

SLAE Written Representation - Traffic and Transportation

LR = Luton Rising, LBC = Luton Borough Council

000673 - Page 6, 5.01 Chapter 18: Traffic and Transportation, LR quote the Aviation Policy Framework policy

| Policy | How and where addressed in ES |
|--|--|
| <p>Surface access is covered in this document in paragraphs 5.11 to 5.13. The document sets out the requirement that all proposals for airport development should demonstrate how the airport will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. ensure easy and reliable access for passengers; b. increase the use of public transport by passengers to access the airport; and c. minimise congestion and other local impacts. <p>The document also states that the general position for existing airports is that developers should pay the costs of upgrading or enhancing road, rail or other transport networks or services where there is a need to cope with additional passengers travelling to and from expanded or growing airports.</p> | <p>The highway and public transport networks, both existing and future with committed improvements, are described in Section 18.7. This demonstrates the quality of the access from the airport to the motorway network and the improvements to rail services that have been introduced recently which, when tied into the opening of the Luton DART link, will provide a very convenient service for air passengers and employees working at the airport and associated offices.</p> <p>The commitments for the increase in use of public transport by air passengers are described in Section 18.1. An FTP [TR020001/APP/7.13] which will support the achievement of those targets has been prepared and tested through a series of workshops attended by representatives of National Highways, LBC, CBC, HCC, and North Herts Council. The FTP [TR020001/APP/7.13] (paragraph 18.8.12) outlines proposals for a comprehensive monitoring process. Traffic models described in Section 18.1 demonstrate that the Highway Interventions that have been proposed and are listed in Table 4.4 of Chapter 4 of this ES [TR020001/APP/5.01] minimise congestion and other local impacts.</p> <p>The Highway Interventions referred to above form part of the Proposed Development and as such will be funded by the Applicant thereby complying with the general position in the document that developers should pay the costs of upgrading or enhancing road, rail or other transport networks or services where there is a need to cope with additional passengers travelling to and from expanded or growing airports.</p> |

SLAE do not believe that LR have addressed the policy sections highlighted in yellow above. A good example of how LR think that they are a 'good neighbour' but actually are not.

SLAE note that when reading the traffic and transportation documents that there is a major topic missing. When the M1 motorway is impacted by an incident (accidents (and called collisions in the application documents)), the knock on impacts to those travelling on non motorway roads in Bedfordshire, Central Beds and Hertfordshire is immense. Instead LR focus on fuel tanker collisions and road junctions.

It is appreciated that Luton Airport can't be held accountable for motorway incidents however the expansion will increase motorway use with journeys to the airport and unfortunately this will most likely increase incidents.

SLAE note that in LR's traffic and transport modelling there is no mention of motorway incident modelling on the adjoining road infrastructure, despite SLAE making LR aware of this at the Harpenden statutory consultation event.

Quite often motorway incidents that cause traffic to slow down or even stop, have knock on impacts. They tend to quickly stretch further than one or two junctions as the overhead signal / sign gantries provide early warnings.

SLAE are concerned about the pressure on roads near to the M1 and which then spread out to residential and town centres when a traffic incident occurs on the motorway. Especially between junctions 9 & 10 and 11 to 10, that cause delays and traffic to build up. In August 2023 SLAE asked the Highways Agency under a **Freedom of Information** (FOI) request to provide details of all M1 reported accidents, northbound Junction 9 to 10 and southbound Junction 11 to 10 for the past five years. Starting at the beginning of each calendar year. Information was provided on, if the motorway had to be closed or partially closed.

When this happens the local road network clogs up as vehicles try to find alternative routes to continue their journeys. In cases of severe incidents when the M1 is closed, partially closed or has long delays, Luton and the surrounding towns and villages nearest to the M1 (including the A5 through Dunstable) suffer horrendous impacts. Suddenly and unexpectedly the local roads, traffic lights, junctions and roundabouts that are not designed to cope with the volumes of motorway traffic become snarled up. Road users are caught up in long queues, delays, missing appointments, picking up family or friends at set times, business transport is held up costing the economy (particularly 'just-in-time' supply train practices), travellers going to Luton Airport become late for their flights and even aircrew and airport staff can be caught out.

SLAE are sure that LR have the mechanisms to count the cost to the economy of such an incident. There will be drivers caught out, not used to driving in such conditions and there is also the health effects of driver stress, worry, impatience, uncertainty and trying to make up lost time by finding short cuts, doubling back and speeding once the road is clear.

SLAE are sure that LR can also calculate the air pollution caused by such gridlock.

SLAE can also see that LR can also calculate the driver stress caused by such incidents using similar models as evidenced in (document 000763-5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 18.1 Traffic and Transportation Methodology) Driver Stress and Delay.

SLAE ask why none of this has been done?

SLAE ask why this has all been missed?

Looking at the FOI information received from the Highways Agency (which SLAE are happy to make available). We can see, that In the last five years and eight months a total of 302 incidents caused one or more lanes of the **southbound** M1 motorway from Junction 11 to Junction 10 to be closed. The Highways agency capture more than one reason for each

incident (example, one lane may be closed and then another etc) and so the columns in the tables are not totalled.

| Incident impact | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | Grand Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Signal / sign setting | 56 | 62 | 31 | 37 | 58 | 44 | 288 |
| Rolling Closure | | 16 | 14 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 55 |
| 1 lane closed | 42 | 56 | 32 | 37 | 60 | 43 | 270 |
| 2 lanes closed | 15 | 3 | | | 1 | | 19 |
| 3 lanes closed | 6 | 3 | | | 1 | | 10 |
| 4 lanes closed | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Whole carriageway closed | | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 |
| Rolling Closure | 3 | | | | | | 3 |
| Traffic stopped | 4 | 18 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 59 |
| Traffic Stopped, Slip road(s) closed | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Traffic stopped, Rolling Closure | 7 | 4 | | | | | 11 |

In the last five years and eight months a total of 101 incidents caused one or more lanes of the **northbound** M1 motorway from Junction 9 to Junction 10 to be closed. The Highways agency can capture more than one reason for each incident and so the columns are not totalled.

| Incident Impact | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | Grand Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Signal / sign setting | 19 | 18 | 10 | 17 | 23 | 11 | 98 |
| Rolling Closure | | 6 | 8 | 9 | 6 | | 29 |
| 1 lane closed | 13 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 15 | 10 | 61 |
| 2 lanes closed | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 5 | | 25 |
| 3 lanes closed | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| 4 lanes closed | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 5 lanes closed | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Whole carriageway closed | 1 | | | | 2 | | 3 |
| Slip road(s) closed | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 3 |
| Slip road(s) closed, Traffic Stopped | | | | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| Rolling Closure | 1 | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| Traffic Stopped | 1 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 5 | | 23 |
| Traffic stopped, Rolling Closure | 7 | 4 | | | | | 7 |

SLAE work out that an average of 4.4 incidents occur each month that may cause motorway traffic to clog the alternative road network. Note, that without covid the numbers would be higher.

LR use models to define traffic flows to predict the volume of road users and SLAE also had a brief look at motorway incidents occurring in the peak hours.

SLAE think that LR Peak hours are as defined in 18.5.13 and 18.5.28 of document 000673-5.01 Environmental Statement Chapter 18 Traffic and Transportation are,

- a. AM Peak hour between 08:00 and 09:00;

c. PM Peak hour between 17:00 and 18:00.

Although, in 18.5.29 LR use extraction from CBLTM-LTN based on a knowledge of the operation of the local highway network.

a. AM Peak Hour (08:00 to 09:00); b. PM Peak Hour (17:00 to 18:00);

c. AM Peak Period (07:00 to 10:00); e. PM Peak Period (16:00 to 19:00);

SLAE decided to only use the Peak hours as defined in 18.5.13 and 18.5.28, and have only used data either starting from 08:00 & 17:00 and ending 09:00 & 18:00 so those incidents that started before and finished outside that time period are not counted. SLAE are well aware that Peak hours are normally classed as 'rush hours' and extend longer than the definition LR use.

59 incidents occurred on the Motorway within the peak times **southbound** whilst **northbound** 24 incidents. Of course incidents that happen and clog up roads before school times would have impacts not captured in these numbers.

If SLAE can ask for and receive the data from the Highways Agency via a FOI, why couldn't LR?

Paragraph 2.2.32 in the document 000763, TR020001-000763-5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 18.1 Traffic and Transportation Methodology, says, 'The following junctions have been assessed with regard to potential environmental effects relating to collisions and safety:'

SLAE took the models shown in tables 1.1 Selected Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flows, table 1.4: Flow changes on the selected links of Document 000764 TR020001-000764-5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 18.2 Selected Traffic Flow Modelling Results. We also took the data from the construction table 18.5 construction traffic estimates found in 000941-5.01-Environmental-Statement-Chapter-18-Traffic-and-Transportation-Revision-1.

We were only interested in the M1 motorway data and in most cases the data in the tables show an increase in vehicle traffic projections due to airport expansion. Therefore it is fair to state that more M1 motorway incidents will occur, more clogged up roads and more driver health issues.

It is also fair to say that most of the road links as named in the full extract of the tables would also be impacted by incidents on the M1 motorway. Construction traffic using 'A' roads would only compound the issue.

SLAE ask that in construction traffic is halted when incidents occur on the M1 motorway, to minimise the impact on non motorway roads.

Tables 1.1 Selected Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flows

| Road Link | 2016 (AADT) | 2027 (AADT) | | | | 2039 (AADT) | | | | 2043 (AADT) | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------|--------|--------|-------------|---------|--------|--------|-------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Base | DM | DS | Change | Change | DM | DS | Change | Change | DM | DS | Change | Change |
| A1081 New Airport Way between London Road slip roads | 38,585 | 45,139 | 48,203 | 3,065 | 6.8% | 48,284 | 55,753 | 7,469 | 15.5% | 50,219 | 59,792 | 9,573 | 19.1% |
| Slip road from A1081 London Road to A1081 New Airport Way WB | 5,705 | 7,957 | 7,654 | -303 | -3.8% | 8,264 | 9,279 | 1,015 | 12.3% | 9,965 | 9,603 | -362 | -3.6% |
| Slip road to A1081 London Road from A1081 New Airport Way EB | 5,377 | 7,723 | 6,941 | -782 | -10.1% | 8,640 | 7,572 | -1,068 | -12.4% | 8,754 | 7,283 | -1,471 | -16.8% |
| A1081 New Airport Way between M1 Jct. 10 and A1081 London Road | 49,667 | 60,820 | 62,798 | 1,978 | 3.3% | 65,189 | 72,604 | 7,415 | 11.4% | 68,941 | 76,678 | 7,737 | 11.2% |
| M1 Jct. 10 southbound on-slip road | 16,413 | 18,140 | 18,599 | 459 | 2.5% | 15,903 | 22,705 | 6,802 | 42.8% | 21,521 | 24,016 | 2,495 | 11.6% |
| M1 Jct. 10 northbound off-slip road | 14,020 | 15,729 | 16,374 | 645 | 4.1% | 17,016 | 18,454 | 1,437 | 8.4% | 17,111 | 19,449 | 2,339 | 13.7% |
| M1 Jct. 10 roundabout (west side) | 23,352 | 28,782 | 29,741 | 959 | 3.3% | 31,011 | 33,589 | 2,578 | 8.3% | 31,947 | 35,978 | 4,031 | 12.6% |
| M1 Jct. 10 roundabout (northern overbridge) | 14,021 | 15,708 | 16,377 | 669 | 4.3% | 17,053 | 18,517 | 1,464 | 8.6% | 17,134 | 19,524 | 2,390 | 13.9% |
| M1 Jct. 10 roundabout (southern overbridge) | 9,332 | 13,054 | 13,366 | 312 | 2.4% | 13,991 | 15,131 | 1,139 | 8.1% | 14,834 | 16,523 | 1,689 | 11.4% |
| M1 between Jct. 9 and Jct. 10 | 139,690 | 163,118 | 163,390 | 272 | 0.2% | 179,510 | 182,464 | 2,954 | 1.6% | 184,731 | 187,830 | 3,099 | 1.7% |
| M1 between Jct. 8 and Jct. 9 | 144,866 | 166,338 | 166,785 | 447 | 0.3% | 183,431 | 184,993 | 1,561 | 0.9% | 187,898 | 190,439 | 2,541 | 1.4% |
| M1 Jct. 10 northbound on-slip road | 9,331 | 13,075 | 13,365 | 290 | 2.2% | 13,958 | 15,072 | 1,114 | 8.0% | 14,813 | 16,454 | 1,641 | 11.1% |
| M1 Jct. 10 southbound off-slip road | 9,890 | 13,917 | 14,456 | 539 | 3.9% | 15,144 | 16,249 | 1,104 | 7.3% | 15,448 | 16,612 | 1,163 | 7.5% |
| M1 between Jct. 10 and Jct. 11 | 128,479 | 156,106 | 156,101 | -5 | 0.0% | 172,495 | 172,631 | 136 | 0.1% | 176,357 | 177,432 | 1,076 | 0.6% |
| M1 within Jct. 11 | 98,648 | 128,483 | 128,568 | 85 | 0.1% | 143,298 | 143,643 | 345 | 0.2% | 146,671 | 147,778 | 1,107 | 0.8% |
| M1 between Jct. 11 and Jct. 11A | 111,262 | 144,204 | 144,480 | 276 | 0.2% | 161,373 | 161,900 | 527 | 0.3% | 165,243 | 166,633 | 1,390 | 0.8% |

Table 1.4: Flow changes on the selected links

| Road Name | 2027 | | | 2039 | | | 2043 | | |
|--|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| | AADT | AM Peak | PM Peak | AADT | AM Peak | PM Peak | AADT | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| Slip road to A1081 London Road from A1081 New Airport Way EB | -10.1% | -9.9% | -12.7% | -12.4% | -13.7% | -5.8% | -16.8% | -7.2% | -18.2% |
| A1081 New Airport Way between M1 Jct. 10 and A1081 London Road | 3.3% | 1.6% | 1.3% | 11.4% | 5.9% | 21.6% | 11.2% | 8.1% | 4.9% |
| M1 Jct. 10 southbound on-slip road | 2.5% | 0.4% | -0.2% | 42.8% | 30.5% | 85.7% | 11.6% | -0.7% | 80.8% |
| M1 Jct. 10 northbound off-slip road | 4.1% | 3.4% | 2.4% | 8.4% | 6.7% | 4.0% | 13.7% | 15.6% | 4.0% |
| M1 Jct. 10 roundabout (west side) | 3.3% | 2.6% | 1.7% | 8.3% | 8.0% | 8.5% | 12.6% | 14.0% | 4.2% |
| M1 Jct. 10 roundabout (northern overbridge) | 4.3% | 3.4% | 3.1% | 8.6% | 6.8% | 4.7% | 13.9% | 15.7% | 5.2% |
| M1 Jct. 10 roundabout (southern overbridge) | 2.4% | 0.9% | 0.9% | 8.1% | 10.7% | 13.2% | 11.4% | 11.0% | 4.5% |
| M1 between Jct. 9 and Jct. 10 | 0.2% | 0.4% | 0.6% | 1.6% | 1.1% | 4.5% | 1.7% | 1.7% | 1.3% |
| M1 between Jct. 8 and Jct. 9 | 0.3% | 0.4% | 0.8% | 0.9% | 0.5% | 1.6% | 1.4% | 1.2% | 1.2% |
| M1 Jct. 10 northbound on-slip road | 2.2% | 0.9% | 0.2% | 8.0% | 10.6% | 12.6% | 11.1% | 11.0% | 3.2% |
| M1 Jct. 10 southbound off-slip road | 3.9% | 1.2% | 1.6% | 7.3% | 1.0% | 5.9% | 7.5% | 2.5% | -1.3% |
| M1 between Jct. 10 and Jct. 11 | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.5% | 0.1% | 0.2% | -0.4% | 0.6% | 0.3% | -0.2% |
| M1 within Jct. 11 | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.5% | 0.2% | 0.2% | -0.6% | 0.8% | 0.2% | -0.1% |
| M1 between Jct. 11 and Jct. 11A | 0.2% | 0.3% | 0.6% | 0.3% | 0.3% | -0.4% | 0.8% | 0.4% | 0.3% |

Table 18.5: Construction traffic estimates

| Assessment Phase | Duration (Quarters) | Total Vehicles (HGVs) | Average Vehicles per Quarter (HGVs) | Peak Vehicles in a Quarter (HGVs) |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Assessment Phase 1 | 10 | 57,866 (43,477) | 5,787 (4,348) | 8,127 (5,933) |
| Assessment Phase 2a | 16 | 145,887 (106,309) | 9,118 (6,644) | 15,333 (9,966) |
| Assessment Phase 2b | 16 | 71,896 (54,199) | 4,494 (3,387) | 9,687 (7,072) |
| Overall | 42 | 275,649 (203,985) | 6,563 (4,857) | 15,333 (9,966) |

13.4 Construction HGV routing

*13.4.1 The lead contractors will consult with local highway authorities regarding local access routes that may be used to access the construction sites. However, the primary access route to the site is expected to be via Junction 10 (M1), along the A1081 (New Airport Way), then via President Way or the AAR, as shown in **Figure 13.1**.*

What will be the measures to stop local access routes from being used?

SLAE suggest that trackers placed in construction site vehicles and that data made available in 'real time' to the public of movements. This would enable LR and the Lead Contractor the chance to keep promises and help form a 'good neighbour' approach, and give the public faith that LR are 'walking the walk', and not 'talking the talk'.