

Pell Frischmann

A453 Nottingham Multi Modal Study

Inception Seminar – 11 February 2000

Seminar Report

Version: 7 March 2000
Project: 5239



CONTACTS

Peter Webster
Pell Frischmann
Lloyd's Court
659 Silbury Boulevard
Central Milton Keynes
MK9 3DP

Tel: 01908 690620

Fax: 01908 663010

Email: pwebster@pellfrischmann.com/

TrafficMKeynes@pellfrischmann.com

Emma Major
Capital Value & Risk Limited
The Courtyard
30c Hart Street
Henley-on-Thames
Oxfordshire
RG9 2AU

Tel: 01491 413 185

Fax: 01491 413 786

Email: major.capval@dial.pipex.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTACTS

- 1 BACKGROUND TO STUDY
- 2 KEY CONCLUSIONS
- 3 BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: SYNDICATE GROUPS
- 4 INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS
- 5 SEMINAR ATTENDEES
- 6 BENEFITS OF STUDY

APPENDIX

- A INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS
- B POST SEMINAR COMMENTS

1. BACKGROUND TO STUDY

This document is the report of the Inception Seminar held on the 11 February 2000 for the A453 Nottingham and M1 North -South Movements Multi Modal Studies.

The seminar was held in order to fulfil the following objectives:

- Δ Allow the wider reference group to get to know the Study Team
- Δ Provide the wider reference group with an understanding of the overall approach and interface between each study
- Δ Detail the programme for the A453 study
- Δ Outline the purpose of the continuous involvement of the Wider Reference Group in the A453 study
- Δ Identify the initial issues which the Wider Reference Group would like to be considered within the A453 study

The seminar was facilitated by Glyn Harrison (Capital Value & Risk Limited) at the Posthouse, City Centre, Nottingham. The participants were divided into five syndicate groups that were facilitated by members of the Joint Venture Team as shown below:

Syndicate	Facilitator and Recorder
1	Les Goddard (Pell Frischmann) Jane Scott (Pell Frischmann)
2	Peter Webster (Pell Frischmann) Jocelyn Bridge (Gillespies)
3	Andrew Spittlehouse (Pell Frischmann) Jim Gibson (Gillespies)
4	Emma Major (Capital Value & Risk Limited) Rainer Schwartzmann (PTV)
5	<u>M1 North-South Movements</u> Don Nutt (Steer Davies and Gleave) Phil Richards (WS Atkins)

2. KEY CONCLUSIONS

Following the Inception Seminar all items generated by the seminar attendees were sorted.

The three main headings by which they were sorted were the MMS requirements, problems, issues and possible solutions. In addition there were sub-headings, as required, for clarity of presentation and ease of use by the study team. The sorted items are shown on the following pages.

2.1 MULTI MODAL STUDY REQUIREMENTS

1. NOTE: the A453 is a Multi role corridor
2. Any Integrated solution should emphasise shifts away from road traffic through the provision of Fair choices
3. Start with a Clean Sheet
4. Ensure Credibility and transparency of the study
5. Ensure deliverability and sustainability
6. Quality of life and social inclusion should be taken into account
7. Need a problem identification phase after surveys to detail all problems - inputs into NATA. Previous example - crime and disorder individuals often give different problems than whole communities
8. Look at the impact on the wider network of any decision
9. Introduce Integrated solutions to corridor problems
10. Look at methods to reduce traffic mileage since there is no extra capacity on A453
11. All types of journey should be taken into account: Short/medium/long
12. Traffic characteristics should be obtained
13. Publicity of the study should be undertaken to raise awareness
14. Establish what solutions are acceptable (different to different people)
15. Self-interest Groups should be consulted, however note that individuals may be members of more than one interest group
16. PPG13 – delivering this should be priority
17. Environmental sustainability should be ensured
18. Timescale for solving problems
19. Solutions - short, medium, long term
20. Safety - immediate solutions
21. Data collection should be undertaken now to determine any modal shift as a result of the study: Assumptions versus base data collection
22. Congestion needs to be reduced
23. Illustrate that all solutions have been looked at
24. Central/regional/local government commitment to study solutions should be maintained and ensured
25. Note the problem of car culture (social status derived from car ownership)
26. Explain to the public the principle of congestion generating further congestion, in order to encourage them onto public transport
27. Education/information should be emphasised

2 KEY CONCLUSIONS - CONTINUED

28. Use Indicators to measure the effectiveness of solutions: noise, quality of life etc. The Study should develop these indicators (Health Action Zones)
29. Ensure NATA includes social issues: Econ Regen - Social inclusion
30. Capacity of road to deal with function should be established
31. East/West through routes are also an issue
32. Displacement is not a solution due to problems with rat running and the impact on rural roads
33. Knock on effects down line should be taken into account
34. Need to know journey patterns for the route
35. Have foresight to plan for the future

2.2 PROBLEMS/ISSUES

2.2.1 Regional

Transport

36. Public transport should be improved
37. Bus priority measures do work with Park & Ride (ref. Cinderhill, A610 near Junction 26)
38. Cannot dismiss bus prioritisation because it is relatively cheap. It would only be a short term solution
39. Demand management (political/ public acceptability)
40. Freight in and out of Nottingham – investigate rail as a possible alternative.
41. The "spend more money" solution is the easy option!
42. A453 forms part of an accident diversion for the M1 between Junctions 24 and 25 Northbound
43. Junction 24 - no diversion routes are available in the event of Road Traffic Accidents
44. Bus priority
 - Δ Newark to East Midlands Airport, priority lane should be ceased
 - Δ Nottingham to Loughborough - conflict at A453
45. Traffic from Coventry uses A453 route
46. Any road traffic going beyond Derby to Stoke uses the A453 route
47. M1 Junctions 24 and 24A and major roads including the A6 are severely congested at peak hours, this is exacerbated from 2.30pm on Fridays – issue for Kegworth
48. How to police illegitimate use of bus lane?
49. Inefficiency of management of current network
 - Δ Right hand turning of HGVs and cars off A453. Opposite Barton turn to avoid weight limit - British Gypsum are seen as the major undertakers of this manoeuvre

Economic/Land Use

- 50. There is sustainable economic development:
 - Δ Airport
 - Δ local authorities have agreed focus for all business parks
- 51. East Midlands Airport is seen as the chief regional airport in UK for freight traffic and is a known source of ground freight transport shift. Only 20% of freight at the airport comes on or off aeroplanes.
- 52. True costing within the modal study should not to be looked at in isolation
- 53. Take into account all funding of transport - renewing as well as capital
- 54. Conflict of Interests:
 - Δ Chamber of Commerce says A453 needs improving, suggest through dualling. This would improve business competitiveness of Nottingham
 - Δ Local Community says reduce the use of A453 to increase safety and reduced pollution
- 55. Take into account Institutional arrangements
- 56. Look at the National policy in air transport
- 57. Sub regional economy
 - Δ Interchange
 - Δ Quality partnerships (Public Transport)
 - Δ Public transport (bus to train transfer)
- 58. Company cars – the actual cost of travel should be obtained
- 59. Bus regulation should be investigated
- 60. Look at the impacts of development on the possible solutions
- 61. The influence of individual choices i.e. Ability to buy cars should be taken into account
- 62. Junction 24 - Conflicts due to multiple land uses in vicinity - congestion
- 63. Economic development around junction 24 could exacerbate current problems
- 64. Donington events increase congestion problems
- 65. HA is constricted to solutions due to the narrowness of the A453
- 66. Maintenance: Major works required (night time work only) to:
 - Δ Carriageway
 - Δ Pavements
 - Δ Bridges
- 67. Pressure for development at Junction 24 and East Midlands Airport for:
 - Δ Business warehousing
 - Δ Service sector
 - Δ Freight
- 68. Airport employment increased by 30% since 1997 which is a source of traffic
 - Δ Only 2% of airport passengers go by public transport
 - Δ Consult with airport regarding mode choice

2 KEY CONCLUSIONS - CONTINUED

- Δ Shifts at night add to congestion into/out of Nottingham at rush hours
- 69. Cannot easily access the planned Parkway station from A453

Environmental

- 70. Opposite Barton, HGVs turn to avoid a weight limit - British Gypsum
- 71. Safeguard the environment
- 72. Ameliorate current impact of roads on in terms of:
 - Δ Landscape
 - Δ People
 - Δ Wildlife
- 73. Pollution
 - Δ Environmental
 - Δ Noise
- 74. True pricing of Environmental Issues
- 75. Green commuter plans should be noted, these tend to be employer/development led

Safety

- 76. Improve Safety
- 77. Public safety
 - Δ Reduce road users: reduce accidents
 - Δ Issue of modal shift re: safety for pedestrians and cyclists
 - Δ Relocate or reduce traffic?
 - Δ Affects to reduce traffic can lengthen emergency response times. However it is difficult to get emergency services through congested areas.
- 78. Poor traffic management on the route does not ease the situation:
Need information eg. Delay notices etc

2.2.2 Local

Transport

- 79. The roles of the A453
- 80. Public transport should be improved
- 81. The "spend more money" solution is the easy option !
- 82. There is an existing cycle route from University into Nottingham Centre (not A453 from Clifton Bridge)
- 83. Major users of A453 from Clifton to the M1 are HGVs.
 - Δ Public transport would not alleviate this issue.
 - Δ The M1 study should look at this

Economic/Land Use

- 84. Local economy
 - Δ Persuasion that car based solutions should not be pursued
- 85. Reduce the need to travel - land use planning
- 86. Study appears to assume that the 'car' traveller is the model subject - must consider others such as pedestrian, cyclist, rail, bus, motorways, air, freight etc.
- 87. A453 is a QMC route (hospital)
- 88. Volumes of freight traffic has increased sharply due to A50 Stoke - Derby
- 89. Incident and duration of peak traffic has increased. This has an impact on local people
- 90. There is Conflict between the local schools and the university and their separate requirements for the A453
- 91. Planning issues
 - Δ Increased housing development at Clifton is planned
 - Δ Where will public transport go? On What routes?
- 92. Look at Donington: On meet days the congestion gets even worse
- 93. Clifton has one of the highest levels of non -car ownership - need to accommodate the needs of these people into the study
- 94. Clifton, as with any community, has increased road traffic from school transport
- 95. Residential developments planned for Clifton which should be taken into account

Environmental

- 96. The study team should remain sensitive to impact on local population
- 97. Key pressure: River Trent alongside the A453 and the crossing of it at Clifton Bridge
- 98. Issues at Clifton include:
 - Δ Congestion
 - Δ Pollution (air, noise and vibration)
- 99. M1 Junctions 24 and 24A and major roads including the A6 are severely congested at peak hours, this is exacerbated from 2.30pm on Fridays – issue for Kegworth
- 100. Safeguard the environment
- 101. Ameliorate current impact of roads on in terms of:
 - Δ Landscape
 - Δ People
 - Δ Wildlife
- 102. Pollution
 - Δ Environmental

2 KEY CONCLUSIONS - CONTINUED

- Δ Noise
- 103. Environmental impacts especially on local residents should be noted
- 104. Environmental considerations:
 - Δ Land Use at Clifton
 - Δ Community effects air/noise pollution
 - Δ Severance
 - Δ Potential social damage and exclusion
- 105. Is there a difference re: congestion during University terms?

Safety

- 106. Improve Safety
- 107. No underpasses: for safety reasons
- 108. Issues at Clifton include:
 - Δ Community severance
 - Δ Congestion
 - Δ Pollution (air, noise and vibration)
 - Δ Safety:
 - ? Of the community when crossing the road (problem for many years)
 - ? Of vulnerable road users e.g. cyclists and pedestrians
- 109. Local safety should be studied and improved – reduce the speed limits
- 110. Reiteration of safety, especially safe routes to schools is paramount
- 111. Clifton - pedestrians
- 112. Road Traffic Accidents occur at rural junctions
- 113. High car speeds, especially at night
- 114. Rat runs through estate causes danger for Farnborough schools
- 115. Pressure of traffic volumes on pedestrians and cyclists: safety implications
- 116. By removing HGVs, cars will speed up and this will have a similar safety issue for the community

2.3 SOLUTIONS

- 117. Package approach preferred: Are solutions/options mutually exclusive

2.3.1 Road

- 118. Quality Park & Ride would promote modal shift
- 119. Multi-occupancy Carriageway

2 KEY CONCLUSIONS - CONTINUED

- 120. Crossing new road to Beeston (i.e. across river - the yellow route).
The fourth crossing.
- 121. M1 to Clifton Improvement
 - Δ Dualling to Clifton
 - Δ Cut (trench) to bridge
 - Δ Clifton - capacity at peak time. Good bus provision in Clifton, but A453 results in congestion
- 122. A453 Clifton traffic calming
- 123. Help alleviate problems of congestion:
 - Δ Develop road upgrade
 - Δ Look at alternative modes of transport
- 124. A bypass is not preferable at the Clifton section
- 125. A bypass is preferable at Kegworth

2.3.2 Public Transport

- 126. Dual A453 (but allow nearside lane to be bus only to Parkway Station). NOTE: the local community opposes dualling in preference to a bypass.
- 127. Light Rail Transit link to Park & Ride
- 128. Underground - mono rail possible solution
- 129. Public transport – establish the amount of usage?
 - Δ Tram system publicised - possible city centre link
 - Δ How will Parkway train station change impacts on the route?
- 130. Improve public transport by using:
 - Δ Public Transport Subsidies
 - Δ Reduce costs of Public Transport
 - Δ Undertake road charging
- 131. Nottingham Light Rail Transit could speed public access (8 -10 years away)
- 132. Parkway Station: Role more at a national scale via Park & Ride
- 133. Nottingham to Birmingham goes via Derby and reverses. Could Castle Donington line save journey time Both locally and inter urban are not consistent services

3. BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: SYNDICATE GROUPS

The seminar participants divided into syndicate groups to identify issues regarding the A453. The group was syndicated as shown in Section 5 of this report. The following conclusions from each group were made. Key issues were identified by consensus at the end of each syndicate session these are shown below:

1 SYNDICATE 1 (LES GODDARD)

3.1.1 KEY ISSUES:

- Δ Developmental pressure in the area eg. Around East Midlands Airport should be taken account of
- Δ Any Integrated solution should emphasise shifts away from road traffic
- Δ Fair choices should be generated to encourage modal shift
- Δ Public transport should be improved
- Δ True costing should be undertaken within the modal study, no one cost should be looked at in isolation

3.1.2 General points:

- Δ Sub regional economy
 - Δ Interchange
 - Δ Quality partnerships (Public Transport)
 - Δ Bus to train transfer
- Δ Local safety should be studied and improved – reduce the speed limits
- Δ Pollution
 - Δ Environmental
 - Δ Noise
- Δ Local economy
 - Δ Persuasion that car based solutions should not be pursued
- Δ True pricing of Environmental Issues
- Δ Choice of mode
 - Δ All types of journey should be taken into account:
 - ? Short/medium/long
 - Δ Traffic characteristics should be obtained
- Δ Publicity of the study should be undertaken to raise awareness
- Δ The East Midlands Airport is expanding and is the biggest cause of growth in the area
- Δ Development pressure in the area, especially surrounding the Airport
- Δ Company cars – the actual cost of travel should be obtained
- Δ The Nottingham to Birmingham train service is considered to be poor
- Δ Bus regulation should be investigated
- Δ Freight in and out of Nottingham – investigate rail as a possible alternative

3 BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: SYNDICATE GROUPS - CONTINUED

- Δ Look at methods to reduce traffic mileage since there is no extra capacity on A453
 - Δ Safeguard the environment
 - Δ Ameliorate current impact of roads on in terms of:
 - Δ Landscape
 - Δ People
 - Δ Wildlife
 - Δ Improve public transport by using:
 - Δ Public Transport Subsidies
 - Δ Reduce costs of Public Transport
 - Δ Undertake road charging
 - Δ Introduce Integrated solutions to corridor problems
 - Δ Demand management (political, public acceptability)
 - Δ Look at the freight on the A453 from the airport
 - Δ Look at the impact on the wider network of any decision
 - Δ Look at the National policy in air transport
 - Δ Take into account all funding of transport - renewing as well as capital
 - Δ Take into account Institutional arrangements
 - Δ Reduce the need to travel - land use planning
-

3.2 SYNDICATE 2 (PETER WEBSTER)

3.2.1 Key Issues:

- Δ The roles of the A453
- Δ Start with a Clean Sheet
- Δ Credibility and transparency of the study
- Δ Quality of life and social inclusion should be taken into account
- Δ Package approach preferred
- Δ Deliverability should be ensured
- Δ Timescale?
- Δ Displacement?
- Δ Ensure Sustainability
- Δ Improve Safety

3.2.2 General Points:

- Δ Establish what is acceptable (different to different people)
- Δ A compromise of what is acceptable - transparencies of local people, politics and deliverability
- Δ Q. Should local people determine what is acceptable
A. No individual group should have the final say
- Δ Conflicts between users (residents, business, travel) should be noted

3 BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: SYNDICATE GROUPS - CONTINUED

- Δ Self-interest Groups should be consulted, however note that individuals are members of more than one interest group
 - Δ Environmental sustainability should be ensured
 - Δ PPG13 – delivering this should be priority
 - Δ Timescale for solving problems
 - Δ Solutions - short, medium, long term
 - Δ Safety - immediate solutions
 - Δ Data collection should be undertaken now to determine any modal shift as a result of the study: Assumptions versus base data collection
 - Δ Green counter plans should be noted, these tend to be employer/development led
 - Δ Illustrate that all solutions have been looked at - deliverability local issues and policy held up by National Government policy
 - Δ Central/regional/local government commitment to study solutions should be maintained and ensured
 - Δ The "spend more money" solution is the easy option !
 - Δ Note the problem of car culture (social status derived from car ownership)
 - Δ Prevent the congestion cycle to encourage modal shift to public transport
 - Δ Education/information should be emphasised
 - Δ Are solutions/options mutually exclusive – package deal preferable
 - Δ Study appears to assume that the 'car' traveller is the model subject - must consider others such as pedestrian, cyclist, rail, bus, motorways, air, freight etc.
 - Δ Car speeds, noise, air quality - less intimidating
 - Δ Congestion needs to be reduced
 - Δ Starting point for study base -point
 - Δ Look at the impacts of development on the possible solutions
 - Δ Use Indicators to measure the effectiveness of solutions: noise, quality of life etc. The Study should develop these indicators (Health Action Zones)
 - Δ Ensure NATA includes social issues: Econ Regen - Social inclusion
 - Δ Solutions to be efficient in the broadest terms - social, economic
 - Δ The study team should remain sensitive to impact on local population
 - Δ The influence of individual choices i.e. Ability to buy cars should be taken into account
 - Δ Capacity of road to deal with function should be established
 - Δ East/West through routes are also an issue
 - Δ Displacement is not a solution due to problems with rat running and the impact on rural roads
 - Δ Who is doing what and for what reason?
-

3 BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: SYNDICATE GROUPS - CONTINUED

3.3 SYNDICATE 3 (AND REW SPITTLEHOUSE)

3.3.1 Key issues:

- Δ Dual A453 (but allow nearside lane to be bus only to Parkway Station).
NOTE: the local community opposes dualling in preference to a bypass.
- Δ Quality Park & Ride would promote modal shift
- Δ LRT link to Park & Ride
- Δ Bus priority measures do work with Park & Ride (ref. Cinderhill, A610 near Junction 26)
- Δ Multi-occupancy Carriageway
- Δ How to police illegitimate use of bus lane
- Δ No underpasses: for safety reasons
- Δ Cannot dismiss bus prioritisation because it is relatively cheap. It would only be a short term solution
- Δ Underground - mono rail
- Δ Crossing new road to Beeston (i.e. across river - the yellow route). The fourth crossing.

3.3.2 General Points:

- Δ There is sustainable economic development:
 - Δ Airport
 - Δ 6 local authorities have agreed focus for all business parks
- Δ Parkway Station – this would be on the Midland Mainline Railway
- Δ Environmental considerations:
 - Δ Land Use at Clifton
 - Δ Community effects air/noise pollution
 - Δ Severance
 - Δ Potential social damage and exclusion
- Δ Clifton Bridge - effect of red route on bridge
- Δ LRT - 2nd line to Clifton - public opinion
- Δ Bus priority
 - Δ Newark to East Midlands Airport, priority to be ceased
 - Δ Nottingham to Loughborough - conflict at A453
- Δ HA constricted due to narrowness of A453
- Δ NOTE: the A453 is a Multi role corridor
- Δ Safety
 - Δ Clifton - pedestrians
 - Δ Road Traffic Accidents occur at rural junctions
 - Δ High car speeds, especially at night
 - Δ Rat runs through estate causes danger for Farnborough schools
- Δ Maintenance
 - Δ Major works required (night time work only) to:

3 BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: SYNDICATE GROUPS - CONTINUED

- ? Carriageway
 - ? Pavements
 - ? Bridges
 - Δ Planning issues
 - Δ Increased housing development at Clifton is planned
 - Δ Where will public transport go? On What routes?
 - Δ A453 Clifton traffic calming
 - Δ Police dual only to Crusader Island (phase 2 to Clifton Bridge)
 - Δ There is Conflict between the local schools and the university
 - Δ Junction 24 - no diversion routes are available in the event of Road Traffic Accidents
 - Δ Junction 24 - Conflicts due to multiple land uses in vicinity - congestion
 - Δ Economic development around junction 24 could exacerbate current problems
 - Δ Donington events increase congestion problems
 - Δ Diversions via 21A - A614 - A6197 since Leist bypass completed
 - Δ A453 forms part of an accident diversion for the M1 between Junctions 24 and 25 Northbound
 - Δ A453 is a QMC route (hospital)
 - Δ Reiteration of safety, especially safe routes to schools is paramount
 - Δ Demand management
 - Δ Knock on effects down line should be taken into account
 - Δ Environmental impacts especially on local residents should be noted
 - Δ Q. How to encourage modal shift?
 - A. Long distance Park & Ride
 - Δ Volumes of freight traffic has increased sharply due to A50 Stoke - Derby
 - Δ Incident and duration of peak traffic has increased. This has an impact on local people
 - Δ Parkway Station
 - Δ Role more at a national scale via Park & Ride
 - Δ M1 to Clifton Improvement
 - Δ Dualling to Clifton
 - Δ Cut (trench) to bridge
 - Δ Clifton - capacity at peak time. Good bus provision in Clifton, but A453 results in congestion
 - Δ Nottingham Light Rail Transit could speed public access (8 -10 years away)
-

3 BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: SYNDICATE GROUPS - CONTINUED

3.4 SYNDICATE 4 (EMMA MAJOR)

3.4.1 Key Issues:

- Δ M1 Junctions 24 and 24A and major roads including the A6 are severely congested at peak hours, this is exacerbated from 2.30pm on Fridays – issue for Kegworth
- Δ Issues at Clifton include:
 - Δ Community severance
 - Δ Congestion
 - Δ Pollution (air, noise and vibration)
 - Δ Safety:
 - ? Of the community when crossing the road (problem for many years)
 - ? Of vulnerable road users e.g. cyclists and pedestrians
- Δ Similar meeting on same area held in 1 989 - nothing followed up. This time the community wants to see results
- Δ Public safety
 - Δ Reduce road users: reduce accidents
 - Δ Issue of modal shift re: safety for pedestrians and cyclists
 - Δ Relocate or reduce traffic?
 - Δ Affects to reduce traffic can lengthen emergency response times.
However it is difficult to get emergency services through congested areas.
- Δ Key pressure: River Trent alongside the A453 and the crossing of it at Clifton Bridge
- Δ Need a problem identification phase after surveys to detail all problems - inputs into NATA. Previous example - crime and disorder individuals often give different problems than whole communities
- Δ Inefficiency of management of current network
 - Δ Right hand turning of HGVs and cars off A453
 - Δ Opposite Barton turn to avoid weight limit - British Gypsum
- Δ Public transport - how much usage?
 - Δ Tram system publicised - possible city centre link
 - Δ How will Parkway train station change impacts on the route?
- Δ Airport seen as chief freight regional airport in UK and is a source of ground freight transport shift. Only 20% of freight at airport comes on/off aeroplanes.
- Δ Conflict of Interests:
 - Δ Chamber of Commerce says A453 needs improving, suggest through dualling. This would improve business competitiveness of Nottingham
 - Δ Local Community says reduce the use of A453 to increase safety and reduced pollution

3 BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: SYNDICATE GROUPS - CONTINUED

3.4.2 General Points:

- △ Help alleviate problems of congestion:
 - △ Develop road upgrade
 - △ Look at alternative modes of transport
 - △ Introduce Parkway Station (local traffic as well as long distance)
- △ Have foresight to plan for the future
- △ Look at Donington
 - △ On meet days the congestion gets even worse
- △ Junction 25 also has problems, but to a lesser extent
- △ A bypass is not preferable at the Clifton section
- △ A bypass is preferable at Kegworth
- △ Note: Kegworth issues will also be incorporated into M1 study
- △ Pressure of traffic volumes on pedestrians and cyclists: safety implications
- △ There is an existing cycle route from University into Nottingham Centre (not A453 from Clifton Bridge)
- △ By removing HGVs, cars will speed up and this will have a similar safety issue for the community
- △ Clifton has one of the highest levels of non-car ownership - need to accommodate the needs of these people into the study
- △ Q. Will there be a report stating all the issues/problems?
A. Yes, this will be issued following the seminar to all attendees
- △ Major users of A453 from Clifton to the M1 are HGVs.
 - △ Public transport would not alleviate this issue.
 - △ The M1 study should look at this
- △ Need to know journey patterns for the route
- △ Clifton, as with any community, has increased road traffic from school transport
- △ Residential developments planned for Clifton which should be taken into account
- △ Pressure for development at Junction 24 and East Midlands Airport for:
 - △ Business warehousing
 - △ Service sector
 - △ Freight
- △ Airport employment increased by 30% since 1997 which is a source of traffic
 - △ Only 2% of airport passengers go by public transport
 - △ Consult with airport regarding mode choice
 - △ Shifts at night add to congestion into/out of Nottingham at rush hours
- △ Train Services:
 - △ Nottingham to Birmingham goes via Derby and reverses. Could Castle Donington line save journey time Both locally and inter urban are not consistent services
 - △ Cannot easily access station from A453

3 BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS: SYNDICATE GROUPS - CONTINUED

- Δ Traffic from Coventry uses A453 route
 - Δ Any road traffic going beyond Derby to Stoke uses the A453 route
 - Δ Is there a difference re: congestion during University terms?
 - Δ Poor traffic management on the route does not ease the situation:
Need information eg. Delay notices etc
-
-

At the conclusion of the seminar there was a question and answer period.
At this time the following points were noted:

- Δ It was stated that 80% of all freight to the East Midlands Airport does not leave the ground. It was noted that this seems to be an extremely high figure.
The team noted that this figure, as with all facts, would be researched properly as part of the study
- Δ It was said that East Midlands Airport is a Regeneration Area, this is not the case since it is all green field site.
The team agreed that this area should be considered a development area

4 INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS

The preceding conclusions were based on discussions and issue identification generated during the seminar. Introductory presentations were given in order to outline the study approach and stimulate discussion.

A copy of all presentation material from the seminar is included in the Appendix to this report.

4.1 DON NUTT – M1 NORTH-SOUTH MOVEMENTS MMS

Don Nutt from the WS Atkins/Steer Davies and Gleave Consultants Team presented an overview of the M1 North-South movements Multi Modal Study:

He outlined the consultation approach and noted that it will:

- Δ engage and satisfy interest
 - Δ local opinion must be taken into account
 - Δ ensure wide interest properly represented
- Δ a transparent approach to inform/assess opinion
- Δ explore problems and possible solutions
- Δ create a condition for successful implementation

He noted that Market research group discussions would be undertaken in order to identify the issues in the vicinity and in the wider area and to inform, interest and solicit views.

In addition he stated that Facilitated workshops - wider reference and project groups would be undertaken to identify:

- Δ problems, issues, uncertainties
- Δ possible policy and scheme options, feasible strategies

This process would be utilised in shaping the way forward – Strategic Choice, namely:

- Δ a process by which, through discussion and debate
 - Δ the objectives of the study are explored
 - Δ key decision areas are identified
 - Δ comparison areas (evaluation criteria) defined
 - Δ uncertainties recognised
- Δ possible strategy(ies) developed

4 INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS - CONTINUED

He then described the Modelling that would be undertaken as part of the study.

He commenced by outlining the principles of the study:

- Δ model to inform the decision process not control it
- Δ define modelling need through Strategic Choice
- Δ full consultation during the model specification stage
- Δ maximum use of existing demand data and models
- Δ use current public transport provision and utilisation data
- Δ transparency in the modelling process and outputs
- Δ compatibility with the A453 model

He then defined the Model:

- Δ the model's ability will rest with its adequate definition
- Δ in simple terms the model has to:
 - Δ cover all major routes in the area (N/S and E/W)
 - Δ cover pertinent types of transport demand
- Δ be capable of forecasting future conditions and the effects of a wide range of scenarios

Following the presentation by Don Nutt several questions were asked by the Seminar Attendees, these are noted below with the responses:

- Δ East Midlands Transport Activists Round Table
 - Need to think carefully about the terms used. The presentation refers to Market Research that biases towards consumers. This should be Public Relations i.e. dealing with the public's issues. This will ensure that the information is not be commercial
- Δ Parish Council
 - Q. The presentation referred to "smaller groups" withwhom consultation could be more regularly undertaken
 - A. The smaller groups will be made up of the 90 WRG members, divided into broad cross-sections
- Δ Protection for rural England
 - Q. Will the study look at road use charges?
 - A. Not pre-empting anything at the moment, but the process will not exclude anything

4 INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS - CONTINUED

4.2 GLYN HARRISON – CONSULTATION PROCESS

Glyn Harrison followed on with a presentation on the A453 Nottingham Multi Modal Study, this presentation is summarised below:

There are four broad aims of the Consultation Process for the Multi Modal Study, namely:

- Δ To obtain useful INFORMATION to help develop and guide the MM strategy
- Δ To increase EVERYONE'S understanding of the issues and factors involved in developing the MM strategy
- Δ To enhance TRANSPARENCY in the decision -making process
- Δ To seek to AVOID DELAYS later during the Public Consultation process

There are five key points during the MMS process when the input of the key stakeholders, i.e. the Wider Reference Group, is required:

- Δ Inception Stage
- Δ Strategy Development
- Δ Option Identification
- Δ Option Assessment
- Δ Study Findings

Different methods of involvement will occur during these stages, these will include newsletters, contact points, seminars, workshops and public exhibitions.

The objectives of the seminar were outlined, these were to:

- Δ Allow attendees to get to know the Study Team
- Δ Bring attendees up to date with the overall approach being proposed and the interface between the two studies
- Δ Detail the programme for the A453 study
- Δ Outline the proposed continuous involvement of the WRG in the A453 study
- Δ Identify initial thoughts on issues which attendees would like to be considered in the A453 study

4 INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS - CONTINUED

4.3 PETER WEBSTER – THE MULTI MODAL STUDY

Following Glyn's presentation, Peter outlined the Multi Modal Study for the seminar attendees as summarised below. First he introduced the Joint Venture Organisation and Team.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Role</u>	<u>Company</u>
Brian Dean	<i>Project Director</i>	Pell Frischmann
Peter Webster	<i>Project Manager</i>	
Les Goddard		
Andrew Spittlehouse		
Jim Gibson		Gillespies
Andrew Fisher		
Jocelyn Bridge		
Thomas Haupt		PTV
Udo Heidl		
Rainer Schwarzman		
John Fearon		JFC
Glyn Harrison		CVRL
Emma Major		
John Dodgson		NERA
Michael Spackman		

He then outlined the 8 phases of the Multi Modal Study (MMS):

- Δ **Phase 1 - Inception**
- Δ **Phase 2 - Surveys and Transportation Model**
- Δ **Phase 3 - Strategy Development**
- Δ **Phase 4 - Option Identification**
- Δ **Phase 5 - Consultation (Continuous)**
- Δ **Phase 6 - Option Appraisal**
- Δ **Phase 7 - Recommendations & Programme**
- Δ **Phase 8 - Management & Reporting (Continuous)**

He then outlined the context for the MMS, focussing upon the interface between the A453 and M1(North-South) studies using the **Role of the A453** as an illustration of travel characteristics in the corridor

- Δ Strategic Movements
 - Δ J24 Confluence of M1, M42, A50 & A6
 - Δ Alternative access to Nottingham & Derby
 - Δ J23a, J24, J25 & J26
- Δ Intercity Stoke Derby
 - Δ Alternative routes include A453/A50, A52 & A6005
- Δ Hinterland to Nottingham
- Δ Local Movements in Clifton

4 INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS - CONTINUED

- Δ Frontage Access
- Δ Major Traffic Generators

The Issues Arising initially were summarised as:

- Δ Environmentally friendly modes poorly provided for
- Δ Conflict between various roles and the local environment
- Δ Inter-relationship between A453 and M1 North-South studies
- Δ Level of service at peak times

After brief coverage of transportation modelling issues and economic/regeneration issues, Peter concluded with pointers to the syndicates as follows.

4.4 SYNDICATE PRESENTATIONS

Following the introductory presentations the Seminar Attendees were syndicated, each syndicate facilitator gave a presentation which summarised the key points of the presentations given by Glyn and Peter and outlined the proposed approach to Strategy and Option development and appraisal. Objectives and Key Indicators were then given to stimulate discussion. A copy of these presentations is provided in the Appendix to this report.

5 SEMINAR ATTENDEES

The Inception Seminar attendees are listed below. They are shown grouped into their various Syndicates for clarity in relation to the Key Conclusions.

Syndicate 1 (Les Goddard)

Name	Organisation
1. Hugh McClintock	North Cycling Campaign
2. Graham Lansdel	CTC
3. Bill Collins	Railway Development Society
4. Paul Kaczmarczue	Barton Parish Council
5. Sven Rufus	Nottingham Wildlife Trust
6. Tony Herrington	Charnwood B C
7. Delia Richards	Castle Donington Parish Council
8. Douglas Reid	Leicestershire County Council
9. Julie Maxwell	East Midlands Regional LGA
10. Ann Goddard	East Midlands Group CPRE

Syndicate 2 (Peter Webster)

Name	Organisation
11 Peter Davison	Broxtowe Borough Council
12 Tony Aspbury	Antony Aspbury Associates
13 Bettina Lange	East Midlands Transport Activists
14 Chris Carter	Nottingham City Council
15 Robert Galey	David Wilson Homes
16 David Herd	Countryside Agency
17 Alan Johnston	East Midlands Airport
18 Karen Stansall	East Midlands Government Office
19 Anne Aldred	GOEM
20 Steve Forgham	Highways Agency
21 Anne Lee	British Horse Society

5 SEMINAR ATTENDEES - CONTINUED

Syndicate 3 (Jim Gibson)

Name	Organisation
22 Erica Marshall	Environment Agency
23 Mary Stephens	Thrumpton Parish Meeting
24 Rachel Hall	Leicestershire Police
25 Mick Mosley	Nottingham Police
26 Kevin Ward	Nottingham City Transport
27 Brent Charlesworth	Clifton & Wilford Area Committee
28 William Kirk	EMDA
29 Mike Sumner	Highways Agency
30 Ian Marshall	GOEM
31 David Fearnhead	GOEM
32 Phil Booker	CPT
33 Harry Bowles	Farnborough School

Syndicate 4 (Emma Major)

Name	Organisation
34 Lesley Pendletin	Kegworth Parish Council
35 Mike Kidger	GOEM
36 J Barrett	CPRE
37 Ian Cartwright	Leicester Fire and Rescue Service
38 Wilf Carey	Transport 2000 - Derbyshire
39 Matthew Lodge	SSRA
40 S McCormack	BRAVE
41 Christine Durrant	Derby City Council
42 Colin Chapman	NWLDC

5 SEMINAR ATTENDEES - CONTINUED

Syndicate 5: M1 Group

Name	Organisation
43 Graham Clarke	Bolsover District Council
44 Pat Adcock	Breaston Parish Council
445 David Skinner	Derbyshire Constabulary
46 Steve Cannon	Derbyshire County Council
47 Benita Holmes	East Midlands Chamber of Commerce
48 David Staples	Erewash Borough Council
49 Gwen Drake	Highways Agency
50 Dale Oscroft	Government Office for the East Midlands
51 John Perkins	Government Office for the East Midlands
52 Mick Woodcock	Government Office for the East Midlands
53 Will Wiseman	Government Office for the East Midlands
54 Chris Perrett	Newark & Sherwood District Council
55 Edward Poyser	Nottingham City Centre Retail Association
56 Jim Warner	Nottingham Coalition for Disabled People
57 Stuart Robertson	Nottinghamshire County Council
58 Mike Salmon	Road Haulage Association Ltd

6 BENEFITS OF STUDY

The following were identified as benefits arising from the Inception Seminar:

- △ The wider reference group was introduced to the A453 Nottingham and M1 North-South Movement Multi Modal Study Teams
- △ The wider reference group were provided with an understanding of the overall approach and interface between each of the multi modal studies
- △ The wider reference group was given the opportunity to ask any questions of either of the multi modal study teams
- △ The programme for the A453 study was outlined
- △ The purpose of the continuous involvement of the Wider Reference Group in the A453 study was detailed and discussed
- △ The initial issues which the Wider Reference Group would like to be considered within the A453 study were identified and noted by the Study Team, as shown throughout this report
- △ Contacts were provided for group members to input any further thoughts they may have

The consultants team would like to thank all members of the Wider Reference Group for their active participation in the syndicates and for comments passed subsequently.

APPENDIX A - PRESENTATIONS

1. Glyn Harrison and Peter Webster: A453 Nottingham MMS
2. Syndicate Presentations: A453 Nottingham MMS
3. Don Nutt: M1 North-South Movements MMS

APPENDIX A - PRESENTATIONS

Glyn Harrison and Peter Webster: A453 Nottingham MMS

APPENDIX A - PRESENTATIONS

Syndicate Presentations: A453 Nottingham MMS

APPENDIX A - PRESENTATIONS

Don Nutt: M1 North -South Movements MMS

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS

- Δ RESPONSE FROM HUGH MCCLINTOCK, CHAIRMAN, PEDALS

- Δ COMMENTS FROM GRAHAM LANSDELL, CTC RIGHT TO RIDE, NOTTINGHAM

- Δ COMMENTS FROM WILF CAREY, TRANSPORT 2000, DERBYSHIRE

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

RESPONSE FROM HUGH MCCLINTOCK, CHAIRMAN, PEDALS

Introduction

Although Pedals considers that the most important level of action for the promotion of cycling is the local level, through local transport plans, we welcome the broad support for cycling in the Interim Regional Transport Strategy.

Detailed Comments

We support the four themes of the IRTS, provided that the action to implement the first of the themes i.e. improving the economic performance of the Region, is not interpreted as a justification for giving this priority over the other three themes relating more directly to sustainable patterns of development which are essential to helping to exploit the full potential of cycling as a daily means of transport, for short trips and, in combination with other modes, for medium and longer distance trips. We therefore also consider of vital importance the first of the four key regional objectives, i.e. "to ensure that decisions about the distribution and location of activity are consistent with sustainable development policies".

Pedals welcomes the statements supporting cycling in paragraph 6.47 but considers that they do not go far enough, especially in the light of the National Cycling Strategy and the subsequent Guidelines for Cycle Audit and Review which emphasises the importance of *making general road conditions much safer and more convenient for cyclists*, rather than relying mainly on traffic free paths and traffic -calmed roads, important as these are if carefully designed, built and maintained with full regard to cyclists' needs. The wording of this paragraph should be revised to reflect more clearly and emphatically this more recent wider emphasis.

Although much of great value for cyclists by way of special provision has been introduced in the Greater Nottingham area we also consider it unfortunate that, also on page 19, the Good Practice example no. 19 highlights the Nottingham Outer Ring Road cycle path extensions as a good example. Although some sections, especially in the Clifton Bridge area, are of generally good standard, this is much less the case with some of the newer sections further north. On these, because of space constraints, and because of the number of road crossings where cyclists have to give way, the solutions at some points are considerably less attractive, especially for more confident cyclists who are more confident about riding in traffic.

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

Pedals would also like to question some of the suggested key indicators in the Monitoring Section (6.105) on pages 38 -9, e.g.

1. Length of new cycle routes developed and number of regular journeys made by bicycle

Our experience suggests that cycle routes, and indeed cycle facilities in general, vary greatly in quality and we therefore feel that there should be more emphasis to making ordinary roads and streets safer to cycle on, with more cycle-friendly layouts, lower speed limits and better enforcement. As this statement stands it would appear to encourage the provision of cycle routes per se, regardless of quality. On the other hand "the number of regular journeys by bicycle" is a much more appropriate indicator, expressed either as absolute numbers or as a percentage of total journeys. We would like to see both increase greatly.

2. Number of households without a car.

This seems a rather ambiguous indicator. Evidence of increase in numbers of households with a car could be interpreted positively by those who see levels of car ownership and use as an indicator is inappropriate in a strategic document committed to achieving more sustainable transport policies. On the other hand, it could be welcomed as a measure of the extent to which richer as well as poorer households are able to depend less on cars because of the improved quality of alternatives. There is therefore a need to clarify the sense in which it is being used.

3. Amount spend on highway maintenance and improvements

We welcome this proposed indicator in so far as it will help to ensure reversal of the all too common deterioration of road surfaces in recent years from which cyclists have particularly suffered in many areas. However, maintenance is important on cycle paths as well as on highways and this has often been even more neglected. If this indicator is included it needs to be made clear that it includes amounts spent on cycle paths, footways and shared paths. We also feel that including "improvements" in this indicator could mean including expenditure on items of very dubious benefit to cyclists if not distinctly disadvantageous as when "improvements" result in features like narrow traffic lanes and new roundabouts that worsen conditions for cyclists on ordinary roads and streets.

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

4. The number of Green Transport Plans implemented

Not all Green Transport Plans give full attention to the promotion of cycling as well as walking and public transport so this rather crude indicator may also conceal some missed opportunities to encourage cycling. Furthermore it seems to imply that GTPs are once and for all documents that have a finite life when, we would argue, that implementation needs to be a continuing process, with regular reviews of the potential to increase further use of green modes by employees and including the potential for off-site as well as on-site measures which could directly and indirectly assist in reducing car dependence at particular worksites. As part of GTP work there should be special efforts, especially by large employers, to introduce and sustain Bicycle User Groups, to give detailed feedback about their experiences with cycling measures introduced and to make detailed suggestions for further improvements. Much can be learned in this respect from the experience of the Nottingham Cycle-friendly Employers' Project, introduced under the Government Cycle Challenge project, as well as from wider lessons of GTP experience, particularly by Nottingham City Council. The introduction of new transport measures such as workplace parking charges, as proposed in Nottingham, will give further opportunities to develop GTP measures and these should be maximised.

5. The modal split of different persons for different types of journey, in particular journeys to school and work.

Pedals regards it as helpful to set targets for particular types of journey but these should also include other types of trips such as leisure trips and shopping trips.

6. Number of park and ride spaces and their usage.

This is also an ambiguous indicator. An increased number of park and ride spaces may be a positive measure of progress if it means a reduced number of cars parked in or near city centres and less traffic on city centres streets and main radial routes but certainly not be a positive measure if it means reduced use of public transport for whole journeys and the replacement of some such trips by journeys covered in part by private car. Any further park and ride schemes must be carefully designed to avoid resulting in any overall increase in car mileage and reduced overall public transport use. With careful planning of detailed measures and well-organised publicity there is some potential at park and ride sites, where they can be justified, of promoting bike and ride, with secure cycle parking and good cycle access, as demonstrated in places like York, Oxford and Cambridge. This can help to reduce the number of car parking spaces as park and ride sites. In general we

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

consider that bike and ride provision, with its much smaller space requirements than park and ride, should be much more vigorously promoted, especially for relatively short journeys. Indeed this view is now shared in the latest draft revision of DETR Planning Policy Guidance Note 13, in its section on interchanges and access to them. The social safety of users as well as convenience and traffic safety should be very important considerations in the detailed design of such provision, as well as thought out publicity and promotion.

7. Use of bus and passenger train services

We support this indicator but suggest that it is accompanied by an indicator to measure increase in combinations of bike and bus and train use, helping to achieve more seamless integration in the spirit of the Integrated Transport White Paper and also of best practice both elsewhere in the UK and also in other European countries.

8. Proportion of freight carried by rail, as opposed to other transport modes

An increasing emphasis on local economic development and local self-sufficiency, in line with sustainable development principles, would help to reduce the amount of freight movements, especially long-distance ones. However, in so far as there is still a need for increased freight movements an increase in the proportion carried by rail is most important. This is particularly important for cyclists since any substantial success in increasing proportions of freight by rail could help to reduce the numbers of HGVs on our roads; vehicles which cyclists often find particularly intimidating, especially on narrow roads. Achieving much higher volumes of freight movement by rail would be particularly beneficial in the East Midlands and, in particular, in the area around East Midlands Airport, in view of the very ambitious nature of the plans to increase the importance of the airport as a freight centre, implying a great increase in HGV movements to and from the airport, in addition to increases in HGVs to serve growth in passenger numbers. Any projects to help move more freight by rail, such as the Central Railways Project (Liverpool to Little) are therefore, in principle, greatly to be welcomed and encouraged.

9. Numbers of passengers and freight transported at EMA

Firstly, indicators of freight transported at EMA should surely be in terms of tonnage or freight movements rather than numbers so this proposed indicator needs rewording. More fundamentally there is a vital need, in a document purporting to assist the implementation of more sustainable transport policies, to question whether any increase in air passenger number or air freight movements is really sustainable.

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

The evidence suggests (Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution Transport and the Environment Report, 1994 and Friends of the Earth, "Plane Crazy" 1999) that air transport may be the most unsustainable form of transport mode, in view of the damage of aircraft emissions to the atmosphere. Without major changes in technology of aircraft engines and fuels, there may well soon be a need to abandon, in the air as well as with road transport, the "predict and provide" approach that still apparently prevails.

Demand for air travel must be subject to demand management just as much as the Government's integrated Transport White Paper recognised in 1998 that demand for unlimited road travel now has to be managed. Recognising the importance of demand management measures on congested roads like the A453, as implied in the current Multi-Modal Study, will be of very limited value without managing demand for air travel at EMA and the traffic generated by the airport and developments in its vicinity.

In any case there should be much more substantial efforts, nationally and regionally, to promote use of much more environmentally benign high-speed rail for travel to cities such as Brussels and Paris on the European mainland and including introduction of the long -delayed direct international trains to and from regions north of London.

As it is, Pedals, like other environmental groups, very much fears the implications for the environment in general and traffic in particular, of the enormous growth in passengers, freight and wider related development in the vicinity of East Midlands Airport, resulting from any apparent possible excessive emphasis of maximising economic opportunities over other very important goals.

At the very least any development at the airport should be strictly confined to that necessary to meet operational needs, without any further development of business parks etc. with their built in very high level of car dependency, completely inconsistent with current Government planning policies on land use planning and transport and the importance of encouraging travel by environmentally-friendly modes. There would be particularly serious implications around the M1 Junction 24 area, already often badly congested, and for its ability to function effectively as a traffic interchange. This would also result in even worse disruption to local communities in terms of noise, intrusion, severance and the general domination of the street environment by traffic. Cyclists and pedestrians would suffer most from this aggravated intimidation.

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

Any major expansion of development around the airport would have a number of other very serious implications including the loss of much attractive countryside, including relatively quiet country lanes that are now fairly peasant to cycle on. This disruption would be in addition to the extra likely direct effects of aircraft movements on local community in terms of noise, possible accident risks etc, especially for those in the vicinity of the main runway take off and landing areas and their approaches including the Castle Donington race track area which can attract major crowds.

The extra dangers to the public may also be worsened by the increased risk of major aircraft collisions in the new very crowded skies of Northwestern Europe and these risks should also be thoroughly investigated before any further decisions are made on developments at the EMA. They should also await decisions on other aspects of national and international air transport policy including the proposals for a fifth terminal at London Heathrow Airport and possible international pressure to tackle the present anomalies in the price of aviation fuel, to reflect more accurately the true global environmental cost of their use.

In considering the probable extremely serious traffic and environmental effects of any growth in EMA operations and associated developments it should also be borne in mind that the airport already has a particularly high share of private car traffic in the total ground traffic it attracts, especially in comparison with airports like Heathrow, Gatwick, Birmingham and Manchester. Even if the current efforts by the Airport Surface Transport Access Forum to increase this have some success in terms of increasing the share by other modes this success is very likely to be completely swamped by the overall substantial increase of private vehicle freight and passenger movements. Demand management measures are, even now, essential, in respect of movements by passengers, employees and freight, and will be all the more vital in the case of any further development, especially when considered also in combination with the likely traffic impact of major new housing developments in many areas.

Conclusion

At the Seminar in Derby in January on the RTS it was pointed out that the East Midlands has an above average record in the introduction of various types of innovative green transport initiatives. In the finalisation of the RTS, and its implementation, every opportunity should be taken to build on this record and develop it further with a comprehensive commitment to more sustainable modes of travel. Examples of good practice, including in the case of cycling, the Nottingham Cycle-friendly Employers Project, the Leicester Bike Park, and the free carriage of bikes

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

on the Robin Hood Line, should be constantly updated and more widely publicised, using the internet as well as printed documents and conferences/seminars, etc.

Cycling has a key role, we feel, in many of these and, in any new transport policies and measures every effort should be made to "think bike" comprehensively so that the opportunities to promote cycling are further exploited rather than overlooked as often in the past.

This very much applies to a number of current transport initiatives big and small, if designed in from the start and well thought out and implemented. Such opportunities including the Multi Modal Study for the A453 (enhancing the safety of cyclists for local trips, especially in the Clifton area and other affected communities) and, in connection with the East Midlands Parkway proposals, promoting seamless and secure bike and ride potential. The opportunities also include the detailed arrangements in Nottingham City for the introduction of workplace parking charges, e.g. the details of the requisite revised car park layouts, including the car park barriers, where careful attention to cyclists' needs has often been overlooked.

Hugh McClintock (Chairman, Pedals)

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

COMMENTS FROM GRAHAM LANSDELL, CTC RIGHT TO RIDE, NOTTINGHAM

I like the idea of the "whole day travel diary" rather than single journey analysis. However, there is a risk that some potential modal options might be overlooked. Just because I attended the meeting today by pedal cycle need not preclude me from using buses/trains for my next trip today, if these modes will carry my cycle. At present, most but not all trains will take bikes, but in the MMS analysis, the possibility of bikes on buses, (as happens a lot in mainland Europe but only very rarely in the UK), should not be overlooked, just because it has not been common so far here. And don't forget that already all hackney carriages in Nottingham carry pedal cycles (whether folded or not).

Will the study include the changes in modal demand which are capable of being achieved following a change in attitudes and behaviour if/when the British are persuaded to view travel more like their continental cousins? Here, public transport is often viewed as of lesser status than private car, this attitude does not occur in Switzerland and Germany for example. We must not risk producing a typically British outcome from the study by overlooking the fact that British attitudes are not fixed, they are capable of change. However, such change will only come about by a concerted effort on all sides: this effort could constitute part of the solution to the problems which the MMS is addressing.

The outcome of the NATA appraisal will be heavily influenced by the weighting which it gives to a variety of conflicting issues, and the fact that some relevant issues might be overlooked in an appraisal system because they cannot be quantified, or because such quantifying is deemed to difficult. For example, the weighting given to the adverse effects of traffic noise on local residents will influence whether or not a particular solution is on balance the best or least worst option. Who is going to decide how such essentially subjective matters are quantified? The answer to this defines who it is that has overall influence on the study's outcome.

What use will be made of examples of international best practice? Continental European countries have often managed their transport needs better than we in the UK. Can this study compare the issues relevant to the A453 with a similar corridor elsewhere? I know that local circumstances will not be identical, but if we fail to look abroad, we may waste resources in effect by trying to reinvent the wheel.

If the best way forward includes any road -building/enlarging, (for example to act as a Kegworth bypass, a need expressed today), it is

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

essential that part of the cost of such road -building includes the cost of taking out of use such existing road capacity as is currently occupied by the traffic which will be diverted onto the new/enlarged road. Otherwise, the liberated capacity within the settlement which has been bypassed will just be appropriated by other vehicles making other journeys.

CTC Right to Ride, Nottingham Graham Lansdell

APPENDIX B – POST SEMINAR COMMENTS CONTINUED

COMMENTS FROM WILF CAREY, TRANSPORT 2000, DERBYSHIRE

A thought immediately following the wider reference group workshops on Friday.

It was surprising that none of the groups came up with the influence of Parking Policy in the City of Nottingham - available, cost of public spaces, work place parking levy.

A point of clarification on an item I raised within our workshop group. Without knowing the figures, I was trying to raise the issue of the relative contributions to the problems in Clifton from

- 1 Traffic passing through
- 2 Traffic with origins or destination in Clifton itself.

Potential solutions could be aimed at mitigating either or both.

Wilf Carey