

# Felixstowe to the Midlands Route Strategy Evidence Report Technical Annex April 2014



## Document History

### Felixstowe to the Midlands route-based strategy evidence report

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</b>	<b>Stakeholder Event Summary</b>	<b>A-1</b>
A.1	Background	A-1
<b>B</b>	<b>Accident Location Details</b>	<b>B-1</b>
B.1	Additional Information	B-1
<b>C</b>	<b>Route condition</b>	<b>C-4</b>
C.1	Structures: additional information	C-4
C.2	Technology: additional information	C-4
C.3	Environment: additional information	C-5
<b>D</b>	<b>Future considerations</b>	<b>D-1</b>
D.1	Economic growth additional Information	D-1

## Tables

Table A.1	Stakeholder Events Record - Greater Cambridge & Greater Peterborough LEP Workshop	A-3
Table A.2	Stakeholder Events Record - New Anglia LEP Workshop	A-25
Table A.3	Stakeholder Events Record - South East Midlands & Northamptonshire Workshop	A-80
Table A.4	Stakeholder Events Record - Leicestershire and Coventry & Warwickshire Workshop	A-122
Table B.2	Collision Cluster Sites (2009 – 2011 study period, Area 8)	B-1
Table C.3	Structures requiring significant works before 2021	C-4
Table C.4	Summary of current technology provision	C-4
Table C.5	Summary of AQMAs	C-5
Table C.6	Summary of Noise FPLs	C-6
Table D.7	Housing and economic growth proposals by Local Authority	D-1

## 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.

Another Route Based Strategy (RBS) Stakeholder Workshop was held in Kettering in October 2013, to help identify current and future issues within the South East Midlands LEP and Northamptonshire LEP areas.

The Northamptonshire LEP area corresponds with the county of Northamptonshire, incorporating seven local planning authorities.

The South East Midlands LEP covers a large area incorporating Luton, Milton Keynes, Central Bedfordshire and Bedford unitary authorities, several of the Northamptonshire district authorities, Aylesbury Vale district (which is also located in the Buckinghamshire Thames Valley LEP) and Cherwell district (which is also located in the Oxfordshire LEP).

The following RBS routes traverse these two overlapping LEP areas:

London to Leeds (East) – this route covers the A1 in Central Bedfordshire and Bedford.

London to Scotland East - this route covers the M1 from Junction 10/10a at Luton to Junction 18 near Daventry, as well as the A5 which extends from M1 Junction 9 in Hertfordshire to the north of Daventry via the junction with the A43 at Towcester and M1 Junction 17.

Felixstowe to Midlands - this route covers the A14 which runs east-west across Northamptonshire, as well as the A421 which links the M1 and A1 through Central Bedfordshire and Bedford borough, and the A45 which links the M1 near Northampton (J15) and the A14 near Thrapston (J13).

Solent to Midlands - this route covers the A43 which links the M1 at J15a near Northampton and the M40 Junction 10 near Bicester, as well as a section of the A34 between M40 Junction 9 (near Bicester) and Oxford.

London to Scotland West - this route covers the M40 from south of Junction 9 (near Bicester) to the north of Junction 11 (near Banbury).

In September 2013, a RBS Stakeholder Workshop was also held to help identify current and future issues with the Highways Agency's Strategic Road Network (SRN) within Leicestershire and Coventry & Warwickshire LEP areas. The following RBS routes traverse these LEP areas:

Felixstowe to Midlands

South Midlands

North and East Midlands

Midlands to Wales

London to Scotland East

London to Scotland West

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.



**Table A.1 Stakeholder Events Record - Greater Cambridge & Greater Peterborough LEP 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
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		✓	✓	No	No evidence was discussed.	None	Mike Salter (Cambridge shire 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					
		the challenges.								
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 Cambridgeshire 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 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> 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 <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.	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> <b>East of England</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	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>



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

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	

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 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	
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 having moderate benefit.			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 <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), 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 acts.	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 <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					
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 too 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 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					
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 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	<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 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	<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 <b>London to Leeds (East)</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>  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.
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	<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.

<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
and the surrounding settlements.				
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 or a local road network.

<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
<b>Error! No table of figures entries found.</b> A1(M), A14, A428 Alconbury Weston, London to Leeds (East) Felixstowe to Midlands	<b>Capacity</b>	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.	2 votes	Not discussed
Roads around Cambridge <b>General comment</b>	<b>Operational</b>	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)	2 votes	Not discussed
Cambridge Area A14 Felixstowe to Midlands <b>General comment</b>	<b>Operational / Capacity</b>	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.	2 votes	Not discussed
M11 London to Leeds (East) Stansted airport to GCGP	<b>Capacity</b>	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.	2 votes	Not discussed
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

<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 <span style="background-color: red; color: white; padding: 2px;">East of England</span>	<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 <span style="background-color: #90EE90; padding: 2px;">London to Leeds (East)</span> 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 - New Anglia LEP Workshop**

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		

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>	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



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>	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
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

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					
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 away road markings.	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 <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					
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 section in question	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					
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
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 <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					
A47 Vauxhall Roundabout, Great Yarmouth <b>East of England</b>	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	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓		No – evidence map for ‘network performance’ does not highlight the issue	No additional evidence highlighted	None	Dave Cumming (Norfolk CC)	3
A11 Thetford Bypass <b>East of England</b>	Capacity issues may arise from significant growth expected to take place around Thetford (including the Thetford Sustainable Urban Extension)	Capacity / Operational		✓		No – evidence map for ‘network performance’ does not highlight any existing capacity issues on the Thetford Bypass	No additional evidence highlighted (but evidence associated with the Thetford Sustainable Urban Extension may be relevant)	None	Peter Mileham (Breckland Council)	3
Network wide <b>East of England</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	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.	Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	✓			No	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 <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 section to be de-trunked (Elveden) and A12 within Lowestoft <b>East of England</b>	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	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	Anthony Wright (Sustrans)	4
Network wide <b>East of England</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	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



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>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
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

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 Lowestoft <b>East of England</b>	Existing capacity issues need to be addressed	Capacity / Operational	✓			<p>Yes – evidence map for ‘peak hour speeds’ shows low average speeds at peak times.</p> <p>Yes – evidence map for ‘network performance’ shows the highest potential economic benefit from congestion relief.</p> <p>Yes – evidence map for ‘safety on the network’ shows high collision risks and a top 100 collision location.</p>	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>  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
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

**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)                      Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>A47 Easton to Tuddenham  <b>East of England</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Not discussed, but it is a pre-2021 priority</p>	<p>Dualling of the single lane section</p>
<p>A47 Middleton - East Winch  <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  <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>



**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 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>
<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></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 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	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	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					
						time			Council	
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

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					
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
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

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					
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
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



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					
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)                      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></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>LEP Great Yarmouth to Lowestoft</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	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
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

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 45 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	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 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	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
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 & 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
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

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 – 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
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

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					
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
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

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 – 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
<b>General Comment</b> <b>East of England</b>	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.	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



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 Copdock Interchange (A12 junction) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	This junction was optimised to protect the A14 and therefore concerns were raised that going forward the A12 could have problems which could affect the economy of the local area and of Ipswich.	Capacity / Operational / Society & Environment	✓	✓	✓	No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience.	None	Peter Grimm (Suffolk CC)	0
<b>General Comment</b> <b>East of England</b> <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	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.	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>  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 – Capacity issues at Ipswich junctions <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	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 <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	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) <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	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 <a href="#">Felixstowe to Midlands</a>	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

**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)                      Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>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.</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Operational</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Not discussed directly</p>	<p>None discussed</p>
<p>A14 – Traffic Officer Service</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Safety / Operational</p>	<p>This is considered a priority due to impacts on safety and delay that occurs when vehicles are not moved quickly following breakdowns or accidents.</p>	<p>Not discussed directly</p>	<p>None discussed</p>
<p>A14 – three lanes</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Safety</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Not discussed directly but it was acknowledged that this scheme was unlikely to be provided</p>	<p>Three lanes is considered a solution to capacity issues.</p>
<p>Port of Felixstowe</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Need to protect the operation of the A14 and A12 to ensure Felixstowe remains an economic driver.</p>	<p>Not discussed directly although delegates acknowledged that it was an important economic priority in the area.</p>	<p>None discussed</p>
<p>A120 Braintree – A12</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>This is considered a priority as it would provide additional east-west capacity in the region and potentially alleviate some pressure on the A14.</p>	<p>Not discussed directly but acknowledged by delegates that this was a lower priority at the engagement as not in the study area.</p>	<p>Capacity improvements – potentially through dualling.</p>
<p>Reduction in traffic and promotion of sustainable travel (region wide)</p> <p><b>General Comment</b></p>	<p>Operational / Society &amp; Environment</p>	<p>Considers a longer term view to maintaining the operation of the trunk road network without large infrastructure changes.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>None 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)                      Maintenance &amp; renewals/Operation / Junction improvement / Adding capacity / New road / other</p>
<p>Resurfacing of concrete sections of the network (region wide)</p> <p><b>General Comment</b></p>	<p>Operational / Society &amp; Environment</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>None discussed</p>
<p>A47 – Acle Straight, recognised as an area that frequently experiences capacity and safety issues.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Safety</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Not discussed but raised as an issue by a number of delegates so potentially of high priority.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>A47 – Thickthorn Interchange</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>This is currently recognised as a junction of high flows, where two key routes in the network meet and which currently experiences congestion issues.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>None discussed</p>
<p>A47 – Longwater Interchange</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>None discussed</p>
<p>A12 – Bascule Bridge – if the bridge is closed this can result in significant congestion issues in the area.</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Safety / Operational</p>	<p>This was recognised as one of the key problems facing the A12 and had a significant impact on Lowestoft.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>The potential for a third river crossing was 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>A12 – Phase 5 Lowestoft Northern Spine Road</p> <p><b>East of England</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>This was considered a priority to remove some vehicles from other overloaded roads in the Lowestoft area.</p>	<p>This was briefly mentioned at the end of the session so potentially considered less of a priority.</p>	<p>None discussed</p>
<p>A12 – Junction 30, 31 and 32a – virtually non-existent slip roads which presents a safety issue.</p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>This is a priority due to the potential for accidents when vehicles are joining a 70mph carriageway from stationary.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>None discussed</p>
<p>Southern section of the A12 can result in severance for local road movements and vulnerable road users</p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>It was acknowledged that the provision of more local road options is a local authority concern rather than the HA.</p>	<p>Provision of more regular local road crossing points.</p>

**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 Felixstowe to Midlands	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 Felixstowe to Midlands	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 Felixstowe to Midlands	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	

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 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	
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		Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	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					
						'potential economic benefit of congestion relief' shows as having high and highest economic benefits				
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 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 or bad condition		Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	3	
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	

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					
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		✓		<p>Yes - Evidence shows moderate economic benefit to the improvement of the roads.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Yes – the evidence map for ‘safety in the network’ shows high collision risks on the section in question</p>		Richard Perkins (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce)	2	
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)	4	
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)	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					
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)	1	
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		Cllr John Hinton (Councillor for Babergh DC)	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					
						generally the travel time is good.				
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	
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					
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	
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	

**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		

<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>  <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)                      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)                      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</p> <p><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</p> <p><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</p> <p><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>  <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)                      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 - South East Midlands & Northamptonshire Workshop**

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

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
SRN wide <b>General Comments</b>	Growth information for Northamptonshire looks accurate but this needs to be the case across all regions so that where growth information is being taken into account in identifying priorities, it is reliable e.g. not based on previous RSS data.	Society and Environment	✓			No	N/A	Further growth information can be provided by respective JPUs in Northamptonshire.	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	
A14, A45, A43 and A5 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>Solent to Midlands</b> <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Lorry parking and the location and availability of lay-bys is becoming an increasing issue. Lay-bys on the A14 in particular and also the A45, A43 and A5 are used for overnight stops by HGV drivers. However the HGV's often become a target of anti-social behaviour.	Society and Environment	✓			No	Lorry parks may not be attractive economic investments and the government/HA need to consider taking a more proactive role in providing lorry parking facilities.  Northampton CC's A14 Challenge and Summit work provides evidence of this and other issues in respect of the A14 (details forwarded	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC) and Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	8

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & 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					
							post-meeting).			
A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	Delivery of housing and employment in Kettering East is dependent on the need for SRN infrastructure - a new junction (10a) and substantial new local road infrastructure (WEWA link to the A43 north of Kettering.	Growth/Society and Environment	✓			Yes – on growth plans	Information produced in support of the Kettering East planning application and AECOM study work.	Information being produced as part of the Kettering East Funding Bid being coordinated by KBC.	Simon Richardson [SR] (Kettering BC)	17
A14 Felixstowe to Midlands	Future pressures on A14 between junctions 3 and 7 and at A14 J4 itself – from growth of Kettering and Corby and wider network growth.	Capacity/Operational		✓	✓	No (not a significant existing problem).	Study work associated with the Kettering Bypass widening scheme.	NCC may have some information on future traffic issues on A14 in Kettering area e.g. NSTM	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants), Simon Richardson [SR] (Kettering BC), and Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	4

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

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

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A45 Felixstowe to Midlands	Accident problems on the A45 e.g. at Raunds.	Capacity/ Operational/	✓			Yes	N/A	N/A	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	
A45 Felixstowe to Midlands	Single carriageway section of the A45 between Stanwick and Thrapstone already has poor journey times and future pressures will increase congestion on this section of the A45.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	Yes	N/A	NCC can provide information from NSTM.	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	
A45 Felixstowe to Midlands	Junction problems in Wellingborough/Rushden area e.g. at Turnells Mill and Wilby Way (PPP scheme at Wilby Way will come under future pressure from development growth).	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	Yes	Current HA study work with input from NSTM.	Town Transport Strategies being produced by NCC.		

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what <u>evidence</u> is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A45 Felixstowe to Midlands	A45 causes severance in the Rushden and Stanwick areas.	Society / Environment		✓	✓	No	Rushden Transport Study commissioned by ENDC, and Town Transport Strategies being produced by NCC.  Destination Nene Valley Report	ENDC and NCC to provide information.	Karen Britton [KB] (East Northants)	3
A45 Felixstowe to Midlands	Possible impact of Rushden Lakes development proposal – subject to SoS decision on Public Inquiry.	Capacity/ Operational		✓	✓	No	Transport Assessment for the development includes a significant improvement to the A45 Skew Bridge junction.	N/A	Andrew Longley [AL] (N Northants)	
A45 Felixstowe to Midlands	Heavy traffic volumes on A45 and its junction in the Northampton area causing flow breakdown on the A45 and congestion on local roads crossing the A45.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	HA study work (HA and local authorities have agreed the need for the A45 Northampton Growth Management Scheme to be delivered principally through developer contributions).	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	1



Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & 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					
A5 London to Scotland East	A5 traffic through constrained historic Towcester causes air quality and other environmental problems. HA should consider addressing this through a Towcester Bypass possibly through a joint scheme with developer of Towcester South.	Society / Environment		✓	✓	Yes	N/A	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	2
A43 Solent to Midlands	Existing congestion in Towcester at the Tove and Abthorpe roundabouts which will get worse as proposed growth takes place at Silverstone and Towcester. PPP scheme at Tove will help ease existing congestion but problems will build up in the future.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	HA PPP scheme modelling and Silverstone/Towcester modelling provides detailed information.	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	
A43, M40, M1 Solent to Midlands London to Scotland West London to Scotland East	Congestion at M40 J10 and section of A43 between M40 and Brackley and at M1 J15a.	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	Yes	N/A	N/A	Helen Russell-Emmerson [HRE] (NCC)	

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

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

<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>	
A45 Chowns Mill junction – Traffic Congestion now and increasing with growth <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Capacity/Operational/ Growth	CW, KB and AL - General agreement that this is a very high priority owing to existing problems of congestion and need to support growth in the surrounding area.	AL – Worst congestion point on the A45 now that Wilby Way has a PPP scheme.	HA recognises this is a priority and is already undertaking preliminary design work in order to submit a bid for funding detailed design of an improvement scheme at the junction – but not yet clear whether this will adequately cater for growth.
Need to have a transparent methodology for assessing priorities – e.g. a matrix based prioritisation framework. This could be used to compare SRN priorities against NCC priorities. <b>General Comment</b>	Partnering	HRE – It will be important for the HA to demonstrate how it has identified priorities and that they are consistent with LEP/NCC priorities (and compare well against NCC priorities).	HRE – It is difficult to assign priorities as the network should be considered holistically.	
A14 Existing junctions around Kettering and new Junction 10a <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Providing SRN infrastructure to support growth	SR – Significant SRN infrastructure has been identified as essential to support growth of Kettering. Kettering Bypass widening is committed but A14 junction improvements at Junctions 8, 9 and 10 are also required as is a new Junction 10a. Developer funding cannot deliver all this infrastructure	Equal or higher priority with A45 Chowns Mill.	Solutions have been identified – this issue is funding and delivery.

<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>A45 Junctions in Wellingborough/Rusden area</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity/Operational/ Growth Society/ Environment</p>	<p>KB - Significant issues of existing congestion and future development pressures coupled with severance effect of the A45 for non-motorised trips between Rusden and Wellingborough areas.</p>	<p>Second A45 priority after Chowns Mill (A6) junction but severance issues a priority in their own right.</p>	<p>Existing PPP scheme at Wilby Way (A509) junction. HA already considering mitigation/improvement schemes at Skew Bridge and Turnells Mill Lane junctions.</p>
<p>A45 Northampton</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity/Operational Growth</p>	<p>HRE - Breakdown in traffic flow already occurs on the A45 owing to high volume of traffic on mainline and at junctions. Also significant delays on local roads crossing the A45.</p>	<p>Important to have a strategy for managing future pressures on the A45 in the Northampton area. Local authorities support need for developer contributions to be used to address future impacts on the A45.</p>	<p>HA has identified the A45 Northampton Growth Management Strategy (NGMS) to be delivered principally through developer contributions.</p>
<p>A5 Towcester</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Capacity/Operational Society/ Environment</p>	<p>HRE - A5 traffic has severe impacts on Towcester and this issue needs to be given higher priority.</p>	<p>LAs are attempting to deliver a Towcester bypass through a SUE on the south side of Towcester. But this cannot deliver all the infrastructure needed to deliver an effective A5 bypass of Towcester.</p>	<p>Developer scheme for Towcester southern link road.</p>
<p>A14 Longer Term - fit for purpose issue</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity/Operational</p>	<p>AL - Consensus that the A14 is a route of national importance and that its standard should reflect its importance. Sections of A14 west of J7 and east of J9 will not be able to cope in the future.</p>	<p>No discussion at the workshop on possible environmental issues of upgrading the A14 – just support for it to be a high standard route.</p>	<p>A14 Kettering Bypass widening scheme has started.</p>
<p>A14 Lorry Parking issue</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Operational Society/Environment</p>	<p>AL and HRE – Demand for lorry parking is evident on the A14 and something needs to be done to address the issue.</p>	<p>Has been a problem for some time and should be treated as a high priority.</p>	<p>Some developer interest in providing lorry parks but not considered sufficient.</p>

<p><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>Improving strategic links in the local road network</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p>	<p>Capacity/Operational</p>	<p>Improvements to the local road network can help relieve pressures on the SRN as well as supporting local objectives</p>	<p>High priority for local authorities in the area.</p>	<p>Schemes listed in NCC Cabinet Report 19/06/2013.</p>

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

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
Overall <b>General Comments</b>	There are economic benefits to using/providing public transport routes; installing crossings at junctions etc.	Society Capacity	✓			No	None discussed	None	Peter Orban (Sustrans)	0
Overall <b>General Comments</b>	60% of journeys that are less than 5 miles are undertaken by car. If a shift to more sustainable modes is achieved for some of these, it would free up some space on the network for 'Economic Driver Vehicle trips'.	Capacity Society	✓			No		Sustrans will provide evidence for this in due course.	Peter Orban (Sustrans)	0
Hockliffe, A5 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Congestion and road safety issues. Worries are connected to the 'de-trunking' of this section of the A5. After the A5/M1 link is completed there is concern that there will be more traffic at this point on the A5	Capacity Safety	✓	✓		This is an anticipated challenge	Traffic modelling forecasting suggests an increase in traffic at Hockliffe	Yes – Further evidence to come.	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council)	2



Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
M1, Junctions 9-11 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	A lot of traffic 'self-diverts' from the M1 to the A5, through Dunstable, if there is a problem on the M1. This has a detrimental effect on the town of Dunstable; noise/air quality. Increase in traffic with the introduction of the A5/M1 link of 14%	Capacity Society Environment Safety	✓			No	Traffic modelling forecasting suggests an increase at Dunstable	GD will provide evidence of this; Central Bedfordshire Council has a wealth of evidence to support this.	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council) Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	13
Leighton Buzzard, A5 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Described as being 'imprisoned' by trunk roads and motorway. Little provision to cross these barriers for non-motorised road users. These roads don't provide for 'multi usage' i.e. pedestrians and cyclists.	Environment Society	✓			No	None discussed	No promise of evidence	Peter Orban (Sustrans)	0
Leighton Buzzard, A5 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Growth in Leighton Buzzard will result in more stress on the A5 at Hockliffe	Capacity		✓	✓	Development growth maps indicate growth to the east of Leighton Buzzard which could generate additional traffic.	Not discussed	None discussed	Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council)	0
Hockliffe Junction A5 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	It is considered that there is an existing problem with A5 traffic and not solely local traffic using the network for local journeys.	Capacity	✓			Yes – Delays and average speeds demonstrate delay.	N/A	N/A	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council)	2*

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
North of Hockliffe (Woburn Rd Roundabout on A5) <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Road safety issues here.	Safety	✓			Is not on the maps, but the consensus is that the HA know about the problems here.	N/A	N/A	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council)	0
M1 Managed motorways <b>London to Scotland East</b>	When there is an incident, management and recovery is considered to be difficult (there is no hard shoulder so it is difficult to access incidents for emergency services). Major incidents cause a problem and the Highways Agency is refusing to authorise reverse flow traffic, which could ease some of the resulting congestion following an incident.	Operational Capacity	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ade Yule (Bedfordshire and Luton Fire and Rescue Service)	8
M1 Junction 11A <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Once the M1/A5 Link is completed, there will be sufficient capacity for Highways Agency network. What about local traffic?	Capacity Operational	✓	✓		The HA are aware, but felt it needed to be highlighted.		MN will provide modelling evidence.	Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council)	0

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A1/A421 Black Cat Roundabout Felixstowe to Midlands London to Leeds (East)	The junction is considered to be poorly laid out, with huge capacity issues in the AM and PM peak. The operation of the junction appears to favour one flow of traffic over others where there is also high traffic demand	Capacity Operational	✓			Delays are shown to some degree on the maps.	N/A	N/A	Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council) Ben Gadsby (Amey)	0
A1/A421 Black Cat Roundabout Felixstowe to Midlands London to Leeds (East)	The worry is that the signalisation/pinch point investment scheme will only 'buy time' with the projected development in the area.  Consensus was that grade separation is required.	Capacity			✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council)	0
A1 South of Black Cat Roundabout 'The Bends' London to Leeds (East)	Massive safety concern. There is a high interaction between the SRN and local roads as well of bends in the road which increase accident potential.  Growth scheduled, needs more capacity. Constraint on the network. Growth means there is the	Safety Capacity	✓	✓	✓	No – the maps do not show a predominate accident hotspot.	Not discussed	None discussed	Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council)  Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	0

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
	<p>perception that more commuting is going to affect the ability of the A1 to serve Bedford's needs.</p> <p>Worry that dealing with problems in isolation will only push them up the corridor – to Bedford.</p> <p>How is the A1 going to be used?</p>									
<p>A1(M) Junctions 6-8</p> <p>London to Leeds (East)</p>	<p>If you ease the congestion along this section of the network, promoting the London to Leeds route, again, you risk pushing the problems up towards Bedford.</p> <p>There is a need for 'strategic thinking'</p>	<p>Capacity</p> <p>Operational</p>		✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	<p>Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)</p> <p>Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council)</p>	3
<p>Luton to Bedford. A6</p> <p>Felixstowe to Midlands</p>	<p>Big barrier to movement between these places on the National Cycle Network (NCN). There is no way to cross the A421 to get onto the NCN in Bedford, North of the A6/A421 roundabout.</p>	<p>Safety</p> <p>Environment</p> <p>Society</p>	✓			No	See right	Will email with the NCN evidence.	Peter Orban (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					
New Bedford bypass. New A6 S of Bedford. Felixstowe to Midlands	Will increase the pressure on the A6 S of Bedford. A6/A421 junction is going to be a problem post 2021.	Capacity Environment (Noise)		✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	Brian Hayward (Bedford Borough Council)	0
M1 Junc 13 Exit on A421 London to Scotland East Felixstowe to Midlands	Very poor signage. Confusing if you are not familiar with it. Leads to people travelling in the incorrect lane. Lots of accidents are seen here (anecdotal)	Safety Operational	✓			Not known. Is it on accident statistics?			Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council) Ben Gadsby (Amey)	4
M1 Managed Motorways London to Scotland East	Some parts are not lit during the night. There is no hard shoulder meaning a broken down vehicle is exposed; this is a real safety problem.	Safety Operational	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ade Yule (Bedfordshire and Luton Fire and Rescue Service)	0
A5 (the section due for de-trunking) London to Scotland East	Drainage issues. There is the perception that maintenance on this section though Dunstable has been neglected due to its inevitable de-trunking in the near future.	Asset Condition Environment Operational	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ben Gadsby (Amey)  Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	13*

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
Overall – Junctions <b>General Comments</b>	Junction design. Highways Agency appears to put ‘safety’ above everything, but this can cause severance, reducing accessibility for other road users.  On top of this it is also considered to look ‘awful’ having metal railings up everywhere.	Society Safety	✓	✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	0
Overall – Junctions <b>General Comments</b>	HA designs are always set to DMRB standards, whereas a lot of local authorities are using guidance such as the Manual for Streets, as a departure from DMRB standards in order to better serve the communities the junction serve/impact upon.	Society Safety	✓	✓	✓	No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ben Gadsby (Amey)	0



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					
A5 London to Scotland East	Road side barriers are along this as it runs through towns such as Dunstable and Hockliffe. These cause severance. The speeds are so low on these roads; it is hard to justify the resulting severance and barriers to crossing the network.	Society Safety	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Ben Gadsby (Amey)	2
A5 London to Scotland East	These barriers and other safety features, used in order to satisfy DMRB standards, often impact on the look of a town, which can be very important to the local economy.	Safety Society and Environment	✓			No	Not discussed	None discussed	Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	0
Dunstable – A5 London to Scotland East	Dunstable is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Worries over the effects that diverted traffic from the M1 onto the A5 has on the air quality in Dunstable.	Environment (AQ)	✓			No	Enquired as to whether the AQMA information is used to inform HA decisions and used as an evidence base for RBS.		Manouchehr Nahvi (Central Bedfordshire Council)  Geraldine Davies (Central Beds Council)	13*

\* Duplicate scores for identical or overlapping challenge

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

<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>	
Congestion on A5 in Dunstable (caused by 'self-diverting' traffic from M1) <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Capacity Operational	Gridlock in Dunstable, will make it less attractive for investment.	No trade offs were discussed.	When the congestion is not incident related is there an option to use VMS and Managed motorway signage to alert drivers to the fact that Dunstable is also busy, possibly discouraging vehicles from electing to use this route?
Bedfordshire East/West constraints <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>General Comments</b>	Capacity		Considered 1 <sup>st</sup> long-term priority. (post 2021)	Not discussed
Identify problematic junctions on the A1. Assess the accessibility/severance in the Bedford/A1 area. <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Capacity Environment Social	Problems are known to exist along this stretch of the A1. An assessment is needed to prioritise and offer best solution to severance issues.  It is important that in dealing with one junction on the A1 the problems aren't just pushed along to the next junction.	Considered 2 <sup>nd</sup> long-term priority. (post 2021)	Not discussed
Infrastructure issues at A1 Junctions <b>London to Leeds (East)</b>	Capacity Environment Social	These are existing issues which need addressing prior to growth coming forward	No trade offs were discussed.	Not discussed
Congestion in communities around	Capacity	There is an existing deficit and an	No trade offs were discussed.	Not discussed

<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>Bedford. Accessibility for non-motorised road users.</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p>	<p>Social Environment</p>	<p>opportunity to influence travel behaviour through improvements</p>		
<p>Severance for Pedestrian and Cyclists at the A421/A6 junction.</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Social Environment</p>	<p>There is an existing deficit and an opportunity to influence travel behaviour through improvements</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>M1 (managed motorway) – Post accident Operation.</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Operational Safety</p>	<p>This is an existing issue.</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed.</p>	<p>Major incidents cause a problem and the Highways Agency are refusing to authorise reverse flow traffic, which could ease some of the resulting congestion following an incident.</p>
<p>Area Wide Freight Management</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>
<p>A5 Hockliffe junction</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Considered a priority because it is a 'strategic movements' issue, not predominantly caused by local traffic. Growth in Leighton Buzzard will contribute to an increase in problems at Hockliffe in the future.</p>	<p>Considered 3<sup>rd</sup> long-term priority. (post 2021)</p>	
<p>M1 Junction 13 – Signage</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Operational Safety</p>	<p>Confusing if you are not familiar with the junction layout. Leads to people travelling in the incorrect lane.</p> <p>Lots of accidents are seen here (anecdotal observations)</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed - however see right</p>	<p>Improve on-road signage. Regarded as a 'quick win' that could be addressed in the short term.</p>
<p>A5 – Around Kensworth</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Safety</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>	<p>No trade offs were discussed</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

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

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what 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					
Milton Keynes Stadium A5 M1 Junctions 13-14 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	The stadium will be increasing capacity to 30k and will be facilitating daily events (rugby, football etc); it will be taking over the MK bowl. A leisure centre is also being built. This will cause movement issues especially on the A5.  There are currently congestion issues around events.  Additional growth and investment for residential and retail developments are planned	Capacity/Operational	✓	✓	✓	The growth map indicates that there will be substantial growth in Milton Keynes; however there are no specific details of growth at the stadium.	There was no discussion of evidence. .	None	Sue Dawson (Stadium MK)	17
A5 to Milton Keynes <b>London to Scotland East</b>	This is a high speed section of the route and there are usually serious incidents because of a lack of lighting and speed. There are also blind spots.	Operational/Safety	✓	✓	✓	The safety map indicates that this section of road has a relatively high level of vehicle casualties.	N/A	Whilst the workshop map shows there to be casualties, this does not necessarily indicate that there were near misses.	Neil Biggs (Thames Valley)	5
M1 Junction 10 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	There are proposals for growth in Luton including employment in the town centre which could increase congestion over the wider network.	Capacity/Operational		✓	✓	The Key Growth map provides details of growth in Luton.	N/A	None	Keith Dove (Luton BC)	

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					
A5 MK M1 Junctions 13-14 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Proposals for residential and retail growth in Milton Keynes which will put pressure on the A5 and M1. MK is expected to grow from a population of 250k to 350k by 2031 and therefore there will need to be enough capacity on the roads. A key factor of this will be commuting which will be around 50k. Currently there are 53k commuters that come into MK from outside. Additionally, delegates felt that Junction 14 was already running at capacity and would not be able to cope with increases in traffic.  Delegates also discussed issues exiting the M1 from the north and south at Junction 14 which form queues. This has been happening Southbound for quite some time. There are more issues at Junction 14 than at Junction 13.	All		✓	✓	The Key Growth map provides some details of growth in this area.  Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	N/A	Ishwer Gohil (MK C) has commuting figures up to 2026.  Travel Plan data is available (Dorian Holloway (OU MK))  Modelling being carried out.	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)  Neil Biggs (Thames Valley)	12 (Jn 14) 3 (Jn 13)
M1 Junction 15 and 15a <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Issues with queuing northbound and southbound exits from the M1.	Capacity/Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	No further evidence discussed.	None	Sue Dawson (Stadium MK)	0

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					
A421 Felixstowe to Midlands	Improvements on this route have pushed the problems further down. Delegates felt that the HA need to keep in mind that when making improvements, that changes will also need to be made further along the route.	Capacity/Operational	✓			Yes/No – the potential economic benefit of congestion relief map indicates that the north-eastbound section between M1 J13 and Bedford would have a moderate to high benefit of congestion relief. The peak hour speeds map does not indicate a low traffic speed problem.	No further evidence was discussed.	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	14
A5 & M1 Link London to Scotland East	Delegates felt that the link would put pressure on this route further along.	Capacity/Operational		✓	✓	None	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	0
A5/ Towester A43 London to Scotland East Solent to Midlands	There are general congestion challenges in Towester. This has got much worse over the last two years, going north and south.  There are also plans for growth around Towester and Silverstone.	Capacity/Operational	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Sue Dawson (Stadium MK)	1
A5 Dunstable M1 Junction 11 London to Scotland East	There are plans for development in Central Beds, for example Houghton Regis where there are plans for 7k new homes which will link to	All		✓	✓	Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	N/A	None	Keith Dove (Luton 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 <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					
	the planned M1 Junction 11a.					The growth maps show some of the growth planned for this area.				
M1 Junction 10 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Around 75% of people travelling to the airport use this corridor. Furthermore, the majority of employment is in this area or in the town which is close to the airport. There are issues at the roundabout of this junction.  There are proposals to increase the airport from 9.8 to 18 mppa by 2028	Capacity/ Operational	✓	✓	✓	The Key Growth map provides details of growth in this area.	No discussion of evidence.	None	Keith Dove (Luton BC)	0
M1 Junction 13 and 14 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Delegates discussed current issues with E/W routes (including A421 and A509) which cause problems at these junctions.	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Dorian Holloway (OU MK)	0
M1 Junctions 15-18 A43 A508 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	These junctions are close together. Queuing evidence needs to be gathered for the southbound carriageway in the AM peak from M1 Junction 21 down to 14. If there is an accident during peak time and the route is running to full capacity then queues sometimes go all the way back to Newport Pagnell. If there are issues then that motorists use the A43 and the A508 to	Capacity/ Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	0

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					
	avoid delays.									
A43 Towester <b>London to Scotland East</b> <b>Solent to Midlands</b>	The Abthorpe Roundabout failed to get pinch point funding; however there are still issues on this roundabout.  There are schemes planned to improve Towester but funding has not been agreed.	Capacity/Operational	✓			The potential benefit of congestion relief map shows some of the highest potential benefits on the north-eastbound section of the A43 approaching the roundabout.	No discussion of further evidence.	None	Hilary Chipping (SEMLEP)	6
M1 Junction 10-13 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Delegates felt that a managed motorway would relieve traffic from M1 junction 10-13 and	Capacity/Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	N/A	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	0
<b>General Comments</b>	There are now far more heavy good vehicles on the motorway which adds pressure.	Capacity/Operational	✓			N/A	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	Neil Biggs (Thames Valley)	0
M1 A5 Milton Keynes <b>London to Scotland East</b>	If there has been an incident on the M1 then there are huge delays on the A5.  There are also issues when events are being held at the stadium.	Capacity/Operational	✓			Yes – the delay map indicates that this section of the route experiences high levels of vehicle delay.	N/A	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	0

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 Junction 13 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Delegates discussed congestion at this junction during peak times of the day.	Capacity/Operational	✓			Yes – the safety on the network 2008-2011 map indicates that The M1 at J13 is a top 100 collision location (ranked 52). This may indicate that collisions are occurring at the junction however the cause is not known.  The potential economic benefit of congestion relief map shows that there would be the highest level of economic benefit of congestion relief on the M1 either side of J13.	N/A	None	Ishwer Gohil (MK C)	0
M1 Junction 13-15a & Junction 15a-19 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Issues with congestion and queuing northbound and southbound on these sections of the route.	Capacity/Operational	✓			The potential economic benefit of congestion relief map shows that there would be the highest level of economic benefit of congestion relief on the M1 either side of J13.	N/A	None	All	4
A5/A421 Junction <b>London to Scotland East</b>	There is no lighting at this section of the route (around the Redmoor Roundabout).	Safety/Operational	✓			No evidence presented on the maps to indicate high collision rate on this section of the A5.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on an individuals' experience, but there seemed to be consensus from many of the delegates that this issue was commonplace.	None	All	1

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

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

<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><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>				
<p>A5/A421 Junction – there is no lighting along this route.</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Operational/ Safety</p>	<p>There are a number of incidents caused by the lack of lighting.</p>	<p>There was no discussion of trade-offs.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>
<p>A5 &amp; M1</p> <p>Event congestion (MK Stadium)</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>Lack of roadside information, e.g. VMS, causes additional congestion problems especially for those travelling in from outside the area.</p>	<p>There was no discussion of trade-offs. Amongst the group, there was an impression that this was a higher priority challenge.</p>	<p>VMS signage and real time information for events at MK.</p> <p>Real time info signs</p>
<p>A43/ A5 Towester Issues</p> <p>There are general congestion challenges in Towester especially around the village of Stonebrew. This has got must worse over the last two years, going North and South</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p> <p><b>Solent to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>There are plans for growth around Towester and Silverstone.</p>	<p>There was no discussion of trade-offs.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>

<p><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>A5 Abthorpe Roundabout</p> <p>The Roundabout failed to get pinch point funding; however there are still issues on this roundabout.</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p> <p><b>Solent to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity/ Operational</p>	<p>There are schemes planned to improve Towester but funding has not been agreed</p>	<p>There was no discussion of trade-offs.</p>	<p>Not discussed</p>



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

Location	Description of challenge	Type of challenge Capacity/Safety/ Asset Condition / Operational / Society & Environment	When does this issue become critical			Is the evidence for this challenge shown on our maps?	If not, what evidence is there to show this is/will become a challenge?	Promises to provide supporting evidence by (name, org)	Raised by	Number of sticky dots received
			Already is	2015-21	After 2021					
A45 / A509 (Wilby Way) <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	This junction is considered to be overloaded and suffering from congestion issues.	Capacity / Operational	✓			The delay maps suggest that there is delay to the west of the junction; however the junction is not specifically included on the maps.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis)	0
A43 between Northampton and Ketting <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b> <b>London to Scotland East</b>	This section of the A43 (as part of a longer section between Corby and Towcester) is considered to suffer from some of the worst congestion within the county. Whilst this section is not part of the HA's network there was a concern that if you improve this part of the route then this will just shift the problem elsewhere.	Capacity	✓			No – not part of the HA's network	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council)	0

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

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

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					
Northampton Felixstowe to Midlands	is constraining development within Northampton.					do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.	were some evidence reports to support this and that AECOM had prepared them.			
A number of junctions on the M1 and A45 around Northampton London to Scotland East Felixstowe to Midlands	There is significant growth planned for Northampton (up to 2029) and these junctions need improvement to support development. The Northampton Growth Management Scheme has generated developer funding towards infrastructure schemes. Delegates questioned whether the HA could contribute to the Scheme?	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓	✓	No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location. The growth map indicates a significant level of growth planned in and around Northampton.	Richard Palmer (Northamptonshire Borough Council) indicated that there were some evidence reports to support this and that AECOM had prepared them.	No	Richard Palmer (Northamptonshire Borough Council)	0

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					
A43 near Towcester <b>London to Scotland East</b>	Some delegates discussed the need for a Towcester Relief Road to take pressure off the town centre and A43.	Capacity / Operational	✓			No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there are some potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.	David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council) made reference to the Towcester Transport Study, which he suggested provided evidence to support a Relief Road.	No	David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council)	0
A14 Junctions 3 – 7 <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	This section of the A14 was identified as a particular congestion concern in the peak hours. A problem with weaving, due to the short distance between junctions, was also identified.	Capacity / Operational / Safety	✓			No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there are some potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location. The safety map does not support the concern with weaving as it is not identified as a part of the network with safety concerns.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis)	3
M1 Junction 17 <b>London to Scotland East</b>	It is not possible to make the movement from M1 southbound to M45 westbound or from M45 eastbound to M1 northbound. This	Capacity / Operational	✓	✓	✓	Daventry is identified as an area that could experience significant growth up to 2021 and beyond.	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis) and David Allen (South Northamptonshire 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					
	means that vehicles have to use M1 Junction 18 and travel through Kilsbury and along local roads to access Banbury or Daventry. David Allen (South Northamptonshire Council) suggested that a link road here could open up a lot of growth.						contradicted by other delegates. Evidence of the number of vehicles that do / could make that movement was not provided.			
M1 corridor southbound <b>London to Scotland East</b>	This corridor experiences significant congestion in the AM peak (particularly 7.30 – 9am)	Capacity	✓			No delay maps included in the delegate pack. However the maps do suggest that there is a high level of potential economic benefits from congestion relief in this location.	Evidence is anecdotal and most delegates agreed that the corridor experiences congestion issues.	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis)	0
A14 corridor <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Delegates identified that the peak hours on the A14 can differ from the traditional peak, or there can be an additional mid-day peak, due to the high level of HGVs using the	Capacity / Operational	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	Simon Bowers (Daventry District Council)	0



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					
	route to access / leave Felixstowe Port. Delegates suggested that this occurs westbound at M1 Junction 19 and consideration should be given to this when planning any improvements at the junction or on the route.									
A14 at Corby Felixstowe to Midlands	Delegates commented that Corby is poorly connected to the SRN and where it does connect the junctions can be of poor quality	Operational / & Society Environment	✓			No	Evidence is anecdotal and based on a few individual's experience in this specific area of the network, although it was not contradicted by other delegates.	No	Chris Lewis (Pro Logis)	0

Workshop Name	SEM LEP / Northamptonshire LEP	Date:	8 <sup>th</sup> October 2013	Breakout Group	Blue Group
Group Facilitator	David Abbott	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>	
In the past there have been some mistakes made, in particular where the road provision has not matched that required to support growth. <b>General Comments</b>	All	Delegates were keen that these mistakes were learned from during this process and that the highway network was of sufficient quality and had enough capacity to support growth proposals going forward.	This was a general point that was raised but limited discussion took place.	None identified
A14 corridor between M1 junction 19 and Kettering – this is perceived to have the highest levels of congestion along this route. <b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b>	Capacity / Operational / Safety	This was seen as the section of the A14 that was the most congested and weaving problems could cause safety issues. Delegates therefore considered that this section should be improved first.	As the A14 is a significant route through the area the successful operation of this was considered key.	None identified.

<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>M1 and A45 junctions around Northampton were identified as experiencing congestion and were currently constraining growth in the area.</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Northampton is identified as an area where significant growth is planned and without improvements to these junctions the growth may not be able to come forward.</p>	<p>This issue was discussed at great length in the workshop and due to the number of junctions that require improvement and the quantum of development proposed in Northampton this was considered a high priority.</p>	<p>Nothing was discussed in particular but AECOM understands that assessments have been undertaken to inform the Management Scheme.</p>
<p>The M1 links and junctions around Daventry may not have sufficient capacity or be of sufficient quality to support development within Daventry.</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Daventry is an area identified for notable levels of growth and there were concerns that if improvements were not made to the M1 in this location that development may not come forward.</p>	<p>It was unclear how much of a priority this is but the access from M1 north to Daventry and vice versa was raised as a significant concern.</p>	<p>A link road was identified between M1 north and M45 west to ease pressure on the local road network. Solutions at other junctions / links were not discussed.</p>
<p>There was some concern that any improvement schemes that come forward could displace problems to other sections of the network, rather than remove them completely.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p>	<p>All</p>	<p>If the existing issues are only shifted to another section of the network then there could still be capacity issues that constrain growth.</p>	<p>This was not discussed in great detail but was raised on more than one occasion when discussing proposed improvements.</p>	<p>Suitable planning procedures need to be utilised to determine the potential wider impacts of improvements on the network.</p>

<p><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>M1 junctions 13-19 – delegates were concerned about how long the widening along this section would provide sufficient capacity for existing and future traffic.</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>This section has recently been widened but delegates noted that there are still regular congestion problems in the peak hours. Therefore concerns were raised regarding the potential for the corridor to accommodate additional traffic in the future.</p>	<p>Although this concern was raised the delegates considered that further improvements at this stage were unlikely and therefore limited discussions took place.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>There are problems entering and leaving the SRN at Northampton due to capacity issues.</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>Northampton is identified as a significant area for growth and these capacity issues could be constraining this growth.</p>	<p>Due to the growth planned within Northampton this was considered to be a relatively high priority.</p>	<p>Not discussed specifically but linked to the Northampton Growth Management Scheme.</p>
<p>The delegates recognised that there are a number of pinch point funding schemes that were not allocated funding, for various reasons.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p>	<p>All</p>	<p>There were concerns that the work that went into identifying and preparing these schemes would not be utilised in the RBS process. Repetitive or wasted work should be avoided.</p>	<p>A number of delegates considered that this was an important issue and were keen for previous studies undertaken to be considered.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p><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>M1 corridor – need to remove strategic trips from the network and encourage other modes of transport.</p> <p><b>London to Scotland East</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational</p>	<p>There were concerns that there are not infinite levels of capacity on the M1 and that attempts should be made to shift existing and future traffic to alternative modes.</p>	<p>This was considered to be a relatively high priority.</p>	<p>The provision of a strategic park and ride site, potentially at Watford Gap, to shift longer distance car trips to bus or rail.</p>
<p>There are current congestion issues on the A45 south of the A14.</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity</p>	<p>The A45 is a key route between Northampton and the A14 and therefore it is considered an important route on which to ensure congestion is limited.</p>	<p>This was the subject of a limited discussion in the group; furthermore some delegates thought it was of less concern than others.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>
<p>There were concerns that the consultation between the HA and local authorities would not identify local schemes that can be linked to strategic improvements and provide greater benefits than large scale schemes alone.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p>	<p>All</p>	<p>If strategic and local schemes are brought forward without consideration of the combined impacts then the greatest benefits from both schemes may not be realised.</p>	<p>Limited discussion on this priority took place within the group.</p>	<p>Not discussed.</p>

<p><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>There are concerns going forward regarding the proportion of HGVs in the A14 traffic (thought to be up to 25% at certain times of the day).</p> <p><b>Felixstowe to Midlands</b></p>	<p>Capacity / Operational / Safety</p>	<p>The reason for this to be considered a priority is due to how this affects the capacity, average speed and safety of the route.</p>	<p>This was not considered a high priority.</p>	<p>Longer / heavier HGVs or HGV convoys.</p>



**Table A.4 Stakeholder Events Record - Leicestershire and Coventry & Warwickshire Workshop**

**Leicestershire and Coventry & Warwickshire RBS workshop  
Breakout session one**

**Date: 24/9/13**

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
South Midlands	Blue	A5	Emerging as a key economical route which is already operating at capacity, and will be even more so from future development. A large amount of new development is planned along the corridor with direct access onto the A5. The pinch point scheme to be delivered by 2015 will only provide enough capacity for 2-3 years.	Capacity	X			Yes – Vehicle Hours Delay	The A5 Strategy, by the A5 Partnership, provides a good evidence base. This proved helpful with the Pinch Points work. DaSTS Study demonstrates the corridors economic importance.	Bill Cullen, HBBC	BC	2
South Midlands	Blue	A46 & M69	Growth plans will put a considerable strain on this section of the SRN. Requires a study similar to the A5. Approx. 21-22,000 houses proposed in the Coventry area. A46 is a strategic cross country route that's inadequate for the load it's currently taking. Particular issues exist between Alcester and Stratford due to a lack of capacity. M69 improvements have linkages to key development priorities.	Capacity	X	X	X	Yes – Vehicle Hours Delay	Coventry Core Strategy? Developments shown on HA maps underestimates amount of development planned around Coventry.		MW & KT	11 for A46 4 for M69
South Midlands	Blue	The two A45/A46 junctions	The TGI and Walsgrave islands around Coventry could undermine the existing investment that's being made on A46 improvements. They are the only at-grade junctions remaining along the corridor and are therefore pinch points on the network. They were not put forward for pinch point funding due to	Capacity/ Safety	X			Yes – Vehicle Hours Delay & Safety map			MW	

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			enormous costs.									
South Midlands	Blue	M42 corridor	Major capacity issues on M42. HS2 and the big allocation of development in the future close by will put greater pressure on this already struggling road. A46 will have a role in relieving the M42 but is under pressure itself.	Capacity.	X			Yes – Vehicle Hours Delay		BC	11	
London to Scotland West	Blue	Gaydon J12 M40	4,500 new houses proposed for Gaydon which the road system will not be able to cope with.	Capacity			X		Stratford Revised Core Strategy	KT		
Midlands to Wales	Blue	M54 – linkages to M6 Toll	Link required from M54 to M6 toll to reduce traffic on M54 and improve access to the underutilised M6 Toll but controversial with district authorities.	Capacity	X					MW		
South Midlands	Blue	M6 Toll	Underutilised but the alternative SRN (particularly the M42, M6 & M54) is generally operating over capacity. Although the toll road is not under the HA remit, if M6 Toll was priced to attract more traffic it would alleviate a lot of the problems the HA face on the SRN, therefore affecting future HA strategies and spend. Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council looking into the M6 Toll issue and its one of the joint LEP priorities.	Operational	X			Yes – Speed map and Vehicle Hours Delay map	Regional Logistics Study for West Midlands has been commissioned (2012) by a consortium of authorities in the West Midlands. Possible evidence base for issues on the SRN in the area.	BC & MW	5	
London to Scotland East	Blue	M1 J21 – J21a	Pinch Point delivery by March 2015 but won't address all congestion problems between J21 and J21a. Pinch Point scheme is a short term fix not long term solution. Safety hazard. Southbound traffic getting off onto M69 blocking back on M1. Signalisation has improved things but still issues remain. Also the link is	Capacity & Safety	X			Yes –Vehicle Hours Delay map		CS, MW	4	

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			short between 21-21a which results in significant weaving.									
All	Blue	General	Water pollution – Outfalls of non permitted discharge not included on HA maps but can be a risk depending on what water bodies they flow into.						FK will provide Environmental Agency maps showing the priority areas of non permitted discharge.		FK	
South Midlands	Blue	A5 Dodwells & Long Shoot junctions	Capacity and safety issues along this stretch of the A5. As above Pinch Points not necessarily going to fix the problem. Dualling is needed to increase capacity and improve safety.	Capacity & Safety	X			Yes –Vehicle Hours Delay, Speed and Safety map	-	-	BC	10
South Midlands	Blue	A46 outside of Stratford	More segregation for cyclists required to improve safety. Pedestrian and cycle crossings near Stratford are an issue.	Safety	X			Safety map	See Stratford Core Strategy for issues. Well documented evidence in the Route Management Strategy (RMS).	-	KT , MW	
South Midlands	Blue	A38 Burton to Lichfield	Good off road cycle route but very stop-start in nature. Cyclists are poorly catered for at junctions so cyclists tend to go along the A38 mainline which presents a safety issue and can reduce traffic speeds. Cycle network needs to be better coordinated and less disruptive.	Safety	X			Safety map	-	-	FK	
Felixstowe to Midlands London to Scotland West	Blue	M6 Jnc 2-4	Heavy usage. Lots of local hopping on and off. Also new engine plant for Jag/Land Rover near I54 will use M6 for delivering to Solihull.	Capacity	X							
South	Blue	M1, M6, A5	Emergency Route Planning - When	Operational	X						BC	5

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
Midlands London to Scotland East Felixstowe to Midlands		and A38	incidents occur on M1 & M6 they impact on the A5 and bring Hinckley to a grinding halt. Flooding of the Trent can result in the closure of several parts of the A38. Can alternative routes be planned?									
All	Green	SRN-wide	Lorry parking and the location and availability of lay-bys is becoming an increasing issue. Lay-bys on the SRN are being used increasingly by HGV drivers to take rest breaks which they are required to take by law. However the HGV's often become a target of anti-social behaviour.	Society and Environment	X			No	Lorry parks may not be attractive economic investments but a truck stops has recently been expanded on the A5 – this wouldn't have been done if not worthwhile. Similar facilities are required in other areas. Northampton lorry parking study provides evidence of the issue in that County.		CL	0
South Midlands	Green	A5	The road acts as a barrier and a 'Berlin Wall' between the Leicestershire and Warwickshire border. The route presents a number of difficulties for non-motorised users to use and cross.	Safety/Society and Environment	X			No	Anecdotal evidence e.g. lack of verges for horse riders.		VA	3
South Midlands	Green	A5	Lots of development is proposed along this corridor. Especially at Rugby Radio station and Rugby Gateway. These are highlighted on the RBS maps but the figures are too low at the Rugby Radio station site (6,200 homes and 31 hectares of employment land are proposed for this site). This will put	Capacity/ Operational		X	X	Yes (but figures inaccurate).	Data provided in the 'Rugby Radio Station Additional Information Guide' document.	Hard copy version of document provided at the workshop with further documentation to follow should	RM	1

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			further pressure on the link.						it be available.			
South Midlands	Green	A5	There has been a lack of investment on this link and there is large variation in the standard of the link. For example, from Hinckley to Tamworth the link suffers from congestion issues which are likely to be exacerbated (with development growth) in the future.	Capacity/Asset Condition/Operational	X	X	X	Yes	Possible information available from LCC – LLITM forecast year outputs.		PS	1
London to Scotland East	Green	M1 J21-J21A	The M1 SB between M1 J21a and J21 at peak times is a crucial congestion hotspot. Long distance traffic often avoids it and uses the local road network which creates associated problems. The motorway is a link of national importance and its poor performance can have detrimental impacts upon the national and regional economy. J21's poor performance also threatens Leicester's ability to attract inward investment. Also issues associated with noise and air quality.	All	X			Yes	South West Leicester and Leicestershire Study		PS	10
London to Scotland East	Green	M1 J23	Growth in Loughborough and Shepshed will impact on M1 J23; congestion will be experienced, particularly during university semesters	Capacity/ Operational		X	X	Yes			PS	
London to Scotland East	Green	M1 J24	M1 J24 is a nationally important part of the M1 as it links to the A50 and A453 routes. and with the airport and SRFI in close proximity. On top of this, it is an important gateway for Nottingham and Derby. However the junction suffers from congestion, it has not been improved and with a large amount of development proposed for the area, its performance will continue to deteriorate. A pinch point scheme is scheduled at this junction for Summer 2014. This will change the way traffic on the A50 EB	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	Yes			PS	5

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			enters the M1 SB. A new carriageway will be created through the junction. However Leicestershire County Council does not think that these measures are sufficient in the long term.									
South Midlands	Green	A45	Development growth – Prologis Ryton Site A and Site B (SW of Coventry) are missing from the growth plans; development traffic from these sites will exacerbate congestion on the A45 link.	Capacity/ Operational		X	X	No	Evidence provided by CL, a commercial developer from Prologis		CL	1
South Midlands	Green	A5 Longshoot and Dodwells	The A5 at Hinckley currently suffers from congestion. There is a plan in place for new traffic signals and a widening of the approaches at Dodwells roundabout as well as changes to the Longshoot junction. However Leicestershire County Council (LCC) does not think that these measures are sufficient in the long term. A long term strategy for improvement is needed as it is crucial to growth in Hinckley and Nuneaton. Need to maximise ability to secure developer funds.	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	No	Evidence gathered by LCC through the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model (LLITM), Transport Trends Report, NMP Congestion Plan 2026, DfT Transport Innovation Fund Congestion Study in the East Midlands.		PS	6
North and East Midlands	Green	A453	Currently suffers from congestion. There is a scheme planned to upgrade a section of the A453 between the M1 and A52 by widening the urban section and upgrading the rural section to become a dual carriageway. However LCC have concerns about the impacts this will have on Kegworth (and possibly other	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	No	Modelling work for NWLDC Core Strategy and for the SRFI		PS	0



Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			areas in NW Leicestershire).									
London to Scotland East Felixstowe to Midlands	Green	Catthorpe Interchange (M1, M6, A14)	Development pressures in this area will affect the performance of this junction – but should be resolved by the current major scheme.	Capacity/ Operational		X	X	Yes			RM	0
Felixstowe to Midlands	Green	M6 J1	Development pressures in this area will affect the performance of this junction.	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	Yes			RM	5
Felixstowe to Midlands	Green	M6 J2-4	Current congestion in this area leads to instability, unreliable journey times and traffic diverting onto the LRN, creating congestion issues on the local road links.	Capacity/ Operational	X	X	X	Yes			IS	1
South Midlands	Green	M6 Toll	Under-utilised and tolls discourage use, exacerbating congestion on the M6.	Operational	X			No	Published traffic information for M6 Toll.		CL	7
South Midlands	Green	Connections to A45 WB and M45 WB from A5 around M1 J18	Local concerns about the prevalence of HGV's on the LRN, due to the poor accessibility of the M45 WB.	Safety/ Asset condition / operational	X			No			CL	1
South Midlands	Green	Roundabout on A46 SW of M40 J15.	Concerns about the roundabout's safety, which was built as part of the J15 Improvements. The roundabout is too small, badly aligned and dangerous.	Safety	X			No	Anecdotal evidence		CL	5
London to Scotland West	Green	M42 J6	The junction is in the heart of the country so is nationally significant. However it suffers from congestion and will continue to do so with the level of growth allocated for this area. This would make journey times unreliable and could have a negative impact on the economy.	Capacity / Operational	X	X	X	Yes			IS	1

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
South Midlands	Green	M42 J9	Potential development near this junction and to the west, in and around Curdworth will cause congestion at this junction.	Capacity / Operational		X	X	No	Birmingham City Council		CL	1
South Midlands	Green	A42 J13	The nearby A511 is a growth corridor which would increase congestion at this junction. Strategic improvements are required to alleviate this pressure. A strategy to secure developer contributions is needed.	Capacity / Operational		X	X	Yes			PS	1
North and East Midlands	Green	Hobby Horse Roundabout (A46)	This roundabout has capacity issues which will be exacerbated by development pressures. This could also affect the performance of the Leicester Outer Ring Road. Associated air quality issues.	All	X	X	X	No			PS	2
All	Green	General	Vulnerable road users have difficulties crossing/using the SRN	Safety	X			No	Anecdotal evidence		VA	10
All	Orange	Overall	Flood risk map shows flooding issues to be a lot less extensive than the Environment Agency have ascertained.	Environment	x	x	x	Provided some evidence including some for Nottingham workshop	Can and will provide more. Contact the EA for more if needed.		TA	
South Midlands	Orange	A5 around MIRA	Shows red on the pavement life cycle map, but it has recently been resurfaced.	Asset condition	x						JS	
All	Orange	Overall	Most flooding is not water course related (i.e. flooding of river floods carriageway) MAINLY run-off from the highway network.	Environment / asset condition	x						TA	
South Midlands	Orange	A46 north of Warwick	Sheer amount of run-off is flooding the immediate area. In cold weather this is freezing.	Safety / environment / asset condition	x						TA	
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1 J21	Major issue for the police and other emergency services, on the motorway and adjacent junctions. 5 to 6 miles of tail backs southbound and congestion	Safety / capacity	x	x	x				GC	

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			accessing Leicester northbound.									
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1 J21	Weaving on/off the M1 to access the services causing safety issues	Safety (RTCs)	x	x	x				GC	3
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1 J23/24, also J21/22	Lots of development proposed in the wider area which will exacerbate already congested junctions. Business/enterprise park in Loughborough - growth 6000+ jobs	Capacity		x	x				MT	6
All	Orange	Overall	Up to 2021, the focus should be on existing problems that will only get worse beyond 2021 without intervention.	Capacity	x	x	x				AH	
South Midlands	Orange	A5/A47 Junc	Heavy congestion - there was talk of a flyover - something needs to be done as this congestion leads to 'rat runs' developing through towns e.g. Higham On The-Hill	Capacity / Society & environment / safety	x						TK	
South Midlands	Orange	A5 Leicester / Warwick	MIRA / Dodwells developments introducing additional traffic.	Capacity							GC	
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1	Undertaking maintenance without causing traffic problems - when is the maintenance going to take place? At night? Seems like there is a lot to do in the next 3 to 4 years.	Operational	x	x					GC	
All	Orange	Bridges throughout the network	Electrification of the rail network is going to take place in the future. Are we/HA using this opportunity to change bridges which will have to undergo transformation for electrification? Which Bridges need doing? Highly problematic dealing with Network Rail (got to get in early) Need to think about this now	Asset condition	x		x				MT, GC	
Felixstowe to Midlands	Orange	A14	Market Harborough grinds to a halt when there is ANY issue on the A14. Incidents seem to be frequent - is there a way to manage the effect on	Capacity / operational / safety	x						TK	

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			surrounding towns if there is a problem on the SRN? Keeping one lane operational during incidents might help.									
All	Orange	Overall	MT asked about models, how good they were now and is there cooperation between authorities. AH indicated that cross county council cooperation was used in the area to develop meaningful accurate models	Capacity	x						MT AH	
South Midlands	Orange	A42	A42 is used like a motorway but should be brought is not motorway standard. Difficult to use by the emergency services, also the addition of development in the area. 2 lanes bring the associated constraints; The Police have had ongoing concerns over safety on the A42.	Operational	x	x					GC	3
South Midlands	Orange	A46 Stratford to Alcester	The A46 is only two lanes and carries a lot of traffic - not really suitable as Strategic Road Network.	Safety / capacity	x						AH	2
South Midlands	Orange	M45	Very quiet, under used. Could lead to speeding due to low vehicle numbers.	Safety	x						AH	
London to Scotland West	Orange	M40 J12	Potential new settlement near to Stratford-Upon -Avon	Capacity			x				AH	
South Midlands	Orange	A46	LEP Priorities Coventry and Warwickshire. East of Coventry A428 TGI Junc. Need to keep the existing network attractive to businesses – so need to keep the M40/M42/M6 moving. Avoid restricting movement from the East to the rest of the Midlands.	Capacity		x	x				AH	
London to Scotland West South	Orange	M42 Corridor	HS2 will bring further congestion on the M42 as will investment in business along the corridor, is there the option to use another corridor on the SRN?	Capacity			x				AH	3

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
Midlands			Suggests using the A46/M69 down M5 as opposed to the M42.									
South Midlands All	Orange	M69 and overall	Inadequate strategic signing.	Operational	x						GC	1
All	Orange	All e.g. backing up of the A46	Lack of coordination between the HA and Highway authority schemes. Different operators? Doing their own little bits. Due to road works Nottingham is currently a no-go zone. Leicester has different works all around the ring road causing congestion. Also UTILITES companies pitch in with their works. Safety challenge mainly because because people speed up after congestion	Operation / Safety	x						TA MT	0
All	Orange	All	There doesn't seem to be a shortage of money, so we can expect to see lots of work to improve the network, so these improvements need to be balanced with the pain of works on the network short term. Can't be done over night, there need to be an acceptance and plan for a period of disruption.	Operation		x	x				AH	
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1 J21 Asda Island in Enderby	There was some coordination between HA and the Emergency services and other Highway Authorities. – picking up on point raised earlier by TA and MT.	Operational	x						GC	0
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1 Corridor Loughborough	Developments are building right up to the M1. The Noise from the motorway is an issue, despite people choosing to live there.	Environment (Noise)	x	xx	xxx				GC	1
South Midlands	Orange	A5 – along the whole route	Severance for Pedestrian and cyclists trying to cross the corridor. Particular problem for pedestrians.	Safety / Operational / society & environment	x						AH	5
All	Orange	Overall	Has any though been given to	Capacity			x				JS, MT	1

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			Autonomous vehicle use in the future? Sparked a debate on the length of time for road investment strategies. Length of a parliament vs. 50 years (China)									
North and East Midlands	Orange	A46 North of Leicester M1 J21	Variable Message Signs (VMS) need to be better utilised to reduce burden on nearby towns when there is an incident on the SRN. 'No route onto the M69' – not good enough when A46 closed There is an opportunity to use signs in conjunction with contingency plans when SRN is affected by incidents. Such contingency planning could help prevent the development of rat runs through small towns.	Operational	x					AH	1	
London to Scotland East Midlands South Midlands North and East Midlands	Orange	M1 A46	Water quality Most of the water issues/ flooding come from the carriageway, not from flooding of surrounding rural area. Issues with drainage and ditches on highways. The claim is that these are maintained, but in reality maintenance is very poor. No treatment of water, not even primary treatment, leading to the quality and quantity of water coming off the carriageways being sub standard. If HA are seen to be doing nothing to move forward and deal with this issue it can damage reputation but also if water quality diminishes it could have legal implications.	Environment	x					Will try and find information in specific areas where this has taken place and been documented.	TA	1
Felixstowe to Midlands	Orange	A14 Market Harborough	The 'Diversion Route Plan' needs to be kept up to date. Otherwise towns like Market Harborough get swapped by traffic leaving the SRN. There is the consensus that	Operational	x					GC	1	



Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			spontaneous incidents will have this affect and that it is unavoidable, but for planned works it is considered unacceptable.									
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1 J23 Shepshed	2500 more houses, not 500 as shown on the maps from core strategy data.	Capacity		x		Maps don't reflect what MT claim			MT	
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1 J24 South of Derby and Notts	Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is going to create 6000 jobs with related car and freight journeys. Want reassurances this is being considered.	Capacity	x	x		Not on map (maybe because not in area covered by this workshop)			MT	
All	Orange	General Maintenance		Operational								4
North and East Midlands	Orange	A46 North of Leicester	Temporary crossovers for maintenance have led to reduction in infiltration and therefore flood issues actually caused by 'maintaining' the network	Environment	x						TA	1
South Midlands	Orange	A46 / A428	Junction will become a problem once Toll Bar is sorted out	Capacity		x					AH	4
South Midlands	Orange	A46 Stanks Junc	Starting to queue back onto the main carriageway of the A46, will get worse with further developments.	Capacity	x						AH	3
South Midlands	Orange	A46 Leek Wootton / Kenilworth	Localised flooding caused by run-off from adjacent fields.	Environment	x						AH	
South Midlands	Orange	A47 / A5	Dodwells Bridge. Development pressures from sustainable urban extensions at Barwell and Earl Shilten.	Capacity	x	x					TK	4
South Midlands	Orange	A5 near Dordon	Floods during sharp rainfall intensity periods.	Safety	x						JS	2
South Midlands	Orange	M6 Toll	Spreading strategic traffic more evenly between the existing routes and the M6 Toll would improve the operability and congestion on A5/M6. Suggestion is 'De-toll' it to encourage better use.		x						AH	5

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
South Midlands	Orange	A5 / MIRA Redgate junction	MIRA major development will cause increased problems.	Capacity		x					TK	4
South Midlands	Red	Nuneaton	3000 new homes are being built to the North of Nuneaton. They are not included on the development map. This development will have a significant impact on the A5. There are 7900 homes planned within Nuneaton and Bedworth by 2028	Society and Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	Yes - the A5 has High Vehicle Delay hours and low average speeds	None provided		SH	2
South Midlands	Red	Rugby	7000 new homes and 3 schools are planned for Rugby 'Mast' development	Society and Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	No - not within the area of consideration at this engagement event	None provided		PM	0
London to Scotland West	Red	Gaydon	4000 dwellings planned adjacent to junction 12 of the M40, Gaydon. Junction improvements planned for the area. Planned start date 2018, completion 2040.	Society and Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	No – but developments included in development plan	None provided		PH	0
South Midlands	Red	A5 Hinckley/ Nuneaton section	Problems with congestion which will only get worse with future development. The A5 is impacted due to many industrial areas, supermarkets etc. Also if the M6/ M1 are closed all of the traffic is diverted to the A5. Improvements are required from The Longshoot junction to the M69. Junction improvements are already planned for the area (SH)	Capacity and Operational	✓			Yes - this section of the A5 shows high vehicle delay hours, low average speed and a high number of casualties	None provided		RW	0
South Midlands	Red	A5	The A5 is needed for freight vehicles as it is a major route. If congestion was eased along the A5 it would allow freight to make deliveries quicker, would also reduce environmental impact due to queuing freight vehicles	Capacity, safety, operational and environment	✓			Yes - sections of the A5 show high vehicle delay hours, low average speed, a high number of casualties and poor pavement quality	None provided		RW	0

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

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
South Midlands	Red	A46 Stratford-Upon-Avon	Two employment sites are planned on the A46 on the Northern edge of Stratford-upon-Avon. Two 18 hectare sites have been set aside for development. The planned start date for both sites is 2018, completion 2030		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	None provided		PH	0
South Midlands	Red	A46 Stratford-Upon-Avon	Need a traffic management on the A46 such as the use of traffic lights at peak times	Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes - a section of the road shows high vehicle delay hours and medium average speeds	None provided		PH	4
South Midlands	Red	A5 North of Coventry	There are crossing issues for cyclists in this area. Need a segregated solution to keep cyclists safe	Safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	None provided		GR	0
Felixstowe to Midlands	Red	M6 Junction 3 to 4	It costs the economy if HGV's have to wait for incidents to be cleared. The M6 junctions 3 to 4 are a key issue area. Toll charges on the M6 should be lifted to enable it to be used as a diversion route after an incident has occurred	Safety, Operational and Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	None provided		RW	2
South Midlands	Red	A46 Stratford-upon-Avon and Alcester Junctions	Congestion issues especially during the morning peak - improvements needed	Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes - high number of casualties at the junction	None provided		PH	2
South Midlands	Red	Coventry airport	The airport could expand - will cause problems on the network	Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	None provided		PM	0
Felixstowe to Midlands	Red	Ricoh Arena/ other event holders	Large events cause issues on the network. Event organisers need to better plan for large events and how they may affect the SRN. There are plans to introduce a train station at the Ricoh arena to ease the traffic around the stadium (SH). The Ricoh blocks the SRN, A444 and Nuneaton Bypass.	Safety, Operational and Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No - one off events	None provided		PM & SH	0

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
South Midlands	Red	A46	The A46 has quickly developing potholes which cause problems for all road users	Safety and asset condition	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>		Yes - some sections show poor pavement quality	None provided		PM	0
South Midlands	Red	Hinckley to Nuneaton	The potential impact of the MIRA upgrade is a concern. At peak times the A5 is busy the busses get re-routed and leave villages along the A5 isolated	Capacity, operational and society	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>		Yes - the A5 has High Vehicle Delay hours and low average speeds	None provided		SH	1
South Midlands	Red	Hinckley to Nuneaton to Atherstone	Desire locally to cycle Hinckley to Nuneaton to Atherstone	Society and environment	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>		No	None provided		SH	1
London to Scotland West	Red	Junction 12 and 15 of the M40	Issues with capacity, could managed motorways be introduced?	Capacity	✓			No	None provided		PM	3
South Midlands	Red	North of Nuneaton	There is an Air Quality Management Area in place	Society and environment	✓			No	None provided		SH	3
All	Red	Trunk roads	Crossings across trunk roads cause the most issues for cyclists (GR). Some roads are just not suitable for cyclists as they are too dangerous. Cyclists want to be on the road, need more safety implications. Want people to cycle but safety issues.	Safety	✓			No	None provided		GR & PM	0
South Midlands	Red	The whole network - specifically the A5 between Rugby and Dordon	There needs to be more suitable rest areas provided for HGV's. The lay-bys are often overloaded, particularly on the A5. Magna Park off the A5 uses clamping enforcement which means that drivers park in the entrance to the park, this causes issues (RW)	Safety	✓			No	None provided		PM & RW	2
All	Red	The whole network	If diversions are in place need to ensure that they are suitable for HGV's e.g. Height and weight restrictions	Safety and operational	✓			No	None provided		RW	2
All	Red	The whole network	Safety cameras don't work. They aren't affective if they aren't working. The signing for the cameras needs to be consistent	Safety and Operational	✓			No	None provided		PM	1

Relevant RBS	Table	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					
All	Red	The whole network	In some places the most direct route for cyclists between trip generators is not along HA roads but the only right of way is along HA roads. So an alternative to improving cycling conditions on the HA roads would be the construction of a cyclist/ pedestrian road on a more direct route; would require the HA to “think outside the box”.	Safety and social	✓			No	None provided		GR	3
All	Red	The whole network	The HA need better incident management procedures. Need the right resources in the right place. Need better planned diversion schemes. Currently it can take up to 1.5 hours to close a section of the motorway. Require the following: ISU's, Screens, resources, information on diversions and de-briefs after an incident	Safety and Operational	✓			No	None provided		PM	2
All	Red	The whole network	Need to promote road user awareness. Need to explain to the public how to use systems such as managed motorways as there is evidence that motorists are using the hard-shoulder even when the scheme is not in place (signs switched off)	Safety and Operational	✓			No	None provided		PM	2
South Midlands	Red	The whole network - specifically Nuneaton	Cycle lane segregation will encourage more people to travel by bike rather than using the car; it would also reduce congestion and improve air quality. There is currently an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) around Nuneaton. Reducing the number of cars using the network in this area would improve the air quality (SH). Just using a white line to segregate cyclists from vehicles does not make them safe. Wish	Capacity, safety, operational, society and environment	✓			No	None provided		RW	6



Relevant RBS	Table	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					
			to promote cycle and HGV awareness (RW)									
All	Red	The whole network	Incidents on the network cause most of the issues. Enforcement tries to prevent incidents. All lane running prevents police using the hard shoulder and so more platforms are required	Safety and Operational	✓			No	None provided		PM	1
All	Red	The whole network	There are concerns amongst the Police about turning the lights off on the motorways	Safety	✓			No	None provided		PM	0
None	Red	Additional comments	There has been good investment in the infrastructure in the area, particularly the introduction of the managed motorways on the M6. Managed motorways improve safety and capacity.	Safety, Operational and Capacity	✓						PM	-
London to Scotland West	Red	Additional comments	Junction 15 of the M40 (Bridge Island) has been improved greatly and reduced queues	Capacity	✓						PH	-

Leicestershire and Coventry & Warwickshire RBS workshop  
Breakout session two

Date: 24/9/13

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
South Midlands	Blue	A5 Dodwells junction & A5 - Atherstone to M42 junction	Capacity	Two key blockages on the A5 which should be priority following on from the Pinch Point improvements so that there is a seamless improvement to the whole route. Capacity / safety improvements (probably dualling) required by 2018. Dodwells is also a priority for Environmental Agency as there are water quality issues around the area. A water body close by is failing due to road run off. EA to be considered in any improvements to this junction.	Emerging as a key route for supporting economic growth. A string of logistics companies along the A5 who are being and will continue to be impacted on.	Environmental Agency to be considered for any improvements to the Dodwells junction.
South Midlands	Blue	TGI (Binley Junction) and Walsgrave Islands, A444 and A428 Toll Bar scheme will move issues up to these junctions.	Operating close to capacity.	Top priority for Coventry City Council in order to deliver growth. Economic case for this is from DaSTS study. Fixes required before 2021.		

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
London to Scotland East South Midlands	Blue	M1 J21/M69	Safety	Safety hazard due to blocking back to mainline and weaving to J21a.		
South Midlands	Blue	Stratford – Alcester A46/A435 single carriageway with safety and speed issues.	Capacity and Safety	Low priority.	Lengthy route hence expensive solutions so low on priority list, as several of the other SRN issues could be addressed for the same money.	
Midlands to Wales South Midlands	Blue	M6 Toll efficiency and link with M54	Capacity	Will make a big difference in alleviating problems on the SRN if more traffic used the toll road and link road provided with the M54.	Politically sensitive and the M6 Toll would have to be more financially attractive to traffic for a direct link from the M54 to be beneficial.	

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
South Midlands	Blue	Need to focus priorities to where job growth will take place and to parts of the economy that are doing well e.g. Mira Enterprise Zone on A5.	Delivering growth.	Safeguarding our economic outturn for the future.		
All	Blue	Priorities should also be governed by housing growth areas. Accident areas tend to correlate well with these areas.		.		
All	Blue	Emergency routing.	Capacity	Some emergency routes place increased pressure on an already congested network which results in standstill.	Better communication between HA and LHA required.	

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
London to Scotland East	Green	M1-congestion in vicinity of M1 J21 and M1 J24	Capacity/Operational/safety	PS- It is a top priority due to the airport, SRFI, three cities being in close proximity. It is a nationally important route; if journey times are unreliable, this could have detrimental impacts on the economy. Also, if nothing is done, then the LRN will become a 'rat run' creating associated problems on this network.	PS- Junction improvements may create other implications on the LRN, including accessibility issues to the SRN.	
All	Green	General – viewing the network as a whole and not individual links/junctions	Capacity/Operational	CL -Viewing the UK as a whole and identifying what is needed for the SRN at a nationwide level should be the starting point e.g. A46 v M42 routes. VA- Focusing on individual junctions/links can move the problems elsewhere, rather than eradicating them.	PS – It is difficult to assign priorities as the network should be considered holistically.	
South Midlands	Green	A46	Capacity/Operational	CL- Strategic improvement to A46 could relieve the M42 and M5 which currently experience congestion.		

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
All	Green	General – vulnerable users have difficulties crossing/using the SRN	Safety	VA- Non-motorised vehicles have difficulty/feel unsafe using the SRN. However, in line with the agenda for more sustainable modes of transport to be used, these road users should be encouraged.	An increase in the number of crossing points could have impacts on congestion on the SRN.	VA- The Vulnerable Users Crossings Improvement Programme from 2003 should be revisited.
South Midlands	Green	M6 Toll	Capacity/Operational	CL- Taking the M6 Toll back into public ownership. This would make it toll free and thus more attractive to road users – helping to relieve M6 congestion and support economic growth in the Midlands region.	CL- This would relieve pressures on the M6 and make better use of the network.	IS- This solution is unlikely to happen.
South Midlands	Green	A5 Longshoot and Dodwells	Capacity/Operational	PS – Improving the performance of this section of the SRN is crucial to securing growth in Hinckley and Nuneaton.		PS- Need a long term strategy for improvement and maximise ability to secure developer contributions.
South Midlands	Green	M45- spare capacity	Capacity/Operational	CL- This link currently has spare capacity and so better use could be made of it which could help to alleviate pressures on other, more congested sections of the SRN.		Target employment growth around this area.

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
All	Green	General- timescales/lessons to be learnt	Capacity/Operational	VA- Getting schemes deliverable over the next 5 years is the priority. CL- the timescales are too short. A thorough, unbiased prioritisation of schemes cannot happen in the allocated timeframe. The priority should be to take time and make sure to get things right rather than being under pressure to deliver within the time period. Lessons should be learnt from M1 J19. The current junction was completed on an ad hoc basis and so still suffers from problems.	Schemes need to be delivered within the time frames otherwise promises will not be met.	
London to Scotland East South Midlands	Orange	A5 corridor. From Daventry to Tamworth. Including the anticipated Rail Freight interchange.	Capacity	TK		
South Midlands	Orange	What is the purpose of the A5? Not considered a strategic corridor.	Operational	A5 is important because it links areas of economic growth in the 'local' area. i.e. Coventry, Warwick and Leicester. Not the entire strategic road network. Economic development of area depends on the A5 functioning – it is a major employment area, MIRA etc. It has got to be made fit for purpose. AH		Find out what the HA consider the function of the A5 is. Maybe devolve control of the A5 from HA to local authorities?



<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
All	Orange	Trunk roads are the main problem in the area.	Capacity	Trunk roads are the priority as Motorways are not considered to be a problem (with the exception of M42) AH		
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1 J21	Capacity	Long term problem. Growth projections in the area are significant, thought needs to be given to considering this predicted growth. TK, AH		
London to Scotland East	Orange	M1 J23/24 J24 – Airport traffic/access J23 – Equally as bad	Capacity	This will need attention. It is going to be very important in opening up investment for the area and attracting business. GC		
South Midlands	Orange	M6 Toll - Empty because it is overpriced.	Operational / capacity	The A5/WM conurbation is suffering from capacity issues that could be eased by vehicles using the M6 Toll, but pricing structure discourages most use. AH	Money. Presumably 100's of Millions to acquire from the private sector, given there is probably 30-35 year concession left on it. Benefits for the A5, and cheaper than building a new one. It is a Government issue though, not a HA one.	De-toll it. Government buy it.
South Midlands	Orange	Leicester – Nuneaton – Coventry – Warwick – Stratford – Evesham (A46)	Capacity	This is the spine of the area, the back bone of the local/regional economy and needs transport infrastructure to match. AH		

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
South Midlands	Orange	A46 Toll Bar maybe cause a problem north of it Pushing problems along the network, not dealing with them	Capacity	It is a priority to consider all of the developments together, because there is a danger of just pushing the problem along the routes to the next junction/pinch point. AH		
South Midlands	Orange	A46/A426 TGI Junction	Capacity	Will become an issue when A46 Toll Bar improvement is finished and traffic is unblocked and flows to this junction. TK		
South Midlands	Orange	Stratford to Alcester Road	Capacity	Single winding carriageway not suitable for strategic road network. If this road does become more frequently used with anticipated development growth (and as a link from M1 to M5, it needs to be made fit for that purpose.		Dual Carriageway
South Midlands	Orange	Congestion at Junctions in Warwick area eg Stanks Junction	Safety / capacity	Starting to see queuing onto the carriageway, which is a safety issue too. HA vs County councils, there is a need for joined up thinking/cooperation. AH		
North and East Midlands	Orange	A46 North of Leicester Maintenance Major resurfacing resulting in the removal of the verge for cross overs. Rising flood risk (less infiltration)	Society & Environment / asset condition	This problem was created by the actions taken to maintain the carriageway. investment should not be CREATING Problems. TA		

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
All	Orange	Strategic Signage	Operational	GC. This should be straight forward to implement, and because it is an easy way to improve capacity it should be prioritised. There is a plan in place for diversions – use VMS to implement it more readily/effectively? Could be used to help stop huge congestion issues in local towns.		Make better use of VMS
South Midlands	Orange	A5 Been forgotten about because the suspicion is that HA don't see it as a strategic route.	Capacity	Perception that HA does not consider that the A5 has a strategic role, but it has a vital role to play in the local/regional economy - so this needs to be addressed. AH		Devolve responsibility from the HA to local authorities. At least make the HA declare what they see what its function is.
All	Red	Wherever there is a major change to a section of the network the HA need to include segregated lanes for cyclists. For example at roundabouts cyclists currently have to use drop kerbs - not ideal (GR)	Safety and society	If a better cycle network is provided then it will encourage more people to use it as a mode of transport	Important as it will improve safety for cyclists	Could provide underpasses or bridges for cyclists at nodes as these are the most difficult part of a route

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
South Midlands	Red	The A5 corridor, particularly through the North of Nuneaton. Problems: Congestion, Safety, Air Quality Management (SH). When an incident occurs on the motorway there is additional congestion on the A5 due to traffic been diverted. The A5 is only 1 lane wide (per direction) in some areas and so it cannot cope with the additional traffic. The congestion often results in trucks sitting in queues which causes environmental issues (RW)	Capacity, Safety and environment	There are a number of issues on the A5 which need to be resolved as they effect a large number of road users (commuters, freight and cyclists)	One of the most important priorities for the group	
London to Scotland East Felixstowe to Midlands London to Scotland West	Red	Safety - need to continue to make roads safer as high impact accidents have a knock on effect on the rest of the network (diversions). Need to educate road users on signs, managed motorways etc. More safety cameras need to be introduced. Areas of particular concern: Capthorpe junction, M6 junction 2, M42/M6 Toll merge, M40 junction 15 (PM).	Safety	Important as better safety levels on the network will reduce accidents	One of the most important priorities for the group	

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
South Midlands	Red	A46 between Alcester and Stratford - single carriageway causes congestion. Do not want to see it duelled from an environmental point of view (PH) however something needs to be done about the congestion.	Capacity	Need a method to ease congestion on the A46 as current levels are not acceptable	Important to ease congestion on the road	Need a traffic management scheme on the A46 such as the use of traffic lights at peak times
South Midlands	Red	A46/ A3400 Bishopton Hill island - there is a 5 lane roundabout planned to ease congestion. This junction is critical to the function of Stratford-upon-Avon	Capacity	Need a method to ease congestion on the A46 as current levels are not acceptable	Important - plans are already in place	

Internal Area 7 RBS workshop  
Breakout session two

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
London to Scotland East	1	M1 J23-24A	Capacity	"Engine room" for economic activity in the area / region. Junction for East Mids airport, a lot of strategic traffic connecting the Derby/Nottingham areas with the SE and Birmingham. Strategic rail freight interchange planned at J24 which will create economic growth through additional jobs but also increase percentage of HGVs and strategic traffic. Consensus that this was the priority in area 7	This route serves a strategic need. Priority is M1, the A38 and A42 in terms of improvements and maintenance (KM)	Part solution is planned in the MP pipeline (M1 J24-25 MM)
North and East Midlands	1	A52 - what is the level of service the HA wants	Capacity, safety	A453 is now the strategic route and is being up-graded by current MP scheme. Lots of development pressures here. What will be the function of the A52 now	Does it serve more of a local need	Should it be de-trunked

<b>Relevant RBS</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Description of challenge / Location</b>  <i>Nb. These could be from any of the groups – not limited to the ones raised by this group</i>	<b>Type of challenge</b> <b>Capacity / Safety / Asset Condition / Operational / Society &amp; Environmental</b>  <i>Prompt if the same types are raised to consider whether they are viewed as a higher priority than other types</i>	<b>Why is this considered to be a priority?</b>  <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>	<b>How does this compare to other priorities?</b> <b>Why? Are there any trade-offs?</b>  <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>	<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>
North and East Midlands	1	A38 Derby Junctions	Capacity	Issues are congestion, air quality, noise and safety. One of the top 2 priorities in the region for the East Mids forum. Interim solution with the PP scheme. As part of the SRFI development we will look at the interdependency of the A38, A42 and M1 next year. No CCTV	Pipeline scheme announced but scheme has always been at arms length. Interacts with M1 J28 therefore cannot improve one without the other as it just moves the problem	MP pipeline scheme Technology provision
All	1	Safety vs other priorities	Safety		Sections with congestion usually have an issue with safety. Need to consider impact of schemes on safety and congestion along a route	
All	1	Asset condition	Asset condition		More important to maintain network due to its impact on safety. There is an opportunity to make best use of the roadspace	
London to Scotland East	1	M1 J21	Capacity	Key strategic junction with M1 and M69, key for local traffic due to the junctions impact on Leicester	Priority is below M1 J23-25	



## 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 Felixstowe to Midlands route (top 250 nationally):

A12/A14 Copdock Mill Roundabout – Rank 35

A14 Brampton Hut Roundabout – Rank 35

A1 Black Cat Roundabout – Rank 69

A45/A6 Higham Ferrers Roundabout – Rank 98

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 Felixstowe to Midlands 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
21*	A421/A6 ebd exit slip	2	2012 Q3- 4 Slight ebd exit slip all rear end collisions
	A421/A6 wbd exit slip	4	2012 Q3 1)Serious PIC – cyclist on wbd exit slip moves into path of V2
13*	A14 Fenstanton	6	4 PICs – turning manoeuvres (In/out) of Service Area ebd
8*	A428 Eltisley	7	No commentary given in study
10*	A14/A11 Jct 36	7	3 PICs- mechanical failure & 1 PIC – icy conditions
11*	A14 Newmarket Service Area	7	3PICs relate to turning movements into/out of Service Area
12*	A14 Woolley - Easton junction (at grade junctions)	7	3 PICs-turning manoeuvre 1 PIC – single vehicle loss of control 1 PIC-U turn through crossover & 1 PIC details not given

Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
12	A14 Spittalls interchange	11	Improvement to Traffic Signal Timing improvements programmed 2013/14
20	A1/A421 Black Cat	13	No commentary given in study
14 & 18	A14 Brampton Hut Site 14 Site 18	18 9	ite 14 - eastern section of circulatory including ebd exit & ebd entry Site 18 – Western section of circulatory including ebd approach & wbd exit
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

Note:

\* identifies site not defined by criteria set for a 'Cluster Site' but where there is a concentration of collisions at the site

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

Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
7	A14 - eastbound offslip to A134 J43 St Saviours Interchange	4	Tail end collisions noted, scheme in forward programme.
52	A14 - southbound offslip to Whitehouse interchange	4	Nose-to-tail collisions identified . Scheme on forward programme.
54	A14 - Junction 51 Mainline Eastbound carriageway	4	Dominant pattern of nose-to-tail collisions identified
51	A14 - eastbound, just east of Risby Interchange	5	2 of the 5 collisions were in road works, 4 of the 5 collisions were nose-to-tails. No accidents recorded in 2012.

Cluster Ref No	Location	No of collisions in 100m radius	Observations
53	A14 – Eastbound carriageway just before junction 57	5	No dominant trend observed.
50	14 - eastbound at the on-slip from the A12 J55 Copdock Mill Interchange	7	Dominant pattern of nose-to-tail collisions, scheme on forward programme
37	A14 - Westbound carriageway at Orwell Service Station	10	Trend of nose-to-tail collisions observed. Scheme on forward programme. under review.
36 & 15	A14 – westbound carriageway on Orwell Bridge	18	High number of collisions as a result of vehicles braking and skidding on Orwell bridge, resulting in rear end collisions

## C Route condition

### C.1 Structures: additional information

**Error! Reference source not found.** 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
A14 Orwell Bridge	Ongoing maintenance programme including bearing replacement	Next 4 years
A14 Huntingdon Rail Viaduct	Extensive monitoring programme to follow current strengthening work	Next 5 years
A14 Concrete carriageway (at Woolpit and Ipswich Southern Bypass Junction 55 – 56)	Major concrete carriageway maintenance	Next 5 years

### C.2 Technology: additional information

**Error! Reference source not found.** 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
A14 Felixstowe to Kettering  Exc Huntingdon to Cambridge Improvement Scheme	CCTV -	At all major junctions	Nil
	VMS -	At all major junctions	Nil
A14 Huntingdon to Cambridge Improvement Scheme	MIDAS -	At all major junctions	Nil
	NRTs -	Fibre	Nil
	CCTV –	At all major junctions	All future requirements are covered by the A14 Improvement scheme.

Route	System	Existing	Known Gaps
A421 M1 to A1	CCTV -	Nil	Nil
	VMS -	Approach to the M1	Approach to A1
A428 A1 to M11	VMS -	Nil	Approaches to both the A1 and M11

### C.3 Environment: additional information

**Error! Reference source not found.** below lists the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) affecting the route.

**Table C.3 Summary of AQMAs**

Location	Authority	Pollutant(s)
An area along the A14 between Bar Hill and Milton	South Cambridgeshire District Council	Nitrogen Dioxide NO <sub>2</sub>
An area encompassing properties at Wood View, Nursery Cottages, Thrapston Road, Bliss Close and Flamsteed Drive close to the A14 in Brampton and Hinchingsbrooke	Huntingdonshire District Council	Nitrogen Dioxide NO <sub>2</sub>
An area encompassing a number of properties either side of the A14 between Hemingford and Fenstanton	Huntingdonshire District Council	Nitrogen Dioxide NO <sub>2</sub>
An area encompassing the southern part of the town centre, bounded largely by the A141 to the west, A14 to the south and the river to the east	Huntingdonshire District Council	Nitrogen Dioxide NO <sub>2</sub>
An area encompassing properties in Wootton Hall Park, Cottesbrooke Gardens, Hermitage Way, Stratford Drive and Chestnut Drive close to the A45 London Road	Northampton Borough Council	Nitrogen Dioxide NO <sub>2</sub>
An area encompassing a number of properties in Bowthorpe Close and Billing Road East close to the A45 Nene Valley Way	Northampton Borough Council	Nitrogen Dioxide NO <sub>2</sub>

Table C.4 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.4 Summary of Noise FPLs**

IA Identifier	Location	Authority
4843	A14 - between Junction 37 and Newmarket Road bridge	East Cambridgeshire
4846	A14 – section parallel to Heath Road	East Cambridgeshire

## D Future considerations

### D.1 Economic growth additional Information

**Error! Reference source not found.** 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	Anticipated growth			Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
		2011 – 2015	To 2021	To 2031	
<a href="#">Babergh District Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">1,515 units</a>	<a href="#">3,935 units</a>	<a href="#">4,642 units</a>	<a href="#">A14 J54 and J55</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">1,940 jobs</a>	<a href="#">4,850 jobs</a>	<a href="#">9,700 jobs</a>	
<a href="#">Bedford Borough Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">4,820 units</a>	<a href="#">11,556 units</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">A421 junctions</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">8,260 jobs</a>	<a href="#">16,000 jobs</a>	<a href="#">Not known (up to 2021)</a>	
<a href="#">Cambridge City Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">2,546 units</a>	<a href="#">10,111 units</a>	<a href="#">14,331 units</a>	<a href="#">A14 J31-35</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">4,420 jobs</a>	<a href="#">11,050 jobs</a>	<a href="#">22,100 jobs</a>	
<a href="#">Central Bedfordshire Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">6,174 units</a>	<a href="#">17,581 units</a>	<a href="#">28,703 units</a>	<a href="#">A421 junctions</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">5,400 jobs</a>	<a href="#">13,500 jobs</a>	<a href="#">27,000 jobs</a>	
<a href="#">Corby Borough Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">1,689 units (from 2012/13)</a>	<a href="#">6,389 units (from 2012/13)</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">A14 Junction 7</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">8,898 jobs</a>	
<a href="#">Daventry District Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">868 units</a>	<a href="#">3,303 units</a>	<a href="#">5,273 units</a>	<a href="#">A14 J1 and 2</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">19,000 jobs (up to 2026)</a>	
<a href="#">East Cambridgeshire District Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">1,587 units</a>	<a href="#">6,108 units</a>	<a href="#">9,770 units</a>	<a href="#">A14 Junctions 33, 35 and 37</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">1,840 jobs</a>	<a href="#">4,600 jobs</a>	<a href="#">9,200 jobs</a>	
<a href="#">East Northamptonshire Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">1,340 units</a>	<a href="#">3,350 units</a>	<a href="#">7,900 units</a>	<a href="#">A45 junctions, A14 J10-13</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">5,188 jobs</a>	
<a href="#">Forest Heath District Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">1,392 units</a>	<a href="#">3,643 units</a>	<a href="#">7,343 units</a>	<a href="#">A11 Fiveways and A14 Junction 37</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">1,460 jobs</a>	<a href="#">3,650 jobs</a>	<a href="#">5,475 jobs (up to 2026)</a>	
<a href="#">Huntingdonshire District Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">2,901 units</a>	<a href="#">8,680 units</a>	<a href="#">10,337 units</a>	<a href="#">A14 J20-26</a>
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">2,080 jobs</a>	<a href="#">5,200 jobs</a>	<a href="#">7,800 units (up to 2026)</a>	



## Route-based strategies stakeholder events

Location of Development	Development Type	Anticipated growth			Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
		2011 – 2015	To 2021	To 2031	
<a href="#">Ipswich Borough Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">1,446 units</a> <a href="#">3,000 jobs</a>	<a href="#">6,043 units</a> <a href="#">7,500 jobs</a>	<a href="#">10,900 units</a> <a href="#">10,500 jobs</a> (up to 2027)	<a href="#">A14 J53-58</a>
<a href="#">Kettering Borough Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">2,060 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">5,150 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">10,700 units</a> <a href="#">8,858 jobs</a>	<a href="#">A14 J3-10</a>
<a href="#">Mid Suffolk District Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">2,074 units</a> <a href="#">1,280 jobs</a>	<a href="#">3,780 units</a> <a href="#">3,200 jobs</a>	<a href="#">4,305 units</a> <a href="#">7,480 jobs</a> (up to 2026)	<a href="#">A14 J46-53</a>
<a href="#">Northampton Borough Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">3,332 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">15,140 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">22,875 units</a> <a href="#">19,00 jobs</a> (up to 2026)	<a href="#">A45 junctions</a>
<a href="#">South Cambridgeshire District Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">2,809 units</a> <a href="#">4,400 jobs</a>	<a href="#">10,119 units</a> <a href="#">11,000 jobs</a>	<a href="#">19,289 units</a> <a href="#">22,000 jobs</a>	<a href="#">A14 J28-35, A428 junctions</a>
<a href="#">St Edmundsbury District Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">1,909 units</a> <a href="#">2,080 jobs</a>	<a href="#">5,946 units</a> <a href="#">5,200 jobs</a>	<a href="#">13,671 units</a> <a href="#">7,800 jobs</a>	<a href="#">A14 J43-45</a>
<a href="#">Suffolk Coastal District Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">1,924 units</a> <a href="#">1,231 jobs</a>	<a href="#">5,257 units</a> <a href="#">3,077 jobs</a>	<a href="#">8,184 units</a> <a href="#">4,923 jobs</a> (up to 2027)	<a href="#">A14 J58-61</a>
<a href="#">Borough of Wellingborough Council</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">1,180 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">2,950 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">7,700 units</a> <a href="#">5,556 jobs</a>	<a href="#">A45 J11-16, A14 J9-10</a>

## Felixstowe to Midlands – key site data

Location of Development	Development Type	Scale by 2015	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031	Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
<a href="#">Bourn Airfield, Cambourne, South Cambridgeshire</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">0 units</a>	<a href="#">0 units</a>	<a href="#">1,700 units</a>	<a href="#">A428 junctions</a>
<a href="#">Cambourne expansion and Land West of Cambourne, South Cambridgeshire</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">345 units</a>	<a href="#">1,450 units</a>	<a href="#">2,150 units</a>	<a href="#">A428 junctions</a>
<a href="#">Northstowe, South Cambridgeshire</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">65 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">1,965 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">5,965 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">A14 J30</a>
<a href="#">St Neots Eastern Expansion, Huntingdonshire</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">160 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">2,359 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">3,700 units</a> <a href="#">25 ha</a>	<a href="#">A428/B1428 junction</a>
<a href="#">University Site, NW Cambridge</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a>	<a href="#">520 units</a>	<a href="#">1,808 units</a>	<a href="#">1,848 units</a>	<a href="#">A14 J31 and 32</a>

## Route-based strategies stakeholder events

Location of Development	Development Type	Scale by 2015	Scale by 2021	Scale by 2031	Anticipated Location of Impact on Route
	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">111,800sqm</a>	
<a href="#">Nacton Road Re-Development, Ipswich</a>	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">16.7 hectares</a>	<a href="#">A14 J57</a>
<a href="#">Suffolk Business Park, Bury St Edmunds</a>	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">4,080 jobs</a>	<a href="#">A14 J45</a>
<a href="#">Alconbury Wield, Huntingdonshire</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">5,000 units</a> <a href="#">8,000 jobs</a>	<a href="#">A14 J21 and 23</a>
<a href="#">Kettering East Sustainable Urban Extension</a>	<a href="#">Residential</a> <a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">1,376 units</a> <a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">4,124 units</a> <a href="#">53,950sqm</a>	<a href="#">A14 J10-11</a>
<a href="#">Northampton Central Area</a>	<a href="#">Commercial</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">Not known</a>	<a href="#">195,500sqm</a>	<a href="#">A45 junctions</a>

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 PR200/13.

\* 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