



Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions

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

WORKING PAPER No 34

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION
Summary of the Representative Body Responses.
Details of the content of the Exhibitions.**

July 2002

REVISION RECORD

<u>Revision</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Originator</u>	<u>Checked</u>	<u>Approved</u>
Issue	July 2002	JHBarrett	PBWebster	BDean

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

Pell Frischmann Joint Venture
Clarendon Chambers
Clarendon Street
Nottingham
NG1 5LN

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Working Paper is complementary to section 8 of the Study Final Report. It contains further information about 2 aspects of the public consultation held in February – March 2002:

- Summary of the responses of the Representative Bodies
- Details of the content of the exhibitions.

2. SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES OF THE REPRESENTATIVE BODIES

2.1 A public consultation exercise was undertaken in February and March 2002 at which Option packages were shown for public comment. In addition, the formal views of the Local Authorities and Representative Bodies were invited. The formal responses received are summarised in Table 1 of this Working Paper.

2.2 The Representative Bodies are listed in Sections 8.2 and 8.3 of the Study Final Report. They consisted of business interest groups, environmental groups, local authorities, and Transport Providers.

3. DETAILS OF THE CONTENT OF THE EXHIBITIONS

3.1 As part of the public consultation a series of exhibitions were held in the Study Area. The main content was a Display of Options, with key items of background information. Copies of the third edition of the Study newsletter 'Inclusion' showing similar information were also made available, and contained a questionnaire for comments. The questionnaire is reproduced in Figure 1 below and the Display is shown in the Appendix to this Working Paper.

4. PUBLIC CONSULTATION

4.1 During February, March and April 2002 an extensive public consultation exercise was staged to inform the general public of the Preferred Strategy and a range of Options to implement it, and the schemes contained within those Options prior to any decision being taken on the Preferred Option.

4.2 The public consultation event consisted of the distribution of 25,000 copies of the 4th edition of the 'Inclusion' newsletter containing details of 3 Options representing a range of solutions for consideration to satisfy the Preferred Transport Strategy for the A453 corridor. This had been preceded by the distribution of 25,000 leaflets advertising the dates and venues of A453 exhibitions.

4.3 The exhibitions were of two types. A mobile exhibition unit that was originally intended to be un-manned. It attracted considerable numbers of visitors at each location and the Study Team had to provide attendance at all venues (see Figures 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3). A static exhibition was provided at 3 venues along the length of the Study corridor considered to be within easy travel distance of most residents, and an additional static exhibition was held specifically for the residents of the village of Ruddington following their representations. Details of the content of the exhibitions are provided at the end of this Working Paper.

Figure 1: Questionnaire for the Public Consultation February – March 2002

A453 MULTI MODAL STUDY Consultation on Final Options

We would like to enlist your help in the development of the recommended transport plan for the A453 corridor, from the Nottingham ring road through Clifton as far as Junction 24 of the M1. Three options have been shortlisted to test the various effects with the intention that the preferred Option will be made up from the best elements of these three. The Options are on display at the public exhibitions and in the Inclusion newsletter. If you wish to express a particular view on any of these Options please complete the questionnaire below.

How often do you travel in the A453 corridor?	Several times per day <input style="width: 30px;" type="checkbox"/>	Every Day <input style="width: 30px;" type="checkbox"/>	Every Day <input style="width: 30px;" type="checkbox"/>	Weekly <input style="width: 30px;" type="checkbox"/>	Rarely <input style="width: 30px;" type="checkbox"/>
How do you usually travel?	Car Driver	Car Passenger		Van Driver	
	HGV Driver	Bus/coach passenger		Train Passenger	
	Pedestrian	Cyclist			
	If other please state				
Which of the following do you use?	Buses (please state route numbers)				
	Trains (state route)				
	Footpaths/cyclepaths (state if appropriate)				
	A453 between Clifton (between Farnborough Road traffic lights and Ring Road A52)				
	A453 between Clifton (between Farnborough Road traffic lights and Crusader Rbt.)				
	A453 between Crusader Rbt. And M1 Junction 24				
How would you improve the transport facilities in the A453 corridor?					
What do you like or dislike about Option A?					
What do you like or dislike about Option B?					
What do you like or dislike about Option C?					
Please place the Option in order of Your preference. (Mark A, B, or C in the Box)	First	Second	Third		
Any other comments?					

Table 1: Summary of Comments from Representative Bodies

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
LOCAL AUTHORITIES								
Broxtowe Borough Council	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The identified East-West road movement should be concentrated on a new link from A453 to Gamston Ings (junction A52/A606), and this should be complementary to on-line improvement of A453 between Crusader Island and Clifton Bridge. Pleased that none of current proposals involve new Trent crossing up stream of Clifton Bridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential for NET extensions to East Midlands Airport should be considered. 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support proposals which complement M1 Study and do not result in transfer of traffic onto A52 at Junction 25. Support analytical approach that seeks to maximise journeys transferred to public transport, and improve capacity of existing roads before determining the extent to which new capacity/new road construction required. 	-
Derby City Council	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some new highway construction necessary to tackle current poor safety record, but provision of high standard dual carriageway will induce a significant amount of new traffic onto corridor. Appraisal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All bus based public transport improvements should be included in preferred option. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demand management policies as identified should form part of preferred solution; and advocate introduction of integrated/ smartcard ticketing at regional (or sub-regional) level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All problems identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic growth. Development pressures. Traffic congestion. Welcome balanced approach. 	-

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
				<p>framework in place will determine appropriate level and scale of highway intervention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to liaise with M1 team to ensure proposals for Junction 24 are consistent. 				
Derbyshire County Council	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to identify effects of options on parallel highway routes (A6005 and A52) and mitigate where appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome in principle measures to improve rail transport. 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports underlying aims of the study. No preference for any of shortlisted options. Any measure included in final recommendations that has a financial implication for Derbyshire CC must be recognised by Government. 	-
Leicestershire County Council	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlikely that will reduce congestion and improve safety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing congestion will concentrate traffic on A453 and reduce diversion onto less safe minor roads. Dualling of A453 and improvements at Clifton are supported. County Council has responded to draft package of M1 study as it understands that motorway junction proposals will be determined by that study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Park and Ride proposal at Junction 23A appears inappropriate for travel to Nottingham in view of alternative sites on A453. Location is also considered unsuitable for a traffic generating developing unrelated to the airport. 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that consultation paper gives little information on impacts and effectiveness of options. 	-

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
City of Nottingham Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported with modifications: dual carriageway eastern bypass and all moves junction with Ring Road. 	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A dual carriageway link between M1 (Junction 24) and Nottingham Ring Road is essential to promoted economic development and regeneration of Nottingham. To protect Clifton from adverse effects, a dual carriageway Eastern Bypass with all moves junction at ring road should be provided. Need to include DM to reduce likelihood of peak hour over loading of Ring Road. Purpose of on-line traffic management measures needs to be clarified. Measures to increase capacity for general traffic on A453 in Clifton or to make it more difficult for pedestrians and cyclists not supported.. Consider closure of link between Crusader Roundabout and Eastern Bypass junction, reduce speed limit and provide improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All public transport measures in 3 options supported in principle, also support local bus and rail service improvements subject to suitable mechanism for funding on-going revenue shortfalls (where required) being secured. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WPL supported. The potential of levy to influence <u>employers</u> decisions (e.g. providing reduced on-site parking provision, incentives for employees to make alternative travel arrangements as part of Company Travel Plans) should be included in study in order to ensure full potential is achieved and impact reassessed. Clarification of viability of achieving reduction in PT fares required (fares are a commercial decision) and should only be included if realistic. Restraint based approach to managing parking is already included in LTP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key criteria should be prioritised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to economic development and regeneration within Nottingham. Accident reduction potential (particularly reducing pedestrian/ vehicle conflict in Clifton). Contribution to reducing congestion and compatibility with Greater Nottingham LTP objectives. Assessment of community impacts (particularly those of traffic and HGV movements in Clifton). Air quality and environmental impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures to specifically improve safety should be implemented in advance of other measures where necessary.

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
				facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on A453 within Clifton. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures specifically to improve safety required. Freight measures should be aimed at alleviating impact of HGV's in Clifton. 				
Nottinghamshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not support <u>over</u>-reliance of option on combined effects of WPL and reduced public transport fares. Does not support single carriageway eastern bypass with limited junction with ring road, as fails to provide an appropriate standard road to reflect importance of A453; still significant traffic levels on existing A453. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absence of demand management is contrary to current LTP and national policy, ∴ underestimates potential modal shift to PT. Need to determine whether planned schemes can accommodate extra traffic on ring road, or whether inclusion of demand management would reduce impact. Any improvements to ring road need to be established, costed and included in package. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not support <u>over</u>-reliance of option on combined effects of WPL and reduced public transport fares. Traffic continues to use sub standard routes through Clifton. Does not support failure to dual A453 between M1 and Clifton. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient attention given to poor accident record of A453. In view of strategic role of A453 it is essential that solutions incorporate necessary capacity improvements to accommodate traffic between Nottingham Ring Road and M1. Does not support a solution which fails to achieve long term relief to congestion between Clifton and Ring Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports package of public transport improvements for bus, light rail and heavy rail; suitably located park and ride facilities; package of pedestrian and cycle measures. Measures consistent with M1 draft preferred package. Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How heavy rail park and ride at Gedling would work without fully developed South Nottinghamshire Rail Network; Viability of simple heavy rail service operations only between East Midland Parkway and Nottingham; Is bus based P&R at Junction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will reduced public transport fares be delivered? £2 per day WPL appears to be higher than proposed by City Council. Concerns that full effects of DM not deliverable, and therefore sensitivity tests should be carried out. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports study objectives and study process including widespread consultation. Not sufficient information available to properly judge options; need information on how they perform in relation to NATA criteria however clear that none of options fulfil necessary requirements. Travel demand and public transport improvements are insufficient on their own, significant highway infrastructure improvements will be required. Further options need to be considered alongside options A, B, C: 	-

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
					<p>23A realistic in view of other competing P&R proposals;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to quantify impact on corridor of NET extension to Beeston. If not significant should it be included in package cost? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Substantial public transport, dual carriageway M1 to Clifton, 'Red Route' dual carriageway through Clifton, and a range of travel demand management. - As above but with other highway improvements to existing road through Clifton, e.g. single four lane carriageway, in place of Red Route improvements. - As above but with an outer dual carriageway bypass to east of Ruddington connected to A52/A606, in place of on line improvements through Clifton. - Sensitivity testing of travel demand management in Option B. • Concern that no consultation on preferred option before submission of final report. 	
Rushcliffe Borough Council	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to investigate impact of demand management on this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only limited relief provided to existing route, congestion back to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over adverse environmental impact of bypass 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitivity tests required to assess impact of <u>reduced</u> public transport in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over heavy reliance on workplace parking levy (WPL) and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests further option (as above) be fully tested to 2021 and compared to 	-

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
		<p>option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to resolve whether compatible with limited capacity of Ring Road. 	<p>current levels by 2011.</p>	<p>proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Contrary to philosophy of minimising new road building. – Impact on Green Belt, SSSI and nature reserve. – Likely to encourage further development pressure and coalescence of settlements. • Support an ‘environmentally friendly’ Red Route (possibly single four lane carriageway) with public transport and demand management measures. 	<p>rural areas and if East Midlands Parkway Station not implemented..</p>	<p>reduced public transport fares without evidence that they can be delivered</p>	<p>other Options. (Not clear whether also want existing Red Route option tested also).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over level of public consultation and impact on its validity. • Need evidence of impact of options on accident levels and environmental issues (including pressure for development adjacent to bypass options). • Request opportunity to comment on full range of options including those proposed, fully evaluated to 2021 before preferred option determined and for GOEM to postpone selecting final option. 	

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
OTHER REPRESENTATIVE ORGANISATIONS								
Barton in Fabis Parish Council	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is substantial support for the Red Route proposal. 	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests clarification of estimates of public transport use, and modelling of WPL. Requests confirmation that preferred strategy will be compared against option that includes Red Route alongside other elements of option. Suggests an additional option for assessment; Option C plus Red Route (26/03/02). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interim solution is needed to deal with safety issues urgently.
The Boots Company PLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that this is only a single carriageway. Only 20% traffic uses bypass. Majority of traffic heading for City will continue to use existing route which will become more congested. Congestion on ring road may divert traffic onto bypass. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferred of 3 options, but should include demand management for direct comparison. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unworkable and likely to create severe delays. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The standard of existing link is a major handicap to business. Previously supported 'Red Route' dualling of A453. 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demand management measures should be put in place to reduce congestion for essential road users and "freight traffic in particular" i.e. for those operators where no alternative is available. WPL is assumed to be £2/day and paid by all road users. It should be noted that initial rate proposed by City Council is £150/year. As the levy is on businesses and not employees it is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports submission from Nottinghamshire Chamber of Trade and Commerce. One further option should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Red Route dualling option with demand management measures which may result in more efficient use of road. Further urgent study required before option submitted to Regional Planning Body. 	-

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
						<p>considered that it will have <u>no</u> direct effect on reducing congestion or car usage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential effects on congestion from WPL, road user charging alternative and other demand management proposals need to be more fully understood and sensitivity analysis undertaken before assumptions are made. 		
Council for the Protection of Rural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with assessment that Environmental Impact is moderately significant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bypass would be highly visible. 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferred option of those presented at this time, as it is the only one that does not involve a bypass in open countryside. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed in principle to bypass through Green Belt. Environmental impact considerably understated. Reservations about any scheme that involves significant amount of road building. Impact in terms of increased development pressure. Detrimental impact on wildlife corridor. On basis of evidence at previous public inquiry believes bypass options perform worse in Environment, Safety, Economy 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support, but disappointed in their extent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about validity and robustness of traffic information provided to WRG and public, and impact on comment/consultation. Concerns about conduct of public consultation due to problems with publicity. Would like to see information on how both a limited Red Route option (single carriageway), and Red Route option compares with options. 	-

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
				<p>terms than on line improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that Red Route discounted as an option. 				
EMTAR East Midlands Transport Activists Roundtable	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support as only solution in line with sustainable development principles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to Clifton Bypass as it will attract traffic, cause development pressure, cause noise pollution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support. Would like to see more bus priority schemes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support, but could be strengthened, e.g. by imposing higher work place car parking charges. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about accuracy and robustness of traffic figures presented to WRG and impact on consultation responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phasing critical. Public transport and demand management measure should be in place before any additional road building is seriously considered.
EMTAR/PAIN	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is preferred option, though development already in pipeline together with noise and air pollution make cycling and walking unviable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of a flyover at Junction 24 had not been discussed previously. Is it a 3rd level over existing junction arrangements, would it be bus only? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A rapid transport system from East Midlands Airport to Nottingham and/or Loughborough MML stations is needed. 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about clarity of options material given in Inclusion. Due to the expansion of East midlands Airport and development of Regional Storage and Distribution Centre at Castle Donington, all options are only short term. Need a moratorium on development. 	-
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land affected by widening of A453 in open countryside and bypass corridor are areas of considerable archaeological potential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land affected by widening of A453 in open countryside and bypass corridor are areas of considerable archaeological potential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the point of view of the historic environment, Option C is preferred option. 	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites and areas of known or potential environmental assets should be identified as part of the process of identifying new transport corridors. Unclear as to the level of environmental 	-

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
							assessment that has been carried out. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request separate meeting with main Government Environmental Agencies. 	
Friends of the Earth	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers there to be strong opposition to both on line improvements through Clifton and also Clifton Bypass. Requesting information on impact of flyover at Junction 24 and Kegworth Bypass. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeking clarification on what is meant by lower public transport fares and how it would be funded. 	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeking clarification of modal shift figures for Options A and C. 	-
The Lady Bay Community Association	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tend to support Option C together with dualling of existing route through Clifton in cutting (as previously envisaged). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bypass options would destroy green belt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to Park and Ride site at Gamston. 	-	-	-
LANRAC	-	-	-	-	-	-	NB Copy of comments made on M1 MMS draft preferred package. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed comments on heavy rail proposals including Castle Donington line upgrade. 	-
Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question how long before single carriageway would need to be upgraded. Concern that restricted access to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most preferred solution, but some appropriate demand management measures should also be included for direct comparison. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not considered to be a long term solution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexible about preferred solution as long as it includes a dual carriageway from Ring Road to M1. Final proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept that improved public transport is needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept that Demand Management is needed. Concern about ability of measures proposed to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor southern access to M1 presents poor image, and severe delays for freight and other traffic have adverse impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timing is key factor; want quickest effective long term solution. Public transport measures should be available before

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
	A52 (Ring Road) would cause problems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some members thought this option would improve likelihood of obtaining a further river crossing. 		should be benchmarked against Red Route proposal with appropriate public transport improvements and demand management.		<p>encourage modal shift and manage demand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictions on long stay parking must target commuters not day shoppers. Research undertaken by Chamber suggests that many businesses would not pass on a charge to employees and therefore would have no impact on reducing congestion or car usage. Road user charging research has been commissioned and perceived to be fairer, more effective and flexible. Lower public transport fares will be difficult to achieve. 	<p>on local economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dual carriageway route is a major priority for local businesses. 	<p>demand management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety improvements as soon as possible.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predicted shift to PT (15%, 37% and 35%) is significant. The only sustainable alternative that can be supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any eastern bypass could result in potential damage to designated wildlife sites and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. Concerns that bypass options would attract extra 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support strong commitment to substantial improvements in public transport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support commitment to Demand Management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for 2021 traffic information. Concerns about the validity of some of model results. Disappointed that call for legislative changes to provide for national reduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid implementation of public transport improvements, with emphasis on quick local improvements (e.g. bus service augmentation and fare reductions). PT measures to be in place before

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
				<p>traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved pedestrian safety in Clifton requires significant speed reduction; carriageway improvements (central reserves) and pedestrian footbridges combined with transfer of freight from road to rail to reduce HGV levels. Diverting traffic onto bypass will not achieve overall reduction in emissions. 			car use not included.	<p>WPL introduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid programme of improved cycle routes and accompanying facilities.
RPS Transport Planning for Kingston Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports dualling of A453 M1 to Clifton; with limited high capacity grade separated junctions, and must include high capacity interchange to serve East Midlands Parkway Station as a basic requirement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports dualling of A453 M1 to Clifton; with limited high capacity grade separated junctions, and must include high capacity interchange to serve East Midlands Parkway Station as a basic requirement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not adequately address existing and future transport problems within route corridor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports general principle of Clifton Bypass. Final route choice/ capacity provided should be determined on basis of critical assessment of environmental, economic and traffic capacity considerations. Must provide 15 years highway capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports early provision of East Midlands Parkway Station and NET Line 1. Supports extensive package of public transport, pedestrian and cycling improvements particularly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Express bus services to East Midlands Airport. Local rail services to East Midlands Parkway Station. Real time public transport information. Bus land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports concept of focussed demand management measures, as outlined in Option A and reduced public transport costs to encourage PT use. However Demand Management should not be employed at local level, and should be implemented on Regional or National level, so as not to disadvantage local area. 	-	-

Representative Body	Option A	Option B	Option C	Highway Issues	Public Transport Issues	Demand Management Issues	General Issues	Implementation Issues
					improvements.			
Trent Park Developments	-	-	-	-	-	-	NB Copy of correspondence to M1 Study team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about fourth river crossing and impact on Trent Park Development; waterside regeneration and traffic conditions on Daleside Road and on inner ring road. • A fourth crossing may be possible in a more appropriate location; further to east, linking with proposed Gelding Bypass. 	-