



Transport Infrastructure Task Group

Supplementary Report

Chairman:
Councillor Penny Martin

Task Group Members:
Councillor Ron Greenhough
Councillor Rita Hewitt
Councillor Andrea Kay
Councillor Gordon McCann (part only)
Councillor Don MacNaughton
Councillor Paul Moon (part only)
Councillor Patsy Ormrod
Councillor Ian Perkin
Councillor Ron Shewan
Councillor David Walmsley
Councillor David Williams

Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Chairman: Councillor May Gandhi

Contents

	Page
• Final Report – Presentation to Cabinet, 25 April 2012	3
• Summary of Further Findings	4
○ Lancashire County Council	4
○ Highways Agency	5
• Revised Conclusions	6
• Revised Recommendations	8
• Responsibility for Recommendations	10
• List of Appendices	11

Final Report – Presentation to Cabinet, 25 April 2012

The Final Report of the Transport Infrastructure Task Group was presented to Cabinet on 25 April 2012, with fifteen Recommendations (see Appendix 1). Many of the recommendations were accepted, although the Economy Portfolio Holder made a number of additional comments and suggestions regarding several of them.

Cabinet referred the report back to the task group to provide some specified additional information and asked them to prepare a further report with revised recommendations for a later meeting of Cabinet. The additional information that the task group were asked to provide is detailed below, and was the substance of the Decision taken by Cabinet:

Cabinet asked the task group to

- Seek the views of Lancashire County Council (LCC) with regard to the detrunking of the A585 as suggested in Recommendation 3.2.1 as this would involve LCC taking over responsibility for the A585.
- Provide financial implications detailing the likely costs of carrying out a cost/benefit analysis on options for the potential detrunking of the A585.
- Provide a clear rationale detailing what other sources of funding might become available if LCC were to take over responsibility for the A585 from the Highways Agency.
- Provide the likely costs of conducting a survey to obtain up to date information about the transportation needs of the residents of Wyre and confirm whether obtaining up to date information about the transportation needs of the residents of Wyre, as suggested in Recommendation 3.3.2, should actually be the responsibility of LCC as transport authority.

Summary of Further Findings

Lancashire County Council (LCC)

LCC were asked for their views regarding the possible detrunking of the A585 as proposed in the original Recommendation 2.1.

A report was submitted to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport by the Executive Director of Environment with the following Recommendation:

“That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport inform Wyre Borough Council that there is no material advantage to the highway network of pursuing de-trunking”.

A decision was taken on 10 July 2012 that the recommendation be approved (see Appendices 2 and 3).

Highways Agency (HA)

The Highways Agency (HA) was consulted further regarding the possible detrunking of the A585 with particular reference to potential funding sources.

Ruth Moynihan, Asset Development Manager North West, who had previously attended a task group meeting on 10 January 2012, clarified the position from the HA's point of view.

In terms of the legislation, the meaning of a "Charging Authority" and "Collecting Authority" for the ability to put a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in place is limited to the a County Council for an area for which there is more than one District Council. Therefore the Highways Agency is not in a position to promote CIL to fund infrastructure projects on roads under its responsibility.

Although Ms Moynihan has seen no examples of a local authority funding infrastructure improvements on trunk roads, there may be a possibility of Lancashire County Council putting a CIL Charging Schedule in place which may raise funds for transport infrastructure on both local and strategic roads. This would be an unusual step in Ms Moynihan's view, and as the Secretary of State is responsible for trunk road investment, any improvements or changes to trunk road infrastructure would require approval from the Highways Agency who acts on behalf of the Secretary of State.

Ms Moynihan reiterated a point that she had previously made, that a detrunked highway is far more under the control of the local highway authority (e.g. LCC) and therefore decisions on improvement plans are generally within the gift of the authority concerned as are innovative new ways to raise funding.

Revised Conclusions

The task group accepts that without the agreement of Lancashire County Council regarding the possible detrunking of the A585, it will not be achieved. However, councillors remain firmly of the view that alternative sources of funding should still be explored and pursued, and that this should remain one of Wyre Council's expectations of Lancashire County Council who, according to the Highways Agency, might still be able to put a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule in place to raise funds for transport infrastructure on both local and strategic roads.

Councillors have had further discussions about the way in which up to date information about the transportation needs of the residents of Wyre could be gathered and have concluded that there are a number of ways in which this can be done at minimal cost.

Councillors acknowledge that Lancashire County Council has the primary responsibility for such assessment of need. The Principal Engineer for Transport Planning, Strategy and Policy, Dave Colbert, has advised that the Commissioning Plan District Needs Profiles are currently under development, although it is not anticipated that they will include the sort of survey that task group members were envisaging.

The task group had in mind to 'piggy back' on methods of communication that already exist. For example, members are aware that the Life in Wyre survey, which is currently out to public consultation, contains several questions regarding the level of traffic congestion, public transport and "good roads", with the public being asked how important those things are compared with other priorities. The questions referred to are:

Q1 How important, if at all, are each of the following in making where you live a good place?

This question includes references to:

- Low pollution levels
- Level of traffic congestion
- Public transport
- Good roads and pavements

Q3 And which of these, if any, do you feel most need improving where you live?

This question includes references to:

- Low pollution levels
- Level of traffic congestion
- Public transport
- Good roads and pavements

Q5 Thinking about where you live, how much of a problem, if at all, do you think each of the following are?

This question includes references to:

- Road safety

Q21 Taking into account all your previous answers, what one thing, if anything, would improve the area where you live?

This question clearly gives the opportunity for respondents to identify any of the previously mentioned issues as detailed above, as the one thing that really needs to be improved.

The results are likely to produce some relevant qualitative information.

The task group also believe that Wyre Voice could be used to host such a survey, as could the council's website. It is recognised by the task group that this would involve some staff time, although that time commitment would not be expected to be too onerous. Aspects of the Community Engagement Strategy would also be consistent with this approach.

By using a variety of methods that are already in place the cost and impact upon staff will be kept to a minimum.

DRAFT

Revised Recommendations

Having considered the further evidence gathered, with specific reference to the comments made by Cabinet on 25 April 2012, members of the task group have formulated the following revised recommendations:

- 1 That the Economy Portfolio Holder pursue and promote a formalised communication structure between all transport partners and elected members.
- 2 That the Council pursue a Memorandum of Understanding with the Highways Agency.
- 3 That the Economy Portfolio Holder pursue the offer of improved consultation with Blackpool Transport and seek to establish similar relationships with other operators, particularly where poor connectivity/access to employment poses a major barrier to employment/opportunity for economically excluded groups, job seekers, younger people, older people and rural communities.
- 4 That the Sustainable Transport Strategy Steering Group is requested to send minutes of its meetings to the Economy Portfolio Holder, for appropriate dissemination to all members of the Council.
- 5 That Lancashire County Council be requested to consider investigating the potential impact and costs/benefits of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and to explore other innovative ways to raise funding that might be used for improvements to the A585.
- 6 That strategies be developed to ensure that all Section 106 opportunities are maximised.
- 7 That Lancashire County Council and bus operators, through an improved formal communication structure, be lobbied to improve connectivity with Poulton railway station.
- 8 That the council, in partnership with Network Rail, evaluate the options for developing parking provision at Poulton station.
- 9 That the (Governance for Railway Investment Projects) GRIP 2 Study is pursued to completion.
- 10 That up to date information about the transportation needs of the residents of Wyre be obtained, using methods that are already in place including community engagement, the Council's website, Wyre Voice, surveys and questionnaires and the local press in order to work more effectively with local transport organisations.
- 11 That best practice from other successful schemes (e.g Todmorden Curve) be studied and applied to the bid to reinstate the Poulton to Fleetwood rail link, as part of the GRIP (Governance for Railway Investment Projects) process.

12 That the Department for Transport, Lancashire County Council, the Regional Growth Fund, local Members of Parliament and other partners be lobbied regarding the Poulton to Fleetwood rail link and its potential impact upon the wider economic benefits to the borough.

13 That, in order to enhance economic development and give Wyre higher priority in transport needs assessments, the Council retains its commitment to preserve the port of Fleetwood, as reflected by the Council's Core Strategy.

14 That Lancashire County Council (LCC) be made aware of the views of some bus operators and task group members, and that LCC be urged to reconsider the implementation of blanket 20pmh zones in residential areas across the county, which are likely to impact negatively upon traffic flows, public transport services and carbon emissions, whilst being largely unenforceable.

DRAFT

Responsibility for Recommendations

Responsibility for implementing recommendations will lie with the following:

Recommendations 1 and 3 will be the responsibility of the Economy Portfolio Holder.

Recommendation 8 will be a joint Recommendation for Network Rail and the Corporate Director of People and Places.

All other Recommendations will be the responsibility of the Corporate Director of People and Places.

DRAFT

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 Final Report of Transport Infrastructure Task Group, presented to Cabinet on 25 April 2012.

Appendix 2 Report to Lancashire County Council's Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport submitted by the Executive Director for Environment on 10 July 2012.

Appendix 3 Details of Decision taken by Lancashire County Council's Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport on 10 July 2012.

DRAFT

1 November 2012



Transport Infrastructure Task Group - Final Report

Chairman:
Councillor Penny Martin

Task Group Members:
Councillor Ron Greenhough
Councillor Rita Hewitt
Councillor Andrea Kay
Councillor Gordon McCann (part only)
Councillor Don MacNaughton
Councillor Paul Moon (part only)
Councillor Patsy Ormrod
Councillor Ian Perkin
Councillor Ron Shewan
Councillor David Walmsley
Councillor David Williams

Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Chairman: Councillor May Gandhi

Contents

- Introduction
- Objectives of Review
- The Review Process
- Summary of Findings
 - Summary of Evidence provided by:
 - Wyre Council's Chief Executive
 - Wyre Council's Head Regeneration and Assets
 - Lancashire County Council
 - Poulton and Wyre Railway Society
 - Highways Agency
 - Wyre Council's Planning Officers
 - Network Rail
 - Blackpool Transport
 - Stagecoach
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Responsibility for Recommendations

Introduction

When this review was proposed it was suggested that the review should focus on the existing transport infrastructure and the impact this has on economic and social development in our borough. It is widely recognised that transport infrastructure and economic and social development are inextricably linked and the review proposed to examine and make recommendations about that relationship. As with any scrutiny review, any proposals needed to be realistic and deliverable.

The potential influence that any borough council might have on transport infrastructure is inevitably limited by its areas of direct responsibility, although the council continues to play an important role in representing its residents and working with others to improve services

Taking these comments into account, the purpose of the review was agreed as:

“To review the way in which key partners work with the Council, to identify the obstacles that prevent effective engagement/partnership working and identify opportunities for improvements”.

The task group initially comprised twelve councillors although Cllr McCann withdrew part way through as a result of his appointment to the council’s Cabinet.

Objectives of Review

The objectives of the review, as specified in the scoping document, were as follows:

- To identify specific, achievable areas for improvement in the way in which partners work with the Council
- To gain agreement for, and ultimately set in place, a working protocol / Memorandum of Understanding between the key agencies

The Review Process

The group's activities included:

- Identifying and understanding the key issues
- Consideration of relevant reports
- Interviewing council officers
- Interviewing witnesses from other organisations

Summary of Findings

Summary of Evidence from Wyre Council's Chief Executive

Garry Payne, Chief Executive, advised members that the Fleetwood/Thornton Area Action Plan (AAP) contained some significant references to transport infrastructure. The A585 was a major focus of the AAP, as was sustainable transport.

Mr Payne expressed his disappointment and frustration at the effectiveness of some of the communication between the agencies in the AAP Strategic Group, which comprised Wyre and Fylde Councils, Lancashire County Council and the Highways Agency (HA). Mr Payne quoted the proposed changes to the Norcross roundabout as an example. It appeared that the HA had decided that changes to the roundabout would be made, but had not adequately informed other agencies; later the decision was reversed, again without adequate consultation and communication. The HA have subsequently accepted that their communication could have been carried out more effectively.

Mr Payne attended the first meeting of the task group, and at that early stage suggested that the task group might choose to take a strategic view, and consider whether the signing of a protocol or Memorandum of Understanding would assist communication. He further advised that it was preferable to focus on the Lancashire Local Transport Plan (LTP) and developing a protocol, rather than getting involved in too much detail, a suggestion that was consistent with the agreed scope of the task group review.

Summary of Evidence from Wyre Council's Head of Regeneration and Assets

Charles Yost, Head of Regeneration and Assets informed the task group about the impact of transport infrastructure on Wyre's economy.

A number of factors related to the area's transport infrastructure, had a significant impact upon the local economy. Access, for example, was a key issue for the private sector both in terms of business growth and investment, and it was a relevant fact that a substantial proportion of Wyre was a peninsula with one way in and one way out. If business growth was to be drawn to the Fylde Coast area, and to Wyre in particular it was essential that the area had good motorway, trunk road and rail links.

Connectivity between rail, bus and tram is currently poor, and this does not facilitate travel to work. A coherent transport system, with good connectivity, was essential.

Mr Yost highlighted the A585 as the absolutely key link to the M55 and M6. He feared stagnation for the area if the problems with traffic flow were not dealt with; according to the Fylde Coast Economic Development Company, it was estimated that this could lead to a 3-4% downturn in the local economy. In Mr Yost's opinion, the development of Hillhouse in Thornton was likely to be restricted by poor accessibility.

High levels of deprivation in Fleetwood were masked, Mr Yost suggested, by the overall prosperity of the borough. With the current transport infrastructure it was very difficult indeed to begin to address these issues in Fleetwood, particularly with the lack of job opportunities there. There were also issues in the rural areas, with Garstang, for example, needing investment in order to stop it becoming a dormitory town for Preston.

Mr Yost reminded task group members that the Poulton to Fleetwood rail link had been on the council's Business Plan for the past four years. A GRIP 2 feasibility study, which was the essential next step, had had money from Lancashire County Council (LCC), previously earmarked, withdrawn. Efforts were underway to try to secure the necessary funding from other sources. It was hoped that LCC might be encouraged to consider reinstating the funding, and this was a matter that would be taken up with LCC representatives as part of the task group's work.

Members noted that it appeared difficult for transport providers to talk to each other and that a 'transport hub' might be needed. They suggested that there was a need to lobby for improved connectivity.

Summary of Evidence from Lancashire County Council

County Councillor Tim Ashton, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport at Lancashire County Council and Sim Lane-Dixon, Public Realm Manager, provided evidence to the task group about a wide range of issues related to transport infrastructure.

Transport connectivity

The new tramway between Blackpool and Fleetwood will be fully operational by April 2012 (projected to re-open on 3 April), and this will provide excellent connectivity. The planned electrification of the Manchester to Blackpool railway line will be another significant improvement for the area.

Following discussions with bus operators, Smart Cards will be able to be used on buses and the prospect of one ticket being used across different forms of transport is a very real one.

Fleetwood is said to be the largest town in England without a rail link. There is also no other district in the county that had its largest town more than ten miles away from a motorway, a fact that was acknowledged by CC Ashton.

Poulton to Fleetwood Rail Link

The allocation of funds by LCC for the rail link GRIP 2 Study to take place will be reinstated, a statement that was warmly welcomed by the task group. Members believe that the resurrection of the rail link will have a very positive impact upon the council's stated aim of addressing deprivation in the borough, and it will facilitate the economic regeneration of Fleetwood in particular.

Eight rail priorities were being considered by LCC. Funding for work on the Todmorden Curve is already agreed and a review will take place of Lancashire's rail schemes in "the near future". Any business case for the Fleetwood to Poulton rail link must be strong and the GRIP Studies were also crucial. Any such project must be able to demonstrate that it provided jobs, improved skills as well as value for money. Halcrow carried out a study of the rail link in 2006 and had concluded that there was an excellent business case for reopening the line.

Much of the funding for transport infrastructure comes from economic development and investment, and companies are expected to make significant contributions. A view was expressed that the situation was 'chicken and egg', to some extent, with improvements to infrastructure being required before some companies would consider moving into the area.

Highways Agency

LCC works very closely with the Highways Agency (HA) at officer level. Despite declining to attend a recent Scrutiny Committee meeting at the County, the HA are

happy to meet with members and officers in a less formal environment. This is consistent with Wyre's experience of relationships with the HA.

Road Safety

Expenditure on road safety is based on statistics. This is the only way in which an effective allocation of funding can be made, so accident figures are taken fully into account and inform the decision-making process.

A speed limit of 20mph for all residential areas across the county will be introduced by 2013. Task group members raised a number of concerns about the effect such a scheme would have on businesses, how it would be enforced and the impact it would have on the carbon footprint. The scheme will not be implemented on main roads unless there is a school on it. CC Ashton accepted that it was a scheme that would not be accepted overnight – it was about 'changing hearts and minds' and that will only be achieved over time.

Cycling

Lancashire County Council is working with employers to develop a Green Travel Plan that will aim to reduce the use of cars.

The Thornton Cycleway, in the vicinity of Norcross roundabout, will be completed in 2012. Full details, including the completion date, will be made available to members of the task group in due course.

Summary of Evidence from the Poulton and Wyre Railway Society

Eddie Fisher, Chairman, and Peter Banks, Membership Secretary of the Poulton and Wyre Railway Society provided evidence to the task group.

The Poulton and Wyre Railway Society (PWRS) has carried out improvement works at Thornton station and at a site at Hillhouse. These improvements are said to have had a very positive effect upon the level of anti-social behaviour in the area as well as making the sites look much more attractive.

The PWRS hopes to see the railway go as far into Fleetwood as possible, although it is unlikely that it will be able to go any further than just to the south of the fish dock. The more significant problems are at Poulton where Network Rail intends to disconnect the line and make essential changes to infrastructure in order to facilitate the electrification of the Manchester-Blackpool line. It is important that, if the line is disconnected, Network Rail place no structures in the way of any potential future reconnection.

PWRS' preference is for a Community Railway, providing a combination of commuter, heritage and freight services. Such a scheme would rely upon the support of local stakeholders including the railway operator/owner, the local authority and local community organisations. It would be run on a 'not for profit' basis. PWRS hoped that, if such a situation arises, Network Rail will sell the remaining infrastructure at a very reasonable cost.

A Community railway would have the following added advantages:

- (i) Employing local people
- (ii) Providing opportunities for regeneration e.g. through tourism
- (iii) Providing an engineering base, with the possibility of apprenticeships

Parking provision at Thornton and Poulton is something that will need to be addressed as the current provision was very poor indeed.

The PWRS representatives argue strongly that any Community Railway project would have to be driven by the local community with support from the local authority. Consideration, they suggested, should be given to making a bid for funding from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, MPs should be lobbied and closer working relationships should be forged with Lancashire County Council.

Task group members felt strongly that the aim should be for full reinstatement of the line to Fleetwood, and such a plan should not be jeopardised in any way by proposals to run a heritage line.

Summary of Evidence from the Highways Agency

Ruth Moynihan, North West Asset Development Manager, explained that the North West region of the Highways Agency (HA) has to compete against other regions for funding. Her task, and that of her colleague, Bob Baldwin, North West Asset Development Team Leader, is to make out the case on behalf of the North West, all bids being fed into the centre for prioritisation. Each bid is scored against a number of agreed criteria and those above a certain cut-off point (determined by the total funding available) are progressed. There has been an increase in centralisation within the Highways Agency over the past two years at the expense of the regions being able to make their own decisions.

The effects of the 'Localism agenda' have not yet been fed into the HA's prioritisation process and there are currently no indications about whether or how this will be done.

A585

Information about traffic flows and casualties on three separate sections of the A585 was provided to the task group. This information shows the following:

Section 1 – Fleetwood to River Wyre roundabout

- (a) The number of casualties is reducing
- (b) The number of vehicles per hour is well under the road's capacity (under 10,000 per hour with capacity of 16-17,000)
- (c) The on time reliability measure is 72.6%, which is good. (This is a measure of the percentage of journeys for which the predicted travel time from A to B is achieved).

Section 2 – River Wyre roundabout to Windy Harbour

- (a) The number of casualties remains constant with no indication of improvement
- (b) The number of vehicles per hour indicates that the road is at or beyond its capacity (13,000 per hour)
- (c) The on time reliability measure is 65.7%

Section 3 – Windy Harbour to M55

- (a) The number of casualties remains constant
- (b) The number of vehicles per hour is just under the road's capacity (12,000 per hour with a capacity of 13-14,000)
- (c) The on time reliability measure is 73.2%, which is good

The HA now consider journey reliability (the 'on time reliability measure') to be a more useful indicator than 'congestion'. People understand that certain routes get congested at certain times of the day so they choose to travel at other times, so achieving a more reliable journey time.

Task group members are concerned that the isolation of Fleetwood and other less accessible areas of the borough is likely to be exacerbated by the lack of upgrade to the A585. Members fear that, with the perceived problems with the A585, people and

jobs will be lost, further undermining the argument for upgrading sections of the road. It is confirmed that there are two projects in the HA's priority list for the next four years (Windy Harbour and Singleton) although there is no guarantee at this stage that the funding would be available for either.

It is possible to consider raising funding for road improvements through other sources, in the way that a link road at Manchester Airport has been funded, specifically through Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The TIF is a method by which future gains in taxes are used to finance current improvements, which are projected to create the conditions for the said gains. The CIL is a new levy that local authorities can choose to charge on new developments in their area. The money can be used to support development by funding infrastructure that the council, local community and neighbourhoods wish to prioritise.

In response to perceived underinvestment in the A585 in recent years, Ms Moynihan said that there had in fact, been £5.8m spent on the road since 2006.

Local authorities need to plan a sustainable economy that minimises the need to travel; it is preferable for people to live, work and play close to their homes in order to reduce the carbon footprint. This is covered by Department for Transport Circular 02/07. *(This circular explains how the Highways Agency (the Agency), on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport, will participate in all stages of the planning process with Government Offices, regional and local planning authorities, local highway/transport authorities, public transport providers and developers to ensure national and regional aims and objectives can be aligned and met.)*

The A585 is a strategic route to Fleetwood port. Since the termination of Stena Line's service from Fleetwood in December 2010, it is worth considering whether there will be advantages in 'de-trunking' the road in order to put the road more within the gift of local people and authorities to carry out the desired improvements. This will also open doors to alternative funding streams.

Consultation

There is regular consultation between local authority officers and the Highways Agency. The HA assumes that this is effective consultation with 'the local authority', although there is a suggestion that information is not always communicated effectively to elected members. This is identified as an area for future improvement.

The HA decides whether or not to undertake a full public consultation based upon the likely impact of a decision on local people. The HA currently has regular meetings with Lancashire County Council but not with districts; this is something that merits review.

The HA is improving the way in which it communicates with the public and specialist groups such as hauliers by providing text alerts from the National Control Centre about current and planned events on routes. It is also possible for those registered on the Road Projects Data Base on the HA website to receive email alerts when changes are made to road project pages.

A previously proposed Memorandum of Understanding (January 2010) between the council and the HA was referred to and both members and the representatives from the HA agree that consideration should be given to reviving it.

Summary of Evidence from Wyre Council's Planning Officers

The Core Strategy will replace the Local Plan and become the Borough's guide to development until 2028. Most planning applications will be judged against it. Part of the Core Strategy includes the Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP), which specifies how infrastructure will be provided, by whom and when.

The Planning Officers provided responses to a number of specific questions that had been raised by the task group, as follows:

Q1 When a new development is proposed how is the amount of Section 106 monies calculated? What are the limitations to its use?

"Circular 05/2005 covers planning obligations. Planning obligations (or 'Section 106 agreements') are private agreements negotiated, usually in the context of planning applications, between local planning authorities and persons with an interest in a piece of land, and intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. If physical works are required to a highway outside the development site the developer may negotiate separately with the local highway authority (s278 of the Highways Act) to secure these works.

Where a financial contribution is required for the implementation of sustainable transport measures e.g. to support a rural bus service, a Section 106 agreement is needed to secure the requisite monies. For all S106 agreements, five tests must be met. A developer cannot effectively 'buy' a planning permission by offering to do things that were over and above what was required to make the development acceptable.

The Area Action Plan, which has been part of the development plan since September 2009, is a mechanism for pooling contributions for use on highway improvements.

Q2 If a new housing development is proposed and Section 106 monies obtained how can that money be used to improve the transport infrastructure to accommodate the increased use by residents of the new development?

Covered in the response to Q1, above.

Q3 If road improvements are required to ease the traffic flow because of the increased use of our arterial routes by residents of the new development and the improvements required are not in the Wyre area, what process is undertaken to consult with other councils / agencies to progress these improvements?

For more significant developments the agreement of the Sustainable Transport Strategy Steering Group (STSSG) is required. The STSSG includes representatives from Wyre, Fylde, Lancashire County Council (LCC) and the

Highways Agency. Any recommendations from that Group are referred to LCC for a decision.

There are no elected members on the STSSG. Any member input is via the decision-making process at LCC. It would be possible for the minutes of meetings to be sent to members – perhaps to the Economy Portfolio Holder – so long as it is recognised that these would be confidential minutes, not for publication.

Cllr MacNaughton asked whether Section 106 money could be made available for the Poulton-Fleetwood rail link, but evidence subsequently obtained confirms that it cannot.

Q4 If a road improvement scheme was undertaken say in Fylde by the Highways Agency that increased the traffic flow from Wyre what % contribution to the scheme would Wyre commit to and would other authorities e.g. Fylde council and LCC also contribute to the upgrade?

The Highways Agency or LCC may, quite independently, propose, and carry out improvement works themselves, at their own cost. LCC would carry out works within the Local Transport Plan and such work would be paid for by them in full.

Q5 What is the consultation process with the Highways Agency, LCC Highways and Fylde Council over any proposed developments in Wyre that would significantly impact on the transport infrastructure?

Statutory consultees are listed in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010. For a strategic site, it would have been part of a previous planning document that would itself have been subject to consultation.

Planners need to be confident that they can defend any planning decision on appeal, and for that reason they pay particular attention to the views of experts, even when the views of local residents and parish/town councils have also been taken into account.

Regarding the Localism Act 2011, new guidance, in the form of a National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is awaited. The Localism Act itself is not likely to affect the way applications are considered.

Referring to the likely impact on the A585 of the 1300 additional houses to be built in the Thornton and Fleetwood area, the Head of Planning Services said that, although on the face of it it looked as though an existing problem was being added to, the increase in housing numbers alongside the economic development of the Hillhouse site was likely to mean that more jobs would be available locally so out commuting would, in fact, be reduced.

Q6 Are the planning officers familiar with Transport Impact Assessment Tool (TIAT) and do they use it? Are there any examples that can be given?

Planning officers are familiar with the tool, but do not currently use it.

Q7 How do planning officers communicate with elected members and are there any ways in which that communication can be made more effective?

Most communication with elected members takes place at Planning Committee and the Planning Policy Group, which first met in September 2009.

Some concern was expressed about lack of effective communication with the Highways Agency. For example, the HA's representative at the STSSG (David Wild) was different from the two HA representatives who attended the Task Group meeting on 10 January (Ruth Moynihan and Bob Baldwin). In addition, the Planning officers were unaware of the HA's priorities as specified at the Task Group meeting on 10 January, as these had not been expressed at the STSSG.

Q8 A previous Memorandum of Understanding with the Highways Agency appears to have fallen into disuse. Would there be advantages in reinstating that MoU and what would those benefits be?

The Head of Planning Services was not aware of any previous Memorandum of Understanding, although he felt that it was something that would be beneficial. From his perception, the HA should place more focus on the work of the STSSG, which was part of an adopted policy. He agreed to propose the development and adoption of a MoU at a STSSG meeting that was scheduled to take place towards the end of February.

Q9 If the A585 were to lose its trunk road status, what would be the advantages and disadvantages?

- The HA would no longer be responsible for its maintenance and improvement.
- Would there be sufficient funds for its upkeep if LCC were to take over??
- At present LCC is the 'ringmaster' in terms of contributions under the STSSG, because it is 'independent'; who would take over this role?
- An advantage would be that the whole network would be the responsibility of a single agency.

The Task Group asked whether, if the A585 was de-trunked, it would then have access to Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) and Tax Increment Financing (TIF)?

The advice received was that TIF was only available to major projects (e.g. airport developments). The council is currently looking at CIL and whether that could be run alongside Section 106 monies. There remains much work still to be done to progress this, and if it is to be done it needs to be completed by April 2014. Currently, there is neither the resource nor the expertise available within the council. If the CIL is to be developed it will have to be done in collaboration with Fylde and Lancashire County Councils, which is an added complication. The experience of other local authorities that have been working with CILs indicates that they are often unable to impose tariffs because they put significant additional economic pressure on developers.

Fleetwood will remain a port until such time as the Government passes an Order to say that it is not.

Summary of Evidence from Network Rail

Andy Bliss, Senior Network Planner (NW) with Network Rail, provided responses to a number of specific questions that had been raised by the task group, as follows:

Q1 At a previous meeting of the Transport Infrastructure Task Group, mention had been made of the granting of a licence for the Poulton and Wyre Railway Society to carry out works on the Thornton section/station. What are the conditions of this licence, i.e. expiry dates? What, if any, conditions need to be met in order to ensure that the licence will be extended/renewed?

Mr Bliss agreed to provide a written response to this question. He added that from Network Rail's point of view the branch line was now 'out of use' so he did not anticipate any difficulties in extending the licence, unless a more wholesome scheme came up unexpectedly, which was unlikely. Network Rail had no plans for the line.

Q2 What proposals are there in relation to vehicle parking for Poulton station (and in the future for Thornton station), which at present do not meet existing demand?

This is a matter for the train operators who run the stations, and therefore the car parks. With current franchises being relatively short, operators find it difficult to invest in car parks. Northern's franchise for Poulton, for example, is due to end in 2013. Longer franchises are being encouraged in order to also encourage that sort of investment. Space is also at a premium in both Poulton and Thornton, with no obvious solutions. There are currently no planned car park schemes at either station.

Q3 What will the impact be of the electrification of the Blackpool line on the Poulton-Fleetwood link, if any? For example, are there plans to sever the link completely at Poulton? If that is planned, what will the impact be of that action on the future of the Poulton-Fleetwood link?

Electrification of the Preston-Blackpool line is part of a wider North Electrification scheme to electrify the NW 'triangle' including Manchester, Liverpool, Preston and Blackpool. The Poulton-Fleetwood link will be severed as part of that scheme, as the new track alignment design will not be the same and to reinstate will incur costs not required by the scheme. If there is sufficient support for linking the Poulton-Fleetwood line, funding will need to be sought from a third party or from the Department for Transport. Lancashire County Council will need to be supportive and a full business case will need to be prepared. The new signalling and track designs will allow for up to 100mph running and will be designed to allow reinstatement of the branch connection should it be required and receive funding.

Todmorden Curve was quoted as a good example of local reinstatement.

Q4 If a rail service is to be re-introduced along the Poulton - Fleetwood route then the current infrastructure will require upgrading. What are the estimated costs to:

(a) Upgrade the current line from Poulton to Burn Naze including a new station and car parking requirement at Burn Naze and the refurbishment of Thornton station along with the replacement of crossing control at Station Rd, Hillylaid Rd and New Lane?

(b) Re-lay the line from Burn Naze to Fleetwood including new station facilities, car parking etc. at Fleetwood?

The GRIP procedures are designed to answer this question in detail, a GRIP 1-3 study identifying suitable options and costs. Without this it was not possible to put any firm figures on the likely costs.

(There were nine stages of GRIP Studies (0-8) – GRIP 0 referred to the initial thinking, GRIPs 1-3 culminated in the production of the final options to be considered, and GRIPs 4-8 related to the delivery of the scheme).

Some figures from other schemes were provided, as examples:

Per kilometre of track	£571k
Per set of points to install and maintain for 60 years	£400k
Per metre of platform	£3.5k
New station for a branch line	£2-5m
To electrify route	£2.8m per mile

Q5 If a rail service was re-introduced, where would the rolling stock be kept and maintained? Would this require additional facilities to be provided locally?

If the line is separate from the network it will be the responsibility of the owners to provide these facilities, which will add to the cost. If the branch line is connected to the network at Poulton it will be possible to make that provision elsewhere.

Q6 What is Network Rail's view on the rail link being re-introduced? Has any feasibility study been undertaken? If so, what were the findings?

Network Rail does not have a particular view about the re-opening of the Poulton-Fleetwood line. It is no longer part of Network Rail's plans, and is formally 'out of use'.

The forthcoming electrification of the Blackpool line will have implications for the line at Poulton. Some infrastructure will need to be removed and some replaced at Poulton, and changes will need to be made to signalling and track alignment. Certain parts of the infrastructure need to be removed and will not be replaced as they are no longer required. If the Poulton-Fleetwood link is to be reopened a parallel line should be considered at Poulton, not a connecting line.

It is important to take things slowly, one step at a time. It is perfectly acceptable to have an ambitious long-term vision, but careful planning is needed over a sustained period of time, unless an unexpected benefactor came forward.

An advantage of the line being self-contained is that any business case would not need to include connection costs, nor will there be demands for more expensive rolling stock. If demand is built up over a number of years it might be possible to make a step change, but only once the case has been proven.

Mr Bliss advised against being too ambitious in the early stages of the project, particularly when it comes to infrastructure, as that would generate unnecessary, and substantial, associated running costs.

Other comments

Mr Bliss advised the task group that it could be feasible to run a separate spur into a platform adjacent to the existing platform at Poulton and later extend the spur beyond the station joining the main line beyond the station in the direction of Preston.

When considering freight using the Poulton-Fleetwood link, it is important to remember that its economy lies in very long trains and longer distances and not in repeated journeys by shorter trains, and so this does not appear to be an efficient or viable proposal.

Finally, Mr Bliss advised Wyre Council to consider working more closely in partnership with Fylde and Blackpool.

Summary of Evidence from Blackpool Transport

The Tramway was due to reopen from Tuesday 3 April. There are some residual problems at the Fleetwood end of the line as the new substation is not yet completed. This means that the system will, for the time being, only support one tram in the loop from Fisherman's Walk to the ferry. A twenty-minute service is planned initially, which will not be affected by the substation problem. From the middle of July the service will increase to every ten minutes.

Bob Mason, Director of Delivery and Guy Thornton, Operations Manager, provided responses to a number of specific questions that had been raised by the task group, as follows:

Q1 There have been a number of recent changes to timetables and routes, some of which run less frequently and some not at all. Are these permanent measures, or are they trials, which might be re-instated if the strength of public feeling is sufficiently strong? This question refers, in particular, to the fact that the No.14 bus no longer runs to Freeport or St Annes.

Bus timetables were reviewed one year ago, having not been reviewed for a significant time previously. The following routes had changes made to their timetables: 1, 7, 9, 11 and 14.

As part of that review, the decision was taken to change the route of the No. 14 service. Maintaining the service to Freeport and St Annes would have required two additional vehicles, for which there was insufficient revenue. It is not in the company's plans to reinstate the service.

Loading figures show that more people are now carried to Freeport on the No. 1 than were carried there on the No. 14 previously.

The question of introducing an 'Express service' with limited stops on the No. 14 route was raised. Mr Mason said that, from his own considerable experience, it was very difficult indeed to run such a service profitably. Customer surveys indicated that the most important factors were reliability and frequency.

Q2 What consultation process do you undertake when planning your service timetables with other transport providers and the community?

Blackpool Transport consults regularly with officers from the County Council and with their own Board, which includes a number of Blackpool councillors. Blackpool Transport would be willing to consult more widely, but it would be a process of consultation and not negotiation.

The current financial pressures on all businesses are now having an impact upon municipal bus companies in the way that they had previously affected PLCs. There is an expectation that costs will be reduced and this will inevitably impact upon the way in which services are delivered.

The views of a Residents' Group, for example, could have an effect upon the decisions taken about a timetable, but it should be remembered that Blackpool Transport is a commercial company.

Q3 When planning your timetables do you consider the connectivity with the services you provide to that of other transport networks or do you look at your services as a stand-alone item?

Blackpool Transport talks to Network Rail but competition provisions in the Transport Act, 1985 prohibit them from speaking to other bus companies.

Connectivity is easier to achieve with a 'hub', but the geography of the Fylde does not facilitate that approach. It is also unreasonable to expect all services to be able to connect with all others; that is something that is, quite simply, impossible to achieve.

Q4 What is the factor which gives the most weight to your decision making process when you compile your timetables or consider new routes?

Loading figures and cost are the key factors.

Q5 The task group understands that various electrical circuitries have already been installed in the track at North Pier in order to facilitate an extension of the tram system to Blackpool North Station at some future date. When is this likely to happen and what obstacles that will need to be overcome for this to become a reality?

The response to this question was supplied in writing by Chris Anslow at Lancashire County Council:

"We have lain a "Delta" junction at North Pier which would allow trams to divert off the tramway from either direction and travel up to Blackpool North station. This is an aspiration of Blackpool Council but will probably cost in excess of £10 million to complete. Through the European SINTROPHER project, the business case for this is being developed and the work to date suggests that there will probably be a good business case for it.

When it comes to funding, the Government has just begun a consultation on devolving the decision making on local major transport schemes (i.e. those over £5 million) beyond 2014/15. It will be for whatever local decision making body is eventually established to consider those schemes put forward for funding and to determine which schemes will take priority within whatever financial resources are made available. I would be surprised if Blackpool doesn't push hard for this scheme to be prioritised. It would be sometime from 2015 onwards before funding is likely to become available."

Other comments

Mr Mason confirmed that Freeport does not currently offer any incentive or subsidy to encourage bus services to go there, but such an approach would be welcomed by Blackpool Transport if it was possible to start a dialogue. Mr Mason said that he would appreciate any assistance that the council was able to give in that regard, in terms of facilitating communication.

A Bus Punctuality Improvement Plan was being set up with Blackpool Council and Mr Mason said that he would welcome a similar approach with Wyre and Fylde. He also said that he would like to see Blackpool and Lancashire Councils communicating more effectively in terms of planned road works.

Summary of Evidence from Stagecoach

Stagecoach in the North West underwent significant restructuring during the past six months, and for that reason it had proven difficult for the company to engage with the task group until recently. Members were very appreciative of Les Burton, the recently appointed Operations Director for the region, who attended a meeting and provided responses to a number of specific questions that had been raised by the task group, as follows:

Q1 We have already identified that improved communication and joined up thinking would be beneficial for all partners across transport provision in Wyre. Would you please comment on the value to your organisation of improving interaction between partners?

Regular meetings are held between Stagecoach and Lancashire County Council's Leader, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and Public Service section. Concerns have been expressed about the high percentage of concessionary fares having a significant impact upon profitability.

It is very important for Stagecoach to be aware of local issues and opinion and for that reason closer working with District Councils would be welcomed.

Q2 Congestion on the A585 is a significant barrier to economic development in Wyre. Increased passenger numbers from Poulton Railway station would go some way to reducing traffic and would have a beneficial impact on carbon emissions.

Whilst we appreciate the complexities of timetabling services, especially given the geographical configuration of Wyre, could more be done to improve connectivity between the station and major centres of population (Fleetwood, Cleveleys, Thornton) particularly at peak time?

Delivery of a more seamless service would help to encourage car drivers to consider public transport as a viable and practical alternative and would surely increase uptake of passenger numbers?

Stagecoach is quite prepared to consider additional routes that are directly related to rail services, depending upon the business case. At the request of the task group, Stagecoach agreed to consider amending timetables in order for their services to fit in more closely with train departures and arrivals.

Q3 As a private sector operator could you clarify your policy on social responsibility with particular regard to the provision of services on less profitable routes which nevertheless provide a lifeline to excluded groups, particularly older people, jobseekers and young people?

It must be remembered that Stagecoach is a PLC. Whilst the fleet of vehicles based at Fleetwood has declined the cost has remained the same. It would be

possible for the company to run its services from the Lancaster and Preston depots. The situation will be reviewed again in twelve months' time.

The reduction in services to Blackpool Victoria Hospital was a specific concern of the task group. Mr Mason made the point that with hospitals you do not have a regular flow of customers which makes planning very difficult. Hospitals themselves lack a degree of social awareness as they do not take public transport arrival times into account when setting their appointment times.

Q4 How can rural areas like Scorton and Calder Village continue to exist without a bus service for an increasingly elderly population, and how might that situation be resolved?

Innovative ways of serving these communities need to be found, and this appears to be a matter where further discussion with Lancashire county Council would be of benefit. For example, the possibility of using a school bus once a week to bring passengers in to Garstang Market from outlying villages, and returning them before school finishes might be explored.

Other comments

Stagecoach's timetables have evolved over a long period of time, without formal review. They are due to be reviewed systematically and improvements are likely to be identified.

Efforts have been made to improve the quality and comfort experienced by passengers, in order to retain and grow customer numbers. This includes low-floor vehicles and the use of CCTV on buses.

The proposed introduction of a 20mph speed limit to all residential areas in the county will have an impact upon service times, CO₂ emissions, fuel consumption and cost. Whilst horizontal inflections (e.g. chicanes) are seen as effective the imposition of a blanket 20mph limit is seen by the company as "questionable" in terms of benefits.

A more effective Transport Forum, or equivalent, would be welcomed.

Conclusions

Throughout the review it has become increasingly clear that there is considerable scope for improvement in communication between the council and other organisations and between the other organisations themselves. Indeed, this became one of the consistent themes of the task group's work.

Connectivity of services was also a recurrent theme, which is likely to be addressed if improved communication is achieved.

In terms of more specific issues, evidence suggests that parts of the A585 continue to be a major obstacle to the potential economic development of the borough, an issue that was supported by a number of the witnesses who contributed to the task group's work.

Similarly, the reinstatement of the Poulton-Fleetwood rail link was seen by a number of witnesses (including Lancashire County Council, Network Rail and the Head of Regeneration and Assets) as a key factor in the borough's regeneration, as well as potentially having a positive impact upon the pressures currently experienced by the A585.

Recommendations

Having considered the evidence gathered during the review, members of the task group have formulated the following recommendations:

1 Communication

1.1 That the Economy Portfolio Holder pursue and promote a formalised communication structure between all transport partners and elected members.

1.2 That the Council pursue a Memorandum of Understanding with the Highways Agency.

1.3 That the Economy Portfolio Holder pursue the offer of improved consultation with Blackpool Transport and seek to establish similar relationships with other operators, particularly where poor connectivity/access to employment poses a major barrier to employment/opportunity for economically excluded groups, job seekers, younger people, older people and rural communities.

1.4 That the Sustainable Transport Strategy Steering Group is requested to send minutes of its meetings to the Economy Portfolio Holder, for appropriate dissemination to all members of the Council.

2 A585

2.1 That a cost/benefit analysis be carried out on options for the detrunking of the A585.

2.2 That the Planning Team undertakes further investigation into the potential impact and costs/benefits of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

2.3 That strategies be developed to ensure that all Section 106 opportunities are maximised.

2.4 That Lancashire County Council and bus operators, through an improved formal communication structure, be lobbied to improve connectivity with Poulton railway station.

2.5 That the council, in partnership with Network Rail, evaluate the options for developing parking provision at Poulton station.

3 Poulton to Fleetwood Rail Link

3.1 That the GRIP 2 Study is pursued to completion.

3.2 That up to date information about the transportation needs of the residents of Wyre be obtained, using community engagement, surveys and questionnaires, in order to work more effectively with local transport organisations.

3.3 That best practice from other successful schemes (e.g Todmorden Curve) be studied and applied to the bid to reinstate the Poulton to Fleetwood rail link.

3.4 That the Department for Transport, Lancashire County Council, the Regional Growth Fund, local Members of Parliament and other partners be lobbied regarding the Poulton to Fleetwood rail link and its potential impact upon the wider economic benefits to the borough.

4 Port of Fleetwood

4.1 That, in order to enhance economic development and give Wyre higher priority in transport needs assessments, the Council retains its commitment to preserve the port of Fleetwood.

5 20 mph speed limit

5.1 That Lancashire County Council (LCC) be made aware of the views of some bus operators and task group members, and that LCC be urged to reconsider the implementation of blanket 20pmh zones in residential areas across the county, which are likely to impact negatively upon traffic flows, public transport services and carbon emissions, whilst being largely unenforceable.

Responsibility for Recommendations

Responsibility for implementing recommendations will lie with the following:

Recommendations 1.1 and 1.3 will be the responsibility of the Economy Portfolio Holder

Recommendation 2.5 will be a joint Recommendation for Network Rail and the Corporate Director of People and Places

All other Recommendations will be the responsibility of the Corporate Director of People and Places

13 March 2012

Part I - Item No. 15

Electoral Divisions affected:
Fylde West, Poulton-le-
Fylde, Amounderness,
Thornton-Cleveleys Central,
Thornton-Cleveleys North,
Fleetwood East

A585 De-trunking: M55 to Fleetwood
(Appendix 'A' refers)

Contact for further information:
Dave Colbert, 01772 534501, Environment Directorate,
dave.colbert@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

Wyre Borough Council has formally requested the view of the County Council with regard to de-trunking the A585 between Junction 3 of the M55 and Fleetwood, with the County Council taking over responsibility for the management and maintenance of the route from the Highways Agency. This report sets out the potential implications and highlights a number of relevant issues related to costs and risk.

Notwithstanding the lack of a strategic case for retaining the A585 between the M55 and Fleetwood as part of the Strategic Road Network, there is no material advantage to the County Council of pursuing de-trunking. Other things being equal, the additional costs arising from de-trunking will outweigh any benefits or likely increased funding, and it would increase the County Council's liabilities and exposure to risk, for example, in relation to winter service provision. De-trunking could also put at risk delivery of the c£11m of mitigation works set out in the Fleetwood-Thornton Area Action Plan Sustainable Transport Strategy.

Recommendation

That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport inform Wyre Borough Council that there is no material advantage to the highway network of pursuing de-trunking.

Background

Wyre Borough Council's Cabinet has requested that the council's Transport Infrastructure Task Group seek the views of the County Council with regard to the de-trunking of the A585 between the M55 and Fleetwood, with the County Council taking over responsibility for the management and maintenance of the route. The

Cabinet has also requested the Transport Infrastructure Task Group provide financial implications detailing the likely costs of undertaking a cost/benefit analysis of options for potential de-trunking, and a clear rationale setting out what other sources of funding might become available if the County Council were to assume responsibility for the A585. These requests have arisen following consideration by Wyre BC's Cabinet of a review undertaken by the Transport Infrastructure Task Group that concluded in November 2011. You may recall giving evidence to the Task Group on a range of issues related to transport infrastructure.

The A585 is currently part of the Strategic Road Network and therefore managed and maintained by the Highways Agency on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. The Department for Transport's current policy position is that unless there is a clear need to retain a road as part of the Strategic Road Network, it would prefer that road to be under local control. Following the cessation of Irish Sea ferry operations at Fleetwood, there is no rationale whatsoever in national policy for retaining the A585 as part of the Strategic Road Network. However, DfT has no plans to institute a further round of de-trunking, but is prepared to investigate the case for de-trunking specific roads individually.

De-trunking the A585 would have consequences for the County Council, in particular, taking over the maintenance and winter service liability for an additional 19km of highway. The County Council would also inherit responsibility for delivering any future small-scale improvements to the route, a number of which have proved contentious in the past. The status of the M55 to Norcross Improvement (the 'Blue Route') would be unaffected by de-trunking as it is a local major transport scheme proposal and not a trunk road improvement promoted by the Secretary of State.

De-trunking would have implications for both Wyre and Fylde Borough Councils, as trunk roads carry special planning obligations. For example, the Secretary of State through the Highways Agency can direct a local planning authority not to grant planning permission (either indefinitely or for a specified period), or direct conditions to be attached to any planning permission a local planning authority may grant. The latter usually requires a developer to fund and deliver mitigation measures on the Strategic Road Network to cater safely and efficiently for anticipated traffic levels and/or to phase delivery of a development. Such powers are not available to a local highway authority. De-trunking therefore has the potential to put at risk delivery of the Fleetwood-Thornton Area Action Plan, adopted by Wyre Borough Council in September 2009. The supporting Sustainable Transport Strategy has identified in excess of £11m of mitigation works on the A585 comprising capacity improvements at a number of the junctions and wholly funded by developers (see Appendix 'A').

De-trunking is a legal process under the Highways Act 1980 and requires the issuing of orders, a process that can take up to 40 weeks and includes a consultation period. If as a result the Secretary of State receives objections that are not withdrawn, a local public inquiry is held. It is not clear whether Wyre BC has discussed the potential implications of de-trunking with Fylde BC, but in order to deliver de-trunking successfully, there would need to be in principle agreement between the County Council and Wyre and Fylde Borough Councils.

Unlike previous programmes of de-trunking, DfT would not make available any additional funding as it considers there are no immediate cost implications. The

amount of maintenance block grant funding is dependent on a formula, and adjusts automatically to reflect the total length of road for which a local highway authority is responsible. However, this adjustment would be considerably less than the annual sum the Highways Agency currently spends on the route in terms of routine maintenance and winter service provision, renewals, structures and local network management schemes.

Should the road be de-trunked, the County Council as local highway authority would be in a position to deliver improvements to the route through the Local Transport Plan; however, any potential schemes on the A585 would need to compete for LTP funding in the same way as those elsewhere on the County's network. The availability of funding for improvements from other sources such as Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), S106 agreements or even a future devolved local major transport scheme budget is not dependent on the A585's trunk road designation.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding the lack of a strategic case for retaining the A585 between the M55 and Fleetwood as part of the Strategic Road Network, there is no material advantage to the County Council of pursuing de-trunking. Other things being equal, the additional costs arising from de-trunking will outweigh any benefits or likely increased funding, and it would increase the County Council's liabilities and exposure to risk, for example, in relation to winter service provision. De-trunking could also put at risk delivery of the c£11m of mitigation works set out in the Fleetwood-Thornton Area Action Plan Sustainable Transport Strategy.

Consultations

Economic Development Service, Office of the Chief Executive.

Implications:

None identified.

Risk Management

The risks associated with the de-trunking of the A585 have been set out in the report.

Any representations made to the Cabinet Member prior to the issue being considered in accordance with the Public Notice of Forward Plans

Name:	Organisation:	Comments:
-------	---------------	-----------

N/A.

**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers**

Paper	Date	Contact/Directorate/Tel
-------	------	-------------------------

N/A.

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A.

Appendix 'A'

Fleetwood-Thornton Area Action Plan A585 Junctions Identified for Improvements:

Denham Way Roundabout, Fleetwood
Eros Roundabout, Fleetwood
Bourne Way Junction Traffic Signals, Thornton-Cleveleys
West Drive Junction Traffic Signals, Thornton-Cleveleys
Victoria Road Roundabout, Thornton-Cleveleys
Norcross Roundabout
Skippool Roundabout
Shard Bridge Junction Traffic Signals, Mains Lane
Singleton Cross Roads Traffic Signals
Windy Harbour Junction Traffic Signals

Decision details

A585 De-trunking: M55 to Fleetwood

[Find out more about this issue](#)

Decision maker: Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

Decision status: Recommendations Approved

Is Key decision?: No

Is subject to call in?: Yes

Purpose:

Wyre Borough Council has formally requested the view of the County Council with regard to de-trunking the A585 between Junction 3 of the M55 and Fleetwood, with the County Council taking over responsibility for the management and maintenance of the route from the Highways Agency. This report sets out the potential implications and highlights a number of relevant issues related to costs and risk.

Notwithstanding the lack of a strategic case for retaining the A585 between the M55 and Fleetwood as part of the Strategic Road Network, there is no material advantage to the County Council of pursuing de-trunking. Other things being equal, the additional costs arising from de-trunking will outweigh any benefits or likely increased funding, and it would increase the County Council's liabilities and exposure to risk, for example, in relation to winter service provision. De-trunking could also put at risk delivery of the c£11m of mitigation works set out in the Fleetwood-Thornton Area Action Plan Sustainable Transport Strategy.

Decision:

County Councillor Tim Ashton, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, agreed to inform Wyre Borough Council that there is no material advantage to the highway network of pursuing de-trunking.

Date of decision: 10/07/2012

Effective from: 14/07/2012

Accompanying Documents:

[Report](#) PDF 72 KB