

# Planning Inspectorate NSIP ref no TR010037

## A47 – A11 Thickthorn Junction

Submission from Richard Hawker IP ref No 20028387 Date: 3 March 2022

### Deadline D8 comments

#### Summary

I describe serious confusion about accident predictions and costs.

I still have major misgivings about the accuracy of prediction of traffic flows and counts, as their basis has still not been explained.

#### Road Safety

The applicant, in REP7-007, refers me to the accident data in APP-125, section 4.12. This was in response to my asking about accident occurrences in the slip road arrangement for A47NW to A11SW, (where the feed from Cantley Lane joins the slip) in the absence of information from the applicant to explain in what way this slip road arrangement was no longer acceptable, and why no acceptable redesign could be contemplated in that local area.

From Fig 4.27, showing the impact area, there appear to have been several accidents at the roundabout near where the main slip road joins it, but it is not clear whether these are near the slip arrangement from Cantley Lane, nor their level of severity. Figures for accidents within the impact area over the 5 years 2014 – 2018 are shown in Table 4.15. This shows 11 serious and 1 fatal.

The next table shown is 4.16, and it is not clear to what geographical area this refers. The text describes the changes in the road layout which would be expected to lead to a reduction in accidents, and these are all concerned with the Thickthorn scheme, nothing else, so it is difficult to imagine that this table refers to anything different from the 'impact area' of Table 4.15. Yet the numbers of accidents area very much greater. Exactly what the figures refer to is not explained. Surely what we should be looking at here is the predicted accidents in the impact area, in order to assess the savings, not any wider area. The table is extremely confusing. The abbreviation KSI is not explained, but I have worked out that it is the sum of fatal and serious accidents.

The text says that section 5 explains how these figures are used to assess the economic savings due to accident reduction, yet all I can see is the figure £7.2M quoted, with no calculation shown.

Thus it is difficult to be:

- a) convinced that there is no safe way of allowing Cantley Lane residents to gain access to the main road system without the expense and environmental disruption of the new road over the A11
- b) assured that the £7.2M saving over 60 years due to accident reduction is valid

#### Transport and Traffic.

- 1) The applicant deems it unnecessary to supply traffic count details and turning counts for both the base year and predictions for 2025 and 2040. There is thus no way that the traffic numbers predicted can be verified in any common-sense way. We have no way of checking whether the predicted figures look reasonable, because we have no current turning counts,

nor the origin and destination of traffic; we have to trust that HE's computer programme works accurately. This was certainly not the case with the most recent local large road scheme, the NDR, where I must assume a similar computer programme was used (because we have not been told of any differences). Many predictions were outside the criteria stated in REP7-007.

- 2) The statement is made that the figures have been calibrated and validated, yet this process has still not been explained. I am aware of what TAG says on the subject; validation is the comparison of predicted with actual figures; calibration is the alteration of the computer programme to improve the difference between prediction and actual. I can understand how this can be done using past and current count figures, or using some current figures on some roads to predict those on other roads, but how this can be done for future figures I do not understand. It would be a great help if the applicant could agree to a meeting to discuss and resolve this difficulty. In the absence of that, it is difficult to be confident that the predicted figures, on which the justification for the scheme is mainly based, is reasonable.

Richard Hawker

3 March 2022