

**THAMES GATEWAY BRIDGE – PUBLIC INQUIRY****INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS: 20 DECEMBER 2005****1 Document TFL/200**

- 1.1 Junctions 18 and 28 – The traffic survey shows no traffic to enter Albert Road from the north, and very little to emerge at the northern end of Nuxley Road. Do these findings result from traffic management in Albert Road and Nuxley Road (or nearby)?
- 1.2 Please provide explicit confirmation of the current and proposed method of control at each junction considered – e.g. priority, roundabout, merge-diverge, signal controlled single junction, multiple signal controlled, other; and, in TFL/202 and TFL/210, the assessment method used in each case.

**2 Document TFL/202**

- 2.1 Paragraph 11 - How were the "key" junctions (line 4) identified, whether by TFL or relevant Borough Council?
- 2.2 Paragraph 19(a) – What are the peak periods referred to here, and on which days would they apply?
- 2.4 Paragraph 19(b) – The southern boundary of the discount would follow the A206 through Bexley. Would this extend to the east of the A2016/A206/A220 junction? Would the northern boundary in Bexley be the river? Would the boundary of the discount area follow the Greenwich borough boundary to exclude or include the whole of Greenwich? Please provide a plan to illustrate the modelled discount area.
- 2.5 Paragraph 19(c) – at (v), why may the need for traffic signals arise at the junction of Woolwich Road and New Road, given the results of the assessment of this junction shown on page 24 of TFL/202?
- 2.6 Paragraph 19(c) – are the network modifications listed here included in the "with TGB" modelled scenario?
- 2.8 Paragraph 28 – an updated version of TFL/125, showing the AM and PM cases, would assist.
- 2.9 Paragraph 37 – was the test that is described in the first sentence applied to the whole of each junction, or to each arm of each junction?
- 2.10 Paragraph 37 – are any of the "few" junctions that are mentioned in the second sentence not among those modelled in the Local Junction Analysis starting at paragraph 40? If so, which?

- 2.11 Paragraph 39 and Figure 7 – Is the M11 a trunk road at its junction with the A406? If so, what is the view of the Highways Agency regarding the current proposal?
- 2.12 Paragraph 39 and Figure 7 – Figure 7 appears to show greater flows on the A206 approach to the A282(T) than Figure D20 of TFL/P/04/3. Is that a correct interpretation? If so, what is the view of the Highways Agency regarding the current proposal?
- 2.13 Paragraph 39 and Figure 7 – Fluctuating increases and decreases are shown along Eastern Way. Please explain.
- 2.14 Paragraph 44 – In the “with TGB” case, what would be the AM and PM peak hour traffic flow in each direction on the A406 mainline through its junctions with the A118, A124 and A12? How many traffic lanes has the A406 mainline in each direction through each of these junctions? In each case, would that be sufficient, and what difference would the Scheme make?
- 2.15 Paragraph 44 – In the “with TGB” case, what would be the AM and PM peak hour traffic flow in each direction on the A406 mainline between its junctions with the A13, A118, A124, A12 and M11? How many traffic lanes has the A406 mainline in each direction on each of these links? In each case, would that be sufficient, and what difference would the Scheme make?
- 2.16 Paragraph 44 – final bullet point - are any measures proposed and committed that would address the situation outlined here?
- 2.17 Paragraph 46 – are signals proposed at the Albert Road/Heron Hill/Woolwich Road junction or not? If so, are they included in the Local TGX model?
- 2.18 Paragraph 47 – Along which routes specifically would the locally re-routed traffic go? What effects would it have there? Were the diverted volumes established by the Local TGX traffic model?

### **3 Annex 1 to Document TFL/202: AM Peak Junction Assessments**

- 3.1 Junctions 2, 3, 5, 7 – have the merge/diverge facilities been modelled in accordance with TD22/92? If so, what was found in the AM and PM cases?
- 3.2 Junction 2 – (a) The AM peak hour traffic flow on the A406 southbound off slip was surveyed in 2005 to be 1174 pcu (TFL/200 Attachment 2). The modelled flow in the 2016 “with TGB” case is 944 pcu. (b) The A124 Barking Road approach to the junction was surveyed in 2005 to carry 799 pcu but is modelled in 2016 “with TGB” with 531 pcu. (c) How are these correct?
- 3.3 Junction 8 – in this and similarly presented cases, what does “total delay sec” mean?

- 3.4 Junction 8 – would the capacity of the traffic lanes on Harrow Manor Way (TFL/203, drg TB/TGRC/SK/VH/68 revision1) be sufficient to avoid congestion?
- 3.5 Junction 12 – in 2005, 200 pcu/hr turned right into Knee Hill; in 2016 with the TGB 188 pcu/hr are forecast. Why is this correct?
- 3.6 Junction 12 – is the “sensitivity test” case proposed and included in the Local TGX model? If so, what would the effects be on New Road and affected “downstream” junctions?

**4 Document TFL/206**

- 4.1 Paragraph 2.3 – the definitions here differ slightly from those in paragraph 2.6 of D829. Are they intended to be the same?

**5 Document TFL/208**

- 5.1 Annex 1 – surveyed and modelled flows are compared here. There are some substantial differences. TFL’s comments are invited.

Borough	Road	2005 Survey:		2016 Do Min: 2-way Flow	2016 with TGB: 2-way Flow	2016 Do Min: 2-way as % of 2005		
		Site	Flow					
Bexley	Knee Hill North	9	844	240	523	28.4%		
Bexley	Yarnton Way (if west end case: Location Not Clear)	8	1036	254	396	24.5%		
Bexley	A2016 Eastern Way, west of Harrow Manor Way	5*	1867	1446	1979	77.5%		
Bexley	A2016 Eastern Way, Harrow Manor Way jn, east side	5&7*	1179	1211	1777	102.7%		
Bexley	A206 Bexley Road, by A2016	19	1678	358	659	21.3%		
Bexley	A206 Erith Road, Upper Park Rd to Brook St	None		85	304	x		
Bexley	A206 east of Picardy Road (comparator with above)	18	1135	?	?			
Greenwich	A2016 Eastern Way E/B offslip (Harrow Manor Way)	7	421	430	1107	102.1%		
Greenwich	A2041 Central Way	Location unclear		674	882	x		
Greenwich	A2016 Eastern Way (Central Way-Harrow Manor Way)	5*	1867	2208	4257	118.3%		
Greenwich	A2016 Pettman Crescent, west side	Location Unclear		6	?	1759	2417	x
Greenwich	A206 Plumstead Road south side of Pettman Cres	6	2291	1562	2314	68.2%		
Greenwich	A2016 Western Way	Location unclear			2424	3576	x	
Greenwich	King's Highway	None			743	985	x	
Greenwich	McLeod Road	9	568	205	408	36.1%		
Greenwich	Harrow Manor Way, Yarnton Way to McLeod Road (if north)	8	1790	2131	2915	119.1%		
Greenwich	Harrow Manor Way, Yarnton Way to McLeod Road (if south)	9	1792	2131	2915	118.9%		
Barkidag	A406/A124 - southbound on slip	2	434	255	664	58.8%		
Newham	Westbound on-slip A406 to Newham Way	3	1944	1233	2100	63.4%		
Newham	Westbound off-slip A406 from Newham Way	3	1087	1043	1605	96.0%		
Newham	A406/A124 - northbound off slip (with U-turn)	2	353	381	922	107.9%		
Newham	A406/A124 - northbound off slip (without U-turn)	2	266	381	922	143.2%		
Newham	A117/A1020 junction	Locations unclear						
Newham	No clearly relevant surveys on Prince Regent Lane, Victoria Dock Road, Tollgate Road, A1020, A124							
Redbridge	A406 j/w A12: southbound on slip	24	798	588	953	73.7%		

Note \* - excludes effect of Nathan Way

**6 Document TFL/210**

- 6.1 Junction 2 – 87 (AM) and 222 (PM) U-turns from the northbound offslip were surveyed and reported in Attachment 2 of TFL/200.

Are those movements allowed for in the assessment presented on page 8 of TFL/210?

6.2 Junction 3 – The assessed space available for internal queuing is different in this analysis from that in TFL/133:

TFL's assessment of allowable queue lengths at Junction 3

	Link	Limit Queue: TFL/133 (pcu)	Queue Space: TFL/133 (pcu)	Queue Space: TFL/210 (pcu)
A13 (west)	111	7	14	13
	113	7	14	12
	115	7	13	12
A406	211	8	14	16
	213	8	14	12
	215	7	13	11
A13 (east)	311	7	15	12
	313	7	14	12
	315	7	12	11
Royal Docks Road	411	11	24	17
	413	11	24	18
	415	11	19	19
	421	28		74
Claps Gate Lane	611	14	20	16

Paragraph 2 of TFL/133 puts the case that “where more than one lane provides for the same movement, traffic will be willing to switch lanes to gain access. Consequently the actual capacity of the junction needs to be looked at in overall capacity terms.” No evidence is given to support that contention. Nevertheless, if it were correct, the Inspectors would be assisted by TFL’s full explanation of how the modelled mean maximum internal queue lengths presented in TFL/210 for junction 3 and the associated limit queues determined in accordance with the TRANSYT manual together indicate that acceptable conditions would obtain in the 2016 “with Scheme” case.

- 6.3 Junctions 1, 4, 6 and 24 appear to have been modelled with TRANSYT, as has junction 3. Please demonstrate the soundness of the approach taken, at each of those junctions, with regard to limit queues and mean maximum internal queue lengths in a similar way to that in 6.1 above.
- 6.4 The tabulated results for Junction 17 show a queuing delay of 4.73 minutes per pcu in the AM “Without TGB” case (C-B). Is that result correctly reported?
- 6.4 Where highway alterations are proposed in association with the Scheme, are the effects of those alterations included in the overall traffic model?
- 6.5 What effect would the scheme have on traffic congestion?