

A453 Widening – Presentation at Kegworth Community Centre 16.09.04

Post presentation question and answer (Q&A) record.

Ian Malcolm – Nottingham City Councillor

Q/Comments

1. The Multi Modal Study was developed as a comprehensive integrated transport package. It assumed a transfer to public transport. Surface junctions through Clifton won't work. Will there be a push for funding the NET in return for widening the road? (i.e. will the HA lobby the DoT for funding in return for going ahead with the road scheme)
2. Concern about footbridges (danger of objects thrown). Effect on privacy of nearby homes and wheelchair access.
3. The MMS recommended a 30mph speed limit through Clifton. Why does this scheme retain 40mph?
4. The widening may ease congestion through Clifton but it will make it far worse between Farnborough Road and Silverdale.
5. Concern about safety. Recent work criticised. Concern expressed about red light jumping. Wonders why there are no cameras through Clifton yet. Believes that the HA consistently refuse to put cameras in to justify widening scheme.

Response

1. SH said that NET funding was not the HA responsibility or remit. If NET does not happen it will have an adverse effect on the widened A453 performance.
2. Footbridges – Studying this area at the moment. Detailed design will look at it in more detail.
3. Speed limit – HA made the comment at the time of the MMS that they wished the 40mph limit to be retained. The geometry of the scheme and the signals should help to enforce a 40mph limit, but this will be kept under review. SH said that the city council have similar roads with a 40mph limit.
4. Silverdale section of A453. SH said that the Area team are looking into this issue, which had been raised at the last public inquiry. He also said that the ECI contractor is likely to be asked to look into it.

5. SH said this issue was being addressed by the Speed Camera Partnership. Adrian Slack (HA Area Team) said a case was being prepared by the Nottingham Safety Partnership and offered to discuss the matter further after the presentation.

Mike Ashton - Chairman of the Clifton, Wilford & Silverdale Forum

Q/Comments

1. A 70mph speed limit approaching Crusader was not acceptable due to proximity of domestic properties from a noise and safety point of view.
2. Queens Drive is 40mph S4. It is adjacent to the river and industrial premises and not comparable to Clifton. NTU nearby. Property near Esso garage seriously affected. Complaint about new fencing and red road painting.
3. Point made about noise problem. Thanked the HA for money for some trees. Would like to see 'silent' tarmac used. Would like a serious central reservation throughout to prevent crossing.

Response

SH said that they would have physical barriers in places and is aware of the safety problem, which would be looked at during detailed design stage. He also stated that the HA use low noise surfacing as a matter of course. Speed cameras would be considered where appropriate. Stated that some people will always cross the road in dangerous places no matter how high the barrier or obstacle.

PW said an unprotected central reservation encouraged uncontrolled crossing. He also said that surveys to confirm pedestrian crossing corridors would be undertaken as part of any detailed design.

PW commented on safety at the Farnborough Road junction. He believes that the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles will be resolved with the introduction of a signalised roundabout which will control/constrain speed. He also mentioned linking the traffic signals together.

PW said that with Crusader signalised and appropriate signage, speed would be brought down. If a NET junction is required then the speed limit change would move further away from the urban area (i.e. to the southwest further into the rural section).

SH said that they would look to retain the position of the existing speed limit change. Clarification made as PW forgot that the speed limit change occurred as the A453 enters the urban area and not at Crusader.

Greg Farnsworth – Gotham Parish Council

Q/Comments

Pleased with the progress since the MMS.

Said that people will still be queuing no matter what was done. He said that the roundabout and pedestrian crossing signals would slow the traffic down anyway. There would still be disjointed traffic as now. Believes there will be little difference. Would like to see it joined up with the NET and speed cameras as a whole package. Would have liked a joint presentation. Approves of the rural section and says that the residents of Gotham will be very relieved. He believes the widening of the urban section is pointless.

Response

PW/SH said that they see this as the highway part of the MMS package and not stand alone as Mr Farnsworth. The aim is for an urban road with the safety factor predominant. PW mentioned traffic demand and believes that flows through Clifton will operate adequately assuming other measures are taken. Stressed that it is not an independent scheme.

GF response

Accepts that an integrated scheme is a good package. Says that as the HA are not in control of other measures then how can 'we' see it as an integrated scheme?

SH response

Said that there is liaison between the HA and the other schemes.

GF response

Wants all parties to come together for a joint presentation rather than a piecemeal fashion.

Grant Butterworth – Nottingham City Council Planning.

Said that the NET phase 2 technical appraisal was with the DfT which answered their questions. Now awaiting the go ahead from the DfT.

Lesley Pendleton – Leicestershire County Council (Kegworth Area)

Q/Comments

Asked about a link between the M1 J24a and the A453. Said that the proposed Parkway Station does not have a GSJ whereas our scheme did.

Response

SH said that the link involving a bridge over the railway line was being considered as part of the M1 widening scheme. Said that the Parkway scheme is a private development and that they would need to liaise with the HA when appropriate regarding the A453 widening scheme.

Mike Harbron – Rushcliffe Borough Council

Q/Comments

1. A60 scheme had bigger emphasis on alternative transport measures for non-vehicular users.
2. Believes that the ECI contract encourages contractors to save money by changing the design. E.g. off line building to keep traffic moving; remove existing access bridges/diversions; link roads built and junctions removed.

Response

1. SH said that the HA are committed to providing cycle and pedestrian facilities. These issues would be looked at in depth at the detailed design stage.
2. ECI contracts have to demonstrate value for money. HA would not allow the contractor to depart from their brief. Budgets are set and the contractor can make savings but not at the expense of important measures. HA fully in control, and design would be further tested at public inquiry.

John Pike – Kegworth Parish Council

Q/Comments

1. At the moment he can only realistically get access via Gotham due to the heavy traffic on the A453.

2. Complaint about the number of bus stops and the lack of coordination between the pedestrian traffic lights. He would like to see a single access to/from NTU.
3. Concern expressed about the ECI contractor. Would like to see a constraint on the number of closures of the A453. Problems caused on local roads during A453 closures.
4. Leicestershire County Council not included on the list at the end of the brochure. Can they have any future relevant literature made available in Kegworth at the Parish Office?

Response

1&2. PW said that the HA are in discussions with NTU about reducing accesses. Issue noted and will be addressed. PW said that the signals would be linked together and highlighted the possibility of linking into the City's traffic management system.

3. Restrictions will be made and closures kept to off peak times if possible. SH stressed that he does not want to mislead anyone about extent of disruption. There will be less disruption on the parts of the rural section where work is off-line, but more on the urban section, especially at access points. HA would work closely with the City and County Councils.

SB said that strategic diversions from the M1 via the A52 would be put in place.

SH said that the ECI contractor would have restrictions on which local roads they could use.

4. SH said that the HA will provide deposit documents to the two councils.

John Pike

Q/Comments

The queue is sometimes back as far as Thrumpton but not down to Farnborough Road from NTU. (making a point about the pedestrian crossings near NTU holding traffic up)

Response

The traffic lights through Clifton would be linked up to regulate the crossing periods in order to smooth the flow. SH said that a balance needs to be struck between the needs of road users and pedestrians/cyclists.

Brian Hill – Chairman, Ratcliffe on Soar Parish Meeting

Q/Comments

The village is very low lying and has had problems with flooding. The A453 is at its most elevated at Ratcliffe and visual and noise pollution would be made even worse by the widening.

He would want environmental mitigation. Would like trees on high embankments.

Response

SH said that environmental considerations are a key design feature and not simply an “add on”. Stated that the HA are the largest tree planters in the UK.

Roger Hawkins – Clerk of Barton in Fabis Parish Council

Q/Comments

What is the criterion for allowing junctions in rural areas?

Response

Tony Parker quoted the DRMB requirement of 1km spacing between junction slip lanes.

John Pike

Q/Comments

Question about the width of the bridge over the River Soar and effect of scheme on river. Has anyone from the Environment Agency been contacted about the scheme? Concerns about impact of construction programme on river users, including businesses.

Response

SH/PW said that HA had met the Environment Agency and would consult them and British Waterways.