

## CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

### **M1 junctions 28 to 31 Managed Motorway Scheme**

Please complete this pro-forma and send to the address below

Dan Tank  
 Highways Agency  
 The Cube  
 199 Wharfside Street  
 Birmingham  
 B1 1RN

Or alternatively you can respond to the consultation by email:

[M1J28-31managemotorway@highways.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:M1J28-31managemotorway@highways.gsi.gov.uk)

#### **PART 1 - Information about you**

Completion of this section is optional but helps with our analysis of results. A note at the end of this form explains that we may be obliged to release this information if asked to do so.

Name	Tom Finnegan-Smith
Address	Riverside House, Main Street, Rotherham
Postcode	S60 1TD
Email	Tom.finnegan-smith@rotherham.gov.uk
Company Name or Organisation (if applicable)	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Please tick one box from the list below that best describes you/ your company or organisation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Small to Medium Enterprise (up to 50 employees)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Large Company
<input type="checkbox"/>	Representative Organisation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade Union
<input type="checkbox"/>	Interest Group
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Government

M1 J32 to 35a Managed Motorway Scheme

<input type="checkbox"/>	Central Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Police
<input type="checkbox"/>	Member of the public
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please describe):
<p>If you are responding on behalf of an organisation or interest group, how many members do you have and how did you obtain the views of your members:</p> <p>Consultation response on Managed Motorways All Lane Running presented to Scrutiny and endorsed by Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Economic Growth, Cllr Gerald Smith as part of the response to the J32-35a proposals..</p>	
<p>If you would like your response or personal details to be treated <b>confidentially</b> please explain why: N/A</p>	

**PART 2 - Your comments**

<p>1. Do you consider that the proposal to introduce the managed motorway scheme on the M1 between junctions 28 and 31 will lead to an improvement in travelling conditions on this section of motorway?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Please add any comments:</p> <p>The congestion problems experienced on this section of the M1 are well known to us and potential improvements to the delays experienced are welcomed. We acknowledge the benefits that variable mandatory speed limits have provided in other Highways Agency Managed Motorways schemes in increasing motorway capacity and reducing congestion. However, we note that the Managed Motorways initiatives already introduced are not to the MM-All Lane Running (MM-ALR) standard due to be introduced here. MM-ALR will see the hard shoulder used as a permanent running lane and not operate with a dynamic hard shoulder which is used in busy peak periods and closed to general traffic in quieter traffic periods.</p> <p>Whilst MM-ALR may operate in broadly the same way as the other MM schemes during the peaks, it is the adoption of the hard shoulder as a permanent running lane that has raised concerns with the South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership of which we are a member.</p>		

<p>2. Are there any aspects of the proposal to introduce the managed motorway scheme on the M1 between junctions 28 and 31 which give you concerns?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Through our involvement in the South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership we are aware that from an operational experience perspective the emergency services suggest that the risk of collisions involving stationary vehicles during non-peak times is an unacceptable risk and one which will have serious and potentially fatal consequences. This risk also involves those personnel who work on the motorways along with the public.</p> <p>There are also significant issues relating to the ability of the Police to conduct pursuit and enforcement activities on this stretch of motorway as it is currently designed. We also have concerns in relation to the permanent use of the hard shoulder in relation to the emergency response to incidents on the motorway and the potential difficulties</p>		

that may arise when incidents occur and the emergency services no longer have the option of using the hard shoulder to gain access.

At this stage you predict an overall decrease in risk of up to 15% although this reduction in risk is not reflected in the objective for Killed and Serious Injuries (KSI's) on this new design, in which you state the safety objective to be 'no worse off'. This is against a local objective of reducing KSI's by 4% per annum to 2020. However, the HA also accept that within the overall decrease in risk of 15% that the risk of a collision with a vehicle stopped in a running lane outside of peak periods increases by 200%.

We are also aware that the Police have highlighted that if they are called to attend incidents on the motorway when MM-ALR is operational they will potentially close the motorway to ensure the safety of their officers, other emergency services and the public, which could detract from the benefits of the proposed scheme.

From the information provided it is unclear what the environmental impact of the proposed MM-ALR scheme will be. The areas adjacent to the M1, particularly the residential communities, are adversely affected by air and noise pollution attributed to traffic on the M1. Whilst the impact is unclear we would be keen to see that the proposed scheme improves the air quality conditions and noise levels in communities adjacent to the M1 and would welcome further information from you to confirm the anticipated outcome. In this respect we note that further details on the outcomes of the Environmental Assessment you are currently undertaking will need to be provided to Rotherham MBC in our capacity as statutory consultee.

Whilst the primary objective of improving congestion is acknowledged it is considered that the safety objective to be 'no worse off' and the lack of clarity associated with the air quality and noise implications of the proposed scheme is not appropriate and demonstrates no ambition to improve conditions for those using or living in the communities adjacent to these sections of the motorway. Rotherham MBC aspires to improve the conditions for its residents and communities and would expect this ambition to be shared by the Highways Agency due to the current adverse impact that the motorway network has on several communities in Rotherham and South Yorkshire.

3. Are there any additional comments you would like to make about the proposal to introduce the managed motorway scheme on the M1 between Junctions 28 and 31?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	-----------------------------

Improving the capacity on the M1 between J28 and J31 is welcome in terms of both its benefit to improved traffic flow and journey times, and its associated impact on the economy. However, we do not feel that this should be at the expense of road safety or worsening air environmental conditions and support the SY Safer Roads Partnership's position in trying to ensure that the risks associated with the MM-ALR standard are mitigated against wherever possible. As mentioned in 2 above we would also urge the HA to consider that it is not just the congestion that should be improved as a result of any proposals and that the objective should also be to improve road safety and the environmental impact of traffic on this section of the motorway. It is understood that further meetings between the HA and representatives from the SYSRP have been arranged to discuss the proposed scheme with a view to considering whether further mitigation or amendments can be achieved. We look forward to a positive outcome of these meetings.

#### Note on disclosure of information

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you want any information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.

In view of this, it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Highways Agency.

The Highways Agency will process your personal data in accordance with the DPA and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.