

From: Rod Fisher [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: 22 September 2015 00:25
To: A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon
Subject: A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Examination

Roderick M A Fisher
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Tuesday, 22 September 2015

Ms Frances Fernandes
The Planning Inspectorate
A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Examination
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

Dear Ms Fernandes

A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Examination
Note for item under "any other business" Thursday 17th September 2015
Roderick Fisher, Brampton A14 Campaign Group

With reference to my submission Wednesday, 11 March 2015 Registration of Interest:

- "The scheme is flawed in that it does not separate all traffic flows North/South with flows East/West but maintains the conflict over the section between Huntingdon and Cambridge, which is a significant factor in current congestion."

From items raised on Wednesday 16th September I learned:

- a] 60% of traffic over the Brampton to Girton section of the A14 is 'through' traffic
- b] plans for the Huntingdon part of the scheme are in some disarray for the area around the bridge over the railway and the junction on the Huntingdon side

Because the scheme at 2010 was cancelled due to cost, and I believe the proposed scheme still to be very expensive, I am suggesting there could be a much cheaper alternative:

- the existing proposed route could be single lane each way, 60mph max speed, no junctions but with some overtaking points, to provide for through traffic
- retain the existing A14, including the viaduct over the railway, for other traffic, thus separating conflicting flows of traffic and reducing congestion

This would reduce markedly the cost of road and bridge building, signing etc and save the cost of demolishing the viaduct.

This proposal should be evaluated but in no way replaces my contention that the whole scheme should be abandoned as unnecessary given the accumulated factors that can reduce congestion and reduce accidents viz:

1. 2% improvement coming from further rail investment
2. 2% improvement coming from A428 dualing investment
3. introduction of comprehensive traffic management, already effective elsewhere, for reducing congestion and accident costs – say 4% improvement [maybe more at peak times]
4. elimination of non-essential junctions on this route to maintain easier traffic flow – say 1%
5. comprehensive signing giving both warnings and encouragement for better awareness of risks and better driving behaviour, as done elsewhere – say 2%
6. realistic traffic forecasts [not designed to justify a new road]

Thank you for this opportunity to express my views.

Yours sincerely