



Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions

MULTI-MODAL STUDY

A453 NOTTINGHAM TO M1 JUNCTION 24

WORKING PAPER NO 24

Wider Reference Group Seminar 26th September 2001

October 2001

Revision Record

Revision	Date	Originator	Checked	Approved
Issue	10/10/01	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

1.1 A continuous programme of consultation has been adopted for the A453 Corridor Multi Modal Study as part of the policy of encouraging wider participation in the development of a future transport strategy. A number of representative groups have been providing their view periodically during the course of the Study. The Steering and Project Management Groups assist primarily in a managerial capacity. The Wider Reference Group represents a wide range of interests in the Study Area, from campaign groups to transport operators and has been formed to provide a forum for the dissemination of study information and to obtain wide-ranging views on transport related issues.

The Wider Reference Group has previously met at the following key stages:

- Study Inception - Seminar on 11th February 2000
- Strategy Development - Seminar on 6th December 2000

1.2 The next key stage to involve the Group was to obtain input to the development of transport options at the earliest opportunity. Accordingly, a Seminar was held on 26th September 2001 at Trent Bridge Cricket Centre, Nottingham. This report provides a summary of the event and the valuable feedback received by the study team.

1.3 The objectives of the Seminar were:

- To update the WRG on Study Progress
- To update WRG on Strategy Issues
- To review Option Development to date
- To present Emerging Results from Initial Tests of transport strategies
- To obtain WRG input to Option Development

1.4 The Seminar programme consisted of three sessions:

- a presentation by the Study Consultants in the morning,
- workshops involving all the participants in the afternoon,
- and finally, a discussion of the issues emerging from workshops.

Session 1: Presentation

A Briefing Note was circulated prior to the Seminar and is included as Appendix 1.

The presentation was in the form of a collection of slide projections with brief commentaries by the Study team.

Further comments on the key elements of the presentations may be found in section 3.2 of this report.

Session 2: Workshops

The Wider Reference Group members were asked to divide into four discussion groups identified by colour. Membership of each group was pre-selected from the list of WRG members who had indicated attendance to ensure that a range of interests was represented in each group. Each group had a member of the Study team to assist with information and help complete the task.

The task was the same for each group: to review the specification of the Initial Strategies and Options and the emerging results from the first tests and to contribute pointers to the way forward in development of the Preferred Option. Comments were recorded in writing at the time and have been set out in this report.

Diagrammatic Option plans with lists of component schemes were handed out for reference. These plans and scheme lists were also on display stands throughout the Seminar.

Session 3: Plenary Discussion

A plenary session provided the opportunity for WRG members to discuss key issues arising from their Workshop groups. This proved to be a lively session, and the main points raised are recorded in Section 3 below.

2. Review of Presentation

2.1 Summary of Study information presented

The sequence of the main activities of the Study was reviewed:

- The study area to be covered.
- Surveys of road traffic, rail and bus passengers, household, people's preferences, planning data for future development.
- The development of four strategies to address the transport problems of the corridor.

- The identification of possible schemes to contribute to the strategies
- The identification and development of initial Options consisting of packages of schemes.
- Appraisal methods to determine the environmental impact of schemes and packages.
- Initial testing of the Options and the emerging results showing how they perform.

A full set of the presentation slides may be found in Appendix 2.

2.2 Initial Options and Emerging Results

The key section of the presentations sought to explain the specification of a set of Initial Options and Emerging Results from first tests using the transportation models.

Peter Webster explained that packages of schemes had been identified to reflect the main thrust of each of the Strategies I to IV. The objective was to define relatively extreme packages to assess what contribution each could make to meeting study objectives and providing a solution to transport problems in the corridor, rather than to see these initial option packages as practical alternatives at this stage.

The initial options presented comprised:

Strategy I	:	Maximum Utilisation	
		- 1 Test	
Strategy II	:	Maximum public transport and demand management	
		- 1 Test	
Strategy III	:	Moderate public transport and some demand management	
		- 1 Test	
Strategy IV	:	Maximum highway	
		- 2 Tests	
			- Yellow route base
			- Red route base

Two highway strategies were included because the former 'Red' route is identified for assessment in the study brief, and the former 'Yellow' route provides another mechanism to reduce traffic impact in Clifton and a basis for comparison with the effect of other strategies.

Emerging results of the Initial Tests were presented in a simplified form at the global (Study Area), corridor, and A453 route levels to facilitate discussion.

3 Feedback from the Wider Reference Group

3.1 Introductory Comments

As a general comment members felt that there was a lot of complex information given to them on the day, and they did not have enough time to absorb it and then comment properly. The Study team explained that they were faced with a particular dilemma: wishing to involve the Group as fully as possible, but having to guard against circulating information that could be misinterpreted as proposals, some of which could be controversial and risk creating blight or unnecessary concern. It is worth recording at this point that it is recognised that the Group has a difficult task because of these unfortunate constraints. However, their contribution has been extremely valuable in providing further guidance.

The comments made in the Group Workshops were wide ranging. Some were new and all have been taken up as an addition to the knowledge base gathered for the Study. The study team's intention is to use the detailed feedback notes as a reference during the development, appraisal, and reporting of the Study Options.

Because of the diversity of the Workshop and Plenary comments, it is not possible to summarise them without loss of some of the value in the details. However, to indicate the general character of the feedback the main points are condensed into the bullet points below

3.2 On The Principles

- It was acknowledged that the problems were complex and would not be solved by single interventions.
- The 'hearts and minds' measures - taxation, levies, commuter plans etc. were seen to be particularly complex and sensitive, but should be considered as elements of possible solutions.
- There was support for taking the longer view and planning for the longer term.
- There was concern about the long lead time for major infrastructure projects.
- Options should include phasing of implementation to provide some early benefits without compromising later schemes.
- It was hoped that the broader inclusive philosophy of Multi Modal Studies would be reflected in corresponding attitudes in Statutory Procedures and Approvals.

3.3 On Emerging Solutions:

- The secondary or consequential changes in traffic should properly assessed.
- The link between land use planning and the highway and NET schemes is important and requires constructive evaluation, especially in Rushcliffe.

- There was consensus that a mixed option including all modes of transport was likely to be necessary to solve the range of problems in the study area.
- There was support across all groups for significant improvements in public transport including infrastructure, integration, information, service quality, reliability, and fare cost.
- There were mixed views about highway solutions, but perhaps more support than opposition for some further road building, as part of a mixed option, and particularly to reduce delays to public transport.
- There was a range of views on a preferred option. If there was any discernible consensus it was for a mixed strategy based on the moderate public transport approach, but with some highway improvement which would include measures for the benefit of buses. Others recommended building up from the Maximum Utilisation Strategy towards a similar objective.

3.4 On more specific issues:

- A solution to safety problems on A453 should be prioritised and if necessary proceed independently of consideration and implementation of the rest.
- Development of the East Midlands Airport and the surrounding area was still a major concern.
- There was no apparent preference between the on-line Red Route and the eastern bypass Yellow Route for the A453 at Clifton, together with a feeling that neither were very satisfactory. If a choice had to be made it would require further more detailed study following this one, reflecting the widespread interest in the particular issue.
- There was a general support for rail and bus schemes, but concern about the ability to co-ordinate planning and deliver schemes.
- There was a wide support for integrated ticketing.
- There was a general support for speed limits with enhanced enforcement, and other traffic calming measures.
- There were many suggestions for individual features or aspects of schemes to be taken into account, and several new schemes were suggested. All were noted and placed on record for reference for the future during the Study.

3.5 The Plenary Debate

A lively debate took place covering the following main subject areas:

- Workplace Parking Levy (and other measures).
There seemed to be greater enthusiasm for some form of traffic demand management than for this particular measure, but views varied.

There was concern that restrictions should not be introduced before public transport or highways were improved.

- Maximum Public Transport Strategy.

This was generally seen as too expensive and possibly uneconomic as a practical proposition (it was meant to show the maximum potential of such a Strategy). More integration should be sought. Journey times by public transport would have to be comparable with those by car, although the Manchester Metro was quoted as an example that has succeeded. This raised the question of how many people would transfer and whether public transport could react quickly enough to an expanding market.

- Green Travel Plans.

It was felt that these should be more widely implemented and accompanied by education and information to foster a better understanding of current and future travel. There was concern that the initial reaction by some employers could be no more than lip service, and people would find ways of avoiding the obligations of Green Travel Plans. It was recognised that some employers operated effective GTP's.

Development planning should also take more account of the implications for transport.

- Homeworking and Flexible working hours

There appeared to be a surprising amount of scope for this with one speaker suggesting that up to 40% of staff could potentially work some of the time from home, whilst up to 20% could voluntarily take it up as part of a Green travel Plan. Flexible hours were seen as important.

- Safety on the existing A453 was a matter for concern, with a general view that solutions to the problems must be incorporated, and possibly proceed independently of the more complex parts of the Study recommendations.
- The strategic issues were discussed. It was important to be consistent with the concurrent Study of the M1 North – South corridor MMS.
- On the strategic view of public transport it was felt that the deregulation of bus and rail was not entirely helpful to co-ordinated transport planning.



APPENDIX 1

WRG BRIEFING NOTE

INTRODUCTION

In January 2001 Members were given a briefing on the stage then reached in the multi-modal studies affecting the Greater Nottingham area. At that time the A453 Study was at Strategy Development Stage, having completed an extensive travel survey programme and sought initial views on the issues in the corridor from a wide range of consultees. This current briefing is intended to update Members of the Wider Reference Group on the present position of the study prior to further consultation with the general public later in the year.

As a reminder, all the studies in the Greater Nottingham area are directed by the same Steering Group with each study managed by a Project Management Group. Both these groups consist of representatives from a wide cross section of the regional community who, together with input from the Wider Reference Group of almost 100 local organisations, provide a new and inclusive process for real local input to the management of multi-modal studies.

KEY ISSUES

The following list will serve as a reminder of key issues arising from consultation:

- Traffic implications of growth and development around East Midlands Airport
- Traffic congestion at Junction 24 and at junctions along the A453
- Diversion of traffic through villages at times of congestion/incident
- Environmental impact of traffic especially through Clifton
- Poor service and high cost of public transport
- Widespread support for a major road scheme to improve the A453
- Strongly held views, both for and against particular routes for a Clifton Bypass.
- Desire for an integrated multi-modal solution
- Strong support for improved public transport, especially NET through Clifton.
- Environmental factors in evaluation of Options
- Walk and cycle movements should be facilitated
- Improved accessibility to Nottingham to aid economic development.

SURVEYS

The extensive portfolio of travel surveys undertaken and reported previously included:

- Home travel surveys (3,250 households approached)
- Roadside interview (18,000 drivers interviewed)
- Bus passenger interview (20,000 passengers approached)
- Rail passenger interview (adopted from the M1 study)
- Coach passenger interview (adopted from the M1 study)
- Pedestrian and cyclist interviews (1,600 interviews)
- Journey time measurements by car and bus (200 trips)

In addition the study team has now carried out a Stated Preference Survey of some 800 residents in the corridor to assess traveller's criteria for future choice of travel. The response was excellent with a 56.6% return giving over 5,000 observations with which to calibrate the computer model.

We have also met with and interviewed representatives of the local freight industry to elicit their views on the issues and remedies that they would like to see implemented.

KEY SURVEY FINDINGS

The following are a reminder of the results from the surveys presented previously plus additional results obtained from further analysis of the surveys:

- Residents in the A453 corridor make 66% of journeys by car, 11% by public transport, 18% on foot, 4% by cycle and 1% other modes.
- The journey purpose of residents in the A453 corridor, 32% shopping, 24% work, 16% leisure, 8% business, 7% education and 13% other.
- 47% of journeys made by the A453 corridor residents are between 300 yards and 3 miles in length.
- Traffic on the A453 at Thrumpton includes 27% commercial vehicles of which over half are goods vehicles larger than a 'Transit' van
- Traffic on the A453 at Thrumpton includes 27% destined beyond Nottingham with over half of these having destinations even further east.
- 45% of traffic on the A453 travelling towards Nottingham has origins beyond Derbyshire/North Leicestershire.
- Over 90% of journeys to the East Midlands Airport made by both travellers and employees are by car.

ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES

Following consultation at the beginning of this year the Project Management Group identified four alternative transport strategies for further development and testing using the transport model. These strategies are:

Strategy I - Make best use of the existing road and rail networks and all the other transport infrastructure in the study area.

Strategy II - Maximise the use of public transport and walk/cycle modes through major investment and a high degree of innovative demand management

Strategy III - Encourage mode choice in the study corridor through moderate investment in public transport together with some demand management.

Strategy IV - Improve highway capacity including a major highway scheme.

These four strategies represent the practical range of options for influencing movement in the study area and also demonstrate the different levels of investment that would be required to implement the alternative strategies. They will be used to focus schemes or groups of schemes into a limited number of Options to be evaluated under the five criteria of environment, safety, economy, accessibility and integration identified by government and recognising possible changes to land use within the study corridor.

It is important to recognise that the study is still very much in the investigative stage and has not yet reached any conclusions. The results presented at this briefing are the emerging results from the tests of these four alternative strategies and should not be construed as final outcomes. It is highly unlikely that when the full set of results of the tests from these four strategies are analysed that any one of them will be seen as a solution in its own right. The final recommended strategy (or strategies) is more likely to be a mixture of parts from one or all of the current strategies, one which provides the best balance between value and impact.

OPTION DEVELOPMENT

In order to implement any strategy, indicative schemes or packages of schemes need to be identified which support that particular strategy. This work of identifying and collecting together schemes to meet a common objective is known in the study as Option Development.

Since January, a significant amount of work has been done on Option Development identifying the ideas and schemes put forward during consultation together with those developed by the study team. Some 136 separate schemes have been identified, including 25 heavy rail, 14 light rail, 20 bus, 22 highway, 24 traffic management/safety, 14 pedestrian and cycle schemes plus various measures for general freight and travel management.

Indicative schemes have been identified on plans and engineered to a point where sensible decisions can be taken about whether to take the scheme forward for more detailed investigation. Three levels of evaluation have been used to reduce the number of potential schemes to a manageable quantity. Level 1 is a desk study, level 2 uses the multi-modal Appraisal Summary Table and level 3 involves a degree of preliminary design.

Many of the schemes are reflections of policies in the Local Transport Plans from the authorities influencing the study area. The committed schemes in these policies have been brought together to form a Do Minimum scenario against which any possible Option can be tested.

For initial testing of the impact of the four selected strategies on travel movements in the study corridor, representative schemes have been collected into a first set of Option Packages to represent those strategies. General descriptions of the schemes in these packages are:

Strategy	Cost £million	Brief Package Description
I - Make best use of the existing road and rail networks and all the other transport infrastructure in the study area	£60m to £70m	Small amount of new works including improvement of junctions on the single carriageway A453 with new speed restrictions. At grade improvements at M1 Junction 24, alterations to the key rail bottleneck at Trent Junction, bus priority and significant improvements to public transport services. Signed cycle routes and better lighting and CCTV on pedestrian routes.
II - Maximise the use of public transport and walk/cycle modes through major investment and a high degree of innovative demand management	£800m to £850m	New heavy rail lines and services with major improvement to the key rail bottleneck at Trent Junction. New sub-urban rail stations and major redevelopment of Nottingham station. NET extensions servicing Beeston/Trowell, Edwalton, Gamston, and Clifton/East Midlands Airport. Bus priorities on existing routes with integrated bus services. Separate network of cycleways and better lighting and CCTV on pedestrian routes. Workplace parking levy in Nottingham and increase in parking charges.
III - Encourage mode choice in the study corridor through moderate investment in public transport together with some demand management	£230m to £260m	Major improvement to the key rail bottleneck at Trent Junction and upgrade of local stations. New station at Ilkeston and enhancement of Nottingham station. NET extensions to Clifton and Beeston. Bus priority and improvement to services. Improvements to junctions on A453 with new speed restrictions, extended UTC system. Separate network of cycleways and better lighting and CCTV on pedestrian routes.
IV- Improve highway capacity including a major highway scheme.	£80m to £90m	Major improvements to Junction 24 on the M1 with dualling of A453 from M1 to Clifton plus a major improvement scheme through or bypassing Clifton.

PLANNING DATA FOR FORECASTING

The purpose of implementing new strategies in the study area is to influence travel movements in a positive way, thereby managing the direction in which the changes occur. In addition it is also necessary to take into account and, where possible, influence the general growth and changes in travel movements in the study area through natural and planned changes in land use that affect population, employment, education and leisure use.

Local authorities, through their structure plans and local plans can provide relatively firm data for a 5 year horizon, and are working on the next 5 year plan at any time. Thus the step to a 2011 forecast is reasonable in terms of the assumptions to be made. However, the following ten year horizon to 2021 provides a challenge in forecasting and the study team has been working closely with local authorities to obtain best estimates based upon national trends and local planning authority advice.

EMERGING RESULTS

The study team is now beginning to obtain results from the first Option package tests carried out using the transportation model. Tests are being carried out for the years 2011 and 2021 and are to be compared to the Do Minimum situation. It is also useful to compare results with the current situation which observers can relate to. Comparative results of the impact of each of the four strategies on the network in the study area will be presented in outline at the briefing.

Interpretation of the results of these first tests is giving a valuable insight into just how much each strategy can contribute to resolving problems and issues in the corridor.

THE WAY FORWARD

Once the team has gained an insight into the effects of both schemes and strategies, a more detailed appraisal of environmental and economic impacts can be undertaken. This more detailed assessment must necessarily be limited to front runners in the study process because of time and resource constraints. Evolution of a preferred strategy is by necessity a somewhat iterative process in order to focus on the schemes that bring most overall benefit to the study area.

Towards the end of this year we will have reduced the number of schemes under consideration and a preferred option will be emerging from the appraisal process.

In parallel with the technical assessment, a vital input to this sifting process is obtaining the views of the local authorities, representative bodies, industry and the general public. With this in mind, the team will be holding a Seminar in late September to obtain the views of the Wider Reference Group on the Option Packages, followed, towards the end of the year, by public exhibitions and formal consultation with local authorities on the preferred strategy.

After taking into consideration all the comments received, the study team will, in the New Year, make a recommendation on a final strategy and package of schemes to the Project Management Group.



APPENDIX 2

PRESENTATION MATERIAL

(Powerpoint slides – not included)

APPENDIX 3

DETAILED NOTES FROM WORKSHOPS

Comments in Square brackets were by the group leaders and generally were clarifications of the subject matter.

GREEN GROUP

Option I

Heavy rail schemes

- Rail schemes will be financed by private funds. How can schemes be assumed in future plans when the private companies will decide for themselves where to spend their money? They in any case have difficulty in planning because of the current franchise arrangements.
- There was concern about the length of time needed to implement the rail schemes in this option. We should look at schemes that could be put in place quickly – and be compatible with a longer term plan.
- Car parking at stations should cost less for local journeys as an incentive to use local rail services for commuting.

Highway schemes

- There should be a ban on overtaking on the A453 with this option
- A 50mph speed limit should be included and techniques used for enforcement to improve safety. A 50 mph limit would not affect overall journey time.
- Attention should be paid to including safety improvements regardless of other highway schemes.
- It would help safety if the A453 were provided with 1 metre strips and lighting as the road is narrow and difficult to drive for HGVs especially at night.

Bus schemes

- A service between E. Leake and M1 J24 and Parkway would be useful.
- Express Bus services should not be introduced to the detriment of local services

Freight

- This option seemed to be lacking in freight schemes.
- The scheme to allow lorries on to lightly used bus lanes was favoured.

Demand Management schemes

- There should be more severe bans on wide loads at heavy traffic periods on A453
- Agricultural vehicle movements should be restricted in times of heavy traffic.

Cycle / Pedestrian schemes

- There should be more crossing points across highways

Option II

General points

- We should plan now for the longer term benefit
- Option II was thought to be a bit drastic and impractical to adopt fully now. It should perhaps be developed to be progressive, moving from option III to II.
- The high cost was cause for concern because it would not produce much benefit until the later stages of implementation.

NET schemes

- Light rail is for short journeys. The longer distance routes in the option were not likely to be worthwhile
- The extension to Gamston would encourage development at Gamston and beyond. This was a general point wherever NET lines end or go further than the edge of the conurbation.

Heavy rail schemes.

- There was a suggestion for a rail connection from the freight only line at Castle Donington to E M Airport even if this meant tunnelling.

Bus schemes

- Season tickets should be available and should be inter-mode so that combined bus/tram/rail journeys could be made on one ticket.
- Bus fares should be lower - possibly financed from parking charges.
- Ticket integration was important in attracting greater use of buses
- Personal security should be improved.

Option III

- The rail link to Castle Donington ought to be in this option to serve the large amount of mail routed through the Airport.
- This option does not have enough NET schemes.
- There was concern that fuel tax increases would be too radical for this option.
- The cycle network should allow for horse riders (in the rural sections at least).
- The improvements in services and infrastructure should be in place before applying restrictions and charges to road users

Option IV

- The dilemma of Red versus Yellow routes (or on line versus bypasses) was reiterated and the difficulty in choosing recognised.
- This Option did not contain any new ideas. There were views for and against expanding highway capacity.
- Surely the accident costs for A453 M1 to Clifton must be high enough by themselves to justify duelling. Option IV schemes would also solve the problem of diversion of traffic

- onto unsuitable minor roads when accidents occur on A453. It was recognised that duelling would be only a partial solution, leaving the problems of extra traffic to be dealt with, as it would attract extra traffic on to the A453 corridor.
- In any A453 highway improvement scheme there should be more grade separated crossings for other road users both in M1 – Clifton and the Clifton sections.
- Park and Ride sites would still be appropriate with highway options
- The A453 is an essential supply route for freight for the south west sector of Nottingham.
- A straw poll of the group indicated a small majority favouring a highway based solution with some additions of features from Option III.

Any other suggestions

- NET light rail services would be the cheapest mode of transport on routes there were enough passengers to fill the trams.
- It would not be practicable to introduce lane restrictions e.g. for HGVs only or emergency vehicles only, on existing roads.
- There could be high level of resistance to increasing road user and fuel taxes.
- A workplace parking levy could increase congestion because drivers would spend more time on the roads searching for parking places, and more 'double' trips would be made ferrying people to and from work rather than parking. Also the use of available work place parking would increase to maximise the return on its cost.
- The efficiency of family use of the car should not be forgotten. Journeys by public transport are more difficult and expensive for families.
- Pedestrian routes must be more direct if they are to attract more use.
- Some cyclists still use the main A453 carriageway in Clifton despite the cycleway alongside. There should be a ban on cyclists using this section of road (and signing to direct use of the track from all access points)
- There should be a network of improved school and college buses also catering for staff.
- The future of Ratcliffe on Soar power station should be considered as other land uses on the site could be significant factors in planning for the A453.
- The smaller public transport schemes in the options were largely supported, but the problem of low frequency of local rail services needs to be solved.
- A bus based Park and Ride should be considered for Ilkeston.

RED GROUP

General questions / issues for discussion

- Can plans be issued to Wider Reference Group members so that they can be to put committees for a fully representative view?
- For the A50 Stoke - Derby route any changes in traffic will affect traffic flows at its junction with the M6 in Staffordshire.
- What is the influence of long distance N-S traffic? Can data be obtained from Government Office for the West Midlands?
- There was general concern that the model should be able to accurately take account of M6 / A50 route choice for NW to SE traffic.
- The influence of freight needs to be taken into account, but the problem has to be evaluated as a complex issue and needs a complex solution.
- One of the current single strategy Options may not on its own provide the whole solution.
- In general the biggest changes in public transport use occur at the intermediate screenline rather than outer screenline.
- Capital costs and running costs need to be balanced
- Junction 24 - Bus prioritisation. How can this be achieved - with a bus lane?
 - Impacts on other road traffic would be significant.
- Maybe greater modal shift can be achieved if public transport is reliable.
- Opinions by travellers and transport providers about the current situation should not be taken as fact, because they may restrain the necessary objective and open approach to developing Options. Modelling must consider modal shift and its full implications.
- The fact that Junction 24 is near the boundary of three local Authorities meet: (Rushcliffe, NW Leicestershire, SE Derbyshire) means that planning is not sufficiently well co-ordinated.
- East Midlands Airport (EMA) is a problem. Look at Manchester Airport 20-25 years ago. A phenomenal growth in use has occurred. What are the implications if EMA follows same trend? (EMA is now owned by same company as Manchester Airport!).
- The implications of investment decisions with a 20 year horizon should be fully appreciated.
- There is potential for millions of sq./ft of storage/business in the vicinity of EMA. Any developments should be airport dependent only.
- Integrated transport policy has to be an objective, together with education about modal choices.
- There is a question about how and how well A453 local traffic is modelled.
- What is likely impact of car parking levy?
- Transport for Queens Drive Industrial Zone needs to be fully considered.
- Are Green Travel Plans able to be accurately included?
- Has a cycle bridge (between Clifton and Beeston) been modelled?
- [Changes to pedestrian and cycle networks are reflected in the transportation models in terms of a general measure of level of service and its affect of mode choice. Pedestrian and cycle trips cannot be modelled specifically due to their generally very short distances & duration. Cycle and pedestrian improvements are a fundamental part of strategies II and III.]
- [The Workplace Parking Levy scheme is included in Option II, but not in option III].
- Should this Study limit itself to the current City Council area for car parking levy.
- Motorway tolling needs to be considered in terms of geographical extent and levels of charging.
- There should be a discount tax levy to companies with effective Green Travel Plans.

- The example of Bergen (Norway) was cited as a successful application of charging a City Centre Road user tax.
- Road User Charge II (in initial Option II) - is a road user charging fairer? should area be widened?
- A regime of Demand Management has to be Multi-faceted no single solution - education should form a part. A quarter of trips in Greater Nottingham are less than 2 miles and could be made by walking or by cycling.
- The stick and carrot approach is needed to get people out of cars. A recent journey took nearly 2 hours from west of Long Eaton to Trent Bridge by public transport (partly caused by roadwork related delays).
- A commonly quoted figure is that 16% traffic in the morning peak are School Trips.
- It was suggested that the study should look at factors that can and can't be influential. [At this stage the study had still ruled nothing in and nothing out.]

Option II - Max Pub.

Rail Schemes

- The rail schemes in general were widely supported, especially the improvement at Trent junction, and wider upgrade and quality schemes, because they can remove road traffic.
- [The prospects for rail schemes are dependent on Railtrack and the Strategic Rail Authority - who are part of our WRG.]
- Heavy rail and Light Rail schemes to Parkway station appear to be in competition with each other.
- The bulk of the £700-800m is the cost of NET schemes? [NET schemes are a large element of cost].
- One of the NET schemes is a fixed link Public Transport to EMA. Heavy Rail could provide some of this function.
- A potential recommendation should be for the Government to step in to subsidise the schemes, if not they are not commercially viable.
- CCTV at Park & Ride sites should be considered. Park safe awards might help improve security.
- Part of Midland Mainline franchise obliged them to look at extension of services from Corby to Kettering, which has a bearing in re-opening the test track route between Melton Mowbray - Nottingham. How would it affect A453? [This line would be parallel to A606 and help reduce A453 traffic, but not a lot].

Summary of comments on Options II and III (Max pub and Mod pub)

- Option II appears to go too far in trying to achieve modal shift, and will not stand up to economic or practicality tests. It gains only slightly more shift than the Moderate Option - but the penalty of not having NET to East Midlands Airport would be continuing delays for the shuttle bus alternative at junction 24 as traffic increases. Can this be overcome?
- What about a heavy rail connection to the Airport. The scale of passenger throughput Manchester (i.e. 10mpa) is needed to justify heavy rail. Given the growth aspirations of EMA, will it reach 10 million pa in the Study period?
- Freight connected with EMA needs to be given an incentive to achieve modal shift off road (but air freight is generally unsuited to rail transport).

- Farnborough Road junction is a bottleneck. [There is a bus priority scheme in Option II].
- Option II should include E7, the single carriageway improvements of the A453 through Clifton.

Option IV

- The A453 as a whole east of the M1 has unavoidable constraints. Removing a bottleneck would simply transfer the problem or spread it on green field areas, so duelling A453 is too simplistic a solution.
- Schemes affecting Green Belt or green field areas are inappropriate i.e. A50 - M1 - A46.
- Suggestion: Improve direction signing but do not widen A453. Would that transfer traffic away from A453?

The group were asked to express a preference to one of the highway solutions – either Red or Yellow routes.

The Red Route affects more people with noise, fumes etc. The Yellow Route affects green spaces, and still affects people with noise, fumes etc. Neither route was universally liked. Both would sever communities.

Clifton had its bypass - built on other side!

Transport corridors create a magnet effect on development. Land use planning must be looked at especially the potential land use effect of Yellow Route.

- The Highways Agency are uncomfortable with Structure Plan in Rushcliffe. Transport corridors have to be sustainable and development must undergo the sequential test in accordance with current national policies.
- The Highways Agency has the right of veto on development.
- The road building option shouldn't be considered until all other options have been evaluated, but accident problems are an issue that needs to be addressed immediately.
- Traffic management measures including speed cameras must be used to limit traffic speeds to 50mph on the rural section of A453 and 40mph on the Clifton section decreased to 30 during the a.m. peak hour.
- The Barton in Fabis junction safety issue must be resolved.
- Eastbound traffic would be removed from the Clifton section of the A453 with a Yellow route single carriageway road, in conjunction with a limited-movements junction with no access to/from A52 Clifton Bridge direction where it meets the Ring Road. This would also require a layout with the eastbound exit back to the existing road at the southern end of Clifton.

General issues and Concluding Comments

- Public transport options are supported, but the accident record needs to be addressed.
- There are no schemes for motor cyclists in the lists. Should they be allowed to use bus lanes, accompanied by a road user education scheme? Has this been tried as a national experimental scheme?
- Car manufacturers should note that 2 seater narrow cars use road space more efficiently.
- Multiple occupancy lanes should be considered - as trialled successfully in Leeds.
- The A453 in Clifton could be widened, but the extra space be used for a bus lane only with no general capacity increase.
- An alternative to Bus Lanes is more specifically a no car lane through Clifton.

- There was considered to be a tidal flow through Clifton. [This scheme actually means having a reversible traffic lane used to provide extra capacity in one direction for the morning peak hour and the opposite for the evening peak hour].
- A cost comparison should be made between a new A453 bus lane through Clifton and the corresponding NET extension scheme.
- The A453 through to M1 could be duelled, but to provide only a no-car lane in each direction.

BLUE GROUP

Rail schemes

- The date of opening of Parkway Station needs to be specified.
- There will be congestion problems to address at level crossings if scheme B8 (increased frequency of trains between Derby and Nottingham) is implemented.
- Car parking at stations should be free.
- The Station being built at Parkway should connect to Birmingham via the freight Line (Castle Donington route, scheme B16).
- Is there a car park capacity constraint at Parkway?
- The scheme for improvements of timetable information (realtime) were welcomed.
- There were doubts about the value of rail improvements North of River Trent.
- Interchangeable ticketing was strongly favoured
- Through ticketing systems would have to be aware of and incorporate pensioners rights.
- The modernisation of Nottingham Station needs to include improvement of integration of transport particularly with the bus station.
- A heavy rail to link to Trowell was suggested (as an alternative to the NET extension in Option II).
- There was support for train routes to Melton and Gedling, but a NET extension to Gedling should be considered as an alternative for the latter scheme.
- The priority order for NET extensions was considered to be: 1. Clifton, 2. Beeston, and 3 Long Eaton

LRT schemes

- Car parking at E M Airport is becoming very difficult.
- Using the train or NET to the airport from Parkway is the way to go.
- Flights to London from the airport may increase and become a factor in future.
- Maximum airport growth should be tested in sensitivity testing in the transport model.
- It was thought that there would be major resistance to LRT through Wilford.

Bus schemes

- There was concern about the impact that priority bus lanes on A453 (through Clifton) would have on private traffic.
- Security, comfort and generally high standards were considered to be very important in encouraging use of buses and coaches including Park and Ride.
- Buses need to link to taxis - for onward journeys.
- There is a need to integrate Buses/Light Rail/Taxis to achieve mode transfer.

Highway schemes

- Consideration should be given to the Purple Route as well (one of the northern and western bypass routes in the 1993 Public Inquiry)
- Frontage Access exists onto A453 and needs to be considered.
- Is there an intermediate solution to satisfy local needs and safety issues (on A453) whilst longer term solutions are developed?

Other schemes and issues

- Pedestrian crossings cause major hold ups in Clifton.
- The gravel extraction bridge under A453 at junction 24 is an under used asset.
- Lower speed limits on A453 were supported.
- There should be more lay-bys on A453 for broken down vehicles.
- The cycle network beyond Clifton needs to be segregated (in Gotham and on the A453).
- There was support for Bus and HGV Lanes combined.
- An extra river crossing for cycles was favoured.
- A choice of Tram and Express Bus Services would be welcome.
- There was concern about the very high congestion at Saxondale roundabout (this may be solved by a new junction as part of the A46 Newark – Widmerpool duelling scheme assumed for this Study as a firm proposal by the Highways Agency).

YELLOW GROUP

General comments

- What is the performance of the existing transport network?
- It is not clear where constraints and bottlenecks occur in the existing highway network and public transport system.
- Is there available capacity on Public Transport especially rail lines and where?
- The Study should present an analysis of the existing situation to reinforce the objectives of the strategies and the individual schemes that they include.
- Indicative costs should have been provided for all elements of schemes and Options for each Strategy. This would have helped in assessing the merits of a particular scheme and its contribution to the overall strategy.

Max Use Strategy

- The strategy seems to the best of existing resources but does not achieve objectives and therefore can only be considered as a contribution to a further mixed strategy Option.
- Costs to implement strategy do not seem too excessive.
- There could be more schemes to contribute to this strategy (*not specified*) but it was accepted that this is an acceptable starting point to build on.

Highway Strategy

- Red / Yellow highway options do not address all problems and most certainly will create others.
- The attraction of road traffic to corridor was unacceptable.
- The strategy does not aim to reduce the reliance on the car.
- Pollution levels on the M1 are said to be at or near the upper permissible limits. Additional traffic in the A453 corridor will mean more traffic using M1 and therefore significant increase in exhaust emissions.
- Traffic reduction must be an objective. In providing increased road capacity this must be allocated to public transport options, e.g. peak period bus lanes.
- The Yellow route could provide more opportunities for public transport Options compared to Red route because of constraints through Clifton.
- What other improvements are associated with the Yellow / Red route and how will the traffic be managed at the M1 and within the City / Ring Road?
- Is a new road scheme deliverable in time to provide the necessary benefit to the corridor in the short-term considering statutory procedures, Public Inquiries etc. to be undertaken? Is tram / heavy rail schemes quicker to implement?

Max Pub/Mod Pub Strategy

- This is an attractive strategy but too expensive.
- There was general agreement that it is difficult to initiate significant mode shift.
- The strategy will deliver very poor returns for the substantial investment required.
- The use of park and ride schemes will result in additional car trips resulting from a redistribution of existing rail trips.

- The scheme B16 for a rail station at Castle Donington and service re-opening the former Castle Donington freight rail line is not in the MOD PUB strategy. Why?
- A direct rail link into the airport should be included.

Group Conclusions:

- The workshop group was unable to comment on individual schemes. Discussions revolved around issues that would be dealt with at a detailed assessment stage.
- The group did not have sufficient time to consider the tasks asked of them especially when the presentation material and emerging results were provided on the day.
- The full list of 136 interventions should be provided to indicate what schemes have been considered in the past (This list was in fact available).
- The outcome of discussion suggested that a hybrid strategy “5” should merge from the strategies presented although the group could not identify specific interventions that may contribute to such a strategy.
- There were indications that a hybrid strategy should contain an element of highway improvement and some of the less expensive public transport schemes along with demand management options.