

Appendix A: Study Plans

(See separate A3 Appendices)

Summary of Comments Received	Sheets 1, 2 and 3
Environmental Constraints and Planning Designations	Sheets 1, 2 and 3
Details of Noise and Air Quality	Sheets 1, 2 and 3
Traffic and Integration	Sheets 1, 2 and 3
Key Development Sites	Sheets 1, 2 and 3

Appendix B: Congestion Reference Flow: A Methodology Statement

“The Congestion Reference Flow (CRF) of a link is an estimate of the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flow at which the carriageway is likely to be congested at peak periods on an average day. For the purposes of calculating the CRF, ‘congestion’ is defined as a situation when the hourly traffic demand exceeds the maximum sustainable hourly throughput of the link. At this point the effect on traffic is likely to be one or more of the following: flow breaks down with speeds varying considerably, average speeds drop significantly, the sustainable throughput is reduced and queues are likely to form. This critical flow level can vary from day to day and from site to site and must be considered as an average. The CRF is a measure of the performance of a road link between junctions.”
 - *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 5, Section 1, Part 3 TA 46/97*

The CRF of a link is given by the formula:

$$\text{CRF} = \text{CAPACITY} * \text{NL} * \text{Wf} * 100/\text{PkF} * 100/\text{PkD} * \text{AADT}/\text{AAWT}$$

Where, CAPACITY is the maximum hourly lane throughput:
 $\text{CAPACITY} = [\text{A}-\text{B} * \text{Pk}\% \text{H}]$

Where, Pk%H is the percentage of HGVs in the peak hour
 A and B are fixed parameters dependent on road standard. For Motorways these are:
 A = 2300
 B = 25.0

NL is the number of lanes;
 Wf is a width factor;
 PkF is the proportion (percentage) of the total daily flow (2-way) that occurs in the peak hour;
 PkD is the directional split (percentage) of the peak hour flow;
 AADT is the Annual Average Daily Traffic flow on the link;
 AAWT is the Annual Average Weekday Traffic flow on the link.

The CRF and the variables employed for its calculation on the M1/M10, Junctions 1 – 19 are:

Link	Site Ref	AADT			AAWT			NL	Wf	PKF	PKd	%H	CRF	Stress Factor
		Northbound	Southbound	Combined	Northbound	Southbound	Combined							
J 1-2	151/158	24846	24798	49644	24798	24846	49644	3	1	12.15	71	6	75193	0.70
J 2-4	152/157	33736	37207	70943	39068	39067	78135	3	1	11.26	67	6	77166	0.88
J 4-5	153/156	44869	44729	89598	44729	44869	89598	3	1	11.01	66	6	88281	1.07
J 5-6	3107/3106	48122	45215	93337	51124	47609	98733	3	1	10.52	67	7	85644	1.08
J 6-6A	3104/3105	33872	35807	69679	37378	34854	72232	3	1	10.59	67	7	86746	0.81
J 6A - 7	3102/3103	75373	75767	151140	79062	78180	157242	3	1	7.32	56	13	137952	1.04
J 7-8	3108/3109	86295	87782	174077	92366	90678	183044	3	1	7.33	50	14	151825	1.18
J 8-9	8901/8902	75790	75247	151037	78370	78570	156940	3	1	6.49	51	14	170105	0.89
J 9 -10	8903/8904	73826	69868	143694	72146	77215	149361	3	1	6.65	52	14	162984	0.88
J10 - 11	9001/9002	68229	66871	135100	68888	71573	140461	3	1	6.84	53	16	151322	0.89
J11 - 12	9003/9004	62164	64865	127029	63712	66100	129812	3	1	6.70	64	18	126560	1.00
J12 -13	9005/9006	61581	62541	124122	63759	63784	127543	3	1	6.84	54	17	148232	0.84
J13 -14								3	1	6.84	54	17		
J14-15	9173/9174	55093	56692	111785	59350	58031	117381	3	1	6.81	52	19	147348	0.76
J15-15A	9651/9652	39983	37611	77594	39583	42125	81708	3	1	6.81	52	19	147174	0.53
J15A - 16	9653/9654	54089	55518	109607						6.81	52	19		
J16 - 17	9655/9656	67310	63593	130903	93854	71957	165811	3	1	6.81	52	19	123816	1.06
J17 -18	9657/9658	52532	51311	103843	54176	54750	108926	3	1	7.53	53	20	128973	0.81
J18 -19	9659/9660	49960	47762	97721	49848	54485	104333	3	1	7.03	53	18	139924	0.70

Appendix C: Summary of Multi Modal Studies interfacing with the M1/M10 Junctions 1 - 19

1.0 London to South Midlands Multi Modal study

1.1 Summary of Study Recommendations for the Highways Agency affecting the M1 RMS

Page No.	Recommend ref	Recommendation/ comment
215	25	M1 J6a-10: Widen to dual 4 lane motorway as highest priority road scheme. Proceed at earliest opportunity
	26	M1 J10-13: widen to dual 4 lane motorway but not in advance of J6a-10
216	27	Dunstable Bypass: Dunstable Northern bypass should replace Dunstable Eastern bypass – to access M1 and bypass Dunstable.
	28 & 29	M1 J12: Consider closing J12 (but retain emergency access/egress) and construct new Junction 11a between Dunstable Northern bypass and M1.
	30	M1 J13: Remodel to separate east west through movements on A421 to M1 access/egress.
	31	M1 J14: Review Junction given widening proposals
	31	M1 J13: Remodel Junction given widening proposals
	32	Ensure no more Junctions are constructed along the route
	33	All major maintenance/ new construction should plan for gantries/telecoms equipment to enable introduction of active traffic management techniques and eventually road user charging.
	34	Review motorway infrastructure to establish the case for incorporating active traffic management.

1.2 Other recommendations and considerations from the London to South Midlands Multi Modal Study relevant to the M1 RMS

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / comment
London to South Midland Multi-Modal Study (LSM STUDYMS)		
27	4.3.3 Rail	Significant rail freight routes through the study area include: The West Coast Main Line (WCML) running from London to Glasgow The Midland Main Line (MML) running from London to Leeds The East Coast Main Line (ECML) from London to Edinburgh

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / comment
37	4.3.4 Highway Network ~ M1	<p>The M1 is the dominant corridor in the Study Area. Conceived as the first full motorway in the UK. It is the principle corridor connecting London with major conurbations to the north including the West Midlands, Greater Manchester, Merseyside, East Midlands, West and South Yorkshire and beyond to the North East and Scotland.</p> <p>The standard on the M1 in the Study Area is Mainly dual 3-lane, with the exception of Junction 6A-7 northbound, Junction 7-8 both directions and Junction 9-10 lanes do not represent through running lanes alone, but need to accommodate weaving movements between the M10/M1 and M1/A414.</p> <p>Flows on the M1 are approximately 105,000vpd at its northern end (Junction 19) and up to 150,000vpd at its southern end (Junction 6A). Over this length of motorway, there is a through movement at the base year of approximately 50,000vpd, heavy goods vehicle flow on the M1 is in the order of 20,000vpd for most sections, of which approximately half presents the long-distance through movement.</p>
39	4.3.4 Other North/South Routes	<p>The other principal north-south routes in the Study Area are the A5, A6 and A10. In the main the long-distance, inter-regional function of these routes has been supplanted by the M1 and M11, also to a lesser extent the A1(M).</p>
70	7.2.3 Problem and Issues ~ Rail	<p>From the analysis undertaken, serious levels of overcrowding are most prevalent on the inner-suburban services.</p> <p>Other problems and issues identified from the consultation process include the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a perceived lack of strategy for rail development with many questioning what plans existed to improve capacity and/or level of service in line with Government policy specific problems associated with lack of east-west travel opportunities for passengers and freight; and a number of very specific issue relating to lack of capacity on existing routes or lack of accessibility from location such as Corby, Dunstable etc
74	7.3.2 Congestion	<p>The southern section of the M1 is seen as a barrier to freight movement during the morning peak.</p> <p>Some junctions cause regular congestion, including the A14/M1 junction and junction 15 of the M1 at Northampton, which suffers from serious peak hour congestion and provides vital access for freight to Northampton and Wellingborough.</p>
107	9.2 Rail Strategy	<p>The rationale for the rail strategy is predicted on two principles, a need for greater connectivity between corridor so that it can act more effectively as a network and strategy has focused on identifying the areas where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sufficient patronage could be attracted to justify the provision of new rail lines; • sufficient patronage could be attracted to justify the provision of new through services over existing lines; • additional passenger capacity is required on existing routes; or

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> additional freight capacity would allow the rail freight industry to continue to grow and thereby remove HGV's from the road network. <p>In additional consideration was given to 'soft measures' which could significantly enhance the quality of journey and perception of the rail network, thereby encouraging existing car users to transfer to rail travel.</p>
108	9.2.1	<p>Two potential new routes through the Study Area are described:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a restored connection between Bedford and Northampton , facilitating through services between the MML and WCML; and <p>a route linking Bristol, Oxford, Milton Keynes and Bedford with Cambridge, Ipswich Norwich and Stanstead Airport.</p>
112	9.2.3 West Coast Main Line	<p>The passenger and freight service enhancement proposed could require the following infrastructure improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> widening the alignment between Watford Junction and Berkhamsted to have six tracks rather than four (allowing separate tracks for fast, semi-fast and slow trains); widening the alignment between Rugby and Birmingham to have four tracks rather than two (allowing separate tracks far fast and slow trains); and lengthening platforms at Kings Langley and Apsley (and outside the Study Area at Euston and Bushey) to accommodate 12-car trains. It should be noted that for widening between Rugby and Birmingham to be effective, additional capacity will be required to Birmingham New Street Station.
113	9.2.4 Midland Main Line	<p>The most significant proposal for the MML as part of the strategy is the further extension of the Thameslink 2000 network from Bedford to Northampton. The original railway between Bedford and Northampton closed in 1962 and most of the former alignment remains intact, it is recommended that this route should re-open, including a station at Olney and a connection with MML and WCML</p> <p>This would enable Thameslink trains, currently terminating at Bedford, to be extended to Northampton and Rugby. In conjunction with other improvements on the WCML between Rugby and Birmingham, it would eventually be possible to extend Thameslink services to Birmingham.</p>
114	Cont'd Midland Main Line	<p>The extension of Thameslink in this manner would fulfil several strategic functions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> providing a connection between Bedford and Northampton (two of the largest towns in the Study Area); providing an alternative route from Northampton to London, which would be slightly slower but give access to a range of destinations within London (notably City Thameslink, Blackfriars and London Bridge); providing a convenient service, probably with only one interchange between a number of North London suburbs and the West Midlands; providing direct access from the West Midlands and Northampton to Luton (including Luton Airport) and St Albans; and designation of Bedford as a major transport interchange, linking with the

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / comment
		<p>particular, passengers from the south would not use the MML to access the WCML, since this would require travelling north to Wellingborough to south of Northampton. As a result, passenger flows for a Northampton to Wellingborough service were forecast to be only around 25% of those achievable with the Northampton to Bedford service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy role for the disused Leighton Buzzard-Dunstable-Luton line, such as providing Dunstable to London (via the MML) or Luton to Milton Keynes (via the WCML) services, would be difficult to deliver because of engineering complexities associated with connecting to the MML at Luton and lack of available paths on the WCML. The service was also tested as part of an east-west rail link, but it was found that the more northerly scheme (discussed in section 9.2.7) would attract a significantly higher patronage. It appears, therefore, that local passenger between Luton and Dunstable can be better accommodated by the proposed Translink scheme, which will serve a variety of locations in both Luton and Dunstable.
118	9.2.5 East Coast Main Line	<p>Parkway stations could make a significant contribution to the ECML</p> <p>It is recommended that the feasibility of expanding the existing station at Stevenage should be examined. A significant increase in parking provision will be required, but also some expansion of the station entrance, platform and footbridge. However, Stevenage is an ideal location for a parkway station since it is adjacent to the A1(M) and already served by inter-city trains.</p> <p>In addition, a parkway station is recommended at St Neots, which will become a major transport hub at the intersection of the A1, the upgrade A421/A428, ECML, and the Bedford-Cambridge-Stansted rail route.</p>
125	9.3 Highway Strategy	<p>The conclusion from earlier testing work suggested the following rationale which should underpin any highway strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the strategy should aim to improve connectivity between strategic corridors in the Study Area, thus lending itself to area-wide management; • the strategy should reinforce network hierarchy and route function within this overall hierarchy; • care must be taken to balance the different elements of the highway network. In fact, balance is more important than the scale of capacity required since it safeguards against generating increased traffic demands and hence problems, on other parts of the network where previously none existed; and • the long-term strategy must protect investments made over the 30-year period. In other words, a strategy, which works at 2016 but deteriorates year by year to 2031 must be buttressed by further measures.
126	9.3.2 Remitted Schemes	<p>Three schemes were remitted to this Study from the Roads Programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M1 Junctions 6A-10; • A1(M) Junctions 6-8; and • A5 Dunstable Eastern Bypass.

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / comment
126	M1 Corridor	<p>The testing work for M1 was undertaken on the basis of resolving known problems and then trying to optimise this solution.</p> <p>The analysis of operational problems for the M1 demonstrated capacity problems between Junctions 6A-13, with capacity problems also occurring on connecting routes both east and west of the M1. Capacity problems were also evident on the southbound section between junctions 15 and 14, but these were primarily attributable to ‘backing-up’ of delays from traffic leaving the motorway at Junction 14. The strategy tests undertaken included tests at dual 4-lane, dual 5-lane and dual 6-lane provision for the section between junction 6A and 13.</p> <p>Testing of a dual 4-lane solution between 6A and 13 provided substantial relief but did not completely meet the v/c criterion of being lower than 0.6 in 2031. Further enhancement to dual 5-lane south of Junction 10 produced only a modest increase in flow but an improvement in congestion relief.</p> <p>Improvement north of Junction 13 association with those to the south produced a number of problems, not least increased flows resulting from transfer from rail and the M40 corridor. The conclusion, therefore, was that the provision of additional capacity in this section would provide relatively little relief and would give rise to undesirable impacts.</p> <p>A further round of testing identified dual 4-lanes between Junction 6A and 13 as the optimum provision given, critically, that the effective capacity of the M25 was also dual 4-lane provision. It was acknowledged, however, that the additional capacity would need to be complemented by other measures, such as ramp metering, to control traffic flows on the motorway at peak times during the later years of the Study period.</p>
129	A5 Dunstable	<p>The A5 through Dunstable currently experiences significant congestion for much of the day. Much of this emanates in the town centre where through movements, north-south and east-west, conflict with local movements.</p> <p>For a number of years there has been a proposal for a north-south bypass (the Dunstable Eastern Bypass) passing through the urban area. This solution has been strongly opposed on environmental grounds. As a result the scheme did not enter the Target Programme of Improvements and was remitted to this study.</p> <p>An analysis of southbound traffic flows on the A5 to the north of Dunstable demonstrated that, whereas some traffic wished to access the M1 at Junction 9, around 30% actually wishes to travel in an easterly direction to Luton, and a further 15% beyond that to the A505 corridor.</p> <p>Consequently, proposals have been tested for a connection from the A505/A5 junction, north of Houghton Regis to the widened dual 4-lane M1 at a new junction 11A, to form a Dunstable Northern Bypass. It is assumed that this route would then be continued as the Luton Northern Bypass to Link up with the A6 and then on to link with the A505 and Luton Eastern Corridor Schemes.</p> <p>Whilst the Dunstable Northern Bypass would remove the need for the Eastern Bypass, it may still be beneficial to provide a new access to Dunstable town centre from the greater detail by more local studies. Together, these schemes would remove a considerable volume of the traffic from the A5 and allow better use of the section through the centre of Dunstable by buses and pedestrians.</p>

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / comment
		<p>Detailed operational analysis of the Dunstable Bypass, together with a Luton Northern bypass identified dual 2-lane provision as being the most appropriate standard, subject to further detailed local study.</p> <p>The opening of the new Junction 11A would warrant the re-consideration of Junction 12 and access to the Toddington service area. This is a detailed operational issue for the HA to address.</p>
132	A421/A428	<p>This long-distance role, when considered in tandem with the increasing levels of congestion, both east and west of the M1, highlighted the need for improvements in this corridor</p> <p>The conclusion from this testing work was that provision east of the M1, as far as the M11, should be at a consistent dual 2-lane standard. West of M1, environmental constraints limited the options available for providing additional capacity. The operational testing works and environmental assessments confirmed that the existing A421 should continue to serve its current function with respect to through movements. This would require some dualling of the A421 west of the M1 Junction 13 from the Junction to the existing section of dual carriageway. In the longer term, further treatment of the many roundabout junctions on the existing A421 through Milton Keynes may be required to accommodate the higher volumes of traffic.</p> <p>The dualling of the A421, both east and west of M1 Junction 13, as well as widening of the M1 immediately south of Junction 13, will create further pressure at the junction, which is already over capacity at peak periods. Analysis of movements at this junction highlighted the significant east-west movement on the A421, which does not require access to the M1. Work by the HA's framework consultant identified the possibility of removing this traffic from the M1 junction by providing a new over-bridge to the north of the junction. This can be achieved without the need for a new Junction 13A, which had been suggested as an alternative and the improvements to Junction 13 are therefore recommended as part of the strategy.</p>
134	9.3.5 Supporting Measures	Any highway strategy will need to be supported by measures to manage the network more efficiently. In this respect, a particularly important role will be played by Active Traffic Management (ATM) which includes improved driver information, intelligence systems, electronic sign gantries and ramp metering.

2.0 Orbit Multi Modal Study recommendations

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / Comment
Orbit Study		
	Note:	Organisations for whose responsibility this is are stated in brackets
361	20.4.1	The Strategy for 2002 to 2011

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / Comment
361	Area-wide Road user Charging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A wide-ranging study of the feasibility of introduction area-wide road user charging should be commenced as soon as possible (Department of Transport). The target should be to let the contract(s) for this work before the end of 2003.
362	Management of Incidents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes should be made in the liability for vehicles and their loads involved in an incident from the recovery crews to the insurers (Department for Transport). Greater use should be made of the data-gathering equipment for automatic incident detection (Highways Agency). Consideration should be given to enabling the removal of vehicles involved in incidents without the authority of the insurers and owners (Department for Transport). Consideration should be given balance between increasingly precaution in dealing with an incident and the effects on safety, especially in the opposing traffic stream (Police and Highways Agency).
362	Mobility Management Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effectiveness of the 'soft' or 'mobility management' measures (that are being promoted and implemented by local authorities) in reducing the rate of traffic grow and traffic levels on the M25 should be monitored and the timetable for other interventions adjusted accordingly (Highways Agency).
362	Integral Demand Management Measures, only with the road improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further work should be undertaken to design and apprise ramp metering and/or mainline flow metering on the above widened sections of motorway (Highways Agency). If ramp metering proves to be the most appropriate form of demand management on the above widened sections of motorway, the reallocation of the M25 capacity through the provision of lanes for priority vehicles (without physical separations) should be considered on all the above sections of motorway, along with car pooling schemes (Highways Agency). Further work should be undertaken to design and appraise motorway charging on the above widened sections of motorway (Highways Agency).
362	Road Improvements, only with Integral Demand Management measures or area-wide road user charging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M25 should be widened between Junctions 5 and 7, Junction 16 and 23, Junctions 27 and 31 to four lanes (Highways Agency). Feasibility study for widening the M25, Junctions 1b and 3 (Highways Agency). Feasibility study for widening the M25, Junctions 23-27 to dual four lanes (Highways Agency). Study looking into junction improvements on the M25 (Highways Agency). Further consideration should be given to a new Lower Thames Crossing with associated link roads, with special focus on its role in facilitating regeneration of Thames Gateway (Highways Agency and Thames Gateway London Partnership).
363	Land-Use Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review should be undertaken of the current controls on land use development adjacent to the trunk road and motorway network. (South East England Regional Assembly, East of England Local Government Conference, Highways Agency, and Central Government).
363	Public Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further work on improvements to the public transport system should be undertaken as part of the feasibility study of area-wide user charging

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / Comment
		recommended above (Department for Transport).
363	Incident Detection and Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the Police procedures within the Police Road Death Investigation Manual with a view to making changes which minimise delays to traffic while meeting Police obligations (Police). • The implementation of incident warning systems, the increased use of the CCTV to monitor traffic conditions, the management of incidents from special centres, the deployment of dedicated medical, debris removal and site photography teams and the upgrading of emergency signing of diversion routes (Department for Transport and Police). • Better training and instruction to drivers in motorway driving, increased police activity on the motorway to deter or identify drivers behaving in such a way as to cause incidents, use of CCTV to identify and apprehend poor drivers, and stricter enforcement of penalties for drivers who are found to be behaving dangerously (Department for Transport and Police).
363	Controlled Motorways and ATM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application of Controlled Motorway and Active Traffic Management techniques if these prove successful in trials, taking care to ensure that these measures do not cause significant diversion to the local road network (Highways Agency).
363	Methods to Reduce Traffic Levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The promotion and implementation of methods to reduce traffic levels on the M25, including land-use concentration and mix policies, travel plans for businesses and schools, flexible and staggered hours, promotion of telecommunications as a substitute for travel, parking controls (including work place parking levies), and other measures (South East England Regional Assembly, East of England Local Government Conference, Greater London Authority and Local Authorities).
364	Measures to reduce Noise and Air Pollution From Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of low noise surfacing and noise barriers in all new road schemes (Highways Agency). • Roadside emissions testing, low emission zones (although care needs to be exercised to ensure that pollution problems are not transferred to other sensitive areas), and the development of low or zero emission technologies (Department for Transport, Local Authorities).
364	Measured Aimed at Improving the Efficiency of Freight Transport by Road Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of Freight Quality Partnerships to encourage improved load utilisation and the making of the inter-urban 'trunk' part of journeys at night (Local Authorities and Freight Transport Organisations). • The development of inter-modal terminals (Strategic Rail Authority). • The SRA's plans for enhancing the rail loading gauge and rail track capacity for freight trains (Strategic Rail Authorities). • The protection of sites with potential multi-modal access (Local Authorities). • The further consideration of a new Lower Thames Crossing and approach infrastructure for rail freight (Strategic Rail Authority).
364	20.4.2	The Strategy for 2011 to 2021
364	Demand Management and Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area-wide road user charging should be implemented as soon as practicable in this period (Central Government in the first instance). • The public transport system should be developed to cater for as many of the

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / Comment
	Transport	restrained car movements as feasible by making use of the revenues generated by the road user charging or Dartford tolls (Strategic Rail Authority, Transport for London, Local Authorities, Train Operating Companies, Bus and Coach Operators).
366		<p>Many of these initiatives are on-going.</p> <p>Orbit have conducted some analyses of possible ways of developing public transport in the study area. These analyses have been restricted to preliminary forecasts of patronage. On this basis, we recommend and support the following actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orbit recommend further work on a high quality orbital coach system providing a combination of speed service and high quality, secure interchanges – such a coach system should be phased, in the initial stages concentrating on existing major transport hubs (e.g. Heathrow, Gatwick, Watford) before being gradually extended across the M25 corridor. To promote and develop the coach system, a Strategic Authority should be established to define the services, organise and monitor the tending process, apportion revenues between operators, manage the interchanges and secure road space for coach priority measures (Department for Transport). • Orbit recommend the exploration of increased operation of shared taxis, to provide a car alternative where demands are too low to justify a bus or coach service (Department for Transport, Local Authorities). • Orbit support further work on the following rail schemes: Airtrack, extensions to Crossrail to Heathrow and improvements to North Downs Line (Strategic Rail Authority, Transport for London). <p>These recommendations are based on the assumption that rail schemes in the Reference Case, including Thameslink 2000, Crossrail 1 and Crossrail 2, will be implemented by 2016.</p>
366	20.4.5 Blight	No decisions have yet been taken about whether the recommendations should go ahead. Many proposals are at early stage in the planning process and, if the recommendations were to be accepted, further work would be required to prepare and consult on detailed designed and route alignments. This would allow specific impacts to be identified.
367	20.6.1 An Overview of the Impacts of the Strategy	<p>Orbit recommendations imply a significant element of choice about the final form of the Strategy. This choice related to both the form of Integral Demand Management n measures that should accompany the proposed M25 capacity increase and the development of area-wide road user charging.</p> <p>Orbit have appraised in detail the following versions of our Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Version 1 – the recommended M25 capacity increases for 2011 alone; • Version 2 – the recommended M25 capacity increase for 2011 combined with a motorway toll of 3.2p/mile for all vehicles on all widened sections; and • Version 3 – the recommended M25 capacity increase for 2011 combined with are-wide road user charging (0.5p/mile in 2011 and 14.5p/mile in 2021). <p>To find out more about these Versions, please refer to the Orbit Study – Final Report.</p>

3.0 M1 Corridor in the East Midlands Study Recommendations

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / Comment
M1 Corridor in the East Midlands Study Recommendations		
23	2.91 M1 Junction 21 (MW1)	<p>The Highways Agency has a proposal to re-allocate lanes on the main carriageway upstream of junction 21 exit slip road to better apportion carriageway space in favour of the movement to exit the motorway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As an interim measure, the Highways Agency should review its proposal and allocate two of the four southbound lanes for traffic exiting at Junction 21 and leaves two lanes for traffic travelling through the junction. This would reduce the conflict between stationary traffic wishing to leave the motorway and the through traffic thus improving safety. New overhead advance direction signing would need to be provided to inform drivers of the revised carriageway allocation. The roundabout circulatory carriageway should be widened to provide an additional lane to cater for the right turn manoeuvre between the M1 north and the M69. These recommendations are minor works which could be done by the Highways Agency as a Local Network Management Scheme. The longer term recommendation for Junction 21 is given under the heading of the mainline improvement between junction 21 and 21A.
25	2.99 Junction 21 to 21A (MW8)	<p>This section of the M1 is one of its busiest links within the study area and it is currently four lanes wide in each direction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended to provide new link roads between the M1 and M69 that would join this section of the M1 motorway removing a significant proportion of traffic from the mainline between the start of the link roads and the current Junction 21 slip roads. North of the link roads there is a need to provide additional carriageway width both to cater for the forecast increase in traffic and to provide greater capacity for safe weaving of traffic between lanes. It is therefore recommended that an additional lane is provided in each direction between the existing A46 slip roads at Junction 21A and the proposed M69 link roads. The additional width would enable the A46 to M69 traffic to remain in the inside lane and not mix with other traffic between M1 north and Junction 21.
25	2.100	<p>This section of motorway also houses the Leicester Forest East motorway service area (MSA). As the previous motorway widening (from 3 to 4 lanes) took up any spare land between the motorway and the service area, it would not be possible to provide on-line, the recommended additional lane without affecting the MSA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exact alignment of the link roads has not been determined and it is recommended that the Highways Agency undertakes further detailed assessment of the most appropriate means of providing the new link roads.
25	2.101	<p>For the purpose of the cost estimate, it has been assumed that the MSA remains intact and that the new link roads diverge north of the MSA and pass around the service area. This way the current MSA layout would not be affected. It is</p>

Page No.	Point / Strategy	Recommendation / Comment
		recognised however, that there may be greater environmental impact with such as option but it is considered that this would be preferable to a significant impact upon the MSA that could add a substantial additional cost to the scheme and indeed jeopardise delivery of the recommendation.
26	2.102 Junction 21A to 23A (MW15a)	<p>These are currently the least trafficked sections of motorway within the study area but will be subject to some of the largest percentage increases in traffic over the study period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended these sections are widened to four lanes in each direction. It is recommended that the widening be undertaken by the construction of an additional lane between junctions without any widening through junctions 22 and 23. • In the longer term, it is expected that four lanes would be needed through the junctions and that these should be provided by reduced width lanes and a discontinuous hard shoulder without affecting existing structures. • Due to the long southbound incline, it is recommended that a crawler lane be provided north of J22, • In the longer term, it is expected that junction capacity improvements may be needed at both Junctions 22 and 23. These improvements are not included in the recommendations.
26	2.103	As the motorway traffic volume is significantly less south of Junction 21, no improvement is considered necessary along that section of motorway.

Appendix D: Summary Table of Development Plan Review

Structure plans for the four counties traversed by the route of the M1/M10; Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Northamptonshire have been studied for details of future developments perceived as having a potential impact on the operation of the motorways. Further information on these developments has been sourced from Local Authority Development Plans; these are presented in geographic order from South to North as shown below.

J1 ⇨	⇨	⇨	⇨	⇨	J19
London Boroughs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brent • Barnet • Harrow 	Hertfordshire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hertsmere • Watford • Three Rivers • Dacorum • North Herts • St Albans 	Bedfordshire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Luton • South Bedfordshire • Mid-Bedfordshire • Bedford Borough 	Buckinghamshire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milton Keynes 	Northamptonshire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Northamptonshire • Northampton • Daventry 	

Further, analysis of these plans has isolated a series of sites of strategic importance to the future operation of the M1. These key development sites have been coded by letter and are presented on plans in Appendix A. A key is presented overleaf:

Key Future Developments by Junction

Junction	Development	Local Authority	Key
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brent Cross / Cricklewood Wembley / Park Royal 	Brent	AB
2			
3			
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centennial Park / Elstree 	Hertsmere	C
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Development and Growth of Watford 	Watford	D
6 / 6A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leavesdon Studios (Former Aerodrome) 	Three Rivers/Watford	E
M10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Development and General Growth of St Albans 		F
7			
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three Cherry Trees Lane Two Waters and Apsley 	Dacorum	GH
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wigmore Butterfield 	Luton	I
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Luton Town Football Club 		J
10A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Luton Airport Translink East Luton Corridor and Vauxhall site 		K L M N
11			
12			
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A421 Strategic Corridor Elstow Depot Cranfield Development Area 	Mid Bedfordshire	O P Q
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Milton Keynes Regional Centre 	Milton Keynes	R

Junction	Development	Local Authority	Key
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grange Park industrial park and new settlement 	South Northamptonshire	S
15A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Swan Valley manufacturing and business park 	Northampton Borough	T
16			
17			
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal and Logistics Park 	Daventry	U
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject of Halcrow Junction 19 Study 		

Brent Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 15 th February 1996 Deposit April 2001 Second deposit April 2001		
Housing No developments of note		
Major Mixed Developments Wembley Regeneration Area	5 miles J1	Confirmed as choice for a new national stadium. Has assisted area status / European Objective 2 Status/ Benefits European Single Regeneration budget
Employment Park Royal London's Largest Industrial and Business Park covering 650 ha. Redevelopment and Renovation of the Area could create over 10,000 new jobs	7 miles J1	

Barnet Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 6 th November 1994 Deposit March 2001 Second deposit March 2001		
Housing To meet demand between 1997 and 2016 14,780 new dwellings are required, including: Mill Lane 500 units Former RAF Hendon 500 units See Below Cricklewood	½ Mile J1 ½ Mile J1	
Major Mixed Developments Cricklewood: one of the largest development sites in the UK	½ Mile J1	Timescale unknown Proposals include 4,000 dwellings / 18,000 new jobs
Employment Brent Cross: 27ha regional shopping centre Proposing additional retail units and car parking. See Cricklewood above	½ Mile J1	Development now conditional on funding Cricklewood Public Transport Requirements. Timescale: unknown

Harrow Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 28 Nov 1994 Deposit June 2001 Review – Second deposit May 2001		
Housing 5182 Housing Units identified for the borough over the period 1997 to 2016. Stanmore Park 400 dwellings under construction	Approx 10 mile radius of M1 J4 Approx 5 miles J4	Accessed from A410 via J4
Transport No major schemes or impact		
Employment No major schemes or impact		

Hertfordshire County Structure Plan	
Affecting: Hertsmere / Watford / Three Rivers / Dacorum / North Herts / St Albans	LOCAL AUTHORITY
Plan Period: 1991 – 2011 Adopted April 1998 Review: Consultation expected May 2002	
<u>Housing</u> 1000 new dwellings in locations around Hemel Hempstead including mixed use development at Three Cherry Trees Lane 4,700 dwellings earmarked for Watford 6,300 dwellings earmarked for St Albans	Dacorum Watford St Albans
<u>Employment</u> Leavesdon Studios Centennial Park, Elstree Three Cherry Trees Lane	Three Rivers / Watford Hertsmere Dacorum

Hertsmere Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted May 1991 Review – 1999		
<u>Housing</u> No major schemes		
<u>Transport</u> No major schemes		
<u>Employment</u> Centennial Park, Key Employment Site: 27 Ha site: 69,675 metres of B1, B2 and B8 floor space.	2 miles J4	No Retail permitted and a maximum of 50% B1a. In March 2002, Phase one completed, 50% constructed with 30% occupancy.

Watford Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted with modifications 11 April 1996 Review – Second deposit May 2001		
<u>Housing</u> As of February 2002, 3068 of 4,700 dwellings identified in the Structure Plan constructed.		
<u>Transport</u>		Plans in the future to transform Watford Junction into a transport interchange
<u>Employment</u> Leavesdon Aerodrome: Key Employment Site 121,500 sq.metres of floor space including offices, R&D, light industry, film studio and facilities with a studio tour and amenity buildings	2 miles J6	Majority of the site in Three Rivers District

Three Rivers Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 12 th April 1995 Review –Deposit Nov 1998		
<u>Housing</u> See Below		

<u>Mixed Developments</u> Leavesdon Studios (Former Leavesden Aerodrome): 32ha. Planning application for 121,500 sq metres of floor space including offices, research and development and light industry; a studio and leisure centre and a minimum of 300 dwellings.	2 miles Junction 6	A reserved Matters application for 320 additional homes is pending Part of the site is in Watford Borough.
<u>Employment</u> See Leavesdon Studios Above		

Dacorum Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 12 th April 1995 Review –Deposit Nov 1998		
<u>Housing</u> See Below		
<u>Mixed Developments</u> North East Hemel Hempstead (also known as Three Cherry Trees Lane) 20.1 ha of land allocated as general employment area: 66% B1b 33% B2/B8 9.46 ha to accommodate 230+ dwellings Two Waters and Apsley: Made up three separate sites classified together as a general employment area. 710 housing units proposed	1 mile Junction 8 5 miles Junction 8	Council also propose a hotel with conference facilities and a waste incinerator. Main employment proposals include light industry, warehousing, office development
<u>Employment</u> See Northeast Hemel Hempstead above See Two Waters and Apslet Above		Development for high Tech B1 light Industrial with some larger B2 and B8
<u>Note:</u> Not included in the local plan is a planning application (4/1898/01) for Riverside (formerly known as “the Plough Site”). 42,413 sq metres in the town centre for Retail, 100 bed hotel, health and fitness centre and 45 apartments.		

North Hertfordshire District Local Plan Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted April 1995 Review – Review to plan to 2016. First deposit withdrawn by notice 27 Dec 2000 to allow alterations owing to PPG3.		
In view of the geographical location of North Hertfordshire future planned development in the county is not deemed as having significant impact on the M1/M10		

St Albans Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted Nov 1994		
<u>Housing</u> 2100 dwellings remain from the structure plan allocation	On Junction 1 M10	St Albans averaging 400 new dwellings a year. More sites and a re-examination of the current green belt boundary is required. As demand rapidly outstrips supply.

Bedfordshire County Structure Plan 1991 - 2011	
Affecting: Luton Borough / South Bedfordshire/ Mid Bedfordshire / Bedford Borough	LOCAL AUTHORITY
Adopted March 1997 Review – Issue Papers Sept – Oct 2001 1 st Deposit Expected March 2002	
<u>Housing</u> Focus Housing and Development in main urban areas and strategic corridors: including 11,000 new dwellings for the A421 strategic corridor between Bedford/Kempston and M1 Junction 13. Elstow Storage Depot: The focus of a development of 4,500 dwellings on eastern tip of the A421 (included in the 11,000 allocation) 6,200 dwellings for Luton	Mid Beds Mid Beds / Bedford Borough Luton
Bedfordshire County Structure Plan 1991 – 2011 (Continued)	
<u>Mixed Use Development</u> Luton Town Football Club: Support to Proposed Relocation from City site Residential Dwellings and Employment in Cranfield Area	Luton Mid Beds
<u>Transport</u> London Luton Airport: Airport to increase passenger numbers form 2 to 10 million people per annum.	Luton

Luton Unitary Development Plan (a)	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 16 th April 1997 Review Issue Papers 2 nd Jan – 22 nd Feb 2002		
<u>Housing</u> Structure Plan allocation of 6,200 dwellings		
<u>Mixed Developments</u> Butterfield Green: 41 ha northeast of Luton University of Luton campus and B1 employment 23,000 seater stadium for Luton Town Football Club	4 miles J5 / J6 500 meters J10A	According to the Council, new plans include a Park and Ride and some residential Awaiting application for a site adjoining proposed Park and Ride on Junction 10A. Implications for capacity and design of junction.
<u>Employment</u> Wigmore Employment Area (also known as Century Park): 40 ha site. Light industry, Office Employment and some airport related warehousing.	4 miles Junction 10A	Due to issues relating to Access the site is under review. It may involve a new access under the Airport.
Transport Translink: 12 km guided busway between Dunstable and London Luton Airport via Luton Town Centre and Luton Parkway Station Proposed Park and Ride at M1 Junction 10A London Luton Airport East Luton Corridor	Access via J10A 2 miles J10A From J10A	Possible extension to include Park and Ride at M1 Junction 10A. Plans to increase annual passenger through flow from 2.5 million to 10 million by 2010. Dualling of A505 from J10A to Princess Roundabout will enhance access to Butterfield Green Link into proposed A5-M1 Link; the Luton Northern Bypass and East Circular North

Note: J11 forms part of the Luton – Dunstable Priority Bus Corridor

South Bedfordshire Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 2 nd September 1993 Review – Deposit 3 Nov –15 Dec 1997		
<u>Housing</u> A housing allowance of 8,800 dwellings particularly in Dunstable / Houghton Regis Area		
<u>Transport</u> Park and Ride at Toddington MSA	½ Mile J12	

Mid Bedfordshire Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 2 nd September 1993 Review – Deposit 3 Nov –15 Dec 1997		
<u>Housing</u> Elstow Storage Depot (see below) 11,000 dwellings for A421 Strategic Corridor (in Marston Vale area) from Bedford to M1 Junction 13	10 miles east J13 J13 to Bedford (10miles east.)	
<u>Mixed Developments</u> Elstow Storage Depot: New Settlement Plan allows for 4,500 dwellings Industrial and Commercial development	10 miles east J13	Elstow sits jointly within the boundaries of Bedford Borough and Mid Bedfordshire District Expansion areas allow between 1000 and 1,500 residential dwellings. Planning Application details: 28,000 sq meters B1 9,000 sq metres B2 9,000 sq metres B8 15,000 sq metres A1 500 sq metres A2 500 sq metres A3
<u>Employment</u> Elstow Storage Depot (see above) Cranfield Development Area: Cranfield Technology Park Former Depot Lodge Road Cranfield Airfield Marston Vale and A421 Corridor	10 miles east J13 3 miles east J13 / J14 J13 to Bedford	Development for high Tech B1 light Industrial with some larger B2 and B8 Strategic Corridor

Bedford Borough Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 1993 Review – Deposit 1997 Proposed Modifications / inspectors report September 2001		
<u>Housing</u> Elstow Storage Depot (see below)	10 miles east J13 J13 to Bedford (10miles east.)	
<u>Mixed Developments</u> Elstow Storage Depot: New Settlement Plan allows for 4,500 dwellings Industrial and Commercial development	10 miles east J13	Expansion areas allow between 1000 and 1,500 residential dwellings. Planning Application details: 28,000 sq meters B1 9,000 sq metres B2 9,000 sq metres B8 15,000 sq metres A1 500 sq metres A2 500 sq metres A3
<u>Employment</u> Elstow Storage Depot (see above)	10 miles east J13	Development for high Tech B1 light Industrial with some larger B2 and B8

Buckinghamshire County Structure Plan 1991 - 2011
Affecting: Milton Keynes Unitary Authority
Adopted March 1996 Review – Consultation expected 8 th April 2002
<u>Housing</u> 36,700 homes for Milton Keynes between 1991 and 2011: 17,000 constructed between 1991 and April 2001 20,000 dwellings allocated in Structure Plan to come on stream between 2001 and 2011 An additional 8,000 dwellings are planned up to 2016.

No other schemes with significant impact on the M1

Milton Keynes Unitary Development Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted unknown Review – unknown		
<u>Housing</u> 20,000 new homes for the city		Proposals for an additional 8,000 homes are being discussed with the County Council (April 2002)
<u>Employment</u> East Milton Keynes 80 ha site for ‘footprint’ development: Warehousing and Distribution	Approx 5km from J13	New Proposals exist for major retail and leisure facilities in Central Milton Keynes (exc.local plan)
Note: Awaiting Plan		

Northamptonshire County Structure Plan	
Affecting: South Northamptonshire / Northampton Borough / Daventry	LOCAL AUTHORITY
Plan Period: 1996 – 2016 Operative from March 2001	
<u>Housing</u> The majority of future housing development is to be concentrated in the east of the county away from the M1 in the Northampton - Corby corridor	
<u>Transport</u> Daventry International Rail Freight Interchange at Junction 18	Daventry
<u>Employment</u> Strategic Development Areas at Daventry and Towcester Daventry International Rail Freight Interchange at Junction 18 including Logistics / Warehousing and Distribution Park	Daventry Daventry

South Northamptonshire Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Plan Period 1988 – 2006 Adopted 24 th October 1997 Review – Issue Papers 30 Nov 2001 – end Feb 2002		
<u>Housing</u> See Grange Park		By January 2001, 350 units completed and 585 under construction.

South Northamptonshire Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Mixed Use Development Grange Park 40 ha for 1,566 dwellings 30 ha for industrial and commercial development Local centre including shopping facilities	200 meters from J15 Direct Access J15	2002 Planning Permission granted for 124 bed hotel Junction already extensively re-modeled
<u>Employment</u> See Grange Park		Collapse of Marconi has delayed leasing of industrial and commercial units.

Northampton Borough Council Local Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted June 1997 Review – Issues Papers Nov 2001; deposit late 2002		
<u>Housing</u> Upton: 1000 dwellings St Crispins: 1000 dwellings	1.5 miles Junction 15A 2 miles Junction 15A	Construction to commence late 2002 Construction to commence late 2002/2003
<u>Mixed Developments</u> Pineham: 30ha suitable for business (B1) or residential use	1 mile Junction 15A	Was subject to a Call-In inquiry at the end of 2001 for 400 dwellings and employment land: permission was not given.
<u>Employment</u> Swan Valley: 84ha business park: potential 2 million square feet of office, manufacturing, warehouse and business support space. Milton Ham: 10 ha site allocated for B1	Adjoins Junction 15A Adjoins Junction 15A	Four large plots already developed at 30,000 sq metres and one at 17,000 sq metres. Subject to current application for B8 warehouse development

Daventry Unitary Development Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
Adopted 26 th June 1996 Review – Began March 2002		

Daventry Unitary Development Plan	Proximity to M1/M10	Commentary
<u>Housing</u> Strategic Allocation of 2,480 dwellings for Daventry	8 miles Junction 18	
<u>Employment</u> Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal (DIRFT) and Logistics Park: Planning Consent for 371,300 sq metres of manufacturing and distribution space on a 174 ha site.	On Junction 18	77.4 ha Rail Terminal Already in operation

Appendix E: A Compendium of Regional Planning Guidance Policies including Regional Transport Strategies

Policy / Page Reference	Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG 9)
	South East' refers to the Greater London area and the areas covered by the shire county, unitary and district councils for Bedfordshire , Berkshire, Buckinghamshire , East Sussex, Essex, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, the Isle of Wight, Kent, Oxfordshire, Surrey and West Sussex.
TRANSPORT	
Policy T5 P63	<p>Public transport (bus, train and water-borne) should be improved to enable it to compete more effectively with the private car and to increase its share of total travel.</p> <p>A. Development plans and/or local transport plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. identify those elements of the strategic inter-urban public transport network which lie within the plan area; ii include policies to protect facilities which support the use and development of the inter-urban and urban public transport networks; iii include proposals to develop the inter-urban, urban and rural public transport network, including the development of inter-modal interchange facilities, such that it supports the spatial strategy and the locational policies set out in this guidance (for example, locating higher trip generating development close to public transport services); iv include policies which ensure that where a disused rail line or railway land may have the reasonable prospect of re-use for transport purposes in the foreseeable future, it is not severed by new development; and v identify a strategy which secures attractive and reliable bus services in support of the spatial strategy. Consideration should be given to the potential for encouraging bus services through reallocation and priority use of road space, particularly where the spatial distribution of land uses is such as to have the potential to encourage and support a viable public transport system. <p>B. In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i local authorities, the Strategic Rail Authority, public transport operators and adjoining authorities should work together in identifying, prioritising and securing investment in support of the Region's strategic inter-urban public transport network, including roadside real-time information facilities; ii proposals should be developed which improve the facilities for convenient and accessible interchange between the strategic inter-urban public transport network, local public transport and other modes; iii local authorities should identify in their LTPs minimum standards of service for key interchange locations and identify in conjunction with all the relevant partners

<p>Policy T6 P64</p>	<p>investment proposals which address any deficiency;</p> <p>iv local authorities and public transport operators, should work together to pursue opportunities to secure and promote integrated networks of high quality local bus services and other public transport services that complement the Region’s interurban public transport network; and</p> <p>v LTPs should also include a strategy for improving travel choice in rural areas. Funding sources for rural initiatives include the Rural Transport Development Fund, the Rural Transport Partnership Scheme, the Rural Bus Subsidy Grant and the Rural Bus Challenge.</p> <p>A fully integrated freight distribution system should be promoted which makes the most efficient and effective use of road, rail, inland waterways and coastal shipping.</p> <p>A. In taking forward this Regional Transport Strategy, the Regional Planning Bodies and Mayor of London, working with the Strategic Rail Authority, Highway Agency, port authorities and other partners, should:</p> <p>i identify a strategic freight network which supports the overall strategy and which promotes the efficient and effective use of road, rail, inland waterways and coastal shipping networks; and</p> <p>ii include a criteria based assessment framework which will allow individual authorities to respond to proposals for inter-modal interchange facilities on a consistent basis.</p> <p>B. Development plans and/or local transport plans should:</p> <p>i identify those elements of a strategic freight network which lie within the plan area in order to channel appropriate movements to it;</p> <p>ii include policies which support making the best use of all existing infrastructure in support of the efficient movement and timely delivery of goods while at the same time reducing its environmental impact;</p> <p>iii include policies designed to increase the proportion of freight moved by rail, inland waterways and coastal shipping, for example by protecting existing facilities or by maximising the potential of development sites to enhance access to rail and inland waterways for the movement of freight;</p> <p>iv include proposals to safeguard sites for rail freight facilities, including wharves and ports and permit development for rail and water freight operations and associated facilities for modal transfer where these would assist in the development of the strategic freight network;</p> <p>v include economically viable proposals for the development of inter-modal interchange facilities where they support the overall strategy, subject to a satisfactory appraisal; and</p> <p>vi support the spatial strategy and locational policies set out in this guidance, for example, for development with higher generation of freight and commercial traffic to be located closest to inter-modal freight facilities, rail freight facilities, port and wharves or roads designed and managed as traffic distributors.</p>
---------------------------------	--

<p>Policy T7 P66</p>	<p>C. In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i consideration should be given to the potential contribution that Freight Quality Partnerships could make to the development of a strategic multi-modal freight network; ii road improvements and commercial vehicle priority measures need to be considered as part of a comprehensive approach to freight distribution. Such measures may help speed the flow of goods and services as well as improving access to the rail, inland waterways and coastal shipping networks; and iii local authorities, port authorities and adjoining authorities should work with the Strategic Rail Authority and the Highways Agency to enhance the level of rail freight access to ports and to develop combined transport freight systems and fully integrated distribution systems. <p>The sustainable development of seaports and port facilities (including road and rail access to them) should be supported for international deep sea, short sea and coastal shipping.</p> <p>A Development plans and/or local transport plans should identify and safeguard from other Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i land for interchange facilities and access improvements to ports especially to promote the use of rail freight and inland waterways; and ii appropriate sites of port and wharf use that will be required to meet changing market needs. <p>B In addition, local authorities, port authorities, the shipping industry and other interested parties should work in partnership to produce development strategies for port facilities and access to them, which are sustainable and make best use of existing facilities. In developing their strategies they should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i have regard to the potential for, and plan to encourage, growth in traffic to be accommodated by rail and inland waterways with the aim of optimising their mode share; ii work with transport providers and other authorities whose areas include ports serving similar markets; iii carefully consider the benefit of continued port operations within the wider spatial strategy in determining the future role of ports. In particular, consideration should be given to identifying the land use which maximises the contribution of a particular site to delivery of the economic, social and environmental objectives of the overall strategy; iv have regard to the economic and environmental potential of the river and river front and the need to avoid the loss of waterfront to development which would not benefit significantly from a riverside location; and v take account of the needs for port development, regeneration and leisure access to river and coastal frontage.
---------------------------------	--

<p>Policy T8 P67</p>	<p>C A study of the port and shipping markets is required in order to develop a more regionally specific ports strategy. It will need to acknowledge the role of neighbouring ports in adjoining regions, and inform the next revision of the RPGs for the South East and East of England and the Spatial Development Strategy for London.</p> <p>Any surface access measures necessary to cater for airport growth either within existing planned limits or for further expansion, should be sustainable. Any further development associated with such airport growth should also be sustainable in nature.</p> <p>A Development plans and/or local transport plans should:</p> <p>i ensure that any development of airport surface access takes account of the wider transport strategy for the local area and provides for a wider choice of mode of travel;</p> <p>ii identify and safeguard land for access improvements to airports, especially for public transport modes; and</p> <p>iii consider the extent to which development is related to the operation of the airport and is sustainable given the prevailing levels, and potential for enhancement of public transport, cycling and walking.</p> <p>B In addition, airport operators should be partners (through Airport Transport Fora where they exist) in implementing surface transport initiatives to ensure that access by public transport is enhanced. This may involve, for example, parking restraint and development of a Travel Plan for the airport, covering journeys by employees and users of the airport.</p>
<p>Policy T9 P68</p>	<p>The regional programme of transport investment in support of the spatial strategy set out within this Regional Transport Strategy, should be developed and reviewed.</p> <p>A Development plans should include policies which safeguard delivery of:</p> <p>i the specific investment proposals identified in this guidance (subject to the special arrangements in London, set out below); and</p> <p>ii other major proposals where they are consistent with the spatial strategy and the regional priorities for investment in transport infrastructure.</p> <p>B Implementation of the investment proposals included in this guidance, should be progressed at the earliest possible opportunity, subject to satisfactory appraisal, consultation with the Mayor of London as appropriate, the completion of all statutory processes and the availability of finance.</p> <p>C In addition:</p> <p>i Regional Planning Bodies, local authorities, the Strategic Rail Authority, public transport operators, the development industry and other partners need to work together in developing proposals which are consistent with the spatial strategy, regional priorities for investment in transport infrastructure and the investment</p>

	<p>ii those priorities in London established through the Mayor's transport strategy and Local Implementation Plans.</p>
<p>P69 9.31</p>	<p>ii Priority Improvements to the Strategic Road Network <i>A New Deal for Trunk Roads</i> published in June 1998 identified a core network of Trunk Roads which are of strategic importance. Major improvements on the core network within the South East will in future be brought forward as part of the development of the RTS. As part of the <i>New Deal for Trunk Roads</i> a programme of investment in the core network was identified which addressed the most immediate problems – the Targeted Programme of Improvements. Delivery of these schemes is consistent with the regional priorities for investment in transport infrastructure and will support delivery of the spatial strategy.</p>
<p>9.32</p>	<p>The start date for those schemes where all the statutory procedures have been completed is as follows:</p> <p>A27 Polegate Bypass 2000/01 A41 Aston Clinton Bypass 2000/01 A43 M40-B4031 Improvement 2000/01 A6 Clapham Bypass 2000/01 A10 Wadesmill Bypass 2001/02 A120 Stansted-Braintree 2001/02 A21 Lamberhurst Bypass 2001/02 M25 Junctions 12-15 Widening 2002/03</p>
<p>P70 9.33</p>	<p>A planned start of works for the remaining schemes in the programme is expected by 2005, subject to the completion of all necessary statutory procedures: A421 Great Barford Bypass The A23 Coulsdon Relief Road, which appeared in <i>A New Deal for Trunk Roads</i>, is now a matter for the Mayor of London.</p>
<p>P70 9.34</p>	<p>iii Multi-Modal Studies <i>A New Deal for Trunk Roads</i> set out a programme of studies which were initially identified in response to the need to address problems associated with the Trunk Road network. However, they will focus on identifying investment proposals which facilitate delivery of the spatial strategy and are consistent with the overall strategy. The following programme of studies have been identified for the South East: London Orbital Multi-Modal Study started 1999/00 London to South West Multi-Modal Study started 1999/00 & South Wales London to South Midlands Multi-Modal Study started 2000/01 London to Reading Multi-Modal Study commencing 2000/01 London to Ipswich Multi-Modal Study started 2000/01</p>
<p>9.35</p>	<p>The outcome of each study will be considered by the relevant Regional Planning Body or the Mayor of London where appropriate. Where the outcome of a study is consistent with the overall strategy of this guidance and the priorities for investment in transport infrastructure set out above, it is expected that proposals will be progressed at the earliest possible opportunity, subject to a satisfactory appraisal, the completion of all statutory processes, consultation with the Mayor as appropriate, and the availability of finance.</p>
<p>P70</p>	<p>iv Developing the Regional Transport Strategies and Proposed Further Studies</p>

<p>9.36</p> <p>9.37</p> <p>9.38</p>	<p>A priority for the development of the RTS should be the identification of key multi-modal routes, having regard to the spatial strategy and existing regional priorities for investment in transport infrastructure. Through this process specific proposals for future investment may emerge for inclusion as part of the RTS.</p> <p>In addition to the studies already underway, a number of additional studies will be required. These will need to examine the capability of the existing transport infrastructure to facilitate and support delivery of the spatial strategy set out within this guidance. It is proposed that these additional studies should consider:</p> <p>i improved rail links to the Channel Tunnel – rail links to the Channel Tunnel from both the wider South East and East Kent are in need of improvement. Consideration of the rail links between Hastings, Ashford and East Kent will be an issue that needs to be taken into account as part of the South Coast Corridor Multi-Modal Study;</p> <p>ii improved transport links in the Thames Gateway - the role and benefits of additional multi-modal transport links in support of the objectives for the Thames Gateway area should be considered. Options could include an increase in cross river capacity east of Dartford (dependent upon work already underway as part of the London Orbital Study) And movement issues between London and Southend, as well as the impact of CTRL And possible increased use of river transport;</p> <p>iii public transport services in the Western Policy Area – the size and proximity of settlements in the west and south west of the Region, where growth pressures are highest, have lead to diverse travel patterns being established, particularly for commuting and to a lesser extent for leisure and shopping. These movements are not well catered for by public transport and this has led to high levels of congestion on the inter-urban road network. Facilitating sustainable economic growth in this area will depend both on reducing car usage within the urban areas and an improved inter-urban public transport system. The work would need to be linked to the existing programme of studies, in particular the London Orbital and London to Reading Multi-Modal Studies; and</p> <p>iv a study of the port and shipping markets – as detailed above at policy T7.</p> <p>As part of the development of options for the potential growth areas the transport investment needs will also need to be considered both for travel within the relevant areas and to improve their external links. The lead times associated with the provision of transport infrastructure will need to be taken into account, particularly the longer lead times associated with the development of viable public transport services. Further guidance on the provision of infrastructure is provided in PPG12 (<i>Development Plans</i>) and the proposed studies of the potential growth areas are referred to in more detail in chapter 12 of this guidance.</p>
<p>DEVELOPMENT</p>	

	<p>Chapter 4: Core Strategy for the Region</p>
4.15	<p>i Priority Areas for Economic Regeneration (PAERs) The South East does not enjoy a uniformly prosperous economy and there are some substantial areas of deprivation as well as smaller pockets of deprivation in many otherwise prosperous towns. For example, the National Index of Multiple Deprivation (2000) ranks 191 wards in 40 districts of the South East among the worst decile of deprived wards in the UK. A sustainable development strategy must tackle such deprivation, both because achieving social inclusion is a fundamental aspect of sustainable development and because making best use of the Region’s resources, including land and people, will increase its overall economic performance and achieve a more equitable distribution of prosperity around the Region.</p>
4.17	<p>The PAERs identified in this Guidance are: Harlow; East London and the Lower Lea Valley; Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis; and the Tendring Coast.</p>
4.24	<p>iii Potential Growth Areas 4.24 Chapter 3 explains that concentration of development is key to a sustainable development strategy for the Region. This applies throughout the Region and implies that urban areas will be the focus for new development. In the longer term there may be a need for additional urban growth areas to be identified as a way of concentrating growth in a sustainable and planned way. At this stage two potential growth areas are identified at Milton Keynes and Ashford.</p>
4.25	<p>Such growth areas will need to take a comprehensive plan-led approach to development, ensuring jobs and homes increase in parallel and that the necessary physical and community infrastructure is provided at the required time to create sustainable communities. Efficient use of land to concentrate development will be particularly important so that it can be effectively served by public transport as well as encourage walking and cycling. Local authorities will need to work closely with neighbouring authorities where a growth area crosses administrative boundaries or could have impacts in neighbouring authorities.</p>
	<p>Chapter 7: The Regional Economy</p>
Policy RE7	<p>In order to address strategic spatial inequalities around the Region, local and regional partners should also give particular attention to actively supporting economic regeneration and renewal, including inward investment in Priority Areas for Economic Regeneration (PAERs).</p>
Policy RE8	<p>In the Western Policy Area, positive strategies should be developed for areas where congestion or labour or land shortages are constraining economic growth. ‘Hotspots’ should be identified and specific policies developed to tackle local problems.</p>
	<p>Chapter 8: Housing</p>
8.3	<p>Recent housing completions in ROSE (Rest of Southeast excluding London) have averaged about 39,000 dwellings a year. Consideration of the above factors suggests that the rate of completions should be increased in future years. However, until assessments have been completed of the capacity of urban areas and the scope for the potential growth areas to accommodate additional development, it is premature to specify precisely the increased level of provision and how it might be distributed, although it would be expected to result in</p>

<p>6.38</p>	<p>INTER-REGIONAL SERVICES The main rail routes through the region are the East Coast Main Line, Midland Main Line and the West Coast Main Line. They have frequent services and there are plans within the current franchise agreements for further improvements, including faster trains on the East Coast route and a major upgrade of the West Coast Main Line. The region also has a number of important inter-regional links provided by Central Trains and the Virgin Cross Country Service, mainly on an east-west axis. The regional transport strategy aims to improve the quality of travel information and the development of integrated ticketing systems system with the co-operation of train operators working in partnership. In addition investigations are being carried out into the feasibility of reopening disused railways such as the Woodhead route, which would link Manchester and Sheffield, as part of the Central Railway proposal and the Invanhoe Line. Further work is required in collaboration with the Strategic Rail Authority, Railtrack and Train Operators to identify passenger rail priorities.</p>
<p>Policy 68</p>	<p>Passenger Rail Services The regional transport strategy supports studies for and investment in passenger rail services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upgrading the West Coast Main line and improving access to it from Northampton; • the Midland Main Line, its stations and rolling stock; • the creation of an international terminal at St. Pancras which will establish links between the East Midlands and the international railway network; • connecting Corby into the national passenger rail network; • improving the freight and passenger capacity of the East Coast Main Line; • improving the accessibility of principal inter-city stations, especially by modes other than the private car; • improving ticketing and timetabling between operators; • improving east-west rail routes including Trans-Pennine rail services, and the possible reopening of the Matlock to Buxton / Chinley railway as part of the South Pennines Integrated Transport Strategy. This route in particular would need to take into account environmental assets of international and national importance which should, if possible, be protected; • Virgin cross-country services from the north-east to the south-west; and • improving South Nottinghamshire rail facilities.
<p>6.39</p>	<p>Ways to improve accessibility to East Midlands Airport (EMA) are currently being examined. The construction of a parkway station in the vicinity of East Midlands Airport and the junction of the M1 and A42 has been given planning permission. The contribution that this facility will make to increased travel to EMA by public transport will be assessed by the EMA Transport Forum which will consider all aspects of surface access to the airport and develop a strategy to increase it.</p>
<p>6.40</p>	<p>The importance of inter-regional coach services has often been understated and local authorities can contribute towards a significantly more attractive operating environment. Development plans within the region can help to promote rail and coach travel by improving interchange at stations with high quality public transport information and integrated ticketing. Interchanges should also provide good walking, cycle and bus links to town and city centres and require full accessibility for disabled travellers. Plans should also encourage linking edge-of-centre stations to the core areas by the concentration between them of appropriate land uses, particularly development with high densities of employment. Improved co-operation over timetables and</p>

	<p>ticketing arrangements between operators of bus and rail services to facilitate seamless journeys will also be encouraged.</p> <p>Policy 69</p> <p>Rail and Coach Services</p> <p>Progressive improvements to inter-regional and international rail and coach services will be encouraged.</p> <p>6.42</p> <p>SUB-REGIONAL SERVICES</p> <p>Public transport also has an important role to play at the sub-regional level. In rural areas, public transport (mainly buses) provides a 'life-line' for many communities that must be safeguarded and enhanced. Innovative public transport schemes will be encouraged and the local delivery of services explored.</p> <p>6.43</p> <p>In urban areas, high quality bus services, together with the promotion of cycling and walking, provide the key to reducing car dependence and thereby combat the linked problems of traffic congestion and environmental degradation. Segregated guided busways and light rapid transit schemes such as those being developed in Northampton and Nottingham aim to provide attractive forms of public transport which avoid problems of traffic congestion. Reliability and frequency can depend on the provision of reserved bus lanes and priorities at congested junctions. Improving local rail services, such as the Ivanhoe National Forest Line and the Robin Hood Line, can also make an important contribution to meeting these objectives. In rural areas, many people are also dependent on public transport, but often there is little transport choice. Greater innovation is required to meet rural transport needs, as well as better information systems and integration among modes.</p> <p>Policy 71</p> <p>Improving Public Transport</p> <p>Improved public transport services for both new and existing development should be secured through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promoting rapid light transit schemes in appropriate cities and large urban areas, investing in bus priorities, improving information systems and improving comfort and convenience for passengers, through 'quality partnerships' with bus companies; • supporting socially desirable evening and weekend bus services to ensure adequate network provision at all times; • promoting innovation to find new types of service provision which better meets diverse needs, particularly in rural areas for example by developing community transport services; • continuing to develop the local rail network, in partnership with the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA), Railtrack, train operating companies and others, by investment in new and improved stations and services, improving information systems, promoting intra-regional services and by safeguarding disused railway lines/stations with potential for re-opening, and other sites with potential as new stations. The new Passenger Rail Partnership Fund is seen as a key way to secure new and improved services; • investing in new and improved interchange facilities and improving inter-modal integration so that public transport, cycling and walking are valued as attractive alternatives for a wider range of journeys; • investing in measures to make the bus and rail networks accessible to people with disabilities;
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • investing in through-ticketing; and • meeting the requirements of travel plans by improving/altering services and routes where appropriate.
<p>6.44</p>	<p>TRANS-EUROPEAN NETWORKS The European Union has identified Trans-European Networks (TENs) for transport, telecommunications and energy infrastructures. The principal objective of the TENs is to ensure the efficiency of the internal market, by improving the mobility of people and goods, and to reinforce economic and social cohesion across the Union. Some of the TEN projects include combined transport improvements that could benefit the environment but others appear essentially road based and have been criticised for taking too little account of environmental considerations.</p>
<p>6.45</p>	<p>Fourteen transport specific projects were agreed at the Essen European Council in December 1994 for special priority. These include the West Coast Main Line rail improvement and the Ireland/UK/Benelux road link (i.e. the A14/M6 corridor through the East Midlands) for which further consideration is being given by the Highways Agency and Railtrack to the promotion of an enhanced rail link along the same corridor. There is no intention that this should become a corridor of unsustainable road related development.</p>
<p>Policy 72</p>	<p>Strategic Impact of Trans European Networks Development plans, local transport plans and the Highways Agency should take account of the strategic impact of TEN's and the routes linking to them in determining the priority for investment in improved infrastructure. Development plans should include policies on built development in the vicinity of the TEN's, taking account of the sequential approach</p>
<p>6.46</p>	<p>SELECTIVE IMPROVEMENT OF THE REGIONAL ROAD NETWORK In determining a road investment programme, any major scheme would need to be considered taking account of the New Approach To Appraisal (NATA). The Approach includes the identification and assessment of problems, identification of options and the assessment of these options. Throughout this process the approach works within the framework provided by the five objectives of environment, safety, economy, accessibility and integration. The emphasis should be on addressing transport, regeneration or environmental problems without any pre-conceptions that the best solution is to increase road capacity. In line with the Transport White Paper, priority will be given to improving the maintenance and management of existing roads before building new ones. This means a better managed road network that delivers a high quality service to road users. This approach is equally appropriate for European routes, nationally provided trunk roads and local authority roads, which are the largest part of the road network. Demand management and public transport improvement measures should generally be preferred. The Government through multi-modal studies is assessing the scope for changes in modes of travel on selected trunk routes.</p>
<p>6.47</p>	<p>NATIONAL MOTORWAY AND TRUNK ROAD NETWORK The motorway and trunk road network crossing the region supports economic and social activity by carrying about one-third of all traffic and about half of freight traffic (by mileage). This heavy use incurs high maintenance costs. The East Midlands trunk road network has been identified as currently being under stress and there are parts of the network where serious traffic congestion occurs at certain times. Attempts to keep pace with demand ('predict and provide') have proved futile because new road capacity often results in greater traffic volumes. This realisation gives impetus to the search for alternative means of travel and for ways to reduce total travel demand to better match</p>

<p>6.48</p> <p>6.49</p> <p>6.50</p> <p>Policy 73</p>	<p>capacity.</p> <p>The Transport Act 2000 defines the Highways Agency's role as a network operator charged with giving a higher priority to better maintenance and making better use of existing roads, with greater emphasis on environmental and safety objectives. The Agency is working to reduce congestion and is developing a number of economic and environmental performance indicators to measure progress against its objectives.</p> <p>The M1 is the most important corridor in the region and several of its junctions are in need of improvement. The multi-modal study of the North/South movements in the East Midlands will consider whether improvements to the M1 are necessary. The study, due to be completed by early 2002, will include consideration of how all modes of travel can make an effective contribution to the need to travel and whether road space needs to be reallocated to specific users. Recommendations from the study can be considered for inclusion in a review of RFG.</p> <p>The Government's Trunk Roads Review "A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England" (July 1998) and "Transport 2010 The Ten Year Plan" (July 2000) set out new priorities for road investment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving trunk road maintenance, making it the first priority; • making better use of existing roads through network control, traffic management measures and safety improvements; and • tackling some of the more serious and pressing problems through a carefully targeted programme of improvements. <p>Two strategic documents "Strategic Roads 2010" and "Roads to the Future" are designed to deliver reduced congestion, better integration and a wider choice of quicker more reliable transport in the next decade.</p> <p>Trunk Road Network</p> <p>Local authorities and the Highways Agency should seek to ensure that the trunk road network is managed along with local roads to ensure integration between all types of transport and good connections between transport networks. In particular, the case for improvements to the M1 junctions in the East Midlands region will be considered in the light of the findings of the multi-modal and road based studies. In setting priorities for new trunk road investment within the region, full consideration should be given to alternative solutions based on demand management and passenger/freight transport improvements. Only after such consideration has been made and deemed ineffective, should road improvements be supported.</p> <p>The following design and build schemes are in the Highways Agency's Targeted Programme of Trunk Road Improvements (TPI), as set out in the trunk road review "A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England", and are supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A46 Corridor Newark - Lincoln, contract let date 2001/2002; • A6 Alvaston, next stage Order making; • A6 Great Glen Bypass, contract let date 2000/2001; • A6 Rothwell - Desborough Bypass, contract let date 2001/2002; • A6 Rushden and Higham Ferrers Bypass, contract let date 2001/2002; • A43 Silverstone Bypass and Whitfield Turn to Brackley Hatch Improvement, contract let date 2000/2001; • A46 Newark to Widmerpool; • A1 Peterborough to Blyth, grade separated junctions (improvement of 6 ground level roundabouts on the A1 in the East Midlands).
--	---

6.51	The Government intends to start work on all schemes in the TPI within seven years of its publication in July 1998, subject to the completion of statutory processes. Although not included in the TPI, work will also continue to be progressed on the A57/A628 Mottram - Tintwistle Bypass. The scheme is an essential element of the South Pennines Integrated Transport Strategy and is supported in principle subject to a detailed assessment in accordance with NATA principles and taking account of the impact on the Peak District National Park.
6.52	In addition to the above, the Trunk Roads Review has identified the need for further studies of trunk road provision in certain areas of the region, in consultation with the RPB. The outcome of these studies will inform consideration of transport infrastructure requirements in preparing the review of RPG, including the need for improvements to the trunk road network.
6.53	These studies are proposed to address the most urgent problems not covered by schemes in the TPI. Multi-modal studies will be taken forward by the Government Office in consultation with regional partners, and roads-based studies will be led by the Highways Agency. Tranche 1 and Tranche 2 studies are currently under way and Tranche 3 will follow.
Policy 74	<p>Major Transportation Studies in the Region</p> <p>The following multi-modal and roads based studies are being progressed in parts of the region and will generate new proposals for consideration:</p> <p>Tranche 1 Multi-Modal Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North South Movements in East Midlands, congestion problems on the M1 between junctions 21 and 30 and the case for an A6 bypass of Kegworth and to take account of the impact of proposals for a possible new junction 29A to serve the Markham Employment Growth Zone; • A453 (M1 - Nottingham), congestion and safety problems; • South East Manchester, assess transport problems in south east quadrant of Greater Manchester; • South and West Yorkshire Motorway Box. <p>Tranche 2 Multi-Modal Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • London to South Midlands, congestion problems in the area based on M1, A1(M)/A1 and M11, A14; • West Midlands to Nottingham, congestion problems in A42/M42 (to M6) corridor. <p>Tranche 3 Multi-Modal Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A52 Corridor from Nottingham to the east. <p>Tranche 1 Road Based Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M1 Junction 19, junction congestion and safety problems. <p>Tranche 2 Road Based Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A38 Derby Junctions, congestion at junctions with A52/A5111 and A61.
6.54	The Highways Agency is undertaking further investigations into a number of road improvement schemes in areas currently being considered by multi-modal studies, including the A45 Stanwick to A14 improvement.
Policy 75	<p>Investment in Major Highway Schemes</p> <p>The resources available to local authorities for investment in major highway schemes are likely to remain limited and will need to be targeted on schemes which reflect regional priorities and which meet clearly defined economic and environmental objectives in relation to local transport plans. Schemes will be subject to rigorous</p>

	<p>appraisal and local authorities will need to demonstrate that there are no feasible alternatives to road investment.</p> <p>Local authorities in the region have proposals for the following major road schemes: Accepted by DTLR for funding and under construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashby Bypass, Leicestershire; • Nottingham Western Bypass Outer Loop Road, Nottinghamshire. <p>Provisionally accepted by DTLR for funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route, Nottinghamshire; • A158 / C541 Coastal Access; • A1073 Spalding-Eye, Lincolnshire; • A47 Earl Shilton Bypass, Leicestershire; • A607 Rearsby Bypass, Leicestershire; • A6096 Ilkeston-Awsorth Link, Derbyshire; • A606 / A6003 Oakham Bypass, Rutland; and • Markham Employment Growth Zone Access, including a new junction at the M1.
Policy 76	<p>Freight Development</p> <p>Development plans and local transport plans should include policies to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encourage and promote the movement of freight by rail, inland waterways and pipelines where appropriate, making use of freight facilities grants and track access grants from Government; • support actions to improve the capacity of the rail network to carry freight, particularly in the North-South corridor, subject to the proposed freight study and assessment of environmental impacts; • safeguard disused railway lines from development unless it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no likelihood that the line could form part of a freight or passenger rail network; • safeguard from alternative development land adjacent to or providing access to disused and operational rail lines where there is potential for rail freight links, interchanges and rail- based distribution activities; • direct lorries to the most appropriate routes and away from environmentally sensitive, tranquil and residential areas; and • promote measures which reduce the need to move freight and encourage the industry to develop more efficient and environmentally friendly operating practices.
Policy 78	<p>Port Development</p> <p>Transport links to and from the region's own ports (especially by rail to Boston), and from the region to the East Anglian and Humber ports, should be safeguarded and improved where appropriate. Proposals that permit the penetration of sea going vessels further inland and the reduction of the dependency of ports upon road transport should be supported.</p>
6.68	<p>Air Transport</p> <p>The main regional airport is the East Midlands Airport (EMA) at Castle Donington. It is highly accessible by road from the A42/M1 junction, and within easy reach of much of the region including the cities of Derby, Nottingham and Leicester. However some parts of the region look to Manchester, Birmingham, Luton, Stansted or Humberside as their most accessible airport. The Midlands Regional Air Services (RAS) Study, which constitutes part one of a three part process, has been completed and will be made available alongside the part two Regional Air Services Co-ordination Study (RASCO) upon publication of the six regional consultation documents (RCD's) for</p>

	<p>each of the component regions. The findings of the part three studies (one covering the Midlands of England) examining longterm runway capacity will also be published. Consultation is expected to commence early in 2002 on the regional documents and one on air services in the South East and East of England. The results of these and of consultation on the "Future of Aviation" consultation document (December 2000) will feed into the preparation of a new Air Transport White Paper (ATWP).</p>
<p>6.69</p>	<p>Airports have become major transport interchanges and traffic generators and attract a range of related and non related developments. PPG13 advises that local planning authorities should consider the extent to which development is related to the operation of the airport and is sustainable given the prevailing and planned levels of public transport. The EMA and its diversified associated land uses are strong direct and indirect contributors to the regional economy. The development of EMA is supported in principle, but the impact of development proposals should be rigorously assessed. Impacts likely to be taken into account would include noise, air quality, water quality, human health, landscape, biodiversity, natural resources and cultural assets, together with social and economic effects. Development should be consistent with national policy for the distribution of traffic to regional airports.</p>
<p>6.70</p>	<p>Airports in adjacent regions also play important roles in providing services to East Midlands residents and businesses. Expansion of these airports will, however, also lead to the exertion of development pressures in surrounding areas. Particularly significant in this respect is Manchester Airport which will experience an increase in the numbers of East Midlands residents using the airport.</p>
<p>6.71</p>	<p>The proportion of airport workers and air passengers arriving daily by car at EMA gives cause for concern and the search for improved public transport connections should be intensified. Local authorities in the region will assist in the development of such improvements by their representation on the EMA's Transport Forum, which was launched in August 1999. Surface access to EMA will need to be re-examined in the light of the findings of the studies mentioned in policy 74 and PPG13 and ATWP. Similar issues apply to air freight and maintenance traffic, with the added concern that freight aircraft tend to be older and hence produce more noise and air pollution and a greater proportion of night flights. Further guidance on noise issues is given in PPG24. The growth and impact of air and surface traffic is being considered as part of a series of relevant studies, including Surface Access, the Regional Air Services Co-ordination Study, and the M1 Multi-Modal Study.</p>
<p>Policy 79</p>	<p>East Midlands Airport Development plans and local transport plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide for the further operational expansion of EMA within its boundaries subject to rigorous assessment of the full range of impacts; • consider the surface access needs of EMA as part of the wider transport strategy for the area; • assess the measures necessary to increase the share of trips to EMA made by public transport in accordance with agreed targets; • seek to ensure that transport proposals are compatible with the need to create effective public transport links to EMA for the long-term; • identify and safeguard land for improving access to EMA, particularly by non-car modes, and including a fixed rail link to support expansion in the long-term; give particular encouragement to the transfer of freight traffic generated by EMA from road to rail; and • seek to ensure that travel plans are brought forward for new development at EMA.

DEVELOPMENT AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT	
	STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION
4.9	<p>One of the most significant investments in recent years has been the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal (DIRFT) located at Junction 18 of the M1 motorway, which has direct access to the West Coast Main Line. This new rail freight terminal, developed with private finance, provides opportunities for fast, integrated road and rail distribution. Regional scale developments also operate at Eurohub in Corby and Magna Park in Leicestershire. It is important that maximum benefit is taken of these significant investments that reflect the region's locational strength at the heart of the nation's transport networks. Ways of doing so should be explored in a regional freight study, which should look at needs and desirable scales of activity elsewhere.</p>
Policy 14	<p>Storage and Distribution Sites</p> <p>If the proposed employment land and freight studies demonstrate a need for regional scale distribution sites, particular attention should be given to the regeneration needs of the Northern Coalfields sub-area, subject to the conclusions of the studies. Development plans should allocate sites away from urban areas where there is good access to transport, to the national road network and where practicable, to a rail freight or water freight facility. Development should not cause unacceptable environmental problems. Where existing sites elsewhere can meet these criteria, expansion will be a sustainable solution to the region's needs. Local authorities should consider the need to allocate in development plans additional smaller scale storage and distribution facilities to serve local markets.</p>
	REGIONAL HOUSING PROVISION
4.42	<p>The overall level of provision for housing is set out in the form of annual rates for each structure plan area. As indicated in PPG3 and PPG11, such rates will provide benchmarks for the monitoring and review process, enabling adjustments to be made every five years, or sooner if necessary, as required by the plan, monitor and manage approach.</p>
4.43	<p>The rates reflect the objectives of the spatial strategy for the region as expressed in the regional economic strategy prepared by emda. It is recognised that economic success will not necessarily create the need for additional housing development in all locations and that where additional housing development is needed it should not be achieved at the expense of the environment. RPG for the adjacent regions, especially the South East and East of England has been taken into account.</p>
4.44	<p>At the regional level the annual average housing provision is anticipated to be around 13,700. This should be regarded as the benchmark against which actual provision is monitored. The figure reflects a number of factors, notably the projected increase of 345,000 in the number of households in the East Midlands in the Government's 1996-based household projections up to 2021. The Regional Planning Body's adjustment for over-estimated migration into Leicestershire reduced this figure by 13,000. In addition, an allowance in the period 1996-2021 of 9,300 for the unmet needs of concealed and sharing households has been included. Transactional vacancies in new stock (about 2%) add 7,000 to the requirement, but offset against that is an assumption that vacancies in the existing stock should be reduced by a half per-cent, which will bring 8,600 dwellings back into use. No allowance is made for demolitions, as a one-for-one replacement is assumed. Prospects for economic growth are adjudged to add 4,000 households over and above the level of household increase in the 1996-based projections. Some of these assumptions are set out in Table One, Appendix Four, of the "Panel Report" (October 2000).</p>

4.45	At the structure plan area level, the allocations take account of the spatial strategy. The annual rates of provision should apply to all development plans until such time as the figures are amended as part of a future review of this guidance, in response to significant changes of circumstances or important new information. Further advice is contained in PPG11 and PPG3.
4.43	NORTHAMPTONSHIRE In the past, Northamptonshire has been one of the most economically buoyant areas of the UK. Much of this growth has been due to the County's role in accommodating the economic and social pressures of other regions, particularly London and the South East, and the West Midlands. Despite the strategies for adjacent regions indicating that there will be less migratory pressure on the region in general, Northamptonshire will continue to be an attractive location for development.

Appendix F: List of Initial Consultees

Name	Company	Address
Route Manager Dave Thomas	Mouchel M25 Managing Agent Area 5 01707 636600 (Tel Hatfield) dave.thomas@mouchel.com	M25 Sphere Leatherhead Motorway Compound Leatherhead Bypass Road Leatherhead KT22 7GZ
Ian Cannard		also St Martin's House The Common Hatfield
Keith Fountain General Manager David Weeks Watchman	Area 8 MAC Carillion/URS 01536 413762 (Telephone) 01536 413700 (Telephone) 01536 511383 (Fax) kfountain@carillion-urs.com	Pytchley Maintenance Compound Pegasus Court Kettering South Business Park Kettering Northamptonshire NN15 6XS
<u>Multi-Modal Studies</u> Commission Manager	Orbit – Transport Solutions around London	Freepost Orbit, Springfield Drive, Leatherhead, KT22 7NL
Commission Manager	West Midlands to East Midlands Multi-Modal Study	W2EM Team GIBB Transport Consulting 7th Floor Alpha Tower Suffolk Street Birmingham B1 1TT
Director - Transportation Mr Howard Blessington	London to South Midlands Multi- Modal Study 0121 2621900 (Telephone) howard.blessington@fabermaunsell.com	Oscar Faber, Beaufort House, 94-96 Newhall Street, Birmingham B3 1PB
Mr David Humby Head of Transportation Planning & Policy	Hertfordshire County Council 01992 556112 (Telephone) 01992 556169 (Fax) david.humby@hertscc.gov.uk	Hertfordshire County Council County Hall Pegs Lane Hertford SG13 8DQ
Head of Transport Planning	Bedfordshire County Council	Bedfordshire County Council County Hall Cauldford Street Bedford MK42 9AP
Head of Transport Planning Team Leader, John Kemplen	Buckinghamshire County Council 01296 395000 (Telephone) 01296 382611 (Fax) 01296 382427 jkemplen@buckscc.gov.uk	Buckinghamshire County Council County Hall Walton Street Aylesbury Bucks. HP20 1UA
Mr Ian Achurch	Northamptonshire County Council 01604 236236 (Telephone) iachurch@northamptonshire.gov.uk	Northamptonshire County Council County Hall Northampton NN1 1DN
Head of Transport Planning	North Hertfordshire District Council 01462 474000 (Telephone) 01462 474227 (Fax) spety@nhdc.gov.uk	Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF

Name	Company	Address
Head of Transport Planning	South Bucks District Council 01753 533333 (Telephone) 01753 529841 (Fax) sbdc@southbucks.gov.uk	Council Offices Windsor Road Slough SL1 2HN
Head of Transport Planning	Daventry District Council 01327 871100 (Telephone) 01327 300011 (Fax) feedback@daventrydc.gov.uk	Daventry District Council Lodge Road Daventry Northamptonshire NN11 5BX
Head of Transport Planning	South Bedfordshire District Council 01582 472222 (Telephone) 01582 474009	The District Offices High Street North Dunstable Bedfordshire LU6 1LF
Head of Transport Planning	Harrow Borough Council	London Borough of Harrow Civic Centre Station Road Harrow Middlesex HA1 2XF
Head of Transport Planning	Barnet Borough Council	Barnet Borough Council The Town Hall Hendon London NW4 4BG Barnet Borough Council Barnet House 1255 High Road Whetstone London N20 0EJ
Head of Transport Planning	Brent Borough Council	Brent Council Town Hall Forty Lane Wembley HA9 9HD
Chris Valentine Head of Planning Services Refer to Mr Jim Tombe Town Centres and Transport Improvement Team Leader	Mid Bedfordshire District Council 01767 602355 (Dir tel) 01767 316717 (Fax) jim.tombe@midbeds.gov.uk	23 London Road Biggleswade Bedford SG18 8ER
D. Godfrey Transportation and Projects Environment and Community Services	Bedford Borough Council	Town Hall St Paul's Square Bedford MK40 1SJ
Mr Nick Edlin Sustainable Transportation Manager	Dacorum Borough Council 01442 228000 (Telephone) 01442 228366 (Dir. Telephone) 01442 228340 (Fax) public.relations@dacorum.gov.uk	Dacorum Civic Centre Hemel Hempstead Herts HP1 1HH
Head of Transport Planning	Hertsmere Borough Council 020 8207 2277 (Telephone) 020 8207 7424 (Fax)	Civic Offices Elstree Way Borehamwood Hertfordshire WD6 1WA

Name	Company	Address
Head of Transport Planning	Three Rivers District Council 01923 776611 (Telephone) 01923 896119 (Fax) enquiries@threerivers.gov.uk	Three Rivers House Northway Rickmansworth Herts. WD3 1RL
Head of Transport Planning	Watford Borough Council 01923 226400 (Telephone) 01923 226133 (Fax) postmaster@watford.gov.uk	Town Hall Watford Herts. WD1 3EX
Head of Transport Planning	Luton Borough Council 01582 546000 (Telephone) webmaster@luton.gov.uk	Town Hall George Street Luton Bedfordshire LU1 2BQ
Head of Transport Planning	South Northamptonshire Council 01327 322322 (Telephone) 01327 322074 (Fax)	Council Offices Springfield Rowcester Northants NN12 6AE
Nick Atkinson Area Manager, North & West Team	Transport for London Street Management Services 020 7941 7057 (Telephone) 020 7941 7260 (Fax) nickatkinson@streetmanagement.org.uk	Windsor House 42-50 Victoria Street London SW1H 0TL
David Rowe Service Development Manager	davidrowe@tfl.gov.uk	
Head of Traffic	City of London Police	26 Old Jewry London EC2R 8DJ
Head of Traffic	Hertfordshire Constabulary	Stanborough Road Welwyn Garden City Herts. AL8 6XF
Head of Traffic	Metropolitan Police	New Scotland Yard Broadway London SW1H 0BG
Head of Traffic	Northamptonshire Police	Wootton Hall Northampton NN4 0JQ
Head of Traffic	Bedfordshire Police	Woburn Road Kempston Bedfordshire MK43 9AX
Head of Transport Planning	Government Office for the South East	Bridge House 1 Walnut Tree Close Guildford Surrey GU1 4GA
Head of Transport Planning	Government Office for the East of England	Heron House 49-53 Goldington Road Bedford MK40 3LL
Head of Transport Planning	Government Office for London	Riverwalk House 157 – 161 Millbank London SW1P 4RR

Name	Company	Address
Mr Will Wiseman, Team Leader	Government Office for the East Midlands	Planning and Transport, The Belgrave Centre Stanley Place Talbot Street Nottingham NG1 SGG
Head of Transport Planning	Greater London Authority	Romney House Marsham Street London SW1P 3PY
Head of Transport Planning	Department of Transport Local Government and the Regions	Eland House Bressenden Place London SW1E 5DU
Head of Transport Planning	South East England Development Agency (SEEDA)	Crosslanes Guildford GU1 1YA
Head of Transport Planning	East Midlands Development Agency 0115 988 8300 (Telephone) 0115 853 3666 (Fax) info@emd.org.uk	Apex Court City Link Nottingham East Midlands NG2 4LA
Head of Transport Planning	London Development Agency	4 th Floor Romney House Marsham Street London SW1P 3PY
Mr Lindsay Gardener Regional Transport Planner	South East England Regional Assembly 01483 555200 (Telephone) 01483 555250 (Fax) secretariat@southeast-ra.gov.uk	Berkeley House Cross Lanes Guildford GU1 1UN
Head of Transport Planning	National Parks Authority	Ponsford House Moreton Hampstead Devon TQ13 8NL
Head of Transport Planning	Railtrack PLC	Railtrack House Euston Square London NW1 2EE
Head of Transport Planning	Virgin Trains	85 Smallbrook Queensway Birmingham B5 4HA
Head of Transport Planning	First Great Eastern	35 Artillery Lane London E1 7LP
Head of Transport Planning	Anglia Railways	St Clare House Princes Street Ipswich IP1 1LY
Head of Transport Planning	Silverlink Train Services	65-67 Clarendon Road Watford WD1 1DP

Name	Company	Address
Head of Transport Planning	WAGN Railway Ltd	Hertford House 1 Cranwood Street London EC1V 9QS
Head of Transport Planning	Midland Mainline	Midland House Nelson Street Derby DE1 2SA
Head of Transport Planning	Central Trains	PO Box 4323 Birmingham B2 4JB
Head of Transport Planning	London Transport Users Committee	Clements House 14-18 Gresham Street London EC2U 7PR
Mr M Strong	SUSTRANS	145 Islingwood Road Brighton Sussex BN2 2SH
Head of Transport Planning	Confederation of Passenger Transport UK	Imperial house 15-19 Kingsway London WC2B 6UN
Head of Transport Planning	UK Public Transport Information	764-768 Holloway Road London N19 3JQ
Mr Mike Lambden General Manager – Planning and Corporate Affairs	National Express Ltd 0121 609 6203 (Dir. Telephone) mike.lambden@nationalexpress.co.uk	Ensign Court 4 Vicarage Road Edgebaston Birmingham B15 3ES
Head of Transport Planning	Stage coach	2-4 Clements Road Ilford IG1 1BA
Head of Transport Planning	First Beeline	Coldborough House Market Street Bracknell Berkshire RG12 15A
Head of Transport Planning	First London	3 rd Floor MacMillan House Paddington Station London W2 1TY
Head of Transport Planning	Association of Train Operating Companies	1 st Floor 40 Bernard Street London WC1 1BY
	AA	Elsinore House 77-85 Fulham Palace Road Hammersmith London W6 8JZ
	RAC	RAC House 1 Forest Road Feltham TW13 7RR

Name	Company	Address
	Transport 2000 020 7613 0743 (Telephone) 020 7613 5280 (Fax)	The Impact Centre 12-18 Hoxton Street London N1 6NG
	Licensed Taxi Drivers Association	Taxi House Woodfield Road London W9 2BA
	Road Haulage Association	35 Monument Hill Weybridge Surrey KT13 8RN
	British Road Federation	Pillar House 194-202 Old Kent Road London SE1 5TG
	British Motorcycle Federation	14-16 Briton Street Leicester LE3 0AA
Mr A Vickers	Association of British Drivers	6 Hilltop Road Kings Langley Herts WD4 8NT
	Motorcycle Action Group	Central Office PO Box 750 Rugby CV21 3ZR
	Cyclist Touring Club	Cotterell House 69 Meadow Goldaming Surrey GU7 3HS
Dr P L Cook	British Horse Society	5 The Street Kingston Lewes East Sussex BN7 3PA
Managing Director	Moto	PO Box 218 Toddington Bedfordshire Luton LU5 6QG
Managing Director	Welcome Break	2 Vantage Court Tickford Street Newport Pagnell MK16 9EZ
	Friends of the Earth	26-28 Underwood Street London N1 7JQ
	National Trust	36 Queen Anne's Gate London SW1H 9AS

Name	Company	Address
	DEFRA - East	Government Offices Victory House Vision Park Histon Cambridge CB4 92R
	DEFRA – East Midlands	The Belgrave Centre Stanley Place Talbot Street Nottingham NG1 5GG
	Civic Trust	17 Carlton House Terrace London SW1Y 5AW
	Forestry Commission	231 Corstorphine Road Edinburgh Scotland EH12 7AT
	FRCA	Rural Development Service Nobel House 17 Smith Square London SW1P 3JR
	Ramblers Association	2 nd Floor Camelford House 87-90 Albert Embankment London SE1 7TW
Mr Michael Brooks	CPRE crps@lineone.net	76 High Street Clophill Bedford MK45 4B
Mr W E (Bill) Driver Northamptonshire Transport Officer	CPRE	51, Wood Street, Geddington, Kettering, Northants., NN14 1BG
	London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority	20 Albert Embankment London SE1 7SD
	Ambulance Service Association	Friars House 157-168 Blackfriars Road London SE1 8EU
	London Ambulance Service NHS Trust	220 Waterloo Road London SE1 8SD
	Chamber of Commerce	33 Queen Street London EC4R 1AP
	Tourist Board	1 Lower Regent Street Piccadilly Circus London SW1Y 4XT

Name	Company	Address
	St Albans District Council	Civic Offices St Peters Street St Albans Herts AL1 3JE
	Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council	Fairway Hall Brook Close Borehamwood Hertfordshire WD6 5BT
	Aldenham Parish Council	1 Aldenham Avenue Radlett Hertfordshire WD7 8HL
	Abbots Langley Parish Council	Council Offices Lanfley Road Abbots Langley Hertfordshire WD5 0EJ
Juliet Pienaar Clerk to St Stephen Parish Council	St Stephen Parish Council 01923 681443 (Tel & fax) ststephenparish@btclick.com	The Parish Centre Station Road Bricket Wood St Albans AL2 3PJ
	Redbourn Parish Council	Village Hall 63 High Street Redbourn St Albans AL3 7LW
	London Colney Parish Council	131 High Street London Colney St Albans AL2 1RJ
	Colney Heath Parish Council	Parish Office Village Hall 83 High Street Colney Heath St Albans AL4 0NS
Mr John Harper Transport Policy Manager Cllr Pat Seymour Mayor of Milton Keynes	Milton Keynes Council john.harper@milton-keynes.gov.uk	Civic Offices 1 Saxon Gate East Central Milton Keynes MK9 3HJ
Mr David Sawyer	Broughton & Milton Keynes Parish Council	3 Dormans Close Milton Keynes Village MK10 9AR
Mr Patrick Langston	Campbell Park Parish Council	126 Vellan Avenue Fishermead Milton Keynes MK6 2SW
Mr Robert Seymour	Gayhurst Parish Meeting	Northern Hay Newport Road Gayhurst Newport Pagnell Bucks MK16 8LG
Mrs Jenny Sharp	Great Linford Parish Council	PO Box 7085 Kiln Farm Milton Keynes MK13 0YJ

Name	Company	Address
Mr Donald Briggs	Hanslope Parish Council	27 Hartwell Road Hanslope Milton Keynes MK19 7BY
Mrs Sheree Watson	Haversham Cum Little Linford Parish Council	Cherry Tree Cottage 1 Spring Lane Alderton Towcester Northants NN12 7LW
Mr Peter Bloomfield	Moulsoe Parish Council	3 Compton Court Cranfield Road Moulsoe Newport Pagnell Bucks MK16 0HQ
Mrs Lesley Welch Town Clerk	Newport Pagnell Town Council	80 High Street Newport Pagnell Bucks MK16 8AQ
Mrs Maria Ripper	Wavendon Parish Council	Wavendon Lodge Lower End Road Wavendon Milton Keynes MK17 8AU
Mrs Sue Draper	Flamstead Parish Council	17 The Coppins Markyate St Albans Herts AL3 8RP
	Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire Ambulance and Paramedic Service	Ambulance Headquarters Hammond Road Bedford MK41 0RG
	2 Shires Ambulance NHS Trust	The Hunters Buckingham Road Deanshanger Milton Keynes MK19 6HL
Mrs G H Wells	Wootton Parish Council 01604 705055 (Telephone) 01604 705777 (Fax) wootton.parishcouncil@virgin.net	29a High Street Wootton Northampton NN4 6LW
	Upton Parish Council	8 Excalibur Close Northampton NN5 4BJ
Mrs J Bruley	Hartwell Parish Council	5 Oak Close Hartwell Northampton NN7 2JX

Name	Company	Address
Mrs S Fowler	Ashton Parish Council	4 Hartwell Road Ashton Northampton NN7 2JR
Mr C Wake	Courteenhall Parish Meeting	The Estate Office Courteenhall Northampton NN7 2QD
Mrs S Chapman	Roads Parish Council	29 Hyde Close Roads Northampton NN7 2LT
Mr N Botterill	Quinton Parish Council	Broadlands Preston Deanery Road Quinton Northampton NN7 2DZ
Mrs V Hartley	Milton Malsor Parish Council	Beech House 17 Deans Row Gayton Northampton N7 3HA
Mrs S Murphy	Rothersthorpe Parish Council	11 Berry Close Rothersthorpe Northampton NN7 3JQ
Mrs A Addison	Kislingbury Parish Council	The Paddocks Baker Street Gayton Northampton NN7 3EZ
Mrs E North	Bugbrooke Community Centre	Camp Close Bugbrooke Northampton NN7 3RW
Mrs K Hill	Harpole Parish Council	12 Cory Gardens Harpole Northampton NN7 4ES
Mrs E North	Upper Heyford Parish Council	The Close Hill Farm Upper Heyford Northampton NN7 3NR
Mrs J Kirkbride	Nether Heyford Parish Council	67 Furnace Lane Nether Heyford Northampton NN7 3JS
Mr Lewis	Lilbourne Parish Council	18 Bracken Drive Rugby CV22 6SP

Name	Company	Address
Miss Woodger	Yelvertoft Parish Council	43 High Street Yelvertoft NN6 6LF
Mr Candelent	Crick Parish Council	20 Bury Dyke Crick Northants NN6 7XA
Mr Asbury	Kilsby Parish Council	Kinvara 9 Rugby Road Kilsby Rugby Warwickshire
Mrs G S Laurie	Watford Parish Council	Corner House Bliss Lane Flore Northampton NN7 4LJ
Mr Hiscock	Whilton Parish Council	Langton House Whilton NN1 5NM
Mr Brody	Brockhall Parish Meeting	The Old Rectory Brockhall NN7 4JY
Mrs Weller	Flore Parish Council	18 Church Street Byfield NN11 6XN
Mr John Ware Head of Planning Services	Rugby Borough Council 01788 533533 (Telephone) 01788 533700 (Direct) 01788 533778 (Fax) rugby.b.c@rugby.gov.uk	Rugby Borough Council PO Box 123 Rugby Warwickshire CV21 2ZP
Chief Executive	Warwickshire County Council	Shire Hall Warwick CV34 4RA
Head of Transport Planning	British Airports Authority	Heathrow Airport 234 Bath Road Hayes Middlesex UB3 5AP
Head of Transport Planning	BAA - Corporate Office	BAA plc 130 Wilton Road London SW1V 1LQ
	London Luton Airport	Percival House Percival Way Luton Beds LU2 9LY
The Chief Executive	Association of Drainage Authorities 01480 411123 (Telephone) 01480 431107 (Fax) drainage@ada.org.uk	The Mews Royal Oak Passage Huntingdon Cambs PE18 6EA

Name	Company	Address
Head of Transport Planning	British Waterways	The Toll House Delamere Terrace Little Venice London W2 6ND
Mr James Clifton B & MK Project Manager	British Waterways 01923 208736 (Dir tel) 01923 208787 (Fax) james.clifton@britishwaterways.co.uk	Brindley Suite Willow Grange Church Road Watford Hertfordshire WD17 4QA
Nigel Fawthrop Customer Services Manager Contact Pru Khimasia	Environment Agency Central Area 01480 414581 (Telephone) 01480 413381 (Fax) pru.khimasia@environment- agency.gov.uk	Broomholme Lane Brampton Huntingdon Cambridgeshire PE28 4NE
	Environment Agency	Apollo Court 2 Bishops Square Business Park St Albans Road West Hatfield Herts AL10 9EX
	English Heritage – London	23 Saville Row London W1S 2ET
Miss Ann Plackett Regional Planner (East and West Midlands)	English Heritage – East Midlands Region 01604 735450 (Telephone) ann.plackett@english-heritage.org.uk	44 Derngate Northampton N1 1UH
Rachel Fancy Asst. Conservation Officer	English Nature Essex, Hertfordshire & London Team	Ormond House 26/27 Boswell Street London WC1N 3JZ
	English Nature - Herts	Colchester Office Harbour House Hythe Quay Colchester Essex CO2 8JF
Mr David Denman Conservation Officer	English Nature – Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire Team	Ham Lane House Ham Lane Nene Park Orton Waterville Peterborough PE2 5UR
	Countryside Agency London	Dacre House 19 Dacre Street London SW1H 0DH
	Countryside Agency East Midlands	Regional Office 18 Market Place Bingham Nottingham NG13 8AP
	Countryside Agency East of England	Ortona House 110 Hills Road Cambridge CB2 1LQ

Name	Company	Address
	Wildlife Trust – London	London Wildlife Trust Harling House 47-51 Great Suffolk Street London SE1 0BS
	Berks, Bucks, Oxon Wildlife Trust	BBOWT The Lodge 1 Armstrong Road Littlemore Oxford OX4 4NT
Pauline Oliver Conservation Officer	Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust 01727 858901 (Telephone) 01727 854542 hertswt@cix.co.uk	Grebe House St Michael's Street St Albans Herts AL3 4SN
	Wildlife Trust Bedfordshire office	Priory County Park Barkers Lane Bedford MK41 9SH
	Wildlife Trust Northampton office	Lings House Billing Lings Northampton NN3 8BE
	RSPB UK Headquarters	The Lodge Sandy Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
Mr Colin Wilkinson Conservation Officer (Planning and Local Government)	RSPB Central England	46 The Green South Bar Banbury Oxfordshire OX16 9AB
Mr Steve Gilbert	RSPB South-East England 01273 763601 (Telephone) Contact helen.dargan@rspb.org.uk	2nd Floor 42 Frederick Place Brighton East Sussex BN1 4EA
Mrs Lyn Lyman	Hulcote & Salford Parish Council	Lodge Cottage School Lane Husborne Crawley Bedfordshire MK43 0UY
Mrs Lyn Lyman	Woburn Parish Council	Lodge Cottage School Lane Husborne Crawley Bedfordshire MK43 0UY
Mrs D Maggs	Aspley Heath Parish Council	68 Church Road Aspley Heath Woburn Sands MK17 8TA
Mrs M Fitzgerald	Aspley Guise Parish Council	10 Bedford Road Aspley Guise Milton Keynes MK17 8DJ

Name	Company	Address
Mrs Lyn Lyman	Husborne Crawley Parish Council	Lodge Cottage School Lane Husborne Crawley MK43 0UY
Mrs P Forrest	Ridgmont Parish Council	29 Turnpike Road Husborne Crawley Bedford MK43 0XB
Mr C West	Lidlington Parish Council	“Westgrave” 17 Lombard Street Lidlington Bedfordshire MK43 0RP
Mrs C A Carter	Flitwick Town Parish Council	Rufus Centre Steppingley Road Flitwick Bedfordshire MK45 1AH
Mrs H Mason	Eversholt Parish Council	Toddington Manor Lodge Park Road Toddington Bedfordshire MK45 5BL
Mr J P Read	Westoning Parish Council	77 Station Road Amphill Bedford MK45 2RE
Mrs M Rutherford	Harlington Parish Council	2A Pilgrims Close Harlington Bedfordshire LU5 6LX
Mrs Helen Mason	Tingrith Parish Meeting	Toddington Manor Lodge Park Road Toddington Bedfordshire MK45 5BL
Mrs J D Saunders	Toddington Parish Council	Parish Office Toddington Village Hall Leighton Road Toddington Bedfordshire LU5 6AN
Mrs B Heley	Chalgrave Parish Council	Foxley Tebworth Road Wingfield Leighton Buzzard Bedfordshire LU6 6DN
Mrs P Kitchener	Streatley Parish Council	1 Grange Gardens Toddington Bedfordshire LU5 6DH

Name	Company	Address
Mr R Barker	Sundon Parish Council	469 Dunstable Road Luton Bedfordshire LU4 8DE
Mr G Twiss	Houghton Regis Town Council	Peel Street Houghton Regis Dunstable Bedfordshire LU5 5EY
Mrs S Goodwin	Caddington Parish Council	14 Wentworth Gardens Toddington Dunstable Bedfordshire LU5 6ED
Mr R Walden	Dunstable Town Council	Grove House 76 High Street North Dunstable Bedfordshire LU6 1LE
Mr Nigel Rose	South East Forum for Sustainability Transport Group	Spinney Side Holme Park Farm Lane Sonning-on-Thames Reading RG4 6SX
Dr P Wadey	British Horse Society	Holland Farm Hill field Lane Aldernam Herts WD25 8DJ

Appendix G: Summary of Highways Agency Strategic Plans

The White Paper and the associated Roads Review, “A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England”, changed the role of the Highways Agency from one of a road builder and maintainer to that of a Network Operator and provided the HA with a new strategic aim:

“to contribute to sustainable development by maintaining, operating and improving the trunk road network in support of the Government's integrated transport and land use policies”

The Highways Agency has therefore been given a new role as the network operator for motorways and other trunk roads in England. On top of their traditional role of building and maintaining England's trunk roads, they now have a remit to actively influence and control how our roads are used so as to provide the best possible service to all users. They are no longer just a maintainer and builder of roads.

Their new role requires them to maintain, operate and improve the network. They work in partnership with other organisations, both in the public and the private sector, to deliver a better service to their customers – the road users and the general public.

The HA have prepared a series of Strategic Plans to explain their new role and what they will be doing in the next five to ten years to promote the Government's policies for sustainable development and help deliver integrated transport solutions.

Actions and objectives set out in these Plans are being taken forward as Route Management Strategies are developed for individual routes in consultation with users and others affected. These RMSs provide an important tool for implementing actions identified in the Strategic Plans.

RMS studies involve stakeholders and the public and provide a consistent, open and integrated framework for identifying objectives, problems, and possible solutions for routes on our core network.

Ministers have identified Investment Areas, Investment Criteria and Key Objectives for the Agency in its management of England's core network of trunk roads, including motorways.

The three investment areas are:

- Maintain
- Operate
- Improve

The five criteria for investment are:

- Safety
- Environment
- Economy
- Accessibility
- Integration

The Highways Agency's Eight Key Objectives are:

- Giving priority to maintenance whilst minimising whole life costs

- Developing the network operator role
- Reducing congestion and increasing journey time reliability
- Carrying out the targeted investment programme
- Minimising the environmental impact of the trunk road network
- Improving safety for all road users
- Working in partnership and promoting choice and information for travellers
- Being a good employer

Each investment criteria and investment area is the subject of a Strategic Plan developed by the Highways Agency. A summary of the eight plans is given below:

1. Maintain

The White Paper has made maintenance the Agency's top priority. The Strategic Plan is concerned with maximising the efficiency of maintenance by keeping the network in a safe condition whilst minimising:

- whole life costs
- disruption
- the effect on the environment

2. Operate

The Agency's new network operator role includes all that they do, but the Operate Strategic Plan is more specific. It deals with actively influencing and controlling how the network is used and the wider management of resources to meet customer needs, assist integration, and deliver an increased role for public transport. The Plan will identify actions to help implement four inter-related and forward-looking themes identified in the White Paper:

- providing real time traffic and travel information
- actively managing traffic
- making better use of available capacity
- involving customers more

3. Improve

The Government's Roads Review, "A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England" gave the Agency a programme to start 37 carefully-targeted schemes costing £1.4 billion on its core network within the next seven years. The Plan will focus on the actions the Agency will take to implement this programme and consider our input to the development of any future major schemes that emerge via the new Regional Planning bodies.

4. Safety

Safety is a high priority; the Agency makes an important contribution to road safety in England and is committed to contributing to the Government's 2010 targets for reducing road casualties. The Plan identifies target user groups, establishes specific safety objectives for each group, and identifies a range of issues and actions to help achieve casualty reductions. It will ensure a consistent approach to safety across the network and improve the management and monitoring of safety work.

5. Environment

The Plan, “Towards a balance with nature” demonstrates the HA’s ambition to do more than in the past. It includes action plans to assist biodiversity, to manage local air quality, noise, waste materials and water quality, and for landscape, townscape and heritage issues.

6. Economy

The Economy Plan is concerned with reducing overall travel costs and increasing journey time reliability, minimising construction and maintenance costs, and with supporting regeneration. Much of the detail may be covered in other Strategic Plans and the Plan will act as a signpost to actions contained elsewhere.

7. Accessibility

This Plan takes as its basis the White Paper's definition of Accessibility: "Improving access to everyday facilities to those without a car and reducing community severance". It is concerned with improving access, both to public transport and in general, for all non-motorised users. It will include action plans to assist pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and vulnerable user groups including disabled people.

8. Integration

The Integration Strategic Plan is primarily concerned with broader policy issues. It will explain how the Agency will assist the implementation of Government policies to integrate all forms of transport and land use planning to develop a better and more efficient transport system. The Plan will provide a link to other Plans that detail actions to assist the integration between different modes of transport.

Appendix H: Route Performance Framework

Appendix I: Proposed Programme for the Route Management Strategy

Appendix J: Summary of Accident Data M1 Junction 1-19 / M10

location	1999			2000			2001			Total	Severity Ratio	length	Accident Rate
	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Fatal	Serious	Slight		1999-2001 average	(km)	
J1-2		5	17	1	2	13		4	15	57	0.21	3.9	0.29
J 2-4		6	24		5	8	1	2	17	63	0.22	6.8	0.12
J 4-5		6	17	1	3	28		6	24	85	0.19	7	0.13
J 5-6		3	8		4	14	1	2	13	45	0.22	3.6	0.13
J6-6a	1	2	5			5		1	6	20	0.20	1.3	0.22
J 6a-7		7	46		11	65	3	5	48	185	0.14	3.9	0.30
J 7-8		6	8		3	15		1	17	50	0.20	1.1	0.25
J 8-9		22	93	1	13	120	1	10	112	372	0.13	7	0.40
J 9-10	1	6	64	1	11	109		8	83	283	0.10	3.8	0.52
J 10-11		3	36		1	43		5	31	119	0.08	5.3	0.18
J 11-12		1	28		1	38		7	36	111	0.08	8.2	0.13
J 12-13	2	2	29	1	6	23		4	27	94	0.16	10.3	0.07
J 13-14		4	22		1	33	1	4	26	91	0.11	7.5	0.10
J 14- 15	1	7	50	3	8	63	2	4	67	205	0.12	19.5	0.07
J 15 -15a		2	5		3	13		2	10	35	0.20	3.8	0.08
J 15a-16	2	4	12		2	17	1	4	7	49	0.27	5.7	0.07
J 16-17	1	6	26	1	8	29		6	25	102	0.22	14.5	0.06
J 17-18			5		1	2	1	1	4	14	0.21	2.7	0.05
J18-19		4	10		1	10	1	4	11	41	0.24	6	0.06
M10 -M1			2			2				4	0.00	0.9	0.15
10 - 10a			5			7		1	5	18	0.06	4.8	0.11

Appendix K: Local Transport Plans

Northamptonshire County Council			
Local transport Plan 2001/02-2005-06 (issued July 2000)			
	<i>Page</i>	<i>Clause</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1	21	3.1.3	Recognition of Multi-Modal Studies and M1 J19 road based study
2	53	3.6.2	County Council welcomes study of M1 J19 and hopes that this will give consideration to south facing slip roads from the A14 to the M1 enabling HGV's to travel direct and attract other vehicles from less suitable roads in the north west of the county.
3	128	6.9	M1 J15a-16 identified as a route requiring casualty reduction.
Annual Progress Report 2002			
1	11	2.21	Successful transfer of responsibility between the county Council and Highways Agency of the A45 (J15 of M1 to A14) trunking.
2	18	2.38	Air Quality Management Areas soon to be announced in connection with traffic on the M1.

Hertfordshire County Council			
Local transport Plan 2001/02-2005-06 (issued July 2000)			
	<i>Page</i>	<i>Clause</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1	19	3.6	Recognition of Multi Modal Studies
2	188	5.34	CC Supports M1 J6a – 10 widening subject to the outcome of the London to South Midlands MMS
Annual Progress Report 2002			
1	27	7.2	M1 RMS recognised along with MMS's
2	58	Annex B	Borough wish to ensure that recommendations arising from MMS's do not impact adversely on Hertsmere. Opportunity should be taken to explore actions to improve access within the Borough, particularly east west movements.

Bedfordshire County Council (excluding Luton & Dunstable)			
Local transport Plan 2001/02-2005-06 (issued July 2000)			
	<i>Page</i>	<i>Clause</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1	68	4.11.2	Recognised MMS but concerned at the continued uncertainty caused by further study work.
2	69	4.11.5	Scale of problems caused by M1 through Dunstable warrants the provision of a bypass.
			A421 between M1 J13 and A1 can not fulfil its strategic role. The Highways Agency is reliant on the private sector and local development for significant improvements to the Bedford to M1 section and this is not an acceptable sole means of providing an adequate trunk road network.

3	70	4.11.1 2	Ridgmont and Husborne Crawley south of J13 suffer from high volumes of traffic including HGV's passing through towards J13. Progress in evaluating a bypass scheme is being made.
Annual Progress Report 2002			
1	8	1.14- .15	Recognition of RMS
2	36	3.39	Ridgmont bypass - ongoing talks with HA with regard to the junction with the A421 Trunk Road. A revised planning application expected within next few months, leading on to Order publication in November 2002 and construction in 2004/5. May have impact on J13 of M1.

Luton & Dunstable			
Local transport Plan 2001/02-2005-06 (issued July 2000)			
	<i>Page</i>	<i>Clause</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1	9		Air quality in residential areas around Luton along M1 are a cause for concern.
2	10		M1 motorway severs the conurbation with limited bridging points. This also channels high levels of traffic through Luton and Dunstable.
3	11		M1 through Luton operates above its design capacity for much of the working day and is regularly heavily congested. Any incident can have a devastating effect on traffic movements within the conurbation.
4	11		Bedfordshire supports widening of M1 but this is subject to MMS outcomes.
5	52		Considering M1-A5 in next plan period.
6	57		The primary major scheme within the Luton - Dunstable LTP is the Translink – a 12km segregated busway using the former rail alignment between Dunstable and Luton Airport Parkway to enhance conurbation services.
7	57		Further extension to the park and ride at junction 10A of the M1 could follow a plan to implement a 12km guided busway.
8	64 & 120		Area near J10a identified as a potential park and ride facility for Luton as part of a larger development for an innovation centre, technology village and university campus. P&R planned for 88-900 spaces with 500-600 initial phase. Programme provides for £500,000 being spent on P&R in the first year. Proposed sports stadium development in association with an express coach transfer facility.
9	65		Park and ride facility to west of London on M1 at Toddington services being considered by the Highways Agency.
10	82		It is hoped that MMS and study on transporting freight will address problems of congestion afflicting goods traffic using the M1.
11	91		DETR have identified the M1 in Luton as needing works to provide a quiet running surface or acoustic barriers to reduce noise.
12	109		As part of the east Luton Corridor Improvement, proposed junction

			improvement to J10A/Airport Way/London Road
13	123		Plans to convert part time signals at junction 11 to full time operation.
14	125		Large volume of traffic from A5 uses the A5120 going through Houghton as an alternative route to /from Luton resulting in queues at peak hour.
15	180		To determine the effectiveness of and develop the local transport plan, a programme of travel counts has been established. The results will help to produce an annual statement of traffic trends in the network. The M1 route provides one of three traffic count routes.
16	197		Support for construction of A5 Dunstable Eastern Bypass and Dunstable/Houghton Regis northern bypass from A5 to A6 via new junction 11A on M1. Area viewed as a priority for economic regeneration but lack of strategic roads/proposals for investment in roads means this objective can not be fulfilled. Await results of MMS.
Annual Progress Report 2002			
1	10	2.28	The Highways Agency in conjunction with Luton BC and Thameslink are going to erect signs on the M1 north of junction 10 to encourage motorists to complete their journey from Luton Airport Parkway station.
2	20	3.39	A stage 3 air quality assessment has been completed and the only area there may be exposure of people to pollution is a narrow strip within 65m of the M1. Monitoring is being carried out at 15 sites along the route. As the M1 is a dominant source of pollutants in the area, the Local Authority wrote formerly to the Highways Agency on 25 th October 2001 and HA expressed their willingness to work in partnership in preparing the Action Plan.
3	20	3.41	HA has published plans to install acoustic barriers alongside the M1 near junction 11 to take place in 2002-2004.
4	25	Case study D	Translink The Translink scheme will be delivered by a public private partnership and will be a guided busway and will be open to all operators provided the buses are equipped for guideway operation and meet standards of accessibility, noise and emissions. A business case for Translink was submitted to government as a major scheme and a decision on funding is expected in summer 2002.. If this is forthcoming, a Transport and Works Act submission will be made during autumn 2002 with a view to receiving approval early 2004 and services are expected to commence late 2007.
5	26	Case study E	The East Luton Corridor (south) Improvements Improvements include redesigning junction 10A allowing direct movements from the M1 to Airport parkway through the middle of the roundabout. Provision of direct links between south and east Kimpton Road roundabout so as to give non conflicting paths for m1 – Airport traffic. A business case was submitted in July 2001. Provisional funding of £21,350,000 has been given. Luton BC are appointing a project management team and are preparing to invite tenders for prelim design work. Subject to a successful public Inquiry (if needed), work could start in 2004 and open 2006.
3	31	4.39	Highways Agency have received planning permission to erect signs alongside M1 to alert motorists of using Luton Airport Parkway as a railhead for London and the Thameslink.

Milton Keynes Council			
Local transport Plan 2001/02-2005-06 (issued July 2000)			
	<i>Page</i>	<i>Clause</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1	21	3.2.6.3	Section of the M1 serving the area and recognition of the London to South Midlands MMS
2	22	3.2.6.3	There will be signalling improvements at junction 14. Milton Keynes council fully support the provision of a new junction between junction 13 and 14 which would support the approved expansion of Milton Keynes beyond 2006 on the eastern flank to the M1
3	43	4.9	Access to the M1 should be a priority. This is a concern and will be addressed in LSM. GOSE had invited Beds CC to be part of the main steering group, Milton Keynes will be working closer with Beds CC in the future.
4	49	5.1.1.6	A public transport system from Milton Keynes centre to the park and ride at junction 14 is to be investigated
5	59	5.2.3	The M1 corridor will be designated an air quality management area and the council will undertake roadside emissions tests.
6	86	5.3.2	The 'Coachway' close to Junction 14, M1 is being used as an informal parking area for people who then car share for onward trips on the M1. This is also being used as a temporary park and ride from September 2000. Milton Keynes plan to develop this park and ride site from 2002
7	104	5.4.3.4	Proposed dualling of the A421 from the A421/A5130 junction at junction 13. Proposed dualling of the A509 from the junction of the A509/ M1 at junction 14 to the A422 (Newport Pagnell Bypass)
8	117	5.8.2	Forecasts for the m1 corridor suggest that it will not meet the NAQS objective for nitrogen dioxide. Therefore, the corridor will be designated an air quality management area. Improving the situation may be difficult as the M1, the main source of nitrogen dioxide, is not a local road. Any measures will be incorporated in a revised LTP.
9	125	6.1.8	Christmas park and Ride services were provided at the MK bowl in 1998 and the Coachway in 1999. The service from the coachway will become permanent from January 2001. The provision of a permanent site is included in the development brief.
Annual Progress Report 2002			
1	4	2.15	Free park and ride service was run from the Coachway at junction 14 of the M1 on a permanent basis throughout 2001/02. This service was withdrawn in January 2002 on the grounds that the service was premature and did not represent good value for money.
2	13	3.64 & 3.65	There are 4 stations for air quality monitoring. A more detailed air quality modelling study has been undertaken along the M1 corridor than the stage 3 assessment.
3	13	3.66	Noise pollution in Newport Pagnell from the M1 has been identified as a problem to be addressed in the M1 RMS.
4	27	8.10	The Highways Agency have programmed an 'integration and safety scheme at junction 14 of the M1 for 2002/03.