

North Yorkshire County Council

Craven Area Committee

31 May 2018

A65 Coniston Aire Causeway Feasibility

Report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services

1.0 Purpose Of Report

- 1.1 To consider the recommendations of a feasibility study which has investigated options aimed at reducing potential damage and associated traffic congestion caused by bridge strikes on the A65 at Coniston Aire Causeway, which is a Grade II listed Structure.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 Members will be aware that the A65 is a vital link to and from the north on the west side on the county which was de trunked by Highways England (formerly the Highways Agency) and is now maintained by the County Council as the Highway Authority. The A65 has several constrictions along its route from Skipton northwards, the Coniston Aire Causeway being one of the significant ones. The causeway is narrow and it is difficult for modern vehicles to pass particularly on the bridge which leads to expensive damage to the structure and many weeks under traffic restrictions while the damage is repaired. The cost of repairs to the causeway is circa £30,000 for each event excluding the cost of disruption to the travelling public caused by queues of traffic waiting to negotiate the accident site.
- 2.2 Members are asked to consider and comment on the appended feasibility study report, entitled *Proposals For The Alleviation Damage To The Bridge And Causeway By Looking At The Use Of The Existing Carriageway Using Traffic Signals Or Widening Of The A65 And Options For A New Coniston Aire Causeway*.

3.0 The feasibility study outcome and next steps

- 3.1 The feasibility study has looked at a range of options and has recommended a preferred option/s as set out below:
- Option 1 Construction of a concrete overlay slab cantilever over the existing bridge, estimated cost - £3.5m.
 - Option 2 Construction of two concrete cantilever slabs one each side of the causeway over the existing bridge, estimated cost - £3.5m to 4.5m.
 - Option 3 Construction of a concrete cantilever on one side of the causeway and the existing bridge, estimated cost - £4.5m.
 - Option 4 Widening one side of the causeway and the existing bridge for the full length of the causeway, estimated cost - £10m plus.
 - Option 5 Construction of a new multi span causeway Estimated Cost - £9.5 m.
 - Option 5.1 Construction of a new causeway 7.65m wide with a 3.7m carriageway upstream or downstream of the bridge. Estimated Cost - £5.4m.
 - Option 6 Traffic Signals - £200,000 to £300,000.

Whilst options 1, 2, 3 and 4 all create a wider structure and hence reduce the potential for damage to the bridge and the associated congestion problems none of these options are recommended because of the significant adverse impact they have on the existing listed structure. The traffic signal option (Option 6) is the least expensive option but is discounted due to the significant adverse impact on traffic flows and delays throughout the year and especially during peak times. Options 5 and 5.1 are therefore considered to be the most effective and are recommended as preferred options in the feasibility study although it is recognised that they both require significant funding to be found in order for either of them to be delivered.

- 3.2 The next step is to report to the Corporate Director, BES and the BES Executive Members to seek approval for the preferred option/s. The report will include the views expressed by members of the Area Committee.
- 3.3 When the preferred option has been agreed, the final design can be completed and planning consent sought. As the preferred option requires significant funding it will be necessary to keep under review any potential funding sources. It will also be necessary to obtain funding before any land which may be needed can be obtained.
- 3.4 An outline programme of work has not been produced because the timeline is dependant the option chosen. If Listed Consent is required, then it could take a year to complete the design, if the new causeway option is chosen then, design, land purchase and procurement could be complete in 18 months of obtaining funding with a construction period of 12 months.

4.0 Programme

- 4.1 Until there is a decision and funding to proceed there is no programme for reasons given in 3.4 above.

5.0 Financial Implications

- 5.1 The initial scheme development work is being funded from existing approved budgets. At present there is no identified funding to complete the scheme. Officers will continue to keep potential funding sources under review and it is worth highlighting that the adoption of a preferred option improves the chances of a scheme being considered suitable for third party funding by means of being more 'bid ready'. However should a preferred option be taken forward to the Strategic Outline Business Case development stage and then be provisionally approved for funding from Department for Transport (DfT) or another funding body, then an appropriate local contribution will need to be identified.
- 5.2 Additional upfront costs will be incurred as a consequence of the design work that will be required. However, some of this would normally be required at a later stage in the development of the scheme business case, and therefore, a significant proportion of the costs can be considered to be a 'pulling-forward', or re-profiling of expenditure that would come at a later stage.

6.0 Equalities Implications

- 6.1 Consideration has been given to the potential for any adverse equalities impacts arising from the recommendations of this report. It is the view of officers that the recommendations included in this report do not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010 (Appendix A). However, it is worth noting that any preferred option(s) would require a full Equalities Impact Assessment to be carried out.

7.0 Legal Implications

- 7.1 At present no legal implications have been identified. Detailed discussions will take place with the County Council's legal department in respect of the legal implications of ensuring that the public consultation exercise and subsequent implementation of any identified options is properly carried out.

8.0 Recommendations

- 8.1 It is recommended that Members of the Craven Area Committee:
- i) Consider and comment on the contents of the appended report.

DAVID BOWE
Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services

Authors of Report: John Smith

Background Documents: Proposals For The Alleviation Damage To The Bridge And Causeway By Looking At The Use Of The Existing Carriageway Using Traffic Signals Or Widening Of The A65 And Options For A New Coniston Aire Causeway, report



**PROPOSALS FOR THE ALLEVATION OF DAMAGE TO THE
BRIDGE AND CAUSEWAY BY LOOKING AT THE USE OF THE
EXISTING CARRIAGEWAY USING TRAFFIC SIGNALS OR
WIDENING OF THE A65 AND OPTIONS FOR A NEW CONISTON
AIRE CAUSEWAY**

A65 CONISTON NORTH YORKSHIRE

BRIDGE NO. 4322

Initial equality impact assessment screening form (As of October 2015 this form replaces 'Record of decision not to carry out an EIA')			
This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.			
Directorate	Business and Environmental Services		
Service area	Highways and Transportation		
Proposal being screened	A65 Coniston Aire Causeway Feasibility Report		
Officer(s) carrying out screening	John D Smith		
What are you proposing to do?	Relieve traffic congestion on A65 at Coniston Aire.		
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	To give further detail of possible options to relieve congestion and allow improved information to be developed prior to seeking authorisation to undertake public consultation.		
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	No.		
Is there likely to be an adverse impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristics? As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics? Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important? Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to? If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be a significant adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your Equality rep for advice if you are in any doubt.			
Protected characteristic	Yes	No	Don't know/No info available
Age		✓	
Disability		✓	
Sex (Gender)		✓	
Race		✓	
Sexual orientation		✓	
Gender reassignment		✓	
Religion or belief		✓	
Pregnancy or maternity		✓	
Marriage or civil partnership		✓	
NYCC additional characteristic			
People in rural areas		✓	
People on a low income		✓	
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		✓	
Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.	No		

<p>Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.</p>	None			
<p>Decision (Please tick one option)</p>	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	✓	Continue to full EIA:	
<p>Reason for decision</p>	The work being proposed is primarily to further develop two possible options - there is no reason for the work programme to cause any negative impact on anybody from within the protected characteristic groups.			
<p>Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)</p>	<i>Barrie Mason</i>			
<p>Date</p>	08/05/18			