

## TORBAY COUNCIL

Report No: **49/2005**

Title: **Tweenaways Cross Junction Improvements**

To: Executive on 15th March 2005

---

### **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 relates directly to the Transforming Torbay corporate priority for Road Safety and Congestion. It also contributes towards the priorities for Jobs and Industry and Community.

### **3. Recommendation(s)**

- 3.1 That Option 2 – enlarged signalised junction based on the Local Plan Inquiry - be accepted as the preferred option for the improvement of Tweenaways cross Junction.
- 3.2 That Pedestrian Option 1 – displaced movements upstream of the junction – be accepted, as part of overall Option 2.
- 3.3 That the Tweenaway Cross Junction Improvement be included in the Torbay Local Transport Plan 2 [2006 – 2011], 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 lower risk of Option 2 [the recommended option] not being delivered than option 3, 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, although the LTP is not yet prepared and the funding situation is not, therefore, finalised [score 2]. 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 6.
- 5.4 **Financial [F]** – The Likelihood of Financial Risk is low in relation to Option 2, and slightly higher if the preferred Option 3 were agreed [score 3]. 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 is likely to 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	6RPF	8
	1	1L	2	3	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 2 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, although the positive impacts would be greater in Option 3, and in the medium/long term the junction may have to be revisited. Option 2 will, however, secure the freedom from congestion objective, which in turn would impact positively on the local economy of Torbay, and especially Brixham and the major employment areas which are accessed from the Ring Road. Unless further Government financial support is forthcoming, Option 3 is unrealistic, whilst option 2 is considered to be attainable within the emerging LTP2 programme.

## **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 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 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 is available in the Members' Rooms. Option 2 received the most support [58%] and is also the cheapest [excluding the Option 1 'do nothing']. However, some concern was expressed that the improvement gained by this scheme would need to be revisited in the longer term. Traffic Option 3 gained some support and has much to commend it from a strategic point of view. However, without additional Government support, Option 3 is not considered to be a realistic option for Torbay. Appendix 1 is a plan showing the extent and design of Option 2. The main advantages of Option 2 are:
- ☐ Increased vehicular and pedestrian capacity
  - ☐ Less congestion
  - ☐ Increased accessibility for public transport
  - ☐ A positive impact on 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 latest estimated cost of Option 3 is around £4 million, i.e. double the cost of Option 2, which has been estimated to cost in the region of £2 million. The proposed way of financing the Option 2 scheme is for a combination of LTP, Sustainable Communities and private sector funding. Officers are committed to exploring other funding options, although to date there has been no indication from Government that additional funding is likely, and for this reason Officers are advising that the Council should commit itself to Option 2, which is considered to be achievable. Clearly, if we are informed that Torbay stands a realistic chance of additional Government funding in the near future, we will report this to the Executive. In addition, 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 in April 2007, following a public inquiry into land acquisition, with completion by October 2007. The key milestones are:
- ❑ Detailed design – March 2005
  - ❑ Public Inquiry – December 2005
  - ❑ Inquiry decision - April 2006
  - ❑ Tender approval - October 2006
  - ❑ Start on site – April 2007
  - ❑ Completion of scheme – October 2007

**Mike Fox**

Assistant Director (Strategic Environmental Policy)

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.e. would generate expenditure or savings in excess of £100,000 or 20% of an approved budget OR affect more than 2,000 residents of the Borough.)	<i>delete as appropriate</i>	If "Yes" - give Reference Number
	Yes	

#### Part 6

**Wards** Potentially affects all wards, but especially Coverdale, Blatchcombe and St Michael's with Goodrington

#### **Appendices**

Appendix 1 Plan of Option 2

#### **Documents available in the Members' Rooms**

Consultation Leaflet and Summary of Consultation Results

#### **Background Papers:**

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