

## Chapter 8 Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>8.3</b>
APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS.....	8.3
<b>FIVE YEAR PROGRAMME INCLUDING MAJOR ROAD SCHEME</b> .....	<b>8.3</b>
PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION.....	8.3
Integrated Transport .....	8.3
Network Management.....	8.4
Maintenance .....	8.4
Major Schemes.....	8.4
<b>IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSALS</b> .....	<b>8.4</b>
ENVIRONMENT .....	8.4
Noise.....	8.4
Local Air Quality.....	8.4
Greenhouse Gases.....	8.4
Landscape .....	8.4
Townscape.....	8.4
Heritage of Historic Resources .....	8.5
Biodiversity.....	8.5
Water Environment.....	8.5
Physical Fitness .....	8.5
Journey Ambience .....	8.5
SAFETY .....	8.5
Accidents .....	8.5
Security .....	8.5
ECONOMY.....	8.5
Transport Economic Efficiency .....	8.5
Reliability.....	8.5
Wider Economic Impacts .....	8.5
ACCESSIBILITY .....	8.6
Option Values .....	8.6
Severance.....	8.6
Access to the Transport System.....	8.6
INTEGRATION .....	8.6
Transport Interchange.....	8.6
Land-Use Policy.....	8.6
Other Government Policies.....	8.6
<b>APPRAISAL SUMMARY TABLES WITH MAJOR SCHEME</b> .....	<b>8.6</b>
SUPPORTING ANALYSES .....	8.7
Problems.....	8.7
Base Year Problems.....	8.7
<b>Table 8.1 Simplified AST - Combined 5 Year Programme</b> <b>with Major Scheme (Earl Shilton Bypass)</b> .....	<b>8.8</b>
Do-Minimum Forecast and Problems Anticipated .....	8.9
CHANGES BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN .....	8.9
<b>ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING ANALYSES</b> .....	<b>8.9</b>
DISTRIBUTION AND EQUITY.....	8.9
Accessibility .....	8.9
Economy.....	8.10
Health.....	8.10
Safety.....	8.10
Environment.....	8.10
Integration Objective.....	8.10

---

AFFORDABILITY AND FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY .....	8.11
PRACTICALITY AND PUBLIC ACCEPTABILITY .....	8.11
IMPACT ON SOCIAL EXCLUSION .....	8.11
<b>ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION .....</b>	<b>8.11</b>
<b>FIVE YEAR PROGRAMME EXCLUDING MAJOR ROAD SCHEME .....</b>	<b>8.12</b>
PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION .....	8.12
IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSALS .....	8.12
Environment .....	8.12
Safety .....	8.13
Economy .....	8.13
Accessibility .....	8.13
APPRAISAL SUMMARY TABLES .....	8.13
<b>SUPPORTING ANALYSES .....</b>	<b>8.13</b>
PROBLEMS .....	8.13
ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING ANALYSES .....	8.13
PRACTICALITY AND PUBLIC ACCEPTABILITY .....	8.13
<b>Table 8.2 Simplified Ast - 5 Year Programme</b>	
<b>without Major Scheme (Earl Shilton Bypass) .....</b>	<b>8.14</b>

## Introduction

### APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS

**8.1** This chapter sets out two simplified Appraisal Summary Tables (ASTs) for the LTP as a whole, with and without including the Earl Shilton Bypass major scheme respectively. The AST is an assessment of the contribution of the LTP to the Government's main five transport objectives. This is achieved by assessing the LTP against a number of set criteria, which are outlined in Government's guidance on appraisal of LTPs. The LTP is compared to a do-minimum scenario, the future situation if the LTP were not implemented, and a score is awarded according to whether the LTP would have a positive or negative contribution.

**8.2** The Earl Shilton Bypass major scheme itself requires a more detailed appraisal which is presented in a separate document. The impacts of the scheme will be mainly local to the Earl Shilton and Hinckley area.

**8.3** The do-minimum scenario is the future without the LTP. In Leicestershire the only committed do-minimum major scheme is the A511 Ashby Bypass. However, there are major areas of approved land use development that will proceed with or without the LTP, which will generate significant growth in travel demand. It is against this do-minimum scenario of growth in travel demand, especially car travel, that the LTP has been assessed.

## Five Year Programme Including Major Road Scheme

### PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

**8.4** The five year programme consists of a variety of schemes and initiatives to be undertaken in the LTP area. Schemes are broadly grouped into the following:

- Integrated Transport Measures.
- Maintenance Proposals.
- Major Schemes.

### Integrated Transport

**8.5** Within the Bid Table, schemes under this heading are further divided into a number of sub-groupings:

#### Public Transport

**8.6** Improvement measures are primarily based on increasing the availability and ease of use of bus services including improvements to bus service quality, bus priority measures, improved interchange in both rural and urban areas, and improved and accessible bus information.

#### Vulnerable Road Users

**8.7** The measures are focused at improving accessibility and safety of vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians, cyclists and those with mobility impairments. Proposals include improved pedestrian crossings, footways, pedestrian preference schemes, pedestrian zones and the expansion of cycle route networks and parking facilities, and improved facilities within the highway boundary for disabled users.

#### Personal Security

**8.8** Personal Security is addressed in the programme through a variety of measures aimed at reducing the fear of crime and improvement to road safety. Measures are targeted at reducing casualties and improving the general travel environment. The programme includes casualty reduction, road safety education, speed management, school travel, street lighting and the introduction of home zones especially in rural areas.

#### Town Centre Management

**8.9** A key part of the LTP programme is the implementation of transport measures on an area basis, as outlined in the Area Strategies in Chapter 5. A number of towns have Town Centre improvement programmes focussed on full and partial pedestrianisation. The towns, and the timing of the work, have been selected on the basis of need and cost-effectiveness of proposals and on their state of readiness.

## Network Management

**8.10** Management of the transport network is part of the programme's proposals. These include improvement of road signing, improvement of SCOOT operation in the towns and focussed improvements to junctions, lorry routes and parking and weight-restriction enforcement.

**8.11** There are a number of miscellaneous measures which are part of integrated transport. These include support for air quality monitoring and the monitoring of travel patterns.

## Maintenance

**8.12** The maintenance programme includes a variety of road and bridge schemes including assessment, resurfacing and strengthening of the Principal Road network and highway structures. There will be a change in the emphasis of the bridge programme during the course of the LTP, as the strengthening work is completed and maintenance increases.

## Major Schemes

**8.13** One major new scheme is included in the programme – a Bypass of Earl Shilton. Continued funding is also required for on-going works on the Ashby Bypass, which received funding through the provisional LTP.

## Impacts of the Proposals

**8.14** As noted earlier, the participation indicated that traffic growth issues were not seen as being a serious concern, except in certain locations at certain times of the day. Traffic surveys highlight that most congestion problems are during the traditional peak hours. The proposals within the LTP are intended to impact upon peak period traffic flows at key locations, although it is expected that there will be benefits throughout the day. With this basis, the impacts of the proposals on the Government's objectives are outlined below.

## ENVIRONMENT

### Noise

**8.15** It is considered that a reduction in instances of excessive noise would be reduced. Noise is a function of traffic flow and speed, and an overall reduction in noise will occur in areas where pedestrianisation measures are proposed and traffic removed, although noise could increase in surrounding areas if traffic is merely displaced. Within Earl Shilton Town Centre, the Bypass will result in noise reduction; although it is likely that noise will be increased in the vicinity of the Bypass as a result of traffic, appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented. The use of low noise surface materials will also have a beneficial effect.

### Local Air Quality

**8.16** A reduction in rate of traffic growth will contribute to a reduction in the rate of deterioration of air quality. Pedestrian friendly areas of Earl Shilton, Ashby-de-la Zouch and to a lesser extent Hinckley, Loughborough and, if funds permit, Lutterworth will benefit from particular air quality improvements due to the localised removal of traffic.

### Greenhouse Gases

**8.17** The reduction in the rate of traffic growth and congestion will also contribute to a reduction in the rate of increase of greenhouse gas emissions which are directly linked to vehicle emissions and to the burning of fossil fuels.

### Landscape

**8.18** The Bypass would have a negative effect on the landscape around Earl Shilton. However, measures to minimise this impact would be included in the design of the scheme.

### Townscape

**8.19** The Town Centre Strategies and the Bypass proposals will considerably improve the urban landscape by removing traffic from the towns and improving the overall Town Centre environment.

## Heritage of Historic Resources

**8.20** The Town Centre Strategies and the Earl Shilton Bypass will contribute to the protection of historic resources by reducing direct traffic and pollution impacts.

## Biodiversity

**8.21** The construction of the Earl Shilton Bypass will result in a small loss of wildlife habitat around Earl Shilton. No positive impacts on biodiversity have been identified.

## Water Environment

**8.22** The LTP encourages use of waterways for leisure and amenity, and freight where it does not conflict with other uses. It is possible that the construction of the Earl Shilton Bypass could have an adverse effect on the local water environment, although this will be considered and minimised as part of the scheme's detailed design.

## Physical Fitness

**8.23** Increased levels of walking and cycling and a reduction in the use of cars will contribute to improved levels of physical fitness. Respiratory diseases and other health problems associated with pollution will also be reduced as a result of improvements in air quality.

## Journey Ambience

**8.24** Improvements in the quality of public transport facilities, including waiting facilities, new vehicles and information availability, will improve the quality of public transport journeys. Infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians will also contribute to improving journey ambience. A reduction in traffic flows, particularly at peak periods, will also improve the journey quality for pedestrians, cyclists and users of buses, all of which are adversely affected by traffic.

## SAFETY

### Accidents

**8.25** The number and seriousness of accidents will be reduced by the road safety

strategy proposed in the LTP. The Earl Shilton Bypass will be particularly beneficial in reducing accidents in the town centre.

## Security

**8.26** Proposals for improved street lighting will increase security for non-car users as well as drivers. Pedestrianisation will reduce some crime levels through increased use of the town centre, and increase safety through decreased traffic. Improvement to public transport interchanges and information will reduce the uncertainty for vulnerable users of using public transport.

## ECONOMY

### Transport Economic Efficiency

**8.27** Measures included in the LTP to improve access, reliability and integration of transport will contribute to improved transport economic efficiency. The Quality Bus Partnerships contribute to reducing the cost of transport provision and help to safe guard the existing bus network. The Earl Shilton Bypass removes through traffic on to more appropriate routes, reducing congestion on the strategic corridors and improving the efficiency of the network.

## Reliability

**8.28** The main gains in transport reliability will result from a reduction in congestion levels at peak times. This will benefit all road users, buses, cyclists, powered two wheelers, freight operators, deliveries and taxis, as well as car drivers. The StarTrak real time information system and Bus Line public transport telephone inquiry service will also improve perception of reliability for transport users.

## Wider Economic Impacts

**8.29** The wider regeneration of the LTP area will be assisted through the integration of transport and land use policies and Town Centre Strategies. The economic development of Hinckley, Earl Shilton and Ashby-de-la-Zouch will be aided by the reduction in traffic congestion and associated environmental and social improvements brought about by the LTP proposals. The SRB scheme in Coalville

includes transport proposals which contribute to achieving the LTP Objectives. These will act as a catalyst for improving the economy of the area.

## ACCESSIBILITY

### Option Values

**8.30** The LTP is focused on reducing traffic impact and increasing the attractiveness of more sustainable travel modes. It is likely that, at some point, most if not all people in the LTP area will benefit from access to travel modes other than the car. Alternative modes will become increasingly attractive as the cost of private car travel and congestion levels increase. However increase in travel options will not be restricted to car drivers, as users of all modes will benefit from having alternatives. It is estimated, therefore, that everyone in the area will benefit to some degree.

### Severance

**8.31** Measures to benefit vulnerable road users, in particular pedestrians, and measures to reduce levels of traffic growth will contribute to reducing severance. Town centre improvement proposals will remove severance caused by traffic congestion on town centre roads. The Earl Shilton Bypass will remove severance caused by through traffic on the A47 in the town centre.

### Access to the Transport System

**8.32** The extension of cycling and walking facilities will make both of these modes more accessible to a large proportion of the population. Improvements in public transport quality, such as information availability through the provision of StarTrak, Busline and the PTI 2000 initiative, and improvement of interchanges including waiting areas and access to station and stops, will also increase access to buses and trains. School travel initiatives will increase accessibility of schools by non-car travel modes.

## INTEGRATION

### Transport Interchange

**8.33** Improvements to bus and bus/train interchange in both rural and urban areas will be developed through the LTP programme. In addition, improved cycling and walking facilities will encourage the integration of these modes with public transport.

### Land-Use Policy

**8.34** The Local Authorities in Leicestershire are working together ensure the integration of land-use and transport policy and this is reflected in the LTP. Proposals in the LTP reflect those in the Structure Plan, and Local Plan reviews will ensure that transport policy is consistent. The main emphasis of the Structure Plan is sustainable development, and that is reflected in the LTP.

### Other Government Policies

**8.35** The LTP will contribute to many Central and Local Government policies, particularly those aimed at improving health, the economy and reducing social exclusion and crime levels. The overall objective of all of these policies is sustainable development - an improved quality of life for everyone. The five-year programme will make a positive contribution to this aim.

## Appraisal Summary Tables With Major Scheme

**8.36** The AST is outlined in Table 8.1 and shows the contribution of the Leicestershire LTP to the Government's objectives. The County Council's main LTP Objectives closely reflect those of central Government. Therefore, the AST also shows the LTP's contribution to achieving the LTP's Objectives. This has been outlined fully in Chapter 7.

**8.37** The AST includes qualitative scores on a 7 point scale to measure the impact of the LTP on the Government's objectives. 1 is the most negative impact and 7 is the most positive impact, with 4 indicating a neutral score, that is, the LTP would not have any impact on the Government's objectives.

## SUPPORTING ANALYSES

**8.38** This appraisal is based on the information contained in the LTP and a generalised assessment of the overall impact of the LTP have been undertaken.

### Problems

**8.39** The do-minimum approach would result in a continuation and probable worsening of the existing problems experienced by users of the area's transport system, particularly road congestion, accidents and declining patronage of public transport services. In rural areas social exclusion resulting from lack of transport alternatives would worsen, and rat running traffic and traffic speed would increase. Wider and more indirect problems such as worsening air quality and adverse economic impacts would continue. These problems were described in Chapter 3.

**8.40** The implementation of the five-year plan would reduce the level and impact of these problems under the Government's five over-arching objectives. Targets contained in Table 7.3 indicate the expected changes which will result from the implementation of the LTP.

### Base Year Problems

**8.41** Existing problems identified in Chapter 3 of the LTP include:

- long-term decrease in bus patronage;
- poor levels of bus service as an alternative for those who do not have access to a car;
- increasing costs of providing the bus network;
- low quality of bus services which therefore fail to attract new users;
- the complexity of some bus journeys, especially for those not used to using them, and the difficulties of accessing relevant information;
- limited integration of bus services and lack of integration between rail and bus services, providing a considerable disincentive to travel by public transport;
- the lack of attention given to walking as a means of transport, indicated by a decline in the average number of journeys walked per person per year in Leicestershire by 12% between 1985/6 and 1993/5 (National Travel Survey);
- a decline in cycling levels in the county;
- continued growth in the proportion of children being driven to school, contributing 12.5% of morning peak hour travel nationally (1995/7);
- significant congestion in the larger towns, particularly at peak times -75% of journeys to work in the East Midlands in 1997 were made by car;
- potential tensions between the county economic strategy, which seeks economic growth, and transport strategy, which seeks to reduce the need to travel and reduce reliance on the private car;
- town centres in the area are facing an increasing challenge to survive against the dispersal of activity brought about by the increasing dependence on the private car and changing patterns of travel;
- high volumes of heavy goods vehicles in the county due to the local motorway network and the presence of several quarries;
- excessive road speeds which contributes to about one third of all road accidents;
- poor street lighting in some areas which deters vulnerable transport users from travelling during the hours of darkness;
- increasing traffic levels - traffic forecasts for Leicestershire indicate that traffic will increase between 35% and 72% over the 1996 level over the period 1996 to 2025, 2% higher than the average for the East Midlands;
- a number of key pollutants, including carbon monoxide and particulates (which result from motorised transport), have been identified as requiring a Second or Third Stage Review during the District Authority 'Review and Assessment' process, meaning that they may exceed national limits;
- developments which have taken place in locations which have few or no local facilities, thus increasing the reliance on private travel;

Table 8.1 Simplified AST - Combined 5 Year Programme with Major Scheme (Earl Shilton Bypass)

Description		Problems		
OBJECTIVE	SUB-OBJECTIVE	QUALITATIVE IMPACTS	QUANTITATIVE MEASURE	ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENT	Noise	Reduction in noise level growth rates		6
	Local Air Quality	Reduction in pollution level growth rates		6
	Greenhouse Gases	Reduction in greenhouse gas level growth rates		5
	Landscape	Bypass disbenefits		3
	Townscape	Benefits from Town Centre proposals in Ashby, Earl Shilton, Hinckley, Loughborough and Melton Mowbray.		7
	Heritage of Historic Resources	Pedestrianisation benefits; protection of Earl Shilton centre by traffic removal		6
	Biodiversity	Bypass – loss of wildlife habitats		3
	Water Environment	Possible adverse effects of Bypass		3
	Physical Fitness	Increased cycling/ walking; cleaner air		6
	Journey Ambience	Improved public transport facilities; better cycling/ walking infrastructure; less traffic		6
SAFETY	Accidents	Reduced numbers and seriousness of casualties	Target 40% reduction in overall casualties by 2011	7
	Security	Better lighting; pedestrianisation; increased public transport patronage		6
ECONOMY	Transport Economic Efficiency	Reducing congestion in towns, improved reliability of transport services and Quality Bus Partnerships		6
	Reliability	Improved public and private transport reliability		6
ACCESSIBILITY	Option Values	Improved mode choice for all users		6
	Severance	Overall reduction in severance. Removal of severance resulting from town centre improvements		7
	Access to the Transport System	Increased accessibility to transport system		6
INTEGRATION	Transport Interchange	Easier rural and urban interchange		5
	Land-Use Policy	Contributes to County/District land-use policies		5
	Other Government Policies	Only minor impacts		4

- ❑ certain groups of individuals are excluded socially due to the lack of available transport options, including the young, elderly, women and those with disabilities. Exclusion is further exacerbated by the continued erosion of facilities experienced in many rural areas;
- ❑ rural areas (the majority of the LTP area) suffer particularly from poor public transport, heavy through traffic, speeding traffic and inappropriate freight traffic. The promotion of tourism in the rural areas can also lead to adverse environmental impact.

## Do-Minimum Forecast and Problems Anticipated

**8.42** National and regional guidance and research indicates that, if no more than the minimum is done, the trends and problems outlined above will worsen and their impacts will become increasingly felt by everyone living or working in, or visiting, the area. For example, reliance on the private car will increase and traffic levels will continue to rise. This will result in further congestion and related air quality problems, social exclusion and economic strain. There will be a corresponding reduction in patronage of public transport, further disadvantaging those who have no alternative means of travel. This will be felt most acutely in the most rural areas.

## CHANGES BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN

**8.43** In general, the impact of the Plan will be to reduce the problems identified and to enable a start to be made in reducing the reliance on the private car. The LTP will lead to:

- ❑ improvements to bus service quality;
- ❑ improvements to interchange facilities;
- ❑ additional public transport information availability;
- ❑ improved rail passenger waiting facilities;
- ❑ improved facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and people with disabilities;
- ❑ a programme of local safety schemes leading to a reduction in road casualties;

- ❑ additional community safety improvements including street lighting and Home Zones;
- ❑ a programme of Town Centre improvements in Hinckley, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Loughborough, Melton Mowbray, Lutterworth and Earl Shilton;
- ❑ improved road signing and traffic management control;
- ❑ better management of freight movements;
- ❑ improved air quality and travel pattern monitoring;
- ❑ a programme of Principal Road and bridge maintenance and repairs;
- ❑ a Bypass of the town of Earl Shilton with associated environmental improvements and a reduction in accident levels.

## Additional Supporting Analyses

### DISTRIBUTION AND EQUITY

#### Accessibility

**8.44** There is a focus on public transport, cycling and walking improvements across the local Area Strategies.

**8.45** The LTP is directed towards people who do not have alternative means of transport available to them and therefore contributes to the reduction of social exclusion. The County Council is working closely with people in rural communities including women, youth, and those who do not have a car available to them, to identify their needs and to set up services to meet these needs. Ongoing liaison on the needs of elderly and disabled people is occurring through community transport providers and voluntary organisations, with particular support given to comprehensive concessionary travel schemes for the elderly, disabled and unemployed residents. Support is given to 50 transport services as well as to access and dial-a-ride services which are continually being developed. Other measures to improve equity include taxibus schemes and the School Travel Plan Strategy. The Rural Bus Grant promotes a more equitable spread of benefits to rural areas, and guarantees a minimum service level.

**8.46** The revenue budget reflects an equitable distribution of investment, with the largest proportion of the budget devoted to concessionary travel (£1,916,000), followed by the promotion of bus services (£ 1,467,000) and a significant amount of investment devoted to rural services (£590,000), as well as community transport and the mobility impaired (£190,000).

## Economy

**8.47** In respect of economic objectives, the LTP is integrated closely with the County Council's Economic Development Policy and Programme, which itself is concerned with development across the county.

**8.48** The town centre management Action Plan is focussed on the development and implementation of improvement schemes for the towns across the county.

**8.49** The road freight Action Plan promotes sustainable distribution of goods, implements an area wide lorry plan and seeks to improve delivery efficiency. The rail and waterways freight Action Plans will have benefits across the county.

## Health

**8.50** Health improvements will be felt on a county-wide basis as a result of the implementation of Public Transport, Cycling and Walking Strategies, which will have benefits associated with:

- improved levels of fitness;
- better air quality;
- reduced stress;
- fewer accidents.

## Safety

**8.51** The overall target is to reduce fatal and serious road casualties by 40% across the county, and accidents involving children, a particularly vulnerable group, by an additional 10% to 50% as this is agreed as an area of particular concern.

**8.52** The benefits will be widespread, particularly as the focus is on identifying and

treating locations with common accident causes through Local Safety Schemes. General improvements in the highway network that minimise danger and encourage safe use of county roads will also contribute. Sensitive areas will be particularly targeted as part of the speed management action plan.

**8.53** The LTP is to be fully integrated with the local crime and disorder strategies to ensure that local issues are adequately addressed.

## Environment

**8.54** Optimising road space allocation, promoting Travel Plans, emphasising public transport and improving travel awareness, will contribute to decreasing the rate of traffic growth, resulting in environmental benefits across the county.

**8.55** Parking management will also have significant environmental benefits (although the LTP participation exercise revealed only a low level of support for parking restraint). The development and implementation of maximum standards for parking will have an effect on car usage and assist in promoting alternative modes of transport.

**8.56** Emphasis on public transport, cycling and walking will have benefits for the environment. Particular benefits will be air quality, noise and climate change which will reach beyond the county boundary.

**8.57** Highway network improvements will focus on those locations where significant environmental benefits will be achieved and where there are no alternative solutions to the problem.

## Integration Objective

**8.58** Nearly all the measures proposed in the LTP will improve integration either between modes or with other policy areas.

**8.59** Land use planning controls will be used to secure sustainable development in transport terms. In particular, the land use planning Action Plan ensures that new development is designed to reduce the need to travel and facilitate and encourage walking, cycling and public transport, and to mitigate

traffic impact, where feasible, through developer funded improvements.

**8.60** Action Plans aimed at improving social inclusion and improving access for disabled people will ensure that the most disadvantaged sections of the community will have access to everyday facilities.

## AFFORDABILITY AND FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

**8.61** The financial performance of the five year programme has not been assessed in detail, but financial details are included in Chapter 6 and information on developer contributions is included in the Area Strategies. Examples of schemes either wholly or partly funded by developer contributions include Melton Mowbray Bypass, Epinal Way Extension and Loughborough Inner Relief Road. Significant contributions have been obtained to enhance walking, cycling and public transport facilities throughout the LTP area.

## PRACTICALITY AND PUBLIC ACCEPTABILITY

**8.62** Public involvement and participation was a key part of the development of the LTP and is outlined in Appendix B. This resulted in the identification of transport problems and potential solutions, thereby ensuring the acceptability of the strategies and measures included in the LTP.

**8.63** The costed implementation programme is based on the construction of two major schemes during the LTP period, both of which are bypasses. The Ashby Bypass has already been accepted and will be substantially completed in 2001/02. Construction of the Earl Shilton Bypass is planned to commence in 2005/06. The need for the latter schemes is justified within the LTP and is in keeping with the attainment of Government objectives. Both the schemes received strong public support and are considered cost effective and feasible.

**8.64** The LTP's emphasis on vulnerable road users, particularly school children, women and the elderly is considered important, as investment for these transport users will have

wider benefits for all transport users. Investment in personal security will also have a range of positive effects on vulnerable road users.

**8.65** Town Centre Management schemes will have benefits for alternative modes of travel, air quality, safety and the health of the population. These are thus considered to be both practical and feasible and to complement other aspects of the LTP.

**8.66** Maintenance is critical to all road users, including public transport, cyclists and pedestrians, and is necessary to maintain the efficiency of the road network.

## IMPACT ON SOCIAL EXCLUSION

**8.67** The LTP gives particular consideration to social exclusion, especially through the Rural Strategy, and to vulnerable groups, including disabled people, children and the elderly. Strategies relating to public transport, school travel, rural areas, disability improvements and street lighting will be particularly beneficial to these groups.

## Alternatives Under Consideration

**8.68** Consideration has recently been given to the possibility of the extension of the existing 'Ivanhoe Line' – a rail service which currently operates between Loughborough and Leicester. The impact of the proposed Ivanhoe Stage 2, which would run between Leicester and Burton, was addressed in order to assess the likely scheme costs and the modal shift from car to train which might be expected.

**8.69** The outline capital cost of the scheme would be £15m, which would be funded by Railtrack and recouped through access charges. The annual running costs of the service would be £2.8m. Passenger demand forecasting showed that around 1000 single trips per day would be made, of which 30% would be made by people who would otherwise have used a car. The estimated fares revenue would be £600,000, leaving a total annual deficit of £2.2m. Best Value principles required that a decision was made in the light of public support and affordability.

**8.70** The Ivanhoe 2 Line has substantial public support as well as support from local MPs and the National Forest Company.

**8.71** The likely financial contribution to the Ivanhoe 2 Line required from the partners was expected to be in excess of £1m a year, which would have implications for other Local Authority services and Council Tax, and in any case may not have been affordable.

**8.72** The subsidy required for the Ivanhoe 2 Line was estimated at around £7.25 per single trip – a particularly high cost.

**8.73** In light of this the County Council has decided not to submit a pre-qualification Rail Passenger Partnership bid at this stage.

**8.74** The County Council has a continued commitment to use its utmost endeavours in negotiating with the Strategic Rail Authority and other appropriate bodies to seek a way forward to progress Ivanhoe Stage 2.

## Five Year Programme Excluding Major Road Scheme

### PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

**8.75** The five year programme consists of a variety of schemes and initiatives to be carried out in the Leicestershire area under two main headings – Integrated Transport and Maintenance. It is identical to the Programme described earlier in this chapter with the exception that the Earl Shilton Bypass is not included. The Ashby Bypass was accepted as a result of the provisional LTP bid.

### IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSALS

**8.76** The impacts of the proposal, as indicated in the AST (Table 8.2) are identical to that for the Five Year Plan including the Bypass, with the differences outlined below:

### Environment

#### Noise

**8.77** Without the Bypass, there will be no specific noise reduction within Earl Shilton. However, increased noise levels outside the town which would result from a Bypass will be avoided.

#### Local Air Quality

**8.78** Earl Shilton would not benefit from particular local air quality improvements.

#### Greenhouse Gases

**8.79** Induced traffic as a result of the Bypass is expected to be small, so greenhouse gases could increase without the Bypass as traffic congestion builds up in Earl Shilton.

#### Landscape

**8.80** Without the Bypass, the landscape surrounding Earl Shilton would not be negatively affected.

#### Townscape

**8.81** Without the Bypass, Earl Shilton Town Centre would not benefit from the removal of traffic and the Town Centre improvements would not be able to be implemented.

#### Heritage of Historic Resources

**8.82** Without the Bypass, historic resources in Earl Shilton will continue to be affected by traffic and pollution impacts.

#### Biodiversity

**8.83** Without the Bypass, there would not be any possible loss of habitat arising from construction of a new road.

#### Water Environment

**8.84** Possible adverse impacts on the water environment around Earl Shilton would be avoided.

## Journey ambience

**8.85** The town centre improvements consequent on the construction of the Bypass, which focus on improving the environment for walking, cycling and public transport users, would not take place.

## Safety

### Accidents

**8.86** Accident levels and trends in Earl Shilton would continue and could worsen if the Bypass was not built.

### Security

**8.87** The complementary Town Centre scheme, which includes measures to improve security, and would facilitate the economic development of the Town Centre, would not be implemented.

## Economy

### Transport Economic Efficiency

**8.88** There would be no removal of congestion or through traffic from Earl Shilton Town Centre, therefore no improvement in transport economic efficiency. The Bypass would also facilitate the economic development of the Town Centre.

### Reliability

**8.89** The Bypass's complementary Town Centre improvements would increase priority for buses. The Bypass would also remove through traffic so buses would not be caught in existing traffic congestion.

### Accessibility

### Severance

**8.90** Earl Shilton will remain divided by the A47 if the Bypass is not built reducing accessibility in the town centre.

## APPRAISAL SUMMARY TABLES

**8.91** An AST of the five year programme without the Bypass is outlined in Table 8.2

## Supporting Analyses

### PROBLEMS

**8.92** The do-minimum approach would result in a continuation and probable worsening of the existing problems experienced by users of the area's transport system, particularly road congestion, accidents and declining patronage of public transport services. Wider and more indirect problems such as worsening air quality and adverse economic impacts would continue. These problems are described in Chapter 3.

**8.93** The implementation of the five-year plan without the Earl Shilton Bypass would reduce the level and impact of these problems under each of the Government's five overarching objectives, although slightly different results under accident reduction, environmental and accessibility objectives would be achieved from the programme including the Bypass.

**8.94** Without the Bypass, the main difference will be that congestion, accident and environmental quality problems currently experienced in Earl Shilton will worsen. However, the adverse environmental impacts which would result from the Bypass construction would be avoided. A more detailed analysis of the need for and impacts of the Bypass is provided in Chapter 5b. Further information as required by Government guidance for Major Highway Schemes is given in a separate submission.

### ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING ANALYSES

**8.95** The impact of the five-year programme without the Bypass will be similar to that with the Bypass in terms of:

- distribution and equity;
- affordability and financial sustainability;
- social exclusion.

### PRACTICALITY AND PUBLIC ACCEPTABILITY

**8.96** The Earl Shilton Bypass has very strong public support locally. A delay in

construction is likely to cause a negative public reaction.

**Table 8.2** Simplified AST - 5 Year Programme Without Major Scheme (Earl Shilton Bypass)

Description Combined 5 Year Programme Without Major Scheme,		Problems		
OBJECTIVE	SUB-OBJECTIVE	QUALITATIVE IMPACTS	QUANTITATIVE MEASURE	ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENT	Noise	Reduction in noise level growth rates		5
	Local Air Quality	Reduction in pollution level growth rates		5
	Greenhouse Gases	Reduction in greenhouse gas level growth rates		5
	Landscape	No impact identified		4
	Townscape	Pedestrianisation benefits		6
	Heritage of Historic Resources	Pedestrianisation benefits		5
	Biodiversity	No impact identified		4
	Water Environment	No impact identified		4
	Physical Fitness	Increased cycling / walking; cleaner air		6
	Journey Ambience	Improved public transport facilities; better cycling/ walking infrastructure; less traffic		6
SAFETY	Accidents	Reduced numbers and seriousness	Target 40% reduction in overall casualties by 2011	6
	Security	Better lighting; pedestrianisation; increased public transport patronage		6
ECONOMY	Transport Economic Efficiency	Removal of through traffic to reduce congestion		5
	Reliability	Improved public and private transport reliability		5
ACCESSIBILITY	Option Values	Improved mode choice for all users		6
	Severance	Overall reduction in severance		6
	Access to the Transport System	Increased accessibility to transport system		6
INTEGRATION	Transport Interchange	Easier rural and urban interchange		5
	Land-Use Policy	Contributes to County/District land-use policies		5
	Other Government Policies	Only minor impacts		4