

## RIS SCHEMES A47 Improvements

### Minutes of Meeting V0.5

<b>Meeting</b>	A47 Preferred Route Decision – Wansford to Sutton	
<b>Venue &amp; Date</b>	Woodlands Lime 15 June 2017 12pm-3:30pm	
	<b>Role</b>	
<b>Chairperson</b>	Phil Davie HE Programme Leader (PL)	
<b>Attendees</b>	HE Project Manager (PM)	
	HE Senior Environmental Advisor (EA)	
	HE DCO & Statutory Process Manager (DCO)	
	Amey Programme Manager (APL)	
	Amey Project Manager (APM)	
	Amey Highway Technical Lead (ATL)	
	Amey Environmental Coordinator (AEC)	
	Amey Stakeholder Manager (ASM)	
	MMS Project Manager (MPM)	
MMS Operations Manager (MOM)		
<b>Apologies</b>		
<b>Distribution</b>		
<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>As they appear chronologically in the minutes</b>	
	Preferred Route Decision	PRD
	Product Control Framework	PCF
	Preferred Route Announcement	PRA
	Appraisal Specification Report	ASR
	HSE works duration notification form	F10
	Department for transport	DfT
	Road Investment Strategy	RIS
	Key Performance Indicators	KPI's
	Site Special Scientific Interest	SSSI
	LiDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
	Non-Motorised User	NMU's
	Appraisal Summary Table	AST
	BCR	Benefit Costs Ratio
	VfM	Value for Money

## Minutes

		Action by	Date
<b>1.0</b>	<p><b>Introductions</b></p> <p>Chair, Phil Davie, thanked everyone for attending, adding that the previous day's PRD Meetings with AECOM went well and gave confidence for going forward.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted that the discussions and outcome would be based not on PCF Stages running consecutively as time constraints have resulted in some overlapping of the PCF Stages and that this approach was instigated by Highways England.</p> <p>As a result, some of the information being presented and discussed will be incomplete and/or have limitations. Highways England acknowledged that this is a risk but are prepared to accept that risk in order to deliver to the required timescales.</p> <p>The Amey team highlighted these areas as information was presented and discussed (see also section 4.0).</p> <p>Everyone introduced themselves in the room</p>	-	-
<b>2.0</b>	<p><b>Health &amp; Safety Moment</b></p> <p>Hazards of using mobile phones whilst walking – inherent danger. Links below show consequences.</p> <p><a href="http://www.dailymail.co.uk/video/news/video-1480483/Shocking-moment-woman-falls-trapdoor-texting.html">http://www.dailymail.co.uk/video/news/video-1480483/Shocking-moment-woman-falls-trapdoor-texting.html</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4580328/Woman-hit-train-Mumbai-survives.html">http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4580328/Woman-hit-train-Mumbai-survives.html</a></p>		
<b>3.0</b>	<p><b>Purpose of PRD Session</b></p> <p>Ensure all evidence presented and discussed with all views aired and recorded, including expectations for Preferred Route Announcement (PRA).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The meeting should conclude with an unqualified decision on the preferred route</li> <li>○ Last opportunity to ensure all views are aired prior to route decision being made</li> </ul>		
<b>4.0</b>	<p><b>Available Information to Inform Decision</b></p> <p>Due to the timing of the PRD being part way through PCF Stage 2 all of the PCF Stage 2 information assessments and reporting were not available to inform the meeting. A list of PCF Stage 2 Products and their</p>		

	<p>status was tabled and discussed. The table shows the status of each of the products which are complete, incomplete including limitations. See Attachment A - Exceptions and Limitations Document - A3 - Rev A</p> <p>Apart from the ASR and F10 notification of construction project all other PCF products are incomplete.</p>		
5.0	<b>Present Information</b>		
5.1	<p><b>Supplier Scheme Overview</b></p> <p>APM presented detail of the scheme constraints and traffic problem:</p> <p><b>RIS Statement</b></p> <p>In December 2014 the DfT published the RIS for 2015-2020 which sets out the list of schemes that are to be developed by Highways England over the period of April 2015 to March 2020. The RIS confirmed Highways England's commitment to six schemes along the A47 corridor with Wansford to Sutton scheme being one of them.</p> <p>The RIS announced the scheme as "dualling of the A47 between the A1 and the dual carriageway section west of Peterborough".</p> <p><b>Scheme Overview</b></p> <p>The Wansford to Sutton scheme is the single carriageway section of the A47 that runs from the A1 in the west (near Wansford) to the dual carriageway section near the village of Sutton (a distance of 2.5 km) to the east. It is approximately 9km west of Peterborough.</p> <p>There are a number of side roads joining the A47 along the scheme length, via at grade priority, simple and right turn lane T junctions. From west to east the following side roads and junction types are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Access to Sacrewell Farm and Country Centre – T junction;</li> <li>○ Access to riverside parking and a pumping station – ghost island junction;</li> <li>○ Petrol filling station – ghost island junction;</li> <li>○ Sutton Heath Road – ghost island junction; and</li> <li>○ The Drift – double T-junction.</li> <li>○ There are a number of farm and field accesses and direct property accesses present on both sides of the A47.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Problems</b></p> <p>A1/A47 Wansford to Sutton Section is operating over capacity for both east and westbound traffic</p> <p>Accidents for the single carriageway section of the A47 between the A1 and the Sutton Roundabout is</p>		

	<p>particularly high compared to other sections of the A47. Within a 5 year period between 1st July 2011 and 30th June 2016, 41 accidents were recorded along this section of the A47. These included: 2 fatal accidents, 5 serious accidents and 34 Slight accidents.</p> <p><b>Option Sifting and Review</b>  Feasibility work undertaken in PCF Stage 0 identified dualling of the A47 Wansford to Sutton scheme as representing a potential solution to the identified transportation problem.  In Stage 1 a number of defined route options were developed and numbered 1 to 10.  Each of the options were assessed using the Highways England objectives and KPI's to ensure that they represented solutions which would solve the problem based on desktop information and a walk through. There was very little difference in these assessments therefore a more detailed assessment was carried out using Engineering parameters, Environmental factors, Transportation and high level Economics.  Option sifting resulted in 3 options - options 1, 8 and 10 being taken forward to Stage 2.  These options were later renumbered 1, 2 and 3 and taken forward for public consultation at the non-statutory Public Information Events in March/April 2017.</p>		
<p><b>5.2</b></p>	<p><b>Identify Constraints</b>  APM/AEC/ATL presented on constraints in the area. Refer to Attachment B – Wansford Environmental Constraints Map.</p> <p><b>Environmental Constraints</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Scheduled Monument (cropmarks) to the north adjacent to existing carriageway and is a designated site</li> <li>○ There are other cropmarks and potential heritage sites in the vicinity at the eastern end of the scheme to the north and south of the existing A47</li> <li>○ Sutton Heath and Bog SSSI to the north</li> <li>○ A number of County Wildlife sites alongside the A47</li> <li>○ River Nene to the south</li> <li>○ Number of Listed Buildings</li> <li>○ Areas of potential ecological importance</li> <li>○ Two noise important areas: one at the junction of the A47 and Sutton Heath Road and another At Wansford along the A1 from the dumb bell roundabout extending South to where the A1 crosses the river.</li> </ul> <p><b>Engineering Constraints</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are statutory undertakers in the existing verges (including fibre optics) and 11kV overhead lines in the area.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wansford Pumping Station at the western end of the scheme just south of the existing A47</li> <li>○ Pumping main (1800mm diameter) running directly north from the pumping station passing east of Sacrewell farm to a reservoir 14km to the north</li> <li>○ Ground Conditions – there is a risk of differential settlement of earthworks along the whole area south of the A47 around the River Nene. Ground Investigation is needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Existing Properties and Buildings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Villages of Wansford to the west &amp; Sutton to the south east</li> <li>○ Fuel Station at the western end of the scheme</li> <li>○ Picnic Area to the West</li> <li>○ 3 Properties of which 2 are directly accessed from the A47</li> <li>○ Sacrewell Farm and Country Centre – tourist attraction attracting over 100,000 visitors a year.</li> </ul> <p>The scheduled monument is a key constraint and was discussed in more detail; as summarised below.</p> <p>National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) states:  “Substantial harm to or loss of designated assets of the highest significance, including World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, grade I and II* Listed Buildings, Registered Battlefields, and grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens should be wholly exceptional.”</p> <p>In order for the route to go through the scheduled monument we would have to demonstrate a wholly exceptional case.</p> <p>The whole study area has a risk of archeological finds. There are further cropmarks at the eastern end of the scheme to the north and south. Geophysical surveys were carried out in the area of scheduled monument which confirmed and mapped the cropmarks, identifying seven ring-ditches of varying size.</p> <p>LiDAR survey assessed existing datasets of the area. There were no unexpected finds.</p> <p>Awaiting Aerial Photography survey data analysis to confirm presence of further cropmarks</p>		
5.3	<p><b>Description of Each Option</b></p> <p>Option 1 – online dualling plus free flow slip road from A1 southbound.  See Attachment C - Revised Option 1</p>		

	<p>Option 2 – Part online to the north, part offline to the south plus free flow slip road from A1 southbound. See Attachment D - Revised Option 2</p> <p>Option 3 – Offline to the north plus free flow slip road from A1 southbound. See Attachment E - Revised Option 3</p> <p>ATL commented that the access into Sacrewell Farm has now been re-engineered to be an underpass rather than overbridge for all options.</p> <p>Potential issue with effect on fuel station was noted as it will lose trade from traffic travelling eastbound. This needs further discussion with HE Lands and DVS in Stage 3.</p>	PM	
<b>6.0</b>	<p><b>Assess the Options</b></p> <p>A number of assessments have been made of the 3 options in order to inform the meeting and assist in the choice of a preferred route</p> <p>The results of these assessments are presented and discussed in sections 6.1 – 6.7 below</p>		
<b>6.1</b>	<p><b>Strategic Outcomes &amp; KPIs</b></p> <p>Each Option was assessed with regards to Alignment to Highways England's Delivery Plan – see Attachment F KPIs Wansford Results.</p> <p>Options 2 and 3 perform marginally better than Option 1 for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Improved user satisfaction</li> <li>○ Supporting the smooth flow of traffic</li> <li>○ Helping cyclist, walkers and other vulnerable users</li> </ul> <p>This is because Option 1 is online resulting in delays during construction. Options 2 and 3 are mostly off line so the existing route can be used for NMUs.</p> <p>Option 1 performs better for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Delivering better environmental outcomes as it has the least impact on designated sites. APM to change score from 3 to 4.</li> </ul>	APM	
<b>6.2</b>	<p><b>AST for Each Option</b></p> <p>ASTs were prepared for each option – see Attachment G – Wansford Draft AST</p> <p>For ease of assessment each parameter was summarised using RAG rating.</p> <p>For the Social section of the AST there was a lack of</p>		

	<p>confidence in the way the results had been interpreted. It was agreed that a colour ranking system is used similar to environment assessment in the EAR. APM to update AST. The updated summary of the ranking is in Attachment H – Wansford Summary AST</p> <p>The AST comparison table was reviewed line by line in the meeting key points of note:</p> <p><b><u>Economy</u></b>  There were no discernible differences between the 3 options in terms of economic categories. All options showed a beneficial rating when assessed against the economy criteria.</p> <p><b><u>Environment</u></b>  For the Environment section, noise, greenhouse gases and Townscape to be left blank rather than neutral. APM to update table.</p> <p><i>Air Quality</i>  Option 1 ranked best as it is online with no unacceptable exposures to new or existing sensitive receptors. Option 3 ranked the worst as it is closer to the property “Heath House”.and to Sacrewell Farm</p> <p><i>Landscape</i>  Option 1 is the most preferred from a landscape point of view as it will affect the least number of receptors relative to options 2 and 3. As it is an online widening, there will be no significant change in the number of receptors affected by the widening compared to the existing conditions. With the offline sections of options 2 and 3, this introduces new features into the landscape and moves the road closer to receptors that currently have no or limited view of the road.  Option 2 the least preferred as it has the greatest potential landscape and visual effects and goes through County Wildlife Site</p> <p><i>Historic Environment</i>  Option 3 goes through the scheduled monument and requires demolition of The Old Station House which is of historic interest so is the least preferred option. Option 2 ranks the best as it moves away from these 2 receptors.</p> <p>With regards to non-designated sites NSPNN states:  “Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments,should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets. The absence of designation for such heritage assets does not indicate lower significance.”  “The Secretary of State should also consider the impacts</p>	<p>APM</p> <p>APM</p>	
--	---	-----------------------	--

on other non-designated heritage assets (as identified either through the development plan process by local authorities, including 'local listing', or through the nationally significant infrastructure project examination and decision making process) on the basis of clear evidence that the assets have a significance that merit consideration in that process, even though those assets are of lesser value than designated heritage assets”

A discussion was held regarding whether all options going through crop circles including those outside of the scheduled monument should be categorised as large adverse impact. AEC stated he was happy with the current assessment showing Option 1 to be moderate adverse and option 2 to be slight adverse.

#### *Biodiversity*

Option 3 ranks worst as it is closer to Sutton Heath and Bog SSSI and has potential impact on the critical hydrology of the SSSI. Option 1 ranks best as it has neutral impact on the SSSI and does not require significant landtake from priority habitats.

#### *Water Environment*

Option 2 ranks worst as it has a greater percentage of the route alignment into the Planning Flood Zones associated with the River Nene and the Wittering Brook. Options 1 and 2 would fall within 1 in 1000 year flood area. A flood risk assessment would be required in Stage 3.

Option 1 ranks best and Option 3 second best.

***Overall from an Environment perspective Option 1 ranks best, Option 2 second and Option 3 worst.***

#### **Social**

There would be an improvement in journey quality and accidents for all options.

It was agreed that Severance should be ranked as beneficial on all 3 options as the provision of a bridge linking to Sacrewell farm would benefit all users.

All options would be affected similarly by access to services, affordability and security in a beneficial manner.

For Physical activity Option 1 ranks worst as it is online. Option 3 ranks best as it is completely offline with the possibility of leaving the existing route for NMUs.

#### **Public Accounts**

The cost to Broad Transport Budget and indirect revenues were similar for all 3 options as these figures are based on one cost estimate provided at Stage 1.

	<p>These figures will be updated with costs received for the 3 options.</p>		
<p><b>6.3</b></p>	<p><b>PIE Summary</b></p> <p>TB summarised responses:  170 responses were received following Public Consultation.  There were 152 responses to the question:  “Do you think improvements are needed to the A47 Wansford to Sutton Route?”  Of these, 147 responded yes and 5 responded no.</p> <p>Option 3 was the most favoured option with 64 strongly in favour and 23 somewhat in favour. Respondents feel it is the best option for addressing congestion and welcome the conversion of the old A47 route into a route for local traffic including cyclists. Respondents say this northerly option will take noise and air pollution away from Sutton and be at less of a risk from flooding. Those who oppose this option are concerned about the land-take required and the impacts on Sacrewell Farm and local heritage assets such as Bronze Age crop marks and the old railway station.</p> <p>Option 1 was the second favoured option with 34 strongly in favour and 26 somewhat in favour. The main reason for support for Option 1 by respondent is that it follows the existing road layout, minimising the land-take and environmental impact and not leaving a ‘dead road’ behind. Others argue this option will cause disruption during construction, force agricultural traffic to mix with long-distance traffic and create ‘rat-runs’ through local villages. Concerns are also expressed about flooding and damage to local habitats as well as the impact on existing junctions and the turning over the old railway.</p> <p>Option 2 was the least favoured option with 13 strongly in favour and 23 somewhat in favour. Support for Option 2 comes from those who believe it will have the least impact during construction and allow Sutton Heath Road to connect directly to the Sutton roundabout using the old A47 road. Respondents would welcome the removal of a lay-by/truck stop close to the A1 which is a location for criminal activity. Those who oppose this option are concerned about its proximity to Sutton and the impact on local residents and businesses. They also say this route could be at risk from flooding and will remove valuable farmland and wildlife habitats.</p> <p><b>Key Stakeholder Preference</b></p> <p>There were mixed feelings from key stakeholders such as local councils and parishes, land owners and cycling groups – refer to Attachment I - Wansford Key</p>		

	Stakeholder Preferences. Overall Option 3 rank better.		
<b>6.4</b>	<p><b>Buildability Analysis</b></p> <p>APL gave a high level overview from information provided by Taylor Woodrow:</p> <p>Construction programs included in cost estimates are robust. Option 1 – 18 months, Option 2 – 16 months and Option 3 – 16 months (Amey assumed 15 months) Option 3 has least issues for construction and traffic management as it is offline for the whole route, Option 1 has highest as it is online for the whole route.</p> <p>Additional environmental issues for option 2 (County Wildlife Sites) and option 3 (Bronze age cropmarks, loss of woodland). Flood risk assessment required for option 2.</p> <p>Option 1 has greatest impact on Statutory Undertakers.</p>		
<b>6.5</b>	<p><b>Key Risks &amp; Opportunities</b></p> <p>Benefits &amp; Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Meets RIS commitment</li> <li>○ A safe and serviceable network by reducing accidents</li> <li>○ A more free-flowing network with more reliable journey times</li> <li>○ Supports economic growth by increasing capacity</li> <li>○ Improved accessibility for NMUs. Consultations have taken place with local cycling group</li> <li>○ Opportunity to work with land owners, Homes &amp; Communities Agency (HCA)</li> </ul> <p>Issues &amp; Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Line of Preferred Route – Potential objections from local residents &amp; business users (including Petrol station)</li> <li>○ Proximity of Scheduled Monument and the possibility of archaeological finds in the area</li> <li>○ River Nene close by</li> <li>○ Sutton County Wildlife site adjacent to carriageway.</li> <li>○ SSSI in the vicinity.</li> </ul>		
<b>6.6</b>	<p><b>Cost &amp; BCR</b></p> <p>APM stated only Option 3 was costed at Stage 1 with most likely cost of £113.75 million and BCR of 1.94. This is considerably higher than the RIS budget of £79 million so a Value Engineering exercise was carried out to</p>		

	<p>reduce scheme costs. This involved removal of the proposed overbridge connecting Sutton Heath Road and The Drift and various other measures such as reduced earthworks, Drainage changed from a positive system with kerbs and gullies to an over the edge Sustainable Drainage (SUDs) solution, Kerbs reduced to 20% to reflect over the edge drainage rather than positive drainage etc.</p> <p>These measures were implemented for all 3 options and sent to HE Commercial for cost estimates. Unapproved costs received from HE Commercial on 14/06/17 are:</p> <p><b>Option 1</b> Min £58.24m, <b>Most Likely £88.83m</b>, Max £141.30m</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> Min £54.42m, <b>Most Likely £81.16m</b>, Max £129.45m</p> <p><b>Option 3</b> Min £51.53m, <b>Most Likely £75.11m</b>, Max £127.40m</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: The above costs have been confirmed by Highways England Commercial.</p> <p>Value for money is currently high for all three options. BCRs below were calculated using Paramics model only and most likely costs: Option 1 – 3.34 Option 2 – 3.56 Option 3 – 3.80</p> <p>Option 3 has the highest BCR followed by Option 2. Option 1 has the lowest BCR. The BCRs are expected to reduce for all options once construction delay modelling is taken into account, however Option 1 BCR is expected to reduce the most as it is online along the whole route causing major disruption during construction.</p>		
7.0	<p><b>Scoring Matrix/Decision</b> Live. Agree &amp; complete options scoring Matrix</p>		
	<p>The assessments overall were discussed and the following were agreed in the room.</p> <p><u>Alignment to Strategic Outcomes &amp; KPIs</u> The high level strategic assessment of KPIs aligned to the Delivery Plan showed Options 2 and 3 to be marginally better than option 1 as they have offline sections that could be used for NMUs and for local traffic during construction whereas Option 1 is online along the whole route.</p> <p><u>AST comparison</u> The only real differentiation from the AST was within the environmental section. The AST showed Option 1 to be the best as it has the least impact on environment and designated sites and option 3 the worst as it goes</p>		

through the scheduled monument and has a potential impact on the SSSI.

#### Consultation Feed back

Option 3 was the most favoured option by the public as they welcome the conversion of the old A47 route into a route for local traffic including cyclists. It was also felt this northerly option will take noise and air pollution away from Sutton and be at less of a risk from flooding.

Option 2 was the least favoured option as it is closer the village of Sutton and to the river with higher risk of flooding. It also affects valuable wildlife habitat.

#### Buildability

Option 3 ranks best as it is offline, Option 2 ranks second and Option 1 ranks worst as it is online along the whole route

#### Costs & BCR

Option 3 is cheapest and within RIS budget and has the highest BCR (based on Paramics model). Option 1 is the most expensive and has the lowest BCR Option 2 is just above the RIS budget.

#### Preferred Route Decision

A discussion took place on the impact of going through the scheduled monument.

It was agreed that although the whole area is of archeological interest, the scheduled monument is a designated site.

Geophysical surveys confirmed that we cannot rule out significant archaeological remains within the scheduled monument. There is a risk that Historic England will object to the route going through the scheduled monument as there are 2 other viable routes avoiding the scheduled monument with less impact on the designated site where the identified engineering and environmental issues can be resolved.

Therefore we cannot demonstrate a wholly exceptional case for progressing with Option 3. Option 3 was rejected on these grounds.

Option 1 was ruled out due to higher cost, VfM and potential delays due to construction/traffic management and lack of suitable diversionary routes.

Option 2 has the second highest VfM. It is just above the RIS budget cost.

There is still a risk of hitting archeological remains but the risk of doing so is less than Option 3 which is a designated scheduled monument.

**It was agreed that Option 2 would be taken forward as the preferred route.**

	<p>At Public Consultation residents of Sutton expressed concern about Option 2 being closer to their village. It also goes through the County Wildlife Site and is too close to the river. It was therefore agreed that the route is to be re-aligned as far north as possible after passing online at the scheduled monument acknowledging that this would require demolition of the property Deep Springs See Attachment J – Wansford Preferred Route Alignment Drawing.</p>		
<p><b>8.0</b></p>	<p><b>Preferred Route Viability</b>  Determine &amp; confirm including justifications and reasons for not promoting discarded options</p>		
	<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p><b>Option 1</b></p> <p><b>Pros</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Has least impact on environment and designated sites</li> </ul> <p><b>Cons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Online so big impact during construction – no easy diversion routes.</li> <li>○ Highest cost</li> <li>○ Lowest indicative BCR</li> </ul> <p><b>Option 2</b></p> <p><b>Pros</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Moves away from scheduled monument</li> <li>○ Cost only slightly over from budget</li> <li>○ Good indicative BCR</li> <li>○ Sections of the existing route could be used for NMUs</li> </ul> <p><b>Cons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Goes through Sutton Meadows CWS.</li> <li>○ Route too close to river - to be re-aligned so it's closer to existing carriageway</li> <li>○ Requires demolition of the property “Deep Springs”</li> <li>○ Least preferred route by public</li> </ul> <p><b>Option 3</b></p> <p><b>Pros</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Completely offline so easier to construct</li> <li>○ Existing route could be used for NMUs</li> <li>○ Cheapest of the 3 options</li> <li>○ Best indicative BCR</li> </ul> <p><b>Cons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Goes through scheduled monument – cannot demonstrate “wholly exceptional case”</li> <li>○ Affects southernmost tip of SSSI</li> <li>○ Requires demolition of the property “Old Station House” which is of historic interest</li> </ul>		