

Objectors' Alternative Proposals Alternative 5 Diversion of Hawthorn Road to Wragby Road East Roundabout

- 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

Contents

- 1. Introduction**
 - 2. Engineering and Buildability**
 - 3. Environmental Impacts**
 - 4. Traffic, Safety and Economics**
 - 5. Land Requirements**
 - 6. Planning Considerations**
 - 7. Cost\Funding**
 - 8. Programme**
 - 9. Conclusion**
 - 10. Previous Inspectors Comments from the 2014 Inquiry**
- Appendix – Plan Showing Alternative 5**

1. Introduction

The A15 Lincoln Eastern Bypass is a Major Project promoted by Lincolnshire County Council. The published Scheme includes the construction of 7.5km of single carriageway between the A158 Wragby Road in the north and the A15 Sleaford Road in the south. It also includes the additional NMU bridge at Hawthorn Road.

Alternative 5 diverts Hawthorn Road on the eastern side of the bypass in a northerly direction to tie in to an enlarged roundabout at the junction of Wragby Road East and the LEB and will remove the need for the left in left out junction of Hawthorn Road and the LEB. The roundabout at Wragby Road East is enlarged to accommodate the additional approach.

Alternative 5 was published in the Lincolnshire Echo on 23rd July 2015.

The County Council has carried out a desktop assessment of the Alternative but has not undertaken a detailed engineering design, or environmental assessment. The time available within the statutory process would make such detailed work unfeasible and the cost of a fully detailed assessment would not be justified in the County Council's view.

This note records the results of the desktop study assessment.

2. Engineering and Buildability

The proposal requires the realignment of the existing A158 East of the existing roundabout on Wragby Road and includes the junction with Greetwell Lane. The larger roundabout required as a consequence of this proposal would have significant impacts on two existing watercourses involving the demolition and reconstruction of 4 major culverts as well as impacting on a large number of existing statutory undertakers plant. The proposal would also require significant traffic management and incur major delays on the network during construction.

Maintaining the NMU Provision along the current line of Hawthorn Road to and from the Carlton development would require a NMU bridge at Hawthorn Road.

3. Environmental Impacts

The proposal would create significant severance of farmland and result in further land compensation costs due to the viability of the land holding being negated.

The proposed diversion route Severs Footpath 140 which would require to be stopped up and an alternative route provided.

There is potential for additional environmental impacts with regards to habitat that exists around the watercourses that would be affected by the proposal. There may be further ecological mitigation required and there is potential for archaeological remains under the line of the Alternative.

4. Traffic, Safety and Economics

The proposal removes direct access to the bypass at Hawthorn Road for southbound traffic.

The proposal to provide an additional 5th leg on roundabout is contrary to best practice as it represents many difficulties in terms of balancing flows and safe operation through a land efficient geometric design. TA16 provides evidence that the addition of a fifth leg is likely to increase the Accident frequency by 60%. The proposal is therefore likely to reduce operational efficiency and generate queues. The diverted Hawthorn Road approach to roundabout will carry lower flows than the other approaches and, as it will be giving way to all the movements on to the LEB, there will be fewer opportunities for this traffic to join the circulation on the roundabout.

The 5th leg is therefore likely to increase accident frequencies compared to a four leg roundabout

Some journeys to and from Cherry Willingham and Reepham may be shorter and quicker with this alternative and some may be longer and slower, depending on the origin and destination of individuals.

However, when considering all traffic in the Lincoln area, it is likely that the differences in journey times and distance travelled between the preferred scheme and this alternative will be negligible and would make no discernible difference to the benefits in a cost/benefit analysis

NMU Provision would need to be considered from the Carlton development. There would probably still need to be a NMU bridge at Hawthorn Road.

5. Land Requirements

The proposed alternative requires significant additional land that falls outside of the highway boundary for which Planning Permission exists for both the permanent works and the temporary works.

The Alternative will require additional land and as a result will need new Compulsory Purchase Orders. A change to the Side Roads Order will also be required.

6. Planning Considerations

A new Planning Permission would be required for the provision of the new link road and the construction of the enlarged roundabout at Wragby Road.

7. Cost\Funding

The net additional cost of providing this proposal is approximately £1.68m. This estimate includes significant diversions of Statutory Undertakers Plant at the existing Wragby Road roundabout. This would require the submission of a new Business Case to central government for funding and may not be capable of being justified before the DfT.

Additional costs would also be incurred due to the elongated construction programme to construct the roundabout.

8. Programme

The scheme programme would be delayed because of the new planning application and CPO\SRO.

9. Conclusion

The Alternative, when compared with the Scheme with planning permission does not provide any advantages that justify investigating it any further.

In traffic terms the Alternative caters for a limited number of movements, all of which have reasonably convenient alternatives under the current proposals.

There are significant cost and programme issues with this Alternative, given the need to obtain planning permission and publish new SRO and CPO's.

The additional cost of the Alternative will change the Business Case to central government that may not be capable of being justified before the DfT to obtain funding.

10. Previous Inspectors Comments from the 2014 Inquiry

At the previous Inquiry the Inspector concluded the following with respect to Alternative No 3 (Alternative 2 at the previous Inquiry):

"This option has limited public support and has attracted counter objections. The advantages to local journeys are unlikely to be significant, whilst the additional arm to the roundabout would reduce operational efficiency and increase the risk of accidents. The new length of highway would be visually harmful to the countryside on the edge of the built-up area and the severance of farmland would be disruptive to the landholding. The identified deficiency with the NMU bridge would not be resolved. In addition to the increased costs of construction would be the costs of delay and potential loss of central funding. Alternative 2 would not offer any material advantage over the Scheme".

Appendix – Plan Showing Alternative 5

