

South Midlands Route Strategy Evidence Report Technical Annex April 2014



Document History

Technical annex to South Midlands route-based strategy evidence report

Highways Agency

This document has been issued and amended as follows:

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

Table of Contents

Document History	1
Table of Contents.....	2
Part A Supporting evidence	4
A1 Introduction	5
A1.3 Route description.....	5
A2 Route capability, condition and constraints.....	6
A2.1 Route performance	6
A2.2 Road Safety.....	12
A2.3 Asset Condition	14
A2.4 Route Operation	14
A2.5 Technology	14
A2.6 Vulnerable Road Users	15
A2.7 Environment	16
A3 Future considerations.....	17
A3.2 Economic development and surrounding environment.....	17
A3.3 Network improvements and operational changes.....	23
A3.4 Wider transport networks.....	23
A4 Key challenges and opportunities	24
A4.2 Timescales	24
A4.3 Stakeholder priorities.....	24
A4.4 Operational challenges and opportunities	24
A4.5 Asset condition challenges and opportunities.....	24
A4.6 Capacity challenges and opportunities	24
A4.7 Safety challenges and opportunities.....	24
A4.8 Social and environmental challenges and opportunities.....	24
Part B Stakeholder engagement	36
B1 Stakeholder workshops	37
B1.1 Engagement events.....	37
B2.1 Stakeholder event invitees	38
B3.1 Stakeholder event attendees.....	46
B4.1 Note taker sheets from stakeholder events	51

Part C Bibliography	194
C1 Bibliography	196
C1.1 Chapter 2.....	196
C1.2 Chapter 3.....	196
C1.3 Evidence from stakeholders	198

Tables

Table A4.1 Schedule of challenges and opportunities	25
---	----

Part A Supporting evidence

A1 Introduction

A1.3 Route description

This section is intentionally blank

A2 Route capability, condition and constraints

A2.1 Route performance

50 busiest sections on the route

RoadLinkDescription	AADF vehicles per day	AADF National Rank (out of 2475 road links -rank 1 is the busiest)
M42 between M42 J7 and M42 J7a (LM512A)	64,694	109
M6 Toll between M42 J8 and M6 Toll T1 (LM1052A)	63,958	117
M42 between M42 J8 and M42 J9S (LM518A)	63,958	117
M42 between M42 J7a and M42 J7 (LM511A)	50,125	361
M6 Toll between M6 Toll T1 and M42 J8 (LM1053A)	46,350	430
M42 between M42 J9 and M42 J8 (LM517)	46,350	430
M42 between M42 J9S and M42 J9 (LM1518)	34,139	769
M42 between M42 J10 and M42 J9 (LM515)	33,794	786
M42 between M42 J9 and M42 J10 (LM516)	33,712	793
A46 between A452 and A45 (AL2698)	30,279	885
A46 between A45 and A452 (AL2699)	29,987	907
A46 between A452 and A429 (AL140B)	28,852	956
A46 between A429 and A452 (AL137B)	28,821	958
M42 between M42 J11 and M42 J10 (LM493)	28,298	982
M42 between M42 J10 and M42 J11 (LM494)	27,883	995
A45 between A46 and A46 (AL2701)	27,499	1,013
M69 between M69 J3 and M69 J2 (LM920)	27,357	1,019
M69 between M69 J2 and M69 J3 (LM921)	27,063	1,029
A38 between A5121 and A5132 (AL1270)	27,015	1,032
A45 between A46 and A46 (AL1661)	26,973	1,037
A42 between M42 J11 and A511 (AL2586)	26,684	1,050
M69 between M6 J2 and M69 J1 (LM917)	26,404	1,063
A42 between A511 and M42 J11 (AL1012)	26,069	1,078
M69 between M69 J1 and M6 J2 (LM916)	25,984	1,082
A38 between A5132 and A5121 (AL1269)	25,901	1,089
A46 between A4177 and A429 (AL135)	25,211	1,118
A46 between A429 and A4177 (AL2738)	25,183	1,121
A42 between A511 and A453 (AL2983)	24,726	1,147
A38 between A5121 and A513 (AL1007)	24,584	1,155
A38 between A50 and A5132 (AL2079)	24,387	1,164
A38 between A5192 and A5206 (AL994A)	24,376	1,166
A38 between A5132 and A50 (AL2078)	24,325	1,169
A42 between A453 and A511 (AL1016)	24,079	1,194
M69 between M69 J1 and M69 J2 (LM919)	23,965	1,200

M69 between M69 J2 and M69 J1 (LM918)	23,603	1,225
A38 between A5206 and A5192 (AL996A)	23,567	1,227
A46 between M40 J15 and A4177 (AL2740)	23,532	1,235
A42 between A453 NEbound and A453 NEbound (AL1287)	23,442	1,239
A38 between A5127 and A513 (AL1001)	23,115	1,261
A38 between A513 and A5127 (AL1000)	23,092	1,265
A42 between A453 SWbound and A453 SWbound (AL1286)	22,971	1,270
A46 between A4177 and M40 J15 (AL2739)	22,699	1,287
A46 between A428 and M6 J2 (AL2713)	22,596	1,297
A38 between A513 and A5121 (AL1004)	22,360	1,313
A46 between M6 J2 and A428 (AL2710)	22,341	1,314
A46 between A428 and A45 (AL2706)	21,951	1,340
A46 between A45 and A428 (AL2705)	21,667	1,353
A45 between A452 and M42 J6 (AL2671)	21,629	1,358
A5 between A51 and M42 J10 (AL153B)	21,613	1,360
A5 between M42 J10 and A51 (AL154B)	21,510	1,372

50 links with highest proportion of freight on the route

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
A42 between M42 J11 and A511 (AL2586)	36%	49	64%	18%	7%	11%
A42 between A511 and M42 J11 (AL1012)	35%	55	65%	16%	7%	11%
A5 between A426 and A4303 (AL3243)	27%	198	73%	4%	6%	18%
A5 between M42 J10 and A444 (AL3254)	26%	224	74%	13%	5%	8%
M42 between M42 J10 and M42 J9 (LM515)	26%	247	74%	9%	6%	11%
M42 between M42 J9 and M42 J10 (LM516)	26%	261	74%	9%	6%	10%
A5 between A4303 and A426 (AL3242)	26%	268	74%	4%	5%	17%
A5 between A5 and A426 (AL3238)	25%	271	75%	4%	6%	15%
A5 between A426 and A5 (AL3239)	25%	292	75%	4%	5%	15%
A46 between M6 J2 and A428 (AL2710)	25%	300	75%	13%	6%	7%
A5 between A444 and M42 J10 (AL3253)	25%	302	75%	12%	5%	8%
A42 between A511 and A453 (AL2983)	24%	328	76%	6%	6%	11%
A42 between A453 NEbound and A453 NEbound (AL1287)	23%	352	77%	6%	6%	11%
A38 between A5192 and A5127 (AL997)	23%	358	77%	6%	6%	12%
A38 between A5127 and A5192 (AL998)	23%	374	77%	5%	6%	12%
A42 between A453 and A511 (AL1016)	23%	388	77%	5%	6%	11%
M6 Toll between M6 J3A and M42 J7a (LM1050A)	22%	402	78%	5%	4%	13%
A5 between A4303 and M69 J1 (AL3247)	22%	404	78%	5%	6%	11%
M69 between M69 J3 and M69 J2 (LM920)	22%	407	78%	10%	6%	6%
A42 between A453 SWbound and A453 SWbound (AL1286)	22%	409	78%	5%	6%	11%
M69 between M69 J2 and M69 J3 (LM921)	22%	443	78%	10%	5%	6%

A38 between A5192 and A5206 (AL994A)	21%	452	79%	5%	6%	11%
A38 between A5121 and A511 (AL1277A)	21%	459	79%	6%	5%	10%
A38 between A511 and A5121 (AL1277B)	21%	459	79%	6%	5%	10%
A38 between A511 and A5121 (AL1276A)	21%	465	79%	6%	6%	10%
A38 between A5121 and A511 (AL1276B)	21%	465	79%	6%	6%	10%
A38 between A5206 and A5192 (AL996A)	21%	495	79%	5%	5%	11%
A5148 between A5 and A38 (AL1638A)	21%	504	79%	6%	6%	9%
A5 between M69 J1 and A47 (AL3249)	21%	514	79%	5%	6%	9%
A5148 between A38 and A5 (AL1639A)	21%	518	79%	6%	6%	9%
M42 between M42 J9S and M42 J9 (LM1518)	20%	524	80%	5%	5%	10%
A5 between M6TollT7 and A5148 (AL2569)	20%	539	80%	7%	6%	8%
A5 between M69 J1 and A4303 (AL3248)	20%	566	80%	4%	6%	10%
M69 between M69 J2 and M69 J1 (LM918)	20%	578	80%	7%	6%	7%
A5 between A5148 and M6TollT7 (AL2570)	20%	583	80%	6%	5%	8%
A38 between A513 and A5127 (AL1000)	20%	600	80%	5%	5%	9%
A5 between A47 and M69 J1 (AL3245)	20%	601	80%	5%	6%	8%
A38 between A5132 and A50 (AL2078)	20%	603	80%	5%	5%	9%
A38 between A50 and A5132 (AL2079)	19%	611	81%	5%	5%	9%
A38 between A5127 and A513 (AL1001)	19%	630	81%	5%	5%	9%
A5 between A444 and A47 (AL3252)	18%	703	82%	5%	5%	8%
A38 between A5121 and A513 (AL1007)	18%	704	82%	5%	5%	8%
M45 between M1 J17 and M45 J1 (LM521)	18%	709	82%	4%	5%	9%
A46 between A4184 and A435 (AL2653)	18%	724	82%	6%	5%	7%
M45 between A45 and M45 J1 (LM520)	18%	750	82%	5%	5%	8%
M69 between M69 J1 and M69 J2 (LM919)	18%	752	82%	6%	5%	7%
A5 between A47 and A444 (AL3251)	18%	766	82%	5%	5%	8%
M45 between M45 J1 and M1 J17 (LM522)	18%	777	82%	5%	4%	9%
A38 between A5148 and A5 (AL1359)	17%	780	83%	4%	4%	9%
A38 between A5 and A5148 (AL1358)	17%	784	83%	4%	4%	9%

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

RoadLinkDescription	On Time Reliability - Percentage Vehicle Miles On Time	On Time Reliability National Rank (out of 2497 road links - rank 1 has lowest OTRM score)
A5 between A47 and A47 (AL3246)	51.7%	15
A45 between A452 and M42 J6 (AL2671)	57.8%	44
M6 Toll between M6 Toll T1 and M6 Toll T2 (LM1047A)	58.4%	55
A46 between A4184 and A44 (AL3723)	60.0%	75
A38 between A5 and A5148 (AL1358)	60.8%	97
A5148 between A5 and A38 (AL1638A)	61.2%	109
A5 between A47 and A47 (AL3250)	61.3%	113
A5 between A5148 and A38 (AL2571)	61.3%	115
A45 between M42 J6 and A452 (AL2670)	61.9%	126
A5148 between A38 and A5 (AL1639A)	61.9%	129
A38 between A5192 and A5206 (AL994A)	62.5%	142
A45 between A423 and A46 (AL142)	62.8%	149
M42 between M42 J9S and M42 J9 (LM1518)	63.0%	163
A46 between A44 and A4184 (AL3724)	63.6%	191
M6 Toll between M6 Toll T7 and M6 Toll T8 (LM1034A)	63.8%	198
A38 between A5121 and A5132 (AL1270)	64.1%	211
M6 Toll between M6 Toll T8 and M6 Toll T7 (LM1032A)	64.1%	212
A452 between A446 and A45 (AL140A)	64.3%	224
A5 between A51 and M42 J10 (AL153B)	64.4%	227
A452 between A45 and A446 (AL137A)	64.5%	238
A5 between M6 J12 and A449 (AL3268)	64.5%	240
A45 between A46 and A46 (AL2701)	64.7%	247
A38 between A5132 and A50 (AL2078)	64.8%	254
A38 between A5206 and A5192 (AL996A)	64.8%	255

M42 between M42 J9 and M42 J8 (LM517)	65.2%	265
A45 between A46 and A423 (AL2702)	65.2%	266
A45 between A471 and M45 J1 (AL2729)	65.4%	280
A46 between A422 and A3400 (AL3715)	65.7%	297
A46 between M6 J2 and A428 (AL2710)	65.7%	304
A5 between A449 and M6 J12 (AL3267)	65.8%	308
A5 between M69 J1 and A47 (AL3249)	66.0%	323
A5 between M6TollT7 and A5148 (AL2569)	66.2%	344
A38 between A5127 and A5192 (AL998)	66.7%	370
A5 between A51 and A453 (AL159)	67.0%	399
A446 between A446 and M6 J4 (AL3272)	67.1%	411
A449 between A5 and M54 J2 (AL2597)	67.5%	448
A449 between M54 J2 and A5 (AL2598)	67.6%	457
A38 between A50 and A5132 (AL2079)	67.7%	464
A38 between A5192 and A5127 (AL997)	67.8%	474
A38 between A513 and A5121 (AL1004)	68.1%	499
A5 between A453 and A51 (AL158)	68.1%	501
A46 between A429 and A4177 (AL2738)	68.1%	504
A5 between A5148 and M6TollT7 (AL2570)	68.2%	511
A46 between M40 J15 and A4177 (AL2740)	68.3%	515
A38 between A5127 and A513 (AL1001)	68.4%	531
A45 between A445 and A423 (AL2721)	68.6%	550
A46 between M5 J9 and A435 (AL3718)	68.7%	559
A5 between A47 and M69 J1 (AL3245)	68.7%	567
A446 between M6 J4 and A446 (AL2667)	68.9%	583
A46 between A439 and M40 J15 (AL2733)	68.9%	584

A2.2 Road Safety

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

Route	Collision Rates											% Diff to 05-09 average
	05-09 Average Baseline	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	
A38*	23.3	30.6	27.1	30.6	25.7	25.5	25.2	20.1	20.3	18.9	18.8	-19%
A42	9.3	12.7	10.1	8.6	13.0	9.2	7.2	9.7	7.6	8.0	4.6	-51%
A449	37.3	81.8	49.8	65.5	50.7	36.9	32.0	22.3	45.2	24.9	31.4	-16%
A45	18.1	22.0	20.4	21.9	23.2	19.9	16.3	17.0	14.1	14.2	13.1	-28%
A452	29.1	20.0	0.0	38.6	38.6	9.5	51.7	26.0	18.2	0.0	56.5	94%
A46*	23.7	28.4	26.1	21.3	23.8	26.4	24.8	21.9	21.9	16.5	16.6	-30%
A5*	28.4	36.4	36.1	33.0	32.9	29.6	29.5	24.5	25.7	28.2	23.3	-18%
M42*	6.9	12.4	9.1	11.1	7.7	6.2	6.9	7.8	5.8	6.0	6.5	-6%
M45	5.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.8	14.2	3.0	6.1	3.0	9.2	9.1	54%
M69	10.3	15.9	13.4	15.9	12.8	10.0	11.3	10.3	7.1	10.6	7.8	-24%

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

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

Route	KSI Casualty Rates											% Diff to 05-09 average
	05-09 Average Baseline	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	
A38*	2.6	4.6	3.2	5.7	2.6	3.4	3.0	1.6	2.3	2.4	1.7	-35%
A42	2.3	2.7	2.3	0.8	3.5	4.4	0.8	2.0	1.1	1.9	1.1	-51%
A449	2.0	13.3	0.0	6.3	4.2	0.0	2.0	0.0	4.1	6.2	2.1	2%
A45	3.9	3.2	5.1	5.3	5.7	3.1	3.1	4.5	3.1	3.9	3.6	-7%
A452	14.5	10.0	0.0	9.6	48.3	0.0	8.6	8.7	9.1	0.0	28.2	94%
A46*	4.7	7.5	7.5	4.5	5.1	5.3	4.8	4.5	3.8	2.2	3.5	-26%
A5*	5.2	9.2	8.3	7.8	7.6	5.1	4.7	3.6	5.0	4.6	4.4	-15%
M42*	1.1	2.9	1.2	1.9	1.7	1.3	1.1	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.6	-44%
M45	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	3.1	0.0	9.2	3.0	157%
M69	1.3	2.7	3.2	2.7	0.6	2.9	1.8	0.6	0.6	0.9	1.2	-8%

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

Road user group analysis of casualties

User Group	A449		A452		M45	
	Casualties	Difference from base	Casualties	Difference from base	Casualties	Difference from base
Car occupants	9	-27%	17	136%	2	-9%
Goods vehicle occupants	0	-100%	0	-100%	1	67%

Powered two wheeler riders & passengers	1	67%	1	25%	0	0%
Pedal cyclists	1	400%	0	-100%	0	0%
Pedestrians	0	-100%	0	-100%	0	0%
Child network users (Aged 1-15)	0	-100%	0	0%	0	0%
Young network users (aged 16-19)	1	-55%	3	400%	0	0%
Elderly network users (aged 70+)	0	-100%	1	400%	0	-100%

Baseline is an average of casualty figures from 2009 to 2011.

Cluster sites

Location	Type	Action/Comment
A5 High Cross	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/14
A42 Measham	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/16
A45 Great Doddington to Earls Barton	KSI	Scheme Identification Study 2013/22
A45 Higham Ferriers Roundabout	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/17
A45 Stanwick to Higham Ferriers	KSI	Scheme Identification Study 2013/24
A45/A46 Tollbar	U	Major scheme starts 2013/14
A5 at Hobby Fish	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/20
A5 Hinckley	KSI	Scheme Identification Study 2013/23
A5 Old Stratford	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/21
A5 Paulerspury	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/19
A5 Penn Lane/Woodway Lane	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/15
A5 Station Road	PJ	Scheme Identification Study 2013/18
A5/A5148 Wall Northern Roundabout	U	PPP 2 scheme design starts April 2013
A5/A5148 Wall Southern Roundabout	U	PPP scheme design starts April 2014 & LNMS
M42 J9	U	PPP scheme 2013 to 2015
M42 J10	U	PPP scheme 2013 to 2015

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

LNMS schemes 2012/13 onwards

Route	Project Title	PIC	KSI	Scheme Cost	Proposed completion	Comments
A45	A45 A5076 Great Billing	14	3	£129,612	2013	0.6 PIC / year - 40
A45	A45 Wilby Way	17	3	£3,237,303	2015	1.46 PIC / year - 84
A45	A45 EB&WB MP 180/8-180/7 Earls Barton Junction Environmental	0	0	£4,500	2016	0
A5	A5 Towcester Car Park	0	0	£86,820	2013	0
M45	M45 WB Barby OSP (MP6/3) Environmental	0	0	£38,983	2013	0
M69	M69 Enderby (MP124/2-125/0) Environmental	0	0	£88,363	2013	0 PIC / year
M69	M69 J1 RaB (MP110/1-110/3) Environmental	0	0	£48,897	2014	0

Primary partners in road safety

	Agricultural Vehicles	Car Occupants	Cyclists	Driving for Work	Motorcyclists	Older drivers	Pedestrians (all)	Pedestrians (Child)	Tire safety	Young drivers
West Midlands Road Safety Partnership			Y		Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Safety Roads Partnership in Warwickshire and West Mercia	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Staffordshire Safer Roads Partnership			Y		Y	Y			Y	Y
Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership		Y			Y					Y

A2.3 Asset Condition

This section is intentionally blank

A2.4 Route Operation

This section is intentionally blank

A2.5 Technology

Section of route	Asset Type	Asset Count	From Juc	To Juc	Distance in KM	Assets per KM
A5 (First asset starts at Dodwells Road (A47 Jct with the A5) southern boundary of area 7 to junction with M1 Jct 18 MP 126/6)	Midas loop arrays	0	A5/A47	M1 Jct 18 MP 126/6	28.4	0.00
	Message Signs	0				0.00
	Signals	0				0.00
	Ramp Metering	0				0.00
	CCTV	0				0.00
A5 (from junction 18 of the M1 MP 126/6 to junction with M6 MP 134/7 between M1 Jct 19 and M6 Jct 1)	Midas loop arrays	0	A5/M1 Jct 18	M6 MP 134/7 between M1 Jct 19 and M6 Jct 1)	6.4	0.00
	Message Signs	0				0.00
	Signals	0				0.00
	Ramp Metering	0				0.00
	CCTV	0				0.00
A38 (junction with A5 first asset starts from the A38/A5121 Jct Derby Road to A50)	Midas loop arrays	8	A38/A5	A50	21	0.38
	Message Signs	8				0.38
	Signals	0				0.00
	Ramp Metering	0				0.00
	CCTV	1				0.05
M42/A42 Jct 11 Appleby to the M1 Jct 23A MP 182/7)	Midas loop arrays	18	M42/A42 Jct 11	M1 Jct 23A MP 182/7	12	1.50
	Message Signs	7				0.58
	Signals	2				0.17

	Ramp Metering	0				0.00
	CCTV	17				1.42
M69 (from M1 Jct 21 MP 155/2 to M69/A5 Jct 1)	Midas loop arrays	14	M69/M1 Jct 21 MP 155/2	M69/A5 Jct 1	14	1.00
	Message Signs	4				0.29
	Signals	22				1.57
	Ramp Metering	0				0.00
	CCTV	0				0.00
M45 (from the M1 Jct 17 MP 123/7 to M45/A45 Jct Coventry Road)	Midas loop arrays	10	M45/M1 Jct 17 MP 123/7	M45/A45 Jct Coventry Road	20	0.50
	Message Signs	0				0.00
	Signals	12				0.60
	Ramp Metering	0				0.00
	CCTV	3				0.15
A5	Midas Out Stations	0	Due to referencing system on A roads Geog addresses are not available to calculate asset count per KM or road			
	Message Signs	5				
	Signals	0				
	Ramp Metering	0				
	Phones	15				
	CCTV	1				
M42 Juc 7 to Juc 11	Midas Out Stations	106	6459	6741	28.2	3.8
	Message Signs	66				2.3
	Signals	112				4.0
	Ramp Metering	1				0.0
	Phones	65				2.3
	CCTV	24				0.9
A449	Midas Out Stations	0	Due to referencing system on A roads Geog addresses are not available to calculate asset count per KM or road			
	Message Signs	0				
	Signals	0				
	Ramp Metering	0				
	Phones	2				
	CCTV	0				
A46	Midas Out Stations	2	Due to referencing system on A roads Geog addresses are not available to calculate asset count per KM or road			
	Message Signs	2				
	Signals	0				
	Ramp Metering	0				
	Phones	20				
	CCTV	1				

A2.6 Vulnerable Road Users

This section is intentionally blank

A2.7 Environment

This section is intentionally blank

A3 Future considerations

A3.2 Economic development and surrounding environment

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

LEP	Development Type	Scale by 2021	Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire	Housing	78,830 dwellings	A38 between Rolleston and A50 only
	Economic	176,509 jobs	
Leicester and Leicestershire	Housing	38,949 dwellings	A42, northern section of M69. A5 borders two districts only.
	Economic	42,678 jobs	
Greater Birmingham and Solihull	Housing	55,096 dwellings	M6T passes on the border of Birmingham, and through the southern section of Lichfield and Cannock Chase. A38 passes through Lichfield, and A5 through Tamworth. Only small stubs of M42 is in Solihull.
	Economic	154,819 jobs ⁺	
Coventry and Warwickshire	Housing	28,702 dwellings	A46, A45 and M45. A5 borders many districts, and passes through North Warwickshire. M42 and M69 pass on edges of 2 districts
	Economic	80,285 jobs	
South East Midlands	Housing	98,674 dwellings	Small section of A5 and M45 in north of Daventry District.
	Economic	134,756 jobs ⁺	
Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire	Housing	42,373 dwellings	A38, A5 and M6T western section, A449,
	Economic	100,975 jobs	
Black Country	Housing	39,997 dwellings	Very small section of A5 and M6T pass alongside border of Walsall
	Economic	36,699 jobs	
Worcestershire	Housing	32,540 dwellings	Southern section of A46
	Economic	48,783 jobs	
Gloucestershire	Housing	33,245 dwellings	Small section of A46 along northern border of Tewkesbury district.
	Economic	43,907 jobs	
Northamptonshire	Housing	38,190 dwellings	Small section of A5 and M45 in north of Daventry District.
	Economic	47,500 jobs	

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

⁺ Figure excludes Solihull/Luton (figure unknown)

D2N2

Location development	of	Development type	Scale by 2012	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031
Ashfield		Residential	825 units	9127 units	1301 units
		Commercial	100ha over plan period		
Gedling		Residential	1082 units	3484 units	1794 units

	Commercial	10ha over plan period		
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	524 units	1572 units	2620 units

	Commercial	50ha over plan period		
--	------------	-----------------------	--	--

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 Commercial	776 units 40-45ha over plan period	3023 units	2648 units
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	

Greater Birmingham and Solihull

Location of development	Development type	Scale by 2012	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031
Birmingham	Residential Commercial		20200 units 50ha (to 2021)	
Lichfield	Residential Commercial	9000 jobs over plan period	5655 units (by 2021)	
Solihull	Residential Commercial	Unspecified	6500 units	
Cannock Chase	Residential Commercial		4543 units 86ha (to 2021)	

Tamworth	Residential Commercial		3175 units 38ha over plan period	
Redditch	Residential Commercial		3684 units 55ha over plan period	
Bromsgrove	Residential Commercial		3684 units 28ha over plan period	
Wyre Forest	Residential Commercial		3000 units 44ha over plan period	

Coventry and Warwickshire

Location development	of	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 200ha 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 development	of	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 Commercial	1102 units 5188 jobs over	3043 units	

		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

Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire

Location of development	Development type	Scale by 2012	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031
East Staffordshire	Residential Commercial	302 dwellings 30ha over plan period	4,679 dwellings	5,217 dwellings
Staffordshire Moorlands	Residential Commercial	490 dwellings 18ha over plan period	1,888 dwellings	1,720 dwellings
Newcastle-under-Lyme	Residential Commercial	601 dwellings	1752 dwellings	1293 dwellings
Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent joint	Residential Commercial	6257/13500 dwellings 112/220 (over plan period)		
South Staffordshire	Residential Commercial	3850 dwellings 14 ha (both over plan period)		
Stafford	Residential Commercial	11523 dwellings 25ha (both over plan period)		

Black Country

Location of development	Development type	Scale by 2012	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031
Wolverhampton City Council	Residential Commercial		1020 units 5931 jobs	None identified 2501 jobs
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council	Residential Commercial		666 units 3063 jobs	None identified 3829 jobs
Walsall Council	Residential Commercial		None identified 2223 jobs	None identified 2779 jobs
Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council	Residential Commercial		1305 units 7277 jobs	None identified 9096 jobs

Worcestershire

Location of development	Development type	Scale by 2012	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031
	Residential Commercial			
	Residential Commercial			
	Residential Commercial			
	Residential Commercial			

Gloucestershire

Local Planning Authority	2021 provision				2031 provision			
	Residential		Commercial		Residential		Commercial	
Gloucester/Tewkesbury /Cheltenham District Total	11835	dwellings	1953	jobs	24985	dwellings	4123	jobs
Cotswold District Total	3051	dwellings	599	jobs	4746	dwellings	931	jobs
Stroud Total	2571	dwellings	3921	jobs	4000	dwellings	6100	jobs
Forest of Dean District Total	2323	dwellings	2751	jobs	3613	dwellings	4279	jobs
Gloucestershire TOTAL	19780	 dwellings	9224	 jobs	37344	 dwellings	15433	 jobs

A3.3 Network improvements and operational changes

This section is intentionally blank

A3.4 Wider transport networks

This section is intentionally blank

A4 Key challenges and opportunities

A4.2 Timescales

This section is intentionally blank

A4.3 Stakeholder priorities

This section is intentionally blank

A4.4 Operational challenges and opportunities

This section is intentionally blank

A4.5 Asset condition challenges and opportunities

This section is intentionally blank

A4.6 Capacity challenges and opportunities

This section is intentionally blank

A4.7 Safety challenges and opportunities

This section is intentionally blank

A4.8 Social and environmental challenges and opportunities

This section is intentionally blank

Table A4.1 Schedule of challenges and opportunities

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
Network Operation	M69	Inadequate strategic signing.	No	X			✓	✓		
	A5 Diversion route	Stakeholders (outside of workshop) highlighted concerns over the use of the A5 as a strategic diversion route for the M6 and the impact on the local road network	No	X			X			
	A5 Hinckley	Low railway bridge - HGV's hit the bridge, causing problems on the network and railway. Technology pinch point scheme will be implemented providing low bridge warning signs	No	X			✓	✓		
	Route-wide	Lack of incident data and duration, opportunity to increase this on the route through stakeholder partnership and utilising technology	Yes	X			X			
Asset Condition	A46	The A46 has quickly developing potholes which cause problems for all road users HA data demonstrates that the large proportions of the pavement will reach the end of its expected design life by 2021	Yes	X	X		✓	✓		
	All	Pavement is reaching the end of its design life – there is a need to coordinate maintenance works with improvement schemes both in region and between regions.	Yes	X			✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	A42/M42	Large proportion of pavement (non-concrete surface) will reach the end of its design life by 2021	Yes		X		X			
	A5	Large proportion of pavement will reach the end of its design life by 2021 Condition of the cycleways is poor	Yes		X		X			
	A38 Burton upon Trent	Large proportion of pavement will reach the end of its design life by 2021	Yes		X		X			
	M45	Geotechnical challenges on this section. Built in 1950s and designed to the standards of the time.	Yes	X	X	X	X			
Capacity	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. The pinch point scheme to be delivered by 2015 will only provide enough capacity for 2-3 years.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A46	Growth plans will put a considerable strain on this section of the strategic road network (SRN). Requires a study similar to the A5. Approx. 21-24,000 houses proposed in the Coventry area.	Yes						✓	
	A46	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.		X	X	X	✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	M42	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.	Yes	X			✓		✓	
	A5 Rugby	Lots of development is proposed 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.	Yes		X	X	✓	✓		
	A5 Nuneaton and Bedworth	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	Yes			X	✓	✓		
	A5 Hinckley to Tamworth	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. The potential impact of the MIRA upgrade is a concern.	Yes	X	X	X	✓	✓		
	A5 / M6 Toll Cannock	Effect on transport of growth at Cannock Chase (needs 5,380 houses). Churchbridge scheme has lifespan until 2020 - need to consider long term	Yes		X	X	✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	A45 Coventry	Development growth – Prologis Ryton Site A and Site B (south west of Coventry) are missing from the growth plans; development traffic from these sites will exacerbate congestion on the A45 link.	Yes		X	X	✓	✓		
	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.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A46 Stratford	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. Need a traffic management on the A46 such as the use of traffic lights at peak times	Yes	X			✓		✓	
	A5 Longshoot and Dodwells	Leicestershire County Council (LCC) does not think that Pinch Point 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.	Yes	X	X	X	✓		✓	
	M42 J7-11	Centro's west midland freight strategy highlights some issues on these sections.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	M42 J9	Potential development near this junction and to the west, in and around Curdworth will cause congestion at this junction.	Yes		X	X	✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	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.	Yes		X	X	✓	✓		
	A38 Lichfield	Projects (pre-planning application) include: - A38: Twin Rivers development in Lichfield and East Staffordshire, 7,500 homes and major employment opportunities – need an integrated transport solution for this. Developments will place pressure on Park and Ride sites	Yes				✓	✓		
	A46 / A428	Junction will become a problem once Toll Bar is sorted out	No		X		✓	✓		
	A46 Stanks junction	Starting to queue back onto the main carriageway of the A46, will get worse with further developments.	No	X			✓	✓		
	A47 / A5	Dodwells Bridge. Development pressures from sustainable urban extensions at Barwell and Earl Shilton.	No	X	X		✓	✓		
	A5 / MIRA Redgate junction	MIRA major development will cause increased problems.	No		X		✓	✓		
	A46	A46, capacity issues, especially junctions around Evesham, impacted by development growth	No	X			✓		✓	

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	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.	Yes	X			✓			✓
	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	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A42	A42 is used like a motorway but 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.	No	X	X		✓	✓		
	All	Existing employers such as Jaguar Land Rover and JCB will provide the most significant growth in jobs. The RBS needs to cover existing employers particularly those that use/rely on the strategic network for access to their supply chain.	Yes	X		X	✓	✓*		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	All	Employment is needed ASAP, so the SRN shouldn't constrain anticipated growth. Growth more regionally outside of this region needs to be accounted for as they will impact on this route.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A449	Lack of technology provision coincides with poor performance on this section in terms of delay	Yes	X			X			
	A46	Lack of technology provision on this section coincides with poor performance in the Coventry, Warwick and Evesham areas	Yes	X			X			
	A5	Lack of technology provision on this section coincides with poor performance along the A5	Yes	X			X			
Safety	A5 Longshoot and Dodwells	(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.	Yes	X			✓		✓*	
	A5 Cannock	Need to address safety issues here.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A46 Stratford	More segregation for cyclists required to improve safety. Pedestrian and cycle crossings near Stratford are an issue.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A38 Burton-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 which presents a safety issue and can reduce traffic speeds. Cycle network needs to be better coordinated and less disruptive.	Yes	X			✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	A38 Fradley	Inadequate substandard junction at Fradley Village	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	A38	A38 accident records – captured in the Karl Freshman report. Needs traffic management proposals. Lack of slip roads contribute to high accident rates.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	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.	No	X			✓	✓		
	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.	No	X			✓	✓		
	A46 Stratford to Alcester	The A46 is only two lanes and carries a lot of traffic - not really suitable as Strategic Road Network.	No	X			✓	✓		
	A5	Severance for Pedestrian and cyclists trying to cross the corridor. Particular problem for pedestrians.	No	X			✓	✓		
	A5 Hinckley	Low railway bridge - HGV's hit the bridge, causing problems on the network and railway.	No	X			✓	✓		
	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	No	X			✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	A38 Fradley. HGVs queuing on to carriageway	Capacity Issues at junction with Fradley – HGVs queuing on to carriageway	No	X			✓	✓		
	A46 Evesham	Lack of safe crossing point at Bengeworth (Evesham) prevents Sustrans from developing major tourism / leisure route from Worcester to Oxford via the Cotswolds	No	X			✓	✓		
	A5 AQMA Bridgetown (Cannock)	The issues could have been resolved by the proposed HA pinchpoint scheme, but it was not taken forward. AQMA concerns remain	No	X	X	X	✓	✓		
Social and environment	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. Maintenance is very poor, with no treatment of water, not even primary treatment, leading to the quality and quantity of water coming off the carriageways being sub standard.	Yes	X			✓	✓		
	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.	No Evidence not yet received	X	X	X	✓	✓		
	Hinckley to Nuneaton to Atherstone	Desire locally to cycle Hinckley to Nuneaton to Atherstone	No	X			✓	✓		
	North of Nuneaton	There is an Air Quality Management Area in place	No	X			✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
	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.	Partial	X			✓	✓		
	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.	No	X			✓	✓		
	A5 near Dordon	Floods during sharp rainfall intensity periods.	No	X			✓	✓		
	All	Flood risk map shows flooding issues to be a lot less extensive than the Environment Agency have ascertained. Need to improve forward planning of maintenance to address environmental damage caused by flooding at bridges and culverts. Night maintenance has improved network performance. Need to consider Water Framework Directive when planning new roads. Possible need for new drainage technology	Yes	X	X	X	✓	✓		

	Location	Description	Is there supporting evidence?	Timescales			Was this Identified through stakeholder engagement?	Stakeholder Priorities		
				Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		Low	Medium	High
Other	All	Need alignment with Emerging Strategic Economic Plans (showing priorities for growth up to 2021) currently being produced by LEPs? In addition, Area Action Plans in Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Solihull and for the Stratford Road. These are based on the LDFs, update key areas of development. In East Staffordshire new developments plans are being added/approved in the near future.	No	X	X	X	✓	✓		
	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	No	X				✓		

Part B Stakeholder engagement

B1 Stakeholder workshops

B1.1 Engagement events

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

- Derby and Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire (D2N2) and Greater Lincolnshire, on 16 September 2013, at Crowne Plaza, Nottingham
- The Marches and Worcestershire areas, on Thursday 19 September 2013, at Sixways Stadium, Worcester
- Coventry and Warwickshire and Leicester and Leicestershire, on 24 September 2013 at Warwick University
- Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Stoke and Staffordshire and Black Country, on 20 September 2013, at Maple House, Birmingham
- Gloucestershire, on 27 September 2013 at Merchants' Meeting Rooms, Gloucester
- South East Midlands (SEM) and Northamptonshire areas, on 8 October at the Kettering Conference Centre, Northamptonshire

B2.1 Stakeholder event invitees

B2.1.1 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 Council
	Peter Baguley	Gedling Borough Council
	Steve Dance	Broxtowe Borough Council
	Julie Clayton	Ashfield Borough Council
	Susan Harley	Rushcliffe Borough Council
	James Arnold	Bolsover District Council
	Dai Lerner	High Peak Borough Council
	Paul Wilson	Derbyshire Dales District Council
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

B2.1.2 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 Motorcyclist 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
	Terry 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

B2.1.3 Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Stoke and Staffordshire and Black Country

Stakeholder group	Invitees	Organisation
-------------------	----------	--------------

LEP	Andy Street	Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP
	Craig Jordan	GBSLEP Planning/Lichfield DC
	Stewart Towe	Black Country LEP
	Peter Davenport	LEP Partnership Manager
	Ron Dougan	Stoke on Trent & Staffordshire LEP
Local Authorities	Stephen Hughes	Birmingham City Council
	Ann Osola	Birmingham City Council
	Stephen Brown	Cannock Chase District Council
	Andy O'Brien	East Staffordshire Borough Council
	Diane Tilley	Lichfield District Council
	Mark Rogers	Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
	Matthew Bowers	Tamworth Borough Council
	Laura Shoaf	Black Country Director of Transport
	Mark Corbins	Walsall Council
	Richard Banner	Walsall Council
	Paul Sheehan	Walsall Council
	Jan Britton	Sandwell Council
	Simon Warren	Wolverhampton City Council
	John Polychronakis	Dudley Metropolitan Council
	Jonathan Dale	LTB Vice Chair
	John Sellgren	Newcastle under Lyme - Chief Executive
	Michael Dunphy	Bromsgrove District Council
	Steve Winterflood	South Staffordshire Council
	Nick Bell	Staffordshire County Council

	John van de Laarschot	Stoke on Trent City Council
	Peter Price	Stoke on Trent City Council
Passenger Transport groups	Rik Thomas	RAC Foundation
	Maria-Pilar Machancoses	Centro Area Manager Coventry and Solihull
Local Freight Groups	Sally Gilson, Policy Manager – Midlands FTA	Freight Transport Association
	Nick Payne, Midlands and West	Road Haulage Association
Local Chamber of Commerce	Jerry Blackett	Birmingham Chamber of Commerce
	Chris Plant	Chase Chamber of Commerce
	Marilyn Castree	Lichfield and Tamworth Chamber of Commerce
	Margaret Corneby	Black Country Chamber
	Sara Williams / Jane Gratton ACEO	North Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry
	Chris Plant	Solihull Chamber of Commerce
	Colin Bell	GVA Planning, Development and Regeneration
Emergency services	Inspector Derek Roberts	Central Motorway Police Group
Countryside/Environmental Groups	Gerard Kells	CPRE
	Adam McCusker	Foe
	Edward Healey	Sustrans
	Jane Scott, RABO East Midlands	British Horse Society
	Kevin Chapman	West Midlands Campaign for Better Transport
Strategic transport groups	Michelle Thurgood	Birmingham Airport
	Janis Homer	NEC Group
	James Hodson	Director Midlands Expressway Limited
	Ian Chambers	Network Rail

Other government departments	Joshua Fox	Department for Transport
	Fiona Keates	Environment Agency
	Andrea Whitworth	Department for Business Innovation and Skill

B3.1 Stakeholder event attendees

D2N2 and Greater Lincolnshire

Break out group	Delegates name	Initials	Organisation
Blue	Jim Seymour	JS	D2N2 LEP
Blue	Steve Hunt	SH	Nottingham City Council
Blue	Andrew Mutter	AM	Newark and Sherwood District Council
Blue	Bettina Lange	BL	East Midlands Transport Activists Roundtable (EMTAR)
Blue	Kam Khokhar	KK	Highways Agency
Blue	Dan Bent		Facilitator
Blue	Jonny Browning		Note-taker
Green	Peter Goode	PG	Nottinghamshire County Council
Green	Jamie Douglas	JD	Representing Andrew Bingham MP
Green	Richard Groves	RG	South Derbyshire
Green	David Hoskins	DH	Environment Agency
Green	Toni Rios	TR	Highways Agency
Green	Graham Powell		Facilitator
Green	Tom McNamara		Note-taker
Orange	David Jones	DJ	Nottinghamshire County Council
Orange	Keith Shayshutt	KS	Trent and Barton
Orange	Joelle Davis	JD	Bassetlaw District Council
Orange	Peter Briggs	PB	Pedal
Orange	Maria Hallam	MH	BIS
Orange	Cyril Day	CD	Highways Agency
Orange	Sravani Vuppala		Facilitator
Orange	Mia-Jade Thornton		Note-taker
Red	Richard Wills	RAW	Greater Lincolnshire LEP
Red	Nigel Lee	NL	Nottingham Friends of the Earth
Red	David Pick	DP	Nottinghamshire County Council
Red	Julie Clayton	JC	Ashfield District Council
Red	Joshua Fox	JF	DfT
Red	Ian Bates	IB	Nottingham Chamber of Commerce
Red	Adrian Slack	AS	Highways Agency
Red	Graham Fry		Facilitator
Red	Abigail Finch		Note-taker
Yellow	Andrew Pritchard	AP	East Midlands Councils
Yellow	Geoff Blisset	GB	Derbyshire County Council
Yellow	Stephen Bray	SB	Gedling Borough Council
Yellow	James Lowe	JL	Sustrans
Yellow	Scott Nicholas	SM	Chesterfield Borough Council
Yellow	Rik Thomas	RT	RAC foundation
Yellow	Dave Lynch	DL	Highways Agency
Yellow	Tim McCann		Facilitator
Yellow	Amie Coleman		Note-taker

The Marches and Worcestershire

Break out group	Delegates name	Initials	Organisation
Red	Peter Hardy		Facilitator
Red	Jan Gondzio		Note-taker
Red	Jeremy Callard	JC	Herefordshire County Council
Red	Sally Gilson	SG	Freight Transport Association
Red	Stephen Harrison	SH	Worcester County Council
Red	John Pattison	JP	Wychavon District Council
Red	Peter Pawsey	PP	Worcestershire LEP
Red	Kevin Postones	KP	BIS
Red	Serena Howell	SH	Highways Agency
Orange	Lee White		Facilitator
Orange	Anthony Hogan		Note-taker
Orange	Emma Baker	EB	Redditch Borough Council
Orange	Michael Dunphy	MD	Bromsgrove District Council
Orange	Nick Payne	NP	Road Haulage Association
Orange	Anthony Werren	AW	BIS
Orange	Henry Harbord	HH	Sustrans
Orange	Jan Cooke	JC	Shropshire County Council
Orange	Patrick Thomas	PT	Highways Agency

Coventry and Warwickshire and Leicester and Leicestershire

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

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

Greater Birmingham and Solihull, Stoke and Staffordshire and Black Country

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

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

Gloucestershire

Break out group	Delegates name	Initials	Organisation
One	Heddwyn Owen	HO	Caravan Club
One	Jason Keates	JK	Gloucestershire Constabulary
One	Mally Findlater	MF	Local Enterprise Partnership
One	Ian Gallagher	IG	Freight Transport Association
One	John Cordwell	JC	Wotton-under-Edge MP
One	Jeremy Williamson	JW	Cheltenham Borough Council
One	Patsy Dray	PD	Highways Agency
One	Ian Parsons	IP	Facilitator
One	Joanna Mole	JM	Note taker
Two	Pete O'Brien	POB	British Motorcycling Federation
Two	John Franklin	JF	Gloucestershire Council
Two	Ed Halford	EH	Highways Agency
Two	Christine Shine	CS	Campaign for Better Transport Gloucestershire Local Transport Board
Two	James Llewellyn	JL	Sustrans
Two	Rupert Crosbee	RC	Facilitator
Two	Christine Fowler	CF	Note taker
Two	Peter Triplow	PT	
Three	Amanda Lawson-Smith	ALS	Gloucestershire Council
Three	Holly Jones	HJ	Tewkesbury Borough Council
Three	Nigel Robbins	NR	Cirencester Beeches MP
Three	Louise Follet	LF	Gloucester City Council

Three	Steve Hellier	SH	Facilitator
Three	Vicky Edge	VE	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

B4.1 Note taker sheets from stakeholder events

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), 2 nd site planning application expected by end of the year. Opportunity exists for investment and contribution to infrastructure. Current pinch points exist; 3 key roundabouts on A46 bypass E of Newark. No obvious solution: duelling would be near impossible due to geographic constraints. Flow on A1 Whinthorpe junction very high, expensive solution proposed in past, but seems to have gone quiet. Junction needs to be looked at for Newark to function properly. Farndon/Cattlemarket/Brownhills (A1) roundabouts all inter-dependent, need to be looked at together.	Capacity / Operational		>		Developments shown on 'Anticipated Growth' D2N2 NE map. Congestion / delay visible around Newark, excl A46 (no data available).		AM	4	
General	The location of other key growth areas / employment sites / growth points needs to be identified and captured. Assessment needs to be made on how quickly they can be brought on stream. Employment is needed ASAP. Need to also take into account growth areas outside of this workshop, as they impact on the region, eg Sheffield, Birmingham. Strong links between Chesterfield and Sheffield constrained by M1	N/A	>			Key sites identified on 'Anticipated Growth' maps		SH, AM	5 3	

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

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

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

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

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

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

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

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 <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					
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	x			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	x			No	A1+ incident logs	PG		
A1	When trunk roads are affected by incidents, they often have to fully close, pushing traffic elsewhere.	Capacity/Operational	x			No	A1+ incident logs	JD	1	
Overall	Total Casualties map does not show severity.	Safety	x			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	x			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	x			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	x			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	x			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	x			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		x	x	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	x	x	x	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	x			Yes			JD	6

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

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@environment-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	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities. Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other	Raised by
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in 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.		
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

<p>Nottingham near the University. The cycle network is not continuous, there is a break in it – discourages cyclists.</p>	<p>Safety (perception maybe)</p>			<p>Link up the cycle routes to better serve the University and South Nottingham.</p>	<p>PG</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>1 Capacity 2 Operational</p>	<p>They cause severe delays, being stuck behind a speed limited HGV.</p>	<p>Seek European evidence.</p>	<p>HGV ban in the outside lane.</p>	<p>DH</p>
<p>Glossop A628. Improvements are needed ahead of growth. There is no room for more traffic on the network, so developments are opposed by residents.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>				<p>JD</p>
<p>A52 West of Nottingham cycle route. Must consider non-motorised road users.</p>	<p>Asset Condition Operational</p>	<p>Consensus it was a priority.</p>			<p>ALL</p>

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 supporting (name, org) to provide evidence by	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					

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

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

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

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

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

Network wide (advanced stop lines)	<p>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.</p>	Operational	×						PB	
A38	<p>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.</p>	Asset Condition				Yes				
A52 Dunkirk	<p>There is a current noise issue around Dunkirk which needs addressing.</p>	Society & Environment	×			Yes			KS/JD	
A52 Beeston	<p>Motorbike noise disturbs me constantly by the A52 Beeston. Disturbance by motorbike noise often occurs along the major arterial routes in/out of Nottingham</p>	Society & Environment	×						JD	
			×						PB	

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 M1 and A38 mainline but no information on the local network at M1 junctions which also have problems.	N/A	N/A	JC	14
Newark A46	A46 is vital to the prosperity of Lincolnshire. Lack of penetration makes linking pinch points important to Greater Lincolnshire LEP (GL LEP). Newark is constrained by single carriageway. Currently A46 junctions at Newark are under pressure although the road link appears to cope. Future development will put it all under pressure.	Capacity	X	X		Yes – Delay and speed maps indicate a problem but delay problem appears worse on A46 (A1- Lincoln) which is dual carriageway. This appears erroneous.	N/A	N/A	RAW	8
A52 south and east of Nottingham	Considerable stress on A52 now with problems on the trunk road spilling onto local roads. Clifton Bridge (A453) to Bingham (A46) – number of junction capacity issues. Likely to worsen as considerable development proposed in the area.	Capacity		X		Yes – Delay map show problems, particularly on A52 Gamston to A46.	-	-	DP	7

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

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

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

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

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?	
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in 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 freight vehicles. There are also plans for growth around Lincoln, will lead to more congestion	Capacity and safety	✓			Not part of HA network	None provided		AP	1
A38 3 Junctions project through Derby	This project has already been put forward to the HA but has been delayed	Capacity	✓			HA already have the evidence/ study	No additional evidence provided		GB	9
M1 East to West movements	A study was conducted on the movement of traffic from North to South on the M1. It was found that a large majority of the problems were caused by East to West movements. These East to West movements should be considered as part of the RBS study	Capacity, Safety, Operational	✓			HA already has evidence in the form of multi-modal study	No additional evidence provided		AP	2
A6211 to A612 East Of Nottingham	A new route which has been developed to accommodate growth in the area. Will allow 1900 new homes to be built. A key site for development, will allow growth in the area. Will provide an additional crossing over the river Trent. Waiting on approval from Nottinghamshire County Council.	Society		✓		Not part of HA network	None provided		SB	7
Link to the A46 around Lincoln	An Eastern bypass would relieve congestion in the area – preliminary discussion have been started with the Council	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – low average speed, high casualties, poor pavement and high vehicle delay hours	None provided		SB	1

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

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

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade- offs?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group *Not in order of priority	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in 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
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	Marches & Worcestershire	Date:	19th September 2013	Breakout Group	Orange
Group Facilitator	Lee White	Note-taker	Anthony Hogan		

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)
			Already is	2018-21	x After 2021			
Redditch	Planned development with affect local and strategic routes to the north of Redditch	Capacity			x	No	Warwickshire County Council - Alan Law / Adrian Hart, Redditch Strategic Transport Assessment	
Redditch / Bromsgrove	Congestion at M42 J3, M42 J1, M5 J5, M5 J4 and M5 J3. Pressure on the SRN result in knock on problems for A38 problems – particularly serious in Bromsgrove. “Every week, Bromsgrove is gridlocked”	Capacity	x			Yes	Gravity model for HA, anecdotal, Longbridge regeneration, VISSIM models (Birmingham CC, Worcestershire CC)	
Redditch / Bromsgrove	30,000 houses deficit for Birmingham will have to be built to north or south. IF south this will be Bromsgrove/Redditch	Capacity			x	No		
Network-wide	More housing equals more home deliveries through internet buying and creates further congestion concerns	Capacity			x	No		
Shrewsbury	25% more housing expected and Oswestry bypass is congested Travelling from Shrewsbury to south-east is difficult without using M54 towards centre of Birmingham	Capacity	x		x	Yes	Online planning documents, models from Las, HA studies, infrastructure delivery plans	
Network-wide	Lack of truckstops / laybys - HGVs stop on SRN for scheduled breaks	Safety	x			No	Closures of existing stops	
A5 Shopshire	A5 Shrewsbury east to west Midlands - should be upgraded to motorway netowrk to attract inward investment	Capacity	x			Yes - safety		Emails with evidence to s from JC
Shrewsbury	Housing growth is increasing congestion, need a Shrewsbury bypass	Capacity				No		
A5 / A483	A5 / A483 exhibit general poor performance. With development growth between Oswestry and Wrexham there is a need for additional capacity. A483 has a bad safety record	Capacity / Safety	x			Yes		

A49 Dorrington / Bayston Hill	Accessibility is limited due to single carriageways through Dorrington and Bayston Hill. Vehicles get stuck behind lorries on single-carriageways, leading to unreliable travel times and slow journey times speeds.	Operational	x			Yes - congestion / delay		
A49	Road is not HGV friendly. With planned growth, more people equals more HGVs to supply goods. Development to east of A49	Capacity	x			No		
Shropshire - Worcester	Hereford - Shrewsbury corridor is not a suitable route for HGVs. Require a strategic route from Shropshire to Worcestershire	Capacity	x			No		
A49/B4368 Craven Arms	Development around Craven Arms, creates new employment, junction is required to accommodate growth	Capacity	x			No		
Network-wide	Access on to SRN is difficult because of traffic growth and causes additional HGV delay	Capacity	x			Yes		
M54 / M6 toll	Slow journey times between M54 and M6 Toll, needs motorway standard link	Capacity	x			Yes		
Network-wide	People use SRN because they cannot easily get across it. The severance is constraining economic growth. This is network-wide with specific issues on A46 around Evesham and links to Worcester	Society	x			No	Living Streets, social equity, passive transport	Documents to provided by Sustrans
A46 Evesham	Lack of safe crossing point at Bengeworth (Evesham) prevents Sustrans from developing major tourism / leisure route from Worcester to Oxford via the Cotswolds	Society	x			No		
Bridgnorth / Kidderminster	Local road links on to SRN are not suitable	Capacity	x			No	Wyre Forest can provide evidence to support, but not present at the engagement	
The Marches	Area-wide underdeveloped transport network - slow, unsafe, unreliable journey times	Capacity	x			No		
A49 Dobbies junction	Specific accident blackspot	Safety	x			Yes		

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

Workshop Name	Marches & Worcestershire	Date:	19th September 2013	Breakout Group	Orange
Group Facilitator	Lee White	Note-taker	Anthony Hogan		

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities. Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
The historic trunk road network in the area does not function adequately for today's needs. Upgrade to existing roads, work to the west of Birmingham required	Capacity	Impacting upon issues in Birmingham - motorway exceeding capacity. Can some of this be drawn out of Birmingham - JC	High priority	
Journeys from Shrewsbury to Worcester mean going into Birmingham	Capacity	Poor connectivity, longer journeys Travellers coming in from Wales add to the problem - JC		Upgrade the A49 to resolve Birmingham capacity and provide western solution for Hereford Enterprise Zone connectivity
The standard of A49 is barely trunk road standard and should be addressed. Potential demand may be suppressed as road users avoid the A49 in favour of motorway network, therefore increasing congestion in Birmingham	Capacity	A49 must be improved to enable the Hereford enterprise zone to flourish. Housing in Telford adds further to potential problems - JC / AW Birmingham Box / M6 is fundamental to performance of the area - JC Current layout not conducive with future growth, evidence that development in the area will cause gridlock - JC	High priority	Upgrade the A49 to resolve Birmingham capacity and provide western solution for Hereford Enterprise Zone connectivity
Connectivity from M54 to M6	Capacity	Not possible to travel north from M54 to M6 without using local roads		
Housing growth is increasing congestion need A5 Shrewsbury bypass	Capacity		Deemed high priority by Shropshire representative	Bypass
Bromsgroves LDF considerations direct employment sites away from Bromsgrove and into Birmingham / Black Country	Capacity		Bromsgrove representative emphasised the priority set out in their LDF considerations	

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

Workshop Name	Marches & Worcestershire	Date:	19/09/2013	Breakout Group	Red
Group Facilitator	Peter Hardy	Note-taker	Jan Gondzio		

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 (name, org) by	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
Enterprise zone, Hereford	Capacity of A49 is a challenge to development in Hereford	Capacity		X		Yes			JC	13
Hereford	Lack of resilience with only one bridge crossing of the river Wye at Hereford. Has impact on M5/M6/M50 as other routes are used to avoid area	Capacity	X			Yes			JC	
A49 Hereford to Shrewsbury	Cars overtaking HGVs on only link road North-South through Hereford	Safety	X			Yes - Safety	Anecdotal from drivers of Freight Transport Association		SG	
Barton Road/A49 Hereford	Need to improve carriageway maintenance	Asset condition	X			No			JC	
M42 J1	M42 at J1 air quality impacts more on WCC roads than on SRN.	Environment			X	Yes - Environment	Modelling done. Assessment of BDP and R&P. Evidence shared with HA.		SH	7
M5 J6 south of Worcester	Unreliable journey times due and congestion/delays on local roads in vicinity of M5J6	Capacity	X			Yes - Delay			SH	14
A46	A46, capacity issues, especially junctions around Evesham, impacted by development growth	Capacity	X			No			SH	5

M5 J7 Worcester	Worcester Parkway rail station planned near M5 J7. This is an opportunity to enable mode shift to rail, but may also be a challenge as cars are attracted to Parkway station.	Capacity		X					SH	1
South and East of Worcester	Significant development spread across S & E edges of Worcester city. Additional traffic will require area-wide investment in local/strategic transport infrastructure e.g. M5/A44	Operational Capacity	X	X					JP	5
Whole region	Need to increase/improve promotion of behavioural change (e.g. through roadside advertising of alternative transport modes)	Society	X						JC	
Whole region	Package approach needed to deliver modal shift and alleviate pressure on roads by providing sustainable transport alternatives	Operational		X	X				SH	
Whole region	Need to join-up relationship and thinking, between those responsible for investment plans for the SRN and local transport network	Operational	X						JP	
Whole region	Tension between SRN being used as a corridor of movement and serving new development	Social	X						JP	
Worcestershire	Poor performance of SRN, especially junctions (M5 J6 and J7), has adverse impact on WCC road network. Therefore schemes cannot be limited to SRN only – need a joined up approach.		X						SH	2
M5/M6 interchange (not in this region)	Unreliable journey times due to volume of traffic results in traffic always being slow	Capacity	X			Yes - Delay	Anecdotal from FTA		SG	
Whole region	Need to consider challenge of reducing CO ₂ impacts across the network	Environment	X	X	X				JC	

A49 Hereford	in Delivery of LDF needs significant increase in capacity on A49 in Hereford								JC	
Bromsgrove area	Adverse impacts on local roads due to “rat-running” near Bromsgrove to avoid M42/M5 congestion	Safety	X						SH	

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

Workshop Name	Marches & Worcestershire	Date:	19/09/2013	Breakout Group	Red
Group Facilitator	Peter Hardy	Note-taker	Jan Gondzio		

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
<p>Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p>Nb In this session we most interested in 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.</p>	<p>Solution Type (& additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance & renewals / Operational / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>General congestion, insufficient capacity, poor reliability and resilience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M42 J1 - M5 J6 - Hereford city <p>Support for Hereford enterprise zone</p>	<p>Capacity Operational</p>	<p>The group considered that transport is a constraint to economic development and needs to be addressed.</p>	<p>The group discussion centred on establishing <i>how</i> transport priorities should be decided, rather than <i>what</i> those priorities are.</p>	<p>There is an opportunity to encourage behavioural change (particularly through the LSTF process) to encourage mode shift and reduce congestion.</p> <p>This has to be done in partnership with the local businesses.</p> <p>Specific places/issues were highlighted in the discussions and logged elsewhere in these notes. These are also identified in the current LTPs/LDFs and LEP proposals.</p>

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

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

Workshop Name		Coventry and Warwickshire, and Leicester and Leicestershire		Date:		24/09/13		Breakout Group		Blue Team	
Group Facilitator		Jenny Oakes (JO)		Note-taker		A. Finch				Page 2	
Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises 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	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?		Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.	
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in 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	
A5 Dodwells junction & A5 - Atherstone to M42 junction	Capacity	Two key blockages on the A5 which should be priority following on from the Pinch Point improvements so that there is a seamless improvement to the whole route. Capacity / safety improvements (probably dualling) required by 2018. Dodwells is also a priority for Environmental Agency as there are water quality issues around the area. A water body close by is failing due to road run off. EA to be considered in any improvements to this junction.	Emerging as a key route for supporting economic growth. A string of logistics companies along the A5 who are being and will continue to be impacted on.		Environmental Agency to be considered for any improvements to the Dodwells junction.	
TGI (Binley Junction) and Walsgrave Islands, A444 and	Operating close to	Top priority for Coventry City Council in order to deliver growth. Economic case for				

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

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

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

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

M1 J24	<p>M1 J24 is a nationally important part of the M1 as it links to the A50 and A453 routes. and with the airport and SRFI in close proximity. On top of this, it is an important gateway for Nottingham and Derby. However the junction suffers from congestion, it has not been improved and with a large amount of development proposed for the area, its performance will continue to deteriorate.</p> <p>A pinch point scheme is scheduled at this junction for Summer 2014. This will change the way traffic on the A50 EB enters the M1 SB. A new carriageway will be created through the junction. However Leicestershire County Council does not think that these measures are sufficient in the long term.</p>	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	Yes	N/A	N/A	PS	5
A45	<p>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.</p>	Capacity/ Operational/		X	X	No	Evidence provided by CL, a commercial developer from Prologis	N/A	CL	1
A5 Longshoot and Dodwells	<p>The A5 at Hinckley currently suffers from congestion. There is a plan in place for new traffic signals and a widening of the approaches at Dodwells roundabout as well as changes to the Longshoot junction. However Leicestershire County Council (LCC) does not think that these measures are sufficient in the long term. A long term strategy for improvement is needed as it is crucial to growth in Hinckley and Nuneaton. Need to maximise ability to secure developer funds.</p>	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:	Note-taker:			
Sarah Guest	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	x	x	x	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	x					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	x					TA		
A46 North Warwick of	Sheer amount of run-off is flooding the immediate area. In cold weather this is freezing.	Safety Environment Asset condition	x					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	x	x	x			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	×	×	×				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 thought been given to Autonomous vehicle use in the future? Sparked a debate on the length of time for road investment strategies. Length of a parliament vs. 50 years (China)	Capacity Safety			×				JS MT	1
A46 North Leicester of 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	<p>Water quality</p> <p>Most of the water issues/ flooding come from the carriageway, not from flooding of surrounding rural area. Issues with drainage and ditches on highways.</p> <p>The claim is that these are maintained, but in reality maintenance is very poor. No treatment of water, not even primary treatment, leading to the quality and quantity of water coming off the carriageways being sub standard.</p> <p>If HA are seen to be doing nothing to move forward and deal with this issue it can damage reputation but also if water quality diminishes it could have legal implications.</p>	Environment	×					Will try and find information in specific areas where this has taken place and been documented.	TA	1
A14 Market Harborough	<p>The 'Diversion Route Plan' needs to be kept up to date. Otherwise towns like Market Harborough get swapped by traffic leaving the SRN.</p> <p>There is the consensus that spontaneous incidents will have this affect and that it is unavoidable, but for planned works it is considered unacceptable.</p>	Operational Capacity	×						GC	1
Shepshed M1 J23	<p>2500 more houses, not 500 as shown on the maps from core strategy data.</p>	Capacity		×		Maps don't reflect what MT claim			MT	
M1 J24 South Derby and Notts	<p>Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is going to create 6000 jobs with related car and freight journeys.</p> <p>Want reassurances this is being considered.</p>	Capacity	×	×		Not on map (maybe because not in area covered by this workshop)			MT	
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 Shilton.	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:	Note-taker:			
Sarah Guest	Tom McNamara			

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

<p>Maintenance A46 North of Leicester Major resurfacing resulting in the removal of the verge for cross overs. Rising flood risk (less infiltration)</p>	<p>Safety Environment Asset condition</p>	<p>This problem was created by the actions taken to maintain the carriageway. investment should not be creating problems.</p>			<p>TA</p>
<p>Strategic Signage</p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>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.</p>		<p>Make better use of VMS</p>	<p>GC</p>
<p>A5 Been forgotten about because the suspicion is that HA don't see it as a strategic route.</p>	<p>Capacity Operational</p>	<p>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.</p>		<p>Devolve responsibility from the HA to local authorities. At least make the HA declare what they see what its function is.</p>	<p>HA</p>

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

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

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

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Is there any trade- offs?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
Nb. these could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group *Not in order of priority	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in 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
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	

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

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

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical?			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2018-21	After 2021					
M6 J15,16,17 Stoke	Getting on and off at junctions, especially A500(T) with M6 is difficult, leading to a constraint on economic development around the A500	Operational / Capacity	X			Yes - Peak hour speeds		GB	4	
M6 J13-19	Delays to trade traffic	Operational	X				Freight company journey times, e.g. from DHL	SG	2	
A50 east of Stoke, towards M1	Unreliable journey times; delays on important trunk route	Operational	X					SG	1	
M5/M6 interchange	Unpredictable journey times and delays due to insufficient capacity affect all users	Capacity	X					SG, AO, BD	4	

A500(T)	Lack of safe and secure stopping points/lay-bys for HGVs / freight Trucks are stuck in traffic just before they are due a break.	Safety	X						SG, BD	2
M6	Sufficient capacity to allow development around M6	Operational	X		X		BCC: city mobility action plan – March 2014 LEP models: economic (KPMG) and transport		AO	
M6 / M6 Toll	M6 Toll empty while M6 congested	Operational	X						BD	10
A5 to A38	Single carriageway on journey to M1 causes delays (See Delay Map)	Capacity	X			Yes - Delays		BD	BD	2
Black Country	Poor accessibility to/from the SRN across Black Country, e.g. journey time/distance to get onto M6 from Dudley	Operational	X						BD	1
Black Country	Business relocating outside Black Country because of congestion	Society	X					BD	BD	
i54, M6 North	Need to improve accessibility once Jaguar Land Rover plant open	Capacity		X					BD	11
Featherstone, M54-M6 link	Potential transport impact of strategic employment sites in the vicinity	Society					Study ongoing		PW	3
Whole network	Need to provide additional information to drivers to let them know where to stop if there is congestion up ahead on the network	Safety	X			n/a			SG	
Whole network	Need to ensure there is network resiliency and efficiency optimisation of the strategic/local routes. Incidents on the strategic network have knock-on effects elsewhere. The appropriate use of technology (e.g. VMS) could be provided	Operational							AO	

North Staffordshire	Need to manage the impact on the local non-strategic road network and consequences of blockages in North Staffs/ South Cheshire	Operational							GB	2
M6 J10a-6	Delays and unreliable journey times due to congestion and mix of traffic e.g. HGVs	Operational							BD	3
Whole network	Need to manage general capacity on motorways	Operational							AO	2
A5	Concerns about safety record	Safety							GB	2
M6 J8 and J7 to South	Insufficient capacity at motorway junctions	Capacity							SH	1
General	Impact of poorly maintained roads on truck tyres	Asset condition							BD	
Whole network	Congestion creates delays for freight traffic and this creates problems for HGV drivers – they cannot drive longer than the legal times	Operational							BD	
M6 / M42	<p>The LEPs' Strategic Economic Plan will have a major impact on growth and employment. This will require highway capacity, particularly on the strategic routes/junctions</p> <p>Key site is UK Central – the M42/Solihull corridor in the vicinity of M42 J5 and J6 and M6 J4</p> <p>Birmingham City Centre enterprise zone is major growth area and will affect traffic growth</p>						<p>Birmingham Mobility Action Plan outputs / analysis</p> <p>Birmingham Development Plan modelling / analysis</p> <p>Solihull MBC work on UK Central</p> <p>Birmingham Airport Surface Access work – SDG study</p> <p>Work being undertaken for GBS LGF investment packages</p> <p>GBS LTB KPMG economic development work</p> <p>Cross-LEP strategic connectivity work</p>	AO		

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

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

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

Route-based strategies stakeholder events

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Route-based strategies stakeholder events

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

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

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

Workshop Name	Gloucestershire	Date:	27th September	Breakout Group	Two
Group Facilitator	Christine Fowler	Note-taker	Peter Triplow		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by
Study	1. Important to get all information in place before making decisions as this challenge underpins all others. If we rely only on the information as shown the South West may lose out.					
M5 Bristol	2. This stretch of the M5 always seems to have roadworks, plus some of the junctions are confusing. This creates a negative impression of Gloucestershire to visitors from the south.	Capacity	Yes			Pete O'Brien
M5 junction 10	3. Question of how well this junction relates to the local road network. If the junction is made accessible to traffic from the south this would encourage more local traffic onto the motorway. This then raises the question of whether the Agency should try and direct local drivers away from the motorway.	Capacity Operational	No			John Franklin
M5 junction 12	4. Too many traffic lights at this junction which cause congestion locally.	Operational	No			Pete O'Brien
M50	5. This road never seems to be open. Question raised as to where it serves and why it was built. Junction 1 is confusing, even to locals.	Asset condition	Yes			Pete O'Brien
A40 north and west of Gloucester	6. Congestion is caused as the road goes from dual to single carriageway. This road is the only access to Gloucester and Cheltenham from west of the river so any problems here impact hard on residents and businesses. Question raised as to whether this road should still be a strategic road.	Capacity Society & Environment	No			Ed Halford supported by Pete O'Brien
A417 south of Cheltenham	7. There is bad congestion on the single carriageway section from Birdlip to Nettleton Bottom. Slopes and landscape designations are likely to make solutions difficult. The hilltop has its own microclimate which can surprise drivers. Together with the volume of traffic, this makes it an accident blackspot. Drivers who do not know the road tend to drive down the hill with their brakes on, which can create confusion at night. The turning into Birdlip at the top of the hill can be tricky for cyclists.	Capacity Safety Society & Environment	Yes	No evidence offered but agreed that we need evidence on journey time, accidents and air quality. We also need businesses and haulage firms to say how much this stretch of road is costing them.	LEP is trying to get evidence together.	Christine Shine supported by Pete O'Brien Ed Halford John Franklin

A417 (lighting and signage)	8. Signs seem overly large for the size of road. Could they be smaller and do all stretches of the road need lighting? Suggestion that it may be possible to turn off more lights than at present.	Operational Society & Environment	No			Christine Shine
A417 / A419 (heading north west)	9. Some drivers heading from the south east to Wales use this road as an alternative to the M4 on the grounds that the M4 <i>might</i> be congested. With better advance signage on the M4 this could be avoided.	Operational	No			Ed Halford
A417 / A419 (heading south east)	10. Some drivers heading from the Midlands to Chippenham and the west side of Swindon use this road as an alternative to the M5 on the grounds that the M5 <i>might</i> be congested. With better advance signage on the M5 this could be avoided.	Operational	No			Pete O'Brien
Countywide information) (journey)	11. There is a lack of information on the origins and destinations of traffic so it is hard to distinguish between long distance and local travellers. For known pinchpoints such as the Air Balloon this information would be useful.	Capacity	No	Christine Shine has information on traffic through Nettleton Bottom. Ed Halford has a traffic model for the central Severn Vale. Travel to work data is available from the census.		James Llewellyn supported by Christine Shine
Countywide (accidents)	12. How useful are the present statistics we have on accidents? Is safety becoming a greater or lesser problem? We need to understand the whole picture rather than relying on injury data.	Safety	Yes			James Llewellyn
Countywide (diversions)	13. Need to think more carefully about where traffic is diverted when strategic roads are shut or congested. Traffic figures plateau once a road become blocked so it can be hard to tell whether traffic is diverting and, if so, how much and where to.	Capacity	No		Christine Shine	Christine Shine
Countywide (crossings)	14. It can be very hard to cross strategic roads at flat junctions, particularly for those on bikes. Examples given of the A419 at Cricklade, the A46 south of Evesham and the M5 at Tewkesbury. Although cycle lanes and crossings have been provided, many cyclists choose not to use them. To date it has been assumed that one solution will fit all cyclists, whereas in fact there are different kinds of cyclists with different needs. The narrowness of unimproved sections also makes things tricky. The growth planned east of Tewkesbury will make the M5 junction even harder to cross.	Safety Society & Environment	No			John Franklin supported by Rupert Crosbee

Countywide (service areas)	15. There is nowhere to park motorbikes at service stations. Also need a lorry park for the M5.	Asset condition	No			Pete O'Brien
Countywide (satnavs)	16. Need to tackle the problem of satnavs sending drivers down roads which are ill-suited to their needs (particular problem with lorries being sent down country lanes. Could the satnav makers be persuaded to provide different settings for cars, bikes, lorries, caravans etc.?)	Operational	No			Pete O'Brien supported by Christine Shine

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

Workshop Name	Gloucestershire	Date:	27th September	Breakout Group	Two
Group Facilitator	Christine Fowler	Note-taker	Peter Triplow		

When does this issue become critical?			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? 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	Sticky dots (also to be placed on the map as well)
Already is	Before 2021	After 2021				
✓			1. Important to get all information in place before making decisions.	Needs to happen before other challenges are tackled.		●
✓			2. The M5 is the main gateway into Gloucestershire from the south so problems around Bristol affect the whole county.	Work is already underway on this stretch of the M5 so it could be a quick win.	Rebuild the Almondsbury interchange to make it less confusing.	
	✓		3. Could make an already congested part of the M5 even busier.	Would only become a problem if the junction were to be made accessible to drivers from the south as well as from the north.		
✓			4. More a local issue than a strategic one.	Not as high a priority as other challenges.		
			5. This road has little impact on Gloucestershire so this is more of an observation than a challenge.	Agreed by all to be a low priority.		
✓			6. A40 north and west of Gloucester. Affects economic activity and connectivity for those living and / or working west of the Severn.	One scheme is already going ahead which may help. Could be a quick win but other priorities are higher.	Redesign of Over Island.	● ● ●
✓			7. A417 south of Cheltenham. Big issue for business, freight and tourism, as well as for local residents. Affects the whole economic attractiveness of Gloucestershire. Causes hold ups in getting fresh fruit and vegetables out of	All agreed this should be the top priority.		● ●

When does this issue become critical?			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 refer back to the county.	How does this compare to other priorities? Why?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.	Sticky dots (also to be placed on)
			8. Has a big visual impact in sensitive areas like the Cotswold AONB.	Something to consider when other changes and improvements are made.		
✓			9. Hard to quantify but could be putting unnecessary strain on the A417 through Nettleton Bottom.	Cannot do much until we know the start and end points of journeys. Could be a quick win as it is only a signage issue.		
✓			10. A417 / A419 (heading south east) used if M5 congested. Hard to quantify but could be putting unnecessary strain on the A417 through Nettleton Bottom.	Cannot do much until we know the start and end points of journeys. Could be a quick win as it is only a signage issue.		●
✓			11. A lack of information on the origins and destinations of traffic. Other challenges, such as 9 and 10, rely on us having this information.	Needs to happen before certain other challenges can be tackled.		● ●
✓			12. Important to understand this issue before making decisions on other challenges.	Needs to happen before other challenges are tackled.		●
✓			13. Important to understand this issue before making decisions on other challenges.	Needs to happen before other challenges are tackled.		●
✓			14. It can be very hard to cross strategic roads at flat junctions. Planned growth will only make this problem worse so we need to act now.	A big priority for cyclists.	Investment should be directed towards growth areas.	● ● ● ●
✓			15. Not a huge priority but something to be borne in mind when new services are proposed.	Less of a priority than solving congestion problems.		●
✓			16. Some lorries and caravans are using unsuitable roads as their satnavs only have one setting.	A high priority but not within the Agency's control.		●

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

Workshop Name	Gloucestershire	Date:	27th September	Breakout Group	Three
Group Facilitator	Steve Hellier	Note-taker	Vicky Edge		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by
Region-wide	2. Diversionary routes when the motorway is closed – must make sure that signs are correct and there is a joined up approach (police, HA, council).	Operational	No			Amanda Lawson-Smith
M5 J11a	<p>3. This is a limited movement junction, which causes some vehicles to undertake strange movements.</p> <p>Vehicles can't turn left from the trading estate. Vehicles can't turn onto the A417, so come out at Zoon's Court roundabout, which causes congestion.</p> <p>There is queuing on the A417, formed by traffic joining Cheltenham (am peak).</p> <p>At the Brockworth roundabout area, there is potential for around 3,000 dwellings to be developed (half of these are committed, half are proposed).</p>	Safety	No			<p>Amanda Lawson-Smith</p> <p>Holly Jones</p>
Missing Link, A417/419	<p>4. Congestion both ways.</p> <p>This is particularly at the top of Crickley Hill during the peak hours. In the evenings, returning from Swindon is a particular problem.</p> <p>Single carriageway length a particular problem.</p>	Capacity				Nigel Robbins
Air Balloon (out of Birdlip), A417	<p>5. Accident blackspot. Congestion and safety issues.</p> <p>Right turn movements, in particular, cause accidents.</p> <p>20 years ago, the Government upgraded the route to be used as an alternative to the M4/M5. Improvements have since then stagnated.</p> <p>Country lanes are used as rat runs as the Air Balloon is being avoided. This proves difficult for villages.</p> <p>AQMA</p>	Capacity / Safety / Society / Environment	Not to the full extent			<p>Amanda Lawson-Smith</p> <p>Nigel Robbins</p>

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by
A419	<p>6. Noise is a problem, and an action group has now been set up because of this. There is a concrete section from Cirencester to Cricklade which causes particular problems.</p> <p>It was noted that this is a problem which may get worse if traffic levels increase (AL).</p> <p>Accidents are caused by people slowing down and speeding up along this route. The variable speed limits are felt to pose a problem.</p> <p>Links to Swindon/Reading etc are important as this is a key aerospace/technological area.</p> <p>The A419 is a DBFO with a 30 year contract (phantom toll), managed by RBS. RBS could argue against reducing traffic as their revenue would be reduced as a consequence.</p> <p>The local authority has heard that RMS are happy with the current situation. If their income is capped, there may be no incentive for solutions to be developed (an increase in traffic would not see their income increase if there is a cap imposed).</p>	Safety / Environment	No	The LEP has recently surveyed businesses in the area about what the effect would be of improvements to J9, J10 and Air Balloon.	The results of the survey should be published soon (LF).	<p>Nigel Robbins</p> <p>Louise Follet</p> <p>Nigel Robbins</p> <p>Amanda Lawson-Smith</p>
M5 J9 (with A46)	<p>7. Congestion at this junction is significant.</p> <p>Right on the junction, there is an area allocated for housing development. A short way to the east, there is a proposal for 2,200 homes, plus employment (currently an MOD site).</p> <p>Worcestershire are requesting dualling of the A46 to Stratford, and a pinch point scheme is currently underway at this junction.</p>	Capacity / Economic growth	Information on junctions not shown			<p>Holly Jones</p> <p>Amanda Lawson-Smith</p>
M5 J10	<p>8. Currently a limited movement junction. Desire for it to become an all-movement junction (LEP priority).</p> <p>4,800 dwellings are proposed very close to the junction.</p> <p>If coming south, have to travel through Cheltenham residential areas to access the motorway.</p> <p>Heading east to Cheltenham, queuing back onto motorway, which is a safety issue.</p>	Capacity / Safety	No			<p>Holly Jones</p> <p>Amanda Lawson-Smith</p>

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by
M5 J11	<p>9. Development planned towards the A46.</p> <p>To the west, it is Highways Agency maintained, and to the east it is local authority maintained.</p> <p>A new park and ride plus improvements to the junction are planned at Elmbridge Court.</p> <p>This junction is currently felt to be operating ok, but will be put under huge pressures by development.</p>	Capacity / Economic growth				Holly Jones
M5 J12	<p>10. Committed development is planned south of Gloucester (some as part of Stroud's plans too). Incinerator site has also been allocated for development. The junction is unlikely to cope with any future development.</p> <p>Queues go back onto the motorway carriageway.</p> <p>A rail strategy is currently being developed. New stations are proposed at: Huntsgrove, Stonehouse, Gloucester Parkway.</p>	Capacity				Amanda Lawson-Smith
M5 J13	<p>11. Congestion on A419, into Stroud.</p> <p>Stroud District Council have development proposals in the area.</p>	Capacity				Amanda Lawson-Smith
A40	<p>12. There are strategic allocations to the west of J11a (North of Gloucester). Another development is proposed at Twigworth, with a possible new roundabout on the SRN,</p> <p>West of Gloucester, there is congestion on A417 (has some pinch point funding).</p> <p>Perceived to be part of 'virtual detrunking', so it is maintained but not improved.</p>	Capacity				Louise Follet
M5/M4	<p>13. Massive congestion problems.</p> <p>Will be over capacity, even with the managed motorway scheme. This makes the case for improving the A419 even stronger.</p>	Capacity				
A40 (council stretch, Gloucester)	<p>14. Lorries using lay-by. Lack of overlay facilities causes a problem as they then rest on A40 and pull out to dual carriageway from a cold start, which poses a safety risk.</p>	Safety				
Elmbridge transport scheme	<p>15. Once Elmbridge transport scheme is in place, need to communicate and understand the impacts on the whole network.</p> <p>Some lorries and vehicles use A417/Chepstow to get to Wales, rather than pay the toll.</p>					

Breakout Session 2: what should the priorities be?

Workshop Name	Gloucestershire	Date:	27th September	Breakout Group	Three
Group Facilitator	Steve Hellier	Note-taker	Vicky Edge		

When does this issue become critical?			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? 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	Sticky dots (also to be placed on the map as well)
Already is	Before 2021	After 2021				
✓	✓		3. M5 J11a an issue due to the limited movements. More development is coming forward, which will have an impact upon capacity. Traffic queuing on the A417 is going to get worse.			
✓			4. Missing Link is an issue, as unlocking capacity on this route would unlock bigger economic benefits for Gloucestershire as a whole.		A pilot project was planned (raised by Nigel Robbins) but not sure it would have worked anyway due to the unpredictability of accidents.	● ● ● ● ●
✓			5. Air Balloon an issue due to safety. It can be included within Missing Link comments as it is all one problem, and requires one solution. All single section carriageways need addressing.			●
✓			6. A419 is a problem due to noise and accidents.			
✓			7. M5 J9 an issue due to significant congestion.			● ●
✓	✓		8. M5 J10 a priority due to the benefits which would be offered by making an all-way junction. There is currently queuing, which will get worse with the significant development proposed. Effects of development need to be mitigated to stop the junction deteriorating further.			● ● ●
	✓		9. M5 J11 will be under pressure due to development from 2021 onwards.			

When does this issue become critical?			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? 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	Sticky dots (also to be placed on the map as well)
Already is	Before 2021	After 2021				
✓			10. M5 J12 a priority for the City Council. Congestion backs onto the carriageway both northbound and southbound. A safety issue as queuing vehicles may not be noticed by oncoming vehicles.			
			11. M5 J13 a lower priority for the area. Unsure of Stroud's proposals, so not sure when it would become a priority.	Lower priority		
✓			12. A40 west of Gloucester an issue. Approach to the region from the Forest/Hereford. There is a P&R, but no bus lane so doesn't really help vehicles.	The scheme at Elbridge roundabout doesn't take account of the huge developments going on in the area.	There are proposals to detrunk, but the current position of the county is that they don't want to take it on (financial liability).	● ● ●

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8 th 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)	
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

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 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
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	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

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
	Junction 9 where difficult to widen.									
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
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)	

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	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)	
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)	

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	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)	
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

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
				✓	✓					
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)	
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)	

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
General - Local Road Network – Strategic Links General Comments	The SRN network in Northamptonshire is part of a wider network which includes key strategic links which are administered by NCC. NCC has key priorities for improvements to the A509 (Wellingborough to Kettering), A43 (Northampton to Kettering), A45 (Daventry to Northampton) and WEAST rail bridge/Route 4. Also potential future problems on A6116 from growth in Corby. Schemes to improve these routes may assist the operation of the SRN and priority needs to be given to addressing issues relevant to both the HA and NCC.	Capacity/ Operational Society/ Environment Growth	✓	✓	✓	No	NCC Strategic Priorities and Northamptonshire Arc.	NCC to provide information.	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	8

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

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?	<i>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</i> <i>Solution Type (& additional notes)</i> <i>Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i>
<i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<i>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</i>	<i>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</i>	
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.

<p>Description of challenge / Location</p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p>Type of challenge</p> <p>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental</p> <p><i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i></p>	<p>Why is this considered to be a priority?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p>How does this compare to other priorities?</p> <p>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p><i>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</i></p> <p><i>Solution Type (& additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>A45 Junctions in Wellingborough/Rusden area</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Capacity/Operational/ Growth Society/ Environment</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Second A45 priority after Chowns Mill (A6) junction but severance issues a priority in their own right.</p>	<p>Existing PPP scheme at Wilby Way (A509) junction. HA already considering mitigation/improvement schemes at Skew Bridge and Turnells Mill Lane junctions.</p>
<p>A45 Northampton</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Capacity/Operational Growth</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>HA has identified the A45 Northampton Growth Management Strategy (NGMS) to be delivered principally through developer contributions.</p>
<p>A5 Towcester</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Capacity/Operational Society/ Environment</p>	<p>HRE - A5 traffic has severe impacts on Towcester and this issue needs to be given higher priority.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Developer scheme for Towcester southern link road.</p>
<p>A14 Longer Term - fit for purpose issue</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Capacity/Operational</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No discussion at the workshop on possible environmental issues of upgrading the A14 – just support for it to be a high standard route.</p>	<p>A14 Kettering Bypass widening scheme has started.</p>
<p>A14 Lorry Parking issue</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Operational Society/Environment</p>	<p>AL and HRE – Demand for lorry parking is evident on the A14 and something needs to be done to address the issue.</p>	<p>Has been a problem for some time and should be treated as a high priority.</p>	<p>Some developer interest in providing lorry parks but not considered sufficient.</p>
<p>Improving strategic links in the local road network</p> <p>General Comments</p>	<p>Capacity/Operational</p>	<p>Improvements to the local road network can help relieve pressures on the SRN as well as supporting local objectives</p>	<p>High priority for local authorities in the area.</p>	<p>Schemes listed in NCC Cabinet Report 19/06/2013.</p>

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8 th 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 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	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 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, 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 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/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/A421 Black Cat Roundabout Felixstowe to Midlands London to Leeds (East)	The worry is that the signalisation/pinch point investment scheme will only 'buy time' with the projected development in the area. Consensus was that grade separation is required.	Capacity			✓	No	Not discussed	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 A1 to serve Bedford's	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
	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 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 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 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
Overall – Junctions General Comments	HA designs are always set to DMRB standards, whereas a lot of local authorities are using guidance such as the Manual for Streets, as a departure from DMRB standards in order to better serve the communities the junction serve/impact upon.	Society Safety	✓	✓	✓	No	Not discussed	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 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
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:	8 th October 2013	Breakout Group	Red Group
Group Facilitator	Eric Cooper	Note-taker	Tom McNamara		

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

<p>Description of challenge / Location</p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p>Type of challenge</p> <p>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental</p> <p><i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i></p>	<p>Why is this considered to be a priority?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p>How does this compare to other priorities?</p> <p>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p><i>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</i></p> <p><i>Solution Type (& additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p> <p>General Comments</p>	<p>Environment</p>			
<p>Severance for Pedestrian and Cyclists at the A421/A6 junction.</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Social Environment</p>	<p>There is an existing deficit and an opportunity to influence travel behaviour through improvements</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>M1 (managed motorway) – Post accident Operation.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Operational Safety</p>	<p>This is an existing issue.</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Area Wide Freight Management</p> <p>General Comments</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>A5 Hockliffe junction</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Considered 3rd long-term priority. (post 2021)</p>	
<p>M1 Junction 13 – Signage</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Operational Safety</p>	<p>Confusing if you are not familiar with the junction layout. Leads to people travelling in the incorrect lane.</p> <p>Lots of accidents are seen here (anecdotal observations)</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed - however see right</p>	<p>Improve on-road signage. Regarded as a 'quick win' that could be addressed in the short term.</p>
<p>A5 – Around Kensworth</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

Workshop Name	SEM LEP	Date:	8 th 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 which will put pressure on the	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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			<p>growth in this area.</p> <p>Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.</p>		<p>up to 2026.</p> <p>Travel Plan data is available (Dorian Holloway (OU MK))</p> <p>Modelling being carried out.</p>	<p>C)</p> <p>Neil Biggs (Thames Valley)</p>	<p>3 (Jn 13)</p>
M1 Junction 15 and 15a London to Scotland East	<p>Issues with queuing northbound and southbound exits from the M1.</p>	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	<p>Improvements on this route have pushed the problems further down. Delegates felt that the HA need to keep in mind that when making improvements, that changes will also need to be made further along the route.</p>	Capacity/Operational	✓	Yes/No – the potential economic benefit of congestion relief map indicates that the north-eastbound section between M1 J13 and Bedford would have a moderate to high benefit of congestion relief. The peak hour speeds map does not indicate a low traffic speed problem.	No further evidence was discussed.	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 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
				✓	✓					
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/ Towester London to Scotland East Solent to Midlands	A43 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 18 mppa by 2028	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 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 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 which adds pressure.	Capacity/Operational	✓			N/A	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue	None	Neil Biggs (Thames Valley)	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	
					was commonplace.				
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
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	None	All	1

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
							was commonplace.			

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

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?	<i>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</i> <i>Solution Type (& additional notes)</i> <i>Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i>
<i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<i>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</i>	<i>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</i>	
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

<p>Description of challenge / Location</p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p>Type of challenge</p> <p>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental</p> <p><i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i></p>	<p>Why is this considered to be a priority?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p>How does this compare to other priorities?</p> <p>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p><i>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</i></p> <p><i>Solution Type (& additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>A5/A421 Junction – there is no lighting along this route.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Operational/ Safety</p>	<p>There are a number of incidents caused by the lack of lighting.</p>	<p>There was no discussion of trade-offs.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>
<p>A5 & M1</p> <p>Event congestion (MK Stadium)</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Lack of roadside information, e.g. VMS, causes additional congestion problems especially for those travelling in from outside the area.</p>	<p>There was no discussion of trade-offs. Amongst the group, there was an impression that this was a higher priority challenge.</p>	<p>VMS signage and real time information for events at MK.</p> <p>Real time info signs</p>
<p>A43/ A5 Towester Issues</p> <p>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</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Solent to Midlands</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>There are plans for growth around Towester and Silverstone.</p>	<p>There was no discussion of trade-offs.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>A5 Abthorpe Roundabout</p> <p>The Roundabout failed to get pinch point funding; however there are still issues on this roundabout.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Solent to Midlands</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>There are schemes planned to improve Towester but funding has not been agreed</p>	<p>There was no discussion of trade-offs.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8 th 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 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	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 /	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
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 between junctions,	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 relief in this	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)	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
	was also identified.					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.				
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 relief in this	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 /	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
						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:	8 th October 2013	Breakout Group	Blue Group
Group Facilitator	David Abbott	Note-taker	Liz Judson		

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?	<i>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</i> <i>Solution Type (& additional notes)</i> <i>Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i>
<i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<i>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</i>	<i>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</i>	
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.
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.

<p>Description of challenge / Location</p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p>Type of challenge</p> <p>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental</p> <p><i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i></p>	<p>Why is this considered to be a priority?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p>How does this compare to other priorities?</p> <p>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p><i>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</i></p> <p><i>Solution Type (& additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>The M1 links and junctions around Daventry may not have sufficient capacity or be of sufficient quality to support development within Daventry.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>A link road was identified between M1 north and M45 west to ease pressure on the local road network. Solutions at other junctions / links were not discussed.</p>
<p>There was some concern that any improvement schemes that come forward could displace problems to other sections of the network, rather than remove them completely.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>If the existing issues are only shifted to another section of the network then there could still be capacity issues that constrain growth.</p>	<p>This was not discussed in great detail but was raised on more than one occasion when discussing proposed improvements.</p>	<p>Suitable planning procedures need to be utilised to determine the potential wider impacts of improvements on the network.</p>
<p>M1 junctions 13-19 – delegates were concerned about how long the widening along this section would provide sufficient capacity for existing and future traffic.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Although this concern was raised the delegates considered that further improvements at this stage were unlikely and therefore limited discussions took place.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>There are problems entering and leaving the SRN at Northampton due to capacity issues.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Northampton is identified as a significant area for growth and these capacity issues could be constraining this growth.</p>	<p>Due to the growth planned within Northampton this was considered to be a relatively high priority.</p>	<p>Not discussed specifically but linked to the Northampton Growth Management Scheme.</p>

<p>Description of challenge / Location</p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p>Type of challenge</p> <p>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental</p> <p><i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i></p>	<p>Why is this considered to be a priority?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p>How does this compare to other priorities?</p> <p>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p><i>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</i></p> <p><i>Solution Type (& additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>The delegates recognised that there are a number of pinch point funding schemes that were not allocated funding, for various reasons.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>A number of delegates considered that this was an important issue and were keen for previous studies undertaken to be considered.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>M1 corridor – need to remove strategic trips from the network and encourage other modes of transport.</p> <p>London to Scotland East</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>This was considered to be a relatively high priority.</p>	<p>The provision of a strategic park and ride site, potentially at Watford Gap, to shift longer distance car trips to bus or rail.</p>
<p>There are current congestion issues on the A45 south of the A14.</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>This was the subject of a limited discussion in the group; furthermore some delegates thought it was of less concern than others.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>There were concerns that the consultation between the HA and local authorities would not identify local schemes that can be linked to strategic improvements and provide greater benefits than large scale schemes alone.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Limited discussion on this priority took place within the group.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>

<p>Description of challenge / Location</p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p>Type of challenge</p> <p>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environmental</p> <p><i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i></p>	<p>Why is this considered to be a priority?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p>How does this compare to other priorities?</p> <p>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</p> <p><i>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</i></p>	<p><i>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</i></p> <p><i>Solution Type (& additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>There are concerns going forward regarding the proportion of HGVs in the A14 traffic (thought to be up to 25% at certain times of the day).</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational / Safety</p>	<p>The reason for this to be considered a priority is due to how this affects the capacity, average speed and safety of the route.</p>	<p>This was not considered a high priority.</p>	<p>Longer / heavier HGVs or HGV convoys.</p>

Part C Bibliography

C1 Bibliography

C1.1 Chapter 2

Area 2 Asset Management Plan

Area 7 Asset Management Plan

Area 9 Asset Management Plan

South West regional safety report

Midlands regional safety report, April 2012

East Midlands airport Sustainable Development Plan 2013-14,
www.eastmidlandsairport.com/developmentplan

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

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

C1.2 Chapter 3

East Midlands airport Sustainable Development Plan 2013-14,
www.eastmidlandsairport.com/developmentplan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rushcliffe core strategy, publication version march 2012

Bolsover Local Plan Strategy

Chesterfield Borough Council; Adopted Local Plan

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

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

High Peak Local Plan Preferred Options

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

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

North East Derbyshire Local Plan Housing Target

Lichfield Local Plan Strategy

Solihull Local Development Framework

Cannock Chase Local Plan

Tamworth Local Plan

Redditch Draft Local Plan No. 4

Bromsgrove District Plan Submission Version

Wyre Forest Core Strategy

North West Leicestershire Core Strategy with Proposed Changes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

East Staffordshire Borough Council Pre-Submission Local Plan 2013

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

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

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

Stafford New Local Plan Publication document

Central Lincolnshire Core Strategy (up to 2031).

South Kesteven Core Strategy (adopted)

South Worcestershire Local Plan

Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Draft Joint Core Strategy

Kettering Borough Council website

North Northamptonshire AMR 2011/12

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

C1.3 Evidence from stakeholders

A5 Business Engagement Event: group discussion feedback, 22 October 2013

Leicestershire and Coventry and Warwickshire

Evidence Title	Evidence source	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
Headline issues within the EA remit that apply to Highways Development + maps	Environment Agency	<p>-Flood risk is broadly referred to.</p> <p>-It is suggested that the Water Framework Directive and Water Quality is included in HA's list of EIA scoping topics.</p> <p>-Highways construction must not make the waterbody status worse and mitigation should be installed to alleviate pollution risks associated with construction works.</p> <p>-Protection and development of natural fisheries environment is one of EA's key priorities – actions for their protection are set out in the document.</p>	-EA did/do not know where work is being proposed and so did not provide specific details with regards to the SRN.	N/A
Leicestershire County Council: Evidence for the RBS stakeholder event	Leicestershire County Council	<p>-Sets out the transport evidence base for Leicestershire.</p> <p>-Provides an overview of major committed developments in Leicestershire and required associated improvements to the SRN.</p> <p>-Describes and reviews committed improvement schemes to the SRN.</p> <p>-Sets out district wide studies in Leicestershire.</p> <p>-Provides a brief synopsis of LLITM.</p>	-All of the content makes direct reference to the appropriate section of the SRN.	<p>-London to Scotland East</p> <p>- North and East Midlands</p> <p>- South Midlands</p>
Leicestershire County Council: County developments map	Leicestershire County Council	-A map displaying housing developments with more than 100 dwellings and employment development areas across the county. It is colour coded to show applications, appeals, SUE sites known and committed developments.	-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.	<p>-London to Scotland East</p> <p>-North and East Midlands</p> <p>-South Midlands</p>
Leicestershire	Leicestershire	-A map showing	-Congestion levels are	-London to

Evidence Title	Evidence source	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
County Council: Congestion map	County Council	congestion levels in the Leicestershire/Nottingham /Derby areas.	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.	Scotland East -North and East Midlands -South Midlands
Leicestershire County Council: Stress map (2026)	Leicestershire County Council	-A map showing a congestion plan of the county in 2026 shown as a Stress (AADT/CRF)%	-Little data is displayed on the SRN (most is positioned on the LRN).	-London to Scotland East -North and East Midlands -South Midlands
Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan: Preferred Options (Part 1&2)	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	The Local Plan/Core Strategy for the borough, running until 2028. Details anticipated housing and employment development in the borough.	One development, North of Nuneaton in particular is adjacent to the A5. General growth within the borough may have mixed impacts on the SRN.	-Felixstowe to Midlands
Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan: Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	Details infrastructure required to support anticipated development. Background to key connections commuting patterns, and traffic issues and trends.	Nuneaton has submitted A5/A47/B4666 Longshoot / Dodwells junction improvements to LTP3. County council have identified 16 highway-related improvements required if full extent of northern expansion (SHS4) development is completed (3 affecting A5. One further general aspiration affecting M6 J3).	-Felixstowe to Midlands -London to Scotland West
Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan: Proposal Map	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	Detailed map of anticipated developments in the borough, along with proposed infrastructure improvements.	Highlights M6 J 3, and A47 junctions with A5. Highlights housing site SHS4's proximity to A5 (3,000 dwellings). County council have identified 16 highway-related improvements required if full extent of development is completed (3 affecting A5, 1 aspirational).	-Felixstowe to Midlands -London to Scotland West
North Warwickshire Core Strategy: Submission Version	North Warwickshire Borough Council	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

Evidence Title	Evidence source	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Route
North Warwickshire Site Allocations Plan: Preferred Options	North Warwickshire Borough Council	The site allocations plan for North Warwickshire. Used as an evidence base for the Core Strategy, above. Covers Employment, Housing and retail sites.	Details the following development options (that have a potential SRN impact): Employment (any size): -Dordon, 31ha (A5) -Atherstone, 6.9ha (A5) Housing (>200 units): -Atherstone & Mancetter, 600 units (A5) -Polesworth & Dordon, 440 units (A5) -Coleshill, 275 units (A446)	-Felixstowe to Midlands - South Midlands
North Warwickshire [Additional information from email, DB 03/10/13]	North Warwickshire Borough Council	Other potential development sites: -Grendon – appeal for further 85 units. -Atherstone - pre-application for additional 400 units. -Employment sites, especially around M42 Js 9&10.	May impact on SRN if any come to fruition.	-Felixstowe to Midlands
Warwickshire LTP 2011-2026	Warwickshire CC	The third Local Transport Plan for Warwickshire. Has background details on local transport in the county and future key proposals. Details strategy delivery of: congestion, land use and transportation, road safety, highway maintenance, intelligent transport systems. Finally, implementation plan up to 2015.	-Notes absence of long term strategy for A5. Report to be drafted in collaboration with HA. -Details many of the SRN improvements currently being planned by the HA: A5 junctions/improvements, M6 junctions, A46 Stratford-Alcester, M40 J 14, A45 junctions, A46 junctions, A45-A46 underpass. -Quality Bus Corridor along A5 from Altherstone-Tamworth. -Many major developments shown around Rugby, including Radio Tower SUE, Gateway SUE and DIRFT will affect SRN. -Congestion strategy (p159) will impact on SRN directly and indirectly. -No major schemes listed in plan to affect SRN up to 2015.	-Felixstowe to Midlands -London to Scotland West -South Midlands

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

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

D2N2 and Greater Lincolnshire

Evidence title	Evidence source and key contacts	Summary of content	Relevance to the SRN	RBS Routes
Flood maps	Environment Agency	<p>-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)</p>	<p>-The SRN has been highlighted so is easy to see where it comes into contact with a flood zone area etc.</p>	<p>-London to Scotland East</p> <p>-North and East Midlands</p> <p>-South Midlands</p> <p>-London to Leeds (East)</p> <p>-South Pennines (outside of this area)</p>
Headline issues within the EA remit that apply to Highways Development	Environment Agency	<p>-Flood risk is broadly referred to.</p> <p>-It is recommended that the Water Framework Directive and Water Quality is included in HA's list of EIA scoping topics.</p> <p>-Highways construction must not make the waterbody status worse and mitigation should be installed to alleviate pollution risks associated with construction works.</p> <p>-Protection and development of natural fisheries environment is one of EA's key priorities – actions for their protection are set out in the document.</p>	<p>-EA did/do not know where work is being proposed and so have not provided specific details with regards to the SRN.</p>	N/A
Ashfield DC Local Plan Publication Document	Ashfield DC	<p>-Provides a summary of the Local Plan Publication Document (which AECOM provided a</p>	<p>-The summary document makes no reference to the SRN.</p>	<p>- London to Scotland East</p>

Summary Leaflet (August 2013) + Policies Map		<p>response to on 20/09/13).</p> <p>-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.</p> <p>-The map highlights the locations of the policies set out in the summary document.</p>	-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	Nottingham City Council	-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.	<p>- North and East Midlands</p> <p>- London to Leeds East</p>
DCC – URS Trans-Pennine Connectivity Study Final Draft Issue 2 (August 2012)	Jamie Douglas, Representing Andrew Bingham MP	-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	Bassetlaw Council	-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.

© Crown copyright 2014.

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

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 PR158/13

* 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 M130521