

TORBAY COUNCIL

Report No: **Env/59/04**

Title: Tweenaways Cross Junction Improvements

To: Executive on 7th December 2004

1. Purpose

- 1.1 This report aims to summarise the results of the recent consultation exercise into the options for the improvement of Tweenaways Cross Junction, Paignton, and goes on to recommend one of the options. It then looks at issues of cost and deliverability.

2. Relationship to Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 The scheme related to the following Transforming Torbay corporate priorities:

Jobs and Industry – towards a prosperous Torbay
Road Safety and Congestion - Improving road safety and access to and around Torbay
Community – Targeted improvement actions to deliver our statutory responsibilities and meet the needs of the community

3. Recommendation(s)

- 3.1 That Option 3 – large signalised junction - is accepted as the preferred option for the improvement of Tweenaways cross Junction.
- 3.2 That Pedestrian Option 1 – displaced movements upstream of the junction – is accepted, as part of overall Option 3.
- 3.3 That the Tweenaway Cross Junction Improvement is included in the Torbay Local Transport Plan 2 [2006 – 2011], to be included for implementation within 2006/2007, if at all possible.
- 3.4 That the cost of the development works is divided equally between the Council [via LTP capital funding] and the private sector [via relevant Section 106 Agreements], but that Council Officers should seek to explore and maximise other funding opportunities.

4. Reason for Recommendation(s)

- 4.1 The recommended option will secure an improvement scheme of sufficient size and design to enable safe and convenient pedestrian crossing movements, whilst at the same time enable the junction capacity to accommodate estimated vehicular traffic flows throughout the plan period to 2011.
- 4.2 The recommended pedestrian option has been discussed with students of the Paignton School Council, who support it, and it is considered a safe alternative to crossing at the junction itself. It was also discussed with the Board of Governors, who did not raise any objection.
- 4.3 The recommended implementation date is set at 2006/07 in order to provide a level of certainty for the business community, and to set a framework for negotiating Section 106 Agreements to secure contributions from developers of employment sites along the Ring Road.
- 4.4 Deliverability will depend on being able to identify detailed scheme costs. A significant proportion of the increase in the amount of traffic that will use the Ring Road in future – and hence the reason for improving Tweenaways Cross Junction – will stem from the

proposed employment developments, especially at Yannons Farm, Holly Gruit and Long Road South. It is therefore considered to be reasonable for these proposed developments to shoulder an appropriate proportion of the improvement costs.

5. **Key Risks associated with the Recommendation(s)**

- 5.1 **Provision of Service [P]** – Likelihood of Risk – There is a slightly higher risk of Option 3 [the recommended option] not being delivered than option 2, on account of the higher cost of the scheme [score 2]. The impact of improvement works at Tweenaways Cross not being implemented would be significant for the ease of traffic movement on the Ring Road and on Totnes Road, and this would have a likely further impact on the local economy and safety [score 3]. Combined impact is therefore 6.
- 5.2 **Legal [L]** – Likelihood and Impact of Risk are low both low – Combined score 1.
- 5.3 **Reputation [R]** – The Likelihood of Risk to reputation is low, as the scheme is a clear priority and is considered to be deliverable [score 1]. The impact on reputation if the Council failed to deliver would probably be higher – say intermediate – as there is a high expectation based on the public consultation response [score3]. Combined score 3.
- 5.4 **Financial [F]** – The Likelihood of Financial Risk is low in relation to Option 2, and slightly higher if the preferred Option 3 is agreed [score 2]. The financial impact of failing to deliver Tweenaways Cross could be higher in terms of a lower LTP/APR settlement from GOSW, and the need to secure even more funding at a later date [score 3]. Combined score 6.
- 5.5 **Strategic [S]** – The Likelihood of Strategic Risk is low, as the scheme is committed and has been through the Local Plan and will go through the LTP2 process [score 1]. The strategic impact of the scheme not being delivered would be quite significant [score4]. Combined score 4.
- 5.6 **Environmental [E]** – The likelihood of environmental risk is low [score 1], although the continuing environmental deterioration [impact] of the junction and the quality of life of residents and pedestrians near to and using the junction as a crossing point would be serious [score4]. Combined score 4].
- 5.7 **Final Risk Score**

Likelihood	6	6	12	18	24
	5	5	10	15	20
	4	4	8	12	16
	3	3	6	9	12
	2	2	4	6PF	8
	1	1L	2	3R	4SE
		1	2	3	4
		Impact			
		Low risk	Intermediate risk	High risk	

The capital letter in the above matrix denotes where the author has assessed the level of final risk to fall

6. **Alternative Options (if any)**

- 6.1 The alternative options to Option 3 have been considered in this report, including Option 1 [do nothing]. The risks to the scheme [especially financial and strategic] are lower in Option 2, but the impacts would be less beneficial, and in the medium term would not secure the freedom from congestion objective, which in turn would impact negatively on the local economy of Torbay, and especially Brixham and the major employment areas which are

accessed from the Ring Road.

7. Background

- 7.1 Tweenaways Cross is a busy and congested key road junction on the Torbay Ring Road, where it crosses the main road from Totnes to Paignton town centre. It is recognised in the Torbay Local Plan as one of the two major junctions [the other being Windy Corner], which restricts traffic flow along the Ring Road, which is the primary corridor of movement around the three towns in Torbay, and is also known as the Western Corridor. The Ring Road is also the principal conduit for the main employment areas in Torbay, including the Yalberton and Long Road areas, and also for the Port of Brixham.
- 7.2 The junction is also located close to and between the two campuses of Paignton Community and Sports College, and therefore experiences a high number of pedestrian crossing movements.
- 7.3 A study has been undertaken to review the existing traffic movements and demands imposed on the junction, projected to 2011. Several improvement options have been prepared, to enable the junction to accommodate existing and projected flows, both for vehicular traffic and to accommodate pedestrian movements. The Executive, on 30 March 2004 [Minute 497.15] approved the principles of an improvement scheme, with provision made for a consultation exercise.
- 7.4 A consultation exercise was carried out in June –July 2004 into seven improvement options for Tweenaways Cross, plus three pedestrian crossing options. A leaflet was circulated at local 'pick-up' points, and a public exhibition was held at the College from 1-3 July, which was attended by 155 members of the public. 334 completed questionnaires and 9 detailed responses were received, and 83% of the response was in support of improvement of the junction. In addition to engaging with the wider community, contact was made with the College, and work has been undertaken with both the Student Council and the Board of Governors.
- 7.5 The leaflet and detailed results of the consultation exercise are set out in Appendix 1. Option 2 received the most support [58%] and is also the cheapest [excluding the Option 1 'do nothing']. However, concern was expressed that the improvement gained by this scheme would be short-lived. Traffic Option 3 gained some support and has much to commend it from a strategic point of view. Appendix 2 is a plan showing the extent and design of Option 3. The main advantages of Option 3 are:
- Increased vehicular and pedestrian capacity
 - Less congestion
 - Longer life, i.e. post 2011
 - Increased accessibility for public transport
 - Greater assistance to the economy
- 7.6 On the pedestrian options for improvement, the displaced pedestrian option – Option 1 – gained the most support [78%]. However, 21% of the response was that pedestrians would still cross at the junction.
- 7.7 The estimated cost of Option 3 is £3.1 million, i.e. double the cost of Option 2. The proposed way of financing the scheme is for a combination of LTP, Sustainable Communities and private sector funding. Officers are committed to exploring other funding options. We will be in a position to know the amount and availability of LTP and Sustainable Communities funding by the end of the year. The Council will be seeking Section 106 contributions to secure private sector funding from major developments that are proposed along the Ring Road.

7.8 In terms of programming, the scheme, it is intended that it will be included in LTP2, [2006 – 2011], with a start date at the end of 2006, following a public inquiry into land acquisition, with completion by April 2007. The key milestones are:

- Detailed design – April 2005
- Public Inquiry – October 2005#
- Inquiry decision - January 2006
- Tender approval - April 2006
- Start on site – November 2006
- Completion of scheme – April 2007

Michael Yeo
Strategic Director for Environment Services

Contact Officer:	Mike Fox
Telephone no.	8810

IMPLICATIONS, CONSULTATION AND OTHER INFORMATION

Part 1

These sections may have been completed by the Report author but must have been agreed by the named officers in the Legal, Finance, Human Resources and Property Divisions.

Does the proposal have implications for the following issues? If "Yes" - give details. <i>delete as appropriate</i>		Name of responsible officer
Legal	Yes – Possible inquiry	Bill Norman
Financial – Revenue	Yes – Continued scheme progression	Adrian O'Rourke
Financial – Capital Plan	Yes – Significant scheme expenditure	Adrian O'Rourke
Human resources	Yes – Staffing the continued progression of the scheme	Clare Armour
Property	Yes – Acquisition of land, and the use of land already in Council ownership	Sam Partridge

Part 2

The author of the report must complete these sections.

Could this proposal realistically be achieved in a manner that would more effectively: <i>delete as appropriate</i>		
(i)	promote environmental sustainability?	No
(ii)	reduce crime and disorder?	No
(iii)	promote good community relations?	No
(iv)	promote equality of opportunity on grounds of race, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief?	No
(v)	reduce (or eliminate) unlawful discrimination (including indirect discrimination)?	No

If the answer to any of the above questions is "Yes" the author must have addressed the relevant issue/s in the main report and have included a full justification and, where appropriate, an impact assessment.

Part 3

The author of the report must complete this section.

	<i>delete as appropriate</i>	If "Yes", give details
Does the proposal have implications for any other Directorates?	Yes	Corporate, especially Legal and Property Children's Services

Part 4

Is this proposal in accordance with (i.e. not contrary to) the Council's budget or its Policy Framework?		<i>delete as appropriate</i>
		Yes
1.	If "No" - give details of the nature and extent of consultation with stakeholders and the relevant overview and scrutiny body.	
2.	If "Yes" - details and outcome of consultation, if appropriate.	
	Extensive consultation with the Paignton Community and Sports College and with the wider community, the details and results are summarised in this report.	

Part 5

Is the proposal a Key Decision in relation to an Executive function?	<i>delete as appropriate</i>	If "Yes" - give Reference Number
	Yes	X37/2004

Part 6

Wards Potentially affects all wards, but especially Coverdale, Blatchcombe and St Michaels with Goodrington

Appendices

Appendix 1 Consultation Leaflet and Summary of Consultation Results
Appendix 2 Plan of Option 3

Documents available in Members' Room

Background Papers:

The following documents/files were used to compile this report: