

- 1. The Lincolnshire County Council (A15 Lincoln Eastern Bypass)  
(Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2014**
- 2. The Lincolnshire County Council (A15 Lincoln Eastern Bypass)  
Compulsory Purchase Order 2014**
- 3. Application In Relation To Proposed Compulsory Purchase Of  
Land Held By The Canal & River Trust**

**Department for Transport Reference: NATTRAN/EM/LAO/0084**

**Response to Questions Relating to Proof of Evidence of Mr David  
Chetwynd**

**Mr Alex Lake**

## 1 Responses to Questions to Mr Chetwynd from Mr Alex Lake

1.1 **Question 1:** Please can you confirm how seasonal traffic has been considered at the A158 Wragby Road roundabout and if this has been factored into the modelling?

1.2 **Answer:** It is agreed that the traffic modelling does not reflect seasonal peaks in traffic, nor does it reflect times when traffic levels will be lower than average. The model uses the industry standard approach, as required by the Department for Transport for scheme assessment, of adopting a neutral month to reflect 'normal' non-seasonal conditions that drivers would expect to experience for the majority of the year. It should be noted that summer seasonal peaks in traffic flows only occur on certain routes while flow levels on most local roads are generally lower than in neutral months as children are not attending school and many people are on holiday and hence not driving on their normal routes during peak periods. Thus, it is not the case that summer traffic flows will be higher on all roads as implied by Mr Lake, and so using a neutral month is the appropriate approach.

1.3 **Question 2:** Please can Mr Chetwynd confirm the strategy for safeguarding future dualling as this is unclear to me? What engineering aspects of the LEB design have been designed at the year of opening such that they can accommodate a future dualling scheme?

1.4 **Answer:** As stated in para 2.7 of my proof: '*A revised single carriageway scheme was therefore developed that used the approximate footprint of the northbound element of the dual carriageway scheme that had been granted planning permission in 2010*'. This remains the same as it has since the single carriageway was adopted back in 2011 and there is no reason for Mr Lake to be unclear about this matter. The scheme that is under consideration at this Inquiry is the same as that at the last Inquiry.

1.5 Section 4 of my proof of evidence (LCC4) clearly details the individual elements of future proofing and therefore the strategy for safeguarding of future proofing of the LEB.

1.6 **Question 3:** Please can Mr Chetwynd confirm and describe what option studies have been carried out by LCC for Traffic calming within Hawthorn Road and the Carlton Estate.

1.7 **Answer:** There are currently no Traffic Calming option studies available for Hawthorn Road either side of the LEB, beyond the benefit that will be derived from the stopping up of Hawthorn Road on the western side through the delivery of the

scheme; as the remaining part of the route falls outside the scope of the scheme for which Planning Permission has been granted. Following completion of the scheme LCC will under continue to review the operation of the network with a view to carrying out studies and implementing any measures that may be identified as arising from such studies.

- 1.8 There are currently no Traffic Calming option studies for the Carlton Estate that would implement any further measures over and above those which already exist. However parking restrictions are due to be implemented in August of 2015 along Carlton Boulevard and have been designed to ensure free flow of traffic but with areas of on street parking retained to help with traffic calming. Further proposals may be investigated in association with the school site once the County Councils new policy document on parking problems at schools has been through its forthcoming consultation process with a view to being implemented late 2015.
- 1.9 Furthermore it should be noted that traffic calming measures are only required where there is a problem associated with a particular location which should not be there. For example; if a local network is congested with local traffic, there are few options that the Highway Authority could pursue other than to reduce vehicle speeds. If however the problem is due to non local traffic, which could be deterred from using that route by traffic calming measures then that is different. The modelling of the proposed scheme before the Inquiry indicates that there will be a reduction in the volume of non local traffic through the Carlton Estate as demonstrated in Mr Smiths Proof of Evidence. On that basis there is no compelling case to review the need for traffic calming other than that currently under review as described in para 1.8.
- 1.10 In the scenario of keeping Hawthorn Road Open the volume of non local traffic will increase and therefore will require intervention by the Highway Authority.
- 1.11 **Question 4:** Please can Mr Chetwynd confirm and describe what option studies have been carried out by LCC for Capacity enhancement at Hawthorn Road / Bunkers Hill junction.
- 1.12 **Answer:** With regard to the existing Ghost Island Right Turn junction; there is no requirement to consider capacity enhancement under the proposed LEB as traffic is reduced with the closure of Hawthorn Road as stated in Mr Smiths Proof of Evidence. An assessment has been carried out in response to the alternative proposals submitted by Objectors and is in accordance with TD42/95. The standard provides a starting point for junction choice with an assessment that uses the modelled data for the scheme. Under the 2018 Do Minimum Scenario (no LEB) Bunkers Hill will have an AADT of 14610 vehicles and Hawthorn Road an AADT of

- 8189 vehicles. When assessed against Figure 2/2 of TD42/95 this places the choice of junction unambiguously in the category of a Roundabout (or other type) junction.
- 1.13 A roundabout was proposed as an alternative prior to the previous Inquiry but discounted due to the significant costs associated with constructing such a provision. These would include significant stats diversions and the extensive demolition of residential property.
- 1.14 The very nature of a major / minor priority junction means that there is little scope for improving flows through minor geometric changes as there are with existing roundabouts for example. Alterations to the side road (Hawthorn Road) have been modelled in PICADY however, and there is little benefit to be gained from minor alterations to the geometry of the junction as it is difficult to deal with the in-balanced flows that source from Hawthorn Road in the AM peak and Bunkers Hill in the PM peak.
- 1.15 It has been concluded therefore that signalisation of this junction would be the only option available should Hawthorn Road remain open post completion of the LEB.
- 1.16 **Question 5:** Please can Mr Chetwynd confirm and describe what option studies have been carried out by LCC for Capacity enhancement at the Greetwell Road / Allenby Road junction.
- 1.17 **Answer:** An assessment has been carried out at the junction; which is currently a double mini roundabout, with a view to providing additional capacity as permitted development under existing Highway powers that also bears in mind the potential for future signalisation under the proposed NEQ development.
- 1.18 A solution has been developed that widens the eastern entry onto the junction from Greetwell Road to two lanes. This has been achieved by widening the carriageway into the North verge within the existing Highway Boundary as well as moving the existing pedestrian refuge to the North. The revised layout has been modelled in ARCADY and performs to an RFC of just above 0.8.
- 1.19 **Question 5:** Please can Mr Chetwynd confirm and describe what option studies have been carried out by LCC for Safety enhancements on Kennel Lane, Greetwell Road, A158 and / or Hawthorn Road.
- 1.20 **Answer:** There are currently no option studies for safety enhancements available as part of the development of the scheme insofar as the routes are outside of the scope of the scheme for which planning permission has been granted.
- 1.21 The Highway Network Manager has identified a scheme to resolve a capacity issue on the existing Kennel Lane approach to the A158. A scheme has been proposed to

provide an additional lane on the Kennel Lane approach that would reduce delays caused by vehicles waiting to turn right into the north bound carriageway of the A158. It had been hoped to deliver the improvement in parallel with the recent Grant funded resurfacing works however this was not possible due to the requirement to carry out Statutory Undertakers plant diversions to deliver the improvement. This scheme remains an aspiration of the Highway Network Manager.

1.22 **Question 6:** Within the geometric assessment of the alternative routes, please can Mr Chetwynd confirm if the A158 roundabout has been included.

1.23 **Answer:** Roundabouts are treated as discontinuities under the assessment process as defined in Paragraph 1.7 of TD9 and have therefore been ignored.

1.24 **Question 7:** Can Mr Chetwynd confirm what LCC consider to be an acceptable range of geometric properties for such roads in Lincolnshire and provide evidence for such criteria indicating upper and lower bound acceptability criteria?

1.25 **Answer:** As stated in my proof of evidence there is no known set methodology available that provides a comparison of measurable characteristics of existing routes. Consequentially there are no established acceptable criterions upon which this data can be judged. The design speed assessment process defined in TD9/93 was chosen to provide a comparative assessment of each route and does not seek to emphasise parts of the routes that may be used to justify a case for or against the route. The assessment process as defined in Chapter 1 of the Technical Directive states that routes shall be assessed over a minimum length of route of two kilometres. The purpose of providing the data was merely to provide a comparison of the alternative routes and those available to other road users around the City in response to an observation made by the Inspector at the Pre Inquiry Meeting.