

A52 Clifton Bridge to Bingham Multi Modal Study

Summary Report

JOB NUMBER: 5008615			DOCUMENT REF: Final Draft_2.doc			
1	Summary Report	Various	JT	ACB	ACB	Feb 04
Revision	Purpose Description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
		ATKINS				

Contents

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1
Background to the study	1
Strategy Objectives	2
Consultation	5
Key Problems and Issues	6
Strategy Development and Appraisal	7
Recommended Strategy	10
Next Steps	16

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Atkins Transport Planning, in conjunction with Steer Davies Gleave, Roger Tym and Partners, and MDS Transmodal, was appointed by the Government Office for the East Midlands to undertake the A52 Clifton Bridge to Bingham Multi-Modal Study (A52MMS).
- 1.2 The Multi-Modal Studies represent an opportunity to examine in depth ways by which the Government's integrated transport and related policies can be implemented specifically in:
 - ◆ Developing transport strategies to form part of Regional Planning Guidance;
 - ◆ Integration of transport and land-use planning at local and regional levels;
 - ◆ Identifying transport solutions supportive of sustainable development; and,
 - ◆ Adopting a consultative approach to the development of preferred solutions.
- 1.3 The primary objective of this study was to carry out an in-depth appraisal of the total transport needs of the A52 corridor between Clifton Bridge and Bingham, at present and for the next 20 years.
- 1.4 This document is the Summary Report, presenting the findings of the study. A more detailed Final Report, plus other supporting documentation, can be obtained from the study website, located at www.a52-mms.org.uk.

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

- 1.5 The overall aims of the study were developed by the Project Management Group as described in the Study Brief, and are set out below:
 - ◆ Carry out an in-depth appraisal of the total transport needs, across all modes, of the A52 corridor between its junction with the A453 at Clifton Bridge, west of Nottingham, and its junction with the A46 at Bingham, east of Nottingham, taking into account movements along the A612, A46, A606, A60, A453 and A6097 at present and for the future to the year 2021, with intermediate horizons at 2006, 2011, and 2016, considering the contributions which different modes of transport can make to developing alternative solutions to travel problems and the potential effects of an integrated transport approach;
 - ◆ Develop transport plans for a long term strategy for the study area and consider and identify:
 - ◆ The opportunities for changing travel behaviour through the implementation of a coherent strategy aimed at modal transfers and reducing traffic volumes
 - ◆ The contributions different modes of travel can make to improving accessibility for rural communities within the study area
 - ◆ Initiatives to encourage the efficient movement of freight and the maximisation of opportunities for the movement of freight by rail
 - ◆ The contributions that investment in transport infrastructure can make to the economic regeneration of the study area

- ◆ The opportunities to reduce the environmental impact of transport
 - ◆ The opportunities to contribute to government targets in reducing road accidents and improving road safety.’
- 1.6 Beneath these overarching aims a series of 18 specific study objectives were identified for the study to address. These included more detailed versions of the aims set out above, as well as more specific objectives. Chief amongst these was the requirement to assess the current cross-river capacity, and future requirements for cross-river travel.

STRATEGY OBJECTIVES

- 1.7 In addition to the overarching study aims and objectives, a series of strategy objectives were also developed. These strategy objectives, known as Core Objectives, were developed to help guide the identification of measures that address the problems and needs of the study area. In particular, the establishment of core objectives enables the adoption of a structured process for the assessment of potential measures or solutions. A core objective appraisal summary table (COAST) was then used to assess measures and identify those that should be taken forward for further testing as part of option development.
- 1.8 The study brief provided objectives for both the study and the strategy to be developed by the study. The objectives within the study brief relating to strategy address the following areas:
- ◆ The Government’s five main criteria for transport set out in its Guidance for the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies (integration, safety, economy, environmental impact, and accessibility);
 - ◆ The importance of economic regeneration and interaction with land-use planning;
 - ◆ Reducing long distance car commuter traffic;
 - ◆ Reducing the use of the A52 for short car journeys;
 - ◆ Efficient freight movement; and
 - ◆ Addressing local transport problems.
- 1.9 There were also a number of regional transport and planning objectives that provided a high level framework for the A52 MMS objectives, as well as Greater Nottingham Local Transport Plan objectives that provided specific and detailed transport objectives for the Greater Nottingham area. These were the starting point for the development of the objectives for the A52 MMS.
- 1.10 The recommended strategy objectives were closely informed by the accepted Regional and Local Transport Planning objectives mentioned above. Two levels of study objective were developed:
- ◆ Core objectives - a small number of higher level objectives. These were used to assess the long-list of potential interventions for the strategy; and
 - ◆ Local objectives – a larger number of more detailed and specific objectives nested within the structure of the core objectives. The local objectives

provided the basis of the appraisal framework for the strategy development part of the study.

1.11 The Core and Local study objectives are set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Core and Local Study Objectives

Core Objectives	Local Sub-Objectives	
Support the economic and social vitality of the study area and surrounding region.	1a	Enhance transport access to internal and external markets
	1b	Increase accessibility to commercial centres by non-motorised and public transport.
	1c	Enhance transport network efficiency including public transport service operations.
Provide enhanced opportunity for all segments of the community to access employment, health, education, social and recreation facilities.	2a	Improve access for non-car users.
	2b	Increase transport choice in rural areas.
	2c	Ensure safe walking, cycling and riding for local journeys including those for access to public transport services.
	2d	Improve perception of personal security for walk, cycle, ride and public transport journeys.
	2e	Improve interchange between transport modes.
Enable economic regeneration and development in a manner that maximises achievement of sustainability objectives.	3a	Ensure integration between land-use and transport planning.
	3b	Ensure walk/cycle/public transport access for new land use development.
	3c	Encourage mode shift from car.
Enhance the quality of life in communities in the study area through minimisation of transport impacts.	4a	Reduce severance impacts of transport upon communities.
	4b	Improve road safety especially for vulnerable road users.
	4c	Reduce impacts of rat-running traffic.
	4d	Improve air quality in communities.
Protect the natural, historic and built environment of the study area.	5a	Minimise the impacts of transport upon the natural, historic and built environment.
	5b	Minimise the impacts of transport upon air quality.

CONSULTATION

- 1.12 Consultation with key stakeholders, a wide range of local interest groups and organisations, and members of the public, was a central element of the study. It was also one of the key tasks which ran throughout the process providing feedback at a number of important stages.
- 1.13 The participation and consultation strategy was designed to encompass the three elements identified in the Government's Guidance on Enhancing Public Participation in Local Government, namely:
- ◆ informing;
 - ◆ listening and learning; and
 - ◆ exchanging (defining issues, debating problems and solutions).
- 1.14 The objectives of the consultation process were to:
- ◆ determine the views and attitudes of stakeholders and the public in the corridor to current problems and, ultimately, to the range of strategies proposed for their resolution;
 - ◆ provide stakeholders with the opportunity to contribute their ideas as to what should be considered;
 - ◆ ensure as many and as wide a range of views as possible were canvassed; and
 - ◆ keep all stakeholders – elected representatives, organisations and businesses, and local residents – informed of the study's progress.
- 1.15 A series of activities were undertaken throughout the study process, feeding into the decision-making process at key points. These are detailed in the remainder of this section.
- 1.16 A series of meetings were held with **elected representatives** to inform them of the progress of the study. These included Nottingham City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, and Gedling Borough Council. Meetings were also held with the three local Members of Parliament: Kenneth Clarke, Alan Simpson and Vernon Coaker.
- 1.17 A study **Wider Reference Group** was established, involving representatives of over 100 local organisations and interest groups. Meetings were held with this group to help ascertain problems and issues, to explain the strategy development process, and to discuss the emerging Preferred Strategy.
- 1.18 The public were also engaged at various points in the study, both generally, and through the employment of formal market research techniques. Formal market research techniques involved the use of **focus groups** at the outset of the study to gain an understanding of problems and issues. A structured **household survey**, aimed at 1500 houses, was also used to gain feedback on the various strategy measures proposed.
- 1.19 Finally, the general public were engaged through a series of three **Newsletters**, published at various times in the study process, two of which contained post-back

questionnaires. This was supplemented by a series of **Public Exhibitions** at six locations in the study area to discuss the strategies proposed. Finally, a study **website** was established to host reports pertaining to the study, and an **email address** was established for people to send through comments.

KEY PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

Existing Problems and Issues

- 1.20 One of the key tasks early in the study process was to identify the existing problems and issues faced for movement in, around, and through the study area. To undertake this task an extensive data collation and collection exercise took place, the findings of which are listed in this section.
- 1.21 The need for the study was largely brought about by significant allocations for housing and employment zones contained within the Draft Rushcliffe Local Plan. Many of these allocations were located close to the A52 and the likely effect of these sites on traffic flows on the A52 led to the Highways Agency lodging a formal objection to the Local Plan. As the study has progressed it has become evident that it is possible to locate an additional element of the South Nottinghamshire Sub Area housing and employment to more centrally located sites within Nottingham City. This means that the allocation for Rushcliffe is likely to decline, but it still played a key role in the study.
- 1.22 A further key issue was that of river crossing provision in the Nottingham area. The M1 Multi-Modal Study stated that a further river crossing in the Nottingham area would be beneficial for relieving congestion on the M1, and it recommended that more detailed work be undertaken on this issue by this study. Feedback from our consultation suggested that there was support in principle for a river crossing, but that there were differing views as to its location and the purpose that it should serve. The need for a crossing was addressed in a quantitative manner later in the study process through the application of the study transport model.
- 1.23 A detailed environmental audit was undertaken of the study area. This audit concluded that the key environmental issues in the study area are concentrated near to the river. Such issues were key in the consideration of additional river crossings.
- 1.24 The key problems and issues related to transport were addressed by undertaking audits of individual modes. Obviously, many of these issues are inter-related, with problems occurring across modes. Key transport problems and issues can be summarised as follows:
- ◆ High levels of congestion on the highway network, particularly during peak periods. Such levels of congestion have impacts on the time taken and reliability for highway trips (both passengers and freight), but also on bus trips;
 - ◆ Allied to the level of congestion, and the associated problems this causes, is the almost complete absence of segregation of buses in the study area;
 - ◆ The high congestion levels are also reflected in a higher than average accident rate, particularly on the A52;

- ◆ Peak period congestion is also causing problems with ‘rat-running’ both in the rural areas of the study area but also through some of the built-up areas as well. Related to this is the problem of severance that results for many communities in the study area; and,
- ◆ Finally, rail in the study area has a very low level of usage, and appears to be underutilised.

Future Conditions

- 1.25 In addition to examining existing problems and issues in the study area, we also undertook forecasts of conditions in the future. The examination of future conditions was underpinned by the use of the transport model developed for the study. This model included representations of both highway and public transport modes. It was validated by replicating existing conditions, but was then used to predict conditions at the five year intervals determined by the study brief: 2006, 2011, 2016 and 2021.
- 1.26 In order to project into the future a series of assumptions had to be made about background land-use patterns, including future distribution of population and employment. The future land use scenario was determined from the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This plan, in its current form, places less emphasis on locating housing and employment in the Rushcliffe and Gedling areas than the previous plan. An allocation of the reduced housing and employment shortfall was made based on the emerging Structure Plan policy, locating development requirements sequentially within, and on the edge of, urban areas.
- 1.27 The other requirement for forecasting future conditions was the changes to the transport supply. A ‘Reference Case’ of schemes and measures, either committed, or highly likely to be committed, was defined. These measures were identified from a number of documents in the public domain, including the Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the East Midlands, the Greater Nottingham Local Transport Plan, and the Highways Agency’s Targeted Programme of Improvements. A full list of Reference Case schemes is shown in Figure 1.
- 1.28 The Reference Case then provided the backdrop for the examination of any strategies or packages that were developed for the study for testing with the transport models.

STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT AND APPRAISAL

- 1.29 Once the key problems facing the study area were identified the study moved on to examining potential solutions in a phase of work known as the ‘Strategy Development and Appraisal’ task. The Strategy Development and Appraisal task was essentially the core element of the study. This task drew upon the knowledge gained from the identification of problems and issues within the study area, and entailed the identification of a range of potential transport interventions that could address specific problems or provide wider opportunities when linked to other policy and planning areas, notably land use.
- 1.30 The evaluation process adopted for the A52 MMS was based on a three stage approach:
- ◆ Short-listing of options for inclusion in alternative strategies;

- ◆ Assembly of alternative strategies and COAST appraisal; and
- ◆ Selection of preferred strategy from results of alternative strategy tests.

The 'Long List'

1.31 At the outset of this process a 'long list' of potential solutions was drawn up. This list was compiled from a number of sources, including:

- ◆ Study Project Management Group workshop on Study Objectives (6th November, 2002);
- ◆ Wider Reference Group consultation (22nd November, 2002);
- ◆ Consultation meetings with elected officials, and Members of Parliament; and,
- ◆ Schemes identified during the trawl of 'Reference Case' schemes, which have been investigated in the past, but are not yet sufficiently well developed to be considered as highly likely to be committed.

Short-listing of Options

1.32 The aim of the first stage of short-listing options, was to permit early rejection of measures that are clearly unsuitable for inclusion in the strategies to be evaluated in the COAST appraisal process.

1.33 It was determined that a measure may be rejected for a variety of reasons including:

- ◆ It provides no positive contribution to the core objectives;
- ◆ It creates severe disbenefits to one or more core objectives that outweigh benefits elsewhere;
- ◆ It would be publicly and/or politically unacceptable;
- ◆ It would have excessive cost for the benefits achieved; and
- ◆ It is highly unlikely to be affordable.

1.34 At the end of this stage a number of measures were rejected, and not considered in any more detail in the rest of the study. In fact few measures were rejected, and the majority of potential solutions were carried forward for more detailed appraisal in the COAST Appraisal work.

Assembly of Alternative Strategies

1.35 The alternative strategies were assembled from the short-listed options identified in the previous phase of the study. The process of assembling the strategies was undertaken by the Project Management Group, and resulted in the short-listed measures being packaged into three alternative strategies.

1.36 The alternative strategies were assembled on the basis of three key strategy visions. In all visions the use of public transport was encouraged for movements accessing the central areas of Nottingham and thus improved radial public transport facilities were implicit in all three. The alternative visions considered the longer distance and orbital movements for which public transport does not generally provide a realistic alternative. The three alternative visions were:

- ◆ Providing a high quality A52 route between Clifton Bridge and Bingham to deliver improved access along the corridor and encourage all traffic that should use the A52 trunk road to do so – thus relieving local roads and communities in the corridor;
 - ◆ Extending the above vision with a new crossing of the River Trent north of Gamston and improvements to the A612 at Colwick to enable the improved A52 to provide increased accessibility to the areas north of the River Trent and east of the City centre – thus bringing relief to the existing river crossings and the City centre in addition to relief to local roads and communities in the corridor; and
 - ◆ Providing a new axis of movement to/from the eastern areas of Nottingham through provision of a new link road to the A46 and a new river crossing to the west of Radcliffe to encourage longer distance access via the A46 – thus relieving the A52, the existing river crossings and the City centre.
- 1.37 It should be noted that the strategies were developed in order to test all the measures short-listed for the strategy development process. It was not intended that the final strategy would be chosen from the three alternatives, but that it would be assembled using a combination of the best performing measures from the strategy tests.
- 1.38 An appraisal was undertaken of the performance of a number of the key measures examined within the strategy against the Core Objectives. This then informed the decision making process, identifying which measures would be rejected, and which would be taken forward for inclusion within a recommended strategy.
- 1.39 A number of measures, referred to as 'givens', were included in all of the strategies. These measures included:
- ◆ Improved facilities for non-motorised and vulnerable users include walk and cycle networks;
 - ◆ Measures to encourage behavioural change (such as workplace travel plans);
 - ◆ Environmental improvements at rail stations;
 - ◆ Improved walk and cycle links to public transport stops;
 - ◆ Provision of public transport services to new developments;
 - ◆ Real time information for public transport;
 - ◆ Integrated public transport ticketing;
 - ◆ Improved community transport services;
 - ◆ Network-wide signing improvements;
 - ◆ Identification of a network for road freight;
 - ◆ Improved signage and enforcement for freight movements;
 - ◆ Management measures to reduce impacts of traffic on local roads; and
 - ◆ Parking management in rural communities to control informal 'park and ride';

RECOMMENDED STRATEGY

- 1.40 The results of the process described in the preceding sections were drawn together and a package of recommended strategy measures was established. The recommendations were therefore based upon:
- ◆ detailed analytical work;
 - ◆ consultation with elected members, the Wider Reference Group and other bodies; and
 - ◆ public consultation undertaken in October 2003.
- 1.41 The recommended strategy package is made up of a number of inter-dependent sub-strategies comprising measures which have been identified for implementation in both the short and long term. The make-up of the strategy means that many of the proposals are considered to be inextricably linked. Therefore, it is vital that the strategy measures are introduced in a cohesive manner in order to maximise the benefits that can be gained from them. It is also important to be realistic about the timeframe associated with the implementation of major infrastructure proposals. It is with these issues in mind that the short term and long term strategy packages have been developed.
- 1.42 As a cohesive package of measures, the strategy has been developed to build upon the extensive knowledge and work already carried out by local authorities and other transportation providers within the study area. This approach serves to ensure that as well as being fully integrated with local authority strategies, the proposals add value by implementing measures in a way that would not normally be achievable through the existing delivery mechanisms.
- 1.43 In addition to the recommended strategy package, which was tested using the study models, a number of other measures are also recommended for inclusion in the strategy. These are measures which are considered to have positive impacts, and which are generally accepted as examples of good practice. The majority of these measures are key elements of existing local authority transport programmes, and as such will be supported and enhanced by the introduction of the A52 MMS recommended strategy package.
- 1.44 Table 2 shows the recommended strategy measures for the A52 Clifton Bridge to Bingham Multi-Modal Study. The table details the measure, gives an indication of likely cost, and outlines the first year under examination by which the scheme is likely to have been implemented.

Table 2 – Recommended Strategy Measures

Mode/Policy	Proposed Measure	Year	Indicative Cost (£'s)
Short Term			
Transport Policy	Behavioural Change measures	2006	9m
Non-Car Modes	Walking Infrastructure Cycling Infrastructure	2006 2006	2.5m 2.5m
Bus Priority Measures on selected routes	A range of bus priority measures	2006	5m
	Village/Town Centre Improvements	2006	3m
	Freight Management Measures	2006	0.1m
Park and Ride	Gamston (bus only)	2006	3m
Long Term			
Park and Ride	Saxondale (bus/rail combined)	2011	3m
Highway Infrastructure	Radcliffe Dualling (<i>Radcliffe to Saxondale</i>)	2016	39m
	Lings Bar Road dualling completion (<i>Gamston Rbt to Wheatcrofts Rbt</i>)	2016	6m
	Junction Improvements – Grade Separation at:		
	◆ Nottingham Knight Rbt	2016	26.5m
	◆ Wheatcrofts Rbt	2016	26.5m
	◆ Gamston Rbt	2016	27m
	Radcliffe – Gamston Improvements	2016	21m
Gedling Relief Road	2011	13m	
New Radcliffe River Crossing	2016	102m	
Rail	Robin Hood Line service extended to Bingham	2011	8m

Short-Term Measures

- 1.45 The short-term strategy package has been constructed as a five year programme, with a view to delivering 'quick wins'. The very nature of these measures, and the limited statutory processes associated with the introduction of them, means that they can be implemented as soon as funding permits.
- 1.46 In addition to ease of implementation, the short-term strategy package measures have been chosen to support and complement one another, whilst permitting a degree of flexibility with the implementation programme. This approach ensures that potential benefits can be maximised and that delivery across the study area can be co-ordinated. For example, the introduction of a school travel plan (recommended behaviour change measures) could be linked to improvements in pedestrian crossing facilities (recommended walking measures), and a revision of speed limits (recommended villages/town centres measures), demonstrating the type of 'joined-up thinking' necessary to make a strategy of this nature work. The short term measures are described below.
- 1.47 A package of **behaviour change** measures has been included in the recommended strategy. The term 'travel behaviour change' is a term that describes the outcome of a range of policy interventions developed to influence travel behaviour. These will help achieve the overall aims of the study by:
- ◆ Improving awareness of alternatives to the use of the car;
 - ◆ Promoting travel choice (by overcoming hurdles people face in using modes other than the car); and,
 - ◆ Changing travel behaviour to reduce trips and travel by car.
- 1.48 The behaviour change measures comprise three core interventions targeting travel planning in schools, travel planning in the workplace and personalised travel planning. Such measures will complement other developments taking place in and around Greater Nottingham, building on work carried out by the local authorities and the Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership, through vehicles such as the 'Big Wheel'.
- 1.49 A package of improvements to the **walking infrastructure** in the study area is recommended. The strategy focuses on the promotion of walking facilities and an improved pedestrian environment within communities in the study area, and will thus complement the behaviour change measures described above. Key elements of the strategy include enhanced pedestrian priority, increased pedestrian accessibility, greater promotion of pedestrian routes, and improved access to public transport facilities.
- 1.50 A package of improvements to the **cycling infrastructure** in the study area is recommended. The strategy focuses on the provision of enhancements to the cycle network in the study area, through the development of additional dedicated routes. It also recommends that cycle facilities be provided at a series of major junctions in the study area, and cycle parking facilities be provided at major destinations, such as rail stations, local shopping centres, and leisure facilities.

- 1.51 A package of **quality bus measures** are recommended for routes within the study area. These rely on a partnership between the local authorities and the bus operators to deliver an improved waiting environment, better information provision, improved security, and accessible vehicles. We have also recommended a series of bus priority measures, based on queue relocation, for the major radials in the West Bridgford area to achieve shorter journey times and improved journey time reliability.
- 1.52 A package of **village and town centre improvements** are recommended for settlements within the study area, with the objective of reducing car trips, improving road safety and promoting sustainable modes of transport. Such measures will include improved pedestrian and cycle routes, Safer Routes to Schools initiatives, improved transport interchanges, traffic calming measures, and a review of on- and off-street parking provision.
- 1.53 It is also recommended that a new bus-based **park and ride** site be provided at Gamston, as included in the original Greater Nottingham Local Transport Plan (2000). A site at this location will maximise potential use by providing a focal point for a large catchment area, by capturing trips from the A52 to the south and west, as well as to the east, without abstracting passengers from other facilities. It will allow advantage to be taken of bus priority measures recently introduced, and planned, in the West Bridgford area.

Longer Term Measures

- 1.54 The measures described above have the potential to be introduced in the short-term and enable the study to deliver 'quick wins' to the transport provision in the study area. The strategy also contains a series of larger infrastructure measures which can be introduced in the longer term to achieve the aims of the study. Whilst these measures are scheduled to be introduced for 2011 and beyond planning for many of these schemes will need to commence now. A brief description of these measures is contained in the remainder of this section.
- 1.55 A series of **improvements to the A52** throughout its length, from Clifton Bridge to Bingham, are recommended, to raise the route standard to a two-lane dual carriageway trunk road. These include the provision of split level junctions at Nottingham Knight, Wheatcrofts, and Gamston roundabouts, the dualling of the Gamston Lings Bar section, and the provision of a new off-line dual carriageway between Radcliffe and Saxondale.
- 1.56 A **new river crossing** for the study area is recommended, with a preferred location identified at Radcliffe. Extensive testing of the crossing has identified that a new crossing will improve access to areas north of the river and east of the city, it will remove unnecessary traffic from the existing river crossings (primarily Trent Bridge and Lady Bay Bridge) and the associated road network, and will result in significantly reduced travel times for users of the new crossing and reduced travel times for users of relieved routes.
- 1.57 In association with the Radcliffe crossing a series of other measures are recommended for consideration, to complement the facility. These include **bus priority measures in the West Bridgford and Trent Bridge areas** to take advantage of the capacity created by the removal of traffic through the provision of a new bridge. The **park and ride** site on the north side of the river, currently located at

the Racecourse site, should also be examined to see if it can be located further out of the city in the vicinity of the new crossing, with **bus priority measures provided on the A612**. Finally, the **Gedling Relief Road** should be provided to remove traffic through the Gedling area.

- 1.58 The final long-term measure involves the extension of the **Robin Hood Line to Bingham**. This measure can be achieved at relatively low cost, as the majority of the infrastructure is already in place, and would represent a major improvement in service to the areas on the route. It is recommended that this measure be supplemented by the provision of a **new parkway rail station at Saxondale**. Such a station would attract a large number of trips, and has the added benefit of removing long-stay parking from the centre of the settlements, particularly Bingham.
- 1.59 Other recommendations include a **signing strategy** for the study area, which can be seen as an integral part of the other improvements recommended. Particular note should be made of a **freight signing strategy** to ease freight movements through the study area. We recommend that the provision of a **new non-car river crossing** is pursued. Finally, other measures, such as environmental improvements to rail stations and improved community transport measures are recommended.

Cost of Strategy

- 1.60 Initial costings of each of the strategy elements have been undertaken, and are set out in Table 2. The overall strategy is expected to cost in the region of £300 million. Major elements within this are the A52 improvements at approximately £140 million, and the new river crossing at Radcliffe, which is expected to cost in the region of £100 million

Strategy Appraisal

- 1.61 The performance of the recommended strategy against the local sub-objectives established for the study is shown in Table 3. This highlights the way in which each of the measures contributes to the objectives. As can be seen the recommended strategy performs strongly against the objectives set out at the outset of the study.

- 1.62 A formal economic cost:benefit appraisal of the recommended strategy was also undertaken. This shows that the strategy performs very strongly, and provides a clear return on the investment required.

Summary of Recommended Strategy

- 1.63 The recommended strategy covers a wide range of measures, which address all modes of transport, covering extensive measures for walking and cycling, through to measures for bus, and strategic highway improvements. The measures are geographically distributed throughout the study area, and have been packaged so that they are capable of a phased implementation. The shorter term measures, described above, are capable of being implemented quickly, to allow the study to generate a series of 'quick wins', which will in turn generate a momentum for the implementation of the remainder of the strategy.
- 1.64 The measures were designed to address the key problems and issues faced in the study area, and perform well against the core objectives established at the outset of the study. The measures also perform well against central government objectives, set out in the five overriding criteria for transport, and generate a healthy return on investment through the economic appraisal. In conclusion, therefore, the package is a balanced package of measures that strongly supports the strategy objectives.

NEXT STEPS

- 1.65 Now that the strategy recommendations for the A52 Clifton Bridge to Bingham Multi Modal Study have been finalised, the recommended strategy must be considered by the Regional Planning Body, which is the East Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA).
- 1.66 During the next three months the East Midlands Regional Assembly will consult widely within the region and collect the views submitted to form a regional response on the study recommendations. The Assembly will then provide advice to Ministers to inform their decisions on study recommendations.
- 1.67 If you wish to provide an input into the consultation process please contact Barry Davies at the Regional Assembly. Barry's details are as follows:

Barry Davies, Head of Regional Transport

East Midlands Regional Assembly

The Belvoir Suite

Council Offices

Nottingham Road

Melton Mowbray

Leicestershire, LE13 0UL

Tel: 01664 502571

Email: barry.davies@emra.gov.uk