

# A63 Castle Street Improvement, Hull

TR010016

Written Submission of Applicant's case put orally at Issue Specific Hearing (1)  
Traffic and Movement  
On 4 June 2019



---

## A63 Castle Street Improvement, Hull Development Consent Order 20[xx]

---

**Written Submission of Applicant's case put orally at  
Issue Specific Hearing (1) – Traffic & Movement on 4 June 2019**

---

<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010016
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	
<b>Author:</b>	A63 Castle Street Improvement Project Team, Highways England

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev 0	17 June 2019	Final

## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Accompanied Site Inspection .....	4
1.2	Purpose of this document.....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>ExA Agenda Item 1 - Welcome, introductions and arrangements for the hearing .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>ExA Agenda Item 2 - The need and case for the scheme, aims and benefits</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Congestion relief and traffic on the A63.....	5
3.2	Other Benefits .....	6
3.3	Economic Assessment .....	6
<b>4</b>	<b>ExA Agenda Item 3 – Movement across the A63.....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1	Motorised vehicles.....	7
4.2	Non-Motorised Users.....	7
<b>5</b>	<b>ExA Agenda Item 4 – Effects relating to minor and local roads and accesses .....</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1	Roads and accesses to be stopped up or restricted .....	9
5.2	New Access and turning arrangements .....	9
5.3	Changes to Traffic Flow.....	10
<b>6</b>	<b>ExA Agenda Item 5 – Effects during construction .....</b>	<b>11</b>
6.1	How traffic will be affected.....	11
6.2	Implications for Businesses .....	12
6.3	Pedestrians .....	12
<b>7</b>	<b>ExA Agenda Item 6 – Safety .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>ExA Agenda Item 7 – Any Other Matters.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Annex A – Case for the Scheme in Terms of Traffic .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Annex B – Equality Impact Assessment .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Annex C – Shuttle Bus Clarification .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Annex D - Local Network Improvements.....</b>	<b>20</b>

---

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Accompanied Site Inspection

1.1.1 On the day of this hearing, on the morning of 4 June 2019 there was an Accompanied Site Inspection of the A63 Castle Street Improvement Scheme which was attended by the following people:

- Peter Willows, Examining Authority (ExA)
- Manveer Phull, Examining Authority (ExA)
- James Leeming, Senior Project Manager, Highways England
- Frances Oliver, Assistant Project Manager, Highways England
- Matthew Twiss, Design Manager, Balfour Beatty (on behalf of The Applicant)
- Pete Wearing representing the Holiday Inn
- Graham Lind representing Kingston Retail Park (KRP)
- Hilary Blackstock representing Hull Civic Society

### 1.2 Purpose of this document

1.2.1 This document summarises the case put by Highways England (the Applicant), at the Issue Specific Hearing (ISH 1) regarding Traffic and Movement which took place at the KCOM Stadium, Hull on 4 June 2019.

1.2.2 In what follows, the Applicant's submissions on the points raised broadly follow the Agenda for ISH 1 set out in the Examining Authority's (ExA) letter which was published on the Planning Inspectorate's website on 28 May 2019.

1.2.3 The following members of the Applicant's team spoke during this ISH:

- Stephen Whale, Counsel to the Applicant (**SW**)
- Katie Persaud, Associate, BDB Pitmans (**KP**)
- James Leeming, Senior Project Manager, Highways England (**JDL**)
- Claire Bond, Technical Director, Arcadis (**CB**)
- Chris Mills, Air Quality Consultant, Mott MacDonald Sweco (**CM**)
- Matthew Twiss, Design Manager, Balfour Beatty (**MT**)
- Julia Barrett, Non-Motorised User Lead, Mott MacDonald Sweco (**JB**)

## 2 ExA Agenda Item 1 - Welcome, introductions and arrangements for the hearing

2.1.1 The ExA welcomed all parties to the hearing and discussed the agenda and format for the day.

- 2.1.2 The ExA explained the process for recording of the hearings and noted that they would be available on the Planning Inspectorate website for a period of five years post hearing.
- 2.1.3 The ExA, prior to the commencement of the hearing asked **SW** on behalf of the Applicant to explain if they were on track with the removal of Option B (the Staples site) from the DCO.
- 2.1.4 **SW** confirmed Highways England is still waiting for the Judicial Review period to expire for the new Arco site's planning approval. The Judicial Review period is due to expire on Wednesday 5 June 2019. Highways England will formally confirm the compound situation as soon as possible after this date subject to no challenge being received.

### 3 ExA Agenda Item 2 - The need and case for the scheme, aims and benefits

#### 3.1 Congestion relief and traffic on the A63

- 3.1.1 The ExA questioned journey times and gave reference to the Transport Assessment (Planning Inspectorate Examination Library reference APP-073 Transport Assessment Report). The Transport Assessment Report was displayed on screen at the hearing.
- 3.1.2 **CB** on behalf of The Applicant presented the 'Case for the Scheme' in terms of traffic which summarised the need for the proposed Scheme, (Statement included in **Annex A**). The proposal is to upgrade the A63 Mytongate Junction to increase the traffic capacity and safety of the road. The project will improve connectivity between the Port of Hull to the east of Hull and the west. It will also result in economic benefits to the area.
- 3.1.3 **CB** advised other schemes have been taken account of in the traffic modelling that has been undertaken for the A63 Castle Street Improvement.
- 3.1.4 **CB** explained the predicted changes in traffic flow (comparing with scheme and without scheme) can be viewed in Figures 4.1 (2025 am peak), 4.2 (2025 interpeak) and 4.3 (2025 pm peak) of the Transport Assessment Report (document reference APP-073). These figures display the area of detailed modelling that has been undertaken.
- 3.1.5 **CB** confirmed that Table 4.4 of the Transport Assessment Report presents the predicted Journey Times along a stretch of the A63 and resultant travel time savings as a result of the Scheme. Table 4.4 within that document indicates that drivers will save between 1 to 3 minutes, on a typical weekday journey, as a result of the Scheme.
- 3.1.6 Figure 4.8 shows the section of the A63 over which the average journey time savings, from Table 4.4, are measured. A section of the A63, of approximately 10km in length, is considered, with the Scheme in the approximate centre.

3.1.7 Therefore, the journey time savings quoted also incorporate the traffic conditions at the junctions immediately adjacent to each end of the Scheme.

### 3.2 Other Benefits

3.2.1 Princes Quay Bridge (PQB) is considered to be a benefit of the scheme. The ExA questioned how the benefit of PQB should be considered in the A63 Castle Street Improvement. **JDL** explained the PQB is a fundamental requirement of the A63 Castle Street Improvement and explained why it remains in the DCO.

3.2.2 **SW** explained the DCO provides a safeguard for PQB to be constructed in case there is any issue with the legal agreements and the ability of the Applicant to complete the scheme is hindered by a party to an agreement.

3.2.3 **JDL** and Hull City Council (HCC) noted the issue with regard to the PQB steps which are located on the north-western side of the scheme. This relates to a request by HCC to amend the approved design by realigning the orientation and location of the steps, which the Applicant is currently supporting.

3.2.4 HCC stated a benefit of the A63 Castle Street Improvement is the land it will unlock which is referenced within in the Local Impact Report (LIR). HCC explained how the A63 Castle Street Improvement will have a significant economic benefit for key enterprise sites (specifically the dock sites to the east of the scheme and city centre sites).

3.2.5 **JDL** agreed with the sentiment and noted that the Applicant has been very supportive with requests from HCC throughout the scheme history, and has helped to assist with their development and regeneration aspirations.

### 3.3 Economic Assessment

3.3.1 **CB** explained that the costs presented in the Present Value of Costs (PVC) in the Planning Statement (document reference APP-070) Table 4.2, differ to the total Scheme costs as they need to be adjusted in order to be able to provide a meaningful comparison to the Present Value of Benefits (PVB). A detailed summary of the conversion process is explained in the following paragraphs.

3.3.2 Scheme costs have been calculated in such a way that they are not comparable to the present value benefits (PVB) presented in Table 4.2 of the Planning Statement. Scheme costs must be converted into a present value cost (PVC) through a process of deflation and discounting in accordance with Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) Unit A1.2 – Cost Estimation. In addition, any costs not including tax (factor costs) must also be converted to include tax (market prices).

3.3.3 TAG guidance indicates that any present value cost or benefit should be presented in 2010 prices. Scheme costs have therefore been deflated from their current 2016 price base back to 2010 using factors provided in the TAG databook. This provides a consistent price level between the PVB and PVC and is referred to as deflation.

- 3.3.4 TAG guidance indicates that both benefits and costs must be discounted back to 2010 values to reflect people's preference to receive monetary benefit now as opposed to in the future; called discounting. The discount rate is set at 3.5% for the first 30 years followed by 3% for the next 45 years. This will reduce the PVC in relation to scheme costs for costs incurred after 2010.
- 3.3.5 Scheme costs have been calculated as factor costs, i.e. that they do not include taxation, as standard. The PVB has been calculated using market prices which do include tax. Therefore, a conversion between factor cost and market price is undertaken to take into account the tax adjustment. The conversion adds 19% to the factor cost.
- 3.3.6 Overall, applying the methodology to convert scheme costs to PVC will usually result in a reduction from the current Scheme cost. This process is required in order to compare the PVB with the PVC and generate a benefit cost ratio for the scheme (BCR).

## 4 ExA Agenda Item 3 – Movement across the A63

### 4.1 Motorised vehicles

- 4.1.1 **MT** explained that North/South movements and all right turn movements are denied at the Mytongate junction due to nature of the works and available space during the main construction phase for the underpass. Vehicles that would ordinarily have turned right from the A63 to continue North or South will now be sent along a signed diversion to either Rawling Way junction or Roger Millward Way roundabout.

### 4.2 Non-Motorised Users

- 4.2.1 The ExA questioned the increase in journey times crossing the A63 for non-motorised users.
- 4.2.2 **JDL** talked through the pedestrian journey times when crossing the A63 and acknowledged that the journey would be longer and not at-grade. **JDL** discussed the use of the High Street underpass to cross under the A63 instead of the Market Place signalised crossing with a diversion of around 330m but which is segregated and safer. The permanent effects on NMUs arising from the Scheme are outlined in Table 15.13: Permanent impacts of the Scheme on NMUs (ES Chapter 15 Effects on all Travellers (APP-023)) as below.
- 4.2.3 The ExA questioned if any thought has been given to retaining any of the at-grade crossings. **JDL** discussed the former over bridge crossing at Market Place that was included in a previous scheme design. **JDL** explained the reason this option was not developed further was due to concerns over setting in the historic environment and therefore never taken forward in this Scheme proposal. The Applicant has been working with Hull Access Improvement Group (HAIG) to alleviate concerns about crossing the A63.

- 4.2.4 **SW** and **JDL** discussed the reasoning behind the removal of the at-grade crossings along the A63 was to ensure the maximum traffic flow benefits for the scheme could be realised.
- 4.2.5 **MT** noted that North/South movements are denied at Mytongate due to nature of the works and available space. NMU's that would ordinarily have travelled North/South will now be sent along a signed diversion to either Porter St, where there will be an 'at-grade' crossing provided until the new Porter St footbridge is completed, or the new PQB footbridge.
- 4.2.6 There will also be a further pedestrian diversion at the east end of the scheme, taking traffic from the current crossing at Market Place/Queens St, and diverting them underneath the A63 at High St/Blackfriargate, using the improved facilities that will be provided.
- 4.2.7 The ExA questioned if the Public Sector Equality Duty has been considered. **JDL** and **MT** explained how A63 Castle Street has been designed with the equality act and standards in mind. The Applicant has consulted with the Access Officer at HCC and HAIG and have integrated concerns into the design where possible. This is explored further in **Annex B**.
- 4.2.8 The ExA noted a discrepancy in the 2.8 Non-Motorised User Route Plans (document reference APP-011) between the plans (Sheet 3 Option A) and written text. The text makes reference to the provision of mixed pedestrian and cycle routes on both sides of the A63, whereas the plans indicate this will be on the northern side of the carriageway. **JDL** advised the plans are correct and there may be a discrepancy in the text. The Applicant will look into this. *[Post Hearing Note: The Applicant wishes to review the shared cycleway/footpath provision along the A63 and will clarify provision for Deadline 4. Any clarification and amendments to assessments within the ES will be undertaken and documents re-submitted accordingly.]*
- 4.2.9 The ExA questioned the shuttle bus proposals. **JDL** presented the shuttle bus proposals, and the reasoning behind this. The shuttle bus is an initiative which was proposed, with detail being developed in terms of timings, stops and route, but as it would not be required until 2022 there would be time to develop the proposal if considered feasible. The proposal is to provide a shuttle bus during the main construction phase as an alternative to the existing pedestrian movement and the connection between the north and south of the Scheme.
- 4.2.10 **JDL** responded to the ExA and HCC with regards to the route across the A63 via the High Street underpass. He noted that both organisations are working on the proposals for this following a recent meeting and a further workshop and site visit is planned.
- 4.2.11 **MT** stated that the scheme has been designed with due regard to the necessary standards to ensure accessibility. This has been done with consultation with local access improvement groups such as the HAIG and with the Access Officer at HCC.



---

## 5 ExA Agenda Item 4 – Effects relating to minor and local roads and accesses

### 5.1 Roads and accesses to be stopped up or restricted

5.1.1 **MT** discussed how the proposed works interact with the local road network. The description runs east to west on the EB carriageway and west to East on the WB carriageway.

5.1.2 The works will require William Street to be stopped up and a new turning head formed to the flats. Cogan Street will also be pedestrianised. This is due to the proximity of William Booth House to the proposed slip roads in final layout of the delivered scheme. Myton Street will be included as a dedicated lane in the EB on slip as opposed to directly off the A63 Castle Street. Throughout the Old Town and to prevent left in left out turning vehicles onto the new A63 Fish Street, Dagger Lane and Vicar Lane will be stopped up and turning heads installed for local traffic. This will include changes to the Old Town area signage. The access to Select Group will be restricted on to the A63 and a new access will be provided through Grammar School Yard.

5.1.3 **MT** noted that the Scheme, running west to east on the WB carriageway interaction with the local road networks will include changes to Humber Dock Street which will be stopped up with a new turning head constructed to the front of Marina Court and the new PQB. This will prevent left out traffic onto the new road. The main access to Holiday Inn will be stopped up. Alterations will be made to the exit to facilitate new access and egress arrangements. Spruce Road will be stopped up and a new access will be constructed connecting through to Lister Street in order to facilitate access. St James Street will also be stopped up preventing left in left out traffic with a 'banjo' style turning head.

5.1.4 **JDL** noted that Princes Dock Street will be restricted to one-way traffic heading north from the A63 as this will be served by the new dedicated slip running east.

5.1.5 **JDL** noted that there will be a number of changes within Old Town which are in line with the HCC desire to maintain their traffic routes, parking and access in and around the old town ensuring that the area. **JDL** noted that The Applicant has worked extremely closely with officers from HCC on this matter.

5.1.6 **JDL** noted that the changes are driven based on safety and the movement of vehicles. The restriction of the traffic entering the A63 will prevent shockwave traffic jams backing up the newly improved road through vehicles entering 40mph traffic from the side streets or crossing the carriageway via weaving lanes and slip roads.

### 5.2 New Access and turning arrangements

5.2.1 The closure of Fish Street and the impact on Trinity Court was discussed and proposals clarified to the ExA for all three turning heads by **JDL**.

- 5.2.2 **SW** explained the current position and requested The ExA to formally ask Mytongate Development Company to respond by a set deadline. The ExA to consider this.
- 5.2.3 **JDL** confirmed The Applicant will be sending the requested information shortly to Epic No.2 Ltd regarding the proposals for this locality and both parties were working closely together on the proposals.
- 5.2.4 **JDL** explained the Spruce Road closure is linked to the site compound options and offers road safety benefits to the Scheme as a new link road is proposed to the service yard from Lister Street.

### 5.3 Changes to Traffic Flow

- 5.3.1 **CB** explained changes to traffic flows across the network which are presented in Transport Assessment Report (document reference APP-073) Figures 4.1 to 4.3 for the forecast year of 2025 and in Figures 4.3 to 4.6 for the forecast year of 2040, show the change in traffic flow as a result of the Scheme.
- 5.3.2 The traffic model forecasts that there is an increase in traffic levels on the A63 with a decrease on parallel routes, such as Anlaby Road, Spring Bank West and the A165 with the Scheme in place.
- 5.3.3 The Examiner requested further information regarding congestion downstream of the improvements as a result of implementing the Scheme. In simple terms, has the Scheme just transferred congestion to the next junctions downstream?
- 5.3.4 To the west of the Scheme, the A63 is a two-lane dual carriageway with grade-separated junctions and as such, has free-flow traffic conditions for A63 traffic. Table 4.3 of the Traffic Assessment Report identifies a 5% to 8% increase in AADT traffic flow, west of the Scheme, referring to rows titled A63 Clive-Sullivan Way (Off-slip Brighton St. to On-slip Madeley St.) and A63 Clive-Sullivan Way (Off-slip Daltry St. to On-slip St. Andrews Quay). This increase in traffic flow is a result of the decreases in traffic flow on parallel routes, as identified above. There are no proposed changes to the road layout to the west of the Scheme.
- 5.3.5 To the east of the Scheme, Roger Millward Way, formerly known as Garrison Road, is a two-lane dual carriageway with a mixture of at-grade and grade separated junctions. Table 4.3 of the Traffic Assessment Report identifies a 14% to 21% increase in AADT traffic flow to the east of the Scheme, referring to rows titled A63 Garrison Road. While a larger percentage increase, when compared to the west of the Scheme, the forecast AADT is of smaller magnitude. The increase in traffic is likely to result in some additional congestion at the at-grade junctions to the east of the Scheme.
- 5.3.6 It is important to note that this increase in traffic flow and resultant congestion was taken into account when considering the overall transport benefit provided by the scheme. As a specific example, as mentioned above, the travel time savings for typical journeys along the A63, as quoted in Table 4.4 of the Transport Assessment Report, includes the sections of the A63 to the west and

east of the Scheme. This means that although some additional congestion may result, the benefit of the proposed Scheme improvements outweigh any dis-benefit that may result due to the additional traffic attracted to sections of the A63 not being improved.

- 5.3.7 The diagrams within Appendix A of the Transport Assessment Report show AADT traffic flow for the forecast years 2025 and 2040 in graphical form rather than the tabular form of Table 4.3.

## 6 ExA Agenda Item 5 – Effects during construction

### 6.1 How traffic will be affected

- 6.1.1 **MT** outlined how during the construction phase vehicular traffic on the A63 will use two narrowed lanes as they travel through the works.
- 6.1.2 In terms of designing the scheme for temporary traffic there has been consideration of the number of heavy vehicles using the road. This has impacted on usable lane widths and available workable area for the construction of the scheme. The lane widths will be 3.25m on the nearside and 2.75m on the offside unless a swept path survey indicates that they needed to be wider as we further develop the detailed traffic management design.
- 6.1.3 The widths of 3.25m and 2.75 are comparable to details given in current standards and guidance on desirable lane widths for the traffic.
- 6.1.4 There will be restrictions to right turning vehicles up Ferensway at Mytongate Junction for both southbound and westbound in order to facilitate the works during the excavation of the underpass.
- 6.1.5 There will be a temporary speed limit introduced of 30mph along the length of the works. This reduction in speed is based on the increased hazards present during construction, specifically the close proximity to a number of buildings, deep excavations and temporary vehicle barriers. The specifications in use for temporary traffic management all suggest that a speed reduction is required and the impact of the alignment of the gyratory will also slow traffic naturally. This will mean that as we push traffic around the works there will be an effect on the traffic speed.
- 6.1.6 **JDL** clarified The Applicant has worked with HCC on the traffic management proposals and explained how the traffic management proposals have been adapted to accommodate movements. The traffic phasing has been produced in coordination with HCC throughout the process. This has been done to avoid a large impact on the city centre traffic which was driven by traffic modelling results.
- 6.1.7 **JDL** confirmed the signage and diversion route proposals for the construction phase will be progressed during the detailed design of the scheme. As there is a

Requirement for the Traffic Management Plan to be agreed with HCC this will allow them to input into this plan.

## 6.2 Implications for Businesses

- 6.2.1 **JDL** discussed the reason for the temporary acquisition of six parking spaces from the Princes Quay car park and summarised the discussions/progress to date with Princes Quay Estates Limited. **JDL** noted that agreements in principle are in place
- 6.2.2 **CB** explained that the traffic modelling and economic appraisal has not assessed the effect of construction on business individually and has only monetised the impact of delay to users for the construction period.

## 6.3 Pedestrians

- 6.3.1 Epic No.2 Ltd discussed their concerns with regards to KRP, specifically relating to the pedestrian movement between Ferensway and Commercial Road.
- 6.3.2 **JDL** noted that both parties are working together to address Epic No.2's concerns and further meetings are planned.
- 6.3.3 **JDL** discussed the recent Automatic Number Plate Recognition system development at KRP and noted that it appeared that parking levels within the retail park appeared to have reduced.
- 6.3.4 **JDL** noted that The Applicant would like to see pedestrian movement figures for KRP.
- 6.3.5 Epic no.2 require further information on the shuttle bus proposal. **JDL** advised the shuttle bus initiative needs to be developed however the initiative seemed like a sensible suggestion so long as it was likely to be used.
- 6.3.6 **JB** confirmed the shuttle bus proposal is listed as mitigation in the Environmental Statement, it is included in the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP). **JB** confirmed the commitment is to look into the feasibility of the shuttle bus during construction. [**Post Hearing Note: See Annex C**].
- 6.3.7 **JDL** confirmed The Applicant is working with HCC on local network improvement work. This is detailed further in **Annex D**.

## 7 ExA Agenda Item 6 – Safety

- 7.1.1 **JDL** advised the Market Place pedestrian crossing issue was raised in the Road Safety Audit. The Applicant is aware of HCC's request to look into the safety of the crossing. The Applicant will consider and agree a deadline to produce a response.
- 7.1.2 HCC raised an issue with the location / positioning of the change in speed limit at Market Place and Queen Street on safety grounds. HCC would like a 30mph

speed limit applied ahead of any pedestrian crossing point. **JDL** advised The Applicant does not have an issue in principle and will consider where the sign is positioned.

- 7.1.3 The ExA questioned when the SoCG with HCC will be completed and signed off. **JDL** advised it is Deadline 6 when SoCG revisions can be submitted, but both parties are keen to complete the SoCG before this deadline and further meetings are planned.
- 7.1.4 The ExA asked about Written Question ExQ 1.8.2 regarding the NN NPS and asked for further information on how this is being complied with (specifically 4.66).
- 7.1.5 **SW** noted that this would be clarified for the ISH notes, which has now been further detailed below.
- 7.1.6 The scheme design has been developed in accordance with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and Highways England's Project Control Framework (PCF). The DMRB includes a framework of geometric and other standards to provide for the safe operation of the highway. In each case where it has not been feasible to meet the requirements of the DMRB a Departure from Standards (DfS) process has been followed, as part of which the justification and safety case for the proposed solution is made and suitable mitigation proposed such that the residual risk is as low as reasonably practicable.
- 7.1.7 The DMRB and PCF set out a framework for independent review of the road safety aspects of proposed scheme design by means of Roads Safety Audits (RSA's) to be undertaken at specific points during the development of the scheme. The PCF requires satisfactory completion of these products in order for the scheme to progress through the stages of development. The first of these audits, the Stage 1 RSA, was undertaken at the completion of the scheme Preliminary Design. Designer's Response and Exception Reports were prepared in response to the Stage 1 RSA which set out how the issues raised would be addressed in development of the scheme Detailed Design including, where it is not considered feasible to address an issue, the associated justification and mitigation. Subsequent RSA's will be undertaken at completion of the Detailed Design, completion of Construction, and post-opening of the scheme to traffic.
- 7.1.8 As required by the PCF and pursuant to the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015, any operational hazards identified through RSA's, DfS processes, or general scheme design development have been identified on the scheme hazard log. This is a live document, updated throughout the development of the project, in which potential hazards are identified and their management recorded. Management entails elimination where possible through development of the design, or else reduction and mitigation, and communication of residual risks.

- 
- 7.1.9 The ExA asked about air quality (with reference to the response to Written Question ExQ 1.1.2). HCC advised the scheme is located in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and advised they are looking for a betterment to air quality such as additional trees and electrical vehicle charging points. The Applicant has been successful in obtaining funding for 6 vehicle charging points in the city centre. **CM** discussed the need for operational mitigation proposals and the benefit of mitigation planting which is limited.
- 7.1.10 The ExA questioned how designated funds are considered in terms of the scheme examination. **JDL** provided further information on designated funds and confirmed designated funds cannot be used for mitigation. He described where the project team had been successful in obtaining designated funds. Further detail regarding designated funds is contained within the Applicants response to the LIR.

## **8 ExA Agenda Item 7 – Any Other Matters**

- 8.1.1 HCC raised an issue with the central reserve design for the A63 Castle Street Improvement. The proposed concrete barrier is considered by HCC to not be appropriate for a city centre location within a conservation area. **JDL** noted the concern and the detail of this will be considered at a workshop later this month.
- 8.1.2 **SW** would like HCC to present an option that would be preferred for the central reserve barrier.

---

## 9 Annex A – Case for the Scheme in Terms of Traffic

- 9.1.1 The historical context of the Scheme and the development of the current proposal is summarised in the Planning Statement, document reference APP-070. The development of highways improvements on the A63 Castle Street have been considered from the early 1990's, when an initial design to formulate options to increase capacity was undertaken. The design process was then halted following a review of the Governments Roads Programme until the Hull East-West Corridor Multi Modal Study (HUMMS), commissioned in 2000, recommended improvements to the A63. Following an option selection assessment, a Preferred Route Announcement was made by the Secretary of State for Transport in March 2010. A pipeline review was carried out in September 2012 and the Scheme has now been in further development since 2013 culminating in this Development Consent Order Application in September 2018.
- 9.1.2 The A63 Castle Street itself is a 1.5km section of dual carriageway that runs to the south of Hull City Centre, close to the Humber Estuary, and forms an important part of the main eastbound / westbound traffic through route. The route forms a vital link between the M62 motorway, as well as the Humber Bridge and the A15 to the west and the Port of Hull to the east.
- 9.1.3 The A63 is a key route of both local and strategic importance and is part of the E20 Trans-European Network Road, which is approximately 1,880km in length connecting Ireland, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Sweden, Estonia and finally Russia. In the United Kingdom the route connects Hull to Liverpool.
- 9.1.4 By virtue of its position in the local and regional road network, the A63 Castle Street attracts large volumes of traffic, both light goods vehicles (including cars) and a significant number of Heavy Goods Vehicles. These comprise of:
- Regional traffic from the development and dock areas to the east of the city heading west to the M62 and the Humber Bridge
  - Local through traffic, in particular, commuters travelling between the western residential areas and their places of work to the east of the city
  - Local commuter, shopping, business and recreational traffic with destinations in and around the city centre.
- 9.1.5 The A63 Castle Street Section of the A63 is therefore one of the busiest sections in Humberside, carrying daily flows in excess of those recorded on the M62 within the region, The current daily traffic flow on the Castle Street Section is around 47,000 Average Annual Daily Traffic two-way flows as detailed in the Transport Assessment Report document reference APP-073. This level of flow is forecast to increase over the next 20 years.
- 9.1.6 A major feature of the current A63 is the large, at grade signalised Hamburger junction known as Mytongate which links the A63 to Ferensway and the city centre to the north and via Commercial Road to the retail and docks areas to the south. This junction restricts the through flow of traffic along the A63, Ferensway and the interconnecting roads. Delays are also caused by the

---

signalised junction at Market Place and the three pedestrian crossing facilities, at Porter Street, Princes Quay and Humber Dock Street / Dagger Lane. The congestion caused is seen to restrict development opportunities within Hull city centre and dockside areas.

- 9.1.7 The A63 Castle Street has been operating at capacity for several years. The current configuration of the junction at Mytongate and the traffic signals on this section of the A63 will struggle to cope with further traffic growth, increasing congestion over and above that already witnessed currently. Key stakeholders, including HCC, are keen that the Scheme should be constructed at the earliest opportunity as identified in the Environmental Statement Chapter 4, Consultation, document reference APP-023, and the Consultation Report, document reference APP-021.



---

## 10 Annex B – Equality Impact Assessment

- 10.1.1 The Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) (APP-059) for the Scheme is undertaken in accordance with Highways England guidance. It provides an analysis of the proposals to support Highways England in meeting its statutory requirements under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) - part of the Equality Act 2010, by ensuring that the design and location of the Scheme is implemented with equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) principles in mind.
- 10.1.2 Consultation was carried out by Highways England to gain feedback from the public on the options for the Scheme, see Consultation Report (APP-021). Three public consultations were undertaken in 2010, 2013 and 2017. In addition to the main public consultations, additional targeted consultation exercises were carried out with other stakeholders. The engagement activities supported the identification of potential direct and indirect, positive and negative impacts of the Scheme on groups with characteristics protected under the Equality Act 2010 and PSED.
- 10.1.3 The following approach was undertaken in the EqIA to assess how the Scheme would affect people with protected characteristics:
- Step one (A) involved desk-based research and demographic analysis, along with the use of GIS software. These were used to gain an overall understanding of the local area in terms of the built environment and demography.
  - Step two (B) involved a screening process which was carried out in order to detect the likelihood of specific impacts on certain protected characteristic groups.
  - The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Tool (EDIT) was used in step three (Step C) as a tool to understand if there are any high-density areas of protected characteristic groups in the surrounding area. These groups were identified as:
    - children under 16
    - young people between 16 and 24
    - older people aged 65 or older
    - people with disabilities
    - those who have gender reassigned
    - Black, Asian or minority ethnic (BAME) groups
    - minority faith groups
    - sex and gender groups
    - those with different sexual orientation
  - The overall EDIT score for the Scheme was 90% suggesting that it would be highly likely that EDI issues would be an important factor in the effective delivery of the Scheme.
  - Step four (D and E) provided a full analysis of the impacts and their duration on the protected characteristic groups. It concluded the following risks:

### During construction

- Reduced traffic speeds, construction generated dust and emissions and loss of green space. This is likely to negatively impact certain protected characteristic groups such as children and older people.

### During operation

- Shared use paths pedestrian and cycle are a source of concern for visually impaired users, potentially limiting their use by this group.
- The installation of new bridges as part of the Scheme may create routes with steeper gradients and additional walking distances for pedestrians, which could particularly impact on wheelchair users and those with mobility impairments, as well as older people with age-related mobility impairments.
- The loss of open space (for example at Trinity Burial Ground, a designated public open space) may negatively impact children.

## 11 Annex C – Shuttle Bus Clarification

- 10.1.1 Highways England wishes to clarify the commitment to the shuttle bus in the DCO.
- 10.1.2 ES Chapter 15 Effects on all Travellers (APP-023) notes that provision of a shuttle bus will be provided and is a mitigation requirement as follows:
- 10.1.3 “15.7.4 A free ‘shuttle bus’ service would also be provided during construction, and this would pick up and drop off NMUs at predetermined locations either side of the A63 and would also include wheelchair access facilities.”
- 10.1.4 The Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (APP-072) and the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) (APP-068) also makes reference to the shuttle bus as a Scheme commitment as below:

T3	CH15	-	-	Effects of construction upon NMUs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Footways either side of the A63 would be closed during construction.</li> <li>Diversions would be implemented throughout construction allowing for east to west movements for NMUs. The diversion routes would alter phase by phase as NMU provisions are installed and would be clearly signed.</li> <li>A temporary at-grade road crossing is anticipated to be provided close to the existing Porter Street crossing, which would be closed once the new pedestrian, cycle and disabled user bridge at Porter Street has been opened.</li> <li>To the east of Mytongate Junction, existing signalised crossings close to Humber Dock Street and at Market Place would be maintained until Phase 3, whilst improvements would be made to High Street for NMUs during Phase 0.</li> <li>A free 'shuttle bus' service would also be provided during construction, and this would pick up and drop of NMUs at predetermined locations either side of the A63 and would also include wheelchair access facilities.</li> <li>Mitigate the potential for construction noise and dust during works which could temporarily reduce the quality of journeys for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> </ul>	Mitigation measures included in the CEMP.	Contractual responsibilities between Highways England and the design consultant and the Principal Contractor.	Contractor	P, C	Signature:  Date:
----	------	---	---	-----------------------------------	--	---	---	------------	------	-------------------------

- 10.1.5 The Applicant would like to revise this commitment to “A free shuttle bus service would also be provided **if feasible** during construction”. The Applicant will engage in further studies and consultation to ascertain whether a shuttle bus service would be beneficial to the public by exploring likely bus timetables, routes, stops across the Scheme, likely users and likely take up, prior committing to this mitigation.
- 10.1.6 The relevant DCO documents will be amended via the DCO Documents Errata in time for Deadline 4 to reflect this approach.

---

## 12 Annex D - Local Network Improvements

- 12.1.1 The traffic management road layouts proposed during construction of the A63 Castle Street scheme involve the closure of a number of turning movements at the Mytongate Junction. As part of the pre DCO submission process, a significant amount of work has been undertaken to assess the likely impact on both the Applicant's and HCC road networks during the traffic management phase.
- 12.1.2 In particular, in the second phase of the works there will be a requirement to restrict both pedestrian and vehicular movement within the Scheme extents in order to construct the Scheme. This will mainly focus around the Mytongate Junction where pedestrians and vehicles will not be permitted to cross north to south (between Ferensway and Commercial Road).
- 12.1.3 The traffic modelling and assessment carried out for this construction stage indicates that there will be increased delay on the A63 and surrounding Local Road Network (LRN) during this phase of works. The impact is particularly significant during the AM and PM peak periods.
- 12.1.4 To mitigate this impact and ensure both the Strategic and LRN are as resilient as possible during the traffic management phases, the Applicant has allocated a sum of money to fund improvements to identified 'hotspots'. The aim would be to carry out this work in the period prior to the Phase 2 works (2022-2025) subject to the Scheme going through the DCO examination period successfully.
- 12.1.5 The Applicant is currently working with HCC to identify the routes or junctions within the HCC network that would benefit most from some form of improvement during the construction phase. Examples of potential mitigation that are being considered are:
- Junction improvements / Signal Optimisation
  - Shuttle bus provision
  - Park and Ride enhancements