

- 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 Objector's Proof

Mrs H Larcombe

Response from Lincolnshire County Council to letter/proof of evidence from Mrs Hazel Larcombe

1 Issues Raised by Mrs Larcombe

1.1 Alternative Routes

- No provision of other reasonably convenient routes when Hawthorn Road is stopped up.
- Objector has used two most convenient routes in all weathers.

1.2 Future Development

- 1850 households in Cherry Willingham with many more planned. Ever increasing traffic still uses the two most convenient routes (Fiskerton Road and Hawthorn Road)

1.3 Congestion at Greetwell Road\Allenby Road\Outer Circle Road Junction ('Wickes Roundabout')

- Wickes roundabouts already congested at peak times, stretching back into Greetwell Hollow which is prone to flooding. Hawthorn Road closure will increase this congestion. Location of hospital on Greetwell Road adds to danger.

1.4 Flooding at Greetwell Hollow

- Greetwell Hollow is prone to flooding

1.5 NMU Provision

- Several improvements to Hawthorn Road over years. Acceptable surfacing and visibility and good segregated NMU provision.

1.6 Traffic on Kennel Lane

- Kennel Lane not designed for heavy traffic. Objector has experienced fog and frost pockets. Sharp bend on Kennel Lane has little verge and poor visibility. Unreported accidents at bend. Queuing on Kennel Lane backs up to Manor Farm. Insufficient space at junction to turn left on to A158 as blocked by right turners.

1.7 A158\Kennel Lane Right Turn Lane

- Recent shortening of right turn lane into Kennel Lane makes manoeuvre more difficult and only allows a few vehicles to wait in safety.

2 Response from LCC

2.1 Alternative Routes

2.1.1 It should be noted that there is a third alternative to using Fiskerton Road or Kennel Lane as an alternative which is to continue to use Hawthorn Road and then join LEB and travel south towards the new roundabout at Greetwell Road. For road users heading south the journey can be continued on LEB or other destinations can be reached by either turning right at the new roundabout or continuing around the roundabout and heading back north. The return journey can be made by joining LEB at the Wragby Road roundabout and then turning left on to Hawthorn Road.

2.1.2 In her report on the 2013 Orders at paragraph 8.39 the Inspector noted:

"In order for the stopping up of Hawthorn Road to be acceptable under the terms of the 1980 Act 'a reasonably convenient route shall be available or will be provided'. To

be convenient, a route has to be suitable for the needs and purposes of all types of user, which requires consideration of journey length, time and safety. The exact same level of convenience need not be demonstrated. Under the public sector equality duty due regard has to be given to the need to advance equality of opportunity, which in this case applies particularly to those who may be disadvantaged by reason of age and disability".

2.1.3 In her report at paragraph 8.50 the Inspector also noted:

"I conclude that the inherent physical characteristics and the traffic conditions of Kennel Lane, Greetwell Road and the bypass would be suitable for these roads to form part of safe alternative routes to the use of Hawthorn Road. Some journeys would involve a more circuitous or less direct route and become slightly longer in terms of distance, but journey time is unlikely to be as seriously affected as suggested in the objections.

The indication is that reasonably convenient alternatives would be available for people travelling by motor vehicle. In addition, there probably would be journeys that would be little affected in time or distance or see an improvement. There is no evidence that the stopping up proposal would have an adverse effect on scheduled regular bus services."

2.1.4 Dr Billington presents in his evidence information on the relative journey distances, times and safety of the alternative routes compared to Hawthorn Road both before and after LEB is open.

2.1.5 Dr Billington notes in his summary at Paragraph 5.1.5:

"With regard to the transport issues relevant to the choice of the Hawthorn Road junction, my evidence has shown that there are currently safe and reasonably convenient alternative routes available for movements to and from Cherry Willingham and Reepham, and that this will remain the case in the future with the Scheme in place."

2.1.6 Dr Billington identified that there would be '*minimum impact on local journey times*'; as a result the additional financial impact of using the alternative routes is also likely to be small.

2.2 Future Development

2.2.1 Mr Smith has noted in Section 2.3 of his evidence:

"Since the earlier inquiry the original Core Strategy approach to local development has been superseded by the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan which has a similar statutory remit. The model forecast procedure has been revised to ensure that updated background traffic growth rates have been included. The opportunity has been taken to include specific details of residential and employment developments generating in excess of 50 trips within any peak hour. Developments that have either been constructed since 2006, or that have been identified as being likely to be constructed by either the opening or design year, have been included. This specific detail complements the general background growth implicit within the DfT TEMPRO

forecasts. The schedule of developments therefore represents focussed growth in specific localities...."

2.2.2 TEMPRO is an industry standard method for forecasting traffic growth and therefore the traffic modelling has allowed for any general development that has not been specifically included.

2.2.3 Future known development has therefore been specifically included in the traffic assessment of the scheme and any unallocated development sites have been catered for by the use of background growth using the TEMPRO software.

2.3 Congestion at Greetwell Road\Allenby Road\Outer Circle Road Junction ('Wickes Roundabout')

2.3.1 Mrs Larcombe alludes to congestion at Wickes Roundabout. This has been assessed in response to Mr Moore's Proof of Evidence. Modelling of the Alternative Option 1, with an overbridge at Hawthorn Road, shows that there is forecast to be a similar increase in traffic on this section of Greetwell Road. Notwithstanding this, this junction is recognised by LCC as already being a sensitive junction. It is accepted that LCC has statutory undertaking to ensure the junction operates at an acceptable level regardless of the construction of the LEB. As a result an assessment of limited proposals to improve the capacity of the eastern approach to the Greetwell Road\Allenby Road element of the junction has also been assessed which indicates that when implemented the junction will operate within capacity. Proposals for future development in the area will be required to assess the impact on junctions in this area and provide appropriate mitigation measures where issues are identified. This issue is addressed in further detail in Section 2.5 of the response issued to Mr Moore (which will be circulated upon completion).

2.4 Flooding at Greetwell Hollow

2.4.1 The County Council's Divisional Highways team had previously identified that there was an ongoing issue with a third party drainage culvert under Greetwell Road at Greetwell Hollow which was prone to flooding, this culvert has had work carried out on it and the issue has now been resolved.

2.5 NMU Provision

2.5.1 Mr Chetwynd's evidence provides details of the Non-Motorised User (NMU) provision included in the scheme. It should be noted that the existing provision is maintained on Hawthorn Road by the inclusion of the NMU bridge to the south of the line of Hawthorn Road.

2.6 Traffic on Kennel Lane

2.6.1 Details of traffic flows were provided in the evidence of Mr Smith. These are summarised for Kennel in the table below. The table includes both 2018 and 2033 two way peak hour flows for the AM peak, Inter Peak and PM peak periods.

Table 1 – Forecast Hourly Traffic Flows on Kennel Lane

Road	Scenario	2018			2033		
		AM	Inter	PM	AM	Inter	PM
Kennel Lane Core Model	Do Minimum	381	97	222	403	120	262
	Do Something	382	81	129	413	120	227
Kennel Lane Sensitivity Model	Do Minimum	376	97	231	412	120	263
	Do Something	268	81	144	310	120	227

2.6.2 As can be seen from the table flows on Kennel Lane are relatively unchanged following the construction of LEB, with the only significant difference being a reduction in flows in the 2018 PM peak. The only increase in flows is in the 2033 AM Peak. This is generally reflected in the sensitivity modelling carried out using the 2015 traffic survey data, with the exception of the AM peak where the count inconsistency identified in Mr Smith's evidence was more evident.

2.7 A158 Kennel Lane Right Turn Lane

2.7.1 As part of a recent resurfacing scheme at the junction, the reinstatement of the road markings for the right turn lane was carried out incorrectly. This resulted in a significant reduction in the available lane length.

2.7.2 The original lane length when checked to current design standards was found to be much longer than recommended and had safety implications by providing too long a length within which inappropriate overtaking could take place. The markings were therefore redesigned and reduced the lane length from 115 metres to 85 metres. However site measurements have confirmed that the actual markings applied give only 65 metres of turning lane due to the erroneous application.

2.7.3 It is therefore proposed that the surfacing contractor will correct his error at his expense and the markings will be amended to the intended 85 metre lane length.

2.7.4 Although not part of the Scheme, these corrective works have now been completed.