



**Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions**

**MULTI-MODAL STUDY  
A453 NOTTINGHAM TO M1 JUNCTION 24**

**WORKING PAPER NO 20  
Consultation Strategy Seminar with Environmental Groups**

**Notes**

**August 2001**

**Revision Record**

<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Originator</b>	<b>Checked</b>	<b>Approved</b>
Issue	10/08/01	J H Barrett	P Webster	P Webster

**Prepared for:**  
Government Office for the East Midlands  
The Belgrave Centre  
Stanley Place  
Talbot Street  
Nottingham  
NG1 5GG

**Prepared by:**  
Pell Frischmann  
Clarendon Chambers  
32 Clarendon Street  
Nottingham  
NG1 5LN

## **1. Introduction**

The seminar of 28 June 2001 was organised by Bettina Lange (East Midlands Transport Activists Roundtable) and GOEM. It was the second of two sessions, the first, starting in the morning, was on the M1 MMS. These are notes for the second session relating to the A453 Multi-Modal Study (MMS).

The chairman was Hugh McLintock of 'Pedals'. The client officers attending were: W Wiseman, J Perkins of GOEM. The consultants team was represented by L Goddard, P Webster, J Barrett of Pell Frischmann and J Gibson of Gillespies. The seminar was introduced by Bettina Lange.

Approximately 20 members and guests of EMTAR attended and all participated in the meeting – attendance is summarised in Appendix A.

Will Wiseman, of GOEM, gave a brief non technical review of the multi modal study process and progress to date. Peter Webster then gave a more detailed account of the considerations and the technical process leading up to the current position. Strategy concepts were developed with the assistance of the last Wider Reference Group consultation in December 2000. Since then the Study has been building up the transport model and working on the identification of the first Options to be tested, which will in turn lead to the evolution of a preferred solution. Peter also gave an outline of ideas under consideration for inclusion in a freight strategy and the study approach to environmental considerations as these were understood to be of particular interest.

The remaining hour and a half was a question, answer, and discussion session based on a list of issues and questions prepared in advance by EMTAR:

## **2. Main Points Raised in Discussion**

### **2.1 Kegworth Bypass**

Is the scheme for an east-west bypass of Kegworth included?

- Appraisal of this scheme between the A6 and M1 J23a is included in the 'brief' for the M1 Study. For the A453 Study, if tests show it to have merit it will be taken forward to the September WRG consultation for potential inclusion in Options.

### **2.2 Issue raised by representative of the local environmental group Wings: Transport implications of growth of East Midlands Airport.**

Given the contract outlined below:

The new owners of EMA are Manchester Airport Plc  
4 times expansion of freight and passengers are planned;  
A planning application for extra 190m on runway has been submitted, which would make the runway 3<sup>rd</sup> longest in UK;  
There are no night flight restrictions, hence Manchester Airports' interest in EMA;  
It is highly attractive to freight operators.

*In addition, recent study (North West Leicestershire DC) found that air quality at and around EMA was the worst in the county.*

How can the A453 MMS ensure the protection of environment quality at EMA?

- The strategy for National Air Growth is being planned at a national level. The responsibility for the Study is to look at possible provision of surface links to EMA. It is not part of the brief to comment on the scale of air traffic growth in a national context.
- The Study can consider alternative levels of growth at EMA. The possible testing of alternatives will be put to the PMG for consideration and if accepted will form part of the planned work for the Study.
- Other studies indicate that a passenger threshold of 10m (i.e. x 4 growth) would make EMA viable for fixed link rail.
- There are likely to be Regional Consultations on the national plans for growth of air travel in the UK. The MMS recommendations should link to that consultation.

There is a way to influence that debate within the A453 MMS by switching the argument around – i.e. can the road network accommodate the planned EMA growth? It is expected that the Study together with the M1 Study will give indications on this question.

### **2.3 Is access to East Midlands Airport from Derby being considered?**

- It is not the main focus of the brief for the Study but it will be recognised in the development of strategies, and the structure of the transport model would enable preliminary assessment.

### **2.4 Parkway Station**

There is concern about the role and traffic effects of the proposed Parkway Station. It has been stated that it would only pick up 5-10% passengers to EMA.

- Parkway Station is a committed scheme independent of the A453 Study. National Express and Midland Mainline applied for planning permission and were successful. The Study has now to adopt it as part of the baseline position (the do-minimum situation) against which Options are assessed.

### **2.5 Are the Police involved in safety aspects of the Study?**

Consultation lists revealed much concern about safety on the A453.

- The police are represented on the Wider Reference Group for the study.
- (This was answered in the session on the M1 study). The police are involved through the Study examination of accident records. The A453 accident rate is not exceptionally high, but is higher than the national average for the type of road.
- Safety is one of the five main evaluation criteria identified by the Government for the MMS assessment process.

**2.6 How will the Study deal with the impact on people and communities living alongside and near to the A453?**

There is concern about land-take, assuming that a highway scheme will form part of the ultimate recommendations.

There is an issue of how study will deal with people on the A453, i.e. Clifton Residents, the Kegworth Area.

Forward planning is essential. A criticism of the MMS approach is that it is difficult to imagine a highway option not being the output.

- The Study brief requires consideration of ‘red route’. The Study is dealing with it equally with all other options.
- The extent of potential land-take is not yet known, as it is not yet known whether the study will actually recommend it.
- The last Government put the red route scheme on hold pending the results of the MMS.
- The evaluation process will look at the effects of the red route along with a number of other alternatives.
- Government policy is to look at integrated approach to transport. If for example the red route were proposed, the MMS would have to demonstrate that a new road is the preferred option.
- The A453 MMS is not a highway feasibility study, it is a multi-modal transportation study considering the contribution which can be made by all modes of transport and transport policy to solving problems.
- The potential contribution of alternative transport modes will be evaluated and the effects they would have on the A453 corridor will be analysed. For example, the Nottingham Express Transit (NET) has possibilities for extension:

Net Line 1	-	Committed
NET Line 2-4	-	Clifton – 2 options
	-	Beeston – 2 options
	-	Ruddington – 2 options

**2.7 When A453 is closed for maintenance traffic rat runs through neighbouring villages. What are the plans, if any, for upgrading the A52 as the primary M1 route into Nottingham?**

- There are no current plans to designate the A52 as the primary route from M1 into Nottingham but this can be considered.

- One possible traffic restriction is to close off the A453 Junction 24 to M1 access. This suggestion is noted.

**2.8 Certain groups believe that the MMS process draws environmental groups into a highway justification scheme**

- The objective is to encourage all interested parties to contribute to the identification of a preferred solution including highways and/or other modes.

**2.9 Has the East Midlands Development Association (EMDA) expressed their views about the MMS?**

- EMDA are represented on the Project Management Group for the Study and are understood to endorse the MMS process in general terms.
- EMDA want the MMS to inform their view.

**2.10 How will the proposed Parkway Station affect A453 traffic?**

- The effect that the scheme will have on local traffic has already been assessed in a Traffic Impact Assessment by the Applicant as part of the Planning Application and Approval process. The Multi Modal Study will form an independent view of the traffic effects, although in practice they will depend on the popularity of the station and the rail and any other services using it. It forms part of the baseline for study proposals.
- The EMDA Junction 24 Steering Group states that there should be no business park at the airport, but they will look at options in the DTZ report. This report raises the possibility of a large number of business parks in a wider radius several miles around the airport.

**2.11 Does the Study recognise the York hierarchy of road use?**

The FoE representative raised issues relating to the York hierarchy and suggested that the only two sustainable forms of transport are walking and cycling and quoted the York model hierarchy:

- 1 Pedestrian
- 2 Disabled
- 3 Cyclists
- 4 Public Transport
- 5 Commercial
- 6 Shoppers
- 7 Coach
- 8 Car borne

As a point of reference the York Hierarchy of Transport Users has been checked with its originators. It has been subject to slight amendment since first created and is now as follows:

- 1 Pedestrian
- 2 People with mobility difficulties
- 3 Cyclists
- 4 Public Transport including rail, bus, coach, and waterborne transport
- 5 Powered two wheelers
- 6 Commercial and business users including deliveries and HGVs
- 7 Car borne shoppers
- 8 Car borne commuters

**Is there priority for pedestrians in the A453 MMS?**

- Nottingham City Council use the York approach in their LTP
- The MMS team will look into the contribution which such a concept could make.
- The Study intends to incorporate full consideration of pedestrian/cyclists into DETR and the HA's appraisal process. It will attempt to look beyond just the issue of accessibility.

Slower speed = increased capacity = increased safety. Cannot this simple speed restriction on the A453 solve all the problems?

- The MMS solution will consider variable speed limits along the A453, but more extensive and radical speed limits do not appear to be currently acceptable to the general public.

**2.12 Does the Study address freight issues properly and are the environmental groups views fully understood?**

- The MMS team are giving specific consideration to the issue of freight and we hope that we understand the environmental groups views as well as those of the business community.
- There is limited opportunity in the relatively local area of the A453 Study to accommodate a view on what are essentially national policy issues and commercial considerations, although we should not miss an appropriate environmental issues for consideration.

Local sourcing should be opportunistic and differentiated not rigidly controlled.

- WW asked for any ideas to contribute to a strategy to reduce the adverse effects of freight movement. BL suggested we consider a goods mileage tax or an air mileage tax.

**2.13 Is quality of life considered in the Study?**

Neighbourhood and environmental issues appear to be not considered together. Communities around EMA suffer noise and air pollution from different sources with cumulative effect.

- Environmental impact is always assessed in terms of change from ambient levels and levels which would prevail if nothing were done.

**Is there a future for water-borne freight?**

- It is on the menu for consideration. Although we cannot quote figures, a significant tonnage for longer distance movements is carried by coastal shipping. It is difficult to see a major role for inland waterways, due to the limited corridors available and the slow journey times in the context of “just in time” delivery policies. Potential will be assessed.