M1 J7 (LM251)	80,647	19
3	M1 between M1 J9 and M1 J8 (LM258)	80,426	20
4	M1 between M1 J8 and M1 J9 (LM257)	79,877	22
5	M1 between M1 J7 and M1 J6A (LM252)	79,225	25
6	M1 between M1 J10 and M1 J9 (LM256)	76,168	34
7	M1 between M1 J9 and M1 J10 (LM255)	76,025	35
8	M1 between M1 J8 and M1 J7 (LM254)	73,647	47
9	M1 between M1 J21A and M1 J21 (LM176)	67,178	84
10	M1 between M1 J24 and M1 J23A (LM188)	66,945	88
11	M1 between M1 J21 and M1 J21A (LM175)	66,927	89
12	M1 between M1 J31 and M1 J32 (LM207)	66,853	90
13	M1 between M1 J42 and M1 J43 (LM233)	65,719	100
14	M1 between M1 J11 and M1 J12 (LM155)	65,515	103
15	M1 between M1 J43 and M1 J42 (LM234)	63,605	122
16	M1 between M1 J13 and M1 J12 (LM158)	62,895	128
17	M1 between M1 J12 and M1 J11 (LM156)	62,665	132
18	M1 between M1 J12 and M1 J13 (LM157)	62,459	133
19	M1 between M1 J23A and M1 J24 (LM187)	62,089	137
20	M1 between M1 J32 and M1 J31 (LM208)	61,490	146
21	M1 between M1 J10 and M1 J11 (LM153)	60,617	163
22	M1 between M1 J25 and M1 J24A (LM186)	60,561	165
23	A1(M) between A1(M) J43 and A1(M) J44 (LM22A)	60,330	169

Rank	SRN section	AADT	National Rank
24	A1(M) between A1(M) J44 and A1(M) J43 (LM23A)	60,290	171
25	M1 between M1 J24A and M1 J25 (LM185)	59,248	184
26	M1 between M1 J17 and M1 J16 (LM168)	58,497	198
27	M1 between M1 J29 and M1 J28 (LM198)	58,493	199
28	M1 between M1 J29 and M1 J29A (LM1060)	58,310	201
29	M1 between M1 J28 and M1 J29 (LM197)	58,310	201
30	M1 between M1 J16 and M1 J15A (LM166)	58,273	203
31	M1 between M1 J16 and M1 J17 (LM167)	57,288	218
32	M1 between M1 J26 and M1 J25 (LM192)	56,937	224
33	M1 between M1 J33 and M1 J32 (LM210)	56,782	227
34	M1 between M1 J25 and M1 J26 (LM191)	56,779	229
35	M1 between M1 J15A and M1 J16 (LM165)	56,561	231
36	M1 between M1 J13 and M1 J14 (LM159)	56,202	236
37	M1 between M1 J30 and M1 J29A (LM200A)	56,159	237
38	M1 between M1 J15A and M1 J15 (LM164)	56,094	239
39	M1 between M1 J27 and M1 J26 (LM194)	56,065	240
40	M1 between M1 J24A and M1 J24 (LM190)	56,004	241
41	M1 between M1 J32 and M1 J33 (LM209)	55,972	243
42	M1 between M1 J29A and M1 J30 (LM199A)	55,814	246

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.2 Sections of the route within 10% least reliable on the SRN**

Rank	Location	On-time reliability measure	National Rank
1	M1 between M1 J10 and M1 J10A (LM151)	51.9%	16
2	A19 between A1290 and A184 (AL1596)	54.1%	21
3	A19 between A194 and A184 (AL547)	55.5%	28
4	A19 between A1056 and A189 (AL1616B)	58.2%	53
5	A19 between A1171 and A189 (AL1304)	59.1%	59
6	A19 between A1130 and A174 (AL1516)	59.8%	69
7	M1 between M1 J41 and M1 J42 (LM231)	61.2%	105
8	A1 between A1 and A694 (AL1210A)	62.1%	131
9	A19 between A1058 and A191 (AL1607)	62.2%	135
10	M1 between M1 J34 S and M1 J34 N (LM213)	62.7%	147
11	A174 between A1044 and A19 (AL1527B)	63.1%	167
12	A19 between A189 and A1171 (AL534)	63.2%	170

Rank	Location	On-time reliability measure	National Rank
13	A1 between A192 and A697 (AL1183)	63.2%	174
14	A19 between A184 and A1290 (AL1598)	64.2%	217
15	A5 between A422 and A509 (AL357)	64.2%	221
16	A19 between A690 and A183 (AL1582)	64.3%	223
17	A194(M) between A195 and A184 (LM69)	64.4%	236
18	M1 between M1 J34 N and M1 J34 S (LM214)	64.5%	239
19	A1(M) between A1(M) J64 and A1(M) J65 (LM52)	64.6%	242

Table Error! No text of specified style in document..**3 Sections of the route within 10% highest proportion of freight in the SRN**

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	Flow_Bin4 vehicles (>11.6m long) as a proportion of all traffic
A1(M) between A1(M)J49 and A1(M)J50 (LM1478)	47%	9	53%	22%	8%	17%
A1(M) between A1(M)J50 and A1(M)J49 (LM1476)	43%	24	57%	19%	7%	16%
M1 between M1 J9 and M1 J10 (LM255)	42%	28	58%	23%	8%	11%
A1(M) between A1(M)J50 and A1(M)J51 (LM1482)	39%	34	61%	16%	7%	16%
M1 between M1 J27 and M1 J26 (LM194)	38%	40	62%	20%	7%	11%
A5 between A428-E and A5 (AL149)	38%	41	62%	5%	6%	27%
A5 between A5 and A428-E (AL3237B)	37%	45	63%	5%	5%	27%
M1 between M1 J21 and M1 J21A (LM175)	35%	54	65%	19%	7%	10%
M1 between M1 J23A and M1 J23 (LM184)	33%	77	67%	15%	6%	11%
M1 between M1 J32 and M1 J31 (LM208)	32%	88	68%	14%	7%	11%
A5 between M1 J18 and A5 (AL2559)	32%	93	68%	4%	6%	22%
A5 between A5 and M1 J18 (AL148)	32%	99	68%	4%	6%	22%
M1 between M1 J24A and M1 J24 (LM190)	31%	102	69%	14%	6%	11%
A5 between A45 and A361 (AL3232)	31%	104	69%	15%	7%	9%
M1 between M1 J28 and M1 J27 (LM196)	31%	110	69%	14%	6%	11%
M1 between M1 J34 S and M1 J34 N (LM213)	30%	125	70%	16%	7%	8%
M1 between M1 J21A and M1 J22 (LM179)	30%	136	70%	12%	6%	12%
M1 between M1 J30 and M1 J31 (LM205)	30%	138	70%	11%	6%	12%
A1(M) between A1(M)J48 and A1(M)J49 (LM28A)	29%	141	71%	7%	6%	16%
A1(M) between A1(M)J49 and A1(M)J48 (LM29A)	29%	142	71%	7%	6%	17%
A5 between A361 and A45 (AL3233)	29%	144	71%	15%	6%	8%
M1 between M1 J14 and M1 J13 (LM160)	29%	160	71%	11%	5%	12%
A1(M) between A1(M) J47 and A1(M) J48 (LM24)	29%	167	71%	6%	7%	16%
M1 between M1 J24 and M1 J23A (LM188)	28%	170	72%	11%	6%	11%
M1 between M1 J29 and M1 J28 (LM198)	28%	174	72%	10%	6%	12%
A1 between A1(M)J51 and A6136 (AL1485A)	28%	186	72%	7%	6%	15%
M1 between M1 J10 and M1 J9 (LM256)	28%	190	72%	13%	5%	10%
M1 between M1 J27 and M1 J28 (LM195)	28%	195	72%	11%	6%	12%
M1 between M1 J22 and M1 J21A (LM180)	27%	202	73%	9%	6%	12%
A1(M) between A1(M) J48 and A1(M) J47 (LM25)	27%	204	73%	6%	6%	15%
M1 between M1 J29 and M1 J29A (LM1060)	26%	225	74%	8%	6%	12%
M1 between M1 J28 and M1 J29 (LM197)	26%	225	74%	8%	6%	12%
M1 between M1 J18 and M1 J19 (LM171)	26%	229	74%	6%	6%	14%
A1 between A6136 and A1(M)J51 (AL1486A)	26%	231	74%	6%	6%	15%
A1 between A6136 and A6136 (AL1490)	26%	234	74%	6%	6%	14%
M1 between M1 J21 and M1 J20 (LM178)	26%	239	74%	7%	6%	13%
A1 between A6136 and A6136 (AL1489)	26%	248	74%	5%	6%	15%

A2.2 Road Safety

This section provides the safety data supporting the safety section with the main RBS report.

Tables A.4 to A.8 below set out the latest available accident statistics over the period from 2002 to 2011 and show the 2011 performance of the roads comprising the London to Scotland East Route in relation to the average baseline figures for the period 2005 to 2009 in the Midlands region.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.4 Collisions numbers summary**

Route	05-09 Average Baseline	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	% Diff 2011to 05-09 average
M1	438.4	596	585	558	546	479	439	380	348	351	284	-35%
A5	224.4	277	271	248	253	234	238	195	202	222	186	-17%

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.5 Collision rates per 100 million vehicle miles summary**

Route	05-09 Average Baseline	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	% Diff 2011 to 05-09 average
M1	11.9	17.3	16.2	14.9	14.7	12.8	11.8	10.6	9.7	9.6	8.0	-33%
A5	28.4	36.4	36.1	33.0	32.9	29.6	29.5	24.5	25.7	28.2	23.3	-18%

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.6 Casualty numbers**

Route	KSI 05-09 Average Baseline	KSI 09	KSI 10	KSI 11	KSI 3 year average	Slight 09	Slight 10	Slight 11	Slight 3 year average	Current Year Monitoring Point	%KSI Diff*
				A						**B**	
M1	69.0	63	46	42	50.3	469	480	419	456.0	56.5	-14.5
A5	40.8	39	36	35	36.7	252	291	257	266.7	33.4	+1.6

* KSI difference between Current Annual Performance (column **A)** and Current Year Monitoring Point (column **B)**

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.7 KSI rates per 100 million vehicles miles**

Route	05-09 Average Baseline	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	% Diff 2-11 to 05-09 average
M1	1.9	3.3	2.6	2.2	2.1	1.7	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.3	1.2	-37%
A5	5.2	9.2	8.3	7.8	7.6	5.1	4.7	3.6	5.0	4.6	4.4	-15%

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.8 Slight casualty rates per 100 million vehicles**

Route	05-09 Average Baseline	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	% Diff 2011 to 05-09 average
M1	17.7	24.4	24.6	21.8	23.2	19.3	17.3	15.3	13.0	13.2	11.8	-33%
A5	36.3	41.2	44.1	41.1	44.3	37.0	38.7	29.8	32.0	36.9	32.1	-12%

The statistics demonstrate generally improving performance of the London to Scotland East Route based on the 2011 performance compared to the average baseline over the 2005 -2009 period. The only exception is the A5 with a RAG status of red for casualty numbers for current annual performance in relation to the current year monitoring point. More detailed information about the incidence and location of these casualties would be required before we can conclude that this performance is relevant to the section of the A5 within London to Scotland East Route.

A2.2.1 Cluster sites information

Two types of cluster analysis are undertaken that are relevant to the London to Scotland East Route. These are:

- Problem Junctions
- KSI Clusters

An annual review of cluster sites has been carried out since 2002. Cluster sites are identified using a standard methodology for analysing incidents on the network and the resulting locations are ranked by collision number. Annual review of identifies relative movement of regular sites and the emergence of new sites. The following

Tables A.9 and A.10 show the current status of the relevant locations on the London to Scotland East Route and the proposed actions for both types of cluster.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.9 2011 problem junction review**

Issue	Proposed action
Problem Junctions 2011 M1 A5	Scheme Identification Studies identified - (Subject to funding) - at: M1 J21A M1J24A M1 J26 M1 J27 M1 J25 M1 J29 There are no junctions on the A5 within the London To Scotland East Route that have been identified as requiring Scheme Identification Studies.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.10 2011 KSI cluster site analysis - proposed actions for scheme identification studies**

Issue	Proposed Action
KSI Collision Clusters 2011	Scheme Identification Studies identified at: M1 Saniacre M1 Kegworth M1 Ilkeston M1 Hucknall M1 Long Duckby wharf M1 Yelvertoft

A5	M1 Broughton Astley – Lutterworth M1 Enderby M1 Shepshed-Markfield No KSI Clusters identified.

A number of Local Network Management Schemes are relevant to the London to Scotland East Route. These are shown in Table 8 below.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.11 Local network management schemes (LNMS) in 2013/14**

Route	LNMS Category	Project Title	PIC	KSI	Cost £m	Proposed Completion	Comments
M1	Safety	M1 Watford Slip KSI	13	11	0.094	2014	0.96 PIC - 63
M1	Safety	M1 J15a safety improvements	6	1	0.145	2013	1.12 PIC -65
M1	Pinch Point	M1 J24 A50 Approach	11	1	5.653	2015	0
M1	Pinch Point	M1 J21 M69	67	3	1.270	2015	2.1 PIC year - 127
A5	Other	A5 Towcester Car Park	0	0	0.087	2013	0
M1	Other	M1 N&SB J15a Environmental	6	1	0.099	2013	1012 PIC/year – 65
M1	Other	M1 SB J29-30 Environmental	0	0	0.050	2013	0
M1	Other	M1 Trowell	0	0	0.097	2016	0

This section contains description of characteristics at accident locations identified within the top 250 nationally for the Yorkshire and North East region on the strategic road network affecting the route.

Accident Locations in Yorkshire and Humber:

- M1 J34 South Interchange, Sheffield (Rank 123) – Congestion related shunt and lane change collisions.

- M1 J30, Mansfield (Rank 202) – Congestion related shunt collisions mainly clustered on southbound exit-slip. Site falls within M1 Managed Motorways J28 to J31 Improvement.
- M1 J33 Interchange, Sheffield (Rank 202) – Congestion related shunt and lane change collisions.

Accident Locations in the North East:

- A19/A1046 Portrack Interchange (Rank 158) –
- A19/A1027 (Rank 52) –
- A1 between A1231 and A167 (4 locations, Ranks 21, 41, 60 and 158) –
- A1 Kingsway South (Rank 158) –
- A1 Lobley Hill Road (Rank 202) –
- A1/A69 Denton (Rank 12) –
- A1/A19 Seaton Burn (3 Locations, Ranks 98, 123 and 123) –
- A19 Moor Farm (2 Locations, Ranks 98 and 158) –
- A19 High Backworth (Rank 202) –
- A19/A1058 Coast Road (Rank 123) –
- A19/A193 Howden (Rank 158) –
- A19/A1231 (Rank 202) –

A2.3 Asset Condition

A2.3.1 Pavements

The general condition of pavement assets is shown on the National Asset Condition Map. The pavement condition is categorised according to the proportion of flexible pavement surfacing reaching the end of its design life by 2020. Using a red amber green (RAG) colour coding the carriageway is categorised into 6 bands, depending on the percentage of pavement within that section likely to reach its design life by 2020. Sections of carriageway pavement where 100% of the surfacing is expected to reach the end of its design life by 2020 are shown in red through to green where 0% of the surfacing is expected to reach the end of its design life by 2020.

The carriageway condition is assessed using a variety of assessment techniques. The National Asset Condition Map is supported by other information provided in the relevant Asset Management Plans.

Carriageway condition is assessed by considering the following aspects:

- Enhanced Longitudinal Profile Variance
- SCRIM – measuring the skidding resistance of the surface
- Cracking – visual inspection and High Speed Road Monitor information

- Rutting – measuring the degree of longitudinal rutting caused by HGVs
- Fretting
- Texture

The National Pavement Asset Condition Map summarises the condition of section of carriageway taking into account these above factors at individual road level and this is summarised in the Evidence Report.

A2.3.2 Structures

The Asset Management Plan for Area 7 references addition relevant information. Much of this information is general to the asset management of the Area however any specific information relevant to the London to Scotland East Route is included in this technical annex.

In common with the network as a whole, critical to the condition scoring indices with structures, is that many were constructed within the period 1964-1979, a period of boom in the motorway/trunk road building programme. The period saw the introduction of many initiatives with regard to both construction techniques and material specifications, some of which have resulted in underlying defects that have significant impact on the original 120 year design life required. In addition the design processes did not tend to consider the need for proactive maintenance during the lifetime of a structure. Particular issues with the bridge stock of this era are:

Thaumasite Attack – Construction techniques have resulted in the situation that bridge foundations and substructure concrete members in bridges have been subject to sulphate attack that has led to:

i. Reduction in capacity that could eventually result in structural failure/collapse if left untreated.

ii. Reduced capacity to withstand pier impact loading

Identified measures:

i. Extensive reconstruction of all sub-surface concrete, including measures to prevent reoccurrence OR demolition and reconstruction.

ii. Pier protection measures.

Alkali Carbonate Reaction (ACR) Affected Structures

Material specification to a section of the M5 (junctions 9 -13) has resulted in deterioration to 13 structures for which ACR has been confirmed as having a contributory factor. Levels of deterioration have varied from localised surface crazed cracking with loss of bond, to extensive delamination of deck construction. These are not within the London to Scotland East Route but included as a general example of issues with structures built around this time and which may occur elsewhere.

Concerns for affected structures are:

i. Deterioration of deck edge beams continuing to be exacerbated by annual freeze-thaw action, resulting in loose and friable concrete over live carriageway with a potential for detaching and falling onto traffic below.

ii. Further deterioration of deck edge beams resulting in containment capability of parapets being affected.

iii. Delamination of deck structure leading to reduced capacity and ultimately failure of the structure.

Bearing Failure

Many structures on the route are carrying higher traffic levels than they were designed for and as such bearings are at risk of failing sooner than designed for.

Bridge Deck Waterproofing

Some structures have waterproofing systems in place > 30 years old, where the accepted effective life span of waterproofing systems is 30 years. Failure to repair can lead to water ingress into structural elements causing corrosion and delaminating of surfaces due to freeze/thaw

Steel Parapets

Parapets and other barrier types on structures are in exposed positions and are subject to corrosion from the effects of winter salting of roads and general exposure. By their nature they are also subject to damage. Recent investigations have identified a number of locations where corrosive action within both posts and rails has significantly reduced containment capability. Localised replacement of rails and wholesale provision of temporary secondary protection measures have been utilised previously.

Post-tensioned Structures

During the 1980`s problems in the UK were identified in an increasing number of post-tensioned bridges such bridges were mainly constructed in the 1970's and previous investigations have highlighted significant underlying defects that could compromise long term stability. Defects include voided and ungrouted post-tensioning ducts, water filled ducts and corrosion to post-tensioning strands

Steel Beam Painting

Structures with main span steel beams that have protective coating systems that have reached the limit of their effectiveness will be a risk of further deterioration due to their age and the effects of weathering. Whilst the risk factors built into the SMIS database do not place these in a high risk category, the defects associated have a major impact on structure condition indicator scoring.

Expansion Joints and Half-Joints

High levels of traffic and lack of regular maintenance are causing expansion joints to fail sooner than might be expected.

Alkali Silicate Reaction

Evidence of initiation of Alkali Silica Reaction at structures can lead to the need for deck refurbishment works to eliminate the potential for future significant deterioration at these types of structures.

Specific Issues Relating to the London to Scotland East Route

Alkali Silica Reaction has affected a number of structures on the M1 between Junctions 24 and 29. There are a number of viaducts affected where the M1 crosses the River Trent floodplain. Each intermediate support comprises reinforced concrete

columns, 17 of which have a discrete pile cap supported on 3 reinforced concrete piles. The pile caps are critical structural components and these have been observed to have extensive ASR cracking and which have been subjected to testing and investigation over the years.

M1 structures due to their age in common with elsewhere are at risk of deterioration developing resulting in concrete spalling, worn joints and defective waterproofing.

1.1.1 Table **Error! No text of specified style in document.**.3 below lists the structures on the route identified as requiring significant works above normal routine maintenance in the period to 2021.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document.**.3 Structures requiring significant works before 2021**

Location and name of structure	Summary of necessary works	Estimated date by which works will be required
Midlands		
M1 J20 exit slip	Renewal of the parapets	2015/16
M1 Desford Brook	Concrete repairs	2014/15
M1 River Trent flood plain viaducts	Foundation strengthening	2015/16
Yorkshire and Humber		
M1 Wood Hill	Concrete repairs and bearing renewal	2016
M1 Highwam Common	Concrete repairs and bearing renewal	2016
M1 Queens Drive	Stengthening to allow passage by abnormal indivisible loads	2019-20
M1 Rainsworth	Concrete repairs and bearing renewal	2019
M1 J36 Tankersley Interchange North and South	Concrete repairs and bearing renewal	2019
M1 Keresworth Hill	Concrete repairs and bearing renewal	2019
M1 Howarth Grange Railway	Waterproofing, expansion joint replacement and concrete repairs	2020
M1 Tinsley Viaduct	Waterproofing of top deck which carries M1, patch painting of steelwork	2019-2021
Route	Risk-based assessment suggests 15 structures likely to require concrete repairs within the route-based strategy period.	To 2021
North East		
A19 Coast Railway	Concrete repairs	2018
A1 Alnwick South	Concrete repairs	2019
A1 Cross Lane Culvert	Culvert repair	2015
A1 Derwenthaugh Entrance	Renewal of expansion joints	2019
A1M Lumley Lodge accommodation	Renewal of waterproofing and expansion joints, concrete repairs	2015
A1M Manor House accommodation	Renewal of waterproofing and expansion joints, concrete repairs	2015
A1 Stalks Road	Renewal of expansion joints	2014

A1M Coatham Interchange	Concrete repairs and refurbishment of replacement of piers at risk of failure	2019

A2.4 Route Operation

This section is intentionally blank

A2.5 Technology

Route	Asset Type	Asset Count	Distance in KM
M1 from boundary of area 7 (between J14-15 MP 86/7) to top of boundary of area 7 (J30 MP 239/3)	Midas loop arrays	738	152
	Message Signs	264	
	Signals	444	
	Ramp Metering	6	
	CCTV	68	

Route	System	Existing	Known Gaps
A1M North	CCTV	Full coverage to J49 (Dishforth)	Limited coverage between J49 & Leeming Bar, Limited coverage between J56 & J65
	VMS	Standard provision to J49 (Dishforth).	Limited coverage between J56 & J65
	MIDAS	Coverage on all sections except those listed.	J56 To J62, J62 to J63,
	ERTS	Complete coverage	
	NRTS	A1 Leeming to Barton Scheme will include NRTS to Barton.	No Fibre between J56 to J65. Existing copper infrastructure is life expired.
A1 North	CCTV	Partial coverage	Limited coverage between Leeming Bar & J56, no coverage between Blaydon Bridge & Seaton Burn, no coverage between Stannington and Berwick upon Tweed.
	VMS	Partial coverage	Leeming Bar to Catterick, Blaydon Bridge to Seaton Burn, Stannington to Berwick upon Tweed.
	MIDAS	Partial coverage	Leeming Bar to J56, Low Eighton to Berwick upon Tweed.
	ERTS	Full coverage to Barton (A1M J56)	Between A1231 & Berwick upon Tweed.
	NRTS	Partial coverage	No Fibre or copper between Leeming bar to J56, J65 to Berwick upon Tweed.
M1	CCTV	Comprehensive coverage	J38 to J42 only at each junction

Route	System	Existing	Known Gaps
	VMS	Full coverage. Provision across route will be substantially improved with Smart Motorways installation.	
	MIDAS	Complete coverage	
	ERT	Complete coverage	
	NRTS	Complete coverage	
A19	CCTV	CCTV installed but not operational on Tees Viaduct	Seaton Burn to A190 junction, A1056 to A1058, A193 to A194, A1290 to Brierton, A1027 to Doncaster.
	VMS	Strategic diversion signs around Newcastle installed as part of NADIS scheme. Ramp metering scheme 2011. NADIS phase 3 camera.	A1 to A190, A1056 to Elwick, A1027 to A1130
	MIDAS		No MIDAS
	ERTS	Partial coverage	Between A689 & Sheraton, Below Thirsk
	NRTS		No fibre optic cable
A194M	CCTV		No coverage
	VMS	Strategic diversion signs around Newcastle installed as part of NADIS scheme..	
	MIDAS	Partial coverage	B1288 to A194
	ERTS	Complete coverage	No gaps
	NRTS		No fibre optic cable
A66	CCTV		A1 to A67
	VMS	Provision associated with snow gates on A66 West only.	A1 to A67
	MIDAS		No MIDAS
	ERTS	Partial coverage	A1 to A67
	NRTS		No copper or fibre optic cable
A66M	CCTV		No CCTV
	VMS	MS1 signs	
	MIDAS		No MIDAS
	ERTS	Complete coverage.	
	NRTS		No fibre optic cable
A696	No technology installed		
A184	No technology installed		
A174	No technology installed		
A168	No technology installed		

A2.6 Vulnerable Road Users

This section is intentionally blank

A2.7 Environment

Summary of AQMAs

Location	Authority	Pollutant(s)
Adjacent to M1 junction 7	St Albans City and District Council	NO_2
Dunstable Town Centre, including the A5 from Union Street to Borough Road	Central Bedfordshire District Council	NO_2
Towcester, including the A5 from Saracens Head crossroads to Silverstone Brook	South Northamptonshire Council	NO_2
Alongside the M1 in Northampton	Northampton Borough Council	NO_2
The M1 corridor in Enderby and Narborough	Blaby District Council	NO_2
The M1 at Mole hill Farm	North West Leicestershire District Council	NO_2
Dwelings immediately to the east of the M1 motorway, either side of Derby Road Sandiacre to the north of junction 25.	Erewash Borough Council	NO_2
Parts of Iona Drive and Tiree Close next to the M1 in Trowell, Nottingham.	Broxtowe Borough Council	NO_2
Derbyshire Avenue next to the M1 in Trowell, Nottingham.	Broxtowe Borough Council	NO_2
One property on Nottingham Road next to the M1 in Trowell, Nottingham.	Broxtowe Borough Council	NO_2
Parts of Nottingham Road, Nottingham, and Nottingham Road and Back Lane, Nuthall next to the M1 in Trowell, Nottingham.	Broxtowe Borough Council	NO_2
Orchard Close, Barlborough where the western property boundaries border the M1.	Bolsover District Council	NO_2
Carter Lane East, South Normanton on the east side of the M1 Motorway.	Bolsover District Council	NO_2
Close to the M1 at Wales Bar between junctions 30 and 31	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	NO_2
Brinsworth and Catcliffe near junction 33	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	NO_2
Near Meadowhall East of junction 34	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	NO_2
Sheffield Citywide AQMA which affects all of the M1 as it passes within or adjacent to Sheffield between junctions 33 and 35A	Sheffield City Council	NO_2
100m either side of the M1 central reservation between junctions 35A and J38	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	NO_2

Wakefield citywide AQMA which is adjacent to the M1 between junctions 39 and 40, and junctions 41 and 42.	Wakefield Council	NO_2
Portobello Terrace and Penshaw View, Birtley adjacent to Washington Services.	Gateshead Council	NO_2
On the A19 between the A194 Lindisfarne roundabout and the end of the north-facing slip road.	South Tyneside Council	NO_2

Summary of Noise FPLs

There are 105 FPLs on the route. However, some impact on properties across two local authorities.

Authority	Number of FPLs
Ashfield	2
Barnet	4
Barnsley	6
Bassetlaw	1
Blaby	3
Bolsover	7
Broxtowe	4
Central Bedfordshire	6
Dacorum	6
Erewash	3
Gateshead	7
Hambleton	5
Hertsmere	3
Hinckley	4
Leeds	9
Luton	1
Milton Keynes	2
Newcastle	3
North East Derbyshire	1
North Tyneside	1
North West Leicestershire	2
Richmondshire	4
Rotherham	5
Selby	1
Sheffield	3
South Northamptonshire	1
South Tyneside	3
St Albans	3
Sunderland	3

Authority	Number of FPLs
Three Rivers	2
Wakefield	11

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
Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire	Housing	78,830 dwellings	M1 passes through all districts, although only marginally through Chesterfield and North East Derbyshire.
	Economic	176,509 jobs	
Leicester and Leicestershire	Housing	38,949 dwellings	M1 passes through all districts, although only marginally through Harborough and Hinckley and Bosworth.
	Economic	42,678 jobs	
South East Midlands	Housing	98,674 dwellings	M1 and A5 pass through all districts, except Aylesbury Vale, which only touches M1 at its NE border.
	Economic	134,756 jobs[+]	
Northamptonshire	Housing	38,190 dwellings	M1 and A5 pass through all districts.
	Economic	47,500 jobs	

D2N2

Location of development	Development type	Scale by 2012	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031
Ashfield	Residential Commercial	825 units 100ha over plan period	9127 units	1301 units
Gedling	Residential Commercial	1082 units 10ha over plan period	3484 units	1794 units
Bassetlaw	Residential Commercial	704 units 79.5-82.5ha over plan period	2112 units	2464 units
Broxtowe	Residential Commercial	553 units 15ha over plan period	2584 units	2448 units
Erewash	Residential Commercial	921 units 20ha (approx) over plan period	2469 units	2448 units
Nottingham City	Residential Commercial	1800 units 12ha over plan period	6300 units	8275 units

Newark and Sherwood	Residential Commercial	1235 units 22.3ha	6940 units 5.08ha	4087 units 52.7ha
Mansfield	Residential Commercial	1150 units 74ha over plan period	3900 units	3000 units
Rushcliffe	Residential Commercial	1625 units 57000sqm office, 20ha industrial	4475 units	3300 units
Bolsover	Residential Commercial	578 units 50.94ha over plan period	1949 units	3206 units
Chesterfield	Residential Commercial	1058 units 79ha over plan period	2394 units	4037 units
Amber Valley	Residential Commercial	955 units 75ha over plan period	2387 units	1638 units
Derbyshire Dales	Residential Commercial	988 units 16ha over plan period	1048 units	877 units
High Peak	Residential Commercial	4090 up to 2021 35ha over plan period		
South Derbyshire	Residential Commercial	962units 69ha over plan period	2476 units	1428 units
Derby City	Residential Commercial	1063 units 185ha over plan period	5585 units	2759 units
North East Derbyshire	Residential Commercial	524 units 50ha over plan period	1572 units	2620 units

Leicester and Leicestershire

Location of development	Development type	Scale by 2012	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031
North West Leicestershire	Residential Commercial	693 units 164ha over plan period	3914 units	4295 units
Harborough	Residential Commercial	681 units 4200 jobs over plan period	2499 units	1880 units
Hinckley and Bosworth	Residential	776 units 40-45ha over	3023 units	2648 units

	Commercial	plan period		
Blaby	Residential Commercial	1027 units 68ha over plan period	3069 units	3011 units
Charnwood	Residential Commercial	1341 units 13400 jobs over plan period	5957 units	4976 units
Leicester City Council	Residential Commercial	3021 units 10ha over plan period	8585 units	6903 units
Melton	Residential Commercial	1924 units 1300 over plan period	1086 units	

Coventry and Warwickshire

Location of development	Development type	Scale by 2012	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031
Rugby	Residential Commercial	676 units 67ha over plan period	4039 units	3083 units
Warwick	Residential Commercial	780 units 66ha over plan period	3370 units	6725 units
Stratford-upon-Avon	Residential Commercial	899 units 80ha over plan period	2000 units	600 units
Coventry	Residential Commercial	2365 units 100ha over plan period	7720 units	3120 units
North Warwickshire	Residential Commercial	345 units 48.5ha over plan period	1680 units	1010 units
Nuneaton and Bedworth	Residential Commercial	 75ha over plan period	4828 units	

Northamptonshire

Location of development	Development type	Scale by 2012	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031
Corby	Residential Commercial	1150 units 8898 jobs over plan period	4700 units	
East Northants	Residential	1102 units	3043 units	

	Commercial	5188 jobs over plan period		
Kettering	Residential Commercial	1195 units 8858 jobs over plan period	2415 units	
Wellingborough	Residential Commercial	635 units 5556 jobs over plan period	3327 units	
Daventry	Residential Commercial	685 units 19000 jobs across WN over plan period	4480 units	3510 units
South Northampton	Residential Commercial	810 units 19000 jobs across WN over plan period	3984 units	2535 units
Northampton	Residential Commercial	1883 units 19000 jobs across WN over plan period	8203 units	5695 units

Local Enterprise Partnership	Local Authority	Anticipated growth		
		2011 – 2015	To 2021	To 2031
Sheffield City Region	Barnsley (also in Leeds City Region)	3500 houses	10500 houses	22200 houses
		7400 jobs	22100 jobs	46600 jobs
	Bassetlaw			
	Bolsover			
	Chesterfield			
	Doncaster	3600 houses	10800 houses	22800 houses
		14400 jobs	43100 jobs	91000 jobs
	North East Derbyshire			
	Rotherham	2700 houses	8200 houses	17400 houses
		6300 jobs	19000 jobs	40100 jobs
	Sheffield	10300 houses	30800 houses	65100 houses
		14100 jobs	42300 jobs	89300 Jobs
Leeds City Region	Bradford	7200 houses	21600 houses	45500 houses
		3000 jobs	9000 jobs	18900 jobs

Local Enterprise Partnership	Local Authority	Anticipated growth		
		2011 – 2015	To 2021	To 2031
	Calderdale	1700 houses	5000 houses	10500 houses
		2000 jobs	5900 jobs	12400 jobs
	Craven (also in York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP)	1200 houses	3700 houses	7800 houses
		3700 jobs	11000 jobs	23300 jobs
	Harrogate (also in York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP)	600 houses	1800 houses	3800 houses
		300 jobs	1000 jobs	2000 jobs
	Kirklees	3500 houses	10500 houses	22200 houses
		6600 jobs	19900 jobs	41900 jobs
	Leeds	10100 houses	30300 houses	64000 houses
		16300 jobs	49000 jobs	103400 jobs
	Selby (also in York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP)	1100 houses	3400 houses	7200 houses
		1000 jobs	3000 jobs	6300 jobs
	Wakefield	3900 houses	11800 houses	25000 houses
		11700 jobs	35100 jobs	74100 jobs
	York (also in York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP)	2900 houses	8800 houses	18600 houses
		4600 jobs	13700 jobs	29000 jobs
York, North Yorkshire and East Riding	East Riding of Yorkshire	4000 houses	12100 houses	25500 houses
		6700 jobs	20200 jobs	42700 jobs
	Hambleton	700 houses	2000 houses	4100 houses
		2600 jobs	7800 jobs	16500 jobs
	Richmondshire	700 houses	2100 houses	4500 houses
		200 jobs	600 jobs	1200 jobs
	Ryedale	500 houses	1400 houses	3000 houses
		4500 jobs	13500 jobs	28600 jobs
	Scarborough	1900 houses	5600 houses	11800 houses
		7900 jobs	23700 jobs	50000 jobs
Tees Valley Unlimited	Darlington	1463 houses	2925 houses	5850 houses
		3040 jobs	6080 jobs	12161 jobs
	Hartlepool	1576 houses	4022 houses	6537 houses
		7759 jobs	9598 jobs	19975 jobs
	Middlesbrough	1743 houses	3485 houses	6970 houses
		2517 jobs	4214 jobs	6475 jobs
	Redcar and Cleveland	600 houses	2400 houses	4500 houses
		3500 jobs	7000 jobs	14000 jobs
	Stockton-on-Tees	5450 houses	10831 houses	20228 houses
		22326 jobs	33981 jobs	65057 jobs

Local Enterprise Partnership	Local Authority	Anticipated growth		
		2011 – 2015	To 2021	To 2031
North East	County Durham	7850 houses	15700 houses	31400 houses
		7836 jobs	15671 jobs	31342 jobs
	Gateshead	486 houses	2517 houses	4854 houses
		2269 jobs	5963 jobs	6938 jobs
	Newcastle	2055 houses	6311 houses	14746 houses
		3489 jobs	7193 jobs	8392 jobs
	North Tyneside	1969 houses	3939 houses	7877 houses
		4421 jobs	8842 jobs	17684 jobs
	Northumberland	4985 houses	7548 houses	
	South Tyneside	1405 houses	2810 houses	5620 houses
		1552 jobs	3105 jobs	6210 jobs
	Sunderland	4541 houses	13682 houses	17383 houses
		2617 jobs	5226 jobs	8583 jobs

A3.3 Network improvements and operational changes

Below is a full list of all committed strategic road network schemes which are expected to be delivered in the period to 2021. This is a full list of the information summarised in Table 3.2 of the main report.

Committed SRN enhancement schemes

Location	Scheme Type	Completion Year	Anticipated Benefits
M1 Jn28 – Jn31	Major scheme - Managed motorways	2015	Safety, journey time reliability and economic growth
M1 Jn31 – Jn32	Pinch point - variable mandatory speed limit	2015	Safety, journey time reliability and consistency
M1 Jn33	Pinch point - junction improvement	2015	Reduce peak hour congestion, improve access
M1 Jn32 – Jn35a	Major scheme - managed motorways	2016	Safety, journey time reliability and economic growth
M1 Jn39 – Jn42	Major scheme - managed motorways	2016	Safety, journey time reliability and economic growth
M1 Jn40	Pinch point - junction improvement	2014	Congestion, journey time reliability, safety, economic growth
M1 Jn41	Pinch point - junction improvement	2014?	Congestion, journey time reliability, safety, economy, improve access
M1 Jn44	Pinch point - junction improvement	2014	Congestion, safety

Location	Scheme Type	Completion Year	Anticipated Benefits
A1 Leeming to Barton	Major scheme - upgrade to 3 lane motorway	2016	Safety, journey time reliability
A1 Lobley Hill to Dunston	Major scheme - upgrade to 3 lane motorway	2016	Journey time reliability, safety, economic growth, capacity
A19 / A174 parkway	Pinch point - junction improvement	2015	Congestion, reduce journey times, economic growth, safety
A19 / A689 Wynyard	Pinch point - junction improvement	2015	Congestion, reduce journey times, economic growth, safety
A19 / A1231 Hylton Grange	Pinch point – junction improvement	2014	Congestion, economic growth
A19 Moor Farm	Maintence scheme – junction improvements	2013	Capacity for development, pedestrian safety
A1 / A19 Seaton Burn	Pinch point – junction improvement	2015	Congestion, reduce journey times, economic growth, safety
A1(M) Leeming to Dishforth	Major Scheme. Up-grade to three lane motorway	2016	Reduced congestion and accident risk, and wider economic benefits.
A1(M) Junction 63 Blind Lane Interchange	Local Authority Pinch Point Scheme. Increased junction capacity	2015	Increased capacity and reduced congestion introduced as part of the development plans for County Durham.
A1(M) Side-winds Mitigation	Local Network Management Scheme Vegetation planting	2014	Reduction in accidents and incident related congestion.
A1 Coalhouse Interchange	Local Network Management Scheme Widening and signalisation	2015	Reduced congestion and accident risk, and wider economic benefits for the Team Valley Trading Estate.
A1 Lobley Hill to Gateshead Quays	Major Scheme. Increased capacity at closely spaced interchanges	2014	Reduced congestion and accident risk, and wider economic benefits for the Newcastle-upon-Tyne conurbation.
A1 Derwenthaugh Interchange	Local Network Management Scheme Increased capacity at interchange slip-roads	2014	Reduced congestion and accident risk.
A1 Birtley to Warreners House Lay-bys	Local Network Management Scheme Improvement in lay-by provision	2014	Reduced accident risk and incident related congestion.
A1 Newcastle Bypass	Local Network Management Scheme Junction Identification Scheme	2014	Reduced accident risk and delays through improved driver information.
A1/A19 Seaton Burn Interchange	Pinch Point Scheme. Increased junction capacity	2015	Increased capacity and reduced congestion introduced as part of the development plans for Cramlington.
A1 Morpeth to Alnwick Passenger Transport Facilities	Local Network Management Scheme Improvement in lay-by provision	2016	Reduced accident risk and improved access to bus-stops.
A1 Warreners House to Earsdon	Local management scheme Removal of trees	2014	Reduced accident risk and incident related congestion.

Location	Scheme Type	Completion Year	Anticipated Benefits
A5 Churchbridge junction	Pinch Point scheme	2015	Realignment of the approaches to the junction as well as the junction itself to increase its capacity
A5 Tove Roundabout, Towcester	Pinch Point scheme	2015	This work has been designed to tackle congestion by widening the A43 to three lanes through the junction and reducing the size of the central island to accommodate this.
M1 J21a	Pinch Point scheme	2015	
M1 Junction 21/M69, Leicester	Pinch Point scheme	2013	The work is designed to improve the capacity of the junction with carriageway widening and an extra lane being created on the M1 southbound exit slip at junction 21 approach to the island.
M1/M6/A14 Junction	Major scheme. Junction improvement	Not known	Improvement junction 19 of the M1 motorway and related sections of the M6 motorway and A14 trunk road within the counties of Leicestershire and Northamptonshire.
A5, Long Buckby Crossroads	Junction improvements and speed limit reduction – S278	2014	Safety benefits assocaited with speed limit reduction to 50mph
M1 Lubbesthorpe - Bridge to Growth - North of M1 J21	New motorway bridges – S278	2015	Local transport link improvements & wider economic benefits in releasing the development land.
A5/A45 Crossroads Weedon Bec (Daventry Public Enquiry Imp)	Junction improvements – S278	2013	Capacity improvements to accommodate development traffic
M1 J30 Improvements	Junction Improvements – S278		Signalisation and lining alterations.
M1 J15a Improvements	Junction Improvements – S278		Minor roundabout widening
M1 J15 Improvements	Junction Improvements – S278		Ramp metering on NB onslip.

A3.4 Wider transport networks

Project	Scheme Type	Completion Year	Anticipated Impacts on the Route
Bedale / Askiew / Leeming Bypass	Part DfT and Part NYCC funded	2016	Redistribution of traffic. No additional traffic.
Morpeth Nothern Bypass	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project	At planning Inquiry stage	Transfer of a small amount of traffic from other junctions.
A1(M) Junction 63, A167 Shields Road and A693 Blind Lane Improvement (Local Pinch Point Scheme)	Local Pinch Point Scheme	2015	More effective operation of A1(M) junction 63 and associated local roads will reduce queuing on the motorway on the approaches to the junction.

Project	Scheme Type	Completion Year	Anticipated Impacts on the Route
A174 in Stockton dualling between Thornaby Road and the A19 (Local Pinch Point Scheme)	Local Pinch Point Scheme	2015	Will enable development to take place, leading to some additional traffic impacting on A19.
Sheffield Bus Rapid Transit	DfT funded Major Transport Scheme		Benefits operation at M1 junction 34 due to construction of link road between Sheffield and Rotherham under Tinsley Viaduct.

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 A4.4 Schedule of challenges and opportunities

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
Network Operation	Route	Multi Modal issues, particularly infrastructure and crossing	N/A	✓			Yes			
	Route	Management of vehicles getting to and from major events, such as Great North Run, Sheffield Arena, Silverstone and Donington Park	N/A	✓			Yes			
	M1	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.	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	M1 Nottingham	Use of M1 for short trips around Nottingham – used as an outer ring road	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	M1 in South and West Yorkshire	Route serves dual role supporting strategic traffic while accommodating a large number of short urban trips. Conflict between needs of different types of user.	Yes					✓		
	A19 in Tees Valley	Route serves dual role supporting strategic traffic while accommodating a large number of short urban trips. Conflict between needs of different types of user.	Yes					✓		
	A1, A19, A194M, A184 in Tyne and Wear	Route serves dual role supporting strategic traffic while accommodating a large number of short urban trips. Conflict between needs of different types of user.	Yes					✓		
	M1 in South Yorkshire	Coordination of technology on strategic roads and local roads is poor leading to poorly informed drivers	N/A	✓			Yes	✓		
	Route north of Dishforth	Lack of technology to inform of journey times, incidents and diversions, lack of ability to manage traffic in Tyne and Wear and Tees Valley. Information needs to be locally relevant.	N/A	✓			Yes			✓

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	Route	Impact of diversion routes on local roads	N/A	✓			Yes			
	A1 in North East	Need to ensure that the SRN is properly maintained.	N/A	✓			Yes	✓		
	A19/A66	Queuing back onto SRN from local road network	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	Northamptonshire sections	Within Northamptonshire improvements to the local road could assist the operation of the SRN and therefore the local road and SRN should be considered together	No		✓	✓	Yes		✓	
	M1 south of M6	The M1 has problems with post - accident operation	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	M1 J13	M1 Junction 13 signage is not positive and clear enough	No	✓			Yes	✓		
	A5 Milton Keynes	A5 MK Stadium Event Management - poor roadside information	No	✓			Yes		✓	
	A5	Suitability of the A5 as a diversion route and the impact on local roads when there is an issue on the M1	No	✓			No			
Asset Condition	M1 (Smart motorways sections)	Ability to maintain the route is constrained by lack of a hard-shoulder and/or limited lane capacity.	Yes	✓	✓		No			
	A1 in the North East	Ability to maintain the route is constrained by lack of a hard-shoulder and/or limited lane capacity.	Yes	✓			No	✓		
	A19	Ability to maintain the route is constrained by lack of a hard-shoulder and/or limited lane capacity.	Yes				No	✓		
	Route	Flood risk in areas of low-lying network or areas with inadequate drainage.	Yes	✓			No			
	A1/M1 Link	Flood risk in areas of low-lying network or areas with inadequate drainage.	Yes	✓			No	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	A19 Billingham	Flood risk in areas of low-lying network or areas with inadequate drainage.	Yes	✓			No	✓		
	A66 Teeside Park	Subsidence	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	Route (structures listed in Technical Annex	Condition of many structures requires increasing maintenance intervention. Potential for major impacts at specific structures listed adjacent.	Yes		✓		No			
	M1 Tinsley Viaduct	Condition of many structures requires increasing maintenance intervention. Potential for major impacts at specific structures listed adjacent.	Yes	✓			No		✓	
	A19 Tees Viaduct	Condition of many structures requires increasing maintenance intervention. Potential for major impacts at specific structures listed adjacent.	Yes	✓			No	✓		
	A1 Allerdene Railway	Weight, width and capacity constraints	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	M1 J10 - 15	Areas in which significant quantities of resurfacing is likely to be required	Yes	✓			No			
	M1 J19 - 23a	Areas in which significant quantities of resurfacing is likely to be required	Yes	✓			No			
	A1(M) J56 - 63	Areas in which significant quantities of resurfacing is likely to be required	Yes	✓			No		✓	
	Whole route in the North East	Rapid and catastrophic failure of TSCS pavement	Yes	✓	✓	✓	No		✓	
	Whole route	Road markings (including reflective studs) requires regular renewal especially in areas of smart motorways.	Yes	✓	✓	✓	No			
Capacity	Whole Network	Need to link route strategies to growth plans and align with economic strategies so that issues on the route do not constrain growth.	N/A	✓	✓	✓	Yes			

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	A5 South	Locations in which congestion is regularly experienced and unlikely to be fully addressed through committed schemes, or where future development is likely to exacerbate existing issues. Specific junctions listed. Details in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the report.	Yes	✓			Yes			
	M1 J21 and 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. J21's poor performance also threatens Leicester's ability to attract inward investment. 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.	Yes	✓			Yes			✓
	M1 J24	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. 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.	Yes	✓			Yes			✓
	M1 J26-25 (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.	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	M1, either side of J25-J28	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. M1 J25-28 widening has resolved the capacity issue on the M1 but junction capacity issues remain.	Yes	✓			Yes			✓
	M1 J34 (Tinsley Viaduct)	Congestion due to limited capacity of the junction	Yes	✓			Yes			✓
	M1 J36 (adjacent local road junction)	The future growth in the Dearne Valley is likely to create further congestion at J36	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	M1 J42 Lofthouse Interchange	Insufficient capacity on this link – need extra link					Yes			✓
	A19 in Tees Valley (A174 Parkway to A689 Wolviston including junctions and mainline)	Development pressures currently an issue, PPP scheme will address in short term, but not longer term	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	A66 around Darlington and Stockton	Development pressures	Yes	✓			Yes			✓
	A1M J58 (nearby local road signals)	Queuing back onto A1(M)	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	A174/A1053 Greystones Roundabout	Development pressures and social implications of this	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	A19 around Nissan, Sunderland	Capacity Bottleneck: Perception & impacts regional future and existing economy (NISSAN)	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	A194M Whitemare Pool	Locations in which congestion is regularly experienced and unlikely to be fully addressed through committed schemes, or where future development is likely to exacerbate existing issues. Specific junctions listed. Details in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the report.	Yes	✓				✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	A19/A189 Moor Farm at-grade roundabout	Locations in which congestion is regularly experienced and unlikely to be fully addressed through committed schemes, or where future development is likely to exacerbate existing issues. Specific junctions listed. Details in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the report.	Yes	✓					✓	
	A1 Newcastle and Gateshead Western Bypass (all junctions)	Locations in which congestion is regularly experienced and unlikely to be fully addressed through committed schemes, or where future development is likely to exacerbate existing issues. Specific junctions listed. Details in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the report.	Yes	✓					✓	
	M1 J23	Growth in Loughborough and Shepshed will impact on M1 J23; congestion will be experienced, particularly during university semesters	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	M1 J25	Concern about delays, due to insufficient capacity. If HS2 station located here more pressure could be put on the junctions. Impact on SRN of reactive development following HS2 stations.	Yes		✓	✓	Yes		✓	
	M1 J28	A multi-module study has shown that a grade separated junction is required at M1 Junction 28	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	M1 J29	2000 new homes are planned for the area - this will put more pressure on the junction	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	M1 J33	Congestion due to weaving	Yes		✓		Yes		✓	
	M1 J39 to 42	Delays. Currently an issue – managed motorway scheme will alleviate in short term, but may become an issue again in longer term					Yes		✓	
	M1 J45 and 46	Developments leading to congestion				✓	Yes		✓	

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	A19 junctions north of Tyne Tunnel	Locations in which congestion is regularly experienced and unlikely to be fully addressed through committed schemes, or where future development is likely to exacerbate existing issues. Specific junctions listed. Details in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the report.			✓	✓		✓		
	M1 in South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire	Locations where network capacity currently constrains growth at Enterprise Zones and other key development sites. Details in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the report.	Yes	✓			No		✓	
	A1 J47 link to A59	Over capacity, constrains Harrogate economy	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	A1 J59	Development pressures	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	A19 Wynyard	Locations in which congestion is regularly experienced and unlikely to be fully addressed through committed schemes, or where future development is likely to exacerbate existing issues. Specific junctions listed. Details in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the report.	Yes	✓			No		✓	
	A66 Darlington	Development pressures	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	A19 / A174 Parkway	Development pressures currently an issue, PPP scheme will address in short term, but not longer term	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	A19	At grade junctions lack capacity. Junction improvements needed. Development pressures.	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	A1/A696 Roundabout	Risk from future development	Yes				Yes	✓		
	M1 / 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. Links between Chesterfield and Sheffield are particularly constrained by congestion on the M1, for example.	Yes	X			✓		✓	

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	A1 Leeming to Barton	Support for upgrade to Motorway	N/A	✓			Yes			✓
	A1 North of Newcastle	Support for dualling on more of length	N/A			✓	Yes			✓
	A19 Tyne Crossing	Constraints on crossings	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	A1 Western Bypass	Interaction between strategic and local traffic	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	A5 in Dunstable	congestion (including during incidents on M1)	Yes	✓			Yes			✓
	M1 Junctions 13 - 14	regular congestion	Yes	✓			Yes			✓
	M1 Junction 14	congestion	Yes	✓			Yes			✓
	A5 / A43 Towcester	congestion - Abthorpe Roundabout	Yes	✓			Yes			✓
	M1 and A45 around Northampton	congestion	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	general	Junction congestion - need to revisit pinch point funding - some schemes missed out on last funding round	No	✓			Yes		✓	
	M1 Junctions 13 - 19	Link congestion (concern over how long planned scheme will provide sufficient capacity)	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	M1 Junction 13	Junction congestion	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	M1 at Daventry	congestion (around junction 16) and future development pressures	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	A5 Hockliffe	junction congestion	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	A5 around Kensworth	congestion	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
Safety	Whole Network	Crossing movements are not always connected to local routes (bridleways and public rights of way)	N/A	✓			Yes			
	Whole Network	Segregation for vulnerable users away from grade separated crossings	No	✓			Yes			

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	Various Locations	Lack of hard shoulder creates a perception of greater risk to road users and makes managing roadworker safety more difficult	Yes	✓			Yes			
	Various Locations	Behaviour of drivers at transitions from dual carriageway to single carriageway locations.	No	✓			Yes			
	A1 North of Newcastle	Perception of poor safety for motorcyclists on single carriageway roads	No	✓			Yes	✓		
	M1 J21 and J21a	Southbound traffic getting off onto M69 blocking back on M1 causes safety hazard. Signalisation has improved things but still issues remain. Also the link is short between 21-21a which results in significant weaving.	Yes	✓			Yes		✓	
	M1 J21, 25 and 26	Locations identified as top 250 locations or links with significant accident records)	Yes	✓			No			
	M1 J28 to 31	Locations identified as top 250 locations or links with significant accident records)	Yes	✓			No			✓
	A1 Wetherby	Locations identified as top 250 locations or links with significant accident records)	Yes	✓			No			✓
	A66T	Locations identified as top 250 locations or links with significant accident records)	Yes	✓			No			✓
	A19 Thornaby to Norton	Locations identified as top 250 locations or links with significant accident records)	Yes	✓			No			✓
	A1 Morpeth to Berwick	Locations identified as top 250 locations or links with significant accident records)	Yes	✓	✓	✓	No			✓
	M1 J6a to 7	Complex junction where the route connects with the M25. Ranked 7th in casualty locations across the SRN. Second busiest section of the route. Although the recently introduced variable mandatory speed limits will not be reflected in the safety data within this report	Yes	✓			No			

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	A5 Dunstable	A5 travels through Dunstable's high street and has the longest section of casualties per billion miles on the route. Predominantly slight collisions due to the low speeds	Yes	✓			No			
	M1 J24a and 25	Section is ranked 14th nationally for casualty locations. Complex section of the route where the M1 interacts with other major SRN and strategic local roads.	Yes	✓			No			
	M1 J26	M1 near Nottingham is ranked 31st and majority of collisions are related to rear end shunts	Yes	✓			No			
	APTR near Middlesbrough	A1053 and A19 high total casualties per billion miles are typically the result of the congestion related collisions	Yes	✓			No			
	A5 south of Milton Keynes	safety concerns (lighting) - around Redmoor Junction	Yes	✓					✓	
	A5 / A421 junction	Safety concerns	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
Social and environment	Whole Network	NMU Safety and prevention of severance of local network and reconnection. Minor Roads replaced and severed. Although diversion is small for vehicles they can be long for NMU's. NMU's need to be considered within the design process.	No	✓			Yes			
	M1	Severance created by motorway and junctions for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians due to factors such as conflict with HGVs at junctions and unsuitable crossing facilities								
	M1 J35 and J36	Severance for Pedestrians	No	✓			Yes	✓		
	A1M	Severance created by motorway and junctions for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians due to factors such as conflict with HGVs at junctions and unsuitable crossing facilities	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	A19 / A66	Severance created by motorway and junctions for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians due to factors such as conflict with HGVs at junctions and unsuitable crossing facilities						✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	A19 in Tyne and Wear	Severance created by motorway and junctions for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians due to factors such as conflict with HGVs at junctions and unsuitable crossing facilities						✓		
	M1 J33	Weaving between closely-spaced junctions (J33 is top 250 accident location)	No				Yes			✓
	A19 / A168	Use of central reserve gaps for right and U turns creates increased risk of accidents	No	✓			Yes	✓		
	A19 / A66	Suitability of route for cyclists	No	✓			Yes	✓		
	A1 North of Newcastle	Effect of convoy on single carriageway sections - overtaking etc	No	✓			Yes	✓		
	A1 North of Belford	Cycleway crosses carriageway several times		✓	✓	✓				
	All	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.						✓		
	All	Flood risk map shows issues less extensive than identified by the Environment Agency. Planning of maintenance to address environmental damage caused by flooding at bridges and culvertsand consideration of Water Framework Directive when planning schemes needed. Possible need for new drainage technology	Yes	✓	✓	✓	Yes			✓
	M1 / A46	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.	No	✓			Yes	✓		
	Whole Network	Risk of flooding at low-lying locations	No	✓			Yes			
	M1 in South Yorkshire	Risk of flooding at low-lying locations	Yes				Yes	✓		
	A19 / A139	Risk of flooding at low-lying locations	Yes		✓		Yes	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	A19 / A690	Risk of flooding at low-lying locations	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		
	Various Sites	Noise at Defra identified locations								
	M1 J33 to J34N	Poor local air quality may be worsened by motorway traffic		✓			Yes			✓
	A1	Need new bridleway links to join up existing network and grade separated links to maintain access to existing minor routes and PROW network	N/A	✓			Yes	✓		
	A1 and A19	Bridge parapet (barrier) height is not appropriate for horseriders					Yes	✓		
	Newcastle / Gateshead	Need a Park and Ride site	No	✓			Yes		✓	
	Various Sites	Need a Park and Ride site	No	✓			Yes			
	Metrocentre	Need to improve access for non-car modes	No	✓			Yes		✓	
	Away from SRN	Poor connectivity to employment		✓			Yes			
	A1 Great Park	Noise and surfacing issues	No	✓			Yes	✓		
	Tinsley Viaduct	High winds	Yes	✓			No	✓		
	M1 J39	High winds	Yes	✓			No	✓		
	All	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. Recent expansion of parks on A5; similar facilities are required in other areas.	Yes	✓			Yes	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Top Priorities		
				Short	Medium	Long		Low	Medium	High
	M1 Northamptonshire	congestion – calls for a strategic park and ride facility at Watford Gap services	No		✓	✓	Yes		✓	
	A5 through Towcester	air quality and environmental problems	Yes	✓				✓		
Other										

Part B Stakeholder engagement

B1 Stakeholder 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 London to Scotland East 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
- Hertfordshire, on Tuesday 1st October at the High Leigh Conference Centre, Broxbourne
- South East Midlands (SEM) and Northamptonshire areas, on 8 October at the Kettering Conference Centre, Northamptonshire
- Sheffield: 26 September 2013
- Leeds: 23 September 2013
- Northallerton: 12 September 2013
- Hull: 24 September 2013
- Middlesbrough: 10 September 2013
- Newcastle upon Tyne: 2 October 2013

B3.1 Stakeholder event invitees

D2N2 and Greater Lincolnshire

Stakeholder group	Invitees	Organisation
LEP	David Ralph	D2N2 LEP
	Ursula Lidbetter	Greater Lincolnshire LEP
	John Whyld	Boots enterprise zone
Local Government	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
Local authorities	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 Counil
	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 Larner	High Peak Borough Council
	Paul Wilson	Derbyshire Dales District Council
Strategic Traffic generators	Rachel Wilson	Lincolnshire Strategic Transport Board
	Martin Szakal	Grimsby & Immingham Port
	Ms Colleen Hempson	East Midlands Airport
Passenger Transport groups	David Astill	Nottingham City Transport
	Chris Deas	Nottingham Express Transit
	Rik Thomas	RAC Foundation
	Keith Shayshutt	Trent and Barton
Local Freight Groups	Frank Taylor	Road Haulage Association - Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire

	Sally Gilson	FTA - Leicestershire
Local Chamber of Commerce	George Cowcher	Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce
	Simon Beardsley	Lincolnshire Chamber of Commerce
Emergency Services	Heidi Duffy	Nottinghamshire Police
	Matt Pickard	Derby and Derbyshire Road Safety Partnership
	Chief Superintendent Russ Hardy	Lincolnshire Police
Countryside/Environmental Groups	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
Vulnerable Road User Groups	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
Motorway Service Areas	Matthew Stringfellow	Trowell (M1)
	Sarah Pilling	Tibshelf (M1)
Other government departments	Joshua Fox	Department for Transport
	Fiona Keates	Environment Agency
	Maria Hallam	Department for Business Innovation and Skills

Coventry and Warwickshire and Leicester and Leicestershire

Stakeholder group	Invitees	Organisation
LEP	Andy Rose	Leicester & Leicestershire LEP
	Alan Cockburn	Coventry & Warwickshire LEP
Local Authorities	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
Passenger Transport groups	Kenneth Treadaway	RAC Foundation
	Chris Hodder	The British Motorcylist Federation
	Marie-Pilar Machancoses	Centro Area Manager Coventry and Solihull
Local Freight Groups	Sally Gilson LLTG	Freight Transport Association

	Ann Morris	Road Haulage Association - Warwickshire
Strategic traffic generators	Trevor Barnsley	Coventry Airport
	Colleen Hempson	East Midlands Airport
	Adrian Young	Fosse Park
	Brian Reid	Mira Technology
	Chris Lewis	Prologis
Local Chamber of Commerce	Angela Tellyn	Coventry & Warwickshire Chamber of Commerce
	Martin Traynor	Leicestershire Chamber of Commerce
	John Merison	North West Leicestershire Chamber of Commerce
Emergency Services	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
Countryside/Environmental Groups	Tim Atkinson	Coventry Friends of the Earth
	Terrry Kirby	FOE
	John Fenlon	South Warwickshire Environmental Association
	Gerard Kells	Warks CPRE
	Jane Scott, RABO East Midlands	British Horse Society
Vulnerable Road User Groups	George Riches	Coventry Cyclists' Touring Club
	Edward Healey	Sustrans West Midlands
Motorway Service Areas	David Blackmore	Corley (M6)
	Saied Faghiri	Warwick (M40)
Other government departments	Ian Smith	Department for Business Innovation and Skills
	Joshua Fox	Department for Transport
	Fiona Keates	Environment Agency

Name	Organisation	Attended
Sheffield, 26 September 2013		
Jamie Douglas	Andrew Bingham MP	Y
	Barnsley and Rotherham Chamber of Commerce	N
Dave Pownall	Barnsley MBC	N
David Rowen	Bassetlaw DC	N
Joe Davies	Bassetlaw District Council	Y
Miles Price	British Land	Y
Richard Bryant	Chesterfield BC	N
Thomas McHugh	Counter Context	Y
Anne Robinson	CPRE	Y
Mick Nott	Cycle Sheffield	Y
Scott Knowles	Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce	N
Paul Wilson	Derbyshire Dales DC	N
Margaret Jackson	DfT	Y
Chris Hobson	DNCC	Y
Steve Birch	Don Valley Strategy Group	N
Daniel Fell	Doncaster Chamber of Commerce & Enterprise	N
Neil Firth	Doncaster MBC	N
Tom Mais	DTA	Y
Anthony Rae	Friends of the Earth	Y
Dai Larner	High Peak	N
Dawn Osborne	Meadowhall	Y
Gary Crisp	Morgan Sindall plc	Y
Martin McKervey	NARBARRO LLP	Y
James Arnold	North East Derbyshire DC	N
John Stanfield	Outokumpu	N
Tim Nicholson	Peak District National Park Authority	Y
Gary Shepherd	R3 Products	Y
Steve Gill	Robin Hood Airport	N
	Rossington Inland Port	N
Ian Ashmore	Rotherham	Y
John Bann	Sheffield CC	N
	Sheffield Chamber of Commerce	N
Ben Still	Sheffield City Region	N
	Sheffield Forgemasters International Limited	N
Keith McKoy	Sheffield Hallam University	N
Caroline Scott	Shepherd Group (Rossington Inland Port)	N
Gordon McArthur	Sustrans	Y
Dave Allatt	SYPTE	Y
Neal Byers	SYPTE	Y

Name	Organisation	Attended
Julie Hurley	SYPTE	N
Nigel Gilmore	Tameside MBC	Y
Mick Morris	Tata Steel	Y
Prof John Flint	University of Sheffield	N
	Visit Peak District & Derbyshire Commerce Centre	N
Leeds, 23 September 2013		
Adam Parbutt	Arup	Y
Peter Stubbs	Calderdale	Y
Anthony Rae	Friends of the Earth	Y
Tim Lawrence	Kirklees	Y
Phil Mitchell	Leeds	Y
Dr Ronghui Liu	Leeds University Institute for Transport Studies	Y
Ian Williams	Leeds, York & N Yorks Chamber of Commerce	Y
David Horseman	Mid Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce	Y
Steven Leigh	Mid Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce	Y
Mike Babbitt	Sustrans	Y
Jeff English	WYPTE	Y
Colin Mackie	Yorkcourt Properties	Y
Graham West	Wakefield MBC	N
Lynn Ward	Realm Limited	N
Paul Smith	Scarborough Development Group	N
David Storer	Prologis	N
Ian Thompson	Wakefield MBC	N
Peter Anderson-Beck	Aire Valley LEZ	N
Kathryn Broadbent	Kirklees MBC	N
Jon Mayor	Leeds Bradford Airport	N
Stephen O Sullivan	Arups	N
Gary Verity	Dry Sand Foundry	N
Roger Marsh	Leeds City Region LEP	N
Martin Farrington	Leeds CC	N
David Feeney	Leeds CC	N
Julian Jackson	Bradford CC	N
Andrew Marshall	Bradford CC	N
Ian Gray	Calderdale MBC	N
Professor Greg Marsden	Leeds University Institute for Transport Studies	N
Prof Ian Strange	Leeds Metropolitan University	N
Lee Savage	Thorpe Park (Scarborough Property Group)	N
Gary Cartmell	Capitol Park (Sterling Capital)	N
	Prologis	N

Name	Organisation	Attended
	J32 Retail and Leisure	N
Denis Copeland	Birstall Shopping Park	
Paul Jacobs	IKEA	
Dean Stratton	White Rose Centre	
Chris Glen	WY Federation of Small Businesses	
Chris Glen	WY Federation of Small Businesses	
Sandy Needham	Bradford Chamber of Commerce	
Len Cruddas	Leeds, York & North Yorks Chamber of Commerce	
	Mid Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce	
Phil Snowden	RHA Northern Region	
Matthew Fitton	Peel Land & Property	
North Yorkshire, 12 September 2013		
	A19 Design Outlet	N
Caroline Bradley	British Horse Society	Y
Catriona Cook	British Horse Society	N
Brian Burke	British Motorcycle Federation	Y
Neil Swain	Castle Howard	Y
Philip Bentley	CECA (Y&H)	N
Ian Stokes	City of York Council	Y
Martin Grainger	City of York Council	N
John Gill	CPRE North Yorkshire	Y
Sian Watson	Craven DC	N
Terry Ratcliffe	Cycling Touring Club	Y
Ian Burnett	East Riding of Yorkshire	N
Stephen Hunt	East Riding of Yorkshire	N
Mick Jewitt	Hambleton DC	N
Dave Allenby	Harrogate BC	N
	John Smith's Brewery	N
	Leeds Chamber of Commerce	N
Derek Gittins	Middlesbrough Council	N
James Copeland	National Farmers Union	Y
Sarah Housden	North York Moors National Park Authority	N
Andrew Bainbridge	North Yorkshire	Y
Barrie Mason	North Yorkshire CC	N
John Grantham	Oakgate Developments	N
	Oakgate Group	N
Peter Featherstone	Richmondshie & Hambleton	N
John Hiles	Richmondshire DC	N
Howard Wallis	Ryedale	Y
David Wheelwright	Ryedale	Y
Julian Rudd	Ryedale DC	N

Name	Organisation	Attended
Iain Simpson	Scarborough Business Park	N
David Hand	Scarborough DC	Y
Eileen Scothern	Selby DC	N
Diane Wilson	Selby District Council	Y
Paul Walker	The Food and Environment Research Agency	N
Richard Wood	York City Council	N
	York Science Park	N
Professor Brian Cantor	York University	N
Andrew Leeming	York, North Yorkshire & East Riding LEP	N
Barry Dodd	York, North Yorkshire & East Riding LEP	N
James Farrar	York, North Yorkshire & East Riding LEP	N
Peter Stockton	Yorkshire Dales NPA	Y
	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	N
Middlesbrough, 10 September 2013		
Neil Etherington	Able (UK) Ltd	N
	Air Products	N
	Asda	N
Jennifer Stelling	ASDA Distribution	N
Neil Raper	Autolink Concessionaires (A19) Ltd	Y
Russell Spink	AV Dawson UK Ltd	Y
	Cameron Hall Developments	N
Carl Muir	Clipper Logistics	N
Bob Mullen	CPRE	Y
Bob Mullen	CPRE	N
Owen Wilson	Darlington Borough Council	Y
Ken Major	Darlington Borough Council	Y
Dave Winstanley	Darlington Borough Council	Y
	Devereux	N
Shaun Woods	Durham Tees Valley Airport	N
Kerry Quinn	Durham Tees Valley Airport	N
Andy Foulds	Durham Tees Valley Airport Ltd	N
Jonathan Spruce	Fore Consulting	N
Malcolm Bingham	Freight Transport Association	Y
Peter Frost	Hartlepool Borough Council	Y
Alistair Smith	Hartlepool Borough Council	N
Mr Tony Haddrill	Impetus Waste Management	N
Derek Gittins	Middlesborough	Y
Mark Lewis	NEPIC (North East Process Industry Cluster)	N
Bryn Littleton	North East Chamber of Commerce	N
Matthew Storey	Office of Andy McDonald	Y

Name	Organisation	Attended
	MP	
Mr Ian Johnson	PD Logistics	N
David Robinson	PD Ports	N
Mr David Varey	PD Teesport	N
Tony Gordon	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council	Y
Phil Jones	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council	N
	Scott Brothers	N
	SITA	N
Richard McGuckin	Stockton on Tees Borough Council	Y
Mr Andy Hill	Tata Tubes	N
Steve Payne	Tees Valley Unlimited	Y
Fran Monacourt	Tees Valley Unlimited	Y
Colin Torode	Tees Valley Unlimited	Y
	Tesco	N
David Turner	TESCO Distribution	N
Tony Stubbs	Tetley GB Ltd	N
Chris Musgrave	Wynyard Park Ltd	N
Newcastle, 2 October 2013		
Steven McCloy	ARUP	Y
Hilary Knox	Association of North East Councils	N
Neil Raper	Autolink	Y
Kathy Atkinson	British Horse Society	Y
Douglas Kell	CECA (North East)	Y
David Laux	City of Sunderland	Y
Lynn Cramman	Cobalt Park	Y
Mark Duggleby	DfT	Y
Dave Wafer	Durham County Council	Y
Adrian White	Durham County Council	N
	Durham University	N
Rob Carr	Environment Agency	Y
	Federation of Small Business	N
Nick Clennett	Gateshead Council	Y
Andrew Haysay	Gateshead Council	N
Peter Jordan	Housebuilders Association	N
Simon Tucker	Metrocentre	Y
Paul Bentley	Metrocentre	Y
Steve Beverley	Metrocentre	N
Sarah Green	NE CBI	N
Heather Evans	NE Cycle Touring Club	Y
	NE Regional Freight Council	N
Nick Best	NECTAR	Y
Graeme Mason	Newcastle Airport	N

Name	Organisation	Attended
Harry Emms	Newcastle City Council	Y
Rachelle Forsyth	Newcastle City Council	N
Ray King	Newcastle City Council	N
Gary MacDonald	Newcastle City Council	N
Tim Townsend	Newcastle University	N
Mark Tewdwr-Jones	Newcastle University	N
Tim Townshend	Newcastle University	N
Helen Matthews	NEXUS	N
Richard Potts	NFU	N
Glen Walker	Nissan	N
Mark Stephenson	North East Chamber of Commerce	N
Jonathan Walker	North East Chamber of Commerce	N
John Cram	North Tyneside Council	Y
Ruth Bendell	Northumberland CC	N
Paul Nicol	Northumberland County Council	Y
Richard McKenzie	Northumberland Couty Council	Y
	Northumberland NPA	N
Jude Leitch	Northumberland Tourism	N
	Northumbria University	N
Keith Wilson	Port of Tyne Authority	N
Malcolm Dodds	RHA Northern Region	N
Trevor Walker	Roadlink (A69) Ltd	N
Rob Dickson	Scottish Borders Council	N
Trevor Male	South Tyneside Council	Y
David Hall	Sustrans	N
David Hamilton	Transport Scotland	N
Ainslie McLauglin	Transport Scotland	N
	Tyne Tunnel Authority	N
John Seagar	UK Land Estates	N

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

SEM and Northamptonshire

Name	Organisation	Group
Andrew Longley	North Northamptonshire	Yellow
Paul Woods	North Northamptonshire	Yellow
Caroline Wardle	North Northamptonshire Development Company	Yellow
Simon Richardson	Kettering Borough Council	Yellow
Helen Russell-Emmerson	Northamptonshire County Council	Yellow
S Bateman	Wellingborough Borough Council	Yellow
Karen Britton (CEO)	East Northamptonshire	Yellow
Peter Orban	Sustrans	Red
Ben Gadsby	Amey	Red
Brian Hayward	Bedford Borough Council	Red
Geraldine Davies	Central Bedfordshire Council	Red
Manouchehr Nahvi	Central Bedfordshire Council	Red
Ade Yule	Bedfordshire & Luton Fire and Rescue Service	Red
Ishwer Gohil	Milton Keynes Council	Green
Keith Dove	Luton Borough Council	Green
Mark Lawman	Luton Airport	Green
Dorian Holloway	Open University Milton Keynes	Green
Sue Dawson	Stadium MK (MK Dons)	Green
Hilary Chipping	SEMLEP	Green
Neil Biggs	Thames Valley Police	Green
David Grindley	Northamptonshire County Council	Blue
Richard Palmer	Northampton Borough Council	Blue
David Allen	South Northamptonshire	Blue
Simon Bowers	Daventry	Blue
Chris Lewis	Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal	Blue
Lee Sambrook	Department for Transport	Blue
Will Moorlidge	Department for Business Skills and Innovation	Blue

Hertfordshire

Name	Organisation	Group
Colin Haigh	Broxbourne Borough Council	Green

		Group
Kevin Langley	Dacorum Borough Council	Yellow Group
Natasha Kopala	Department for Transport	Red Group
Martin Paine	East Herts District Council	Red Group
Sanjay Patel	Hertfordshire County Council	Yellow Group
Jameel Hayat	Hertfordshire County Council - AECOM	Red Group
Joan Hancock	Hertfordshire LEP	Yellow Group
Martha Lytton-Cobbold	Knebworth House/Stadium	Green Group
Lorraine O'Gorman	North Herts District Council	Yellow Group
Chris Carter	North Herts District Council	Red Group
Chris Briggs	St Albans City and District Council	Green Group
Viv Evans	Stevenage Borough Council	Green Group
Nigel Brigham	Sustrans – EoE	Red Group
Steve Farrell	Three Rivers District Council	Yellow Group
Philip Bylo	Watford Borough Council	Red Group
Sue Tiley	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Green Group

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

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

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), 2nd 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		Y		Developments shown on 'Anticipated Growth' D2N2 NE map. Congestion / delay visible around Newark, excl A46 (no data available).			AM KK	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	Y			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	Y			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	Y						BL DB	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	Y						BL AM SH	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	Y			Environment map.			JS SH BL	4

East-West links very poor	Much of Nottingham-Leicester traffic now using A46 due to improvements. Added pressure on Eastern section of A52. Highlights lack of E-W options. 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. 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. 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.	Capacity / Operational	Y						AM BL AM AM	0
Role of strategic network	Lots of development E of J25 on A52; new journeys will treat the A52 as local distributor rather than strategic link. OD data required – how do people actually use the network? It may technically be strategic, but locals will consider it a standard link. A453 – what is it's function? Is there a way to influence passenger choice to improve efficiency of network? 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.	Operational	Y					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	KK BL JS	11
Physical Geography	Difficult to provide new links due to geography, eg major rivers such as Trent. Anything radical will require new bridges. Development should be planned to account for trip generation and access without requiring major new investment – use the current network more efficiently.	Environment	Y					EM councils looking at economic data beyond land use, with Nottingham Trent Business School – Will Rossiter	AM BL	0
Derby – A38 to 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.	Capacity	Y						KK JS	7

Traffic management	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. 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. 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.	Operational / Safety	✓						JS / AM AM KK	 4

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

Description of challenge / Location Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	**Type of challenge** **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	**Why is this considered to be a priority?** 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	**How does this compare to other priorities?** **Why? Are there any trade-offs?** Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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
Network Management: 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
Employment Sites / Growth Points / Economic Growth: 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.		

Network Development: Improving the network and connectivity at a regional level to improve performance	Capacity / Operational	SH, BL, AM – E-W corridor needs improving to help support area development and reduce strain on N-S, nationally important links. JS – A52/M1 cross is focal point for the area, key for access into Nottingham and Derby, E-W links, HS2, Airport. AM – Very poor links to Manchester / Birmingham – E-W links need to extend beyond D2N2 boundaries. AM – A15 very poor quality route, lots of freight – difficult to overtake	Links with network management	
Better Dialogue: Communicate better with developers, other organisations, councils to ensure everyone knows what is going on, more efficient plans can be made.	N/A	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. 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.	Links with network management	

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

Workshop Name:	**Route Based Strategies Nottingham Workshop: Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire and Greater Lincolnshire.**	**Date: 16/09/13**	**Breakout Group:** **GREEN**	**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** **Toni Rios – Highways Agency**
Group Facilitator: **Graham Powell**	**Note-taker:** **Tom McNamara**			

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					
A1	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				No	Feedback from Councillors? A1+ incident logs		PG	1
			×							
A1	Police periodically close the A1 and do not tell anyone, so these closures are not reflected in HA evidence.	Operational				No	A1+ incident logs		PG	
			×							
A1	When trunk roads are affected by incidents, they often have to fully close, pushing traffic elsewhere.	Capacity/Operational				No	A1+ incident logs		JD	1
			×							
Overall	Total Casualties map does not show severity.	Safety				No	Accident stats and stats 19 data		PG	
			×							
A6 Spur	Surprised A6 Spur is a hotspot for casualties given that it is a new road.	Safety				Yes			RG	1
			×							

A52	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	×			No	Accident stats and stats 19 data		PG	
M1 (Junc 27-29)	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	×			No	Accident stats and stats 19 data		DH	3
Overall	Maybe accident figures are skewed as in poor weather conditions some roads are closed, pushing traffic/accidents onto other roads.	Safety / Operational	×			No	A1+ Closure/Incident data?		JD	
M1, South of the area covered by the workshop	Heavy traffic on the network leading into the D2N2 area.	Capacity	×			No	Will be shown on adjacent area maps.		RG	2
A52 SE of Nottingham	Large residential development will contribute to even larger peak traffic levels. How will the existing network cope?	Capacity		×	×	Yes			PG	1
A52 SE of 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.	Operational / Capacity	×	×	×	Yes			PG	1
M62 and A628	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	×			Yes			JD	6

South Derby A50 **M1 J24** **A38 Derby Juncts.**	Large amount of development is going to impact on these routes and junctions	Capacity		×	×	Yes			RG	7
Overall	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	Capacity/Operational	×			No	Review journey time data and show it more relevantly.		JD / PG	
A38/A50 Junc	Background traffic growth, particularly with the introduction of Strategic Rail Freight Interchange – speculate 3,000 – 6,000 more jobs.	Capacity			×	No	It is in the planning stage, but will be available somewhere		RG	2
M1 J25	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.	Capacity			×	?	Information should be or become available – planning applications etc		JD / PG	
Overall	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	Capacity / Operational	×	×	×	Not really			PG	2

M180 Isle of Axholme	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. enquires@enviroment-agency.gov.uk Isle of Axholme information – Flood Risk Management Strategy.	Not published fully on website yet.	DH	4
A38, Derby	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
A50 South Derby	The introduction of more residential development will impact on the road capacity. Noise impact areas.	Environment				Some developments are shown			RG	3
A1 North of Newark.	Flood areas	Environment				No	Comparison with EA flood risk prediction maps - EA website.		DH	2
Overall	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	
Overall	Better planning is needed, to ensure roads don't all come to end of design life at same time.	Asset Condition				Yes			PG	
A1	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	
Overall	Don't consider road improvements in isolation, consider as a '**package**'									2

A1/A46 Newark Triangle –	Delay, people avoid Newark. Adverse impact on trade and business	Capacity	×	×	×	Not properly			PG	2
M1 J25	Concern about delays, due to insufficient capacity.	Capacity	×			Yes (delay maps)			PG	3
Tintwistle – A628	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
Glossop A628 –	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?

Workshop Name:	**Route Based Strategies Nottingham Workshop: Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire and Greater Lincolnshire.**	**Date: 16/09/13**	**Breakout Group:** **GREEN**	**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**
Group Facilitator: **Graham Powell**	**Note-taker:** **Tom McNamara**			

Description of challenge / Location Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	**Type of challenge** **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	**Why is this considered to be a priority?** 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	**How does this compare to other priorities?** **Why? Are there any trade-offs?** Nb In this session we most interested in **<u>how</u>** 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	**Raised by**
Reduce overall delay on the network. Reducing the 'cost of delay' is KEY **– M1, A628, A50, A38**	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 **– Overall**	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

Overall					
A1/A46 Newark Triangle – 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. **– Overall**	Capacity				
Glossop A628 – 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
Overall – New standards used in all drainage associated with not only new but renovated/maintained roads.	Asset Condition	1. If the WFD is not adhered to it will become a legal issue for the Environment Agency. 2. The footprint of these higher capacity roads is going to be higher, so drainage infrastructure needs to align to this. 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.	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. **A50 - South Derby, M1 J24**	Capacity	Housing developments planned. Growth in both residential use and commuters from these developments, negative impact on capacity.			RG
Tintwistle – A628 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

Nottingham near the University. 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
D2 Roads. 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
Glossop A628. Improvements are needed ahead of growth. There is no room for more traffic on the network, so developments are opposed by residents.	Capacity				JD
A52 West of Nottingham cycle route. 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?

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

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 Nottingham between Priory Island and QMC	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 & 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.	Capacity	X			Yes			Keith Shayshutt (KS)/ Peter Briggs (PB)	13
A52 between Bingham and Gamston	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.	Capacity				Yes			KS	8

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	X				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	X	X	X		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	X			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		X	X				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	X						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		X	X				PB	2
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	X			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	X						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	X			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	X X						JD PB	5

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	**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	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	**Why? Are there any trade-offs?** Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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

A52 Derby Road	Capacity	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)		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).
Access to the Boots Enterprise Zone	Operational	Access to the Enterprise Zone is a key priority which needs to be argued strongly on the economic development of the site. (DJ)		
Network wide – infrastructure to support Core Strategies	Capacity	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)		
Accidents on A1 near Worksop	Safety	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)		

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/ Asset Condition	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).		

Location specific infrastructure improvements - funding	Asset Condition	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)	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.	
Network wide – non-motorised users	Society & Environment	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).		

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

Workshop Name	D2N2 & Greater Lincolnshire	Date:	16/09/13	Breakout Group	Red Team
Group Facilitator	Graham Fry	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					
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 M1and A38 mainline but no information on the local network at MI 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 discourages 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?

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

Description of challenge / Location Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	**Type of challenge** **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	**Why is this considered to be a priority?** 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	**How does this compare to other priorities?** **Why? Are there any trade-offs?** Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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?

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

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 fright 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 on 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 and Lincoln infrastructure	The infrastructure which links to the trunk road needs improving	Operational/ asset condition	✓			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	Various other studies have already been conducted into these issues. Route management strategies for North Derbyshire seem to have been forgotten about. 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)		✓			NA	NA		GB SM	0
Lincoln	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	Capacity/ Operational	✓			No	None provided		AP	0
The whole network	Capacity Issues: - The network functions reasonable well in the region in terms of capacity - The main issues are with junctions - Need to improve the capacity of the junctions A number of sites have introduced Ramp Metering, this causes issues at surrounding junctions	Capacity	✓			No	None provided		GB	0
Cycle Schemes	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	Safety/ Social and Environment		✓		No	None provided		JL	0

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

Description of challenge / Location Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group ***Not in order of priority**	**Type of challenge 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	**Why is this considered to be a priority?** 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	**How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?** Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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
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 at capacity	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 to provide 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?

Workshop Name	**Coventry and Warwickshire, and Leicester and Leicestershire**	**Date:**	**24/09/13**	**Breakout Group**	**Blue Table**
Group Facilitator	**Jenny Oakes (JO)**	**Note-taker**	**A Finch**		**Page 5**

Description of challenge / Location Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	**Type of challenge** **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	**Why is this considered to be a priority?** 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	**How does this compare to other priorities?** **Why? Are there any trade-offs?** Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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 A428 Toll Bar scheme will move issues up to these junctions.	Operating close to capacity.	Top priority for Coventry City Council in order to deliver growth. Economic case for 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	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. 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.	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 Leciester 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**		
Description of challenge / Location Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	**Type of challenge** **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	**Why is this considered to be a priority?** 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	**How does this compare to other priorities?** **Why? Are there any trade-offs?** Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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?

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

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					
Overall	Flood risk map shows flooding issues to be a lot less extensive than the Environment Agency have ascertained.	Environment	×	×	×	Provided some evidence including some for Nottingham workshop	Can and will provide more. Contact the EA for more if needed.		TA	
A5 around MIRA	Shows red on the pavement life cycle map, but it has recently been resurfaced.	Asset condition	×						JS	
Overall	Most flooding is not water course related (i.e. flooding of river floods carriageway) MAINLY run-off from the highway network.	Environment Asset condition	×						TA	
A46 **North of Warwick**	Sheer amount of run-off is flooding the immediate area. In cold weather this is freezing.	Safety Environment Asset condition	×						TA	
M1 J21	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	×	×	×				GC	

M1 J21	Weaving on/off the M1 to access the services causing safety issues	Safety (RTCs) Capacity	×	×	×				GC	3
M1 J23/24 **Also J21/22**	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
Overall	Up to 2021, the focus should be on existing problems that will only get worse beyond 2021 without intervention.		×	×	×				AH	
A5/A47 Junc	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	
A5 **Leicester/** **Warwick**	MIRA / Dodwells developments introducing additional traffic.	Capacity							GC	
M1	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	
Bridges throughout the network	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	
Bridges throughout the network cont.	Highly problematic dealing with Network Rail (got to get in early) Need to think about this <u>now</u>	Asset condition	×						GC	

A14	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	
Overall	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	
A42	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
A46 Stratford to Alcester	The A46 is only two lanes and carries a lot of traffic - not really suitable as Strategic Road Network.	Safety Capacity	×						AH	2
M45	Very quiet, under used. Could lead to speeding due to low vehicle numbers.	Safety	×						AH	
M40 J12	Potential new settlement near to Stratford-Upon -Avon	Capacity			×				AH	

A46	**LEP Priorities** 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	
M42 Corridor	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
M69 and Overall	Inadequate strategic signing.	Operational	×						GC	1
All **e.g. backing up of the A46**	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
All	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	

M1 J21 **Asda Island in Enderby**	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
M1 Corridor Loughborough	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	×	XX	XXX				GC	1
A5 – along the whole route	Severance for Pedestrian and cyclists trying to cross the corridor. Particular problem for pedestrians.	Safety Operational Society	×						AH	5
Overall	Has any though 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
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 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

M1 A46	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. 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. 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.	Environment	×					Will try and find information in specific areas where this has taken place and been documented.	TA	1
A14 **Market Harborough**	The 'Diversion Route Plan' needs to be kept up to date. Otherwise towns like Market Harborough get swapped by traffic leaving the SRN. There is the consensus that spontaneous incidents will have this affect and that it is unavoidable, but for planned works it is considered unacceptable.	Operational Capacity	×						GC	1
Shepshed **M1 J23**	2500 more houses, not 500 as shown on the maps from core strategy data.	Capacity		×		Maps don't reflect what MT claim			MT	
M1 J24 **South of Derby and Notts**	Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is going to create 6000 jobs with related car and freight journeys. Want reassurances this is being considered.	Capacity	×	×		Not on map (maybe because not in area covered by this workshop			MT	
General Maintenance		Operational								4

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

Description of challenge / Location Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	**Type of challenge** **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	**Why is this considered to be a priority?** 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	**How does this compare to other priorities?** **Why? Are there any trade-offs?** Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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	**Raised by**
A5 corridor. From Daventry to Tamworth **Including the anticipated Rail Freight interchange.**	Capacity				TK
What is the purpose of the A5? Not considered a strategic corridor.	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
Trunk roads are the main problem in the area.	Operational Capacity	Trunk roads are the priority as Motorways are not considered to be a problem (with the exception of M42)			AH

M1 J21	Capacity	Long term problem. Growth projections in the area are significant, thought needs to be given to considering this predicted growth.			TK AH
M1 J23/24 **24 – Airport traffic/access** **23 – Equally as bad**	Capacity Operational	This will need attention. It is going to be very important in opening up investment for the area and attracting business.			GC
M6 Toll **Empty because it is overpriced.**	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
Leicester – Nuneaton – Coventry – Warwick – Stratford – Evesham	Operation Capacity	This is the spine of the area, the back bone of the local/regional economy and needs transport infrastructure to match.			AH
A46 **Toll Bar maybe cause a problem north of it** **Pushing problems along the network, not dealing with them**	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
A46/A426 TGI Junction	Capacity	Will become an issue when A46 Toll Bar improvement is finished and traffic is unblocked and flows to this junction..			TK
Stratford to Alcester Road	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.		Duel Carriageway	AH
Congestion at Junctions in Warwick area eg Stanks Junction	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			AH

		thinking/cooperation.			
Maintenance **A46 North of Leicester** **Major resurfacing resulting in the removal of the verge for cross overs. Rising flood risk (less infiltration)**	Safety Environment Asset condition	This problem was created by the actions taken to maintain the carriageway. investment should not be creating problems.			TA
Strategic Signage	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
A5 **Been forgotten about because the suspicion is that HA don't see it as a strategic route.**	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?

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

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, safety, operational and environment	✓			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?

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

Description of challenge / Location Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group ***Not in order of priority**	**Type of challenge 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	**Why is this considered to be a priority?** 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	**How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Is there any trade-offs?** Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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
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	

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.	Capacity	Need a method to ease congestion on the A46 as current levels are not acceptable	Important to ease congestion on the road	Need a traffic management scheme on the A46 such as the use of traffic lights at peak times
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	Capacity	Need a method to ease congestion on the A46 as current levels are not acceptable	Important - plans are already in place	

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8th October 2013	Breakout Group	Yellow Group
Group Facilitator	Jonathan Price	Note-taker	Graham Fry		

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	***2015-21***	***After 2021***					
SRN wide **General Comments**	Growth information for Northamptonshire looks accurate but this needs to be the case across all regions so that where growth information is being taken into account in identifying priorities, it is reliable e.g. not based on previous RSS data.	Society and Environment	✓			No	N/A	Further growth information can be provided by respective JPUs in Northamptonshire.	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
A14, A45, A43 and A5 Felixstowe to Midlands Solent to Midlands London to Scotland East	Lorry parking and the location and availability of lay-bys is becoming an increasing issue. Lay-bys on the A14 in particular and also the A45, A43 and A5 are used for overnight stops by HGV drivers. However the HGV's often become a target of anti-social behaviour.	Society and Environment	✓			No	Lorry parks may not be attractive economic investments and the government/HA need to consider taking a more proactive role in providing lorry parking facilities. Northampton CC's A14 Challenge and Summit work provides evidence of this and other issues in respect of the A14 (details forwarded post-meeting).	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC) and Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	8
A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	Delivery of housing and employment in Kettering East is dependent on the need for SRN infrastructure - a new junction (10a) and substantial new local road infrastructure (WEWA link to the A43 north of Kettering.	Growth/Society and Environment	✓			Yes – on growth plans	Information produced in support of the Kettering East planning application and AECOM study work.	Information being produced as part of the Kettering East Funding Bid being coordinated by KBC.	Simon Richardson [SR] (Kettering BC)	17
A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	Future pressures on A14 between junctions 3 and 7 and at A14 J4 itself – from growth of Kettering and Corby and wider network growth.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	No (not a significant existing problem).	Study work associated with the Kettering Bypass widening scheme.	NCC may have some information on future traffic issues on A14 in Kettering area e.g. NSTM	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants), Simon Richardson [SR] (Kettering BC), and Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	4

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
A14 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Some congestion already at A14 junctions 8 and 9 which will increase as a result of future development in the Kettering area and in Wellingborough and Northampton.	Capacity/ Operation	✓			No – maps concentrate on SRN only not on local roads at SRN junctions	Transport assessments associated with proposed developments and AECOM study work.	NCC may have some information on future traffic issues on A14 in Kettering area e.g. NSTM (Northamptonshire Strategic Transport Model)	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	
A14 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	A14 not fit for purpose as a nationally important route over the longer term as much of the route in Northamptonshire and wider afield is only two lanes in each direction. Kettering Bypass widening may create problems east of Junction 9 where difficult to widen.	Capacity/ Operational			✓	No (not a significant existing problem except in some specific locations).	Study work associated with the Kettering Bypass widening scheme.	NCC may have some information on future traffic issues on A14 in Kettering area e.g. NSTM	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	8
SRN wide including A1 **General Comments** **Felixstowe to Midlands**	A14 has good provision of ITS (e.g. VMS). However, limited alternative routes except A45. Other routes have limited ITS - better real time traveller information is required on all strategic routes.	Capacity/Safety/ Operational/	✓			NA	N/A	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	10

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
M1 J19 **London to Scotland East**	This junction is a major congestion point on the A14 – should be largely resolved by the current major scheme – but some key local movements will not be accommodated with adverse consequences for local roads and development. The operation of the improved junction and local network will need to be reviewed.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	Yes	N/A	NCC will be able to provide information on local roads affected by limitations of the improved Cathorpe Interchange.	Caroline Wardle [CW] (North Northamptonshire Development Company) and Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	
A45 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Main issue on the A45 in Northamptonshire is congestion at Chowns Mill junction – affecting both the A45 (e.g. long queues westbound in the morning peak) and A6 route. Development growth will significantly increase congestion at this junction e.g.growth in Rushden area	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	Information from current HA scheme/ study work and NSTM.	Rushden Transport Study commissioned by ENDC	Caroline Wardle [CW] (North Northamptonshire Development Company) and Paul Woods [PW] (North Northants) and Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	13
A45 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Accident problems on the A45 e.g. at Raunds.	Capacity/ Operational/	✓			Yes	N/A	N/A	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
A45 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Single carriageway section of the A45 between Stanwick and Thrapstone already has poor journey times and future pressures will increase congestion on this section of the A45.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	Yes	N/A	NCC can provide information from NSTM.	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	
A45 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Junction problems in Wellingborough/Rushden area e.g. at Turnells Mill and Wilby Way (PPP scheme at Wilby Way will come under future pressure from development growth).	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	Yes	Current HA study work with input from NSTM.	Town Transport Strategies being produced by NCC.		
A45 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	A45 causes severance in the Rushden and Stanwick areas.	Society / Environment		✓	✓	No	Rushden Transport Study commissioned by ENDC, and Town Transport Strategies being produced by NCC. Destination Nene Valley Report	ENDC and NCC to provide information.	Karen Britton [KB] (East Northants)	3
A45 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Possible impact of Rushden Lakes development proposal – subject to SoS decision on Public Inquiry.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	No	Transport Assessment for the development includes a significant improvement to the A45 Skew Bridge junction.	N/A	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
A45 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Heavy traffic volumes on A45 and its junction in the Northampton area causing flow breakdown on the A45 and congestion on local roads crossing the A45.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	HA study work (HA and local authorities have agreed the need for the A45 Northampton Growth Management Scheme to be delivered principally through developer contributions).	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	1
A5 **London to Scotland East**	A5 traffic through constrained historic Towcester causes air quality and other environmental problems. HA should consider addressing this through a Towcester Bypass possibly through a joint scheme with developer of Towcester South.	Society / Environment		✓	✓	Yes	N/A	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	2
A43 **Solent to Midlands**	Existing congestion in Towcester at the Tove and Abthorpe roundabouts which will get worse as proposed growth takes place at Silverstone and Towcester. PPP scheme at Tove will help ease existing congestion but problems will build up in the future.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	HA PPP scheme modelling and Silverstone/Towcester modelling provides detailed information.	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
A43, M40, M1 **Solent to Midlands** **London to Scotland West** **London to Scotland East**	Congestion at M40 J10 and section of A43 between M40 and Brackley and at M1 J15a.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	N/A	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	
A5 and M1 **London to Scotland East**	Air quality issues associated with A5 in Towcester and M1 in the Northampton area (J15 – J15a). AQMAs have been designated.	Society/ Environment	✓	✓	✓	Not evident on the HA maps	N/A	NCC has information of AQMAs.	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	
General - Local Road Network – Strategic Links **General Comments**	The SRN network in Northamptonshire is part of a wider network which includes key strategic links which are administered by NCC. NCC has key priorities for improvements to the A509 (Wellingborough to Kettering), A43 (Northampton to Kettering), A45 (Daventry to Northampton) and WEAST rail bridge/Route 4. Also potential future problems on A6116 from growth in Corby. Schemes to improve these routes may assist the operation of the SRN and priority needs to be given to addressing issues relevant to both	Capacity/ Operational Society/ Environment Growth	✓	✓	✓	No	NCC Strategic Priorities and Northamptonshire Arc.	NCC to provide information.	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	8

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
	the HA and NCC.									

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8th October 2013	Breakout Group	Yellow Group
Group Facilitator	Jonathan Price	Note-taker	Graham Fry		

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
A45 Chowns Mill junction – Traffic Congestion now and increasing with growth **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Capacity/Operational/ Growth	CW, KB and AL - General agreement that this is a very high priority owing to existing problems of congestion and need to support growth in the surrounding area.	AL – Worst congestion point on the A45 now that Wilby Way has a PPP scheme.	HA recognises this is a priority and is already undertaking preliminary design work in order to submit a bid for funding detailed design of an improvement scheme at the junction – but not yet clear whether this will adequately cater for growth.
Need to have a transparent methodology for assessing priorities – e.g. a matrix based prioritisation framework. This could be used to compare SRN priorities against NCC priorities. **General Comment**	Partnering	HRE – It will be important for the HA to demonstrate how it has identified priorities and that they are consistent with LEP/NCC priorities (and compare well against NCC priorities).	HRE – It is difficult to assign priorities as the network should be considered holistically.	
A14 Existing junctions around Kettering and new Junction 10a **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Providing SRN infrastructure to support growth	SR – Significant SRN infrastructure has been identified as essential to support growth of Kettering. Kettering Bypass widening is committed but A14 junction improvements at Junctions 8, 9 and 10 are also required as is a new Junction 10a. Developer funding cannot deliver all this infrastructure so it must be considered within the RBS approach.	Equal or higher priority with A45 Chowns Mill.	Solutions have been identified – this issue is funding and delivery.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
A45 Junctions in Wellingborough/Rushden area **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Capacity/Operational/ Growth Society/ Environment	KB - Significant issues of existing congestion and future development pressures coupled with severance effect of the A45 for non-motorised trips between Rusden and Wellingborough areas.	Second A45 priority after Chowns Mill (A6) junction but severance issues a priority in their own right.	Existing PPP scheme at Wilby Way (A509) junction. HA already considering mitigation/improvement schemes at Skew Bridge and Turnells Mill Lane junctions.
A45 Northampton **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Capacity/Operational Growth	HRE - Breakdown in traffic flow already occurs on the A45 owing to high volume of traffic on mainline and at junctions. Also significant delays on local roads crossing the A45.	Important to have a strategy for managing future pressures on the A45 in the Northampton area. Local authorities support need for developer contributions to be used to address future impacts on the A45.	HA has identified the A45 Northampton Growth Management Strategy (NGMS) to be delivered principally through developer contributions.
A5 Towcester **London to Scotland East**	Capacity/Operational Society/ Environment	HRE - A5 traffic has severe impacts on Towcester and this issue needs to be given higher priority.	LAs are attempting to deliver a Towcester bypass through a SUE on the south side of Towcester. But this cannot deliver all the infrastructure needed to deliver an effective A5 bypass of Towcester.	Developer scheme for Towcester southern link road.
A14 Longer Term - fit for purpose issue **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Capacity/Operational	AL - Consensus that the A14 is a route of national importance and that its standard should reflect its importance. Sections of A14 west of J7 and east of J9 will not be able to cope in the future.	No discussion at the workshop on possible environmental issues of upgrading the A14 – just support for it to be a high standard route.	A14 Kettering Bypass widening scheme has started.
A14 Lorry Parking issue **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Operational Society/Environment	AL and HRE – Demand for lorry parking is evident on the A14 and something needs to be done to address the issue.	Has been a problem for some time and should be treated as a high priority.	Some developer interest in providing lorry parks but not considered sufficient.
Improving strategic links in the local road network **General Comments**	Capacity/Operational	Improvements to the local road network can help relieve pressures on the SRN as well as supporting	High priority for local authorities in the area.	Schemes listed in NCC Cabinet Report 19/06/2013.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
		local objectives		

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8th October 2013	Breakout Group	Red Group
Group Facilitator	Eric Cooper	Note-taker	Tom McNamara		

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	***2015-21***	***After 2021***					
Overall **General Comments**	There are economic benefits to using/providing public transport routes; installing crossings at junctions etc.	Society Capacity	✓			No	None discussed	None	Peter Orban (Sustrans)	0
Overall **General Comments**	60% of journeys that are less than 5 miles are undertaken by car. If a shift to more sustainable modes is achieved for some of these, it would free up some space on the network for 'Economic Driver Vehicle trips'.	Capacity Society	✓			No		Sustrans will provide evidence for this in due course.	Peter Orban (Sustrans)	0
Hockliffe, A5 **London to Scotland East**	Congestion and road safety issues. Worries are connected to the 'de-trunking' of this section of the A5. After the A5/M1 link is completed there is concern that there will be more traffic at this point on the A5	Capacity Safety	✓	✓		This is an anticipated challenge	Traffic modelling forecasting suggests an increase in traffic at Hockliffe	Yes – Further evidence to come.	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council)	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***
M1, Junctions 9-11 **London to Scotland East**	A lot of traffic 'self-diverts' from the M1 to the A5, through Dunstable, if there is a problem on the M1. This has a detrimental effect on the town of Dunstable; noise/air quality. Increase in traffic with the introduction of the A5/M1 link of 14%	Capacity Society Environment Safety	✓			No	Traffic modelling forecasting suggests an increase at Dunstable	GD will provide evidence of this; Central Bedfordshire Council has a wealth of evidence to support this.	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council) Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	13
Leighton Buzzard, A5 **London to Scotland East**	Described as being 'imprisoned' by trunk roads and motorway. Little provision to cross these barriers for non-motorised road users. These roads don't provide for 'multi usage' i.e. pedestrians and cyclists.	Environment Society	✓			No	None discussed	No promise of evidence	Peter Orban (Sustrans)	0
Leighton Buzzard, A5 **London to Scotland East**	Growth in Leighton Buzzard will result in more stress on the A5 at Hockliffe	Capacity		✓	✓	Development growth maps indicate growth to the east of Leighton Buzzard which could generate additional traffic.	Not discussed	None discussed	Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council)	0
Hockliffe Junction A5 **London to Scotland East**	It is considered that there is an existing problem with A5 traffic and not solely local traffic using the network for local journeys.	Capacity	✓			Yes – Delays and average speeds demonstrate delay.	N/A	N/A	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council)	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 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*
North of Hockliffe (Woburn Rd Roundabout on A5) **London to Scotland East**	Road safety issues here.	Safety	✓			Is not on the maps, but the consensus is that the HA know about the problems here.	N/A	N/A	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council)	0
M1 Managed motorways **London to Scotland East**	When there is an incident, management and recovery is considered to be difficult (there is no hard shoulder so it is difficult to access incidents for emergency services). Major incidents cause a problem and the Highways Agency is refusing to authorise reverse flow traffic, which could ease some of the resulting congestion following an incident.	Operational Capacity	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ade Yule (Bedfordshire and Luton Fire and Rescue Service)	8
M1 Junction 11A **London to Scotland East**	Once the M1/A5 Link is completed, there will be sufficient capacity for Highways Agency network. What about local traffic?	Capacity Operational	✓	✓		The HA are aware, but felt it needed to be highlighted.		MN will provide modelling evidence.	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council)	0

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***
A1/A421 Black Cat Roundabout **Felixstowe to Midlands** **London to Leeds (East)**	The junction is considered to be poorly laid out, with huge capacity issues in the AM and PM peak. The operation of the junction appears to favour one flow of traffic over others where there is also high traffic demand	Capacity Operational	✓			Delays are shown to some degree on the maps.	N/A	N/A	Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council) Ben Gadsby (Amey)	0
A1/A421Black Cat Roundabout **Felixstowe to Midlands** **London to Leeds (East)**	The worry is that the signalisation/pinch point investment scheme will only ‘buy time’ with the projected development in the area. Consensus was that grade separation is required.	Capacity			✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council)	0
A1 South of Black Cat Roundabout ‘The Bends’ **London to Leeds (East)**	Massive safety concern. There is a high interaction between the SRN and local roads as well of bends in the road which increase accident potential. Growth scheduled, needs more capacity. Constraint on the network. Growth means there is the perception that more commuting is going to affect the ability of the	Safety Capacity	✓	✓	✓	No – the maps do not show a predominate accident hotspot.	Not discussed	None discussed	Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council) Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	0

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*
	A1 to serve Bedford's needs. Worry that dealing with problems in isolation will only push them up the corridor – to Bedford. How is the A1 going to be used?									
A1(M) Junctions 6-8 **London to Leeds (East)**	If you ease the congestion along this section of the network, promoting the London to Leeds route, again, you risk pushing the problems up towards Bedford. There is a need for 'strategic thinking'	Capacity Operational		✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council) Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council)	3
Luton to Bedford. A6 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Big barrier to movement between these places on the National Cycle Network (NCN). There is no way to cross the A421 to get onto the NCN in Bedford, North of the A6/A421 roundabout.	Safety Environment Society	✓			No	See right	Will email with the NCN evidence.	Peter Orban (Sustrans)	0
New Bedford bypass. New A6 S of Bedford. **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Will increase the pressure on the A6 S of Bedford. A6/A421 junction is going to be a problem post 2021.	Capacity Environment (Noise)		✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council)	0

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***
M1 Junc 13 Exit on A421 **London to Scotland East** **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Very poor signage. Confusing if you are not familiar with it. Leads to people travelling in the incorrect lane. Lots of accidents are seen here (anecdotal)	Safety Operational	✓			Not known. Is it on accident statistics?			Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council) Ben Gadsby (Amey)	4
M1 Managed Motorways **London to Scotland East**	Some parts are not lit during the night. There is no hard shoulder meaning a broken down vehicle is exposed; this is a real safety problem.	Safety Operational	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ade Yule (Bedfordshire and Luton Fire and Rescue Service)	0
A5 (the section due for de-trunking) **London to Scotland East**	Drainage issues. There is the perception that maintenance on this section though Dunstable has been neglected due to its inevitable de-trunking in the near future.	Asset Condition Environment Operational	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ben Gadsby (Amey) Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	13*
Overall – Junctions **General Comments**	Junction design. Highways Agency appears to put ‘safety’ above everything, but this can cause severance, reducing accessibility for other road users. On top of this it is also considered to look ‘awful’ having metal railings up everywhere.	Society Safety	✓	✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	0

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***
Overall – Junctions **General Comments**	HA designs are always set to DMRB standards, whereas a lot of local authorises are using guidance such as the Manual for Streets, as a departure from DMRB standards in order to better serve the communities the junction serve/impact upon.	Society Safety	✓	✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ben Gadsby (Amey)	0
A5 **London to Scotland East**	Road side barriers are along this as it runs through towns such as Dunstable and Hockliffe. These cause severance. The speeds are so low on these roads; it is hard to justify the resulting severance and barriers to crossing the network.	Society Safety	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ben Gadsby (Amey)	2
A5 **London to Scotland East**	These barriers and other safety features, used in order to satisfy DMRB standards, often impact on the look of a town, which can be very important to the local economy.	Safety Society and Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	0

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***
Dunstable – A5 **London to Scotland East**	Dunstable is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Worries over the effects that diverted traffic from the M1 onto the A5 has on the air quality in Dunstable.	Environment (AQ)	✓			No	Enquired as to whether the AQMA information is used to inform HA decisions and used as an evidence base for RBS.		Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council) Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	13*

* Duplicate scores for identical or overlapping challenge

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8th October 2013	Breakout Group	Red Group
Group Facilitator	Eric Cooper	Note-taker	Tom McNamara		

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
Congestion on A5 in Dunstable (caused by 'self-diverting' traffic from M1) **London to Scotland East**	Capacity Operational	Gridlock in Dunstable, will make it less attractive for investment.	No trade offs were discussed.	When the congestion is not incident related is there an option to use VMS and Managed motorway signage to alert driers to the fact that Dunstable is also busy, possibly discouraging vehicles from electing to use this route?
Bedfordshire East/West constraints **Felixstowe to Midlands** **General Comments**	Capacity		Considered 1st long-term priority. (post 2021)	Not discussed
Identify problematic junctions on the A1. Assess the accessibility/severance in the Bedford/A1 area. **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity Environment Social	Problems are known to exist along this stretch of the A1. An assessment is needed to prioritise and offer best solution to severance issues. It is important that in dealing with one junction on the A1 the problems aren't just pushed along to the next junction.	Considered 2nd long-term priority. (post 2021)	Not discussed
Infrastructure issues at A1 Junctions **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity Environment Social	These are existing issues which need addressing prior to growth coming forward	No trade offs were discussed.	Not discussed
Congestion in communities around Bedford. Accessibility for non-	Capacity	There is an existing deficit and an opportunity to influence travel	No trade offs were discussed.	Not discussed

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
motorised road users. **Felixstowe to Midlands** **General Comments**	Social Environment	behaviour through improvements		
Severance for Pedestrian and Cyclists at the A421/A6 junction. **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Social Environment	There is an existing deficit and an opportunity to influence travel behaviour through improvements	No trade offs were discussed.	Not discussed
M1 (managed motorway) – Post accident Operation. **London to Scotland East**	Operational Safety	This is an existing issue.	No trade offs were discussed.	Major incidents cause a problem and the Highways Agency are refusing to authorise reverse flow traffic, which could ease some of the resulting congestion following an incident.
Area Wide Freight Management **General Comments**	Capacity	Not discussed	No trade offs were discussed	Not discussed
A5 Hockliffe junction **London to Scotland East**	Capacity	Considered a priority because it is a ‘strategic movements’ issue, not predominantly caused by local traffic. Growth in Leighton Buzzard will contribute to an increase in problems at Hockliffe in the future.	Considered 3rd long-term priority. (post 2021)	
M1 Junction 13 – Signage **London to Scotland East**	Operational Safety	Confusing if you are not familiar with the junction layout. Leads to people travelling in the incorrect lane. Lots of accidents are seen here (anecdotal observations)	No trade offs were discussed - however see right	Improve on-road signage. Regarded as a ‘quick win’ that could be addressed in the short term.
A5 – Around Kensworth **London to Scotland East**	Safety	Not discussed	No trade offs were discussed	Not discussed

Workshop Name	SEM LEP	Date:	8th October 2013	Breakout Group	Green Group
Group Facilitator	Chris Shaw	Note-taker	Tasha Duggan		

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	**2015-21**	**After 2021**					
Milton Keynes Stadium A5 M1 Junctions 13-14 **London to Scotland East**	The stadium will be increasing capacity to 30k and will be facilitating daily events (rugby, football etc); it will be taking over the MK bowl. A leisure centre is also being built. This will cause movement issues especially on the A5. There are currently congestion issues around events. Additional growth and investment for residential and retail developments are planned	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	The growth map indicates that there will be substantial growth in Milton Keynes; however there are no specific details of growth at the stadium.	There was no discussion of evidence. .	None	Sue Dawson (Stadium MK)	17
A5 to Milton Keynes **London to Scotland East**	This is a high speed section of the route and there are usually serious incidents because of a lack of lighting and speed. There are also blind spots.	Operational/ Safety	✓	✓	✓	The safety map indicates that this section of road has a relatively high level of vehicle casualties.	N/A	Whilst the workshop map shows there to be casualties, this does not necessarily indicate that there were near misses.	Neil Biggs (Thames Valley)	5
M1 Junction 10 **London to Scotland East**	There are proposals for growth in Luton including employment in the town centre which could increase congestion over the wider network.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	The Key Growth map provides details of growth in Luton.	N/A	None	Keith Dove (Luton BC)	
A5 MK M1 Junctions 13	Proposals for residential and retail growth in Milton Keynes	All		✓	✓	The Key Growth map provides some details of	N/A	Ishwer Gohil (MK C) has commuting figures	Ishwer Gohil (MK	12 (Jn 14)

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /*	*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*
-14 **London to Scotland East**	which will put pressure on the A5 and M1. MK is expected to grow from a population of 250k to 350k by 2031 and therefore there will need to be enough capacity on the roads. A key factor of this will be commuting which will be around 50k. Currently there are 53k commuters that come into MK from outside. Additionally, delegates felt that Junction 14 was already running at capacity and would not be able to cope with increases in traffic. Delegates also discussed issues exiting the M1 from the north and south at Junction 14 which form queues. This has been happening Southbound for quite some time. There are more issues at Junction 14 than at Junction 13.					growth in this area. Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.		up to 2026. Travel Plan data is available (Dorian Holloway (OU MK)) Modelling being carried out.	C) Neil Biggs (Thames Valley)	3 (Jn 13)
M1 Junction 15 and 15a **London to Scotland East**	Issues with queuing northbound and southbound exits from the M1.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	No further evidence discussed.	None	Sue Dawson (Stadium MK)	0
A421 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Improvements on this route have pushed the problems further down. Delegates felt that the HA need to keep in mind that when making improvements, that changes will also need to be made further along the route.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes/No – the potential economic benefit of congestion relief map indicates that the north-eastbound section between M1 J13 and Bedford would have a moderate to high benefit of congestion relief. The peak hour speeds map does not	No further evidence was discussed.	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	14

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

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /*	*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*
	18 mppa by 2028									
M1 Junction 13 and 14 **London to Scotland East**	Delegates discussed current issues with E/W routes (including A421 and A509) which cause problems at these junctions.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Dorian Holloway (OU MK)	0
M1 Junctions 15-18 A43 A508 **London to Scotland East**	These junctions are close together. Queuing evidence needs to be gathered for the southbound carriageway in the AM peak from M1 Junction 21 down to 14. If there is an accident during peak time and the route is running to full capacity then queues sometimes go all the way back to Newport Pagnell. If there are issues then that motorists use the A43 and the A508 to avoid delays.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	0
A43 Towester **London to Scotland East** **Solent to Midlands**	The Abthorpe Roundabout failed to get pinch point funding; however there are still issues on this roundabout. There are schemes planned to improve Towester but funding has not been agreed.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			The potential benefit of congestion relief map shows some of the highest potential benefits on the north-eastbound section of the A43 approaching the roundabout.	No discussion of further evidence.	None	Hilary Chipping (SEMLEP)	6
M1 Junction 10-13 **London to Scotland East**	Delegates felt that a managed motorway would relieve traffic from M1 junction 10-13 and	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	N/A	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	0
General Comments	There are now far more heavy good vehicles on the motorway	Capacity/ Operational	✓			N/A	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals'	None	Neil Biggs (Thames	0

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /*	*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*
	which adds pressure.						experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.		Valley)	
M1 A5 Milton Keynes **London to Scotland East**	If there has been an incident on the M1 then there are huge delays on the A5. There are also issues when events are being held at the stadium.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	N/A	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	0
M1 Junction 13 **London to Scotland East**	Delegates discussed congestion at this junction during peak times of the day.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – the safety on the network 2008-2011 map indicates that The M1 at J13 is a top 100 collision location (ranked 52). This may indicate that collisions are occurring at the junction however the cause is not known. The potential economic benefit of congestion relief map shows that there would be the highest level of economic benefit of congestion relief on the M1 either side of J13.	N/A	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	0
M1 Junction 13-15a & Junction 15a-19 **London to Scotland East**	Issues with congestion and queuing northbound and southbound on these sections of the route.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			The potential economic benefit of congestion relief map shows that there would be the highest level of economic benefit of congestion relief on the M1 either side of J13.	N/A	None	All	4

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /***	***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***
A5/A421 Junction **London to Scotland East**	There is no lighting at this section of the route (around the Redmoor Roundabout).	Safety/ Operational	✓			No evidence presented on the maps to indicate high collision rate on this section of the A5.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	All	1

Workshop Name	SEM LEP	Date:	25th September 2013	Breakout Group	Green Group
Group Facilitator	Chris Shaw	Note-taker	Tasha Duggan		

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
M1 Junction 14 queuing/ congestion. Delegates felt that Junction 14 was already running at capacity. **London to Scotland East**	Capacity / Operational	There are plans for growth which could increase problems.	There was no discussion of trade-offs. Amongst the group, there was an impression that this was a higher priority challenge.	Not discussed
A421 Improvements on this route have pushed the problems further down. Delegates felt that the HA need to keep in mind that when making improvements that changes will also need to be made further along the route. **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Capacity / Operational	Not discussed	There was no discussion of trade-offs. Amongst the group, there was an impression that this was a higher priority challenge.	Dualling on the A421 to improve traffic issues
M1 Junction 13 peak time traffic **London to Scotland East**	Capacity / Operational	There are plans for growth which could increase problems.	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Not discussed.
M1 Junction 13-15a & Junction 15a-19 Issues with congestion and queuing N&S on these sections of the route. **London to Scotland East**	Capacity / Operational	Issues with queuing N&S.	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Managed motorways at Junction 13-15a & Junction 15a-19

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
A5/A421 Junction – there is no lighting along this route. **London to Scotland East** **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Operational/ Safety	There are a number of incidents caused by the lack of lighting.	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Lighting
A5 & M1 Event congestion (MK Stadium) **London to Scotland East**	Capacity / Operational	Lack of roadside information, e.g. VMS, causes additional congestion problems especially for those travelling in from outside the area.	There was no discussion of trade-offs. Amongst the group, there was an impression that this was a higher priority challenge.	VMS signage and real time information for events at MK. Real time info signs
A43/ A5 Towester Issues There are general congestion challenges in Towester especially around the village of Stonebrew. This has got must worse over the last two years, going North and South **London to Scotland East** **Solent to Midlands**	Capacity/ Operational	There are plans for growth around Towester and Silverstone.	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Not discussed
A5 Abthorpe Roundabout The Roundabout failed to get pinch point funding; however there are still issues on this roundabout. **.London to Scotland East** **Solent to Midlands**	Capacity/ Operational	There are schemes planned to improve Towester but funding has not been agreed	There was no discussion of trade-offs.	Not discussed

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8th October 2013	Breakout Group	Blue Group
Group Facilitator	David Abbott	Note-taker	Liz Judson		

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	***2015-21***	***After 2021***					
A45 / A509 (Wilby Way) **Felixstowe to Midlands**	This junction is considered to be overloaded and suffering from congestion issues.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay maps suggest that there is delay to the west of the junction; however the junction is not specifically included on the maps.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis)	0
A43 between Northampton and Ketting **Felixstowe to Midlands** **London to Scotland East**	This section of the A43 (as part of a longer section between Corby and Towcester) is considered to suffer from some of the worst congestion within the county. Whilst this section is not part of the HA's network there was a concern that if you improve this part of the route then this will just shift the problem elsewhere.	Capacity	✓			No – not part of the HA's network	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council)	0

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / [illegible]*	*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 [illegible]*	*Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)*	*Raised by*	*Number of sticky dots received*
A14 in the vicinity of M1 Junction 19 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	There were concerns from the delegates that improvements at M1 Junction 19 could shift issues on the A14.	Capacity	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	Simon Bowers (Daventry District Council)	0
M1 Junction 15 **London to Scotland East**	There is a concern that the current layout (dumbbell roundabout) is not sufficient for the volume of traffic at the junction. Delegates identified that there was a need for a double bridge at the junction going forward.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council)	0
A5 route as a whole **London to Scotland East**	There were concerns from the delegates that piecemeal upgrades on the A5 were not sufficient to support existing and forecast levels of traffic – the route needs completely upgrading.	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓	✓	No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However growth maps indicate significant growth is proposed in the vicinity of the A5.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council)	0

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /*	*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*	*Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)*	*Raised by*	*Number of sticky dots received*
M1 at Daventry **London to Scotland East**	There are currently congestion issues on the M1 near Daventry. Delegates questioned whether there could be local road improvements here that could benefit the SRN.	Capacity	✓			No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	Simon Bowers (Daventry District Council)	3
M1 and A5 between M1 junction 15A and 19 **London to Scotland East**	One delegate suggested that the A5 between M1 junction 15A and 19 should be de-trunked and that improvements should be focused on the M1.	Capacity / Operational	✓			No	Evidence is one delegates experience and other delegates expressed concerns that this might not be feasible. In particular they raised the issue that this would potentially remove an alternative route should the M1 be experiencing problems.	No	Simon Bowers (Daventry District Council)	0
A number of junctions and links on the A43 and A45 around Northampton **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Delegates identified that existing congestion at these junctions is constraining development within Northampton.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.	Richard Palmer (Northamptonshire Borough Council) indicated that there were some evidence reports to support this and that AECOM had prepared them.	No	Richard Palmer (Northamptonshire Borough Council)	15

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /*	*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*	*Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)*	*Raised by*	*Number of sticky dots received*
A number of junctions on the M1 and A45 around Northampton **London to Scotland East** **Felixstowe to Midlands**	There is significant growth planned for Northampton (up to 2029) and these junctions need improvement to support development. The Northampton Growth Management Scheme has generated developer funding towards infrastructure schemes. Delegates questioned whether the HA could contribute to the Scheme?	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓	✓	No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location. The growth map indicates a significant level of growth planned in and around Northampton.	Richard Palmer (Northamptonshire Borough Council) indicated that there were some evidence reports to support this and that AECOM had prepared them.	No	Richard Palmer (Northamptonshire Borough Council)	0
A43 near Towcester **London to Scotland East**	Some delegates discussed the need for a Towcester Relief Road to take pressure off the town centre and A43.	Capacity / Operational	✓			No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there are some potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.	David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council) made reference to the Towcester Transport Study, which he suggested provided evidence to support a Relief Road.	No	David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council)	0
A14 Junctions 3 – 7 **Felixstowe to Midlands**	This section of the A14 was identified as a particular congestion concern in the peak hours. A problem with weaving, due to the short distance	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there are some potential economic benefits from congestion	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis)	3

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /*	*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*	*Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)*	*Raised by*	*Number of sticky dots received*
	between junctions, was also identified.					relief in this location. The safety map does not support the concern with weaving as it is not identified as a part of the network with safety concerns.	other delegates.			
M1 Junction 17 **London to Scotland East**	It is not possible to make the movement from M1 southbound to M45 westbound or from M45 eastbound to M1 northbound. This means that vehicles have to use M1 Junction 18 and travel through Kilsbury and along local roads to access Banbury or Daventry. David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council) suggested that a link road here could open up a lot of growth.	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓	✓	Daventry is identified as an area that could experience significant growth up to 2021 and beyond.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates. Evidence of the number of vehicles that do / could make that movement was not provided.	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis) and David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council)	0
M1 corridor southbound **London to Scotland East**	This corridor experiences significant congestion in the AM peak (particularly 7.30 – 9am)	Capacity	✓			No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion	Evidence is anecdotal and most delegates agreed that the corridor experiences congestion issues.	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis)	0

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*	*Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)*	*Raised by*	*Number of sticky dots received*
						relief in this location.				
A14 corridor **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Delegates identified that the peak hours on the A14 can differ from the traditional peak, or there can be an additional mid-day peak, due to the high level of HGVs using the route to access / leave Felixstowe Port. Delegates suggested that this occurs westbound at M1 Junction 19 and consideration should be given to this when planning any improvements at the junction or on the route.	Capacity / Operational	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	Simon Bowers (Daventry District Council)	0
A14 at Corby **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Delegates commented that Corby is poorly connected to the SRN and where it does connect the junctions can be of poor quality	Operational / Society & Environment	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis)	0

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8th October 2013	Breakout Group	Blue Group
Group Facilitator	David Abbott	Note-taker	Liz Judson		

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
In the past there have been some mistakes made, in particular where the road provision has not matched that required to support growth. **General Comments**	All	Delegates were keen that these mistakes were learned from during this process and that the highway network was of sufficient quality and had enough capacity to support growth proposals going forward.	This was a general point that was raised but limited discussion took place.	None identified
A14 corridor between M1 junction 19 and Kettering – this is perceived to have the highest levels of congestion along this route. **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Capacity / Operational / Safety	This was seen as the section of the A14 that was the most congested and weaving problems could cause safety issues. Delegates therefore considered that this section should be improved first.	As the A14 is a significant route through the area the successful operation of this was considered key.	None identified.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
M1 and A45 junctions around Northampton were identified as experiencing congestion and were currently constraining growth in the area. **Felixstowe to Midlands** **London to Scotland East**	Capacity	Northampton is identified as an area where significant growth is planned and without improvements to these junctions the growth may not be able to come forward.	This issue was discussed at great length in the workshop and due to the number of junctions that require improvement and the quantum of development proposed in Northampton this was considered a high priority.	Nothing was discussed in particular but AECOM understands that assessments have been undertaken to inform the Management Scheme.
The M1 links and junctions around Daventry may not have sufficient capacity or be of sufficient quality to support development within Daventry. **London to Scotland East**	All	Daventry is an area identified for notable levels of growth and there were concerns that if improvements were not made to the M1 in this location that development may not come forward.	It was unclear how much of a priority this is but the access from M1 north to Daventry and vice versa was raised as a significant concern.	A link road was identified between M1 north and M45 west to ease pressure on the local road network. Solutions at other junctions / links were not discussed.
There was some concern that any improvement schemes that come forward could displace problems to other sections of the network, rather than remove them completely. **General Comments**	All	If the existing issues are only shifted to another section of the network then there could still be capacity issues that constrain growth.	This was not discussed in great detail but was raised on more than one occasion when discussing proposed improvements.	Suitable planning procedures need to be utilised to determine the potential wider impacts of improvements on the network.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
M1 junctions 13-19 – delegates were concerned about how long the widening along this section would provide sufficient capacity for existing and future traffic. **London to Scotland East**	Capacity / Operational	This section has recently been widened but delegates noted that there are still regular congestion problems in the peak hours. Therefore concerns were raised regarding the potential for the corridor to accommodate additional traffic in the future.	Although this concern was raised the delegates considered that further improvements at this stage were unlikely and therefore limited discussions took place.	Not discussed.
There are problems entering and leaving the SRN at Northampton due to capacity issues. **London to Scotland East** **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Capacity	Northampton is identified as a significant area for growth and these capacity issues could be constraining this growth.	Due to the growth planned within Northampton this was considered to be a relatively high priority.	Not discussed specifically but linked to the Northampton Growth Management Scheme.
The delegates recognised that there are a number of pinch point funding schemes that were not allocated funding, for various reasons. **General Comments**	All	There were concerns that the work that went into identifying and preparing these schemes would not be utilised in the RBS process. Repetitive or wasted work should be avoided.	A number of delegates considered that this was an important issue and were keen for previous studies undertaken to be considered.	N/A
M1 corridor – need to remove strategic trips from the network and encourage other modes of transport. **London to Scotland East**	Capacity / Operational	There were concerns that there are not infinite levels of capacity on the M1 and that attempts should be made to shift existing and future traffic to alternative modes.	This was considered to be a relatively high priority.	The provision of a strategic park and ride site, potentially at Watford Gap, to shift longer distance car trips to bus or rail.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
There are current congestion issues on the A45 south of the A14. **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Capacity	The A45 is a key route between Northampton and the A14 and therefore it is considered an important route on which to ensure congestion is limited.	This was the subject of a limited discussion in the group; furthermore some delegates thought it was of less concern than others.	Not discussed.
There were concerns that the consultation between the HA and local authorities would not identify local schemes that can be linked to strategic improvements and provide greater benefits than large scale schemes alone. **General Comments**	All	If strategic and local schemes are brought forward without consideration of the combined impacts then the greatest benefits from both schemes may not be realised.	Limited discussion on this priority took place within the group.	Not discussed.
There are concerns going forward regarding the proportion of HGVs in the A14 traffic (thought to be up to 25% at certain times of the day). **Felixstowe to Midlands**	Capacity / Operational / Safety	The reason for this to be considered a priority is due to how this affects the capacity, average speed and safety of the route.	This was not considered a high priority.	Longer / heavier HGVs or HGV convoys.

Workshop Name	Hertfordshire LEP	Date:	1st October 2013	Breakout Group	Yellow Group
Group Facilitator	Angela Middleton	Note-taker	Liz Judson		

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	*2015-21*	*After 2021*					
Area wide **General Comments**	The location of strategic growth sites across the county is not generally known yet. All the local authorities are at different stages in their Local Plan preparation. There is concern therefore that when the RBS's are written the finer details of local growth will not be known and therefore will not be taken into account fully.	All		✓	✓	Partially – delegates noted that the quantum of development included on the map was broadly correct but that the locations of development were not confirmed at this time.	Evidence of development locations to be provided if/when available.	Delegates in general but particularly Kevin Langley at Dacorum Borough Council	Lorraine O' Gormen (North Herts District Council)	0
M25 in general **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Hertfordshire's location in close proximity to London and the associated arterial roads means that any problems on the M25 have a significant impact on the local road network in Hertfordshire.	Capacity / Operational	✓			High levels of delay on the M25 between Junction 21 and 24 shown on the delay map partially support this – the A414 acts as an alternative route for this section of the M25.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Steve Farrell (Three Rivers DC)	0
A1(M) junction 7 and the section to the south **London to Leeds (East)**	If there is congestion on the A1(M) then this can have a knock impact on the local roads through Knebworth	Capacity / Operational	✓			High levels of delay shown around junction 7 of the A1(M) and further south.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Lorraine O' Gormen (North Herts District Council)	14

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
M25 west of junction 21 **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	There are significant problems on the M25 in the west of the county. This is considered to be a constraint to development in this area due to the route already being at capacity.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	Evidence of delay on the M25 to the west of junction 21 is shown on the delay map, which partially supports this.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	2
A1(M) junctions 7 and 8 **London to Leeds (East)**	There are significant problems on the A1(M) at Stevenage. This is considered to be a constraint to future development in this area due to the route already being at capacity.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	Some delay shown between junctions 7 and 8 of the A1(M).	Evidence is anecdotal and based on delegates' experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	14*
M25 Junction 21a to M1 Junction 6 (A405) **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	There are concerns regarding the A405 link between M25 Junction 21a and M1 Junction 6 and the constraint that this limited capacity into Watford has on the potential for growth in the area.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	Delay maps show that there is some delay on this link of the A405.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on delegates' experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	7

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
A414 and M1 Junction 8 **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Scotland East**	There are concerns that St Albans growth could have an impact on the operation of the A414 and Junction 8 of the M1. There is the possibility that 4,000 houses and significant employment could be built on land between St Albans and Hemel Hempstead. A potential M1 Junction '8a' could be considered as a solution.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The delay maps show some existing delay on the M1 in this location. Furthermore there is significant development (particularly employment) proposed for Hemel Hempstead near to Junction 8 at Maylands Business Park.	No further evidence was discussed – St Albans City and District development plans are not yet known.	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	8
Area wide **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Scotland East** **London to Leeds (East)**	There are concerns that the capacity and quality of the rail services to and from London in the future may result in a shift to car use in the county following planned growth.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	0
A1(M) Welwyn Hatfield (Jn 4) to Stevenage (Jn 7/8) **London to Leeds (East)**	This section of the A1(M) currently has capacity issues, which could be exacerbated by development to the west of Stevenage and at Junction 4 at Welwyn Garden City.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	High levels of delay shown on the map between junctions 4 and 8	N/A	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	14*

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
A1(M) around junction 6 **London to Leeds (East)**	The two lane section at this point is a constraint and operates badly in the peak hours.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	Some of the highest levels of growth in the Herts area are in the vicinity of junctions 6 and 7.	Not discussed	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	14*
A1(M) corridor **London to Leeds (East)**	The delegates perceived that there is a high level of local traffic using the A1(M), rather than predominantly strategic traffic, as the local roads are not considered to be of a high enough standard.	Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Lorraine O' Gormen (North Herts District Council)	14*
M25 in general **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Alternative east-west routes to the M25 are poor across the area, which puts pressure on the operation of the M25. Suggestions that there needs to be an outer east-west ring road other than the A414 to provide another suitable alternative route.	Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational	✓			The maps indicate that there are generally significant levels of delay on the M25 within the Herts area.	Not discussed	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC) and Steve Farrell (Three Rivers DC)	5

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
East – west movements through the county **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Leeds (East)**	A study of the A602 indicated that to encourage growth there needed to be a greater provision of east-west movements for freight traffic. A number of existing routes are not considered to be of a sufficient standard.	Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational	✓			No	Not explicitly discussed, however an A602 study may provide further detail.	Sanjay Patel - HCC	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	0
M1 corridor and A5 **London to Scotland East**	The M1 still experiences congestion despite the recent widening of the carriageway and hard shoulder running. The A5 is an even worse potential alternative route because it experiences congestion.	Capacity	✓			The delay map suggests that the M1 currently experiences high levels delay on the majority of links north of the M25.	N/A	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	1
A1(M) corridor **London to Leeds (East)**	Traffic modelling of the effects of proposed growth in this corridor indicated that there will be impacts on the A1 (M), which could be a problem for all authorities in the area. Mitigation was calculated at £42m, of which £32m is required for the SRN	Capacity		✓	✓	There is growth proposed in a number of areas along the A1(M) corridor.	Evidence is being prepared in support of North Herts District Council's and Stevenage Borough Council's emerging local plans.	No evidence was promised specifically but Lorraine O' Gormen raised the issue of modelling and therefore may have evidence if requested.	Lorraine O' Gormen (North Herts District Council)	0
Area wide **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Scotland East** **London to Leeds (East)**	There are concerns that the three areas where the highest levels of growth are proposed, are the areas that currently experience the most congestion on the network (Watford, St Albans/ Hemel Hempstead and Stevenage).	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	This is generally supported by the growth map (although details of St Albans growth are unclear at the moment) and the network delay map.	N/A	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	0

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
M1 Junction 5 **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Scotland East**	Delegates highlighted that northbound queuing occurs on the offslip at M1 Junction 5, back to the mainline carriageway and that this forms a major access route to Watford.	Capacity	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	0
M1 corridor **London to Scotland East**	In the AM peak the M1 southbound is often congested from Junction 11. Unless motorists get through this section before 8am there can be significant delays.	Capacity	✓			The delay map suggests that this section of the M1 experiences significant delays.	N/A	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	1
A1(M) Junction 9 **London to Leeds (East)**	On the northbound offslip there is a dedicated left turn lane which gives way to traffic which is exiting the roundabout which is considered to be unsafe. The visibility for left-turning traffic is considered to be poor and there is a problem with junction design.	Safety	✓			The safety map does not indicate that this junction specifically is a problem but the link between junctions 8 and 9 does have some safety concerns.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on delegates' experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	1

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
A414 Park Street roundabout **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	This junction is considered to be a safety concern, which could be exacerbated by the Rail Freight Interchange planned nearby.	Safety	✓	✓	✓	No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on delegates' experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	2
Area wide **General Comments**	Consideration should be given to the surfaces used on the SRN to reduce noise pollution.	Asset Condition / Society and Environment	✓			There is poor pavement condition on a number of routes across the county, as suggested on the relevant map.	N/A	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	0
A1(M) Junction 3 **London to Leeds (East)**	There are concerns with the ramp metering at Junction 3. The nearby Hatfield Business Park means that the junction is nearing capacity.	Capacity	✓			No	No specific evidence was discussed. There appeared to be amongst the group that this could be a significant challenge .	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	0

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
M25 Junction 22 **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	One delegate observed peak hour queuing from the slip roads onto the mainline carriageway.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay maps indicate that there is delay on the mainline links around junction 22 but there is no specific junction information.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	0
M1 corridor **London to Scotland East**	There are concerns regarding the potential expansion of Luton Airport on the operation of the M1.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The evidence maps do not provide any details of growth at Luton Airport (airport growth is highlighted on the SEMLEP workshop map because the airport is located outside of Hertfordshire).	No evidence discussed. Current planning application may provide relevant data.	None	Unknown (did not initial post-it note)	0

* Duplicate score for overlapping issues

Workshop Name	Hertfordshire LEP	Date:	1st October 2013	Breakout Group	Yellow Group
Group Facilitator	Angela Middleton	Note-taker	Liz Judson		

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
There are current congestion issues on the A1(M) between junctions 6 and 8 due to the reduction from three lanes to two in this section, which results in a bottleneck for traffic. **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity	This is a key north-south route through the area with connections into London. Any delays caused by the two lane section impacts on the movement of vehicles along this route, the local and national economy and the ability of the network to provide for future growth.	This was considered to be a high priority by the group.	Widening of the carriageway from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in both directions.
There are considered to be consistent delays leaving Hemel Hempstead at M1 Junction 8 and it is likely that significant development proposals could exacerbate these issues in the longer term, particularly those in St Albans and Dacorum. **London to Scotland East**	Capacity	There is significant growth proposed in this area and therefore if improvements are not made then either the network could become even more congested or the current constraints could prevent growth coming forward.	This was considered to be a high priority by the group.	Two potential solutions to this problems were discussed - a new M1 Junction 8a and a north-eastern relief road linking the A414 (near Maylands) with the B487 Redbourn Road.
There are heavy delays on the A5, which is also used as an alternative to the M1 when there are problems on the motorway. **London to Scotland East**	Capacity	Due to the A5 sometimes operating as an alternative route to the M1 when the M1 is experiencing significant delays, as well as its own role as a trunk road that serves Milton Keynes and Northampton and	There was limited discussion on this route, with no indication of it being a high or low priority.	An A5 Dunstable bypass.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
		a local distributor road (e.g. in Dunstable) , delays on this route can have significant implications further afield on the local road network.		
The link between M25 junction 21a and M1 junction 6 (the A405 link road) experiences safety and capacity issues. **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Capacity / Safety	The link between the two is considered to be sub-standard, especially considering that it links two of the most important motorways in the country. It also functions as a local distributor route between St Albans and Watford.	This link was discussed in detail and was considered a high priority amongst the delegates as it is an existing issue that will get worse if it is not addressed.	A ‘free flow’ interchange link between the M1 and M25 was discussed as a potential solution.
A number of delegates commented on the safety concerns on the A1(M) junction 9 northbound offslip (primarily related to junction design and visibility) **London to Leeds (East)**	Safety	This was considered to be a significant safety issue on the SRN in Hertfordshire.	Whilst this did not appear to be such a high priority when compared with some congestion issues in the area it was considered a high priority when evaluating safety in the area.	No particular solutions were discussed, however a re-design of the junction was suggested.
There are concerns that despite the recent widening and hard shoulder running approaches there are still significant delays on the M1 between junctions 8 and 11 (mainly southbound in the AM peak and northbound in the PM peak). **London to Scotland East**	Capacity	This is one of the primary north-south routes in the country and therefore significant delays on this route can impact on the economy as well as restrict future growth.	Whilst the delays here were considered significant a number of delegates were unsure what else could be done to alleviate congestion and therefore was not discussed as much as some other issues.	Not discussed.
There are long term concerns about the growth of Harlow on the M11. **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity / Operational / Safety	Harlow is one of the key growth areas in the region and is on the edge of the Hertfordshire LEP area; therefore the impact of this growth could have a significant impact on the	This was mentioned briefly and did not appear to be a high level priority. From a Hertfordshire perspective, there may be trade-offs with other County-based priorities.	Not discussed.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
		routes in Hertfordshire.		
There are considered to be significant issues with congestion on the M25 between Junction 21 to Junction 10 (A3). **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Capacity	The M25 is crucial to the national economy and this section includes access to Heathrow Airport, therefore its successful operation is important.	It could be considered a lower priority due to the majority of the route being outside the Hertfordshire LEP area, however no trade offs were discussed amongst the group	Not discussed.
The general congestion issues along the A1 corridor are considered a significant current concern and a barrier to future growth in the area. **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity / Operational / Safety	The A1 is a key north-south route through the county and therefore it is important to ensure that a good operation is maintained.	The corridor was considered to be important however high priority was assigned to links and junctions specifically.	Not discussed in general (see references to specific links and junctions)
There is a concern regarding the potential impact of the potential Radlett Rail Freight Interchange on the operation of the A414 Park Street roundabout. **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Safety	There are current safety concerns at the A414 Park Street roundabout that future growth could exacerbate these issues.	This is considered to be one of the key safety issues within the Herts LEP.	Not discussed.
The impact of construction traffic associated with the Croxley Rail Link is considered to potentially be a concern. **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Operational / Capacity	This was not discussed in great detail.	This was considered a priority for one delegate but was not discussed by other delegates in detail.	Not discussed.
There are concerns that the impact of proposed growth could cause problems at M25 Junction 25. **London Orbital and M23 to**	Capacity / Operational	This was not discussed in great detail.	This was mentioned briefly at the end of the session and was not discussed in detail.	Not discussed.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
Gatwick				
Clarification should be provided regarding how the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be applied, how much of a contribution will be made to funding by Local Authorities and what the definition of the CIL is. **General Comments**	All	There was a concern that the CIL process was not clear and could lead to confusion amongst stakeholders, developers and members of the public.	This was considered a priority for one delegate but was not discussed by other delegates in detail.	The CIL process should be clarified.
There is a lack of capacity on east-west routes, which could constrain proposed development across the LEP area. **London Orbital M25, A414T)** **London to Scotland East** **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity	Proposed developers (particularly employment development with high levels of HGVs) may be dissuaded from locating in some areas due to the lack of good quality east west routes. This lack of east-west options also puts significant pressure on other similar routes (M25 and A414).	This was discussed in detail and considered a relatively high priority.	A505 Hitchin Bypass or other new east-west routes.
The changing market to a higher proportion of online goods purchases is resulting in more online distribution centres and light vehicle trips, particularly on the A1(M), M1 and A10. **London to Scotland East** **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity	This shift in purchase patterns could result in more vehicles on the network (higher number of LGV than HGV delivery vehicles) and put pressure on routes throughout the area.	Minimal discussion took place on this point, in particular how it could be addressed.	Not discussed.

Workshop Name	Hertfordshire LEP	Date:	1st October 2013	Breakout Group	Red Group
Group Facilitator	Jenny Volp	Note-taker	Simon Willison		

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	***2015-21***	***After 2021***					
Congestion on the A405T and poor linkage between M25, A405 and M1 (between St Albans and Watford). **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	The section of the A405 between the M1 J6 and M25 J21a experiences severe congestion, especially southbound during the AM peak period. This can cause traffic to block back onto the anti-clockwise offslip at J21a, with traffic on occasions queuing onto the mainline carriageway which poses significant safety concerns.	Capacity / Safety / Operational	✓			Yes / No – the Network Performance delay map shows the A405T to be experiencing moderate levels of delay, however the peak hour speeds map shows low to moderate speeds. Most significantly, the safety on the network 2008-2011 map shows that the A405T experiences the highest level of total casualties per billion vehicle miles, that M25 J21a is a top 50 casualty location, and that M1 J6 is a top 250 casualty location.	N/A	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	6
M1 north of J10	Experience occurs on the M1 north of and through J10.	Capacity	✓			Yes – the Network Performance delay	N/A	None	Philip Bylo (Watford	0

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
congestion **London to Scotland East**	The section, which has recently been improved, experiences congestion because of a lack of capacity.					map shows the M1 to experience the highest levels of vehicle hours delay between April 2012 and March 2013.			Borough Council)	
M1 J4 – J6 congestion **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Experience occurs on the M1 between J4 and J6.	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes/No – the Network Performance delay map shows this section of the M1 experienced moderate levels of vehicle hours delay between April 2012 and March 2013. The peak hour speeds map shows speeds closer to the national speed limit.	N/A	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	0
Change people's travel behaviour **General Comments**	There is an increasing need to influence people's travel behaviour before considering providing infrastructure improvements which could lead to further traffic issues in the future. There is too much focus upon the need to provide for economic growth and less attention paid to the potential environmental consequences.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
A41 Western Avenue / Watford Road Roundabout congestion **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Congestion at the A41 Western Avenue / Watford Road Roundabout (adjoining the spur to M25 Junction 19). The delegate noted that the junction is some way from the M25 and therefore congestion may not have a knock-on effect.	Capacity / Operational.	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	0
M25 Junction 20 congestion **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	The signalised gyratory currently experiences congestion.	Capacity / Operational	✓			No - The congestion issues are understood to occur on the signalised gyratory and therefore will not show up on the maps	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	0
A1(M) Junction 8 congestion **London to Leeds (East)**	The signalised gyratory currently experiences congestion. This poses a risk to safety where there are long stationary queues on the circulatory carriageway adjacent to moving traffic.	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			Yes/No - Issues occurring on the signalised gyratory do not show up on the maps. The Safety on the Network 2008-2011 map (reference has been made to the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough LEP workshop map) shows there to be a high collision risk on the section of the A1(M) between J8 and J9	Not discussed – the delegate noted that the issue was based upon anecdotal observations.	None	Chris Carter (North Herts District Council)	5

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
						however it is unclear if this is associated with the operation of the J8 signalised gyratory.				
A1(M) Junction 7 congestion **London to Leeds (East)**	Congestion occurs at the junction on the adjoining mainline carriageway, including during the AM peak (southbound)	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			Yes – The network performance delay map shows that the A1(M) experiences high levels of vehicle hours delay southbound, north and south of J7 and on the northbound carriageway to the south of J7 only.	This is already an issue. Evidence building work is already being undertaken to understand the issue in more detail.	Yes – a study is currently being undertaken by Hertfordshire County Council to explore the issues currently occurring on the A1(M) corridor and explore potential options.	Chris Carter (North Herts District Council) Jameel Hayat (on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council)	11
A1(M) mainline congestion Junction 8 to Junction 6 **London to Leeds (East)**	Congestion occurs on the A1(M) mainline, particularly in the southbound direction in the AM peak period and in the northbound section in the PM peak period. The existing lane drop northbound at J6 is a particular problem. Consideration needs to be given to what is considered to be an acceptable delay (if it is not possible to completely eliminate congestion). Development growth is coming forward in districts clustered around the corridor	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			Yes (as above)	This is already an issue. Evidence building work is already being undertaken to understand the issue in more detail. ANPR data is being collected to understand what proportion of A1(M) traffic is strategic (i.e. long distance) and commuting (i.e. junction-hopping/commuting	Yes – a study is currently being undertaken by Hertfordshire County Council to explore the issues currently occurring on the A1(M) corridor and explore potential options.	Jameel Hayat (on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council)	11*

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
	which could increase pressure even further.						trips).			
M11 Junction 8 NMU provision **London to Leeds (East)**	There is currently limited provision for NMUs at M11 Junction 8. It forms an important link between Bishop's Stortford and Stansted Airport, both of which could experience increased pressure in the future.	Safety / Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0
M1 near Redbourn – on the Nicky Line cycle route - poor lighting in underpass. **London to Scotland East**	The lighting beneath the M1 on the Nicky Line near Redbourn is poor. Discussions with the HA are understood to be on-going.	Safety / Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0
M25 underpass near to J23 South Mimms - flooding **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Leeds (East)**	Flooding regularly occurs on the new footway/cycleway underpass route near M25 Junction 23 South Mimms (Wash Lane – Dancers Lane ('Great North Way')	Safety / Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
A414 – used as an alternative to the M25 especially during times of congestion **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	The A414 through Hertfordshire is used as an alternative route to the M25 especially during times of congestion which leads to severe congestion including to the south of St Albans, around Hatfield and in Hertford. The A414 already experiences high traffic flows without issues occurring on the M25. This issue points to a wider issue regarding the quality of east-west routes across Hertfordshire which is an existing deficit and is likely to become more important in the future.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	0
M25 J23 South Mimms congestion from A1(M) Southbound onto M25 Clockwise **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	The merge from the A1(M) onto the M25 clockwise experiences congestion especially during the PM peak period.	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Jameel Hayat (on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council)	0
A10/M25 Junction 25 north-south footway/cycleway underpass linking Broxbourne and Enfield **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	A10/M25 Junction 25 north-south footway/cycleway underpass linking Broxbourne and Enfield needs to be improved.	Safety / Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
Poor east-west routes across Hertfordshire which has consequences on SRN **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Leeds (East)** **London to Scotland East**	There is a lack of good quality east-west routes across Hertfordshire. Some major road links such as the A414 vary in standard/capacity. Congestion occurs which causes traffic to seek other routes. If east-west routes can be improved, not just road but also public transport, this may take the pressure off the SRN by providing new/alternative journey opportunities.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.	✓		✓	No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	5
Expansion of Luton and Stansted Airports **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Leeds (East)** **London to Scotland East**	Future expansion of nearby airports presents a challenge to the operation of the SRN.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council) Chris Carter (North Hertfordshire District Council)	0
Need for improved technology – opportunity to increase capacity **General comments**	Improved technology should play an increasing role in the operation and improvement of the SRN – it could substitute physical improvements to the network.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	8
A414T Park Street Roundabout congestion **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	A414T Park Street Roundabout currently experiences severe congestion	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	4

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
Need to re-start the Influencing Travel Behaviour Programme in recognition of existing and possible future capacity issues **General comments** **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Leeds (East)** **London to Scotland East**	There is a need to re-start the Influencing Travel Behaviour Programme in recognition of existing and possible future capacity issues, as it can provide benefits and comparatively low cost.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Jameel Hayat (on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council)	0
M11 Junction 8 – potential to be affected by future growth including Bishop's Stortford urban extension and Stansted Airport **London to Leeds (East)** **East of England**	Significant growth is forecast for areas surrounding M11 Junction 8 (including areas surrounding the A120 which adjoins the M11 at Junction 8	Capacity / Operational / Safety		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	3
M25 section in the vicinity of the M4 and M40 congestion **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	The section of the M25 in the vicinity of where the M40 (J16) and M4 (J15) join still experiences congestion, even though the section has been upgraded	Capacity / Operational	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	0

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &***	***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***
M25 Junction 25 – pressure from proposed development growth **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	M25 Junction 25 (with the A10) could experience increased cumulative pressure from Enfield, Broxbourne and East Hertfordshire.	Capacity / Operational / Safety		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	0
Poor cycle linkage between St Albans and Hemel Hempstead along A414 corridor **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Scotland East**	There is poor cycle linkage between St Albans and Hemel Hempstead, with a need for a cycle route alongside the A414T corridor. Potential future development growth east of Hemel Hempstead and west of St Albans could increase travel demand on this corridor.	Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0
A1(M) Junction 4 existing congestion and future pressure from development **London to Leeds (East)**	A1(M) near Hatfield currently experiences congestion (on the circulatory carriageway) and is likely to experience increasing pressure in the future as a consequence of proposed development coming forward in surrounding districts including East Herts and Welwyn Hatfield.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.	✓	✓		No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	0
A1(M) Junction 10 – pressure from potential future development at nearby strategic development site.	A1(M) Junction 10 –potential future development at a strategic site at Letchworth (put forward within the NHDC Local Plan Issues and Option consultation) could create issues at this junction in the	Capacity / Operational / Safety			✓	No	Not discussed	None	Chris Carter (North Herts District Council)	0

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &*	*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*
London to Leeds (East)	future.									

* Duplicate score for overlapping issue

Workshop Name	Hertfordshire LEP	Date:	1st October 2013	Breakout Group	Red Group
Group Facilitator	Jenny Volp	Note-taker	Simon Willison		

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
Congestion on the A405T and poor linkage between M25, A405 and M1 (between St Albans and Watford). **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** The section of the A405 between the M1 J6 and M25 J21a experiences severe congestion, especially southbound during the AM peak period. This can cause traffic to block back onto the anti-clockwise offslip at J21a, with traffic on occasions queuing onto the mainline carriageway which poses significant safety concerns.	Capacity / Safety / Operational	It is an existing issue which presents risks to motorists' safety (in particular traffic which is reported to be queuing on the M25 J21a anti-clockwise offslip). This issue could intensify in the future, especially with proposed growth coming forward in the Watford area.	No trade-offs were discussed. This was identified as one of the highest priorities.	Improve the layout of M1 Junction 6 and M25 Junction 21a or create a 'free-flow' interchange link between the M25-A405 and M1.
A414T Park Street Roundabout (south of St Albans) **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** The existing unsignalised roundabout at the end of the A414T experiences severe congestion especially during peak periods	Capacity / Safety / Operational	It is an existing issue that could intensify in the future.	No trade-offs were discussed.	It was suggested the junction needs to be signalised.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
A1(M) Junction 6 to Junction 8 **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity / Safety / Operational	It is an existing issue that could intensify in the future.	No trade-offs were discussed however the delegates did discuss whether, at a strategic policy level, further consideration needs to be given to what level of delay is acceptable which may influence the scope and timing of any improvements to the A1(M) through Hertfordshire.	No specific measures were discussed except the need for additional capacity.
Poor east-west routes across Hertfordshire which has consequences on SRN **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** **London to Leeds (East)** **London to Scotland East** There is a lack of good quality east-west routes across Hertfordshire. Some major road links such as the A414 vary in standard/capacity. Congestion occurs which causes traffic to seek other routes. If east-west routes can be improved, not just road but also public transport, this may take the pressure off the SRN by providing new/alternative journey opportunities.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.	There is an existing lack of good quality east-west routes in Hertfordshire. As pressures on the SRN and other parts of the transport network increase in the future, there could be a greater need for improved east-west routes. Improvements could present an opportunity as it could take pressure off parts of the SRN, and potentially avoid the need to improve parts of the SRN in the longer term.	No trade-offs were discussed.	Improvement to the A414, especially where it runs through towns such as Hertford and at linkages with key roads such as the A1(M) at Junction 4. Linkage between Stansted and Luton Airports – A120/A505/A602 improved links (may allow traffic to avoid using the M25). New rail links and potential with Crossrail 2 to/from Hertfordshire – would make more sense to extend Crossrail 2 to Stansted Airport.

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
Need for improved technology – opportunity to increase capacity **General comments** Improved technology should play an increasing role in the operation and improvement of the SRN – it could substitute physical improvements to the network.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.	Improved technology, both in-car and road-side, presents an opportunity to increase capacity through more intelligent use of the SRN, including management of incidents.	No specific trade-offs were discussed, however delegates recognised that increasing awareness of the potential of new technologies should be given before considering expensive physical improvements to the road network.	No solutions were discussed.
M11 Junction 8 – potential to be affected by future growth including Bishop's Stortford urban extension and Stansted Airport **London to Leeds (East)** **East of England** Significant growth is forecast for areas surrounding M11 Junction 8 (including areas surrounding the A120 which adjoins the M11 at Junction 8	Capacity / Operational	M11 Junction 8 is a major junction on the M11 and A120, providing access to Stansted Airport which could expand significantly in the future.	No trade-offs were discussed.	No solutions were discussed.

Workshop Name	Hertfordshire LEP	Date:	1st October 2013	Breakout Group	Green Group
Group Facilitator	David Abbott	Note-taker	Tasha Duggan		

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	**2015-21**	**After 2021**					
A1(M) Junctions 6-8 **London to Leeds (East)**	Delegates discussed heavy congestion on this section of the A1(M). Additionally, there is concern that the planned pinch point programme will move existing congestion issues further upstream.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			The performance delay maps indicate that there are currently high levels of delay between these junctions.	There appeared to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace. It was indicated that there is evidence to justify this as a key challenge.	Viv Evans will supply a document	Viv Evans (Stevenage Borough Council)	0
A1(M) Junctions 3-4 **London to Leeds (East)** **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Capacity issues between A1(M) junctions 3 and 4 which are partially caused by the A414 (delegates felt this was a major factor of congestion) have constrained development especially in Hatfield and to the East of St Albans. Welwyn Hatfield DC is under pressure to deliver housing and employment growth in the borough therefore this issue may hinder development in the future.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			The performance delay maps indicate that there are currently some high levels of delay between these junctions.	Not discussed in detail, however Sue Tiley indicated that modelling work is being undertaken.		Sue Tiley (Welwyn Hatfield DC) Chris Briggs (St Albans DC)	0
A1(M) Junctions 4-10 **London to Leeds (East)**	There needs to be improved event planning to deal with traffic on the A1 (M) between junctions 4-10 for events taking	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Not shown on maps	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience.	No promises of evidence, however Martha Lytton-Cobbald will supply ideas that have previously been	Martha Lytton-Cobbald (Knebworth	0

Location	***Description of challenge***	***Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /***	***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***
	place at Knebworth House.							dismissed.	House)	
M1 Junction 8 **London to Scotland East**	Delegates felt that Junction 8 of the M1 was already overloaded and there are issues getting on and off the M1 at this junction. There is growth planned in east Hemel and St Albans (which could be higher than is shown on the growth map), additionally some growth may not be able to occur in these areas and in Dacorum if congestion at Junction 8 persists.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	The performance delay maps indicate that there are currently some high levels of delay at this section. Growth in St Albans and Hemel is shown in the Key Growth map, which could exacerbate issues – St Albans City and District Council has not published a new Local Plan and does not have an adopted Core Strategy in place.	There was no discussion of evidence to support this challenge.	No	Chris Briggs (St Albans DC)	9
A414, M25 **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Delegates felt that the A414 was used as an alternative route to the M25 and that the A414 can regularly experience congestion because traffic is possibly diverting off the M25 .	Capacity/ Operational	✓			The network performance delay maps indicates high vehicle hours delay on the M25, in particular between J21a and J24.	N/A	No	Sue Tiley (Welwyn Hatfield DC)	0
A10, M25 Junction 25 **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick**	Delegates discussed M25Junction 25 with the A10 and raised concern that the current mainline widening works do not comprise of any alterations to the slip roads to increase capacity. Delegates felt that this could be an issue in Broxbourne if slip road capacity is not improved as there are reported to be existing capacity issues at the junction.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			The performance delay maps indicate that there are currently high levels of delay at this junction. Growth in Broxbourne is shown on the Key Growth map.	Broxbourne BC indicated that evidence existed which demonstrated that this is/will be a challenge.	Colin Haigh will forward data.(ELHAM Model is being used to determine forecast traffic flows)	Colin Haigh (Broxbourne BC)	8
M25	There are issues with congestion on non HA roads	Capacity/	✓			Not possible to show this	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals'	No	Colin Haigh	0

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /*	*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*
London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	when the M25 is congested.	Operational				on the maps presented	experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.		(Broxbourne DC)	
A1(M) **London to Leeds (East)**	Noise and air pollution in Welwyn (Junctions 4-6) and Stevenage (Junctions 7-8) caused by the A1(M). This may also cause constraints for developments.	Society & Environment	✓			The environment map indicates that the section of the A1 from Junctions 3 to 4 is a designated Noise Improvement Area (2012).	N/A	No	Sue Tiley (Welwyn Hatfield DC)	5
A1(M) **London to Leeds (East)**	Proposals for retail growth and the regeneration of Stevenage Town Centre could cause capacity issues at junctions 6 through 8.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	The delay maps indicate there are currently high vehicle hours of delay on this section of the route. The growth map shows that there are proposals for employment but does not specify numbers.	No evidence was discussed.	No	Viv Evans (Stevenage BC)	0
A1(M) Junction 7 and 8 **London to Leeds (East)**	There are proposals for 1,500 to 5,000 dwellings to the west of Stevenage which could have a significant impact on the A1(M).	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	The delay maps indicate there are high volumes of delay on this section of the route.	N/A	No	Viv Evans (Stevenage BC)	0
A1(M) Junctions 6 and 7 **London to Leeds (East)**	Delegates felt that there needs to be non motorised access to Knebworth House at Junction 6. Issues with people walking across junction 7 of the A1(M) to gain access	Society & Environment/ Safety/ Capacity/ Operational	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' local knowledge.	No	Martha lytton-Cobbald (Knebworth House)	7
Luton Airport Application **London to Leeds**	Proposals for the Luton Airport to increase from 10 to 18 million passengers could have impacts	Safety/ Capacity/		✓	✓	No	Evidence was not discussed.	No	Viv Evans (Stevenage BC)	0

Location	*Description of challenge*	*Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational /*	*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*
(East) **London to Scotland East**	on the M1 and A1(M)									

Workshop Name	Hertfordshire LEP	Date:	1st October 2013	Breakout Group	Green Group
Group Facilitator	David Abbott	Note-taker	Tasha Duggan		

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
M25 Junction 25 **London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick** Capacity issues on the slips roads.	Capacity/ Operational	It is a current issue and therefore the problem may intensify in the future unless it is addressed.	No trade-offs discussed	Not discussed
A1(M) Junction 1-10 Congestion, Capacity and Safety **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity / Safety/ Operational	There are already significant congestion and capacity issues on the corridor and it is considered that this will be a constraint on development.	Discussion amongst the group indicated that this was considered to be a high priority with no suggestion of trade-offs against other priorities.	Not discussed
M1 Junction 8 **London to Scotland East**	Capacity / Operational	Issues with getting on and off at this junction. Delegates felt that Junction 8 of the M1 was already overloaded and planned developments would cause further issues.	No trade-offs discussed	No discussed
New M11Junction 7A **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity/ Operational	Delegates considered that a new junction on the M11 between Junction 7 and Junction 8 is required in order to facilitate planned growth around Harlow and to alleviate existing and predicted future congestion issues at Junction 7.	No trade-offs discussed	Implementation of M11 Junction 7A

Description of challenge / Location *Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group*	***Type of challenge*** ***Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental*** *Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types*	***Why is this considered to be a priority?*** *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*	***How does this compare to other priorities?*** ***Why? Are there any trade-offs?*** *Nb In this session we most interested in **how** 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/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other*
A1(M) Junctions 6 – 10 **London to Leeds (East)**	Capacity/ Operational	Congestion and Capacity issues	No trade-offs discussed	Not discussed.
A1(M) Junctions 4-8 **London to Leeds (East)**	Society & Environmental	Issues with noise and air quality around Welwyn Garden City (Junctions 4-6) and Stevenage (7-8) which may cause a constraint to future development proposals.	No trade-offs discussed	Not discussed.
Access to Knebworth House and Developments **London to Leeds (East)**	Society & Environment/ Safety/ Capacity/ Operational	Issues with people walking across junction 7 of the A1(M) to gain access.	No trade-offs were discussed.	Delegates felt that there needs to improve non motorised access to Knebworth House across the A1(M).

Events Yorkshire and the North East were recorded differently to those taking place in other regions. However, equal weight has been given to the views of stakeholder expressed in those events compared to those at events in other regions.

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
M1	Severance	Society	✓					y					
M1	Poor journey time reliability due to variable congestion	Operation and capacity	✓				Yes –on the delay map, but the peak hour speed map does not accurately reflect the problem	Y	Strategic Modelling – SYSTM+, HA NAT modelling	Y		SCC, TS, R3	13
M1	The Sheffield City Region Enterprise Zones are unlikely to fully develop due to capacity on the M1	Capacity			✓		Yes –on the delay map, but the peak hour speed map does not accurately reflect the problem	Y	Strategic Modelling – SYSTM+, HA NAT modelling	Y		LLP, BL	
M1	There is limited coordination between the local road and the strategic road technology – limited driver information	Operation	✓				No –not applicable					SCC	
M1	The M1 creates severance for access to development sites by bicycle	Safety	✓				No –not applicable	y				Sustrans	
M1 jcts	Currently an issue, Development pressures will exacerbate	Capacity	✓				Yes	Y				LCH	2
M1 and M18	Liable to flooding	Environment	✓				Yes	Y				SCC	
M1 South Yorkshire	Environmental issues (air quality and noise)	Environment	✓					y					3
M1 J29-31	Accidents along this section	Safety	✓				No					CS, TS, CC	
M1 J33	Congestion due to weaving	Capacity and operation	✓				Yes –on the delay map, but the peak hour speed map does not accurately reflect the problem	Y	Strategic Modelling – SYSTM+, NAT modelling	Y		SCC	
M1 J33	Poor signage	Operation	✓				No – not applicable					MH	
M1 J33 – J34N	Poor air quality on the M1 past Sheffield	Environment	✓				Yes –Sheffield is an AQMA	Y				SCC	5
M1 (junction 33 and 34)	Future growth on development sites between J33 and J34S will not be accommodated in the current capacity	Capacity		✓			No –this is a future challenge	y				SCC, SYPTE	
M1 J34	Events at Sheffield Arena	Operation	✓				No – not applicable	y				BL	1
M1 J34S and N	Congestion due to limited capacity of the junction	Capacity and	✓				Yes –on the delay map, but	Y	Strategic Modelling – SYSTM+, HA NAT	Y		SCC, LLP, DTA, BL	31

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
		operation					the peak hour speed map does not accurately reflect the problem		modelling				
M1 J35	Severance and unsuitable footbridge	Safety, Society											1
M1 J35	Congestion due to limited capacity of the junction	Capacity and operation	✓				Yes –on the delay map, but the peak hour speed map does not accurately reflect the problem	Y	Strategic Modelling – SYSTM+, HA NAT modelling	Y		SCC, LLP	4
M1 J36	Unsafe movements for cyclists –frequent conflict with HGVs	Safety	✓				Yes	Y				Sustrans	
M1 J36	The future growth in the Dearne Valley is likely to create further congestion at J36	Capacity		✓			No –a future challenge	y				LLP	
M1 JN35	Severance for Pedestrians	Society	✓					y					
M1 (north of junction 39)	Delays. Currently an issue – managed motorway scheme will alleviate in short term, but may become an issue again in longer term	Capacity	✓			✓	Not long term impacts	y				LCH, WYPTE	
M1 to M62 west (junction 42)	Insufficient capacity on this link – need extra link	Capacity	✓					y				CoC	3
M1 jn 42 / M62 jn 29	Currently an issue, Development pressures will exacerbate	Capacity	✓					y				KMBC	11
M62 and M1 in West Yorkshire	Development pressures	Capacity				✓		y					
M1 JN45 / JN46	Developments leading to congestion	Capacity				✓		y					
A1	Lack of technology to inform on incidents / alternatives routes (A19 – accepting issue regarding toll on Tunnel, but also that this could form part of message to drivers, as per M6 Toll) & lack of integration with UTMC	Operation / Maintenance	✓				N/A	y	Existing provisions (techMAC data)	Y		Autolink, Sunderland	1
A1	Information that is provided to drivers regarding incidents and issues at network not of use to peak hour travel – should inform of local (rather than longer distance) issues	Operation / Maintenance	✓				N/A	y				Sunderland	1
A1	Diversion routes impact on local roads	Operation	✓				N					North Yorkshire County Council	
A1	New bridleway links to existing network and access rights which are grade separated to maintain access to existing minor road / PROW network	Safety	✓				N					CB, British Horse Society	2
A1	Flooding	Environmental	✓				Y	Y	Regional Flood and Coast Committee, Environment Agency	Y		Farmers Union JC	3

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
A1(M) upgrade	Drive is boring. Need to show local countryside without the road becoming a visual or noise impact. Improve driver experience and market the local area.						N						
A1 south	Support for provision of motorway. Missing motorway at existing southern all-purpose A1 south	Other		✓			N/A		N/A – general support			Sunderland	
A1 north	Convoy effect on single carriageway stretch	Safety	✓						Existing Stats			Northumberland / Sunderland	
A1 / A19 "onion" (SRN around Newcastle)	Capacity Bottleneck: Perception & impacts regional future and existing economy (NISSAN)	Capacity	✓				N/A	y	North East Chamber of Commerce (T&W only nett exporter of goods) LPA / LEP economic impact reports	Y		Sunderland	11
A1 North of Newcastle	Capacity	Capacity				✓		y					
A1 / A19	Ability to manage traffic around T&W and lack of technology	Capacity, Operational	✓										7
A1 / A19	More info on JT so people can make own route choice	Operation / Maintenance	✓									Newcastle City Council	11
A1 / A19	Lack of NMU provision and tie-ins to LRN, diversion required / lack of crossing provisions	Safety	✓				N/A		Evident from existing provision	Y		NE Cycle Touring Club	10
A1 / A19	Resilience in response to incidents (Interaction and the use of technology)	Safety / Operational	✓										1
A1 / A19	Parapet height for horse riders	Safety	✓										4
A1 / A19	Maps show cycleway, actually bridleways	Environmental / Social	✓				No		Other maps and studies	Y		Horse Society	1
A1/M1 link	Maintenance, noise, flood risk, Insufficient capacity	Asset condition, Capacity	✓					y					2
A1/A64	If improvements are delivered elsewhere on the A64 will this become a bottle neck?	Capacity				✓	N	y					
A1 J47 linking to A59	Over capacity, constrains Harrogate economy	Capacity	✓				N	y				North Yorkshire County Council	1
A1 near Richmond, Hackforth to Great Fencote	NMU crossing issues	Safety & Severance	✓				N	y				TR of Cycle Touring Club	
A1 Brompton Railway Tunnel	Being Filled in	Capacity	✓				-					CB, British Horse Society	
A1 Brompton on Swale	Noise issues	Environmental	✓				N						
A1 at Scurragh House crossing east of Richmond near Skeeby	NMU crossing issues	Safety & Severance	✓				N	y				TR of Cycle Touring Club	
A1(M)/A66 (Scotch Corner)	Limited access junction	Capacity, Operation	✓				n	y	Refer to junction layout			DBC	5

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
A1 Scotch Corner	Mess / litter / bad neighbourhoods. Needs to be gateway to region	Environmental	✓				N						
A1/A68 jct 58	Queuing back onto A1(M)	Safety	✓				n	y	Development forecasts	Y	CT, TVU	DBC	
A1(M)/A167 jct 59	Development pressures	Capacity			✓		y	Y					3
A1(M) near Durham	Pressure where 2 new bypasses will meet A1(M)	Capacity				✓	n	y	Scheme details	Y	BM	CPRE	
A1 Durham	Safety Fencing	Safety	✓										1
A1 J62 / J63	Capacity	Capacity	✓				No		Schemes already in place, just not shown			Durham City Council	0
A1 Western Bypass	Gridlock (especially S. Bound) – interaction between local and strategic movements. Existing capacity and development pressures.	Capacity	✓			✓	Yes	Y	Slower speeds than what is shown on the map		Gateshead Council possesses traffic flow evidence showing operational issues on the A1 NGWB are linked to increasing trips through the city centre.	Metrocentre	14
A1 Gateshead	50mph limit outside of peak periods (consideration of variable limit at off-peak periods)	Operation / Maintenance	✓				N/A					Sunderland	
A1 Metrocentre	Gridlock causes safety risks	Safety	✓										1
A1, (A69)	Right-turn provisions towards LRN & coast, travelling from south	Safety	✓						Visitors from outside of Region account for 12% of County's economy, travelling predominantly from south of region	Y		Northumberland	
A1 Denton Burn Roundabout	Capacity	Capacity				✓		y				Newcastle City Council	0
A1 N. Brunton to Lobley Hill	More information needed	Capacity	✓					y				Newcastle City Council	1
A1/A696 Roundabout	Risk from future development	Capacity				✓		y				Newcastle City Council	4
A1 Great Park Slip	Noise and surfacing issues	Operation / Maintenance	✓									Newcastle City Council	0
A1 Seaton Burn Roundabout	PPP but capacity for future growth, South west sector development an additional issue	Capacity				✓		y	Big housing scheme			Newcastle City Council, Northumberland CC	4
A1 Dishforth and Seaton Burn	Technology - provision, planning for future, decision making	Operation / Maintenance	✓					y					0
A1 Morpeth	Abnormal loads and low bridges. One structure means that abnormal loads have to travel through Morpeth.	Operation / Maintenance	✓			✓		y					0
A1 North of Newcastle, Morpeth to Felton	Overtaking	Capacity	✓										1

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
A1 N. Of Alnwick	Motorcyclists on single carriageway	Safety	✓										0
A1 N. Of Belford	Cycleway crosses carriageway several times	Safety	✓									Newcastle City Council	0
A19 and A168	Central reserve gaps	Safety	✓				N					North Yorkshire County Council	1
A19 and A168	Sat Nav Routing	Safety	✓				N					North Yorkshire County Council	
A19	At grade junctions lack capacity	Capacity	✓				N	y	Maps only show mainline capacities				
A19	Concrete Road	Environment	✓					y					
A19	Junction improvements needed	Capacity	✓					y				Newcastle City Council, Durham City Council	7
A19	Lack of technology to inform on incidents / alternatives routes (A1) & lack of integration with UTMC	Operation / Maintenance	✓				N/A	y	Existing provisions (techMAC data)	Y		Autolink, Sunderland	8
A19	TESTO / Silverlink / Moor Farm / Seaton Burn (post-PPP)	Other		✓								Sunderland	
A19 corridor	Development pressures	Capacity		✓				y					3
A19 and A66	Cycle accidents	Safety	✓				n	y	Study report	Y	KM, HA	MBC	4
A19 and A66	Lack of crossing points	Safety	✓				n	y					5
A19 at grade junctions	At grade junctions cannot cope with traffic flows	Capacity											3
A19 Thirsk	Noise on bypass	Environmental	✓				N						
A19 at Haynes Arms, Kirby Sigston to Osmotherley	NMU crossing issues. Site to be earmarked for a crossing when volumes achieve 16000 v.p.d	Safety & Severance		✓	✓		N					TR of Cycle Touring Club	
A19 coast to coast (Ingleby crossroads)	NMU crossing issues, Crossing south of Black Swan, Ingleby Ancliffe, people run across carriageway.	Safety & Severance	✓				N					TR of Cycle Touring Club	
A19/A174 Parkway	Development pressures currently an issue, PPP scheme will address in short term, but not longer term	Capacity	✓			✓	y	Y	Also TVU data	Y	CT, TVU	TVU, MBC	11
A19/A66	Queuing back onto SRN from local road network, Weaving	Capacity, Safety	✓				n	y	TVU AAP	Y	CT, TVU	CPRE	3
A19 Tees Viaduct	Structures, Congestion and Safety	Capacity, Asset Condition, Safety	✓					y					12
A19 Tees Viaduct	Lack of resilience, A66 acts as alternative route during incidents – problem on single lane section around Darlington, Also problems around A19 (Tees Viaduct) in event of accident / breakdown / closures	Operational	✓				n	y	Gateshead accident stats	Y		DBC	15
A19 Wynyard		Capacity, Safety				✓							

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
A19/A689 Wynyard	Development pressures currently an issue, PPP scheme will address in short term, but not longer term	Capacity	✓			✓	y	Y				TVU	13
A19/A689 Wynyard	Noise – concrete surface	Environmental	✓				y	Y	Also DEFRA info	Y		TVU	
A19/A179	Development pressures	Capacity		✓			y	Y					5
A19 / A1018	Lack of 'full movements' and impact of housing growth in Durham	Capacity	✓					y	Existing layout & LDF aspirations	Y		Sunderland	2
A19 / A1231 to Testos and A1	Flooding issues: - existing and response to LDF housing allocations	Environmental / Social	✓					y	HA Draining Study for identified junctions, 'Reasons for Failure report', (Environment Agency – no measurement for run-off)	Y	National dataset available from Environment Agency website, Water company mapping mirrors surface water flooding	Sunderland / Autolink / Environment Agency	3
A19 / A1290	Operation outside of peak (Nissan shift change and anticipated expansion)	Capacity	✓				N/A (not peak period issue)	y	Existing (TRADS) data / MAC knowledge / Identified PPP scheme	Y		Autolink / Sunderland	4
A19 Testos to Lindisfarne	Noise issues	Environmental / Social	✓					y					0
A19 South of Tyne to Sunderland	Future capacity issues due to development	Capacity				✓		y					
A19 Second Tyne crossing	Congestion at Testos worse since opening	Capacity	✓					y					0
A19 Tyne crossings	Constraints on these crossings	Capacity	✓					y	Overall benefits of the 2nd Tyne Tunnel in respect of journey times and reliability. Noting there have been some localised issues at Testos.	Y			9
A19 Tyne Tunnel	Development pressures	Capacity			✓			y					1
A19 Silverlink / Moor Farm / Seaton Burn	NMU Provision	Safety	✓				N/A		Evident from existing provision	Y		NE Cycle Touring Club	4
A19 Killingworth Junction	Safety Issues	Safety	✓										1
A66	Winter resilience (HGV vs Light Vehicles)	Operation	✓				-					Farmers Union, JC	3
A66	Replace existing horse corralls with grade separation – full study required.	Safety	✓				N					TR of Cycle Touring Club	
A66	General safety record needs improving	Safety	✓				Y	Y	Accident record already exists	Y			
A66	Winter snow issues. Closed 5 days in last 2 years. Use signage / gates as on other routes to prevent use. Close to certain vehicle types	Environmental	✓				N	y				North Yorkshire County Council	

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
A66	Grade separated junctions a safety risk	Safety	✓				N					North Yorkshire County Council	
A66 (East of Darlington)	Development pressures	Capacity	✓				y	Y				DBC	11
A66 (Durham Airport)	Potential future expansion (airport or industrial uses) may become capacity issue in the future	Capacity			✓		n	y				DBC	4
A66 Darlington Bypass	Single carriageway insufficient. A66M north facing slips.	Capacity						y					1
A66 around Darlington and Stockton	Development pressures	Capacity	✓				n	y	Congestion levels should be shown as being worse on the A66, but the map suggests otherwise. Parts show congestion which is not there				
A66 (Elton Interchange)	Lack of capacity, limiting future development	Capacity	✓				y	Y				DBC	4
A66 (Teesside Park)	Subsidence	Asset condition	✓				n	y					1
A1053 / port access	Lack of resilience	Operational	✓				n	y	Operators info	Y	MB, FTA	FTA	1
A174 (Greystones)	Development pressures and social implications of this	Capacity	✓				n – don't reflect tidal issues	y	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council traffic counts	Y		RCBC	11
A174 and A19 (Billingham Bottom)	Flood risk	Environmental, Safety	✓				y	Y				MBC	2
A179	Junction in Durham	Safety	✓						Accident data	Y		Durham City Council	3
A184	Cycle route missing link	Operation / Maintenance	✓										0
Airport	Maintaining traffic flow on the SRN in order to access flights	Capacity / Operational	✓										0
Allerdene Bridge	Weight, width and capacity constraints	Capacity and Operational	✓					y					1
Allerdene Bridge	Maintenance	Operation / Maintenance	✓	✓				y	The remaining working life of this asset is estimated at 5-7 years but largely unknown.				7
EDR's	Diversion routes when innocents occur pass large volumes of traffic through villages and local roads which are not designed for them.	Safety, Environmental, Society	✓				N						
Gateshead / Newcastle	Need a Park and Ride site	Environmental / Social	✓										12
Managed Motorways	Managed Motorways improve link capacity but not junction capacity	Capacity		✓			n						
Metrocentre	Access other than by car	Environmental	✓									Metrocentre	12

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
		/ Social											
Teesport	Investment in ports (establish whether this should focus on Teesport or include elsewhere?)	Other	✓										1
None SRN alternative routes	Local Authority restrictions affect use of non-SRN alternatives	Capacity	✓				-					Farmers Union, JC	
Alternative Routes	Capacity and sustainability issues	Capacity	✓				-					IS, City of York Council	
Away from SRN	Poor connectivity to employment (need to work with employers who will promote improvements, particularly in public transport).	Operation / Maintenance	✓						Lynn Cramman of Cobalt Park has a variety of inward investor feedback that stresses the importance of links to the SRN e.g. Santander	Y			2
Other	Poor rolling stock for rail	Other	✓										1
Signage Policy	Inconsistency in policy implementation	Policy					N						
Various	Lack of park and ride sites	Operational	✓				n	y				CoC	5
Various	Lack of resilience	Operational	✓				n	y				Ar, CoC	6
Various	Lack of journey time reliability.	Operational	✓				n	y				CoC, YCM	4
Various	Noise (as a result of surfacing). Low noise surfacing currently only being introduced in a piecemeal fashion rather than across the network	Society and environment	✓				n		Location/extent of surfacing introduced across the network	Y		ITS	2
Various locations across whole network	Lack of hard shoulder	Safety	✓				n	y				DBC	1
Where applicable	Transition / Lane reduction (3-2, 2-1)	Safety	✓				N					British Motorcycle Federation, BB	2
Whole NE	Attract inward investment (recognising the North East as a major region and a place in which to do business)	Environmental / Social	✓					y	Cobalt Park has a variety of investor feedback that demonstrates the importance of the SRN.	Y	Lynn Cramman is happy to share the data she possesses on employee location (noting the trend in recent years of employees locating in closer proximity to Cobalt Park.		8
Whole network	Most of current network was and still is rural A roads. Upgrading to motorway needs to consider how SRN is feeder to local network rather than a bypass. Improvements need to ensure economic viability rather than leave the area bypassed.						N						
Whole network	The SRN is used for short trips because it is often quicker than the local road alternative	Operation	✓				No – not applicable					Unknown	1
Whole network	There is no charge for developers adding trips to the network and making the environmental pressures	Environment	✓				No – not applicable					Unknown	3

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
	worse												
Whole network	There is a need to link route strategies to growth plans. Need to align with economic strategies. Should RBS drive local growth or respond to it? Which drives which and will RBS be flexible to changing circumstances?	Operation, Policy	✓				No – not applicable					Unknown	13
Whole network	The transport issues in the area are multi modal	Operation	✓				No – not applicable					Unknown	8
Whole network	Uncertainty about future development and growth (where, when, what, how much?)	Capacity		✓	✓	✓	Yes, but uncertain	Y	Best estimate, but may change in future. Also - plans do not include developments identified in previous development plans, but not yet brought forward. NE Independent Economic Review (April 2013)			CoC, LCH	7
Whole network	Co-ordination of works, Diversions onto LRN.	Operational	✓				n		Journey time data available for dates when incidents / works	Y	P Mitchell, LCC	LCC, DRL, YCM	18
Whole Network	Concentration on operation of the mainline not sufficient, consideration of junction operations and interaction with LRN required – lack of holistic approach	Operation, Capacity	✓									RMBC	30
Whole network	Lack of integration with LRN, other forms of transport. Public transport links focused on access to key centres – reliance on car based travel for journeys elsewhere.	Operational	✓				n					CoC	9
Whole network	There is a lack of realistic alternatives to replace SRN trips, for example park and ride	Operation	✓				No – not applicable					Unknown	2
Whole network	Lack of technology / real time information. Lack of updates for users	Operational	✓				n	y	Only 2 VMS signs currently (A689)			CoC, MBC	39
Whole network	Population growth, ageing population, increased journeys	Society and environment				✓						FoE, ITS	1
Whole network	Impact of growth on traffic flows	Capacity				✓	No	y	Background Growth Dynamics			Richmondshire, JH	
Whole network	Interference with local road network. Connectivity / Rat Running	Operation	✓				-					Richmondshire, JH	3
Whole network	Resurfacing / Reconstruction to benefit vulnerable users	Safety, operation	✓				N					IS, City Of York Council, British Motorcycling Federation, BB	
Whole network	Restricted access for agricultural vehicles. Need access to encourage business	Operation	✓				N					Farmers Union, JC	
Whole network	Need to remember multi-purpose nature of routes	Operation	✓				N					North Yorkshire	

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
												County Council	
Whole network	Street furniture	Safety	✓				N					British Motorcycle Federation, BB	1
Whole network	Crossing movements of Trunk Roads not connecting to local routes	Safety	✓				N						21
Whole network	Managing network during peak months	Safety	✓				N						
Whole network	None slip manhole covers	Safety	✓				N					British Motorcycle Federation, BB	
Whole network	Road furniture on outside of bend	Safety	✓				N					British Motorcycle Federation, BB	
Whole network	Lack of understanding of HGV parking and communication as to where it is	Operational	✓				n		Report	Y	CT, TVU	FTA	3
Whole network	Lack of co-ordination between HA and local operation teams for maintenance works and incident response	Operational	✓				n					DBC	3
Whole network	Lack of maintenance, Damage to vehicles, Affects resilience	Asset condition	✓				n	y	Freight survey	Y	MB, FTA	FTA	7
Whole network	MSAs	Operation	✓				-						
Whole network	Accommodating new housing	Capacity				✓	No		Newcastle Gateshead Plan shows 21,000 houses, Northumberland 14,000 – 24,000 proposed houses	Y		Newcastle City Council, Northumberland County Council	3
Whole network	No strategic signing for events	Operation / Maintenance	✓										0
Whole network	Maintenance of Cycle routes	Operation / Maintenance	✓				N/A		Evident from existing provisions	Y		NE Cycle Touring Club	3
Whole network	Existing flooding issues and growth of housing	Operation / Maintenance	✓										6
Whole network	Plan for seasonal impacts of tourism	Operation / Maintenance	✓										1
Whole network	Management of major events eg GNR	Operation / Maintenance	✓										1
Whole network	Post winter maintenance / repair	Operation / Maintenance	✓										2
Whole network	Historic signage taking people on to wrong routes	Operation / Maintenance	✓									ARWP	0
Whole network	Perception of safety	Safety	✓										0
Whole Network	Better use of shared opportunities for NMUs alongside wildlife corridors. Dual use could be best for everyone.	Environmental	✓				N					CB, British Horse Society	
Whole Network	More space for cyclists and horse riders required at access road to trunk roads	Operation	✓				N					British Motorcycle Federation, BB	

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
Whole network	Segregation for NMUs away from grade and grade separated crossings	Safety	✓				N					CB, British Horse Society	7
Whole Network	Lack of provision for cyclists and pedestrians at junctions causes barrier (existing and improvement schemes)	Safety	✓	✓	✓	✓	n		Description of ped and cycle issues at improvement works	Y	M Babbit, Sus	Sus	6
Whole network	NMU Safety and prevention of severance of local network and reconnection. Minor Roads replaced and severed. Although diversion is small for vehicles they can be long for NMU's. NMU's need to be considered within the design process.	Safety	✓				N	y				CB, British Horse Society	10
Whole network	Make best use of existing infrastructure for NMUs	Operation	✓				-					Cycling Touring Club, TR	1
Whole network	Quality of NMU crossing, enforces reliance on car	Operation / Maintenance	✓						The poor quality of existing crossings for NMU (shown through audits) is preventing the use of active modes. Constraints of SRN in the urban area.	Y			6
Whole network	Horse Riders contribute £750m/year to North Yorkshire Economy. Severance and safety of public network by fast vehicles	Safety	✓				N		North Yorkshire County Council Right of Way Statistics	Y		CB, British Horse Society	
General	Ongoing HA monitoring of NMU issues at crossing points	Other, Severance					N					Cycle Touring Club, TR	0
General	COBA Assessment doesn't favour NMUs. Leaves cycle improvement schemes undervalued. Better scoring system needed.	Severance	✓				N					Cycle Touring Club, TR	
General	Signage to draw attention to smaller areas, Also sign national parks to encourage economy	Other					N						2
General	Connectivity between towns and sub regional centres	Other					N						2
General	Maximise opportunity to improve other modes, e.g. Rail, cycle	Other, Environmental					N					IS. City of York Council, Cycle Touring Club, TR	0
General	There is trouble gaining an evidence base of cyclist accidents as no data is available from 20 years ago. More data is available now but there are fewer cycle movements now due to higher traffic volumes on the network.	Other, Evidence Base	✓				N					Cycle Touring Club, TR	
General	Guidance documents commonly talk of parallel routes along the trunk road network; however, it is more important to provide better crossing facilities across the trunk road and keep cyclists on the local road network.	Other, Policy	✓				N					Cycle Touring Club, TR	
General	Opportunity to combine resurfacing of carriageway with small improvements to reduce cost	Other					N						
General	HA and Local Authorities must use same evidence base otherwise different evidence at interface between SRN and LHN.	Policy					N						

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
General	Interface between LP's, LEP and RBS	Other					N					Rydedale, DW	2
General	HAPMS does not accurately reflect pavement condition	Asset Condition											
General	Depot / winter maintenance provision	Operational											1
General	Flooding off adjacent land	Environment, Operation											1
General	Arrangements to funding improvements	General											1
General	Prior knowledge of improvements. Need to understand when and where improvements will be happening in advance to plan vehicle movements from large generators	Operational	↘										
Northern part of network	Depot capacity	Operational						y					
Trunk road	Poor drainage and lack of drainage data on trunk road network	Asset condition, Environment	✓				n	y	Further information could be provided by Environment Agency	Y			
Various locations	Asset condition	Asset condition	✓	✓	✓	✓	n	y	No account of other assets; the pavement condition is only as important as other structures, drainage and barriers for keeping the road open				
Various locations	Flooding	Environment	✓				n	y	The A66 should show greater areas as at risk of flooding				
Whole Network	Impact of HS2, HS2 will impact on junctions in Sheffield and Leeds	Capacity				✓							2
Whole Network	Junction need to be improved. Main line improvements are no good if junctions are not improved.	Capacity	✓				n		Maps only show main line capacities				
Whole network	Improving safety	Safety	✓				Not fully		The map should include operatives as well as users –are the locations considered as safe to enter the network really safe?				4
Whole network	Accommodating freight traffic	Capacity, Safety, Operational	✓										1
Whole network	More data / more consistent data	Capacity, Safety, Operational	✓						Traffic data for Darrington to Dishforth	Y	Alistair Snart, RMS		
Whole network	More / improved technology (to measure delay), ITS not considered to be 'real time' with SATNAV companies giving better information than overhead	Capacity, operation	✓									BL, TS, R3	10

Location	Description of Challenge	Type of Challenge	When critical?				Ev on maps?	HA Evidence on the maps or elsewhere	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	3rd Party Evidence	Promises to provide supporting evidence by	Raised by	Dots
			Already is	Pre 2018	2018-21	After 2021							
	gantries												
Whole network	Large sections of pavement will require replacement before 2020	Asset condition		✓	✓		Y	Y					
Whole network	Keeping network moving, Journey time reliability	Operational	✓										6
Whole Network	Abnormal loads. Could be changes to vehicles allowing different weight, height and width.	Operational				✓							
Whole Network	Joints failing on viaducts	Maintenance	✓					y					
Whole Network	Pavement Condition	General Condition					n	y	Maps show theoretical design life rather than how it is coping on the ground.				
Whole network	Delivering results (not just asking questions / collecting data)	All	✓										3
Whole network	Defining role of the route	All	✓										19
Whole network	Trunk roads should be built to the same standard as Motorways if they have similar level of vehicles	Asset management	✓		▪	▪	No					ABMP	1
Whole network	Areas of traffic management appear too long in distance and duration compared with other countries	Operation, Safety, Capacity	✓		▪	▪	No – not applicable					R3	1
Whole network	Traffic brakes heavily for average speed cameras causing safety and capacity problems	Safety, Capacity	✓		▪	▪	No – not applicable					TS, BL	

Part C Bibliography

C1.1 Chapter 2

Area 7 Asset Management Plan

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

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

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).

North Northamptonshire AMR (scale up to and including 2021)

West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission document (scale up to and including 2026).

Rugby Borough Council AMR 2012 (scale up to and including 2026)

Warwick District Council Preferred Options (scale up to and including 2029)

Stratford on Avon Housing Sites and Completions June 2013

Coventry CC Housing Policy Topic Paper (scale up to and including 2028)

North Warwickshire Borough Council Annual Monitoring Report 2012 (scale up to and including 2027)

Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan Preferred Options

Kettering Borough Council website

North Northamptonshire AMR 2011/12

C1.3 Evidence from stakeholders

Leicestershire and Coventry and Warwickshire

Evidence Title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
Headline issues within the EA remit that apply to Highways Development + maps	Tim Andrews (EA) www.environment-agency.gov.uk enquiries@environment.agency.gov.uk	-Flood risk is broadly referred to. -It is suggested 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.	-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	Paul Sheard/Jennifer Hill (Jennifer.Hill@leics.gov.uk)	-Sets out the transport evidence base for Leicestershire. -Provides an overview of major committed developments in Leicestershire and required associated improvements to the SRN. -Describes and reviews committed improvement schemes to the SRN. -Sets out district wide studies in Leicestershire. -Provides a brief synopsis of LLITM.	-All of the content makes direct reference to the appropriate section of the SRN.	-London to Scotland East - North and East Midlands - South Midlands
Leicestershire County Council: County developments map	Paul Sheard/Jennifer Hill (Jennifer.Hill@leics.gov.uk)	-A map displaying housing developments with more than 100 dwellings and employment development areas across the county. It is colour coded to show applications, appeals,	-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.	-London to Scotland East -North and East Midlands

Evidence Title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
		SUE sites known and committed developments.		-South Midlands
Leicestershire County Council: Congestion map	Paul Sheard/Jennifer Hill (Jennifer.Hill@leics.gov.uk)	-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)	Paul Sheard/Jennifer Hill (Jennifer.Hill@leics.gov.uk)	-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)	Documents found online. Link provided by Ashley Baldwin - Planning Policy, Principal Planning Officer ashley.baldwin@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk	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	Documents found online. Link provided by Ashley Baldwin - Planning Policy, Principal Planning Officer ashley.baldwin@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk	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	Documents found online. Link provided by Ashley Baldwin - Planning Policy, Principal Planning	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	-Felixstowe to Midlands -London to

Evidence Title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
	Officer ashley.baldwin@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk		improvements required if full extent of development is completed (3 affecting A5, 1 aspirational).	Scotland West
North Warwickshire Core Strategy: Submission Version	Dorothy Barratt, Forward Planning & Economic Strategy Manager, North Warwickshire Borough Council DorothyBarratt@NorthWarks.gov.uk	The core strategy of North Warwickshire borough from 2006 until 2028.	Significant housing development planned in Atherstone & Mancetter and Dordon (A5), and Coleshill (A446).	-Felixstowe to Midlands - South Midlands
North Warwickshire Site Allocations Plan: Preferred Options	Dorothy Barratt, Forward Planning & Economic Strategy Manager, North Warwickshire Borough Council DorothyBarratt@NorthWarks.gov.uk	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]	Dorothy Barratt, Forward Planning & Economic Strategy Manager, North Warwickshire Borough Council DorothyBarratt@NorthWarks.gov.uk	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	Adrian Hart, Transport Planning, Warwickshire CC adrianhart@warwi	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	-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	-Felixstowe to Midlands -London to Scotland West

Evidence Title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
	ckshire.gov.uk	transportation, road safety, highway maintenance, intelligent transport systems. Finally, implementation plan up to 2015.	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 indirectly. -No major schemes listed in plan to affect SRN up to 2015.	-South Midlands
A Strategy for the A5 (December 2013).	Adrian Hart, Transport Planning, Warwickshire CC adrianhart@warwickshire.gov.uk 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	Dave Barber, Warwick District Council. dave.barber@warwickdc.gov.uk	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

Evidence Title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
Stratford-upon-Avon District Council – Strategic Transport Assessment October 2012	Nicholas Dauncey, Warwickshire County Council nickdauncey@warwickshire.gov.uk	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% (100), 2% (150). -Scenario 3: 4% (300), 2% (200), 6% (100), 4% (150), 3% (150). -Scenario 4: 23-25% (2,100), 8-10% (1,050), 7% (100), 13-14% (500), 8-9% (450). -Scenario 5: minimal, minimal, minimal, 8-9% (300), 4% (200). Details interventions that would be required under each scenario on the SRN.	-South Midlands -London to Scotland West
Warwickshire County Council Stratford-on-Avon Strategic Transport Assessment Phase 2 Modelling Report June 2013	Nicholas Dauncey, Warwickshire County Council nickdauncey@warwickshire.gov.uk	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). Expected sizes (dwellings/employment): SUE - 2,750/8ha, SRZ – 700, 25ha, GLH – 5,000/18ha. Includes expected mitigations as	Details impacts on the local Stratford area, including A46, and M40 J12-13. General network stats only are detailed for Stratford. Fairly similar results between comparison and with SUE and SRZ and mitigation measures. Journey times with GLH development reduced in 2028 scenario on M40.	-South Midlands -London to Scotland West

Evidence Title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
		part of each approach.		
Stratford-on-Avon Strategic Transport Assessment Phase 2 Studley Scenario Analysis	Nicholas Dauncey, Warwickshire County Council nickdauncey@warwickshire.gov.uk	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)

D2N2 and Greater Lincolnshire

Evidence title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Routes
Flood maps	Tim Andrews (EA) www.environment-agency.gov.uk enquiries@environment.agency.gov.uk	-Flood maps showing flood zones, flood 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)	-The SRN has been highlighted so is easy to see where it comes into contact with a flood zone area etc.	-London to Scotland East -North and East Midlands -South Midlands -London to Leeds (East) -South Pennines (outside of this area)
Headline issues within the EA remit that apply to Highways Development	Tim Andrews (EA) www.environment-agency.gov.uk enquiries@environment.agency.gov.uk	-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.	-EA did/do not know where work is being proposed and so have not provided specific details with regards to the SRN.	N/A
Ashfield DC	Julie Clayton	-Provides a summary of	-The summary document	- London to Scotland East

Local Plan Publication Document Summary Leaflet (August 2013) + Policies Map	(Ashfield DC) localplan@ashfield-dc.gov.uk	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.	makes no reference to the SRN. -The location of different policies in relation to the SRN can be seen on the map. However the SRN is not clearly highlighted.	
NCC average speed data	David Pick david.pick@nottscc.gov.uk	-8 maps displaying average speed data in the Newark and Nottingham City Centre areas for AM and PM peaks.	-Data is provided for both the LRN and SRN in the immediate vicinities of Nottingham City Centre and Newark.	- North and East Midlands - London to Leeds East
DCC – URS Trans-Pennine Connectivity Study Final Draft Issue 2 (August 2012)	Jamie Douglas (Jamie.Douglas@parliament.uk 01298 26698)	-Evidence provided with regards to the economic benefit of improved transport links between Manchester and Sheffield.	-The A628 is the only part of the SRN which links Manchester to Sheffield. There is little reference to this link in the document.	-South Pennines
Bassetlaw Site Allocations	Joelle Davies (Joe.Davies@Bassetlaw.gov.uk 01909 533193)	-Provides detailed information regarding the housing trajectory for Bassetlaw from the period 2014-2028 which is split across several different strategic sites.	Provides more detail as to pre and post 2021 growth.	-London to Leeds East

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

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

If you have any enquiries about this document email **ha_info@highways.gsi.gov.uk** or call **0300 123 5000***.
Please quote the Highways Agency publications code PR154/13

* 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 M130517

GOV.UK