



Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions

MULTI-MODAL STUDY

WORKING PAPER NO 14

Do-Minimum Schemes

June 2001

REVISION RECORD

| <u>Revision</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Originator</u> | <u>Checked</u> | <u>Approved</u> |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Issue | 07/06/01 | JHB | AJS | PBW |
| Revised (OATMSG) | 14/06/01 | JHB | AJS | PBW |

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

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



CONTENTS

Page

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Introduction | 2 |
| 2 | Scheme Schedules | 2 |
| 3 | Specification of the Do-Minimum | 4 |
| 4 | Do-Minimum schemes | |
| | 4.1 Heavy Rail | 5 |
| | 4.2 Light Rail | 5 |
| | 4.3 Bus Operators | 5 |
| | 4.4 Highways Agency | 6 |
| | 4.5 Local Authority Schemes | 6 |
| 5 | Freight | 7 |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| APPENDIX 1 | Comparison of Local Authority Strategies | |
|------------|--|--|

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The assessment of schemes and option packages within the A453 Multi Modal Study requires a baseline describing the future situation both to facilitate problem identification and to provide a common base against which all options should be evaluated.
- 1.2. The Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-modal Studies volume 1 section 6.4.3 requires the base line to be 'a realistic one which can genuinely be expected to occur in the absence of positive policy action'.
- 1.3. That situation is normally taken to include those transport measures already committed to implementation by the various authorities and operators involved, hence referred to as the 'Do-Minimum situation'. The approach adopted here is compatible with that adopted in the M1 North–South Movements MMS.

2. Scheme Schedules

- 2.1 Commitment to implementation in practice is not easy to define, as it necessarily tries to anticipate the future and is commonly defined in different ways by different providers. The study aims to reflect the confidence shown by the providers themselves in their programmes. Schemes are regarded as committed if they are in firm programmes, with no significant statutory obstacles, and with funds allocated. The year 2005/2006 has been assumed to be the date by which a scheme has to be implemented, to be considered as Do-Minimum.
- 2.2 Besides committed schemes transport providers may have substantial programmes of measures which they are promoting, but which carry a degree of uncertainty mostly because they cannot guarantee the funding. As this category of schemes could in combination significantly affect the Study Options they have been identified separately in this report as probable schemes. These may be used in the option assessment to represent an alternative further baseline in addition to the Do-Minimum situation in sensitivity testing or selectively included in the Do-Minimum.
- 2.3 The schemes listed in the following sections have been taken from programme statements of the Authorities and Transport Operators with responsibilities in the Study area. Local Highway Authorities were invited to comment on the listings, all (with the exception of Leicestershire County Council) have responded.
- 2.4 This method of deriving a Do-Minimum situation diverts attention from an important area of development by Local Authorities which nevertheless has to be considered: that is ongoing programmes implementing strategies. The table in Appendix 1 identifies such strategies in each Local Authority's LTP.
- 2.5 The key elements of the 3 most significant Local Transport Plans have been reviewed and summarised in the table. It can be seen that the majority of strategy elements are common to the 3 LTPs. The most significant differences appear to be with regard to bus priority measures where the more rural part of Leicestershire is less suited to such measures. Light rail is currently under construction in Nottingham and nowhere else. Also of note is the commitment to trialling congestion charging in Derbyshire.

“Soft” schemes

- 2.6 Other intervention measures (which could be referred to as “soft” schemes) are included in the LTPs such as bus quality partnerships (BQPs) which are less certain in terms of their anticipated time period for implementation and exact details of the measures to be adopted. For example BQPs require considerable co-operation from the bus industry, implementation is dependant on agreements being reached. Funds have been bid for, but cannot be regarded as Do-Minimum schemes as these are dependant on the future Government LTP settlements.
- 2.7 Most are already accounted for as schemes in our long list or in the Do-Minimum schemes in the following section of this Working Paper. In principle the Study should treat these as study options so that their outcomes can be compared with the other strategies in the Study. However, the subject of parking charges including Workplace Parking Levies (WPL) is a special case. The so called “3 cities” group was set up to allow the cities to progress a co-ordinated programme of measures, particularly related to demand management and rail development issues. It seems unlikely that these measures would be pursued in isolation without the co-operation of all 3 cities. For example the implementation of on street parking charges in the City centres.
- 2.8 City centre on street parking charges have been progressively implemented in Nottingham since April 2001. The traffic surveys undertaken for the A453 study and Nottingham City Council were undertaken before these charges were introduced. These charges must therefore be included as a Do-Minimum scheme. Derby City council are committed to the introduction of on street charging in the city centre by the end of December 2001. Further extensions outside the city centres will be regarded as possible future schemes to be included in strategy options rather than Do-Minimum schemes because at present they are likely to face problems of acceptability.
- 2.9 Proposals for WPL are being pursued particularly in Nottingham, but until they have reached a more definite stage they will be included in the schemes to be included in the strategy options rather than in the Do-Minimum schemes list. There is a potential problem, in that the 3 cities are at different stages in the process of investigating/implementing WPL.
- 2.10 The following list includes all the “soft” elements that feature in LA LTP bids.
- Bus Quality partnerships/bus promotion/Rail promotion
 - Improved Public Transport information
 - Promotion of Green Travel Plans/Travel Awareness/Education
 - Safer Travel to Schools schemes and Local Safety schemes
 - Freight Quality Partnerships
 - Residential/Rural Traffic Calming
 - Cycling schemes

3. Specification of the Do-Minimum

- 3.1 The OATMSG were invited to verify the concept of the following schedules. Appropriate members have advised on the inclusion of certain schemes. This has resulted in a slightly revised list of Do-Minimum schemes. An alternative column heading has been added to indicate where schemes have not been included in the Do-Minimum and transferred to the long list of schemes and interventions for consideration in the formation of strategy option packages.
- 3.2 The PMG are invited to endorse this report as a basis for compiling the Do-Minimum model networks.
- 3.3 In parallel with this the Study team are proceeding to define indicative schemes for inclusion in the Do-Minimum model networks

4. Do-Minimum Schemes

4.1. Heavy Rail

| <u>Do-Minimum Schemes</u> | <u>Schemes transferred to the list of schemes and interventions</u> |
|---|---|
| Improved Derby – Nottingham rail services (Increased capacity, frequency of service, changes to stops) | New station at Ilkeston |
| Improved Midland Mainline services (Improved peak hour frequency, improved journey times, changes to stops and routes, new rolling stock and greater overall capacity) | |
| East Midlands Parkway Station | |
| | Improved line capacity at Trent Junction (including the likelihood of new track) |

4.2. Light Rail

NET Line one

4.3. Bus operators

Ongoing renewal of bus fleets by major operators (NCT, Trent/Barton)

4.4. Highways Agency

| <u>Do-Minimum schemes</u> | <u>Schemes transferred to the list of schemes and interventions</u> |
|---|---|
| A46 Newark – Lincoln dualling Start 2001/2 completion by 2003 | |
| A46 Widmerpool – Newark dualling Likely Start 2006/7, completion by 2010/11(a 10 year plan scheme) | |
| A46/A607 Syston. Hobby Horse roundabout improvement 2002/3 | |
| A52/A60 Nottingham Ring road, Nottingham Knight roundabout improvement 2002/3 | |
| A52/A606 Nottingham Ring Road Wheatcrofts roundabout improvement 2003/4 | |

4.5. Local Authority Schemes

4.5.1. Nottinghamshire County Council

| | |
|---|---|
| A6002/A6007 Coventry Lane Bramcote Under construction | |
| Mansfield – Ashfield Regeneration Route | |
| A610/A6002 Nuthall roundabout Phase 3 Expected Completion 2003/4 | Nottingham Ring Road bus priority Expected Completion after 2006 |
| Gamston Park and Ride scheme Expected Completion 2003/4 | |
| A6011 Radcliffe Road West Bridgford bus priority expected completion 2004/2005 | |

4.5.2. Nottingham City Council

Do-Minimum schemes

Schemes transferred to the list of schemes and interventions

City on-street parking charges
 (Implemented Spring 2001)

4.5.3. Derbyshire County Council

A610 corridor bus and rail network improvements.

Green Travel Plans for major employers

Derby – Nottingham Cycle routes/Greenways

Freight quality partnership (one)

4.5.4. Derby City Council

Derby Integrated Transport Scheme
 Start 2005/6
 NB Although this scheme is a package , only part of which is currently committed for Do-Minimum situation the OATSMG resolved that 100% completion should be assumed within the modelling period

4.5.5. (Leicestershire County Council)

None

5. Freight

There are no specific measures for freight under either the do minimum or the “scheme transferred to the list of schemes and interventions” categories.

APPENDIX 1

Comparison of Local Authority Strategies

| Local Authority Strategies | N | D | L |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Quality bus initiatives | * | * | * |
| Bus priority / reallocating road space | * | * | * ¹ |
| Park and Ride | * | * ¹ | * ¹ |
| Better community transport | * | * | * |
| Better public transport to rural areas | * | * | * |
| City centre restricted access – buses, cyclists, taxis and disabled only | * | * | * ¹ |
| Increase walking to school/ reduce car journeys to school | * | * | * |
| Extensive cycle route network | * | * | * |
| Enhance personal safety | * ¹ | * ¹ | * |
| Community Rail Partnerships/ Rail Quality Partnerships | * | * | * |
| Tram network/ Light rail | * | | |
| Speed management | * | * | * |
| Increase the adoption of travel plans/ commuter plans | * | * | * |
| Road user charging | | * | |
| Parking charges++ | * | * | * |
| Improved maintenance of carriageways, footways and bridges | * | * | * |
| Workplace parking levy | * | | |

KEY

N=Greater Nottingham Local Transport Plan

D=Derby City Local Transport Plan

L=Leicestershire Local Transport Plan

* = strategy with particular relevance or application within study area

*¹ = strategy with no relevance or application within the study area but featuring in LTP elsewhere in the Local authorities area (e.g Park and Ride in Leicester)

++East Midlands Parking Group incorporating Derby, Leicestershire, and Nottingham, was recently set up to examine the issues relating to the development of parking standards for the region. These are therefore unlikely to differ greatly.