

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO:	Leader and Cabinet	10 May 2007
AUTHOR/S:	Corporate Manager - Planning & Sustainable Communities	

**STANSTED AIRPORT
BAA CONSULTATION ON GENERATION 2 SURFACE ACCESS STRATEGY**

Purpose

1. To respond to a consultation from the British Airports Authority (BAA) on surface access arrangements to serve a two-runway airport at Stansted – a project known as Generation 2. Note: the Highways Authority is also consulting on the road proposals.

Executive Summary

2. The BAA, working closely with the Department for Transport (DfT), Highways Authority, Government Office for the East of England and Network Rail, has produced a draft Surface Access Strategy (SAS). The SAS is designed to meet the growth in demand from air travellers in the context of overall regional growth. The BAA anticipate passenger numbers will grow from 24 million a year today, to 35 million by 2015 and 68 million in 2030 with the second runway, which is in addition to population and employment growth in the region, and particularly in the M11 corridor. The SAS sets out the existing and forecast travel in the Stansted Sub-Region, as well as a package of measures to address access to the airport for passengers and staff by all modes.
3. This report sets out a brief context in relation to the Stansted expansion proposals and M11, outlines the BAA consultation on Generation 2 Surface Access Strategy, and the implications for South Cambridgeshire.

Context

Stansted

4. The Government's consultation paper South East Regional Airport Study (SERAS) was considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 5th June 2003; the Council responded in the following terms:
 - (a) Urged the government to have regard to the environmental impact of unrestrained growth in demand for air travel and to manage future demand;
 - (b) Objected to the development of a second runway at Stansted Airport;
 - (c) Supported maximum use of the existing runway at Stansted Airport;
 - (d) Advised that should the government decide to promote a second runway at Stansted Airport that any resultant development pressures for housing and employment should be accommodated close to the Airport;

- (e) Supported additional runway capacity being created at Cliffe in the Thames Estuary, Gatwick, RAF Alconbury, Luton, Manchester and other regional airports.
5. The subsequent conclusion to provide a second runway at Stansted is set out in The Future of Air Travel White Paper 2003. The Government's principal conclusions are:
- (a) Making best use of the existing runway at Stansted;
 - (b) The provision of two new runways in the South East in the 30-year period to 2030;
 - (c) Development as soon as possible (BAA expects around 2011/12) of a wide-spaced second runway at Stansted, with strict environmental controls, as the first new runway to be built in the South East (the other would be at Heathrow or Gatwick).
6. In December 2005 the BAA consulted on masterplan options for a second runway at Stansted Airport. Cabinet on 9 March 2006 responded to the consultation in the following terms:
- (a) South Cambridgeshire District Council supports the East of England Regional Assembly position that accepts the expansion of the airport up to the full capacity of its existing single runway (Policy ST5) but it does not support a second runway, which would create serious environmental damage to the surrounding area and contribute to global warming;
 - (b) Without prejudice to that policy position and without prejudice to the Council being able to assess the overall impact of a fully worked up proposal to expand Stansted to a 2 runway airport, South Cambridgeshire District Council is concerned that the British Airports Authority has not provided sufficient information for the Council to assess the impact of additional aircraft movements over South Cambridgeshire, namely:
 - It is not possible to give a full opinion on the proposed options contained within the consultation document with regards to potential noise effects on South Cambs residents. The report is not detailed enough to make an adequate assessment.
 - In order to make a proper assessment data is needed on predicted noise levels at South Cambs properties both at ground level and air noise. These figures would need to take into account stacking of aircraft which is likely to take place over South Cambs, not just take off and landings.
 - Noise contours should be provided for 54 dBA leq and 50 dBA leq in line with WHO recommendations. These noise contours should be mapped for the years preceding 2030 as well as just 2030.
 - Information on the number of proposed night flights and day flights, including flight paths should also be provided.
 - As a general point there is no data on impacts of air pollution, the report should include: CO₂ emissions, NO₂, NO_x, SO₂, PM10, PM2.5 these should be referenced to Local Air Quality.
 - (c) However, on the basis of the evidence provided by the British Airports Authority, South Cambridgeshire District Council would have a strong

preference for options operating in segregated mode which would have least environmental impact, including upon South Cambridgeshire, and would be more consistent with the Future of Air Transport White Paper requirement for stringent environmental limits than 2 runways operated in mixed mode.

M11

7. The Government Office for the East of England's consultation paper the London to South Midlands Multi Modal Study (LSMMS) was considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 18 July 2002; the Council responded in the following terms:
 - (a) Support the east-west rail link connecting Cambridge to the Midlands, subject to recognition that this was for the purposes of achieving modal shift for both passengers and freight.
 - (b) Support the capacity improvements to the A14 between Cambridge and M1 and seek an upgrade as soon as possible, particularly the heavily congested section between Cambridge and Huntingdon.
 - (c) Support the improvements to the A428/A421 and emphasise the dualling takes place as soon as possible on the remaining sections between Hardwick and Caxton Gibbet to complement the dualling currently underway at Cambourne (the remaining sections Cambourne-Hardwick and Cambourne – Caxton Gibbet are not programmed by the Highways Agency for completion until 2006). This should be "fast-tracked" as the Route Management Strategy (considered by Cabinet on 20th June 2002) recognises that accidents occur as a result of the interface between dual carriageway and single carriageway stretches. It is also essential that the entire route to the A1 should be upgraded to dual carriageway.
 - (d) Support the improvements to the M11 between junctions 8 and 9, but recommend that the M11 is widened up to junction 14 as this stretch is also congested.
8. The Council also responded to the Highways Agency's M11 Route Management Strategy (RMS). A copy of the response is attached in **Appendix 1**.

Surface Access Strategy Background

9. The SAS has been produced following recommendations in the Air Transport White Paper and DfT guidance. The BAA has worked closely with the DfT, Highways Authority, Government Office for the East of England and Network Rail in developing proposals for the highway and rail elements of strategy. The SAS is designed to meet the growth in demand from air travellers in the context of overall regional growth. The BAA anticipate passenger numbers will grow from 24 million a year today, to 35 million by 2015 and 68 million in 2030 with the second runway. This is in addition to population and employment growth in the region, and particularly in the M11 corridor.
10. Stansted Sub-Region. The SAS is structured around the Stansted Sub-Region, which includes the built-up area of Cambridge and the southern part of South Cambridgeshire between the A603 and A1307 roads, as shown in Figure 1 in **Appendix 2**. It is unclear how the extent of the sub-region was determined.

11. Modelling. The BAA contend that the SAS is based upon up to date transport models for the region (with data from 2003), with a particular emphasis on the Stansted Sub-Region. The models cover the entire East of England and North London in appropriate detail, with a broader view of the rest of the country. They have been used to forecast traffic and travel conditions for the period from 2015 to 2030.
12. Policies. The BAA have identified the key relevant national, regional and local policies and set out clear objectives which those policies require from a SAS for Stansted. Paragraph 11.37 of the Air Transport White Paper (2003) is particularly relevant to the development of SAS for Stansted. It states *“Provision for surface transport infrastructure to support a new runway at Stansted will need to be developed in conjunction with emerging proposals for the Growth Area to serve not only links to London but also to the north and the East Midlands in particular. Growth at and around Stansted from airport and wider regional development will place pressure on strategic and local surface transport infrastructure. The package of road schemes announced by Government in July 2003 included several improvements that will support the airport’s development, including the widening of the M25 and M11, and upgrading the A120.”*
13. The Future of Air Transport Progress Report (2006) refers to the Stern Review and Eddington Study having been undertaken since the White Paper. The Eddington Study, in its key findings and recommendations (10) states *“...the strategic priorities for long-term transport policy should be growing and congested urban areas and their catchments; the key inter-urban corridors; and the key international gateways that are showing signs of increasing congestion and unreliability. Government should focus on these areas because they are heavily used, of growing economic importance, and showing signs of congestion and unreliability – and these problems are set to get significantly worse. They are the places where transport constraints have significant potential to hold back economic growth.”*
14. Clearly surface access to Stansted airport, as an international gateway, on a key inter-urban corridor between London and Cambridge, in an area that has been identified for growth meets the criteria for transport investment proposed by Eddington.
15. Regional and airport growth. The BAA has considered how existing travel demand is accommodated on the region’s transport networks and have forecast regional and airport growth. The London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough corridor has been identified as an area for significant growth in population and employment by 2021 in the Government’s Sustainable Communities Plan 2003. The BAA have used the proposed growth estimates over this period and assumed a similar annual growth rate between 2021 and 2030 to forecast regional travel demand. Forecasts indicate that road traffic levels could increase by 50% between 2003 and 2030. Similar levels of growth are expected on the rail network over the same period.
16. Existing and forecast travel in the Stansted Sub-Region. The consultation document recognises the M11 carries a high proportion of long distance strategic traffic. In the morning peak 40% of the traffic on the section between junctions 7 and 8 travels from junction 9 or further north to junction 6 or further south (paragraph 4.2.5). Paragraph 4.4.13 identifies traffic growth

on the network of over 60% by 2030, compared to an assumed increase in highway capacity of 10%, which will invariably lead to congestion.

17. The 2030 forecasts for morning peak hour traffic flows in the vicinity of Stansted show the motorway system will generally be busy, with flows on the M11 between junctions 6 and 8 forecast to rise by approximately 50% (flows on the A120 will increase by about 100%). With Generation 2, this flow is forecast to increase further in the order of 5 – 7% (the A120 will increase by 15%). Elsewhere there are only small changes in flow forecast as a result of the second runway development.
18. In assessing future conditions in the region and sub-region, a core scenario was developed, based upon a set of assumptions about growth in airport activity, changes in population and employment levels, future costs of travel, provision of transport infrastructure (road and rail). The core scenario results in “a significant increase in highway traffic within the region”.
19. Paragraph 4.6.6 and Figure 15 of the consultation document shows there is demand from north of junction 9, and paragraph 4.6.7. states that one third of passengers are from the East of England and 11% from the rest of the south east. Therefore, it is clear that passengers originate from a much wider area than the Stansted Sub-Region. However, the consultation document states that only a very small percentage of traffic on the road network 15km from Stansted is related to the airport (paragraph 4.6.2). The implication being that the increase in traffic on the M11 north of junction 8 cannot be attributed to the airport expansion, and therefore there is no need to include proposals to widen the M11 beyond junction 8.
20. The current view of the future development of the rail network in the region is the Eastern Regional Planning Assessment for the Railway published by DfT in February 2006. Network Rail has subsequently commenced work on the Greater Anglia Route Utilisation Strategy, which will address how the rail industry should optimise the route capacity and identify possible capacity enhancements. Approximately 90% of air passengers who travel to the airport by rail come from the London area. Future growth in rail, even without Generation 2, will require additional capacity before 2020.

Proposed Surface Access Strategy

21. BAA have considered various measures to reduce the need to travel, especially by car; improving public transport; making best use of the existing highway infrastructure; and new highway infrastructure.
22. Reducing the need to travel, especially by car. It is proposed to introduce a forecourt charging system, which would impact on approximately 36% of current traffic entering the airport. This would reduce the number of drop-off and taxi trips to the airport, which generally require two vehicle trips (to and from the airport) to serve each of the outward and return legs of a journey. It is also intended to build on the success of the staff Travel Plan to reduce encourage car sharing, greater public transport use, limited car parking, enhanced free on-site bus.
23. Improving public transport. The preferred approach to delivering additional train service requirements for Generation 2 would be by the provision of additional capacity as necessary on the West Anglia Main Line with the

opportunity to lengthen trains to 12 car-length (with associated platform lengthening). In the longer-term there will be a need to change the service pattern to introduce additional trains. Additional infrastructure, such as a second rail tunnel into the airport, may also be required. The BAA are continuing to work with Network Rail and the DfT to determine the most appropriate solutions to serve the combination of airport and regional demand for rail services into the future.

24. Coach patronage has increased by over 300% in the five years to 2005, with mode share increasing from 7% (0.7 million passengers) to 14% (2.3 million passengers). It is envisaged that further concentration on new or strengthened markets generated by the increased airport demand in future years will enable the mode share to be enhanced further.
25. It is proposed to expand the public transport interchange to be able to handle 120 buses and coaches per hour (more than twice the size of the current Heathrow or Victoria coach stations). In addition, the BAA is considering the potential for the provision of a separate layover area within the airport, but away from the terminals to avoid blocking active spaces in the interchange.
26. Making best use of the existing M11 motorway. High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes (HOVL), hard shoulder running and integrated demand management were all considered but rejected by the Highways Agency for various reasons. The HOVLs were discounted due to a relatively low proportion of cars with more than one occupant. Hard shoulder running during the peak periods is being piloted on the M42 but the full results are not yet known, particularly with regard to safety. Integrated demand management may have a role to perform in conjunction with widening proposals, but do not offer a solution to the capacity issues on the M11 in the absence of widening.
27. New highway infrastructure. It is proposed to widen the M11 between junctions 6 and 8 to dual four-lane carriageway (a decision will be made by Government ministers following this consultation). A new junction is to be provided on the M11 (junction 8b) and local road infrastructure to provide access into the airport. Note, the Highways Agency is consulting on these proposals.
28. Strategy for other local and regional roads. Paragraph 5.9.1 recognises that although the SAS is expected, through the range of measures provided, to discourage increased use of regional roads, there will be an increase in flow on M11 between junctions 8 and 9 of 7% as a result of Generation 2 and the SAS.
29. Paragraphs 5.9.4 and 5.9.5. state that the East of England Plan sets out proposals for significant growth in the corridor, which will require commensurate investment in regional transport infrastructure. However, it is expected that the individual development plans and associated transport proposals that will be developed in the next 25 years will influence the future shape and performance of the regional network. This fails to consider the role of the M11 as a national route between London and the Midlands and beyond.

Considerations

30. The BAA consultation document outlines the assumptions made in terms of additional growth within the region, and more specifically within the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough corridor, that have been included in the transport modelling work. The document even identifies at paragraph 4.4.13 traffic growth on the network of over 60% by 2030, compared to an assumed increase in highway capacity of 10%, which will inevitably lead to congestion. Paragraph 4.2.5 states that the M11 carries a high proportion of long distance strategic traffic and that in the morning peak 40% of the traffic on the section between junctions 7 and 8 travels from junction 9 or further north to junction 6 or further south. In addition, the document identifies passenger and staff origins, beyond the Stansted Sub-Region. However, despite this evidence, the BAA appears to suggest there is not a significant impact from the airport expansion on the M11 to the north of junction 8, and therefore there is no need to widen the M11 between junctions 9 to 14.
31. North of Stansted, the M11 is important in planning and transport terms. In July 2003 the Secretary of State for Transport, in responding to the recommendations of the LSMMS confirmed his support for a number of road improvement schemes, which included M11 widening between junctions 8 and 9. However, there is no programme for improving the road, despite the DfT announcing in 2005 it would be kept under review and did not rule out the early provision of uphill HGV lanes if they became necessary.
32. The length of M11 between junctions 9 and 14 was also recommended by the LSMMS for improvement in due course and is crucial to Cambridge. The M11 RMS also identifies that there is insufficient capacity in the dual two-carriageway stretch. The motorway not only acts as a north south bypass for the city for long distance traffic but also acts as a local distributor road for the city's road system, as does the A14 northern bypass. Unlike the A14, there is no programme for improvement, nor does the M11 RMS identify measures to address problems already identified, notably congestion and accidents, let alone cope with additional traffic resulting from further development. Given the pressures in the future on the M11 corridor, it is important to ensure that the route has adequate capacity for both strategic and local traffic.
33. The Eddington Study clearly recommends Government focuses on areas such as the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough corridor for transport investment. However, there is a lack of commitment to addressing the existing problems, which will be exacerbated with further airport and regional development, in the wider M11 corridor. The consultation document refers to the East of England Plan and delivery of its proposed growth as investing in regional transport infrastructure, and the individual development plans that will be developed over the next 25 years influencing the future shape and performance of the regional road network (paragraph 5.9.4.). Despite the LSMMS and M11 RMS demonstrating a need for improvements to the M11 between junctions 9 to 14, and the Eddington recommendation, the SAS and Highways Authority demonstrate a lack of commitment to improving the M11 north of junction 8.
34. It is not apparent whether any consideration has been given to the proposed A14 upgrade between Ellington and Fen Ditton, or the A428 dualling between Caxton Gibbet and the A14 / M11, as these are outside the Stansted Sub-

Region. As a result of the additional capacity, it is expected the widening will generate additional traffic. Therefore, there is potential for further long distance traffic to use the M11 from these routes, thus exacerbating congestion along the stretch around Cambridge. In addition, junctions 13 and 14 are restricted movement junctions, further exacerbating congestion in the area.

35. In terms of public transport, it is recognised that the existing rail lines to London are under considerable pressure and will come under greater pressure, particularly in peak periods. Network Rail is proposing a programme to lengthen stations to match the intention to provide longer trains for services from Cambridgeshire stations. However, the current single track access to Stansted is recognised as being unacceptable and will need to be addressed as part of expansion proposals.
36. There is little said about timescale. The Highways Agency believes widening of the M11 will be inevitable in the period 2015-2020, but the BAA anticipates the new runway will be operational by 2015. There would therefore seem to be a discrepancy over timing of Surface Access provision, with measures to cater for the extra generated traffic being required sooner. The second runway should not be permitted until adequate access measures are in place.

Implications

37. Financial	None.
Legal	None.
Staffing	None.
Risk Management	None.
Equal Opportunities	None.

Consultations

38. None.

Effect on Annual Priorities and Corporate Objectives

39. Affordable Homes	Increased aircraft activity from a second runway at Stansted Airport has the potential to adversely affect the south west of the District and contribute towards global warming whilst an increase in the availability of destinations could benefit the lifestyles of many of the District's residents and the economic potential of many of its businesses.
Customer Service	
Northstowe and other growth areas	
Quality, Accessible Services	
Village Life	
Sustainability	The District Council has taken a supportive view of working with its partners in the Eastern Region to question the need for a 2 nd runway at Stansted Airport.
Partnership	

Recommendations

40. Cabinet is recommended to respond to the British Airport Authority (and copy the response to Highways Agency with regard to the road proposals) in the following terms:

- (a) South Cambridgeshire District Council supports the East of England Regional Assembly position that accepts the expansion of the airport up to the full capacity of its existing single runway (Policy ST5) but it does not support a second runway, which would create serious environmental damage to the surrounding area and contribute to global warming;
- (b) The consultation document demonstrates significant additional traffic growth as a result of further development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough corridor and from the airport expansion. There is already an infrastructure deficit in the East of England region and improvements to the A14 and A428, in addition to M11 widening from junction 8, will lead to a bottleneck on the dual two-lane stretch of the M11. Without prejudice to its objection to the proposed second runway, the Council supports the improvements to the M11 between junctions 6 and 8, but recommend that the M11 is widened up to junction 14 as this stretch is also congested and The Generation 2 proposals will contribute to exacerbating existing conditions on the already congested dual-two lane section of the M11.
- (c) Without prejudice to its objection to the proposed second runway, the Council supports measures to improve rail capacity on the West Anglia Main Line, such as lengthening trains, with associated platform lengthening, and improved service provision, but recommends additional track capacity be provided north of Stansted.
- (d) The Council has concerns over the timescale for the delivery of the surface access proposals, in particular the highway improvements. The British Airports Authority anticipate the second runway will be operational by 2015, whilst the Highways Agency believes widening of the M11 will be inevitable in the period 2015-2020. The second runway should not be permitted until adequate access measures are in place.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

BAA Stansted, Stansted Generation 2 Surface Access: February 2007 Consultation
 Highways Agency Stansted Generation 2 Airport Access from M11 and A120 Consultation Spring 2007
 BAA Stansted, Stansted Generation 2: December 2005 Consultation
 Cabinet Report: Stansted Airport BAA Consultation on 2 Runway Masterplan, 9 March 2006
 Government Response to the London to South Midlands Multi Modal Study, July 2003
 The Future of Air Transport Government White Paper, December 2003
 Cabinet Report: London to South Midlands Multi Modal Study, 18 July 2002
 Response to Highways Agency in relation to the M11 Route Management Strategy, 18 April 2005

Contact Officer: Keith Miles – Planning Policy Manager
 Telephone: (01954) 713181

APPENDIX 1

Department
Our ref: C/6/4
Your ref:
713418
Date 18 April 2005

Development Services

Contact: Claire Spencer

Direct dial: 01954

E-Mail: claire.spencer@scambs.gov.uk

Mr S DAVY
M11 RMS Project Sponsor
Highways Agency
Heron House
49-53 Goldington Road
Bedford
MK40 3BR

Dear Mr Davy

PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON M11 ROUTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Thank you for your letter of 21 January 2005 regarding the above strategy and for the opportunity to comment.

The District Council previously made comments at the start of the process, in June 2002. These comments related to Junction 14 and the congestion and road traffic accidents caused by traffic merging from the A14, M11 and Cambridge City, problems exacerbated by weaving traffic. In the current Highways Agency Public Consultation on the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton proposals, it is noted that Junction 14 will be remodelled and should address many of these concerns.

The District Council has a number of concerns regarding the M11 Route Management Strategy (RMS); these are detailed below. In addition, a number of technical comments relating to specific parts of the RMS and its Appendices have been set out in the attached schedule.

- 1. Timescales.** There are numerous references to the RMS covering a ten-year period, but it is not clear when this ten years starts. For example, will the RMS cover ten years from the date it is adopted? Or has the ten years already begun, as the study has already been ongoing for three years? For the study to be meaningful, given the future development pressures facing the route, it will need to cover a long enough period from the date of adoption. Will the final RMS include a timetable for implementing the various management measures?
- 2. Relationship with Development Strategies.** The RMS only partially recognises the extent of future development pressures, particularly in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Even where development pressures have been identified in the RMS, there appears to be a lack of understanding of the implications for the M11. For example, where the RMS reports on the expansion of Stansted it focuses on managing the local area, but fails to consider the knock-on impact on the wider route.

There is considerable development pressure in and around Cambridge, which the RMS fails to identify. The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan clearly sets out

future development requirements; substantial development (of 10,000-12,000 dwellings) at Cambridge East; Cambridge Southern Fringe and Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) (2,900 dwellings). The references included in the RMS to the new town of Northstowe, which will be 8,000 dwellings, and development on the west of Cambridge are inaccurate (see attached schedule for details). It is also noted there are no references to the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy 14, covering the period to 2021.

The District Council is currently in the process of preparing a Local Development Framework (LDF) to replace the adopted Local Plan 2004. The first tranche of documents will include Area Action Plans for Cambridge East, Cambridge Southern Fringe and Northstowe. The Council undertook public participation on Preferred Options in October / November 2004 and is in the process of preparing the draft LDF in light of responses received. It is intended the draft LDF will be published in June 2005.

The RMS does not appear to consider the impact of the increased levels of traffic which will result from the substantial amount of development. For example, traffic forecasts appear to be on the basis of a central estimate from the National Road Traffic Forecasts and not related in any way to the level of future development in the Growth Area. It is essential that the RMS has a more accurate assessment of future traffic levels in the M11 corridor to develop a holistic strategy on how best to manage it. See also comments in the schedule.

It is very difficult to ascertain how the various sections contained within the RMS have been drawn together into a comprehensive strategy. Whilst various sections of the report deal with quite specific aspects there does not appear to be much correlation between them. In fact, it is not clear from the RMS what the strategy actually is. At Section 9.1 the RMS refers to the strategy being devised to overcome the Route Issues, which are addressed in the Route Outcomes. However, the Route Outcomes do not address issues arising from Sections 2 (Route Description – which includes traffic and congestion, accidents analysis, integration and accessibility, multi-modal studies etc.) and 6 (Development Control Statement - which includes development proposals) of the report. These sections contain considerable information which is pertinent to the development of a RMS, therefore the strategy cannot be considered comprehensive.

- 3. National and Regional functions of the M11.** The RMS confuses the national and regional functions (see comments in the schedule). Without a clear understanding of how the route functions, the RMS cannot begin to devise a strategy to manage the use of the route effectively.
- 4. Relationship with Multi Modal Studies.** The London to South Midlands Multi Modal Study (LSMMMS) and Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi Modal Study (CHUMMS) recommended road improvements to the A428 and A14 respectively. The A428 is to be dualled in autumn 2005, whilst the A14 is programmed to be completed in the period 2011-15. Improvements to these two major routes will have a significant impact on the M11 and needs to be carefully managed.

One associated issue relating to these road improvements, is the function of Junctions 13 and 14, neither of which are all-movement. The RMS assumes that these junctions will be addressed as part of implementing the CHUMMS recommendations. However, from the recent public consultation on the A14

Ellington to Fen Ditton scheme it is clear that neither junction will be upgraded to all-movement. Upgrades to the A428 and A14, along with the substantial development pressure in the Cambridge area, will place considerable pressure on an already congested section of the route and accesses into Cambridge. The RMS needs to address the serious implications for a lack of a full movement junction (Junction 14) at the confluence of three major routes, a situation exacerbated by the lack of north facing slips at Junction 13 and the resultant conflict between local and strategic traffic.

- 5. Movements around Cambridge.** Not only does the RMS fail to address the serious implications of a lack of all-movement junctions at Junctions 13 and 14 on M11, it also fails to consider the movement needs of people in and around Cambridge. The junction of the A11 and A14 (on the east of the City) also has restricted movements. As a result traffic heading northbound on the A11 cannot head west on A14 to access the north of Cambridge, an area facing considerable additional development. Therefore, traffic accessing the northern parts of Cambridge to / from the south has to route via M11 northbound and A14 eastbound, and vice versa, placing greater demand on the M11. This issue does not appear to have been identified or addressed in the RMS.
- 6. Widening of the M11 between J8-14.** One recommendation from the LSMMS is for the widening of the M11 between Junctions 8-9 and 9-14. The Secretary of State has requested the Highways Agency undertake further work for widening between junctions 8-9 to bring forward proposals to enter into the Targeted Programme of Improvements in due course, but the situation with J9-14 is less certain. The Secretary of State has requested the Highways Agency undertake further work for widening 9-14, which, if taken forward could be implemented around the middle of the next decade. What would happen if these schemes were not successful? The RMS clearly identifies that there is insufficient capacity in the dual two-carriageway stretch. However, there are few measures proposed in the RMS which would help address the problems already identified, notably the congestion and accidents, let alone cope with the additional traffic resulting from considerable further development. These problems will be exacerbated by the continuation of restricted movement Junctions 13 and 14.
- 7. Relationship with Local Transport Plans.** Given that the RMS is meant to be a management plan and given the Highways Agency's commitment to encouraging travel by sustainable modes, there is a lack of coordination with local authorities' Local Transport Plans. The Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan contains a clear strategy to improve access into Cambridge along the main radial routes by public transport. The District Council has yet to consider its response to the A14 proposals, but it would appear that there is an opportunity to improve public transport access into west Cambridge and provide access to Madingley Park and Ride if north facing slips were provided at Junction 13. In addition, an all-movement Junction 14 could remove the conflict between local and strategic traffic at Junction 13 and improve the A1303 corridor for bus movements into the city.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require clarification of any issues.

Yours sincerely
DAVID HUSSELL
Development Services Director

APPENDIX 2

