

Appendix 4

LTB Scheme Prioritisation – Advisory Group Comments

Comments were invited from the LTB Advisory Group on the prioritisation of schemes between 5th and 7th March.

The following comments were received for the LTB to consider within their decision-making:

Scheme Overview	Comment	Source	Proposed Response
A602 Corridor	<p>By-pass to Hooks Cross We appreciate that in some areas of this section of the road there is limited space for widening, however, it is advisable to consider improving those areas that can feasibly be improved now and sign those areas that cannot be widened.</p>	Stevenage	To be noted and considered in next phase of scheme development as to whether it can fit within funding and timing constraints for the 2015-19 funding period.
	<p>Hertford Road roundabout Following on from the above, the better option here would be to increase the size of the existing give way priority roundabout. Traffic signal control would only redistribute the delays.</p>	Stevenage	To be noted and considered in next phase of scheme development as to whether it can fit within funding and timing constraints for the 2015-19 funding period.
A1(M)	<p>Objective We believe that the solution to the problem identified is widening of the A1 (M) to three lanes throughout. The UTP acknowledges that 3 lanes will ultimately be required and that hard shoulder running would only suffice as an interim measure. It would be preferable therefore to consider widening as a safer and more durable solution than MM-ALR.</p>	Stevenage	To be noted and considered in next phase of scheme development as to whether it can fit within funding and timing constraints for the 2015-19 funding period.
	<p>Scope outline We welcome capacity improvements at Junction 7 although there is little detail here of the proposal. We also welcome consideration of capacity improvements to the A1 (M) itself between J6 and 8 in order to ease existing congestion and facilitate future development. We feel that MM-ALR or hard Shoulder running is less safe than widening to 3 lanes and is a compromised solution which will act as an expensive stop-gap before widening becomes inevitable.</p>	Stevenage	To be noted and considered in next phase of scheme development as to whether it can fit within funding and timing constraints for the 2015-19 funding period.

Scheme Overview	Comment	Source	Proposed Response
	<p>Whilst the focus of the scheme overview document seems to be very much around the problems between Junctions 6 and 8, and associated with growth in Stevenage and North Herts, we are keen to ensure that any proposals for motorway improvements there take full account of potential “knock on” impacts further south, as we know that there are already some potential capacity issues between junctions 1 and 3 and that the problems northbound at Junction 6 during the evening peak currently lead to tailback towards Junction 5, together with increased use of local roads.</p> <p>In this context I think the scheme overview document should make reference to the pinch-point funding approved last year for Managed Motorway improvements at Junction 6 and immediately to the north, and how any future scheme might relate to these. If, as stated on page 6 of the draft overview, permanent all-lane running (MM-ALR) is to be introduced between junctions 6 and 8 (or parts of this section) we would like to see the implications of this (for example for emergency services access) explored in a little more detail before a formal submission.</p>	<p>Welwyn Hatfield</p>	<p>To be noted and considered in next phase of scheme development as to whether it can fit within funding and timing constraints for the 2015-19 funding period.</p>