

# East of England Route Strategy Evidence Report Technical Annex

April 2014



## Document History

### East of England route-based strategy evidence report technical annex

Highways Agency

This document has been issued and amended as follows:

Version	Date	Description	Author	Approved by
0.0		Draft for internal review		
	4/4/2014	Final	D. Abbott	C. Brookes

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Tables</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>A Stakeholder Event Summary</b>		<b>A-2</b>
A.1 Background		A-2
A.2 Stakeholder submissions following events		A-4
<b>B Accident Location Details</b>		<b>B-1</b>
B.1 Additional Information		B-1
<b>C Route condition</b>		<b>C-1</b>
C.1 Structures: additional information		C-1
C.2 Technology: additional information		C-1
C.3 Environment: additional information		C-1
<b>D Future considerations</b>		<b>D-1</b>
D.1 Economic growth additional Information		D-1
D.2 Future committed schemes additional information		D-3

## Tables

Table A.1 Stakeholder Events Record: Cambridge	A-6
Table A.2 Stakeholder Events Record: Norwich	A-28
Table A.3 Stakeholder Events Record: Chelmsford	A-84
Table A.4 Stakeholder Events Record: Hertfordshire (Hoddesdon)	A-113
Table B.1 Collision Cluster Sites (2009 – 2011 study period, Area 8)	B-1
Table C.1 Structures requiring significant works before 2021	C-1
Table C.2 Summary of current technology provision	C-1
Table C.3 Summary of Noise FPLs	C-2
Table D.1 Housing and economic growth proposals by Local Authority	D-1
Table D.2 Committed SRN enhancement schemes	D-3
Table D.3 Committed local transport network enhancement schemes	D-4



## A Stakeholder Event Summary

### A.1 Background

During September 2013, a Route Based Strategy (RBS) Stakeholder Workshop was held in Cambridge to help identify current and future issues with the Highways Agency's Strategic Road Network (SRN) within the Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough (GCGP) Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) area. The GCGP LEP consists of the counties of Cambridgeshire, Peterborough and Rutland; and the Districts of West Norfolk, North Hertfordshire and Uttlesford (Essex). It includes parts of three of the RBS routes:

The East of England route, containing the A47, A12, A11, A120

The Felixstowe to the Midlands route, which contains the A14, A45, A421 and A428

The London to Leeds (East) route, which comprises of A1, A1 (M) and M11 in this LEP.

A Route Based Strategy (RBS) Stakeholder Workshop was also held in Norwich in September 2013. to help identify current and future issues with the Highways Agency's strategic road network within the New Anglia LEP area. The New Anglia LEP consists of the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk and includes two of the RBS routes:

The majority of the East of England route, which includes the A47, A12, A11, A120; and

Part of the Felixstowe to the Midlands route, which contains the A14

In September 2013, a Route Based Strategy (RBS) Stakeholder Workshop was also held in Chelmsford to help identify current and future issues with the Highways Agency's Strategic Road Network (SRN) within the northern section of the South East LEP area. The South East Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) consists of the counties of Essex, Kent, and East Sussex and the districts of Southend, Thurrock, and Medway. This workshop covered the areas of Essex, Southend, and Thurrock and includes three of the RBS routes:

Part of the East of England route, which includes the A12 and A120;

Part of the London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick route, which contains the M25 and A13; and

Part of the London to Leeds (East) route, which contains the M11.

In October 2013, a Route Based Strategy (RBS) Stakeholder Workshop was held in Hoddesdon, Broxbourne, to help identify current and future challenges related to the Highways Agency's strategic road network within the Hertfordshire LEP area. The Hertfordshire LEP area corresponds with the county of Hertfordshire, incorporating ten planning authorities. The following RBS routes traverse this LEP area:

The A1(M) which runs north-south through the heart of the LEP area forms part of the London to Leeds (East) route, along with the M11 which runs north-south just outside of Hertfordshire, to the east of Bishop's Stortford.

The M25 forms part of the London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick and runs across the southern part of the LEP area, incorporating key junctions including Junction 21 (interchange with the M1) and Junction 23 (interchange with the A1(M)). The A405T forms a link between M1 Junction 6 and M25 Junction 21a and also serves a local distributor road function. The A414T connects the M1 at Junction 7 with the A414 at the Park Street Roundabout, south of St Albans.

The M1 forms part of the London to Scotland East route which runs north-south through the south-western and western parts of the LEP area.

The A120 (part of the East of England route) runs to the east of M11 Junction 8, near Bishop's Stortford. Whilst it is not within the LEP area, the A120 forms a major access route into Hertfordshire from the east including London Stansted Airport and Essex.

Table A.1 lists all the issues raised during the stakeholder events. Comments are collated into common themes, with location specific information ordered generally from south to north.

Table A.1 also records the results of the prioritisation exercises undertaken within the events. These have been used to inform the preparation of the main route based strategy report.

## A.2 Stakeholder submissions following events





**Table A.1 Stakeholder Events Record: Cambridge**

**(a) Cambridge Workshop**

**i) Group A**

Workshop Name	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough LEP	Date:	17 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Yellow (A)
Group Facilitator	Angela Middleton	Note-taker	Simon Willison		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what 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					
A14 Huntingdon to Cambridge <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	The A14 is currently congested and needs to be improved. It is noted that this issue was not voted for since it is already committed as a scheme.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓			Yes	N/A	None	All delegates	0
No specific location <b>General comments</b>	Concern was raised regarding the expansion of residential and employment areas and the emphasis has been placed on designing the transport network primarily to accommodate traffic. Influencing travel behaviour should be tackled at the stage of designing developments and ensuring that walking, cycling or travelling by public transport is attractive and convenient. It was recommended that a network wide NMU audit needed to be undertaken and greater emphasis of NMU needs in the development of new schemes.	Operational / Society / Environment	✓	✓	✓	No	No specific evidence was discussed; however the comments made were understood to be based on the delegates personal experiences as a representative of Sustrans.	The delegate promised to provide a list of current issues and potential issues in his area of responsibility.	Rohan Wilson (Sustrans)	7

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					
No specific location <b>General comments</b>	The delegate expressed the need for more emphasis to be placed on assessing the economic value of certain sections of the SRN in order to determine which sections are the most important and will generate the most value from investment.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.		✓	✓	No	No evidence was discussed.	None	Mike Salter (Cambridge shire County Council)	0
No specific location <b>General comments</b>	The delegate raised the issue with the division of responsibility at junctions where problems regarding operation and safety are both local and strategic, and how these problems should be addressed in a coordinated manner.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓	✓	✓	No	No evidence was discussed.	None	Steve Sillery (Cambridge Airport)	6
A14 J35 Bottisham / Quy Junction and A14 J37 Exning Junction (east of Cambridge) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	The delegate expressed that these junctions could experience congestion and may experience further congestion in the future arising from proposed development in the area.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.			✓	No	No evidence was discussed	None	Sally Bonnet (East Cambridges hire District Council)	4
A428 St Neots – Caxton Gibbet (single lane section) / wider east-west movement issues <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	The single lane section of the A428 between the A1 (near St Neots) and Cambourne, was discussed as a section that needs to be addressed. It is currently single lane and can experience congestion (slow moving queues). Safety / accidents were also identified as an issue that needed to be addressed. The future function of the A428, potentially as an alternative route to the proposed A14 toll road, was discussed, which delegates consider increases the need for improvements to the A428. Its function as an east-west route combined with the A421, and the need to improve these routes (when there is currently very poor public transport alternatives) was raised.	Capacity/Safety/ Operational / Society & Environment	✓	✓		Yes	No evidence was discussed – the problem was well recognised by delegates	None	Mike Salter (Cambridge shire County Council)	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 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					
A14 J33 Milton Interchange, J32 Histon Interchange and A14 mainline section between these two junctions <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Both junctions and the section of the A14 between the junctions can experience severe congestion, which is both a local road and strategic road network issue. Concern was expressed that these junctions were not being addressed as part of the proposed A14 scheme. Congestion at Milton Interchange can result in traffic from A10 north diverting through Soham.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓	✓		Yes	No evidence was discussed – the problem was well recognised by delegates	None	Steve Sillery (Cambridge Airport)	18
A1/A428 Black Cat Roundabout <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	The roundabout can currently experience severe congestion especially during the weekday peak periods. It is a major junction for north-south and east-west movements. A three-layer challenge exists: a) Existing queues / delays b) Development pressures (e.g. around St Neots and Cambourne) c) When A14 is tolled, the A428 will become a more attractive alternative route.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓	✓		Yes	No evidence was discussed – the problem was well recognised by delegates	None	Mike Salter (Cambridge shire County Council)	4
A428 St Neots (south of) – severance and NMU provision <b>East of England</b> <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	NMU provision between the Phoenix Park triangle and the Eaton Socon urban area is currently poor (pedestrians have to cross the A1 southbound offslip). Consideration also needs to be given to improving NMU links along A428 corridor alongside any improvements to the route.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓			No	No evidence was discussed	None	Rohan Wilson (Sustrans)	0
A47 within Fenland area, particularly around Wisbech <b>East of England</b>	The capacity of the A47 through Fenland, including the section around Wisbech, is poor. The route is also important for freight. Accommodating high HGV flows on this route is a key priority. Proposed development in the area is creating pressures, and there is no alternative to the A47, and especially no public transport alternative to the route.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓	✓		No	No evidence was discussed	None	Gill Prangnell Cambridge CoC	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 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					
A47 Hardwick Interchange, King's Lynn <b>East of England</b>	The Hardwick Interchange (King's Lynn) is a major junction and currently experiences congestion which is likely to intensify in future years without intervention.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓	✓		No	No evidence was discussed – the problem was well recognised by delegates	None	Gill Prangell Cambridge CoC	0
A47 Sutton-Wansford section (north of Peterborough) <b>East of England</b>	Poor space provision for NMUs on section of the A47.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓			No	No evidence was discussed	None	Rohan Wilson (Sustrans)	0
A1(M) at Stilton (south of Peterborough) <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Poor access/egress to/from Stilton – the only way currently is via the A1, making the village heavily car dependent. Improved public transport services are required.	Society	✓			No	No evidence was discussed	None	Rohan Wilson (Sustrans)	0
A14 Bar Hill <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Bar Hill is very car-orientated at present. Consideration needs to be given to NMU provision in the vicinity of the A14, especially in relation to the proposed improvements  A more general point was raised regarding cycle crossings at slip roads which are considered to be unsuitable/sub-standard.  A suggestion was made that Bar Hill could benefit from a new Park and Ride facility. Currently there is not a Park and Ride facility serving the A14 (NW) corridor into Cambridge.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓			No	No evidence was discussed	None	Rohan Wilson (Sustrans)  Steve Sillery (Cambridge Airport)	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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
Park and Ride, Cambridge, and their relationship to the operation of the A14 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Work needs to be undertaken to understand the relationship between the Cambridge Park and Rides and the A14 to determine whether the current location, number and capacity of facilities is sufficient to meet future demands – a coordinated approach between the HA, Cambridgeshire County Council and other stakeholders is required.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.			✓	No	No evidence was discussed	None	Steve Sillery (Cambridge Airport)	0
M11 (west of Cambridge – section to/from Stansted) <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	The M11 is currently dual 2-lanes. To accommodate long term growth it is considered that the M11 needs to be widened to dual 3 lanes.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.			✓	No	No evidence was discussed	None	Steve Sillery (Cambridge Airport)	5
A14 east of Milton Interchange (between Junctions 33 and 36) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	The A14 is currently dual 2-lanes. To accommodate long term growth it is considered that this section needs to be widened to dual 3 lanes.	Capacity			✓	No	No evidence was discussed	None	Steve Sillery (Cambridge Airport)	2
Alconbury – proposed development <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	The proposed A14 scheme does not address access by non-car modes to the proposed development.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas			✓	No	No evidence was discussed	None	Rohan Wilson (Sustrans)	0
Network wide – role of new technology <b>General comments</b>	Current VMS information can be poor. Improved and more intelligent technology could substitute physical improvements to the SRN by providing better information to motorists especially in terms of incident management.	Capacity / Operational		✓		No	No evidence was discussed	None	Gill Prangnell Cambridge CoC	5

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

Workshop Name	Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough LEP	Date:	17 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Yellow (A)
Group Facilitator	Angela Middleton	Note-taker	Simon Willison		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
A14 Huntingdon to Cambridge <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a> The A14 is currently congested and needs to be improved.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	It is an existing issue that needs to be addressed. A scheme is already in development.	This is considered to be the highest priority.	A scheme is already in development. Some delegates expressed some reservations with the proposal to toll a section of the improved route.
A14 J33 Milton Interchange, J32 Histon Interchange and A14 mainline section between these two junctions <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a> Both junctions and the section of the A14 between the junctions can experience severe congestion, which is both a local road and strategic road network issue. Concern was expressed that these junctions were not being addressed as part of the proposed A14 scheme.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	These junctions are important to the local economy as they provide access to Cambridge not just for A14 traffic but also for north-south movements, e.g. to/from Ely on the A10.	No trade-offs were discussed. After the proposed improvements to the A14, improvement to these A14 junctions and the section of the A14 between is considered to be a top priority (pre 2021).	No specific solutions were suggested.
Consideration of NMUs, including addressing severance at key junctions – multiple locations (network wide) <b>General comments</b> <a href="#">East of England</a> <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a> <a href="#">London to Leeds (East)</a>	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.	It was considered to be an existing issue and as traffic demand on the SRN is likely to increase, alternative non-motorised modes of transport may become more popular therefore ensuring facilities for NMUs are sufficient is important.	No trade-offs were discussed.	No specific solutions were suggested.

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

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A47 – whole route</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>The route through west Norfolk, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough varies in standard, is heavily used by HGVs and poses risks to safety)</p>	<p>This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.</p>	<p>It is an existing issue which could worsen if not addressed as there is no viable alternative major route (in particular for HGVs) and proposed development in the area, including around Wisbech, is going to increase traffic demand on the route.</p>	<p>No trade-offs were discussed.</p>	<p>Dualling single lane sections</p>
<p>M11 (west of Cambridge – section to/from Stansted)</p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p> <p>The M11 is currently dual 2-lanes. To accommodate long term growth it is considered that the M11 needs to be widened to dual 3 lanes.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>The M11 is important to the Cambridge economy. With the A14 scheme likely to be addressed, the M11 will become a priority.</p>	<p>No trade-offs were discussed however there appeared to be some consensus that other schemes/issues would need to take priority over improvement to the M11, and that improvement to this corridor represented a longer term aspiration.</p>	<p>Widening the dual 2-lane section to dual 3 lanes.</p>
<p>A14 east of Milton Interchange (between Junctions 33 and 36)</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p>The A14 is currently dual 2-lanes. To accommodate long term growth it is considered that this section needs to be widened to dual 3 lanes.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>The A14 is important to the Cambridge economy. With the A14 scheme likely to be addressed, issues may arise on this section to the north-east of Cambridge.</p>	<p>No trade-offs were discussed.</p>	<p>Widening the dual 2-lane section to dual 3 lanes.</p>
<p>A1/A428 Black Cat Roundabout</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p> <p>The roundabout can currently experience severe congestion especially during the weekday peak periods. It is a major junction for north-south and east-west movements.</p>	<p>This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.</p>	<p>The Black Cat Roundabout is a major junction where north-south and east-west movements converge. It is important not only to the economy of the Cambridge sub-region but also to the wider area.</p>	<p>No trade-offs were discussed. The scheme was considered to be a pre-2021 priority</p>	<p>No specific measures discussed.</p>

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

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>Network wide – role of new technology</p> <p><b>General comments</b></p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p> <p>Improved and more intelligent technology could substitute physical improvements to the SRN by providing better information to motorists especially in terms of incident management.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Improved technology could be a more cost effective means of delivering improvement to the operation of the SRN without providing expensive physical works.</p>	<p>No trade-offs were discussed.</p>	<p>No specific measures discussed.</p>



ii) Group B

<b>Workshop Name</b>	GCGP LEP (EoE)	<b>Date:</b>	17/09/13	<b>Breakout Group</b>	Group B (Green)
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	Eric Cooper	<b>Note-taker</b>	Grace Foster		

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					
A14 (Cambridge to Huntingdon), A1 and A47 <b>General comments</b> Felixstowe to Midlands East of England London to Leeds (East)	Improvement of incident reporting: RTC result in traffic diverting through more rural areas, so better comms between HA and LPA.	Operational – advanced knowledge allows changes to traffic flow with temp traffic lights etc	✓			Not shown on HA maps	None mentioned		Bob Tuckwell, Cambridge County Council	12
Black cat roundabout, A1/A421 London to Leeds (East)	Not enough capacity (specifically for vehicles crossing flow of traffic) at rbt means RTC more likely,	Capacity	✓			Evidence of lower peak hour speeds	None mentioned		Mike Stanley, Peterborough MSA (evergreen extra)	2
A47/A1 junction to Sutton East of England	Single lane carriageway causing safety issues – 4 fatalities in the last month	Safety	✓			Evidence of higher collision risks in map	None mentioned		James Harrison, Peterborough City Council	9
A47 King's Lynn to Wisbech East of England	Lack of capacity at major junctions are a barrier to growth – large pockets of growth expected	Capacity		✓		Evidence of lower peak hour speeds	None mentioned		Wendy Otter, Fenland District Council	14

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

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					
A47, Guyhirn to Wisbech <b>East of England</b>	Unsafe road and no diversion alternative, but built on embankment – unsure of solution	Safety		✓		Evidence of higher collision risks in map	None mentioned	Wendy Otter, Fenland District Council	0 (although may have been included with previous point)	
A606/A1 jct (Stamford), and general Stamford bypass (A1) <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Short run off and tight bend – safety worries. Short slip-roads	Safety	✓			Evidence of a higher collision rate	None mentioned	Gary Toogood, Rutland County Council	12	
A1 in Rutland <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Maintenance works create large amounts of congestion, longer lasting pavement?	Asset condition/Operational	✓	✓		Not really, although map does show high % of pavement to be replaced by 2020	None mentioned	Gary Toogood, Rutland County Council	0	
A14/A11 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Regularly congested with HGVs	Operational/Capacity		✓		No – HA maps indicate normal peak hour speeds around these junctions.	None mentioned	Bob Tuckwell, Cambridge County Council	0	
M11 (S) <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	HGV overtaking problems, long rush hours	Capacity. Suggested solution of opening up hard shoulder in peak times.	✓			No – HA maps indicate normal peak hour speeds around these junctions.	None mentioned	Bob Tuckwell, Cambridge County Council	0	
A14 Thrapston to Brampton <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Not to standard, too many at-grade junctions (gaps in central reserve), hazardous for vehicles to cross	Safety	✓			Medium collision risk on map in this location	None mentioned	Bob Tuckwell, Cambridge County Council	3	

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

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					
Rutland, A1/ B668 junction <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	New army development going to significantly increase HGV traffic	Capacity		✓		Not currently indicated in peak hour speed maps, but does not factor in future growth	None mentioned		Gary Toogood, Rutland County Council	0
A1(M)/A1139, jct 17 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	More HGVs expected due to growth – widen the junction	Capacity			✓	Not currently indicated in peak hour speed maps, but does not factor in future growth	None mentioned		James Harrison, Peterborough City Council	2
Waterbeach on A10 (just adjacent to A14) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	15,000 new homes expected	Capacity		✓	✓	Anticipated job and homes growth map shows just half this number	None mentioned		Bob Tuckwell, Cambridge County Council	4
A428 Cambourne to St Neots <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Lack of capacity	Capacity		✓		Evidence of lower peak hour speeds	None mentioned		Bob Tuckwell, Cambridge County Council	8
A47/A15 <b>East of England</b>	Junction improvements required due to growth	Capacity		✓		Evidence of lower peak hour speeds	None mentioned		James Harrison, Peterborough City Council	5

<b>Workshop Name</b>	GCGP LEP (EoE)	<b>Date:</b>	17/09/13	<b>Breakout Group</b>	Group B (Green)
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	Eric Cooper	<b>Note-taker</b>	Grace Foster		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities. Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	
Wisbech junctions (along the A47) <b>East of England</b>	These junctions (approx 5) have regular congestion and will restrict growth in the long term	This is a problem that will only get worse, especially due to expected growth in housing and jobs	Important for many areas in north of east of England 14 dots	Junction improvement works
Wisbech to Guyhirn <b>East of England</b>	Built on an embankment so safety issue when vehicles veer off the road.	Severely restricted capacity, and safety issues	No alternative routes available	Unsure of what most cost effective solution would be – long term scheme.
A14 relief road (Cambs to Huntingdon) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Already proposed and hopefully get approved.	Road at capacity now.	Very important	Solution already designed
A47/A15, junction 20 (Eye) <b>East of England</b>	Currently an at-grade roundabout which is at capacity	Capacity issues	5 dots	Considered a grade-separated roundabout, but would not allow for dwellings' link road
A1/A47 with A47 to Sutton <b>East of England</b> <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Affects A1 journey times, long queues, and A47 is single carriageway there creating a funnel point.	Capacity	9 dots	Widen A47 on approach to dual carriageway to ease problem?
A428 St Neots to Cambourne <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Congestion problems. Lots of growth at St Neots	Must expand capacity to aid growth	8 dots	Lots of barriers to offline improvement (railway, river).
Junction 33 on A14 (Waterbeach) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Lack of capacity, modal shift will be necessary.	Lots of growth expected from new homes, needs improvements.	4 dots	Guided busway suggested
A606/A1 – Stamford <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Grade separated junction with short run in. Problems now, and will only get worse.	No good alternatives for diversions	12 dots	Many engineering constraints to solution – shift whole junction over by 200 yards?

iii) Group C

Workshop Name	New Anglia LEP	Date:	17 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Green (C)
Group Facilitator	David Abbott	Note-taker	Vernon Silson		

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					
A1, A47 Interchange and pinch point <b>East of England</b> London to Leeds (East)	There is set to be significant growth around Peterborough which is going to put pressure onto the A1, A47 interchange which already has safety issues and is nearing the end of its design life	<b>Safety / Asset Condition / Operational</b>		✓		Yes – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows the section to currently experience a moderate to high collision risk  Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is between 75-99% and 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about.			Adrian Cannard GCGP LEP	4
A47 <b>East of England</b>	The A47 is believed to have a general resilience problem. There are currently no major alternatives to the road and it is believed that the road condition is currently detrimental to residents and businesses alike. There is a desire to see the road improved to help ensure future developments are met.	<b>Safety / Asset Condition / Operational</b>	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows the section to currently experience a moderate to high collision risk  Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is between 75-99% and 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about.  Yes – evidence map for ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ shows as			Stuart Bell Huntingdonshire District Council	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 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					
						having moderate benefit.				
A1(M), A14, Alconbury Weston, <a href="#">London to Leeds (East)</a> <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	There is a possibility that there a new multi-modal freight train station will be placed near Alconbury Weston. This will likely affect transport patterns into and around Cambridge and there is a desire to see the plot linked to the Strategic Highways Network.	<b>Capacity</b>		✓		Yes – evidence map for ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ shows as having moderate to highest benefits.			Stuart Bell Huntingdonshire District Council	2
A1(M) Alconbury <a href="#">London to Leeds (East)</a>	Alconbury Enterprise Zone will see an increase in job numbers in the local region and it is believed that the roads need to be improved in order to ensure that businesses locate to the park.	<b>Asset Condition / Operational / Capacity</b>		✓		Yes – evidence map for ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ shows as having the highest benefit.			Stuart Bell Huntingdonshire District Council	0
A10 Retrunking <b>General comment</b>	Desire to see the A10 re-trunked. Since detrunking the road has fallen into disrepair and it is believed that retrunking would increase funding of the road.	<b>Asset Condition / Operational / Capacity</b>	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences		Keith Miles South Cambridgeshire District Council Stuart Bell Huntingdonshire District Council	0
A14 M11 improvements <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	The route between the A14/M11 to Cambridge needs to be improved	<b>Operational</b>	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ shows as having moderate to highest benefits.			Keith Miles South Cambridgeshire District Council	5
A14 <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	Data available on incidents to drivers on A14 is inconsistent	<b>Operational</b>	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences		John Hopkins University of Cambridge	0

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	It was stated that the proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement could exacerbate capacity issues along the unimproved Brampton-Thrapston-Kettering section	Operational	✓				Not Available	John Hopkins University of Cambridge	0	
A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	Upgrade the road to a motorway ('M' Road) to improve investment opportunities	Operational	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences	John Hopkins University of Cambridge	0	
A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	Short-term local interchange improvements. Display more journey certainty on A14/Spittals roundabout. This will help ease congestion and reduce journey times	Operational / Capacity	✓	✓		Yes – evidence map for 'potential economic benefit of congestion relief' shows as having moderate to highest benefits.		Stuart Bell Huntingdonshire District Council	0	
A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	HGV Parking Improvement. Many of the lay-bys along the A14 have trucks parked in them. This reduces the ability for breakdown capacity and is not a nice place for the truck drivers. An example of this is the Barhill residential areas.	Operational / Capacity	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences	Keith Miles South Cambridgeshire District Council	0	
General General comment	Desire to ensure that the design life of any new projects is correct.	Operational		✓	✓		Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences	Adrian Cannard GCGP LEP	0	
Roads around Cambridge General comment	It is believed that transportation planning is generally out of sync with what is actually going on. Roughly 75% of jobs in Cambridge are filled by commuters and there is a desire to see this taken into account when creating future planning	Operational	✓	✓			Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences	John Hopkins University of Cambridge	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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
	acts.									
Roads around Cambridge <b>General comment</b>	There is a desire to see an increase in public transport links and other methods of transport (such as cycling) to Cambridge and the surrounding settlements.	<b>Operational</b>	✓	✓	✓		Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences	Ben Bishop Cambridge City Council	5	
A14 J37 Turners Distribution and service area <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	There is set to be significant growth in Bury St. Edmunds and it will likely put pressure on Turners distribution into Fordham and further affect the slip roads, which are already too short and as a result are hazardous.	<b>Operational / Safety</b>	✓	✓		No – Collision risk is currently moderate to low.		Adrian Cannard GCGP LEP	0	
A14 Bury St. Edmunds <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	There is set to be significant growth in Bury St. Edmunds and there is significant queuing on the A14 which is likely to affect businesses' decisions' on locating to the new park.	<b>Capacity</b>	✓	✓		No – the potential economic benefits of improving congestion in along this stretch of road is low to moderate.		Adrian Cannard GCGP LEP	1	
A14 Bury St. Edmunds <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	There is a desire to improve access for all forms of transport to the proposed Bury St. Edmund's business park.	<b>Capacity</b>		✓			Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences	Adrian Cannard GCGP LEP	2	
A1, A428, A421 St Neots <b>London to Leeds (East)</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	There is a desire to share and coordinate information regarding Black Cat roundabout. The site is believed to be a significant pinch point in the area and to cause a great deal of delays. It is also believed to affect commuters to Cambridge, Cambridgeshire and businesses in general.	<b>Operational / Capacity</b>	✓	✓		Yes – evidence map for 'potential economic benefit of congestion relief' shows as having moderate benefits.		Stuart Bell Huntingdonshire District Council	7	



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					
General <b>General comment</b>	There is a desire to see a shift towards long term planning which incorporates growth as an issue. This should be done to avoid a so called 'sticking plaster' approach to solving issues and a desire to see robust planning and maintenance operations to be put in place.	<b>Operational</b>	✓	✓	✓		Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences		Stuart Bell Huntingdonshire District Council	0
A428 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	There is a desire to see an improvement into the resilience and reliability of the A428 between A1 and A1198	<b>Operational</b>	✓	✓		Yes - Evidence of reduced peak hour speeds.			Stuart Bell Huntingdonshire District Council	8
A1198/A428 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	The roundabout that intersects the two roads is believed to be a source of continued congestion that is affecting the area.  N.B. this could be integrated into the above point.	<b>Operational / Capacity</b>	✓			No – the potential economic benefits of improving congestion in along this stretch of road is low to moderate.  However, there is a high collision risk at and around the interchange			Tumi Hawkins South Cambridgeshire District Council	0
Junction 13/14, M11 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	These two junctions are believed to be acting as a significant bottleneck on traffic throughout the LEP and for vehicles heading towards London. They are also affecting traffic entering the A1303.	<b>Operational / Capacity</b>	✓			Mixed. There is evidence to suggest that the area to the west and north of the interchanges have several issues. Generally the area does need to have its congestion relieved, with the exception of the west of junction 14.			Keith Miles South Cambridgeshire District Council	12
A14 M11 junction <b>London to Leeds (East)</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	The limited movement on the junction is causing heavy traffic to build up along local road networks, such as Histon Road and Huntingdon Road.	<b>Operational / Capacity</b>	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences		John Hopkins University of Cambridge	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	2015-21	After 2021					
Cambridge Area A14 Felixstowe to Midlands General comment	There is a new railway station being constructed near Cambridge science park. It is likely to affect transportation patterns in the city and the region, specifically junction 33 on the A14.	Operational / Capacity		✓			Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences	Ben Bishop Cambridge City Council	2	
Cambridge & LEP, M11 London to Leeds (East)	There is a need for improvements and more robust transportation links to London in general.	Operational	✓	✓	✓		Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences	Ben Bishop Cambridge City Council	4	
M11 London to Leeds (East)	There is a desire to see the roads enhanced between Stansted Airport and Cambridge. The roads are stated to be in disrepair and require additional funding.	Operational	✓			Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about.  Yes – evidence map for 'potential economic benefit of congestion relief' shows as having high benefits.		Stuart Bell Huntingdonshire District Council	2	
M11 London to Leeds (East)	Stansted airport has a new owner who is pushing for substantial growth. The LEP would like to see an increase in road capacity and improvement to the airport to ensure that the growth is capitalised upon.	Operational / Capacity		✓	✓	Yes – evidence map for 'potential economic benefit of congestion relief' shows as having high benefits.		Adrian Cannard GCGP LEP	0	

Workshop Name	New Anglia LEP	Date:	17 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Green (C)
Group Facilitator	David Abbott	Note-taker	Vernon Silson		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes)  Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Junction 13/14, M11 London to Leeds (East)	<b>Operational / Capacity</b>	These two junctions are believed to be a significant bottleneck action on traffic throughout the LEP and for vehicles heading towards London. They are also affecting traffic entering the A1303.  This is affecting local economic growth and is also affecting businesses investment confidence, an issues which was agreed upon by many in the group.	12 votes  This is believed to improve the entire region, not just southern part of the LEP. As a result his was deemed to be of the highest priority.	Not discussed
A428  There is a desire to see an improvement into the resilience and reliability of the A428 between A1 and A1198  Felixstowe to Midlands	<b>Operational</b>	The road is perceived to have fallen into disrepair and to the point where the group believes it is seriously affecting businesses and residents alike. This is a similar issue to the one stated below.	8 votes	It was suggested that a grade separated junction between the A428 and the A1 be built.  It is believed that dualling the A428 would help ease congestion and improve capacity.
A1, A428, A421  St Neots  London to Leeds (East) Felixstowe to Midlands  There is a desire to share and coordinate information regarding the Black Cat roundabout.	<b>Operational / Capacity</b>	The site is believed to be a significant pinch point in the area and to cause a great deal of delays. It is also believed to affect commuters to Cambridge, Cambridgeshire and businesses in general.  This is a similar issue to the one stated above	7 votes	The possibility of smart management systems and greater information integration was discussed as a short term solution. There is also a desire to see all of the 'pinch points' along the road improved in a logical linear order rather than the random fashion that has appeared to have been used.  It is believed that dualling the A428 would help ease congestion and improve capacity.

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes)  Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Roads around Cambridge <b>General comment</b>  There is a desire to see an increase in public transport links and other methods of transport (such as cycling) to Cambridge and the surrounding settlements.	<b>Operational</b>	Cambridge has very little further road development capacity and currently has roughly 75% of its jobs being filled by people not from the city. As a result there is a Desire to increase alternative travel options to that of road vehicles.	5 votes	It was suggested that there could be greater bus links between Cambridge and Huntingdon.
A14 M11 improvements <b>London to Leeds (East)</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>  The route between the A14/M11 to Cambridge needs to be improved.	<b>Operational / Capacity</b>	The route between the A14/M11 to Cambridge needs to be improved. This is similar to several other issues stated by the group, including the one below.	5 votes	Junction 9 was cited as an area that needs significant improvement, and is currently perceived as a pinch point.
Cambridge & LEP, M11 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>  There is a need for improvements and more robust transport links to London in general.	<b>Operational / Capacity</b>	There is a need for improvements and more robust transport links to London in general. This is to improve business links with the capital.	4 votes	Not discussed
A1, A47 Interchange and pinch point <b>East of England</b>  The area is set to be significant growth around Peterborough	<b>Capacity</b>	There is set to be significant growth around Peterborough and this is going to put pressure onto the A1, A47 interchange which already has safety issues and is nearing the end of its design life	4 votes	There is a desire to see all of the ‘pinch points’ along the road improved in a logical linear order rather than the random fashion that has appeared to have been used
A47 <b>East of England</b>  The A47 is believed to have a general resilience problem	<b>Safety / Asset Condition / Operational</b>	There are currently no major alternatives to the A47 and it is believed that the road condition is currently detrimental to residents and businesses alike. There is a desire to see the road improved to help ensure future developments are met.	3 votes	The general consensus from the group is that the road needs to be improved heavily and there is evidence from the HA that states the road is nearing the end of its design life. There is also a desire to put an alternative route in place, however it was not discussed if this should be a trunk road

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?	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 <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes) Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
				<p>or a local road network.</p>
<p>A1(M), A14, A428 Alconbury Weston, <b>London to Leeds (East)</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p><b>Capacity</b></p>	<p>There is a possibility that a new multi-modal freight station will be placed near Alconbury Weston. This will likely affect transport patterns into and around Cambridge and there is a desire to see the plot linked to the strategic Highways network.</p>	<p>2 votes</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>Roads around Cambridge <b>General comment</b></p>	<p><b>Operational</b></p>	<p>It is believed that transportation planning is generally out of sync with what is actually going on. Roughly 75% of jobs in Cambridge are filled by commuters and there is a desire to see this taken into account when creating future planning acts. (similar to previous point)</p>	<p>2 votes</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>Cambridge Area A14 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>General comment</b></p>	<p><b>Operational / Capacity</b></p>	<p>There is a new railway station being constructed near Cambridge science park. It is likely to affect transportation patterns in the city and the region, specifically junction 33 on the A14.</p>	<p>2 votes</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>M11 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b> Stansted airport to GCGP</p>	<p><b>Capacity</b></p>	<p>Stansted airport has a new owner who is pushing for substantial growth. The LEP would like to see an increase in road capacity and improvement to the airport to ensure that the growth is capitalised upon. This is similar to an issue stated later.</p>	<p>2 votes</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes)  Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
A14 Bury St. Edmunds East of England	<b>Capacity</b>	There is a desire to improve access for all forms of transport to the proposed Bury St. Edmund's business park. The business park is set to act as a major employer for residents in both New Anglia and GCGP. Similar to the below issue	2 votes	Not discussed
A14 Bury St. Edmunds East of England	<b>Capacity</b>	There is set to be significant growth in Bury St. Edmunds and there is significant queuing on the A14 which is likely to affect businesses' decisions' on locating to the new park. As the park is set to become a major employment area in the region there is a desire to improve access to the area as much as possible. This is similar to the above issue	1 votes	Not discussed
M11 London to Leeds (East) Stansted airport to GCGP	<b>Capacity</b>	There is a desire to see the roads enhanced between Stansted Airport and Cambridge. The roads are stated to be in disrepair and enquire additional funding. This is similar to a previously stated issue.	1 votes	Not discussed

**Table A.2 Stakeholder Events Record: Norwich**

**(b) Norwich Workshop**

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					
No specific location <b>General comment</b>	Communication and coordination between the Highways Agency and other Stakeholders, including local authorities and developers, can sometimes be poor, and the process of identifying, agreeing and bringing forward mitigation on the Agency's network is complicated and not fully understood by all.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the key challenges.	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Eddie Tyrer (Norfolk Chamber of Commerce)	1
No specific location <b>General comment</b>	There is a lack of certainty about the Highways Agency's commitment towards addressing issues arising on their network which creates uncertainty with developers and local authorities about how to bring forward growth.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be some consensus from delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Eddie Tyrer (Norfolk Chamber of Commerce)	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 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					
No specific location  <b>General comment</b>	There needs to be a greater understanding and transparency regarding delivery mechanisms, and ensuring the most appropriate delivery mechanisms are known when prioritising schemes (the priority assigned to a scheme may be influenced by communication between Stakeholders, knowledge of available funding and mechanisms for delivery of schemes in the appropriate timescales)	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓			No	None	None	Eddie Tyrer (Norfolk Chamber of Commerce)	1
A47 and A11 (concrete sections, including the A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange) <b>East of England</b>	Several delegates cited the poor condition of the A11 and A47 as being a key existing challenge, and raised concern about the Agency's maintenance programme in addressing this widespread problem which require immediate attention. The A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange, and concrete sections of the A11 and A47 were identified as key challenge locations (temporary signs have had to be installed at the Thickthorn Interchange to indicate to motorists the permitted lane movements, to substitute worn	Asset Condition / Operational / Safety	✓			Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is at 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about.	N/A	N/A	Peter Jermany (King's Lynn and W Norfolk Council), Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC), Mike Rigby (local MP Researcher)	8



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					
	away road markings.									
A47 Longwater Interchange <b>East of England</b>	There is an existing lack of capacity at the junction and expected increasing pressure in the future arising from planned growth in the area.	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓		No – The evidence maps, in particular ‘peak hour speeds’, do not highlight this issue (potentially because it is occurring off the mainline carriageway)	Evidence is anecdotal but it is a widely acknowledged challenge that needs to be addressed.	None (studies however have been prepared by NCC to explore options for addressing capacity issues at the junction which may contain relevant evidence)	Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC)	8
A47/A11 Thickthorn Interchange <b>East of England</b>	Existing lack of capacity and expected increasing pressure in the future arising from planned growth in the area.	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓		No – The evidence maps, in particular ‘peak hour speeds’ do not highlight this issue on either the A47 or A11	Evidence is anecdotal but it is a widely acknowledged challenge that needs to be addressed.	None (studies however have been prepared by NCC to explore options for addressing capacity issues at the junction which may contain relevant evidence)	Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC)	12
A47 Easton to Tuddenham <b>East of England</b>	There is existing chronic congestion on the single carriageway section between Easton and the Tuddenham roundabout. There are associated safety issues. Buses which use the A47 between Swaffham and Norwich are getting stuck in the congestion so it is not just car users who are experiencing problems.	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓	✓		No – the evidence map for ‘peak hour speeds’ does not highlight this issue  Yes – the evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows high collision risks on the	Evidence is being compiled in relation to the Local Plan which could be ready in the next few months	Evidence can be provided – Peter Mileham (Breckland Council)	Peter Mileham (Breckland Council)	8

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					
						section in question				

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					
Network Wide <b>East of England</b> Felixstowe to Midlands	Disruption to Public Transport using the Highways Agency's network	Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	✓			No	None	None	Peter Jermany (King's Lynn and W Norfolk Council), Peter Mileham (Breckland Council)	8

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					
A47 King's Lynn bypass junctions – Hardwick (A10/A149), Saddlebow and Pullover (A17) junctions. <b>East of England</b>	Existing congestion issues are already a constraint on growth coming forward.	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓		No – the evidence map for 'peak hour speeds' does not highlight this issue	No additional evidence highlighted	None	Peter Jermany (King's Lynn and W Norfolk Council)	3
A47 Wisbech including the Broad End Road junction and Guyhirn junction (south of Wisbech) <b>East of England</b>	Existing congestion issues as well as accidents occurring	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓	✓		No – evidence map for 'network performance' does not highlight the issue however Wisbech is on the Norfolk/Cambridgeshire border and so the full extent of issues may not be highlighted on the New Anglia map.  Yes – the evidence map for 'safety on the network' shows high collision risks on the section in question	No additional evidence highlighted	None	Peter Jermany (King's Lynn and W Norfolk Council)	6

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					

<p>A47 Vauxhall Roundabout, Great Yarmouth <b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Existing congestion issues, however a challenge in terms of addressing issues at this junction could be that there is no planned growth immediately surrounding the junction which could make funding improvements difficult</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>		<p>No – evidence map for ‘network performance’ does not highlight the issue</p>	<p>No additional evidence highlighted</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC)</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>A11 Thetford Bypass <b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity issues may arise from significant growth expected to take place around Thetford (including the Thetford Sustainable Urban Extension)</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>		<p>✓</p>		<p>No – evidence map for ‘network performance’ does not highlight any existing capacity issues on the Thetford Bypass</p>	<p>No additional evidence highlighted (but evidence associated with the Thetford Sustainable Urban Extension may be relevant)</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Peter Mileham (Breckland Council)</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Network wide <b>East of England</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Poor engagement between the Highways Agency and local communities who reside along parts of the network, in particular on the A47 (between King’s Lynn – Swaffham) and A12 (Lowestoft) on addressing small-scale issues such as vehicle crossovers.</p>	<p>Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC)</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>A11 section to be de-trunked (Elveden) and A12 within Lowestoft <b>East of England</b></p>	<p>HA unable (or unwilling?) to respond effectively to small scale projects such as footway and cycleway provision adjacent to and crossing the network – A11 Elveden section to be de-trunked cited as one example. Needs to be more focus on cyclists’ pedestrians’ needs</p>	<p>This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.</p>	<p>✓</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Anthony Wright (Sustrans)</p>	<p>4</p>

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					
Network wide <b>East of England</b> Felixstowe to Midlands	Recognising that capacity issues may arise on the local road network that could have knock-on consequences on the operation of the strategic road network – would there be scope to use the RBS investment on local roads where such knock-on impacts are recognised?	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.			✓	No	None	None	Ian Lambert (South Norfolk Council)	0
Not location specific <b>East of England</b> Felixstowe to Midlands	Improvements delivered before 2021 could create new pinch points and other challenges after 2021 which are currently unknown.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.			✓	No	None	None	Mike Rigby (local MP Researcher), Ian Lambert (South Norfolk Council)	0
A47 Acle straight <b>East of England</b>	Existing capacity and safety issues need to be addressed	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows the section to currently experience a high collision risk  No – evidence map for ‘network performance’ does not highlight significant issue in terms of congestion.	None	None	Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC)	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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A47 Middleton - East Winch <b>East of England</b>	Existing capacity and safety issues need to be addressed	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows the section to currently experience a moderate to high collision risk  No – evidence map for ‘network performance’ does not highlight significant issue in terms of congestion.	None	None	Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC)	2
A12 Lowestoft <b>East of England</b>	Existing capacity issues need to be addressed	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘peak hour speeds’ shows low average speeds at peak times.  Yes – evidence map for ‘network performance’ shows the highest potential economic benefit from congestion relief.  Yes – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows high collision risks and a top 100 collision location.	None	None	Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC)	0
Not location specific <b>General comment</b>	Who, besides the Highways Agency, will be involved in making the decision on investment?	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.		✓		No	None	None	Eddie Tyrer (Norfolk Chamber of Commerce)	0

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
Not location specific  <b>General comment</b>	In situations where there are incidents or roadworks occurring on the trunk road network which as a consequence require traffic diversions onto the local road network, the local roads are unable to cope with increases in traffic – there needs to be better coordination between the HA and local highway authorities, and consideration needs to be given to the resilience of the local road network in coping in such situations.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas, if it impinges on the delivery of improvements that could address any of the challenges.	✓			No	None	None	Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC), Ian Lambert (South Norfolk Council), Mike Rigby (local MP Researcher)	

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

Workshop Name	New Anglia LEP	Date:	10 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Yellow / Group A
Group Facilitator	Angela Middleton	Note-taker	Simon Willison		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities. Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	
A47/A11 Thickthorn Interchange <b>East of England</b> Existing lack of capacity and expected increasing pressure in the future arising from planned growth in the area.	Capacity / Operational	The general discussion around the table suggested this challenge to be a high priority because it is an existing issue, and with the level of growth planned in the area, without intervention the problem will intensify in the future.	Not discussed directly, however this was considered to be the highest priority (pre-2021) suggesting that there may not be any reasonable trade-offs, with the exception of improving the condition of the existing junction layout which could provide some short term benefit.	Work is already underway to identify solution options
A47/A11 Longwater Interchange <b>East of England</b> Existing lack of capacity and expected increasing pressure in the future arising from planned growth in the area.	Capacity / Operational	The general discussion around the table suggested this challenge to be a high priority because it is an existing issue, and with the level of growth planned in the area, without intervention the problem will intensify in the future.	Not discussed directly, however this was considered to be a highest priority (pre-2021) suggesting that there may not be any reasonable trade-offs.	None discussed
A47 Easton to Tuddenham <b>East of England</b> There is existing chronic congestion on the single carriageway section between Easton and the Tuddenham roundabout. There are associated safety issues. Buses which use the A47 between Swaffham and Norwich are getting stuck in the congestion so it is not just car users who are experiencing problems.	Capacity / Operational	The general discussion around the table suggested this challenge to be a high priority because it is an existing issue, and with the level of growth planned in the area, without intervention the problem will intensify in the future.	Not discussed, but it is a pre-2021 priority	Dualling of the single lane section



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

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A47 Middleton - East Winch</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>Existing capacity and safety issues need to be addressed</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational / Safety</p>	<p>The general discussion around the table suggested this challenge to be a priority because it is an existing issue.</p>	<p>The group considered that addressing this issue may not need to occur until after 2021</p>	<p>Dualling of the single lane section</p>
<p>Network Wide</p> <p><b>East of England</b>  <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p>Disruption to Public Transport using the Highways Agency's network</p>	<p>Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environment</p>	<p>This is considered to be a high priority because it was recognised that the Strategic Road Network is used by non-car users. Bus routes using network, for example the A47, provide vital links between towns and an important means of accessing Norwich. Whilst improvement to the road network is important, consideration needs to be given to the priority given to public transport services.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>No solutions raised.</p>

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

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A47 and A11 (concrete sections, including the A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange)</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>Several delegates cited the poor condition of the A11 and A47 as being a key existing challenge, and raised concern about the Agency's maintenance programme in addressing this widespread problem which require immediate attention. The A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange, and concrete sections of the A11 and A47 were identified as key challenge locations (temporary signs have had to be installed at the Thickthorn Interchange to indicate to motorists the permitted lane movements, to substitute worn away road markings. During the second breakout session, the issue of maintenance was expanded to include drainage (flooding) and poor lighting (especially around King's Lynn)</p>	<p>Asset Condition / Operational / Safety</p>	<p>This is an existing issue that requires immediate attention.</p>	<p>As it is an existing issue, this suggests that should take priority over larger-scale capacity improvements.</p>	<p>Replacement of concrete sections and use of more durable road surface materials for road surfacing and road marking.</p>
<p>A47 Acle straight</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>Existing capacity and safety issues need to be addressed</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational / Safety</p>	<p>This is an existing issue that requires attention.</p>	<p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed after 2021, however preparatory work should commence prior to 2021 (e.g. trialling).</p>	<p>Dualling of the single lane section.</p>

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

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A47 Wisbech including the Broad End Road junction and Guyhirn junction (south of Wisbech)</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>Existing congestion issues as well as accidents occurring</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational / Safety</p>	<p>There are existing issues which could intensify when planned growth comes forward.</p>	<p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2021.</p>	<p>Enlargement of the roundabouts and measures to improve safety</p>
<p>A47 Blofield – North Burlingham</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>There is an existing safety problem with accidents occurring.</p>	<p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2021.</p>	<p>Dualling of the single lane section.</p>
<p>A47 Vauxhall Roundabout, Great Yarmouth</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>Existing congestion issues, however a challenge in terms of addressing issues at this junction could be that there is no planned growth immediately surrounding the junction which could make funding improvements difficult</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>There is an existing congestion issue (intensified by U-turning traffic from nearby supermarket)</p>	<p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2021.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>

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

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A47 King's Lynn bypass junctions – Hardwick (A10/A149), Saddlebow and Pullover (A17) junctions.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>Existing congestion issues are already a constraint on growth coming forward.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>There are existing congestion problems which are likely to intensify in the future with planned growth.</p>	<p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed after 2021.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>A12 Lowestoft</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>Existing capacity issues need to be addressed</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>There are existing congestion problems which are likely to intensify in the future with planned growth.</p>	<p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed after 2021.</p>	<p>A third river crossing</p>

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

<b>Workshop Name</b>	New Anglia LEP (EoE)	<b>Date:</b>	10/09/13	<b>Breakout Group</b>	Group B (blue)
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	Brian Pitkin	<b>Note-taker</b>	Grace Foster		

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					
Lowestoft <b>East of England</b>	Current system cannot support expected growth. Accessibility to London is poor ( 2 hours to get to M25)	Capacity	✓			Yes, trunk road north of Lowestoft sees high delays, and there is no alternative trunk road.	Lowestoft Prospectus	David Cummins to provide economic growth predictions within Lowestoft Prospectus	Desi Reed, Waveney and Suffolk Coastal	3
Acle Straight <b>East of England</b>	High accident rate over long straight length. Dualling it would be a solution to it	Safety	✓			Yes, but not as a 'hotspot' as it is not a junction but people attempting to overtake along the length when drivers are going v fast.	None offered		John Walchester, Broadland District Council	7
Lowestoft <b>East of England</b>	Abnormal loads on vehicles likely to arrive from Lowestoft Port due to expansion of off-shore energy industry.	Capacity.		✓		This sort of information is not included in HA maps	Lowestoft prospectus	David Cummins to provide	D Reed, Waveney and Suffolk Coastal	0
A47 <b>East of England</b>	Economic growth restricted due to capacity of road	Capacity	✓			It is generally shown on peak hour speeds maps due to lower speeds at peak time	Mott Macdonald report produced to show job generation if A47 was improved.	DG to provide. Report was produced for A47 Alliance.	David Glason, Great Yarmouth District Council	0

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

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					
Blofield junction on A47 <b>East of England</b>	Junctions with trunk road do not allow maximum capacity and it is single carriageway at this point.	Capacity	✓			Eastbound traffic has a lower peak hour speed, but west bound seems to be 51-60mph average peak hour speeds (evidence from HA peak speeds map)	None mentioned		D Harrison, A47 Alliance Norfolk County Council	0
Thickthorn on A47/A11 bypass around Norwich <b>East of England</b>	Very congested	Capacity	✓			No, peak hour speeds appear to be 61-70mph according to HA map	Studies exist, but none promised		Jo Deverick, Norwich City Council	10
Longwater junction on A47 bypass around Norwich <b>East of England</b>	Congestion problems at interchange, made worse as they are 'at grade' rfts (AECOM Note – Roundabouts are grade separated from A47). Going to be worsened by developments in Costessey	Capacity	✓	✓		West of junction seems to see lower peak hour speeds but east of junction seems acceptable (61-70mph)	Studies exist, but none promised		J Deverick Norwich City Council	5
River crossing in Lowestoft <b>East of England</b>	An extra one would allow further growth	Society		✓		Location unspecified, unable to comment, although peak hour speeds around Lowestoft are low; another crossing may ease pressure on the existing network (from HA maps)	None discussed		D Harrison, A47 Alliance Norfolk County Council	8

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

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					
Lowestoft <b>East of England</b>	Not enough capacity on roads, so working towards a 15% modal shift, but economic growth would increase road users, so road capacity still needs to increase.	Capacity/society.		✓	✓	Peak hour speeds are very low along the A12 out of Lowestoft, suggesting it is 'at capacity', although economical benefits map highlights the lack of CBA of congestion relief (from HA maps)	Within Waveney Council website shows evidence about modal shift.	No	D Reed, Waveney and Suffolk Coastal D Reed	4
Crossing between Thetford and Thetford forest <b>East of England</b>	Societal – widening a trunk road creates a further 'severance effect' of the community due to difficult crossings	Societal and environmental	✓			Information not displayed on HA maps, although accident rates are high along that stretch of A11 (from HA safety map)	None discussed		Natalie Beal, the Broads Authority	0
Hopton roundabout, A12, Gorleston, <b>East of England</b>	Has just been improved but capacity will be bad in future	Capacity		✓	✓	Yes, area sees 31-40 mph average speeds at peak times. Although data could have been from before the recent improvement works from (HA map)	County information would provide further detail	No	N Beal, The Broads Authority	0
Kings Lynn roundabout on A47/A149/A10 <b>East of England</b>	High accidents, as one side of A47 is dual c'way, then other (after rbt) is single carriageway.	Safety	✓			Junction is a top 250 collision 'hotpot', but stretch of roads on either side sees moderate accident levels (evidence on HA maps)	None discussed		D Harrison, A47 Alliance Norfolk County Council	1

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

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					
A47 at Swaffham <b>East of England</b>	Road swaps between single and dual carriageway a number of times	Safety	✓			Road has moderate to high accident levels (HA maps)		D Reed, Waveney and Suffolk Coastal	16	
A47 Norwich southern bypass <b>East of England</b>	Not very safe due to slip roads, jct with A140 and driving speeds	Safety	✓			Safety rates on stretch of road are relatively low (from HA map), although junctions could provide collision 'hotspots' which just aren't in the top 250.		D Harrison, A47 Alliance Norfolk County Council	0	
A47 at Swaffham <b>East of England</b>	Signing is very confusing, causes congestion for unfamiliar drivers	Operational	✓			Information not displayed in HA maps although accident rates are high along that stretch of A47 (from HA safety map)		D Reed, Waveney and Suffolk Coastal D Reed	0	
Norwich to Dereham route (along A47) <b>East of England</b>	Majority of drivers are alone i.e. no car sharing. This makes congestion worse. Buses are full though, so more buses should be provided.	Society	✓			Information such as number of passengers per vehicle is not shown on HA maps.		N Beal, The Broads Authority	5	
A14 to Lowestoft route <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	No signing of Lowestoft from the A14, only Great Yarmouth. Confuses drivers.	Operational	✓			Information such as road signage is not shown on HA maps.		D Reed, Waveney and Suffolk Coastal D Reed	0	



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

<b>Workshop Name</b>	New Anglia LEP (EoE)	<b>Date:</b>	10/09/13	<b>Breakout Group</b>	Group B (blue)
<b>Group Facilitator</b>	Brian Pitkin	<b>Note-taker</b>	Grace Foster		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities. Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	
Lack of safety arising from changing between dual and single carriageway, most notably along the A47 at Swaffham, and at King's Lynn rbt on A47 <b>East of England</b>	Safety	Not only does this cause congestion, but also safety issues – high links with accidents at points of swapping	16 dots - High priority shown by number of dots	Preferred solution – all dualled (rather than all single)
Longer lasting road surfacing for higher safety and cost efficiency <b>East of England</b>	Asset condition, operational and safety	Because resurfacing roads regularly causes large disruption	Comments were highly supported at the time but received no dots, presumably because this is a general comment towards roads rather than a specific area.	
Acle straight. Many problems caused by this route, including high speeds (due to straight nature of road) and overtaking which lead to a significant number of accidents <b>East of England</b>	Safety, but also capacity	Safety is a priority	8 dots – many accepted as a large problem, would have probably received more dots if an easy solution was in sight, but road runs through the Broads National Park.	Most unsure how to fix the problem, many logistical and environmental constraints.
Modal shift and behavioural change (i.e. car sharing) to decrease number of cars on the roads <b>East of England</b>	Societal challenge to aid capacity	Less CO2 emissions and less requirements of road capacity improvements	9 dots shows general appreciation for the importance of it.	Challenge to be taken on by local councils?
Lowestoft access poor. Economic growth restricted by insufficient infrastructure.	Capacity challenge	Lowestoft needs to be able to grow.	High priority but not for many people (generally only those in the Lowestoft area) –3 dots	Suggestion of trunking.

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

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p><b>East of England</b></p>				
<p>Development of Lowestoft offshore energy industry means that more abnormal roads will come up the roads, so they need to be designed for this.</p> <p>‘General’</p>	<p>Capacity challenge</p>	<p>Allowing Lowestoft to expand economically and remain competitive as a port</p>	<p>Not a particularly high priority – no votes</p>	<p>Widening of roads</p>
<p>A47/A11 junction (Thickthorn) improvements</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Priority junction</p>	<p>10 dots</p>	
<p>A1047/A47 (Longwater)</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Priority junction</p>	<p>5 dots</p>	
<p>A47/A17 (King’s Lynn)</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Priority junction</p>	<p>1 dots (lack of dots could be lack of knowledge, most people on the table were not involved in that area)</p>	
<p>A47/A1042 (Postwick interchange)</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Priority junction</p>	<p>5 dots</p>	
<p>Incomplete Norwich Northern Distributor Route</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Lack of capacity on A47 Norwich Southern Bypass exacerbated by lack of alternative route to the north.</p>	<p>7 dots</p>	<p>Complete the Northern Distributor Road.</p>

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

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>LEP Great Yarmouth to Lowestoft  <b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Must emphasise growth in areas which have the infrastructure to allow it. Unsure of further details</p>	<p>6 dots</p>	
<p><b>Suggestion:</b> tackle roads in order of delays on the roads, as longest delays create more congestion, CO2 emissions and worse air quality and more accidents.  <b>General comment</b></p>	<p>Environment</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Suggested by N Beal, but no dots. She did follow up with an email repeating this point, as it is a sensible suggestion.</p>	<p>Rather than a specific problem, this is just a suggestion of how to prioritise improvements.</p>

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

Workshop Name	New Anglia LEP	Date:	10/09/2013	Breakout Group	Group C
Group Facilitator	Rowena Dyer	Note-taker	Liz Judson		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A14 – Orwell Bridge <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	When the Orwell Bridge is closed all traffic has to re-route through Ipswich, which causes huge problems. Ipswich has resilience issues and the Felixstowe port needs to be protected as it's a key driver in the area. Also some delegates noted that there appear to be accidents westbound on the bridge. Delegates questioned when Orwell Bridge was expected to reach capacity.  Orwell Bridge also has regular maintenance issues and Ipswich takes the brunt of diversions.	Capacity / Operational / Safety / Asset Condition	✓			Partially – there is some evidence of safety issues and poor pavement condition on the bridge.	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.  Peter Grimm indicated that he had evidence to support safety claims.	Peter Grimm to provide evidence regarding safety claims	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC) and Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	5

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

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					
A14 – Junctions around Ipswich <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	All junctions on the A14 around Ipswich are considered to be congested, in particular the A14 / A12 Copdock Interchange	Capacity	✓			There is some evidence of congestion at the A12/ A14 junction and to a lesser extent on other links around Ipswich. Evidence of junction congestion specifically not available	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	Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	3
A14 – Lay-bys and Lorry Parking <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	A number of lay-bys on the A14 are currently sub-standard. There have been fatal collisions where people in lay-bys are not properly protected.  This is also linked with lorry parking. Some sites are full every night, which means some lorries park in lay-bys, exacerbating the problems in lay-bys	Safety / Capacity	✓			No	Evidence of fatalities from Steve Griss at Suffolk Constabulary. Evidence of overcrowding at lorry parking areas is anecdotal.	None	Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	1

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

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					
A14 – Junction with A142 at Newmarket <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	Junction experiences congestion and there are problems due to the lack of a link between the A14 westbound and A11 northbound, which means that traffic making this movement has to route through local villages. Congestion	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	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC) and Magnus Magnusson (Forest Heath DC)	2
A14 junctions in general <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	A key issue was identified that generally junctions along the A14 are overloaded and that queues stretch back to the mainline carriageway. This can cause safety issues due to high speed collisions with stationary cars. It was identified by one delegate that this particularly occurs around Newmarket.	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			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.  Some anecdotal evidence from Steve Griss regarding high speed collisions.	None	Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	0

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

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					
A14 – Junctions 43 & 44 <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	Both junctions observed to be at capacity at peak times.	Capacity	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience.	None	Ian Poole (St Edmundsbury DC)	2
A14 – Junction 45 <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	This junction is considered small and not fit for purpose. The junction needs improving in order to facilitate growth.	Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience.	None	Ian Poole (St Edmundsbury DC)	3
A14 – General Comment <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	The HA traffic officers finish at Newmarket and do not cover the A14 further east. Delegates consider that Norfolk and Suffolk are seen as 'poor relations' as they have no motorways.	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			No	Anecdote came from Steve Griss at Suffolk Constabulary – he observes impacts regularly first hand of the lack of traffic officers (i.e. accidents / breakdowns not being moved quickly, resulting in congestion issues etc).	None	Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	1

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

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					
A14 – General Comment <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	A need for three lanes along the A14 was identified to release congestion, particularly in Ipswich and Bury St Edmunds area.	Capacity	✓			Some but limited on the ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ map	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	Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	0
A14 – General Comment (also applicable to A47 / A11 / A12) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Resurfacing of concrete sections of the road needs to occur – it currently causes noise disturbance	Asset Condition / Society & Environment	✓			Yes in places	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.  It was acknowledged during the engagement that a number of the current concrete road surfaces in the area are reaching the end of their life span.	None	David Sparkes (Mid Suffolk DC)	2
A14 & A12 – Felixstowe <b>East of England</b> – A14 & A12 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> – A14 & A12	The majority of delegates identified the need to maintain the function of Felixstowe port as it is a key economic driver in the area. Therefore the operation of the A14 and A12 needs to be maintained in order to do this.	Operational / Society and Environment	✓	✓	✓	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	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC)	3



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

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					
A14 – Tolling <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Concern was raised that tolling of the A14 could work against Felixstowe port and discourage freight from using the port due to charges.	Operational		✓	✓	No	Evidence of the impact of the potential toll road was not provided, rather the impacts were those perceived by the delegates	None	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC)	0
A12 – Junctions 31 and 32a <b>East of England</b>	Extremely short slip roads and sub-standard, which increases the risk of collisions	Safety	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience.  Some anecdotal evidence from Steve Griss regarding collisions.	None	Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	3
A12 – Bascule Bridge (Lowestoft) <b>East of England</b>	When the bridge is closed this can cause severe congestion issues.	Capacity	✓			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	Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	2

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

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					
A12 – Stratford St Mary <b>East of England</b>	When this section of dual carriageway is closed traffic re-routes via Stratford St Mary.	Capacity	✓			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 (not a trunk road)	Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	0
A12 – General Issue <b>East of England</b>	Trunk road is seen as a barrier to local movements in the area. To the south of Ipswich local traffic needs to be able to cross the trunk road without joining it.	Operational / Severance issues	✓			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	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC)	2
A12 – A120 Braintree to A12 improvements <b>East of England</b>	The link is currently one lane and therefore does not provide a very attractive alternative east-west route through the region to ease the pressure on the A14.	Capacity / Operational	✓			No	There is no evidence to suggest that the provision of additional capacity on the A120 would benefit the A14, rather this was the delegate's perception.	None	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC)	3

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

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					
A47 – Vauxhall Roundabout and Acle Straight <b>East of England</b>	Both locations experiencing congestion problems.	Capacity / Safety	✓			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.  Sian Berry (Campaign for Better Transport) indicated that any solutions need to consider the impact on The Norfolk Broads National Park. She suggested that the footprint of the road should not be increased (dualling) to facilitate overtaking.  Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary) indicated that this needed to be weighed up against the number of people who have lost their lives on the Acle Straight and that dualling may be the best approach.	Peter Grimm presented evidence to Rowena Dyer	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC) and Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	3
A47 – Acle Straight <b>East of England</b>	There is a concern that the increase in offshore wind technology beyond 2021 could have an impact on the Acle Straight.	Capacity / Safety			✓	Some limited evidence	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience.	None	Claire Milton (BIS)	3

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

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					
A11 – Tuddenham Road and Herringswell Road <b>East of England</b>	Significant safety issues at these two junctions as they do not have slip roads onto the A11, only give way junctions. Vehicles have to enter directly onto a 70mph carriageway. Also – cars can turn right at the junctions to cross to the opposite carriageway to travel northbound – no central reservation.	Safety	✓			Some limited evidence	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	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC) and Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	6
A11 – Five Ways junction <b>East of England</b>	Although capacity improvements are planned at this junction some delegates considered that it would still be an issue. Mildenhall development is expected to have an impact on the Five Ways junction. 700 additional dwellings up to 2031.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience. Hope is for grade-separated junction; however Ian Poole (St Edmundsbury DC) suggested that this may not be affordable as previous studies have indicated.	None	Magnus Magnusson (Forest Heath DC)	3
Brandon Bypass <b>East of England</b>	Capacity issues in the Brandon area could be solved by the Brandon Bypass	Capacity	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience. Delegates aware that this is not a trunk road issue but thought it was important to raise as could have an impact on trunk road trips	None	Magnus Magnusson (Forest Heath DC)	2

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

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					
<b>General Comment</b> <b>East of England</b>	<p>Concerns were raised regarding the operation of the whole network due to the lack of alternative routes. In areas where there is a motorway there are alternatives, however there are no motorways in this area. Any road closures therefore have a huge impact on the operation of local roads and villages.</p>	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	Steve Griss (Suffolk Constabulary)	0
<b>General Comment</b> <b>East of England</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	<p>Concerns were raised that in the long term (beyond 2021) improvements to capacity elsewhere, i.e. further west on the A14 and the A11 to the north will filter more traffic through to Suffolk and the south of the A11. This could increase pressure on these sections of the network.</p>	Capacity / Operational			✓	No	Evidence was not provided by the delegates, rather the potential future problems were perceived.	None	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC)	0

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

Workshop Name	New Anglia LEP	Date:	10/09/2013	Breakout Group	Group C
Group Facilitator	Rowena Dyer	Note-taker	Liz Judson		

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities. Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	
A14 – Capacity issues at Ipswich junctions <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Capacity	Affects the economy of Ipswich and the local area.	Not discussed directly – one of the first concerns raised, suggesting a higher level of importance	None discussed
A14 – Orwell Bridge <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Capacity / Safety	When Orwell Bridge is closed this results in a significant number of vehicles being routed through Ipswich, placing extensive pressure on the Ipswich network. This occurs fairly regularly due to maintenance issues on the bridge.	Not discussed.	None discussed
A14 - Capacity through Bury St Edmunds – including problems at junctions 42 – 45 (sub-standard) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Capacity / Safety	There is concern that problems experienced on the mainline and the associated junctions can result in a shift in traffic to the local road network.	Not discussed	None discussed
A14 Lay-bys and lorry parking <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Capacity / Safety	Concern is regarding sub-standard lay-bys and this is considered to be a priority due to the safety issues and accidents caused by the lay-bys. Lay-bys are often used for lorry parking due to limited capacity at designated parking areas.	Not discussed directly but acknowledged that the lorry parking is not under the control of the HA and therefore may be a lower priority than other HA schemes.	None discussed

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp;</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing
Nb. These could be from any of the				

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

groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	<b>Environmental</b>  Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	their views on the priorities. Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
A14 – three lanes <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Capacity / Safety	This is seen as an aspirational priority to relieve capacity issues along the A14 and provide a safer road if there are delays caused by accidents / breakdowns	Not discussed directly but it was acknowledged that this scheme was unlikely to be provided	Three lanes is considered a solution to capacity issues.
Port of Felixstowe <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Capacity / Operational	Need to protect the operation of the A14 and A12 to ensure Felixstowe remains an economic driver.	Not discussed directly although delegates acknowledged that it was an important economic priority in the area.	None discussed
A14 / A142 junction – lack of link between A14 East and the A11 North and therefore have to use the A142 junction and route through local villages. <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Operational	The A14 and A11 are two major routes through the region and the lack of a link road between the two (westbound to northbound and Southbound to eastbound) is considered a significant problem.	Not discussed directly	None discussed
A14 – Traffic Officer Service <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Safety / Operational	This is considered a priority due to impacts on safety and delay that occurs when vehicles are not moved quickly following breakdowns or accidents.	Not discussed directly	None discussed
A120 Braintree – A12 <b>East of England</b>	Capacity	This is considered a priority as it would provide additional east-west capacity in the region and potentially alleviate some pressure on the A14.	Not discussed directly but acknowledged by delegates that this was a lower priority at the engagement as not in the study area.	Capacity improvements – potentially through dualling.
Reduction in traffic and promotion of sustainable travel (region wide) <b>General Comment</b>	Operational / Society & Environment	Considers a longer term view to maintaining the operation of the trunk road network without large infrastructure changes.	Not discussed	None discussed

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  Nb. We are not asking the group to	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
---	--	---	--	---

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

raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Resurfacing of concrete sections of the network (region wide) <b>General Comment</b>	Operational / Society & Environment	Seen as a priority to reduce noise disturbance and acknowledged that many trunk road surfaces in the area are coming to the end of their life span.	Not discussed	None discussed
A47 – Acle Straight, recognised as an area that frequently experiences capacity and safety issues. <b>East of England</b>	Capacity / Safety	This is seen as a priority due to the high levels of traffic through the area and a poor safety record which can result in fatalities	Not discussed but raised as an issue by a number of delegates so potentially of high priority.	Potential for dualling to improve capacity and safety (by removing the need for overtaking vehicles on a one lane section). The need to protect the National Park and water quality was also raised - it was suggested that alternatives to dualling should therefore be considered.
A47 – Thickthorn Interchange <b>East of England</b>	Capacity	This is currently recognised as a junction of high flows, where two key routes in the network meet and which currently experiences congestion issues.	Not discussed	None discussed
A47 – Longwater Interchange <b>East of England</b>	Capacity	It was acknowledged that there are a number of development proposals in the area and that the current junction may need upgrading to support these.	Not discussed	None discussed
A12 – Bascule Bridge – if the bridge is closed this can result in significant congestion issues in the area. <b>East of England</b>	Capacity / Safety / Operational	This was recognised as one of the key problems facing the A12 and had a significant impact on Lowestoft.	Not discussed	The potential for a third river crossing was discussed.
<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.  Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding



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

	as a higher priority than other types	that we can follow up if necessary	are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	capacity / New road / other
A12 – Phase 5 Lowestoft Northern Spine Road <b>East of England</b>	Capacity / Operational	This was considered a priority to remove some vehicles from other overloaded roads in the Lowestoft area.	This was briefly mentioned at the end of the session so potentially considered less of a priority.	None discussed
A12 – Junction 30, 31 and 32a – virtually non-existent slip roads which presents a safety issue.	Safety	This is a priority due to the potential for accidents when vehicles are joining a 70mph carriageway from stationary.	Not discussed	None discussed
Southern section of the A12 can result in severance for local road movements and vulnerable road users	Safety	This was considered a priority due to the impact on local road movements. Also, local movements currently have to use the A12 to cross it and therefore by reducing severance this could reduce trips on the trunk road.	It was acknowledged that the provision of more local road options is a local authority concern rather than the HA.	Provision of more regular local road crossing points.

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

Workshop Name	New Anglia LEP	Date:	10 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Red / D
Group Facilitator	Mark Knight	Note-taker	Vernon Silson		

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					
A12 (Ipswich to Lowestoft) <b>East of England</b> <b>General comment</b>	Desire to re-trunk the road. Since detrunking the road is regarded to have had less funding and generally degraded.	Operational	✓			n/a	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Richard Perkins (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce) Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	10	
A17 <b>General comment</b>	Desire to re-trunk the road. Since detrunking the road is regarded to have had less funding and generally degraded.	Operational	✓			n/a	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Richard Perkins (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce)	0	
A140 <b>General comment</b>	Desire to re-trunk the road. Since detrunking the road is regarded to have had less funding and generally degraded.	Operational	✓			n/a	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Richard Perkins (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce) Marie Finbow (New Anglia LEP)	14	

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

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					
A14 Orwell Bridge <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	Orwell Bridge Congestion and road works	Capacity	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ shows as having moderate economic benefits.		Richard Perkins (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce) Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	8	
A14 Orwell Bridge <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	Lack of capacity on the Orwell bridge. The north of Ipswich is set to see significant growth over the next few years, and will further exacerbate the congestion along the A14. An Ipswich Northern Bypass is required.	Capacity	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ shows as having moderate economic benefits.  Towards a growth plan <a href="http://www.newanglia.co.uk/Assets/Files/Content/New%20Anglia%20Plan%20for%20Growth.pdf">http://www.newanglia.co.uk/Assets/Files/Content/New%20Anglia%20Plan%20for%20Growth.pdf</a>  Northern Distributor road <a href="http://www.newanglia.co.uk/Assets/Files/Content/NDR%20leaflet.pdf">http://www.newanglia.co.uk/Assets/Files/Content/NDR%20leaflet.pdf</a>  A47 – Gateway to growth <a href="http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/NCC118687">http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/NCC118687</a>		Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC) Marie Finbow (New Anglia LEP)	20	
A14 Lack of hard shoulder <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	The lack of hard shoulder is causing congestion issues when cars breakdown. A hard shoulder would help assist breakdown recover and allow a place for the cars to stop when they breakdown	Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ shows as having moderate economic benefits.		Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	4	

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

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					
A14 Toll road proposal – Remove toll <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	It is believed that the toll road would have a negative effect on business. Michael Newsham suggested that the toll road might be accepted if a viable alternative road was built alongside it. However Richard Perkins and Cllr John Hinton both stated that they were entirely against the toll road and cited the case of the M6 toll as an example of why an A14 toll should not go ahead. Most of the table seemed in agreement.	Society & Environment		✓		No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC) Richard Perkins (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce) Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	2	
A14 & A12 Smart Technology and electronic signs <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>East of England</b>	The managed traffic system is believed to have been positioned poorly. Complaints included signs stating heavy congestion being placed after the driver is able to leave the road to find an alternative route.	Operational	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	1	
Nacton (J57) to Copdock Interchange (J55) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>East of England</b> <b>General comment</b>	There is heavy congestion along these roads affecting Ipswich, Felixstowe and Suffolk Coastal. It was stated that improvements to the interchanges were needed as well as the local roads surrounding the area. It is believed that this can only be achieved by improving communication between the Highways Agency and local councils.	Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational	✓			Yes – evidence map for 'potential economic benefit of congestion relief' shows as having moderate and high economic benefits.		Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	5	

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

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					
A12 Junctions 30-32 <b>East of England</b>	The junctions from Copdock Mill heading into Essex (Junctions 30, 31 & 32) have been poorly maintained and designed. The slip roads are stated as being too short to reach the required speed to join the A12. This has resulted in accidents	Safety	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows the section to currently experience a moderate to high collision risk		Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	5	
Connectivity to South East LEP improvement <b>General comment</b>	A large amount of business is conducted in the SELEP and it is believed that general connectivity needs to be improved.	Capacity /Operational	✓			n/a	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	1	
A120 <b>East of England</b>	Large parts of road are single carriageway and it is believed that this is causing congestion, which in turn is negatively affecting businesses. There is a strong desire to upgrade the single carriageway from the A12 junction on wards.	Capacity	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ shows as having high and highest economic benefits.		Sarah Collins (Suffolk University) Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	5	
A14 Improve resilience and reliability <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	There is a general consensus that the A14 has fallen into significant disrepair and requires significant investment in maintenance and development.	Asset Condition	✓			Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is between 75-99% and 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about.		Richard Perkins (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce)	10	

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

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					
Sizewell Route Analysis <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>General comment</b>	Improving links to Sizewell. This will help local business and education, particularly the engineering sector.	Capacity / Operational	✓			n/a	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Sarah Collins (Suffolk University)	1	
Thetford & Fiveways Roundabout design and congestion <b>East of England</b>	This area is causing significant congestion issues. The scheme to upgrade the A11 does not include much work to the terminal roundabouts. The designs of the roundabouts are believed to be unsafe and cause collisions	Capacity	✓			Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is between 75-99% and 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about.  Yes – the evidence map for 'safety in the network' shows high collision risks on the section in question  Yes – evidence map for 'potential economic benefit of congestion relief' shows as having high and highest economic benefits		Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	1	
Great Yarmouth/Lowestoft growth hub <b>East of England</b>	There is significant growth planned in the region and it is believed that improvements to the road network are required to help improve economic competitiveness. The environmental impact of noise from roads has also been raised as an issue.	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes - the pavement condition, evidence map for 'safety in the network, potential economic benefit of congestion relief, and average speed at peak times maps all show this section of road to be in poor or bad condition		Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	3	

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

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					
Great Yarmouth/ Lowestoft development for offshore wind farm <b>East of England</b>	The area is set to see a large wind farm come into operation. Once this happens there will be a significant increase in the amount of traffic to and from the wind farm, due to an increase in businesses supporting the industry. It is believed that the road capacity improvements are required.	Capacity / Operational		✓		Yes – evidence map for ‘potential economic benefit of congestion relief’ shows as having high and highest economic benefits		Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	2	
Single carriageway at North Burlingham & Acle straight (A47) <b>East of England</b>	The road is believed to be a major constraint on the economic growth of Norwich, Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft. Dualling the road will reduce congestion and improve the economic competitiveness of the area.	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes - the pavement condition, evidence map for ‘safety n the network, potential economic benefit of congestion relief, and average speed at peak times maps all show this section of road to be in poor condition		Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	2	
A47/ A1042 Postwick Hub <b>East of England</b>	It was stated that the roads around the proposed business hub should be improved as they are currently heavily congested and relatively dangerous. It is believed that this could affect the business hub once it has finished being constructed.	Capacity		✓		Yes - Evidence shows moderate economic benefit to the improvement of the roads. Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about. Yes – the evidence map for ‘safety in the network’ shows high collision risks on the section in question		Richard Perkins (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce)		

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

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					
A11/ A47 Thickthorn Roundabout Congestion <b>East of England</b>	There were suggestions that the Thickthorn Interchange had severe congestion and was affecting local enterprises around Norwich	Capacity	✓			No – evidence map for ‘network performance’ does not highlight significant issue in terms of congestion.		Richard Perkins (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce)		
A47 Single Carriage Way Congestion. <b>East of England</b>	This is the same point as the Dualling of Burlingham issue.	Capacity	✓			Yes - the pavement condition, evidence map for ‘safety n the network, potential economic benefit of congestion relief, and average speed at peak times maps all show this section of road to be in poor condition		Marie Finbow (New Anglia LEP)		
A47 Single carriageway from Honingham towards Dereham <b>East of England</b>	This stretch of the A47 is believed to have high congestion and is affecting an important economic artery between Norfolk and King’s Lynn	Capacity	✓			Yes - Evidence shows moderate economic benefit to the improvement of the roads.  Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about.  Yes – the evidence map for ‘safety in the network’ shows high collision risks on the section in question		Marie Finbow (New Anglia LEP)		



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

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					
Lack of Improved Traffic Links To Cambridge <b>East of England</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>General comment</b>	A large number of residents travel to Cambridge and Cambridgeshire. Cambridge international airport is set to increase in size and it is believed that an improvement in links will help improve the economy in the region.	Society & Environment		✓		No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	1	
Improve Travel time on all routes <b>General comment</b>	There was a general consensus that travel times need to be improved on all routes.	Operational	✓			No – the evidence states that average speeds at peak times are generally good. There are some exceptions such the area between Fiveways roundabout and Thetford (where there is a Scheme to improve the route), but generally the travel time is good.		Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	1	
Dereham Interchange <b>East of England</b>	It was stated that Dereham interchange has fallen into disrepair and is starting to affect congestion times.	Capacity/ Asset Condition	✓			No – the evidence states that average speeds at peak times are generally good.  Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about.		Marie Finbow (New Anglia LEP)	0	
Norwich Growth Hub	It is believed that the road capacity is insufficient to accommodate the future growth.	Capacity		✓		No – the evidence states that average speeds at peak times are generally good.		Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	0	

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

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					
<b>East of England</b>										
A14 Haughley Bends – Reinstated substandard slips <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	It is believed that the slip roads on the A14 near Haughley are dangerous and causing collisions.	Safety	✓			Yes – the evidence map for ‘safety in the network’ shows moderate collision risks on the section in question			Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	0
Ipswich Growth Hub <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	It is believed that the roads around Ipswich do not have the capacity nor are they in a good enough condition to accommodate the planned future growth.	Capacity/ Asset Condition		✓		No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.		Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	0

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

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					
Improve Travel time on all routes <b>General comment</b>	There was a general consensus that travel times need to be improved on all routes.	Operational	✓			No – the evidence states that average speeds at peak times are generally good. There are some exceptions such the area between Fiveways roundabout and Thetford (where there is a Scheme to improve the route), but generally the travel time is good.		Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	1	
Dereham Interchange <b>East of England</b>	It was stated that Dereham interchange has fallen into disrepair and is starting to affect congestion times.	Capacity/ Asset Condition	✓			No – the evidence states that average speeds at peak times are generally good.  Yes - the pavement condition map highlights where the proportion of flexible pavement surface reaching the end of its design life by 2020 is 100%, which appears to tally with the sections that delegates had raised concern about.		Marie Finbow (New Anglia LEP)	0	
Norwich Growth Hub <b>East of England</b>	It is believed that the road capacity is insufficient to accommodate the future growth.	Capacity		✓		No – the evidence states that average speeds at peak times are generally good.		Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	0	
A14 Haughley Bends – Reinstated substandard slips <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	It is believed that the slip roads on the A14 near Haughley are dangerous and causing collisions.	Safety	✓			Yes – the evidence map for ‘safety in the network’ shows moderate collision risks on the section in question		Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	0	

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

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					
Ipswich Growth Hub <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	It is believed that the roads around Ipswich do not have the capacity nor are they in a good enough condition to accommodate the planned future growth.	Capacity/ Asset Condition		✓		No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Michael Newsham (Ipswich BC)	0	
A12 Leiston to Lowestoft – region is set to grow <b>General comment</b>	The region is believed to have insufficient capacity and in too bad a condition to accommodate future growth.	Capacity/ Asset Condition		✓		n/a	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.  Region is not near a trunk road	Carolyn Barnes (Suffolk Coastal DC)	0	
Cambridge Growth Hub <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	This area is set to grow and it is believed that a large number of New Anglia residents will be travelling to this area. It is believed the capacity is insufficient to meet the future demand.	Capacity		✓		No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	0	
Haverhill growth constrained by Transport links. <b>General comment</b>	Haverhill's growth is hampered by the lack of good transport links to the area.	Operational	✓			n/a	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.  Region is not near a trunk road	Marie Finbow (New Anglia LEP)	0	

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

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					
Sign posting is insufficient between A14 to Felixstowe <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	The signing in this region is believed to be causing confusion and causing delays for haul trucks and seen as generally increasing confusion, road congestion and negatively affecting businesses	Operational	✓			No	Evidence is generally anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace. However there is evidence that there is a high collision occurrence rate in the area.	Paul Davey (Port of Felixstowe)	0	

Workshop Name	New Anglia LEP	Date:	10 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Red / D
Group Facilitator	Mark Knight	Note-taker	Vernon Silson		

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>Congestion on Orwell Bridge leading to demand for an Ipswich northern bypass.</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operations</p>	<p>To help relieve traffic congestion along the Orwell bridge. The north of Ipswich is also set to see significant growth over the next few years, and will further exacerbate the congestion along the A14.</p> <p>To help future proof the area as north Ipswich is set to grow heavily over the next few years as is Felixstowe and Colchester. It is also believed that the scheme would help reduce the number of collisions that occur heading towards Felixstowe.</p>	<p>20 votes</p> <p>The economic benefits of this were openly discussed and it was believed that the scheme would help improve both trunk roads and local roads. This was agreed by the representatives from Suffolk Coastal DC, Ipswich BC, Felixstowe, Suffolk CoC, New Anglia Enterprise Partnership, Councillor for Babergh DC, Haven Gateway Partnership, and UCS</p> <p>This is considered to be the highest priority and should be implemented ASAP.</p>	<p>A short term solution was suggested where a highways patrolman was placed on site to permanently monitor the bridge. That way when a vehicle breakdown on the bridge a situation can be improved immediately.</p> <p>Ideally a new relief road running around the north of Ipswich should be built. This is believed to provide the best solution.</p>
<p>A140</p> <p><b>General comment</b></p> <p>The potential of re-trunking the road. Since detrunking the road is regarded to have had less funding and generally degraded.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operations</p>	<p>Since the roads were detrunked they have fallen into a state of disrepair and have not been able to have the required upgrades. This is believed to be due to the councils not being able to co-ordinate their plans along with a general lack of funding from central government. Re-trunking the roads will help improve the economic competitiveness of the region and will help improve links between the three largest cities in the LEP.</p>	<p>14 votes</p> <p>This is believed to improve the entire region. As a result there was unanimous consensus amongst the group members that this should be a high priority.</p> <p>This is considered to be a high priority and should be implemented ASAP.</p>	<p>The only viable alternative was if central government improved road funding to the LEP. The group strongly recommended and desired the road be re-trunked.</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A12</p> <p><b>General comment</b></p> <p>The potential of re-trunking the road. Since detrunking the road is regarded to have had less funding and generally degraded.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operations</p>	<p>Since the roads were detrunked they have fallen into a state of disrepair and have not been able to have the required upgrades. This is believed to be due to the councils not being able to co-ordinate their plans along with a general lack of funding from central government. Re-trunking the roads will help improve the economic competitiveness of the region and will help improve links between the three largest cities in the LEP.</p>	<p>10 votes</p> <p>This is believed to improve the entire region. As a result there was unanimous consensus amongst the group members that this should be a high priority</p> <p>This is considered to be a high priority and should be implemented ASAP.</p>	<p>The only viable alternative was if central government improved road funding to the LEP. The group strongly recommended and desired the road be re-trunked.</p>
<p>A14 Improve resilience and reliability</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p>There is a general consensus that the A14 has fallen into significant disrepair and requires significant investment in maintenance and development.</p>	<p>Asset Condition / Operations</p>	<p>The A14 has fallen into disrepair and many of the group members have stated it is negatively affecting local businesses and residence, pot hole damage to vehicles is seen as relatively high. Road condition has been cited as a reason some businesses have chosen not to use Felixstowe port.</p>	<p>10 votes</p> <p>This is believed to improve the entire region. As a result there was unanimous consensus amongst the group members that this should be a priority.</p> <p>This is considered to be a high priority and should be implemented ASAP.</p>	<p>Highway Patrols should be reinstated on the road to help alleviate and aid with breakdowns and other issues that arise.</p> <p>A toll road could improve the area, however this scheme was generally seen as a very negative alternative and there was no desire to see this alternative come to light.</p>
<p>A14</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p>Orwell Bridge Congestion and road works</p>	<p>Operations / Capacity</p>	<p>Orwell Bridge is seen as being a significant bottleneck around Ipswich. The road is the main artery to Felixstowe Port and the congestion is seen as hampering local business.</p>	<p>8 votes</p> <p>This was generally received well as it was similar to the Ipswich northern bypass issue. However it is perceived as only being a short term solution and a relief road would be preferred, hence why it has received fewer votes than then previous comment.</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>A short term solution was suggested where a highways patrolman was placed on site to permanently monitor the bridge. That way when a vehicle breakdown on the bridge a situation can be improved immediately.</p> <p>Junction improvement would possible also help.</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A120</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>Large parts of road are single carriageway and it is believed that this is negatively affecting congestion, which in turn is affecting businesses. There is a strong desire to upgrade the single carriageway from the A12 junction onwards</p>	<p>Asset Condition / Operations</p>	<p>The congestion is having a negative effect on commuters travelling to Ipswich and there is a desire to see the road improved and have the single carriageway transformed into a dual carriageway.</p> <p>Sarah Collins has stated that the congestion is causing problems for the university and that both staff and students have left the university citing the long commute time as the reason.</p>	<p>5 votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Widening the roads would help improve the capacity and reduce commuter times. No other alternative was discussed. This subject will likely be brought up again in the Chelmsford workshop.</p>
<p>Nacton (J57) to Copdock Interchange (J55)</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p><b>General comment</b></p> <p>There is heavy congestion along these roads affecting Ipswich, Felixstowe and Suffolk Coastal. It was stated that improvements to the interchanges were needed as well as the local roads surrounding the area. It is believed that this can only be achieved by improving communication between the Highways Agency and local councils.</p>	<p>Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational</p>	<p>This follows the same lines as the Orwell bridge Improvements and the Ipswich Northern Bypass improvements. However the other two options appeared to be desired more.</p>	<p>5 votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>A short term solution was suggested where a highways patrolman was placed on site to permanently monitor the bridge. That way when a vehicle breakdown on the bridge a situation can be improved immediately.</p> <p>Junction improvement would possible also help.</p>



<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A12 Roundabout and Junction access</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>The junctions from Copdock Mill heading into Essex have been poorly maintained and designed. The slip roads are stated as being too short to reach the required speed to join the A12. This has resulted in accidents</p>	<p>Asset Condition / Health &amp; Safety</p>	<p>This has been raised as a health and safety issue as it is difficult to reach the required speed to join the A road, resulting in collisions.</p>	<p>5 votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>A14 Improve resilience and reliability</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p>The lack of hard shoulder is causing congestion issues.</p>	<p>Capacity / Asset Condition</p>	<p>The congestion on the road is affecting businesses and residents. A hard shoulder would help assist breakdown recover and allow a place for the cars to stop when they breakdown</p>	<p>4 votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Place a hard shoulder along the road.</p>
<p>Thickthorn Roundabout Congestion</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>There were suggestions that the Thickthorn Interchange had severe congestion and was affecting local enterprises around Norwich.</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>There was not much discussion about this, nor was there evidence to support this statement in the maps.</p>	<p>4 votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>Great Yarmouth/Lowestoft growth hub  <b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Asset Condition</p>	<p>There is significant growth planned in the region and it is believed that improvements to the road network are required to help improve economic competitiveness. The environmental impact of noise from roads has also been raised as an issue.</p> <p>There is evidence to support the need for the roads to be improved as they are nearing the end of their life cycle.</p>	<p>3 votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>A14 Toll road proposal – Remove toll  <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p>It is believed that the toll road would have a negative effect on business</p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>Michael Newsham suggested that the toll road might be accepted if a viable alternative road was built alongside it. However Richard Perkins and Cllr John Hinton both stated that they were entirely against the toll road and cited the case of the M6 toll as an example of why an A14 toll should not go ahead. Most of the group was in agreement.</p>	<p>2 votes</p> <p>As this project is only in the pre-planning stage it is not seen as an immediate priority and is believed that the proposal will be rejected.</p>	<p>Improving the road network would be a much more preferable solution to building a new toll road that is perceived as an additional hidden tax on Suffolk businesses and residents.</p>
<p>Great Yarmouth/ Lowestoft development for offshore wind farm  <b>East of England</b></p> <p>It is believed that the road capacity improvements are required due to future development</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Cllr John Hinton stated that the area is set to see a large wind farm come into operation and will likely see an increase in local businesses being set up to support the development</p>	<p>2 votes</p> <p>This was deemed to be a relatively low priority.</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed after 2015.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>Dualling of Blofield to North Burlingham / Acle straight (A47)</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Asset Condition / Capacity</p>	<p>The road is believed to be a major constraint on the economic growth of Norwich, Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft. Dualling the road will reduce congestion and improve the economic competitiveness of the area.</p> <p>There is evidence to support this statement</p>	<p>2 votes</p> <p>This was deemed to be a relatively low priority. Likely due to the location of the road and the majority of the group members and their affiliate organisations not being directly affected by the road. However this topic is very similar to that of the A47 Single Carriage Way Congestion below.</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed ASAP</p>	<p>Discussed briefly, and suggested the road condition be improved and possible dualled.</p>
<p>Postwick Hub</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>The roads around the proposed business hub should be improved as they are currently heavily congested and relatively dangerous</p>	<p>Asset Condition / Health &amp; Safety</p>	<p>There is evidence to support this statement. It is believed that the road conditions should be improved as its current condition is likely to dissuade business to locate to the hub.</p>	<p>2 votes</p> <p>This was deemed to be a relatively low priority. Likely due to the location of the road and the majority of the group members and their affiliate organisations not being directly affected by the road.</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed after 2015.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A47 Single Carriageway between Easton and Tuddenham.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Asset Condition / Capacity</p>	<p>This topic is very similar to that of the dualling of the A47 Blofield to North Burlingham and should be considered as the same topic.</p> <p>The road is believed to be a major constraint on the economic growth of Norwich, Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft. Dualling the road will reduce congestion and improve the economic competitiveness of the area</p>	<p>2 votes</p> <p>This was deemed to be a relatively low priority. Likely due to the location of the road and the majority of the group members and their affiliate organisations not being directly affected by the road. However this topic is very similar to that of the dualling of the A47 Blofield to North Burlingham above.</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed ASAP</p>	<p>Discussed briefly, and suggested the road condition be improved and possible dualled.</p>
<p>A14 &amp; A12 Smart Technology and electronic signs</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p>The managed traffic system is believed to have been positioned poorly</p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>Complaints included signs stating heavy congestion on the road after the driver is able to leave the road to find an alternative route.</p>	<p>1 vote</p> <p>This was deemed to be a low priority. The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed ASAP</p>	<p>Move the position of the electronic signs to more appropriate positions.</p>
<p>Connectivity to South East LEP improvement</p> <p><b>General comment</b></p>	<p>Capacity /Operational</p>	<p>A large amount of business is conducted in the SELEP and it is believed that general connectivity needs to be improved.</p>	<p>1 vote</p> <p>This was deemed to be a low priority. This was raised by Ipswich BC, but is also likely to affect Felixstowe to Midlands East of England.</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed ASAP</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>Sizewell Route Analysis</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p><b>General comment</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>It is believed that the routes to Sizewell will help the area economically and intellectually. The decommissioning and construction of the nuclear plants are large projects and the local area could capitalise on them. For this reason it is believed that the general road links to the site should be improved</p>	<p>1 vote</p> <p>This was deemed to be a low priority</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed ASAP</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>Thetford and Fiveways Roundabout design and congestion</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>This area is causing significant congestion issues and the designs of the schemes are believed to be unsafe and cause collisions. There is evidence to support this.</p>	<p>1 vote</p> <p>This was deemed to be a relatively low priority. Likely due to the location of the road and the majority of the group members and their affiliate organisations not being directly affected by the road.</p> <p>The low votes could also be due to the fact that the improvement scheme is under construction, however the terminal roundabouts are not being improved and this could cause problems in the future.</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed ASAP</p>	<p>Improve the road conditions and alter the designs of the junctions.</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A47 single carriageway between Honingham and Dereham</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>This stretch of the A47 is believed to have high congestion and is affecting an important economic artery between Norfolk and King's Lynn. There is evidence to support this.</p>	<p>1 vote</p> <p>This was deemed to be a relatively low priority. Likely due to the location of the road and the majority of the group members and their affiliate organisations not being directly affected by the road.</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed ASAP</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>Improve Traffic Links To Cambridge</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p><b>General comment</b></p>	<p>Society &amp; Environment</p>	<p>A large number of residents travel to Cambridge and Cambridgeshire. Cambridge international airport is set to increase in size and it is believed that an improvement in links will help improve the economy in the region.</p>	<p>1 vote</p> <p>This was deemed to be a low priority</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed ASAP</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>Improve travel time on all routes</p> <p><b>General comment</b></p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>There was general consensus that the routes in the LEP had long travel times due to high congestion levels, however the evidence presented by the HA contradicted this statement.</p>	<p>1 vote</p> <p>This was deemed to be a low priority. Likely due to the proposal being too vague and over too large an area.</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a priority to be addressed ASAP</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

**Table A.3 Stakeholder Events Record: Chelmsford**

**(c) Chelmsford Workshop**

Workshop Name	South East LEP	Date:	25 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Green
Group Facilitator	David Abbot	Note-taker	Vernon Silson		

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					
Jct 7 M11 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	The junction is believed to be acting as a significant bottleneck to people accessing Harlow and has also been seen as a reason why proposed developments have been rejected.  Epping Forest Council are keen to see this junction improved as they plan on creating major developments near Harlow	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘Vehicle Hours Delay’ shows as having moderate to high delays.	Evidence will also be supplied by Harlow Council. A report by AECOM will be published before the end of the month.	Paul McBride - Harlow Council John Rowley - Epping Forest District Council	16 (split with M11 Jct 8)	
A12 <b>East of England</b>	Roughly 90% of the population in Maldon use roads due to lack of alternative transport. This has caused the population to use the roads a significant amount. There is a desire to see Jcts 17, 18, and 19 improved.	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘Vehicle Hours Delay’ shows as having moderate to high delays.		Gary Sung - Maldon District Council	0	

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A12, A414 <b>East of England</b>	Junction 18 on the A12 is causing problems with people trying to get on to and off of the A414. Desire to see it improved	Operational	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Gary Sung - Maldon District Council	2	
A12/M11 jct 28 <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b> <b>East of England</b>	The capacity and general delay at this junction is seen as causing significant problems regarding the growth of the region. There is a high desire to see this area improved	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes – evidence map for 'Vehicle Hours Delay' shows as having moderate to high delays.	Essex CC is due to publish a report on the A12 in October.	Gary Sung - Maldon District Council	0	
A132 <b>General comment</b>	C2C train service is already at maximum capacity and network rail does not want to increase the capacity currently. This will cause problems on the A132 (not a trunk road), which could have a knock-on effect on other roads.	Capacity	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace. However the distance of the A132 from any of the SRN is so great that it is unlikely to be an issue to the HA	Gary Sung - Maldon District Council	0	
Beaulieu Park, Jct 19, A12 <b>East of England</b>	It is believed that Beaulieu Park development will increase congestion on the A12 and create bottlenecks along jct 19.	Capacity		✓	✓	Yes – evidence map for 'Vehicle Hours Delay' shows as having moderate to high delays.		Gary Sung - Maldon District Council	4	
A12 <b>East of England</b> <b>London Orbital</b>	The operational conditions of the A12 in general is seen as bad. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are constraints at M25/A12 (jct28 of the M25)</li> <li>Constraints near Brentwood, the</li> </ul>	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes – evidence map for 'Vehicle Hours Delay' shows as having moderate to high delays. Yes - evidence map for 'Peak Hours Speeds' shows as having	Essex CC is due to publish a report on the A12 in October.	Gary Sung - Maldon District Council	0	



Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
and M23 to Gatwick	<p>road should have 3 lanes throughout, not 2 lanes then 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jcts around Chelmsford need to be improved</li> </ul>					<p>moderate peak speeds.</p> <p>No – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows the section to currently experience a low to moderate collision risks</p>				
A12 East of England	Jcts 20a and 20b of the A12 need to be redesigned or even closed as they are seen as unsafe	Safety	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows the section is the 98 <sup>th</sup> highest casualty site in the country.		Gary Sung - Maldon District Council	1	
A120/M11 Jct 8 London to Leeds (East) East of England	Jct 8 on the M11 is acting as a barrier to create sustainable alternative transport access, such as cycle lanes. If this is changed it is believed that there could be a significant modal shift.	Operational / Society & Environment	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Kris Radley - Sustrans	0	
<b>General comment</b>	Sustrans would like all of the major constraints noted by the HA and to improve communication between themselves and the HA. This would allow for better planning and also help reduce the strain on the SRN, Sustrans also want to see an improvement in the overall sustainable transport infrastructure.	Society & Environment	✓	✓	✓		Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences. The subject was largely unknown by the group.	Kris Radley - Sustrans	16	
M11, Jct 9 London to Leeds (East)	The design of junction 9 is seen as being a problem for motorists. People cannot easily leave the motor way when heading south at this junction, which is causing people to travel down to junction 8	Operational	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Melanie Jones - Uttlesford Council	2	

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
	and then turn around or leave the motorway at junction 10 and travel south on local roads. This causes unnecessary road mileage and congestion.									
M11, jct 8 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	This junction is seen as a major pinch point and there is a desire to increase its capacity.  There are also issues on the M11 with overtaking, particularly trucks overtaking and is considered a hazard.  The problems here seem to be caused by lack of capacity at junction 7	Operational/ Safety	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘Vehicle Hours Delay’ shows as having moderate to high delays.		Melanie Jones Uttlesford Council	16 (split with M11 Jct 7)	
<b>General comment</b>	Alignment between different transport bodies needs to be improved, as well as large employers such as hospitals, universities, etc. The time frames of the RBS also seems to be short term and there is a desire to take into account long term thinking such ie 30 year time frames.	Operational	✓	✓	✓		Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	John Rowley - Epping Forest District Council	0	
A120 Great Dunmow South Junction and Hoblong Junction <b>East of England</b>	Hoblong Junction is causing issues with the Great Dunmow South Junction and there is a desire to see the South junction improved to help reduce the effect of traffic backlog	Operational	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Melanie Jones Uttlesford Council	0	

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
M25 jct 26 London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	The level of demand at this junction is seen as being too high, but is affected mainly by traffic heading into and out of Epping.	Capacity	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘Vehicle Hours Delay’ shows as having moderate to high delays.		John Rowley - Epping Forest District Council	0	
M11 Junction 5, M25 jct 26 London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick London to Leeds (East)	M25 J26 is seen as operating above capacity. This is believed to be due to people leaving the M11 at junction 5 and travelling through Loughton as a short cut to junction 26 on the M25	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘Vehicle Hours Delay’ shows as having moderate to high delays.		John Rowley - Epping Forest District Council	3	
M11 Junction 4 London to Leeds (East)	The managed road system speed is slow and there is a desire to see smarter management systems and driver information systems put into place.	Operational	✓				Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experiences, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Paul McBride - Harlow Council	1	
A120 heading east from Braintree East of England	The road is seen as congested and there is a desire to have improvements made to it to improve journey times.	Capacity	✓			Yes – evidence map for ‘Vehicle Hours Delay’ shows as having moderate to high delays. Yes - evidence map for ‘Peak Hours Speeds’ shows as having moderate peak speeds		Melanie Jones - Uttlesford Council	3	

Workshop Name	South East LEP	Date:	25 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Green
Group Facilitator	David Abbot	Note-taker	Vernon Silson		

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	Why is this considered to be a priority?	How does this compare to other priorities?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.
Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	<p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</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><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
M11, Junction 7 and 8 improvements. <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational	<p>Junction 7 is seen as a major pinch point and there is a desire to increase its capacity.</p> <p>The junction is believed to be acting as a significant bottleneck to people accessing Harlow and has also been seen as a reason why proposed developments have been rejected.</p> <p>Epping Forest Council are keen to see this junction improved as they plan on creating major developments near Harlow.</p>	<p>16 Votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a high priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	The creation of junction 7a is seen as being a great step to improving the capacity of the road. However the group want the HA to make sure that the design is appropriate and that it takes into account the predicted future growth of the region
Improve sustainable transport infrastructure to help modal shift <b>General comment</b>	Capacity / Operational	Sustrans would like all of the major constraints noted by the HA and to improve communication between themselves and the HA. This would allow for better planning and also help reduce the strain on the SRN, Sustrans also want to see an improvement in the overall sustainable transport infrastructure. In some regions it is believed ha promoting modal shifts to different forms of transport other than cars is the only way to significant reduce road traffic on many of the road networks.	<p>16 Votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a high priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	Not discussed

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>Improve junction 19 on the A12</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>The junction is seen as currently being a bottleneck on the road network. It is believed that the problems will increase once the Beailieu Park development is in place due to the size of the scheme and the creation of an additional railway station. There is a strong desire to see the junction improved as a result.</p> <p>(it is worth noting that there is currently a development funded scheme to do this)</p>	<p>4 Votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a medium priority to be addressed after 2015.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>Improve the A120 from Braintree east</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Asset Condition</p>	<p>The road has reached its capacity. There is a strong desire to see the road improved heavily to help local businesses and residents.</p>	<p>3 Votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a low priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>It was suggested that the road be turned into a dual carriageway.</p>
<p>M25, junction 26 needs to be improved as it is affecting traffic on the local roads</p> <p><b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Junction 26 is causing problems for Epping Forest Council as they are queues backing up to junction 27. This is causing motorists to leave at junction 5 of the M11 and use the A121 as a shortcut to the junction, which is causing problems for the local area, particularly Loughton. This is an issue as the forest just outside Loughton is a protected green zone and there are environmental concerns regarding the amount of traffic on the road.</p>	<p>3 Votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a low priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>M11 junction 9</p> <p>London to Leeds (East)</p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>The design of junction 9 is seen as being a problem for motorists. People cannot easily leave the motor way at this junction, which is causing people to travel down to junction 8 and then turn around or leave the motorway at junction 10 and travel south on local roads. This causes unnecessary road mileage and congestion.</p>	<p>2 Votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a low priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Improve the design of junction 9 or create a new junction allowing the motorists to leave after junction 10.</p>
<p>Improvements to A414</p> <p>East of England</p> <p>London to Leeds (East)</p>	<p>Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational</p>	<p>Although this road is not a SRN, it does affect the A12 and the M11. There is a desire to see the road improved as it is believed to have significant capacity issues along it as well as the junctions joining the SRNs. There was no evidence available for this, but it was discussed in great detail in the meeting.</p>	<p>2 Votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a low priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Not Discussed</p>
<p>M11 Improving Road Management</p> <p>London to Leeds (East)</p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>The road is seen as requiring better smart management to help alleviate traffic issues such as bottlenecks.</p>	<p>1 Votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a lowest priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Not Discussed</p>
<p>A12 junction 20a and 20b</p> <p>East of England</p>	<p>Operational / Safety</p>	<p>These junctions are seen as being a traffic bottleneck and being badly designed. There is a desire to have them removed and replaced with one single junction. There was also desire to ensure that a new junction was fully grade separated and of a robust design.</p>	<p>1 Votes</p> <p>The group considered that this would be a lowest priority to be addressed before 2015.</p>	<p>Not Discussed</p>

Workshop Name	South East LEP	Date:	25/09/2013	Breakout Group	Yellow
Group Facilitator	Paul Robinson	Note-taker	Liz Judson		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
Area wide <b>East of England</b> London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick London to Leeds (East)	Delegates considered that proposals for high levels of growth within the SELEP region could put significant pressure on the highway network in general.  Planning of land use and transport means that individual junctions are struggling and it is hard to see how much more capacity can be drawn out of the current layouts.	All		✓	✓	Maps indicate that there are areas that experience problems currently and there are areas in which growth is proposed, which is likely to exacerbate problems if no changes are made to the network.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.  See comment in previous box	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC) stated that 150,000 houses and 150,000 jobs are expected across the area by 2021.  Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC) indicated that there are expected to be an additional 18,000 houses each for Colchester and Chelmsford between 2021 and 2036.	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC) and Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	0
A12 in general <b>East of England</b>	Delegates commented that the A12 is not always used for strategic trips as often as would be expected. Often used for local trips, this could be exacerbated by growth.	All	✓	✓	✓	No – evidence map for 'safety on the network' shows the section to currently experience low to moderate collision risks	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC)	0
A12 Colchester to Chelmsford <b>East of England</b>	The section of the A12 between Colchester and Chelmsford is considered to be a significant problem with regards to congestion.	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section has one of the highest levels of vehicle delay in the area.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	8

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					
A12 south of Chelmsford <b>East of England</b>	It was considered that this section of road is likely to get worse in the future, in terms of congestion.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	Some evidence of delay currently on this section, which could be exacerbated by future growth locations.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	13
A12 in general <b>East of England</b>	Road does not meet the standards expected of a dual carriageway, in terms of pavement standard varying along the route, junctions, slip roads and laybys.	Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational	✓			The pavement condition map indicates that a large proportion of the A12 is expected to reach the end of its design life by 2020, apart from some small sections.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC)	0
A120 east of Braintree <b>East of England</b>	The road to the east of Braintree (one lane country road) is not sufficient for the purpose it serves, i.e. as an east west route or an alternative to the A12 if there are problems on that route. Some people travelling from East London to Colchester will use the M11 / A120 rather than the A12 despite it being significantly longer. Also, vehicles travelling from Chelmsford to Colchester can use A131 / A120, which puts pressure on A120.  Delegates considered that this was unlikely to be improved before 2021.	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓		The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience high levels of delay.  Growth along this route is shown in the Key Growth map, which could exacerbate issues.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Peter Smith (Braintree DC)	10



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					
A120 at Coggeshall / Earl's Colne crossing <b>East of England</b> London to Leeds (East)	There are currently problems with crossing and joining the A120 at this junction, which results in operational and safety issues.	Safety / Operational	✓			The safety map indicates that this junction is a Top 250 casualty location.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC)	1
A120 Braintree to M11 <b>East of England</b> London to Leeds (East)	This route is currently operating fine but concerns that if Stansted expansion comes forward then this could put pressure on the A120 route and M11 Junction 8.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	No – evidence map for 'Vehicle Hour Delay' shows the section currently experiences low delays	Perception as a potential future problem without any specific evidence being provided by delegates.	None	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC)	0
M25 Junction 28 <b>East of England</b> London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	Significant growth proposed within the Brentwood urban area. Delegates concerned that this could have an impact at the M25 / A12 junction.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	Key Growth map indicates that there will be development in and around Brentwood up to 2031	Perception as a potential future problem without any specific evidence being provided by delegates.  Delegates stated that they had not seen any modelling of the junction but expect there to be an impact from development.  Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC) indicated that M25 Junction 28 is perceived as one of the M25 junctions with the highest level of stress.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A12 Junction 17 <b>East of England</b>	This junction currently functions badly and is also perceived by the delegates to be a significant future problem. The A130 links Southend/ Basildon to Chelmsford and also provides a diversion from Dartford to Chelmsford away from A12. Traffic using this route has significant impacts on the junction. There is peak hour queuing on both A12 slip roads.	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section has one of the highest levels of vehicle delay in the area.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.  Delegates found it hard to identify which strands of traffic are a priority for solutions – considered that modelling is required.	None	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC) and Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	4
A12 between Junctions 16 and 17 <b>East of England</b>	Growth is planned in this area post 2021 which could have an impact on the operation of this section of the network	All			✓	Key Growth map indicates that there will be development in and Junctions 16 and 17 up to 2031	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	0
A12 between Junctions 17 and 19 <b>East of England</b>	It is perceived amongst some delegates that there will soon be increases in delay along this route, potentially as a knock on from junction 17.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	No specific evidence but key growth map indicates growth across Chelmsford and specific growth near Junction 19 up to 2031	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	0
A12 Junction 18 <b>East of England</b>	The delegates consider that the Park and Ride at this junction is having an impact as it currently attracts high levels of traffic.	Capacity / Operational	✓			No – evidence map for 'Average Speed at Peak Times' shows the section currently experiences good average speeds	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A12 Junction 19 <b>East of England</b>	<p>This junction is constantly under stress and mitigation measures have been identified under LEP funding to cope with current growth.</p> <p>There is concern that a new Rail Station that is planned close to the station could exacerbate these problems. The plans for the station include 1,400 car parking spaces. Developer contributions and Local Transport Board funding is in place and it is expected that the station could open in 2019/20.</p>	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	Delay is higher and peak hour speeds lower than other areas of the network (on the links near junction 19).	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	0
A12 Junction 21 <b>East of England</b>	<p>There is significant growth proposed in the area of the junction and therefore more problems are anticipated at the junction, although doesn't operate too badly at the moment.</p>	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	Key Growth map indicates that there will be development in and around Witham (near Junction 21) up to 2031.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Peter Smith (Braintree DC)	0
A12 Junction 22 <b>East of England</b>	<p>There are current peak hour issues due to the turn off from the A12 south to Witham and turn on from Witham to A12 south. Both are a very tight right turn with short slips, which can be very dangerous.</p> <p>It was noted that there are a lot of logistics firms nearby and therefore there are a high level of HGV movements that exacerbate this issue.</p>	Safety / Operational	✓			No – safety map does not reference specific junctions unless they are a top 250 casualty locations.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC) and Peter Smith (Braintree DC)	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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A12 Junction 22a <b>East of England</b>	This refers to the give way junction in Rivenhall. It is considered very dangerous, particularly to those who are unaware of the junction. Delegates considered that this junction could be closed if further fatalities occur.	Safety	✓			No – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows the section currently experiences a low to moderate collision risk	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	0
A12 Junctions 23 and 24 <b>East of England</b>	Motorists trying to access the A12 from the Tiptree area have to go through Kelvedon, which adds pressure on Kelvedon road network.	Operational	✓			No. Problem is on local road through Kelvedon, not on the SRN.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	0
A12 Junction 25 <b>East of England</b>	Growth is planned in Marks Tey near junction 25. This junction may not currently be a problem but delegates considered that it could become a problem.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The Key Growth map indicates that there will be growth within Stanway up to 2031.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC) and Rachel Forkin (Colchester BC)	0
A12 between junctions 26 and 27. <b>East of England</b>	It was noted that there are a lot of weaving movements with vehicles travelling northbound, entering the A12 at junction 26 and leaving at junction 27, which is a short section of road.	Safety / Operational	✓			No – evidence map for ‘Average Speed at Peak Times’ shows the section currently experiences good average speeds	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Rachel Forkin (Colchester BC)	0
A12 Junction 28 <b>East of England</b>	There is the potential for a lot of growth around the junction and a potential Park and Ride at the end of 2014. The development is taking place currently and	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The Key Growth map indicates that there will be growth near the junction up to 2031.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals’ experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue	None	Rachel Forkin (Colchester BC)	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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
	beyond 2021. By the end of 2014 a road will be built that links the junction into Colchester.						was commonplace.			
A12 Junctions 28 – 29 <b>East of England</b>	It was considered that this needed an extra lane due to proposed development in the area.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The Key Growth map indicates that there will be growth near the junction up to 2031.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC)	0
A12 / A14 – Copdock Interchange <b>East of England</b>	This junction is likely to be a problem due to growth in Ipswich and Colchester. Delegates consider that this junction needs signals. (This junction is already fully signal controlled)	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The Key Growth map indicates significant growth in Colchester.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC)	0
A120 east of Colchester <b>East of England</b>	Where the road changes from two lanes to one lane on the way to Harwich, which results in accident issues. At grade roundabouts need to be provided at Little Bentley. Population of Tendring is slightly older and so the perception of speed and the lack of lighting is an issue.	Safety / Operational	✓			The safety map indicates that this section of road has a relatively high level of vehicle casualties.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Derek Stebbing (Chelmsford CC)	4
M11 Junction 7a <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	The provision of Junction 7a was considered to be a solution to potential issues caused by growth in Harlow, through the provision of a second access to the M11.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The Key Growth map provides details of main areas of growth in Harlow.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Chris Stevenson (Essex CC)	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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
Dartford Crossing London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	The existing Dartford Crossing experiences high levels of congestion and delay – there is a lack of an alternative route	Capacity / Operational	✓			Dartford Crossing not included on the maps but evidence of delay on the M25 north of the crossing.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Unclear (included on post it but no initials)	0

Workshop Name	South East LEP	Date:	25/09/2013	Breakout Group	Yellow
Group Facilitator	Paul Robinson	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?	Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities. Solution Type (& additional notes) Maintenance & renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other
Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group	Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	
A12 between Colchester and Chelmsford in general has a number of existing small issues that need to be addressed. <b>East of England</b> London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick London to Leeds (East)	Capacity / Safety / Operational	This section of the A12 is perceived to operate poorly currently.	Not discussed.	Improved signing, laybys, junction and slip road improvements, speed cameras to manage speed, reduce incidents and increase capacity.
There is an absence of HGV parking areas in major towns <b>East of England</b> London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick London to Leeds (East)	Operational / Safety	If specific HGV areas are not provided then they use laybys to park in which can be a safety and operational concern.	Not discussed.	Provision of more HGV parking in major towns.
Growth in Harlow could put pressure on junction 7 of the M11 as there is no other SRN junction access to Harlow. London to Leeds (East)	Capacity / Safety / Operational	Needed to support future growth in Harlow.	Not discussed.	Provision of a new junction on the M11 (Junction 7a).

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>The Coggeshall junction on the A120 is considered to be a safety issue due to poor design and high levels of HGV traffic.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>The A120 is a key east-west route and an alternative to the A12; this is a key junction on the route.</p>	<p>Not discussed specifically but delegates considered the safety concern to be high.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>There are high levels of congestions at A120 Galley's Corner and also perceived to be some air quality issues.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</p>	<p>The A120 is a key east-west route and an alternative to the A12; this is a key junction on the route.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>The A12 currently does not have any traffic officer patrols and therefore any incidents on the carriageway are not dealt with as quickly as possible.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Any incidents on the carriageway are not dealt with as quickly as they could be and therefore this can result in delays due to stranded vehicles.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Reinstate the traffic officer patrols along the A12 (or just key sections)</p>
<p>The A120 at Little Bentley has current safety concerns and the lighting provision is poor.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Safety / Asset Condition</p>	<p>There are very short merge/diverge tapers at this junction which can result in safety concerns</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Convert the junction to a roundabout.</p>
<p>The A120 between Braintree and the A12 is currently one lane and not at an acceptable level for the purpose it serves (support the airport and as an alternative to the A12).</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>The A120 is a key east-west route and the single lane between Braintree and the A12 does not provide enough capacity for the traffic demand.</p>	<p>Not discussed specifically but seemed to be a high priority.</p>	<p>Provision of offline dualling.</p>



<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>There is a lot of growth planned within Essex, particularly in Brentwood, Chelmsford and Braintree. There is concern that this growth will have an impact on the operation of the A12 in the Long Term.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>All</p>	<p>The A12 is the main north-south route through the area and currently experiences problems in some areas. Any growth without improvements made to the route could lead to increased delay and safety issues.</p>	<p>Not discussed specifically but seemed to be a high priority.</p>	<p>No specific solutions identified, these were discussed in more detail when considering each junction and link.</p>
<p>There is concern that the expansion at Tilbury and London Gateway could put pressure on the operation and capacity of the A13.</p> <p><b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Upgrade of the A13 to three lanes.</p>
<p>The operation of M25 junctions 30 and 31 are a concern in the long term.</p> <p><b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Provision of the Lower Thames Crossing (Option C) to take traffic away from the M25 and therefore ease pressure on junctions 30 and 31.</p>
<p>A12 Junction 17 (at the A130) is considered a potential hotspot in the future due to proposed growth.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>The A130 is a key north-south route and is used as alternative route to Chelmsford away from the A12 and M25 and therefore this is seen as a potential problem.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>There are currently only one way facing slip roads at M11 junction 5 which is considered to be a problem.</p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b>  <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b></p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>Both directions are required on the slip roads to improve the operation of the M11.</p>	<p>Not discussed specifically but seemed to be a bit of an afterthought.</p>	<p>Slip roads should be provided in both directions.</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>There are currently only one way facing slip roads at M11 junction 5 which is considered to be a problem.</p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p> <p><b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b></p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>Both directions are required on the slip roads to improve the operation of the M11.</p>	<p>Not discussed specifically but seemed to be a bit of an afterthought.</p>	<p>Slip roads should be provided in both directions.</p>
<p>There are concerns that business growth between Colchester and Brentwood will lead to problems on the A12.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>A12 is the key route through the area and therefore needs to be protected.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Delegates discussed the need for a modelling / engineering solution but nothing specific was raised.</p>
<p>There are concerns that growth In Colchester and Ipswich could have a negative impact on the A12 / A14 Copdock Interchange.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>This is the interchange between the main north-south and east-west routes through the area and therefore needs to be protected.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Further grade separation.</p>
<p>The A120 single lane section between Hare Green and Harwich currently experiences safety and capacity issues.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Safety</p>	<p>Harwich is a key port and employer in the area and therefore access to it is important. Furthermore there is growth planned in the area that needs to be supported.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Dualling.</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></p> <p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b>  <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Capture any solutions that are proposed and ensure people feel heard, but re-focus on discussing their views on the priorities.</p> <p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>The MSA access from M11 junction 8 is considered to be too close to the northbound off-slip, causing congestion issues.</p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>The MSA access should be re-designed or moved away from the slip road.</p>
<p>The information provision along the A12 is poor.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>This is considered important as early information for motorists would allow then to make a decision about using an alternative route if there is a problem on the A12.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>	<p>A technology package for the A12.</p>

Workshop Name		Date:	25 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Red
Group Facilitator	Rob Barron	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					
London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick Free Flow Tolling	The Delegates stated that free flow tolling should be put in place along the M25, and should also replace existing toll systems, such as the system in the Dartford Crossing	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay map indicates that this section of the route currently experiences high levels of delay		Karen Gearing (Southend on Sea BC)	5	
M25 Dartford Crossing to Junction 28 Southbound London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	Delegates discussed issues of disruption from people coming on at Brentwood and backing up from J28. They also felt that general congestion in this section of the M25 was a priority.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay map indicates that this section of the route currently experiences high levels of delay		Karen Gearing (Southend on Sea BC)	6	
M25 Junction 30 & 31 London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	Delegates considered Thurrock to be a major growth area (£6 billion investment) which is caused by the bridge area and crossing. Improvements planned to Junction 31 but delegates felt that it would not be able to take the level of traffic as there is already congestion issues.  It is also believed that the growth will affect junction 30, which already has congestion problems and subsequently cause issues on the A13. Delegates also reported accidents at this junction with slow clearing times.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	The delay map indicates that this section of the route currently experiences high levels of delay  Some growth along this route is shown in the Key Growth map.	Perception as a potential future problem without any specific evidence being provided by delegates.	Karen Gearing (Southend on Sea BC)  Les Burns (Thurrock Council)	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 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					
<b>General comment</b>	Southend airport is growing rapidly with 2 million passengers by 2020. There are housing and business growth improvements proposed	All		✓		The Airport is not on the SRN therefore not shown on the evidence maps.	A joint action plan between Thurrock and Southend can be found on the Southend website.	Can be found on the Southend website	Stephen Metcalfe (MP for South Basildon and East Thurrock)	
M25 Junction 28 <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	Delegates discussed issues of disruption from people coming on at Brentwood and backing up from J28.	Capacity/ Operation	✓			The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience high levels of delay.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.		Les Burns (Thurrock Council)	3
A120 <b>East of England</b>	The A120 was perceived to be under massive pressure at Braintree.	Capacity/ Operation	✓			The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience high levels of delay.			Les Burns (Thurrock Council)	
A120 Galleys corner roundabout <b>East of England</b>	Delegates reported congestion issues at this roundabout.	Capacity/ Operation	✓			The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience high levels of delay.			Stephen Metcalfe (MP for South Basildon and East Thurrock)	
M25, Junction 30/31 (Thurrock) <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	Delegates discussed proposals for residential and retail expansions next to lakeside which would put pressure on the network. There is an expansion due into the entrance of Lakeside.	All		✓		The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience high levels of delay.  Some growth along this route is shown in the Key Growth map.			Stephen Metcalfe (MP for South Basildon and East Thurrock)	

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					
A13 London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	It was considered that there has been an increase in traffic on the A13. This growth was cited due to an increased number of developments along this route, and with the completion of London Gateway there is likely to be more traffic.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience moderate levels of delay.		Les Burns (Thurrock Council)	7	
M25, Junction 28/ A12 London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick East of England	Delegates suggested that there is a disruption from people coming on from the A12 Brentwood in the AM Peak. There is regularly a ten mile queue which sometimes goes back to J27.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience high levels of delay.		Les Burns (Thurrock Council)		
<b>General comment</b>	There are proposals for a £1billion Basildon Town Centre Development	All	✓			The growth map shows a significant amount of development in Basildon district council, however the figure could not be verified.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Stephen Metcalfe (MP, South Basildon and East Thurrock)		
A13/ A126 East Facing Slips London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	There are currently only West facing slips. There are also major development proposals for this section which could exacerbate problems	Operational		✓	✓	The growth map shows that there will be growth in the area.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Les Burns (Thurrock Council)	5	
A127 <b>General comment</b>	It was considered that there are currently safety issues at the 'Fortune of War' roundabout in Basildon. However, this was not discussed further. (Not part of the Trunk Road network).	Safety	✓			Not part of the SRN therefore not shown on the evidence maps.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Stephen Metcalfe (MP, South Basildon and East Thurrock)		

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					
A127 <b>General comment</b>	This route was seen to have major issues. (Not part of the Trunk Road network).	Capacity / Operational	✓			Not part of the SRN therefore not shown on the evidence maps.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Karen Gearing (Southend on Sea BC)		
M25 Junction 29 <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	It was felt by delegates that Junction 29 caused issues for those travelling into Southend. Additionally, there is only one route into Southend which is also a freight route.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience high levels of delay.		Karen Gearing (Southend on Sea BC)		
A12 Junction 27 <b>East of England</b>	There are issues here where it changes from three lanes into two lanes	Operational/Safety	✓			There is no evidence on the delay or peak hour speeds maps to support this.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Les Burns (Thurrock Council)		
A12 <b>East of England</b>	Delegates felt that retail and residential proposals in Chelmsford would cause issues on the A12 which is currently running at capacity and already suffers with congestion.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The Key Growth map indicates that there will be growth in Chelmsford beyond 2021.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Karen Gearing (Southend on Sea BC)	2	
A130 <b>East of England</b>	It was noted that there are queues on the NB section of this route	Capacity / Operational	✓			Not part of the SRN therefore not shown on the evidence maps.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Les Burns (Thurrock Council)		

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					
M11 Junction 7&8 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Delegates discussed the congestion between these two junctions, which they perceived to be due to accidents. They also reported straddling from where it changes to two lanes north of Junction 8.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience high levels of delay.		Les Burns (Thurrock Council)		
M11 Junction 5 <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	There is lots of congestion south of this junction.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay map indicates that there are some sections of this route that currently experience high levels of delay.		Les Burns (Thurrock Council)		
A12 <b>East of England</b>	Delegates felt that the whole of the A12 is in poor condition especially going north from Chelmsford to Colchester.	Safety/ Asset Condition/ Operational	✓			The pavement condition map indicates that a large proportion of the A12 is expected to reach the end of its design life by 2020.		Karen Gearing (Southend on Sea BC)	1	
A12 Junction 25 <b>East of England</b>	Delegates reported frequent flooding at this junction.	Safety/ Society & Environment	✓			This problem is not shown on the Evidence Maps.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Karen Gearing (Southend on Sea BC)		
Army Navy Roundabout A138/A414 <b>General comment</b>	There are air pollution issues at this roundabout. (Not part of the Trunk Road network).	Safety/ Society & Environment	✓			Not part of the SRN therefore not shown on the evidence maps.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	Karen Gearing (Southend on Sea BC) Les Burns (Thurrock Council)		



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					
A12, Junction 13 <b>East of England</b>	There are currently safety issues at Ingatestone, delegates reported problems with ice that could cause accidents.	Safety/ Society & Environment	✓			This problem is not shown on the Evidence Maps.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from some of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.		Les Burns (Thurrock Council)	

Workshop Name	South East LEP	Date:	25 <sup>th</sup> September 2013	Breakout Group	Red
Group Facilitator	Rob Barron	Note-taker	Tasha Duggan		

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	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/Operation / 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	<b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types	Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary	Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be	
London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick Free Flow Tolling	Capacity/ Operational	Delegates felt that free flow tolling would improve issues.	5 Votes Not discussed	Not discussed
M25 Dartford Crossing to Junction 28 Southbound London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	Capacity/ Operational	Delegates discussed issues of disruption from people coming on at Brentwood and backing up from J28. They also felt that general congestion in this section of the M25 was a priority.	6 Votes Not discussed	Not discussed
A13 Widening/ London gateway Current and Additional London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	Capacity/ Operational	Impact from the London Gateway was highlighted as a priority.	7 Votes Not discussed	Widen the A13 to help increase the capacity of the road.
M25, Junction 28 Southbound London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	Capacity/ Operation	Traffic Flow Improvements at this junction were rated as priority.	3 Votes	Not discussed
A12 East of England	Capacity/ Operational	Delegates felt that retail and residential proposals in Chelmsford would cause issues on the A12 which is currently running at capacity and already suffers with congestion.	2 Votes Not discussed	Not discussed
A12 East of England	Operational/ Asset Condition/ Safety	Delegates felt that the whole of the A12 is in poor condition especially going north from Chelmsford to Colchester.	1 Vote	Not discussed

Description of challenge / Location	Type of challenge	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><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></p> <p>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</p>	<p>Nb. We are not asking the group to reach a consensus about the priorities, but to discuss their views. Include initials of the delegates so that we can follow up if necessary</p>	<p>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</p>	<p>Solution Type (&amp; additional notes)</p> <p>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>M25 Junction 30-31 congestion London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</p>	<p>Operational/ Capacity</p>	<p>Delegates considered Thurrock to be a major growth area (6 billion pound investment) which is cursed by the bridge area and crossing. Improvements planned to Junction 31 but delegates felt that it would not be able to take the level of traffic as there is already congestion issues.</p> <p>There are currently congestion problems at Junction 30 which subsequently cause issues on the A13. Delegates also reported accidents at this junction with slow clearing times.</p>	<p>3 Votes</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>A13/ A126 East Facing Slips London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>There are currently only West facing slips. There are also major development proposals for this section which could exacerbate problems</p>	<p>5 Votes</p>	<p>Introduction of East facing slips</p>

**Table A.4 Stakeholder Events Record: Hertfordshire (Hoddesdon)**

**(d) Hoddesdon Workshop**

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

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
Area wide <b>General Comments</b>	The location of strategic growth sites across the county is not generally known yet. All the local authorities are at different stages in their Local Plan preparation. There is concern therefore that when the RBS's are written the finer details of local growth will not be known and therefore will not be taken into account fully.	All		✓	✓	Partially – delegates noted that the quantum of development included on the map was broadly correct but that the locations of development were not confirmed at this time.	Evidence of development locations to be provided if/when available.	Delegates in general but particularly Kevin Langley at Dacorum Borough Council	Lorraine O' Gormen (North Herts District Council)	0
M25 in general <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	Hertfordshire's location in close proximity to London and the associated arterial roads means that any problems on the M25 have a significant impact on the local road network in Hertfordshire.	Capacity / Operational	✓			High levels of delay on the M25 between Junction 21 and 24 shown on the delay map partially support this – the A414 acts as an alternative route for this section of the M25.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Steve Farrell (Three Rivers DC)	0

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A1(M) junction 7 and the section to the south <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	If there is congestion on the A1(M) then this can have a knock impact on the local roads through Knebworth	Capacity / Operational	✓			High levels of delay shown around junction 7 of the A1(M) and further south.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Lorraine O' Gormen (North Herts District Council)	14
M25 west of junction 21 <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	There are significant problems on the M25 in the west of the county. This is considered to be a constraint to development in this area due to the route already being at capacity.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	Evidence of delay on the M25 to the west of junction 21 is shown on the delay map, which partially supports this.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	2
A1(M) junctions 7 and 8 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	There are significant problems on the A1(M) at Stevenage. This is considered to be a constraint to future development in this area due to the route already being at capacity.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	Some delay shown between junctions 7 and 8 of the A1(M).	Evidence is anecdotal and based on delegates' experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	14*

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					
M25 Junction 21a to M1 Junction 6 (A405) <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	There are concerns regarding the A405 link between M25 Junction 21a and M1 Junction 6 and the constraint that this limited capacity into Watford has on the potential for growth in the area.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	Delay maps show that there is some delay on this link of the A405.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on delegates' experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	7
A414 and M1 Junction 8 <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b> <b>London to Scotland East</b>	There are concerns that St Albans growth could have an impact on the operation of the A414 and Junction 8 of the M1. There is the possibility that 4,000 houses and significant employment could be built on land between St Albans and Hemel Hempstead. A potential M1 Junction '8a' could be considered as a solution.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The delay maps show some existing delay on the M1 in this location. Furthermore there is significant development (particularly employment) proposed for Hemel Hempstead near to Junction 8 at Maylands Business Park.	No further evidence was discussed – St Albans City and District development plans are not yet known.	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	8
Area wide <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b> <b>London to Scotland East</b> <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	There are concerns that the capacity and quality of the rail services to and from London in the future may result in a shift to car use in the county following planned growth.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	0

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A1(M) Welwyn Hatfield (Jn 4) to Stevenage (Jn 7/8) <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	This section of the A1(M) currently has capacity issues, which could be exacerbated by development to the west of Stevenage and at Junction 4 at Welwyn Garden City.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	High levels of delay shown on the map between junctions 4 and 8	N/A	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	14*
A1(M) around junction 6 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	The two lane section at this point is a constraint and operates badly in the peak hours.	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	Some of the highest levels of growth in the Herts area are in the vicinity of junctions 6 and 7.	Not discussed	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	14*
A1(M) corridor <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	The delegates perceived that there is a high level of local traffic using the A1(M), rather than predominantly strategic traffic, as the local roads are not considered to be of a high enough standard.	Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Lorraine O' Gormen (North Herts District Council)	14*

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					
M25 in general <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	Alternative east-west routes to the M25 are poor across the area, which puts pressure on the operation of the M25. Suggestions that there needs to be an outer east-west ring road other than the A414 to provide another suitable alternative route.	Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational	✓			The maps indicate that there are generally significant levels of delay on the M25 within the Herts area.	Not discussed	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC) and Steve Farrell (Three Rivers DC)	5
East – west movements through the county <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b> <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	A study of the A602 indicated that to encourage growth there needed to be a greater provision of east-west movements for freight traffic. A number of existing routes are not considered to be of a sufficient standard.	Capacity / Asset Condition / Operational	✓			No	Not explicitly discussed, however an A602 study may provide further detail.	Sanjay Patel - HCC	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	0
M1 corridor and A5 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	The M1 still experiences congestion despite the recent widening of the carriageway and hard shoulder running. The A5 is an even worse potential alternative route because it experiences congestion.	Capacity	✓			The delay map suggests that the M1 currently experiences high levels delay on the majority of links north of the M25.	N/A	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	1



Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A1(M) corridor London to Leeds (East)	Traffic modelling of the effects of proposed growth in this corridor indicated that there will be impacts on the A1 (M), which could be a problem for all authorities in the area. Mitigation was calculated at £42m, of which £32m is required for the SRN	Capacity		✓	✓	There is growth proposed in a number of areas along the A1(M) corridor.	Evidence is being prepared in support of North Herts District Council's and Stevenage Borough Council's emerging local plans.	No evidence was promised specifically but Lorraine O' Gormen raised the issue of modelling and therefore may have evidence if requested.	Lorraine O' Gormen (North Herts District Council)	0
Area wide London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick London to Scotland East London to Leeds (East)	There are concerns that the three areas where the highest levels of growth are proposed, are the areas that currently experience the most congestion on the network (Watford, St Albans/ Hemel Hempstead and Stevenage).	Capacity	✓	✓	✓	This is generally supported by the growth map (although details of St Albans growth are unclear at the moment) and the network delay map.	N/A	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	0
M1 Junction 5 London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick London to Scotland East	Delegates highlighted that northbound queuing occurs on the offslip at M1 Junction 5, back to the mainline carriageway and that this forms a major access route to Watford.	Capacity	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	0

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					
M1 corridor <b>London to Scotland East</b>	In the AM peak the M1 southbound is often congested from Junction 11. Unless motorists get through this section before 8am there can be significant delays.	Capacity	✓			The delay map suggests that this section of the M1 experiences significant delays.	N/A	None	Kevin Langley (Dacorum BC)	1
A1(M) Junction 9 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	On the northbound offslip there is a dedicated left turn lane which gives way to traffic which is exiting the roundabout which is considered to be unsafe. The visibility for left-turning traffic is considered to be poor and there is a problem with junction design.	Safety	✓			The safety map does not indicate that this junction specifically is a problem but the link between junctions 8 and 9 does have some safety concerns.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on delegates' experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	1
A414 Park Street roundabout <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	This junction is considered to be a safety concern, which could be exacerbated by the Rail Freight Interchange planned nearby.	Safety	✓	✓	✓	No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on delegates' experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	2

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
Area wide <b>General Comments</b>	Consideration should be given to the surfaces used on the SRN to reduce noise pollution.	Asset Condition / Society and Environment	✓			There is poor pavement condition on a number of routes across the county, as suggested on the relevant map.	N/A	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	0
A1(M) Junction 3 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	There are concerns with the ramp metering at Junction 3. The nearby Hatfield Business Park means that the junction is nearing capacity.	Capacity	✓			No	No specific evidence was discussed. There appeared to be amongst the group that this could be a significant challenge .	None	Sanjay Patel (Herts CC)	0
M25 Junction 22 <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	One delegate observed peak hour queuing from the slip roads onto the mainline carriageway.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay maps indicate that there is delay on the mainline links around junction 22 but there is no specific junction information.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Joan Hancock (Herts LEP)	0

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					
M1 corridor <b>London to Scotland East</b>	There are concerns regarding the potential expansion of Luton Airport on the operation of the M1.	Capacity / Operational		✓	✓	The evidence maps do not provide any details of growth at Luton Airport (airport growth is highlighted on the SEMLEP workshop map because the airport is located outside of Hertfordshire).	No evidence discussed. Current planning application may provide relevant data.	None	Unknown (did not initial post-it note)	0

\* Duplicate score for overlapping issues

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

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	<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 (&amp; additional notes)</i> <i>Maintenance &amp; 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 <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</i>	
There are current congestion issues on the A1(M) between junctions 6 and 8 due to the reduction from three lanes to two in this section, which results in a bottleneck for traffic. <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Capacity	This is a key north-south route through the area with connections into London. Any delays caused by the two lane section impacts on the movement of vehicles along this route, the local and national economy and the ability of the network to provide for future growth.	This was considered to be a high priority by the group.	Widening of the carriageway from 2 lanes to 3 lanes in both directions.
There are considered to be consistent delays leaving Hemel Hempstead at M1 Junction 8 and it is likely that significant development proposals could exacerbate these issues in the longer term, particularly those in St Albans and Dacorum. <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Capacity	There is significant growth proposed in this area and therefore if improvements are not made then either the network could become even more congested or the current constraints could prevent growth coming forward.	This was considered to be a high priority by the group.	Two potential solutions to this problems were discussed - a new M1 Junction 8a and a north-eastern relief road linking the A414 (near Maylands) with the B487 Redbourn Road.
There are heavy delays on the A5, which is also used as an alternative to the M1 when there are problems on the motorway. <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Capacity	Due to the A5 sometimes operating as an alternative route to the M1 when the M1 is experiencing significant delays, as well as its own role as a trunk road that serves Milton Keynes and Northampton and a local distributor road (e.g. in Dunstable) , delays on this route can have significant implications further afield on the local road network.	There was limited discussion on this route, with no indication of it being a high or low priority.	An A5 Dunstable bypass.

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></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><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></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><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p><i>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</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 (&amp; additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>The link between M25 junction 21a and M1 junction 6 (the A405 link road) experiences safety and capacity issues.</p> <p><b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Safety</p>	<p>The link between the two is considered to be sub-standard, especially considering that it links two of the most important motorways in the country. It also functions as a local distributor route between St Albans and Watford.</p>	<p>This link was discussed in detail and was considered a high priority amongst the delegates as it is an existing issue that will get worse if it is not addressed.</p>	<p>A 'free flow' interchange link between the M1 and M25 was discussed as a potential solution.</p>
<p>A number of delegates commented on the safety concerns on the A1(M) junction 9 northbound offslip (primarily related to junction design and visibility)</p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>This was considered to be a significant safety issue on the SRN in Hertfordshire.</p>	<p>Whilst this did not appear to be such a high priority when compared with some congestion issues in the area it was considered a high priority when evaluating safety in the area.</p>	<p>No particular solutions were discussed, however a re-design of the junction was suggested.</p>
<p>There are concerns that despite the recent widening and hard shoulder running approaches there are still significant delays on the M1 between junctions 8 and 11 (mainly southbound in the AM peak and northbound in the PM peak).</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>This is one of the primary north-south routes in the country and therefore significant delays on this route can impact on the economy as well as restrict future growth.</p>	<p>Whilst the delays here were considered significant a number of delegates were unsure what else could be done to alleviate congestion and therefore was not discussed as much as some other issues.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>There are long term concerns about the growth of Harlow on the M11.</p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational / Safety</p>	<p>Harlow is one of the key growth areas in the region and is on the edge of the Hertfordshire LEP area; therefore the impact of this growth could have a significant impact on the routes in Hertfordshire.</p>	<p>This was mentioned briefly and did not appear to be a high level priority. From a Hertfordshire perspective, there may be trade-offs with other County-based priorities.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>There are considered to be significant issues with congestion on the M25 between Junction 21 to Junction 10 (A3).</p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>The M25 is crucial to the national economy and this section includes access to Heathrow Airport, therefore its successful operation is important.</p>	<p>It could be considered a lower priority due to the majority of the route being outside the Hertfordshire LEP area, however no trade offs were</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></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><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></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><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p><i>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</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 (&amp; additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</p>			<p>discussed amongst the group</p>	
<p>The general congestion issues along the A1 corridor are considered a significant current concern and a barrier to future growth in the area.</p> <p>London to Leeds (East)</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational / Safety</p>	<p>The A1 is a key north-south route through the county and therefore it is important to ensure that a good operation is maintained.</p>	<p>The corridor was considered to be important however high priority was assigned to links and junctions specifically.</p>	<p>Not discussed in general (see references to specific links and junctions)</p>
<p>There is a concern regarding the potential impact of the potential Radlett Rail Freight Interchange on the operation of the A414 Park Street roundabout.</p> <p>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>There are current safety concerns at the A414 Park Street roundabout that future growth could exacerbate these issues.</p>	<p>This is considered to be one of the key safety issues within the Herts LEP.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>The impact of construction traffic associated with the Croxley Rail Link is considered to potentially be a concern.</p> <p>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</p>	<p>Operational / Capacity</p>	<p>This was not discussed in great detail.</p>	<p>This was considered a priority for one delegate but was not discussed by other delegates in detail.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>There are concerns that the impact of proposed growth could cause problems at M25 Junction 25.</p> <p>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>This was not discussed in great detail.</p>	<p>This was mentioned briefly at the end of the session and was not discussed in detail.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>Clarification should be provided regarding how the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be applied, how much of a contribution will be made to funding by Local</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>There was a concern that the CIL process was not clear and could lead to confusion amongst stakeholders, developers and members of the public.</p>	<p>This was considered a priority for one delegate but was not discussed by other delegates in detail.</p>	<p>The CIL process should be clarified.</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b></p> <p><b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></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><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></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><b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b></p> <p><b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p><i>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</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 (&amp; additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>Authorities and what the definition of the CIL is.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p>				
<p>There is a lack of capacity on east-west routes, which could constrain proposed development across the LEP area.</p> <p><b>London Orbital M25, A414T)</b></p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Proposed developers (particularly employment development with high levels of HGVs) may be dissuaded from locating in some areas due to the lack of good quality east west routes. This lack of east-west options also puts significant pressure on other similar routes (M25 and A414).</p>	<p>This was discussed in detail and considered a relatively high priority.</p>	<p>A505 Hitchin Bypass or other new east-west routes.</p>
<p>The changing market to a higher proportion of online goods purchases is resulting in more online distribution centres and light vehicle trips, particularly on the A1(M), M1 and A10.</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p> <p><b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>This shift in purchase patterns could result in more vehicles on the network (higher number of LGV than HGV delivery vehicles) and put pressure on routes throughout the area.</p>	<p>Minimal discussion took place on this point, in particular how it could be addressed.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>



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

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what 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					
Congestion on the A405T and poor linkage between M25, A405 and M1 (between St Albans and Watford). <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	The section of the A405 between the M1 J6 and M25 J21a experiences severe congestion, especially southbound during the AM peak period. This can cause traffic to block back onto the anti-clockwise offslip at J21a, with traffic on occasions queuing onto the mainline carriageway which poses significant safety concerns.	Capacity / Safety / Operational	✓			Yes / No – the Network Performance delay map shows the A405T to be experiencing moderate levels of delay, however the peak hour speeds map shows low to moderate speeds. Most significantly, the safety on the network 2008-2011 map shows that the A405T experiences the highest level of total casualties per billion vehicle miles, that M25 J21a is a top 50 casualty location, and that M1 J6 is a top 250 casualty location.	N/A	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	6
M1 north of J10 congestion <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Experience occurs on the M1 north of and through J10. The section, which has recently been improved, experiences congestion because of a lack of capacity.	Capacity	✓			Yes – the Network Performance delay map shows the M1 to experience the highest levels of vehicle hours delay between April 2012 and March 2013.	N/A	None	Philip Bylo (Watford 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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
M1 J4 – J6 congestion <a href="#">London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</a>	Experience occurs on the M1 between J4 and J6.	Capacity / Operational	✓			Yes/No – the Network Performance delay map shows this section of the M1 experienced moderate levels of vehicle hours delay between April 2012 and March 2013. The peak hour speeds map shows speeds closer to the national speed limit.	N/A	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	0
Change people's travel behaviour <b>General Comments</b>	There is an increasing need to influence people's travel behaviour before considering providing infrastructure improvements which could lead to further traffic issues in the future. There is too much focus upon the need to provide for economic growth and less attention paid to the potential environmental consequences.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0
A41 Western Avenue / Watford Road Roundabout congestion <a href="#">London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</a>	Congestion at the A41 Western Avenue / Watford Road Roundabout (adjoining the spur to M25 Junction 19). The delegate noted that the junction is some way from the M25 and therefore congestion may not have a knock-on effect.	Capacity / Operational.	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	0

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					
M25 Junction 20 congestion <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	The signalised gyratory currently experiences congestion.	Capacity / Operational	✓			No - The congestion issues are understood to occur on the signalised gyratory and therefore will not show up on the maps	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	0
A1(M) Junction 8 congestion <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	The signalised gyratory currently experiences congestion. This poses a risk to safety where there are long stationary queues on the circulatory carriageway adjacent to moving traffic.	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			Yes/No - Issues occurring on the signalised gyratory do not show up on the maps. The Safety on the Network 2008-2011 map (reference has been made to the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough LEP workshop map) shows there to be a high collision risk on the section of the A1(M) between J8 and J9 however it is unclear if this is associated with the operation of the J8 signalised gyratory.	Not discussed – the delegate noted that the issue was based upon anecdotal observations.	None	Chris Carter (North Herts District Council)	5
A1(M) Junction 7 congestion <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Congestion occurs at the junction on the adjoining mainline carriageway, including during the AM peak (southbound)	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			Yes – The network performance delay map shows that the A1(M) experiences high levels of vehicle hours delay southbound, north and south of J7 and on the northbound carriageway to the south of J7 only.	This is already an issue. Evidence building work is already being undertaken to understand the issue in more detail.	Yes – a study is currently being undertaken by Hertfordshire County Council to explore the issues currently occurring on the A1(M) corridor and explore potential options.	Chris Carter (North Herts District Council) Jameel Hayat (on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council)	11

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					
A1(M) mainline congestion Junction 8 to Junction 6 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Congestion occurs on the A1(M) mainline, particularly in the southbound direction in the AM peak period and in the northbound section in the PM peak period. The existing lane drop northbound at J6 is a particular problem. Consideration needs to be given to what is considered to be an acceptable delay (if it is not possible to completely eliminate congestion). Development growth is coming forward in districts clustered around the corridor which could increase pressure even further.	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			Yes (as above)	This is already an issue. Evidence building work is already being undertaken to understand the issue in more detail. ANPR data is being collected to understand what proportion of A1(M) traffic is strategic (i.e. long distance) and commuting (i.e. junction-hopping/commuting trips).	Yes – a study is currently being undertaken by Hertfordshire County Council to explore the issues currently occurring on the A1(M) corridor and explore potential options.	Jameel Hayat (on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council)	11*
M11 Junction 8 NMU provision <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	There is currently limited provision for NMUs at M11 Junction 8. It forms an important link between Bishop's Stortford and Stansted Airport, both of which could experience increased pressure in the future.	Safety / Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0
M1 near Redbourn – on the Nicky Line cycle route - poor lighting in underpass. <b>London to Scotland East</b>	The lighting beneath the M1 on the Nicky Line near Redbourn is poor. Discussions with the HA are understood to be on-going.	Safety / Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0

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					
M25 underpass near to J23 South Mimms - flooding <a href="#">London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</a> <a href="#">London to Leeds (East)</a>	Flooding regularly occurs on the new footway/cycleway underpass route near M25 Junction 23 South Mimms (Wash Lane – Dancers Lane ('Great North Way'))	Safety / Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0
A414 – used as an alternative to the M25 especially during times of congestion <a href="#">London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</a>	The A414 through Hertfordshire is used as an alternative route to the M25 especially during times of congestion which leads to severe congestion including to the south of St Albans, around Hatfield and in Hertford. The A414 already experiences high traffic flows without issues occurring on the M25. This issue points to a wider issue regarding the quality of east-west routes across Hertfordshire which is an existing deficit and is likely to become more important in the future.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	0
M25 J23 South Mimms congestion from A1(M) Southbound onto M25 Clockwise <a href="#">London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</a>	The merge from the A1(M) onto the M25 clockwise experiences congestion especially during the PM peak period.	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Jameel Hayat (on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council)	0

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					
A10/M25 Junction 25 north-south footway/cycleway underpass linking Broxbourne and Enfield  London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	A10/M25 Junction 25 north-south footway/cycleway underpass linking Broxbourne and Enfield needs to be improved.	Safety / Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0
Poor east-west routes across Hertfordshire which has consequences on SRN  London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick London to Leeds (East) London to Scotland East	There is a lack of good quality east-west routes across Hertfordshire. Some major road links such as the A414 vary in standard/capacity. Congestion occurs which causes traffic to seek other routes. If east-west routes can be improved, not just road but also public transport, this may take the pressure off the SRN by providing new/alternative journey opportunities.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.	✓		✓	No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	5
Expansion of Luton and Stansted Airports  London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick London to Leeds (East) London to Scotland East	Future expansion of nearby airports presents a challenge to the operation of the SRN.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council) Chris Carter (North Hertfordshire District Council)	0

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					
Need for improved technology – opportunity to increase capacity <b>General comments</b>	Improved technology should play an increasing role in the operation and improvement of the SRN – it could substitute physical improvements to the network.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	8
A414T Park Street Roundabout congestion <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	A414T Park Street Roundabout currently experiences severe congestion	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	4
Need to re-start the Influencing Travel Behaviour Programme in recognition of existing and possible future capacity issues <b>General comments</b> <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b> <b>London to Leeds (East)</b> <b>London to Scotland East</b>	There is a need to re-start the Influencing Travel Behaviour Programme in recognition of existing and possible future capacity issues, as it can provide benefits and comparatively low cost.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Jameel Hayat (on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council)	0

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					
M11 Junction 8 – potential to be affected by future growth including Bishop’s Stortford urban extension and Stansted Airport <b>London to Leeds (East)</b> <b>East of England</b>	Significant growth is forecast for areas surrounding M11 Junction 8 (including areas surrounding the A120 which adjoins the M11 at Junction 8)	Capacity / Operational / Safety		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	3
M25 section in the vicinity of the M4 and M40 congestion <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	The section of the M25 in the vicinity of where the M40 (J16) and M4 (J15) join still experiences congestion, even though the section has been upgraded	Capacity / Operational	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Philip Bylo (Watford Borough Council)	0
M25 Junction 25 – pressure from proposed development growth <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	M25 Junction 25 (with the A10) could experience increased cumulative pressure from Enfield, Broxbourne and East Hertfordshire.	Capacity / Operational / Safety		✓		No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	0
Poor cycle linkage between St Albans and Hemel Hempstead along A414 corridor <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b> <b>London to Scotland East</b>	There is poor cycle linkage between St Albans and Hemel Hempstead, with a need for a cycle route alongside the A414T corridor. Potential future development growth east of Hemel Hempstead and west of St Albans could increase travel demand on this corridor.	Society & Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None	Nigel Brigham (Sustrans)	0



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					
A1(M) Junction 4 existing congestion and future pressure from development <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	A1(M) near Hatfield currently experiences congestion (on the circulatory carriageway) and is likely to experience increasing pressure in the future as a consequence of proposed development coming forward in surrounding districts including East Herts and Welwyn Hatfield.	This challenge has potential consequences in all areas.	✓	✓		No	Not discussed	None	Martin Paine (East Herts District Council)	0
A1(M) Junction 10 – pressure from potential future development at nearby strategic development site. <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	A1(M) Junction 10 –potential future development at a strategic site at Letchworth (put forward within the NHDC Local Plan Issues and Option consultation) could create issues at this junction in the future.	Capacity / Operational / Safety			✓	No	Not discussed	None	Chris Carter (North Herts District Council)	0

\* Duplicate score for overlapping issue

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

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

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

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

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

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A1(M) Junctions 6-8 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Delegates discussed heavy congestion on this section of the A1(M). Additionally, there is concern that the planned pinch point programme will move existing congestion issues further upstream.	Capacity/Operational	✓			The performance delay maps indicate that there are currently high levels of delay between these junctions.	There appeared to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace. It was indicated that there is evidence to justify this as a key challenge.	Viv Evans will supply a document	Viv Evans (Stevenage Borough Council)	0
A1(M) Junctions 3-4 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b> <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	Capacity issues between A1(M) junctions 3 and 4 which are partially caused by the A414 (delegates felt this was a major factor of congestion) have constrained development especially in Hatfield and to the East of St Albans. Welwyn Hatfield DC is under pressure to deliver housing and employment growth in the borough therefore this issue may hinder development in the future.	Capacity/Operational	✓			The performance delay maps indicate that there are currently some high levels of delay between these junctions.	Not discussed in detail, however Sue Tiley indicated that modelling work is being undertaken.		Sue Tiley (Welwyn Hatfield DC) Chris Briggs (St Albans DC)	0
A1(M) Junctions 4-10 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	There needs to be improved event planning to deal with traffic on the A1 (M) between junctions 4-10 for events taking place at Knebworth House.	Capacity/Operational	✓			Not shown on maps	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience.	No promises of evidence, however Martha Lytton-Cobbald will supply ideas that have previously been dismissed.	Martha Lytton-Cobbald (Knebworth House)	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
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
M1 Junction 8 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Delegates felt that Junction 8 of the M1 was already overloaded and there are issues getting on and off the M1 at this junction. There is growth planned in east Hemel and St Albans (which could be higher than is shown on the growth map), additionally some growth may not be able to occur in these areas and in Dacorum if congestion at Junction 8 persists.	Capacity/Operational	✓	✓	✓	The performance delay maps indicate that there are currently some high levels of delay at this section.  Growth in St Albans and Hemel is shown in the Key Growth map, which could exacerbate issues – St Albans City and District Council has not published a new Local Plan and does not have an adopted Core Strategy in place.	There was no discussion of evidence to support this challenge.	No	Chris Briggs (St Albans DC)	9
A414, M25 <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	Delegates felt that the A414 was used as an alternative route to the M25 and that the A414 can regularly experience congestion because traffic is possibly diverting off the M25 .	Capacity/Operational	✓			The network performance delay maps indicates high vehicle hours delay on the M25, in particular between J21a and J24.	N/A	No	Sue Tiley (Welwyn Hatfield DC)	0
A10, M25 Junction 25 <b>London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick</b>	Delegates discussed M25 Junction 25 with the A10 and raised concern that the current mainline widening works do not comprise of any alterations to the slip roads to increase capacity. Delegates felt that this could be an issue in Broxbourne if slip road capacity is not improved as there are reported to be existing capacity issues at the junction.	Capacity/Operational	✓			The performance delay maps indicate that there are currently high levels of delay at this junction.  Growth in Broxbourne is shown on the Key Growth map.	Broxbourne BC indicated that evidence existed which demonstrated that this is/will be a challenge.	Colin Haigh will forward data.(ELHAM Model is being used to determine forecast traffic flows)	Colin Haigh (Broxbourne BC)	8

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					
M25 London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick	There are issues with congestion on non HA roads when the M25 is congested.	Capacity/Operational	✓			Not possible to show this on the maps presented	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.	No	Colin Haigh (Broxbourne DC)	0
A1(M) London to Leeds (East)	Noise and air pollution in Welwyn (Junctions 4-6) and Stevenage (Junctions 7-8) caused by the A1(M). This may also cause constraints for developments.	Society & Environment	✓			The environment map indicates that the section of the A1 from Junctions 3 to 4 is a designated Noise Improvement Area (2012).	N/A	No	Sue Tiley (Welwyn Hatfield DC)	5
A1(M) London to Leeds (East)	Proposals for retail growth and the regeneration of Stevenage Town Centre could cause capacity issues at junctions 6 through 8.	Capacity/Operational	✓	✓	✓	The delay maps indicate there are currently high vehicle hours of delay on this section of the route.  The growth map shows that there are proposals for employment but does not specify numbers.	No evidence was discussed.	No	Viv Evans (Stevenage BC)	0
A1(M) Junction 7 and 8 London to Leeds (East)	There are proposals for 1,500 to 5,000 dwellings to the west of Stevenage which could have a significant impact on the A1(M).	Capacity/Operational		✓	✓	The delay maps indicate there are high volumes of delay on this section of the route.	N/A	No	Viv Evans (Stevenage BC)	0
A1(M) Junctions 6 and 7	Delegates felt that there needs to be non motorised access to Knebworth House at Junction 6.	Society & Environment/ Safety/	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' local	No	Martha lytton-Cobbald	7

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					
London to Leeds (East)	Issues with people walking across junction 7 of the A1(M) to gain access	Capacity/Operational					knowledge.		(Knebworth House)	
Luton Airport Application London to Leeds (East) London to Scotland East	Proposals for the Luton Airport to increase from 10 to 18 million passengers could have impacts on the M1 and A1(M)	Safety/Capacity/		✓	✓	No	Evidence was not discussed.	No	Viv Evans (Stevenage BC)	0



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

<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>	<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 (&amp; additional notes)</i> <i>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i>
<p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></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><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><i>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</i></p>	
<p>M25 Junction 25 London Orbital and M23 to Gatwick Capacity issues on the slips roads.</p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>It is a current issue and therefore the problem may intensify in the future unless it is addressed.</p>	<p>No trade-offs discussed</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></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><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></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><b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p><i>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</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 (&amp; additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>A1(M) Junction 1-10 Congestion, Capacity and Safety  <b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Safety/ Operational</p>	<p>There are already significant congestion and capacity issues on the corridor and it is considered that this will be a constraint on development.</p>	<p>Discussion amongst the group indicated that this was considered to be a high priority with no suggestion of trade-offs against other priorities.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>M1 Junction 8  <b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Issues with getting on and off at this junction. Delegates felt that Junction 8 of the M1 was already overloaded and</p>	<p>No trade-offs discussed</p>	<p>No discussed</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></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><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></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><b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p><i>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</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 (&amp; additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
		<p>planned developments would cause further issues.</p>		
<p>New M11 Junction 7A  <span style="background-color: #90EE90;">London to Leeds (East)</span></p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>Delegates considered that a new junction on the M11 between Junction 7 and Junction 8 is required in order to facilitate planned growth around Harlow and to alleviate existing and predicted future congestion issues at Junction 7.</p>	<p>No trade-offs discussed</p>	<p>Implementation of M11 Junction 7A</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></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><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></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><b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p><i>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</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 (&amp; additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
<p>A1(M) Junctions 6 – 10  <b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>Congestion and Capacity issues</p>	<p>No trade-offs discussed</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>A1(M) Junctions 4-8  <b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p>	<p>Society &amp; Environmental</p>	<p>Issues with noise and air quality around Welwyn Garden City (Junctions 4-6) and Stevenage (7-8) which may cause a constraint to future</p>	<p>No trade-offs discussed</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>

<p><b>Description of challenge / Location</b></p> <p><i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i></p>	<p><b>Type of challenge</b>  <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b></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><b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b></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><b>How does this compare to other priorities? Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b></p> <p><i>Nb In this session we most interested in <b>how</b> they decide what should be a priority rather than what the priorities are. The sticky dot session will help show what the group think the priorities should be</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 (&amp; additional notes)</i></p> <p><i>Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</i></p>
		<p>development proposals.</p>		
<p>Access to Knebworth House and Developments  <b>London to Leeds (East)</b></p>	<p>Society &amp; Environment/                      Safety/ Capacity/                      Operational</p>	<p>Issues with people walking across junction 7 of the A1(M) to gain access.</p>	<p>No trade-offs were discussed.</p>	<p>Delegates felt that there needs to improve non motorised access to Knebworth House across the A1(M).</p>



## B Accident Location Details

### B.1 Additional Information

This section contains accident locations identified within the top 250 nationally on the SRN affecting the route, and details of collision cluster sites identified from a 3 year study period.

Accident locations on London to Leeds route (top 250 nationally):

A47/A17 Pullover Roundabout (south-western side) – Rank 60

A47/A17 Pullover Roundabout (north-eastern side) – Rank 60

A12 Bury Lodge NB Off-slip – Rank 98

A12/Denmark Road (south of Lowestoft) – Rank 98

A47 Paston Parkway Roundabout, Peterborough – Rank 123

A12 Lowestoft Road (Middleton Roundabout - Link Road Roundabout) – Rank 158

A12 Great Yarmouth Road – Harfreys Roundabout – Rank 158

A120/B1018 Galley's Roundabout, Braintree – Rank 158

A12/A120 Marks Tey Roundabout – Rank 202

A12 Spring Lane on/off slips – Rank 202  
A120/B1024 Junction, Coggeshall – Rank 202

A11 /A1101 Roundabout – Rank 202

A47/A1073 Eye Green Roundabout – Rank 202

A47 Station Road Roundabout, Thorney – Rank 202

Accident studies were carried out over 3 years study period by the respective MACs for Area 6 and Area 8. Details of identified accident cluster sites on the sections of the East of England route in Area 8 and Area 6 are given in Table B.1 and B.2 respectively. The cluster references numbers indicated in the tables are specific to the study area.

**Table B.1 Collision Cluster Sites (2009 – 2011 study period, Area 8)**

Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
10	A14/A11 Jct 36	7	3 PICs- mechanical failure & 1 PIC – icy conditions
14	A11 Fourwentways	9	4 PICs (2009) at MP77/6 (1 PIC – Ice, 2 PICs Single vehicle loss of control 1 PICs Late lane change) 3 PICs nbd exit slip

Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
20	Area 8 Pedal Cycle collisions	23	2009 - 2011 records 23 PICs involve a cyclist 2009- 2 Fatal, 2 Serious & 3 Slight 2010-1 Fatal, 3 Serious & 4 Slight 2011-1 Fatal, 5 Serious & 2 Slight 2012 Q1 & 2 – 3 Serious (A421, A428 & A11) Area Safety Review Study of Cycle Collisions programmed for late 2013/14

**Table B.2 Collision Cluster Sites (2010 – 2012 study period, Area 6)**

Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
35	A11, 1600m from Barton Mills Roundabout	4	Dominant pattern of attempted overtake manoeuvres observed.
32	A11, Approximately a mile south of Elveden Equestrian Centre	4	Rear end collisions observed.
11	A11 Mundford Road Roundabout, Thetford	4	No dominant trend observed.
3	A11 Barton Mills Village (C614)	5	Collisions due to vehicles turning right at the junction.
24	A11 - War Memorial	5	All rear end collisions.
20	A11 Elveden Cross Roads	5	No commentary given in study
9	A11 London Road Roundabout, Thetford	5	No commentary given in study
30	A11 - Fen Street, London Road Roundabout	5	Dominant pattern of loss of control accidents observed (2 of these on the roundabout)
18	A11/ B1112 Junction to Icklingham	8	High number of collisions as a result of vehicles turning right/left from B1112.
15	A11, Thickthorn Roundabout	8	3 Collisions due to vehicles changing lanes at roundabout. 5 collisions were coded as nose-total collisions.
5	A11 Barton Mills Five Ways Roundabout	9	Collisions due to vehicles changing lanes/Circulatory movement in the roundabout.
29	A12 Tesco's /Bentley Drive Roundabout	4	3 out of 4 collisions involved pedal cyclists.



Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
22	A12 Junction Great Eastern Linear Park, Lowestoft	4	No dominant trend observed.
31	A12 Gunton Street Junction	4	All collisions due to vehicles turning into Gunton Street.
12	A12 Southbound carriageway near Terling Hall Bridge	4	Rear end collisions observed. Examined during 2013 Route Report
20	A12 northbound carriageway, near Henry Dixon Bridge	4	No dominant trend observed.
21	A12 Southbound carriageway near Henry Dixon Bridge	4	No dominant trend observed.
82	A12 Southbound Carriageway near Southbound on slip B1024 Kelvedon Interchange	4	Rear end collisions observed.
102	A12 Southbound J25 Marks Tey	4	Pattern of lane change manoeuvres
103	A12S, Northbound near A12(J27)/A133 Spring Lane	4	No dominant trend observed.
74	A12 Southbound carriageway on near onslip from spring lane	4	No dominant trend observed.
104	A12 Northbound mainline at Ardleigh interchange	4	Pattern of loss of control collisions
106	Southbound carriageway near A12(J30)/B1029 Stratford St Mary	4	Pattern of tail end collisions
34	Southbound carriageway near A12(J31)/B1070 Four Sisters Interchange	4	Scheme delivered February 2011, improving signs to onslip, two collisions since improvements with no clear pattern.
79	Southbound carriageway & on-slip near A12(J33)/A14(J55) Copdock	4	Lane change manoeuvres observed however, these occurred prior to recent improvement (signalisation) scheme in November 2011.
17	A12, 800m North of Marsh Road	5	Tail end collisions observed.
7	A12 Rackham's Corner Roundabout	5	No dominant trend observed.
2	Southbound offslip A12(J12)/A1023/B1002 Mountnessing	5	
4	Northbound offslip A12(J15)/A414/B1002 Webb's Farm	5	Rear end collision at approach to roundabout observed.
77	Northbound carriageway near A12(J30)/B1029 Stratford St	5	Pattern of tail end collisions

Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
	Mary		
8	A12 Junction with Corton Long Lane	6	Collisions involving turning manoeuvres at Corton Long Lane,
27	A12 Bevan Street	6	No dominant trend observed.
15	A12 Station Square	6	2 pedal cycle collisions and 2 powered two wheeled collisions but no dominant cause.
31	Northbound offslip A12(J27) at A133 Spring Lane RBT	6	Rear end collisions observed at approach to roundabout.
101	Southbound near A12(J19)/A130/A138/B1137 Boreham	7	Rear end collisions.
97 & 61	A12 Northbound and Southbound Hughes Corner	7	Collisions due to vehicle skidding. Scheme delivered
93	A12/A14/A1214 Copdock Roundabout	7	High number of collisions due to change of lanes at traffic lights observed. Section 278 improvement scheme delivered November 2011. The majority of these collisions occurred prior to scheme completion.
2, 3, 19 & 28	A12, Pasteur Road Roundabout including approaches and n/b exit	8	Five of the collisions occurred in 2010, trend of tail end collisions observed.
14	A12 Denmark Road Junction with Katwijk Way	8	Collisions due to vehicles turning right into Katwijk Way
1	Southbound carriageway & off-slip 25(J28)/A12(J11)/A1023 Brook Street	9	Rear end collisions observed.
60	A12 Northbound carriageway near New Arch Bridge	9	High number of loss of control collisions observed of which 2 are fatal
4	A12, Harfreys Roundabout	10	Tail end collisions and Roundabout related collisions observed.
20	A12 Entrance to James Paget Hospital	10	Right turn & tail end collisions observed.
90	Northbound offslip to J26 Eight Ash Green	11	Rear end collisions observed,
36	Northbound carriageway & off-slip A12(J33)/A14(J55) Copdock	19	High number of rear end collisions at approach to roundabout observed. Section 278 improvement scheme delivered November 2011. 7 of the collisions occurred since the scheme completed.
63	A47 South Brink j/w Nettle Bank	3	No dominant trend observed.

Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
47	A47 - Bretton Way Interchange Westbound off slip	4	Rear end Collisions due to vehicles slowing down when approaching roundabout.
10	A47/A1073 Eye Green Roundabout	4	No dominant trend observed.
23	AQ47 - Junction with Church Lane, East Winch	4	Collisions due to vehicles waiting to turn right.
40	A47 - Poplar Farm/Church Road/Dell Corner Lane	4	No dominant trend observed.
95	A47 westbound carriageway, approximately 180 m west of unstill marshes	4	No dominant trend observed.
45	A47 Junction with Paddy's Loke	4	High severity cluster – 2 eastbound nose-total collisions and one head on.
9	A47 - Hodney Road Roundabout	5	No dominant trend observed.
49	A47 - Eastbound approach to B1441 junction, Guyhirn & the B1441 Junction	5	No dominant trend observed.
42	A1064 Acle Roundabout	5	Tail end collisions observed
44	A47 - Junction with Halvergate Road	5	No dominant trend observed.
76	A47 East Roundabout	6	Majority of collisions occurred due to Loss of control of vehicles. 3 of the 6 accidents occurred in the wet.
19	A47/A1101 Roundabout	6	Tail end collisions due to vehicles waiting at the roundabout to give way
37	A47 - Cucumber Lane Roundabout	9	High number of rear end collisions observed at approach to roundabout as a result of queuing traffic ahead.
6	A47 - Dogsthorpe/P aston Parkway	16	High number of tail end collisions observed at approach to roundabout as a result of queuing traffic ahead. Loss of control accidents also observed.
5	Harwich Road junction with A120, Little Bentley.	9	High number of collisions due to vehicles turning into/from Harwich road observed.
6	Little Bromley Road junction with A120.	9	High number of collisions due to vehicles turning into/from Little Bromley road observed.
7	A120 Horsley Cross Roundabout.	4	No dominant trend observed.
2	A120 - B1018 Galleys Corner Roundabout	7	Collisions due to circulatory movement at roundabout.

Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
5	A120 Kings Lane Junction	7	Collisions due to vehicles turning into/from Kings Lane Road. Junction operation influenced by recent Marks
28	A120 200m west of Hollies Road	4	No dominant trend observed.
7	B1024 Colne Road Junction	6	Collisions due to vehicles turning into/from Colne Road.

## C Route condition

### C.1 Structures: additional information

Table C.1 below lists the structures on the route identified as requiring significant works above normal routine maintenance in the period to 2021.

**Table C.1 Structures requiring significant works before 2021**

Location and name of structure	Summary of necessary works	Estimated date by which works will be required
A12 Lowestoft - Bascule Bridge	Replacement of Hydraulic Drive Units	20014/15
A138 (old A12) - Chelmers Viaduct	Replacement of structure	2016
A12 Great Yarmouth – Breydon Bridge	Drainage modification, deck repainting and expansion joints replacement	2014/15

### C.2 Technology: additional information

Table C.2 below lists the technology provision along the route, along with any known gaps in provision.

**Table C.2 Summary of current technology provision**

Route	System	Existing	Known Gaps
A11	CCTV -	Nil	Nil
	VMS -	Both approaches to A14 only	Nil
A12	CCTV -	9 cameras along route	Nil
	VMS –	Colchester and Chelmsford and approaches to A14 & M25	Nil
A47	CCTV -	Eye and Guyhirn	Possible at major junctions
A120	CCTV -	3 Cameras	Possible at major junctions
	VMS -	FTMS at approach to M11	Nil

### C.3 Environment: additional information

Table C. below lists areas which noise modelling and monitoring has identified as important areas with first priority locations (FPLs) for which we have prepared noise action plans.

**Table C.3 Summary of Noise FPLs**

IA Identifier	Location	Authority
4759	A12 London Road (section parallel to Old London Road between Dobbies Lane and Winnards Windybags)	Colchester
4784	A12 Ipswich Road (between Park Lane and Turnpike Close)	Colchester
4787	A12 Ipswich Road (between River Stour and Stratford Road)	Colchester
4789	A12 Ipswich Road (between Hughes Road and Dedham Road)	Babergh
4790	A12 (between Wenham Lane and Woodgates Road)	Babergh
4791	A12 (between Woodgates Lane and Junction 31)	Babergh
4794	A12 (between Red Lane and Pound Lane)	Babergh
4796	A12 (section east of Capel St Mary)	Babergh
4797	A12 (section south of Junction 32b, opposite Ipswich Cricket Club)	Babergh
4989	A12 (between William Adams Way roundabout and Park Road roundabout)	Gt Yarmouth
4996	A12 Yarmouth Road (between Hall Road and Jay Lane)	Gt Yarmouth
4999	A12 Yarmouth Road (between Market Lane and Gorleston Road roundabout)	Waveney
5000	A12 Yarmouth Road (between Gorleston Road roundabout and Blundeston Road)	Waveney
5358	A12 Ingatestone Bypass (between Seymour Field and Junction 13)	Brentwood
5411	A12 (between Telling Hall Road and Waltham Road)	Chelmsford
5412	A12 Ipswich Road (between Hughes Road and Dedham Road)	Chelmsford & Braintree
5413	A12 (section between Junction 20B and Bury Lane)	Braintree
5414	A12 (section parallel with Howbridge Hall Road)	Braintree
5415	A12 (section between Howbridge Hall Road and River Brain)	Braintree
5416	A12 (section between Domsey Brook and Ewell Hall Chase)	Colchester
5417	A12 (section between Easthorpe Road and Domsey Chase)	Braintree
5420	A12 (section between Sniveller's Lane and A12 off-slip)	Braintree
5705	A12 Ingatestone Bypass (between Fryerning Lane and Junction 13 off slip)	Brentwood
5706	A12 Ingatestone Bypass (between Roman Road and A12 on slip)	Brentwood
5707	A12 Ingatestone Bypass (between A12 on slip and Church Lane)	Brentwood

IA Identifier	Location	Authority
5751	A12 (section between Weald Road and Wigley Bush Lane)	Brentwood
6092	A12 (section between Junction 26 roundabout and on/off slip to Spring Lane)	Colchester
6097	A12 Ipswich Road (between Birchwood Road and Ipswich Road off slip)	Colchester
6141	A12 Ipswich Road (section parallel with B1137 Main Road, opposite Brick House Farm)	Chelmsford
6142	A12 (section between Travelodge Hotel and B1024 London Road bridge)	Braintree
6143	A12 (between Travelodge Hotel and Easthorpe Road, opposite Maple House)	Braintree
6144	A12 London Road (section between Junction 22 and Oak Road junction)	Braintree
6145	A12 London Road (section between Henry Dixon Road and Oak Road)	Braintree
6170	A12 Ingatestone Bypass (section parallel with B1002 High Street)	Brentwood
6191	A12 (section parallel with B1137 Main Road, west of Terling Hall Road bridge)	Braintree
6192	A12 (section between Junction 20b and Junction 21)	Braintree
6232	A12 (section between Weald Road and Doddinghurst Road)	Brentwood
4760	A12 London Road/A120 Coggeshall Road, Marks Tey	Colchester
4712	A120 (between M11 Junction 8 roundabout and Priory Wood roundabout)	Uttlesford
4720	A120/B1256 Stortford Road Junction	Uttlesford
4730	A120 section parallel with B1256, between Stebling Road and Bletches Farm	Uttlesford
4738	A120 (section between Notley Road bridge and River Brain	Braintree
4744	A120 Coggeshall Road (between Kings Lane and Lanham Farm Road)	Braintree
4747	A120 Coggeshall Road (between Water Lane and Bridge Hall Road)	Braintree
4748	A120 Coggeshall Road ( between Bridge Hall Road and Riverside)	Braintree
4749	A120 Coggeshall Road (between Riverside and River Black Water)	Braintree
4758	A120 Coggeshall Road (between Church Lane and Great Tey Road)	Colchester
4948	A11	Forest Heath
4950	A11	Forest Heath

IA Identifier	Location	Authority
4951	A11	Forest Heath
4952	A11	Forest Heath
4953	A11	Forest Heath
5178	A47	Peterborough
5197	A47	Breckland
5198	A47	Breckland
5199	A47	Breckland
5200	A47	Breckland
5201	A47	Breckland
5202	A47	S Norfolk
5204	A47	Broadland
5209	A47	Broadland
5210	A47	Broadland
5378	A47	Peterborough
6186	A47	Peterborough
6285	A47	Peterborough
6286	A47	Peterborough
6287	A47	Broadland



## D Future considerations

### D.1 Economic growth additional Information

Table D.1 below lists the housing and economic growth proposals by Local Authority. Where possible, these are taken from the adopted local plan. For authorities without an adopted local plan, figures are a 'best estimate' based on options which the authority has placed in the public domain. This is a list of the information summarised and aggregated at Local Enterprise Partnership level in Figure 3 of the main report.

**Table D.1 Housing and economic growth proposals by Local Authority**

Location of Development	Development Type	Scale by 2015 <sup>1</sup>	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031 <sup>2</sup>	Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
Babergh District Council	Residential Commercial	1,515 units 1,940 jobs	3,935 units 4,850 jobs	4,642 units 9,700 jobs	A12 J30 – A14 Copdock Interchange
Braintree District Council	Residential Commercial	996 units 2,240 jobs	3,255 units 5,600 jobs	4,575 units 8,400 jobs (up to 2026)	A120 junctions – Braintree bypass
Breckland Council	Residential Commercial	2,206 units Not known	8,604 units 6,000 jobs	14,209 units 6,000 jobs (up to 2026)	A11 Thetford – Attleborough A47 Swafham - Dereham
Brentwood Borough Council	Residential Commercial	624 units Not known	1,585 units 2,160 jobs	3,632 units 5,400 jobs (up to 2030)	A12 J11
Chelmsford City Council	Residential Commercial	2,059 units 1,920 jobs	8,382 units 4,800 jobs	Not known Not known (up to 2021)	A12 Junctions 14 - 19
Colchester Borough Council	Residential Commercial	2,736 units 2,840 jobs	8,067 units 7,100 jobs	10,914 units Not known (up to 2027)	A12 Junctions 25 - 29
East Cambridgeshire District Council	Residential Commercial	1,587 units 1,840 jobs	6,108 units 4,600 jobs	9,770 units 9,200 jobs	A11/B1085 junction (nr Red Lodge)
Fenland District Council	Residential Commercial	1,590 units 1,440 jobs	4,810 units 3,600 jobs	11,000 units 7,200 jobs	A47 junctions between Guyhirn - Wisbech
Forest Heath District Council	Residential Commercial	1,407 units 1,460 jobs	3,557 units 3,650 jobs	7,221 units 5,475 jobs (up to 2026)	A11 Fiveways and A14 Junction 37

Location of Development	Development Type	Scale by 2015 <sup>1</sup>	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031 <sup>2</sup>	Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
Greater Norwich area	Residential Commercial	8,765 units 6,000 jobs	22,894 units 15,000 jobs	32,039 units 22,500 jobs (up to 2026)	A47 including Norwich bypass and A11
Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Residential Commercial	704 units Not known	3,333 units Not known	6,285 units Not known (up to 2029)	A12 junctions
King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council	Residential Commercial	3,090 units 1,000 jobs	9,472 units 2,500 jobs	14,489 units Not known (up to 2026)	A47 junctions including King's Lynn bypass
Peterborough City Council	Residential Commercial	4,521 units Not known	15,617 units Not known	24,266 units 20,000 jobs (up to 2026)	A47 (east of A1)
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Residential Commercial	2,809 units 4,400 jobs	10,119 units 11,000 jobs	19,289 units 22,000 jobs	A11, SE of Cambridge
Tendring District Council	Residential Commercial	1,509 units 1,600 jobs	4,003 units 4,000 jobs	Not known Not known (up to 2021)	A120 Colchester - Harwich
Uttlesford District Council	Residential Commercial	1,873 units 1,156 jobs	4,462 units 2,890 jobs	6,534 units 4,913 jobs (up to 2028)	M11 Junctions 8/8a and 9, and A120
Waveney District Council	Residential Commercial	803 units 1,000 jobs	2,717 units 2,500 jobs	3,828 units Not known (up to 2025)	A12, Lowestoft

<sup>1</sup>From April 2011/12

<sup>2</sup>Plan periods vary – where they differ to 2031, this is stated in brackets

#### East of England – key site data

Location of Development	Development Type	Scale by 2015	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031	Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
Thetford Sustainable Urban Extension, Breckland	Residential Commercial	Not known Not known	Not known Not known	5,000 units 5,000 jobs	A11 Thetford bypass junctions

Location of Development	Development Type	Scale by 2015	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031	Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
South of Attleborough Urban Extension, Breckland	Residential Commercial	Not known Not known	Not known Not known	4,000 units 2,000 jobs	A11 Attleborough bypass junctions
West of Mile End Road, Colchester	Residential	0 units	2,857 units	4,000 units	A12 Junction 27
Beaulieu Park, North of Chelmsford	Residential Commercial	Not known Not known	Not known Not known	3,600 units 62,300sqm	A12 Junction 19
Norwich Research Park expansion	Commercial	Not known	Not known	100,000sqm / 50ha	A47/A11 Thickthorn Interchange, A47/B1108 Watton Rd junction, A47/A1074 Longwater Interchange
Rackheath, Old Catton, Sprowston and Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich	Residential Commercial	995 units Not known	3,770 units Not known	10,000 units Not known	A47 Postwick Interchange
Broadland Business Park expansion, Norwich	Commercial	Not known	Not known	50,000 sqm	A47 Postwick Interchange
Lake Lothing, Lowestoft	Residential Commercial	389 units Not known	954 units Not known	1,585 units 1,000 jobs	A12 junctions

## D.2 Future committed schemes additional information

Table D.2 provides a full list of all committed strategic road network schemes which are expected to be delivered in the period to 2021. This is a full list of the information summarised in Table 3.2 of the main report.

**Table D.2 Committed SRN enhancement schemes**

Location	Scheme Type	Completion Year	Anticipated Benefits
A11 Fiveways - Thetford	A11 widened to dual carriageway between Fiveways and	2014-15	Capacity and safety benefits plus improved access to several major developments along A11 corridor

	Thetford.		and to Norwich
A12 Kelvedon	Pinch-point scheme: Average speed safety cameras	2014-15	Safety benefits and reduced incident-related disruptions
A12 Hughes Corner	Pinch-point scheme: Average speed safety cameras	2014-15	Safety benefits and reduced incident-related disruptions
A47 Honingham	Pinch-point scheme: Junction improvement	2014-15	Capacity and safety benefits plus improved access to several major developments along A47 corridor
A47 Wansford, Peterborough	Pinch-point scheme: Junction improvement	2014-15	Capacity and safety benefits plus improved access to developments along A47 and A1 corridors
A120 Galleys Corner	Pinch-point scheme: Junction improvement	2014-15	Capacity benefits and improved access to developments along A120 corridor

Table D.3 provides a full list of known, committed local transport network enhancement scheme expected to be delivered in the period to 2021. This is a full list of the information summarised in Table 3.4 of the main report.

**Table D.3 Committed local transport network enhancement schemes**

Project	Scheme Type	Completion Year	Anticipated Impacts on the Route
Ipswich Transport Fit for 21st century 2012-13	Mixed	2014-15	Likely to generate opportunities for modal shift including for A12 traffic to and from Ipswich
A12 J19 Boreham Improvement (developer funded)	Road	Developer timetable	Facilitates efficient access to/from development to A12

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

© Crown copyright 2014.

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

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

If you have any enquiries about this document email [ha\\_info@highways.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ha_info@highways.gsi.gov.uk) or call **0300 123 5000\***. Please quote the Highways Agency publications code PR197/13

\* 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 Bedford Job number s130629