

# POPE of Major Schemes Summary Report

Scheme Title	A2 Bean – Cobham (Phase 2)
Opening Date	February 2009
POPE Stage	Five Years After

## **Scheme Description**

The A2 Bean – Cobham- Phase 2 scheme was a major Highways England project in Kent which opened in February 2009. The A2 trunk road is an east-west route between London and north Kent. The A2 Bean – Cobham scheme was implemented in two phases, with Phase 1 completed in December 2004. This involved works to improve the A2 from Bean to Pepperhill. Phase 2 comprised works from Pepperhill to Cobham, a distance of 4.5 miles. These works involved providing a new, wider road alongside the original A2, although some widening of the existing road also took place.

This document summarises the findings of the five years after post-opening evaluation study of Phase 2 of the scheme.

Objective (Source: Environmental Statement)	Objective Achieved?
Reduce journey time and improve reliability	<b>✓</b>
Improve Safety	✓
Provide enhanced access to the major regeneration area of Kent Thameside and other regeneration areas in north and east Kent	<b>√</b>
Facilitate access to Ebbsfleet International Rail Station from the road network	<b>√</b>
Provide safe and appropriate access along the route for non-motorised users	<b>√</b>

## **Summary of Scheme Impacts**

### **Key Findings**

- Five years after opening, the scheme has been successful in achieving its objectives;
- Journey times on the A2 have been reduced from pre-scheme to post-scheme;
- Although the number of collisions has not reduced, the severity index of collisions has decreased, meaning there are fewer collisions classed as fatal or serious; and
- Traffic has increased on the A2 from the before to after periods.

#### **Traffic**

 Average daily traffic flows on the A2 have increased by as much as 18% five years after the opening of the scheme.



- In contrast, traffic flows have decreased along the M20. This suggests some re-routing of traffic
  from the M20 on to the A2. However, several other schemes have been constructed in the vicinity
  so impacts should not be overstated.
- Traffic flow increases on the A2 were higher than forecast, which may also have been affected by nearby schemes or due to an underestimation in traffic growth prior to construction.
- Journey times have decreased in both directions on the A2 and across all time periods (AM peak, inter-peak and PM peak), with savings as high as three minutes.

### Safety

- The number of personal injury collisions occurring along the Phase 2 section of the A2 has remained consistent with before the scheme.
- In the wider area, which includes the M20 and the Phase 1 section of the A2, collisions increased slightly. The severity of these collisions has decreased.
- The collision rate on this part of the A2 has reduced, even taking into account the increased level
  of traffic.
- The installation of two footbridges to replace subways crossing the A2 has had a positive impact on personal security for pedestrians and cyclists.

#### **Environment**

- Noise mitigation measures for the scheme, such as acoustic barriers, are in good condition.
- The landscape mitigation measures provided are as expected in the Environmental Statement.
- Landscape impacts are considered moderate beneficial, as expected, as mitigation measures have been provided as planned.
- The impacts on heritage are neutral, as expected.
- In terms of the water sub-objective, impacts are slight beneficial, as expected.
- The scheme's impact on physical fitness is moderate beneficial, as expected.
- Journey ambience receives a score of moderate beneficial.

### **Accessibility and Integration**

- Facilities for non-motorised users have improved along the route, with the installation of footbridges and the provision of off-road walking and cycling facilities.
- All integration sub-objectives received an as expected score.

## **Summary of Scheme Economic Performance**

All Monetary Figures in 200	Forecast	Outturn	
Investment Cost in Present V	£122.4m	£124.9m	
Present Value Benefit (PVB)	£360.4m	£260.6m	
Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)	Indirect Tax Impact Treated as a Cost	2.9	2.1
Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)	Indirect Tax Impact Treated as a Benefit	3.0	2.1

- Due to the nature of the improvements, journey time benefits would be expected from the opening
  of the scheme. Journey times, which made up the benefits, improved as expected, although
  forecasts were higher than observed.
- Collision benefits were not monetised, due to the scheme having no impact on collisions. This helps to explain why the forecast Present Value Benefits are higher than the outturn benefits.
- With regards to wider economic benefit, the impacts on the Regeneration Area are positive.
- The BCR is slightly lower than expected, although significant benefits are still experienced from this scheme and the scheme offers high value for money.