

# Major Schemes Summaries 4

## 4.1 Ashton Northern Bypass Stage 2

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Ashton Northern Bypass Stage 2</b>
<b>Promoting Authority</b>	<b>Tameside MBC</b>
<b>Location of Scheme</b>	The scheme is located in Ashton-under-Lyne, one of Greater Manchester's Key District Centres. (Grid Ref. SJ9399)
<b>Scheme Description</b>	Construction of a new 0.5km long single carriageway road which will complete the bypass around the north of Ashton town centre. The relieved section of Wellington Road/Penny Meadow is a key walking route into the town centre from surrounding residential areas and from town centre car parks. It forms part of the Manchester to Stalybridge Quality Bus Corridor and passes through the town centre conservation area. The relieved route will be re-arranged to benefit buses, bus passengers, pedestrians, cyclists and the built environment in the town centre.
<b>Local &amp; Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –</b>	(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).
<b>Please Reference</b>	<p><b>Tameside Community Strategy</b></p> <p>The scheme is consistent with the Key Theme in the Tameside Community Strategy of promoting 'A Prosperous Society' by improving transport links into and around Ashton town centre.</p> <p><b>Tameside UDP</b></p> <p>Policy 1.2, 1.6, 1.7., T1, T3(2)</p> <p><b>GMLTP1 and Provisional LTP2 Objectives Addressed:</b></p> <p>LTP1 Objective A, C, I, PLTP2 Objective 1,4,6– Improves access to and the attractiveness and environment of Ashton town centre assisting with improving the economic viability of the town, reducing the need to travel further to access goods and services.</p> <p>LTP1 Objective E, PLT2 Objective 5 – Provides improvements to a Quality Bus Corridor serving Ashton town centre.</p> <p><b>GM Economic Development Plan</b></p> <p>Driver 2: Attracting and Retaining Investment,</p> <p>Driver 6: Securing a Modern, Integrated and Efficient Transport Network</p> <p>Sharing the Vision – A Strategy for Greater Manchester</p> <p>Key Action 1: Promoting a Dynamic Economy</p> <p>Key Action 4: Improving Connectivity</p> <p><b>Regional Economic Strategy</b></p> <p>Key Activity 4.2: Scheme is located in Ashton St Peters Ward, which is one of the 10% most deprived wards in England.</p> <p>Key Activity 8.1: Scheme will support economic development and regeneration.</p> <p><b>RPG13</b></p> <p>SD1, EC5 (improves links to Ashton Moss Strategic Site), EC8, UR3,</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Ashton Northern Bypass Stage 2
	<p><b>Draft RSS</b></p> <p>W4</p>
	<p>(b) Social objectives (if applicable).</p> <p><b>Tameside Community Strategy</b></p> <p>The scheme is consistent with the Key Theme in the Tameside Community Strategy of promoting 'A Safe Environment'. Commercial properties, some with residences above, on the bypassed section of Wellington Road/Penny Meadow will benefit from reduced traffic noise and emissions and a reduced risk of road accidents.</p> <p><b>Tameside UDP</b></p> <p>Policy 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 1.12, S1, T1</p> <p><b>GMLTP1 and Provisional LTP2 Objectives</b></p> <p>LTP1 Objective B, PLTP2 Objective 2 – Reduces impact of road traffic on Ashton town centre and improves road safety</p> <p>LTP1 Objective C, PLTP2 Objective 4– Assists with viability of Ashton town centre and helps reduce need to travel further and to non central locations.</p> <p>LTP1 Objective E,F,G, PLTP2 Objective 5– Improves operating conditions for buses and for pedestrians and those with mobility difficulties, helping to improve access to jobs and services for non car owners.</p> <p><b>RPG13</b></p> <p>T4, SD1, EC8,</p> <p><b>Draft RSS</b></p> <p>SDF12, L1, W4</p>
	<p>(c) Environmental objectives (if applicable).</p> <p><b>Tameside Community Strategy</b></p> <p>The scheme is consistent with the Key Theme in the Tameside Community Strategy of promoting 'An Attractive Borough' by removing through traffic from a town centre street with high volumes of pedestrians allowing environmental improvements and enhancements for pedestrians, buses and cyclists and to the public realm to be carried out.</p> <p><b>Tameside UDP</b></p> <p>Policy 1.5, 1.6,1.9, T1, T6</p> <p><b>GMLTP1 and Provisional GMLTP2 Objectives</b></p> <p>LTP1 Objective A, PLTP2 Objective 1 – Assists with improving viability of Ashton town centre</p> <p>LTP1 Objective I, PLTP2 Objective 6 – Improvements for buses, pedestrians and cyclists may contribute to reduced car use.</p> <p><b>RPG13</b></p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Ashton Northern Bypass Stage 2
	<p>SD1, EC5, EC8, UR3</p> <p><b>Draft RSS</b></p> <p>SDF12, W1, W4, RT1</p>
<b>Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)</b>	<p>The Ashton Northern Bypass has been included in Tameside Council's Unitary Development Plans adopted in September 1996 and November 2004.</p> <p>Planning Approval for the road was granted in September 2003. Since then, extensive consultations with the Trustees of a mosque affected by the proposals have identified a suitable relocation site and planning approval for a replacement mosque has been granted.</p> <p>The necessary CPO and Side Roads Orders are been prepared. Construction could start once the Statutory Processes have been completed and Full Approval for funding received. Subject to this it is anticipated that construction could start in 2007.</p> <p>An Annex E for the scheme was submitted through the GMLTP in July 2002. Provisional Approval was granted by the Secretary of State in December 2002 for this scheme with a cost of £7.74m.</p> <p>The scheme has been retained in the Provisional GMLTP2 as a priority major scheme for Greater Manchester.</p> <p>In December 2004, whilst the scheme retained its Provisionally Approved status, the Secretary of State remitted the scheme to the region for prioritisation.</p>
<b>Cost £</b>	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>£8.29m in August 2005 based on out-turn prices and assumed inflation at 2%</p> <p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>Optimism bias is not included however contingencies of 5% are included within the costs.</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost? (Estimate)</p> <p>Private sector funding is not available, however Stage 1 of the Ashton Northern Bypass, completed in December 2003 was wholly private sector funded.</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	<p>Please state numerically.</p> <p>1.866 (BCR calculated on costs and benefits at 1998 price levels, discounted to 1998) as included in the July 2002 Annex E.</p>
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits? Y/N</p> <p>No</p> <p>Ashton Northern Bypass Stage 2 will enhance the viability of Ashton town centre by improving access by public transport, cycle and on foot and by allowing upgrades to the street scene. The scheme and the town centre are located in Ashton St Peters Ward, which is within the 10% most deprived wards in England. Enhanced viability</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Ashton Northern Bypass Stage 2
	of the town centre will help ensure the retention of services and job opportunities for local people. The scheme will also improve access to the Ashton Moss Strategic Development Site.
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>The reduction in traffic on the bypassed section of Wellington Road/Penny Meadow will improve the environment for the many pedestrians who use the route and for commercial premises located along its length. The route will be refurbished to create an attractive environment within Ashton town centre.</p> <p>An Impact Assessment for Noise and Air Quality was prepared as part of the planning application for the scheme, approved in September 2003. This indicated that noise levels on the bypassed section of Wellington Road/Penny Meadow will be reduced but that there will be some noise increase adjacent to the new road although this is not expected to exceed the 68dB LA10 (18 hour) threshold. Modelled air quality impact for the proposed route indicates that there will be no exceedances of the Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000.</p>
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p><b>Strategic Fit</b></p> <p>Information given above demonstrates that the scheme is consistent with Tameside, Greater Manchester and Regional policies.</p> <p><b>Deliverability</b></p> <p>Scheme preparation is progressing well with design work at a fairly advanced stage. Planning approvals for the scheme and for the relocation of a mosque have been secured. Site investigation has been carried out. Consultations with Network Rail and Northern Rail regarding land acquisition, the design of boundary walls, and alterations</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Ashton Northern Bypass Stage 2
	<p>to the railway station car park have progressed to the extent that the Council is confident that all outstanding issues of detail can be resolved within the required timescales.</p> <p>The necessary CPO and Side Roads Orders are been prepared. Construction could start once the Statutory Processes have been completed and Full Approval for funding received. Subject to this it is anticipated that construction could start in 2007.</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

### 4.2 Bolton Town Centre Public Transport Scheme

Scheme Name	Bolton Town Centre Public Transport Scheme
Promoting Authority	Bolton MBC
Location of Scheme	Bolton, Bolton MBC.  OSGR 371808, 408849 (location of proposed interchange).
Scheme Description	Package of measures anchored by the creation of a single high quality passenger transport interchange that will serve bus and rail and act as a "gateway" to Bolton town centre.
Local & Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –  Please Reference	<p>(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>To support increased economic activity (GMLTP Objective 1) in Bolton town centre by improving its attractiveness and accessibility.</p> <p>To improve connectivity within Greater Manchester through enhanced bus / rail interchange facilities (GMLTP Objective 7)</p> <p>(b) Social objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>To reduce social exclusion (GMLTP Objective 5) by providing transport facilities that are accessible to all.</p> <p>(c) Environmental objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>To induce modal shift from car by improving bus travel for journeys to/from Bolton, and by improving bus-rail interchange for journeys between Bolton and the Regional Centre, therefore assisting in reducing congestion (GMLTP Objective 6) and minimising environmental damage (GMLTP Objective 3).</p> <p>To support complementary land use and transport policies (GMLTP Objective 4) by providing high quality facilities that encourage greater use of public transport.</p>
Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)	Outline appraisal carried out.  Major scheme proposal for LTP2 drafted.
Cost £	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>£21.9m, 2002 prices.</p> <p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>No, but 24% is allowed for in calculating b/c ratio.</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost? (Estimate)</p> <p>Private sector contributions will be sought for junction improvements that form part of the strategy.</p>
Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio	Please state numerically.  1.4.

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Bolton Town Centre Public Transport Scheme
	The benefit to cost ratio quoted here refers only to the proposed new interchange and not to the full package of measures. It is therefore likely to understate the case for the scheme.
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?  An Economic Impact Report has not been prepared.
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?  No.
	(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?  N/A
	(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	(a) Are Transport & Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?  No.
	(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?  N/A
	(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?  N/A
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.  No.
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p>A major scheme bid for the scheme is anticipated in 2006. Subject to funding availability, implementation could commence in 2007/2008 with the scheme becoming operational in 2009/10.</p> <p>The strategy provides an important complement to the planned capacity enhancement on the Wigan – Bolton – Manchester rail corridor which would provide higher capacity rolling stock.</p> <p>The strategy also complements wider LTP2 Integrated Transport measures aimed at reducing car use and increasing the use of public transport, including Quality Bus Corridor programmes through the town.</p> <p>A contribution of £2.5m to the strategy from the Transport Infrastructure Fund (a fund specific to transport in the Districts of Bolton and Wigan) is planned.</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

### 4.3 Glossop Spur

Scheme Name	Glossop Spur
Promoting Authority	Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Location of Scheme	The Scheme is located close to the village of Hollingworth in Tameside
Scheme Description	<p>The Glossop Spur is the local authority element of a larger highways improvement scheme, which also includes the Highways Agency promoted A628 Mottram-Tintwistle Bypass. The two elements are intrinsically linked and comprise a comprehensive bypass solution for the traffic related problems experienced in the villages of Mottram, Hollingworth and Tintwistle. The overall scheme also provides relief for other residential communities in Longendale which are exposed to diverted traffic.</p> <p>The Glossop Spur is a 1.2km long single carriageway road, with roundabout junctions at each end. The scheme, which extends the Highways Agency's scheme, provides additional traffic relief/public transport benefits to Hollingworth and other local villages (eg Broadbottom).</p> <p>The proposal is primarily concerned with the relief of the A57 route between Mottram and Glossop, which forms part of a key strategic link between the cities of Manchester and Sheffield. The A57 is also an important link to the A628 Trunk Road that also connects Manchester to Sheffield and other towns in South Yorkshire.</p> <p>Removing through traffic from the existing roads which pass through the villages of Mottram, Hollingworth, Tintwistle, Broadbottom, Hattersley, Charlesworth and Gamesley, will improve significantly the journey times and reliability of the bus services running between and through these villages to Glossop, Hyde, Ashton, Stalybridge and Manchester. In addition the improved road conditions will provide substantially improved environment and opportunities for better pedestrian and cycling facilities, measures to assist in the above are to be promoted in parallel with the road scheme.</p>
<p>Local &amp; Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –</p> <p>Please Reference</p>	<p><b>(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).</b></p> <p><b>GM Local Transport Plan</b></p> <p>2.12 Regeneration</p> <p><b>Provisional GM Local Transport Plan 2</b></p> <p>3.3.4 Complementary land use and transportation strategies</p> <p>3.3.5 Improved accessibility</p> <p>3.3.6 Reduce congestion</p> <p>3.3.7 Improve strategic transport Links</p> <p>2.18 Better working with the Business Sector</p> <p><b>GM Economic Development Plan</b></p> <p>Driver 2, 'Attracting &amp; Retaining Investment, Visitors and Talent' by providing the infrastructure that employers need</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Glossop Spur
	<p>Driver 4, 'Achieving Economic Inclusion' – including the removal of barriers for people accessing work</p> <p>Driver 6, 'Securing a Modern, Integrated and Efficient Transport Network'.</p> <p><b>Accelerating Economic Growth – An Implementation Plan for Greater Manchester</b></p> <p>Theme 4, 'Creating Conditions for Sustainable Growth' (including infrastructure, regeneration and transport)</p> <p>Theme 3, 'Growing the labour force' (including inactivity/exclusion and inward migration)</p> <p><b>Sharing the Vision – A Strategy for Greater Manchester</b></p> <p>Key Action 1, 'Promoting a Dynamic Economy' (includes transport and accessibility)</p> <p>Key Action 4, 'Improving Connectivity'</p> <p>Key Action 6, 'Creating Sustainable Communities'</p> <p><b>Tameside Unitary Development Plan</b></p> <p>1.2 Maintaining an integrated transport strategy</p> <p>1.6 Securing Urban Regeneration</p> <p>1.9 Maintaining access to local employment services</p> <p>1.12 Ensuring and accessible safe and healthy environment</p> <p>S1 Town centre improvements</p> <p>T1 Highway Improvements and Traffic management</p> <p><b>Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG13)Regional Economic</b></p> <p>Revive local economies (focussed on urban centres)</p> <p>Provide necessary transport infrastructure to promote use of sites for manufacturing industry</p> <p><b>Draft Regional Spatial Strategy</b></p> <p>6.4.1 &amp; 6.4.2 Supporting regeneration</p> <p><b>Regional Economic Strategy</b></p> <p>Objective 4 (Deliver Urban Renaissance), including Key Activity 4.2, 'Support the regeneration of the most deprived areas and most deprived wards by strengthening their wider economic base'</p> <p>Objective 6 (Secure Economic Inclusion), including Key Activity 6.1, 'Secure Economic Inclusion' and Key Activity 6.7, 'improve the physical accessibility of job opportunities through transport initiatives...'</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Glossop Spur
	<p>Objective 8, (Develop the strategic transport, communications and economic infrastructure), including Key Activity 8.1, 'Identify and champion the implementation of strategic transport initiatives required to support economic development and regeneration'.</p> <p><b>Moving Forward – The Northern Way</b></p> <p>Priority 1, 'Create premier transit systems in each city region and stronger linkages between city regions'</p> <p>Priority 9, 'Create truly sustainable communities'</p> <hr/> <p><b>North European Trade Axis (NETA)</b></p> <p>'to improve economic and social cohesion within a positive environmental context through more sustainable modes of trade and transport, to enhance both prosperity and quality of life' Tameside is firmly situated within the NETA Corridor</p> <p><b>City Region Development Programme</b></p> <p>'Improve the connectivity of the city region' through the promotion of multi modal transport systems within the City Region (which includes High Peak and Derbyshire)</p> <p><b>(b) Social objectives (if applicable).</b></p> <p><b>GM Local Transport Plan</b></p> <p>2.14 Better Public Health</p> <p>2.15 Better Links with Education Providers</p> <p>2.16 Improved Community Safety (Including road safety)</p> <p><b>Provisional Local Transport Plan 2</b></p> <p>3.3.2 improved community safety</p> <p>3.3.3 improved health and quality of life</p> <p>3.3.5 improved accessibility</p> <p>3.3.5 improved social inclusion</p> <p><b>Unitary Development Plan</b></p> <p>1.2 Maintaining an integrated transport strategy</p> <p>1.7 Supporting the role of town centres</p> <p>1.12 Ensuring an accessible, safe and healthy environment</p> <p><b>Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG13)</b></p> <p>UR2 An inclusive social infrastructure</p> <p>UR3 Promoting social inclusion through urban accessibility and mobility</p> <p><b>Draft Regional Spatial Strategy</b></p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Glossop Spur
	<p>L1 Achieving social inclusion and accessibility</p> <p>UR1 Urban Renaissance reviving communities</p> <p>UR3 Promoting social inclusion through urban accessibility and mobility</p> <p>6.4.2 &amp; 7 Reduced social exclusion in Greater Manchester</p> <p>6.4.5 Reduced social effects of transport including road safety etc</p> <p><b>Tameside Community Strategy</b></p> <p>Priority 6, 'An Attractive Borough', to increase bus use within Tameside</p> <hr/> <p><b>(c) Environmental objectives (if applicable).</b></p> <p><b>Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan</b></p> <p>2.13 Improved Public Transport</p> <p>2.17 Improvements to the Environment</p> <p>2.17 Improved walking and Cycling</p> <p>2.17 Improving Air quality</p> <p>2.17 Reducing noise</p> <p>6.10 Highways Improvements</p> <p><b>Provisional Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan</b></p> <p>4.4.5.a) &amp; 4.4.3.2 Major schemes the Glossop Spur</p> <p>3.3.4 Improved public transport</p> <p>3.3.1 Improved environment</p> <p>3.3.2 Improved road safety</p> <p>3.3.3 Improved air quality</p> <p>3.3.8 Making the best use and value for money</p> <p><b>Unitary Development Plan</b></p> <p>1.2 Maintaining an integrated transport strategy</p> <p>1.9 Maintaining local access to employment and services</p> <p>T1 Highway improvement and traffic management</p> <p><b>Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG13)</b></p> <p>UR3 Promoting social inclusion through urban accessibility and mobility</p> <p>EQ2 Air quality</p> <p><b>Draft Regional Spatial Strategy</b></p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Glossop Spur
	<p>Locate development in sustainable locations, with particular emphasis on links to public transport</p> <p>6.4.4 Improved public transport, cycling and walking</p> <p>6.4.4 Improved environment</p> <p>6.4.5 improving the highway network</p>
<p><b>Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)</b></p>	<p>The Glossop Spur is included in Tameside Council's Unitary Development Plan. In 2002 the scheme was retained in the plan following examination at Public Inquiry. On this basis, the scheme has secured in principle planning approval from the Council and the Secretary of State.</p> <p>In 2000 following submission of an Annex E through the GMLTP the Secretary of State granted provisional approval for the Spur, approving a sum of £7.18m.</p> <p>The scheme has been retained in the Provisional GMLTP2 as a priority major scheme for Greater Manchester.</p> <p>In 2004 whilst retaining its provisional approval status, the Secretary of State remitted the scheme to the region for prioritisation.</p> <p>A detailed planning application has been submitted to the relevant Planning Authorities (Tameside and High Peak Councils) for the Spur. Whilst, subject to objections, a Public Inquiry may be called, the issues involved will be limited to CPO's. Public Rights of Way and Private Means of Access. The expectation is that the two elements of the overall scheme will be dealt with at 'back to back' inquiries.</p> <p>The HA has recently appointed Mowlem PLC under the Highways Agency's Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) initiative, to take the Mottram – Tintwistle scheme forward. This allows for detailed planning work to be carried out while the scheme is taken through the statutory procedures.</p> <p>The next stage will be the publication of Draft Orders under the Highways Act 1980, which seek the powers necessary to acquire the land and build the scheme. At this stage the public will have a chance to comment on, support or object to the proposals.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a Public Inquiry will be held in front of an Independent Inspector in 2006. The decision to proceed with the scheme will be taken after the Secretary of State for Transport has considered the Inspector's Report.</p>
<p><b>Cost £</b></p>	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>The capital cost of the scheme is £7.18m based on outturn prices of 2005/06. The costs and benefits have been discounted to 1994 prices.</p> <p>In the provisional GMLTP2 the scheme costs have been increased to £8.081 to accommodate inflationary increase.</p> <p>Discussion has commenced with the Highways Agency and their contractors to incorporate the Glossop Spur into the ECI contract. This will involve Mowlems identifying a target price for the scheme taking into account the likely cost saving produced by combining the two schemes.</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Glossop Spur
	<p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>Optimism bias has not been accommodated, however, the cost/benefit ratio for the scheme is 7.81 (Low Growth) and 13.32 (High Growth). (Annex E, 2000)</p> <p>On this basis if an adjustment for optimism bias were applied to the cost/benefit ratio it is likely that the ratio would still be significantly positive</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost? (Estimate)</p> <p>Whilst private sector funding is not available, it is expected that the Bypass and Spur will be constructed as a single scheme by the contractors appointed by the Highways Agency under their EC1 commission. To this end, the HA made reference in their tender documents to the possibility of their contract being extended to include the Glossop Spur. On this basis it can be expected that the overall cost to the public will be reduced and the cost to the community due to disruption during construction will be minimised.</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	<p>Please state numerically.</p> <p>The cost/benefit ratio for the scheme is 7.81 (LG) and 13.32 (HG)</p>
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits? No</p> <p>Whilst a formal assessment has not been carried out High Peak Borough Council have brownfield development plans to assist the community of Glossopdale aimed at providing new job locally. The Glossop Spur and Mottram to Tintwistle Bypass will assist in this by improving accessibility for all road users</p> <p>From a GM perspective, the scheme is aimed at addressing environmental/social/sustainable transport issues and is not aimed at increasing the design capacity of the route. Existing congestion will be removed thereby improving journey times for strategic traffic.</p> <p>:</p>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? Y/N na</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Glossop Spur
	<p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>No listed buildings are demolished by the scheme</p> <p>Whilst the scheme does pass through green belt the surrounding land will retain its current use as primarily grazing farm land.</p> <p>A comprehensive environmental assessment has been prepared as part of the planning application. The scheme design and related mitigation measures will address the environmental issues as required.</p>
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p>In 1988 following removal of the A628 Mottram-Tintwistle bypass from the Trunk Road Programme, a lobbying campaign was undertaken by a partnership of local MP's and Local Authorities. This included the MP's from Longdendale and Glossop together with Tameside MBC, Derbyshire CC, High Peak BC, Barnsley MBC and The Peak Park Planning Authority. This support is focused through the Peak Park Transport Forum of which the above are Members, together with other transport authorities in the South Pennines area including the PTA's. An integrated strategy developed and approved by the PPTF, the South Pennines Integrated Strategy includes the Mottram-Tintwistle Bypass as a key element.</p> <p>In 1992 the Secretary of State announced the preferred route for the scheme designed to relieve the Longdendale villages. Included was the statement that the Highways Agency would be responsible for progressing the Bypass and the Local Highways Authorities for the Spur.</p> <p>Throughout the development of the bypass and spur the respective authorities have worked closely together to ensure the schemes have been developed in parallel. This is intended to ensure the appraisal work and designs are compatible and can be taken through public inquiry as a single scheme. The programme for the overall scheme is dictated by the HA's bypass programme.</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

### 4.4 Highway Retaining Walls Strengthening Scheme

Scheme Name	Greater Manchester Authorities Highway Retaining Walls Strengthening Scheme
<b>Promoting Authority</b>	<p><b>Stockport MBC</b></p> <p><b>Oldham MBC</b></p> <p><b>Rochdale MBC</b></p> <p><b>Tameside MBC</b></p>
<b>Location of Scheme</b>	<p>Borough wide in all four districts</p>
<b>Scheme Description</b>	<p>Following assessments of highway retaining walls in Oldham and Stockport, it is evident that there are substantial lengths requiring significant strengthening and refurbishment work in order to meet current safety standards. This work will include strengthening, reconstruction and parapet replacement to existing structures and in some cases new construction to stabilise steep slopes.</p> <p>Rochdale MBC and Tameside MBC have yet to complete a first round of condition assessments, but both have projected from their existing condition data that they will also have significant lengths of retaining wall requiring strengthening and refurbishment.</p> <p>Stockport is nearing completion of assessments of its highway retaining walls. By the end of 2004/05 a total of 40 retaining walls (some 3.5km length) were identified as requiring strengthening and other repair works to bring them in line with safety standards. Condition data from the remaining 30% of inspections are pending.</p> <p>Oldham has an established GIS retaining wall database providing condition data on walls throughout their borough. Their bid is the continuation of works previously highlighted in their successful £14m Supplementary Major Maintenance Scheme Bid in 2001 but due to the award made at that time, could not be funded.</p> <p>It is proposed that all four districts work jointly on a 5 year programme of repair and reconstruction of retaining walls failing to meet current safety standards. As Tameside and Rochdale have yet to complete their assessments, safety works in these districts will be programmed for 2008/09-2010/11. Stockport will complete their assessment of the remaining 30% of retaining walls in 2005/06.</p>
<p><b>Local &amp; Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –</b></p> <p><b>Please Reference</b></p>	<p>(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>Retaining walls (including parapets) are a vital element of the highway infrastructure and as such have a crucial function in the LTP2 contribution to improving the connectivity of the city region internally, across the North and nationally, as well as connecting communities in outlying rural areas to the conurbation.</p> <p>Improving links between city regions in the North is a key theme in the Northern Way Growth strategy (C8, 8.14) and Regional Economic Strategy (2003, 8 and 2005 draft Infrastructure Activity 2) in order to promote the competitiveness of the region as a whole. Many of these retaining walls affect routes that provide important links across the Pennines, connecting Manchester to cities in West and South Yorkshire (particularly Sheffield). Many of these routes are crucial freight links as outlined in the network developed as part of the Greater Manchester Freight Strategy, and work will be required to strengthen retaining walls to current loading criteria.</p> <p>In addition, important local employment and commercial centres exist in outlying regions of the Manchester conurbation. If these areas are to be sustainable and developed appropriately, a reliable highway infrastructure is essential to attract commercial investment. Many of these routes are crucial for providing access to the regeneration areas of East Manchester. The Northern Way Growth Strategy (C8, 8.9)</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Greater Manchester Authorities Highway Retaining Walls Strengthening Scheme
	<p>recognises that within North West city regions the predominant public transport option will continue to be the bus, and this places additional importance on ensuring the highway network can support future aspirations for public transport.</p> <p>This scheme will contribute to the achievement of LTP2 Objectives No. 1 (support increased economic activity in sustainable ways), No.2 (Improve road and community safety and security) No.7 (improving links for passengers and freight) and No.8 (ensuring value for money in maintenance and improvement of existing highway infrastructure).</p> <p>(b) Social objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>Safety of the highway network is the paramount objective of this bid. Ensuring the safety of public highways is an element in Corporate Plans in all four districts and is encompassed in LTP Objective No.2 and is implicit in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RT2). Although policies related to road safety refer principally to traffic management and awareness raising measures, the safety of the highway infrastructure must also be an assumed basis for these measures.</p> <p>As mentioned in (a) above, the majority of highway retaining walls occur in the outlying regions of the Manchester Conurbation. This scheme will help to contribute to LTP2 Objective No.5 (improve accessibility to meet needs and promote social inclusion) by ensuring a reliable, safe and available highway ensuring access to facilities in the urban areas and at the same time encouraging the pursuit of leisure and tourism activities from the conurbations and even wider afield.</p> <p>(c) Environmental objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>This scheme clearly supports RSS Policy RT8, which gives the highest priority to maintenance of existing transport network and assets and LTP2 Objective No 8 (to maintain, improve and make best use of existing infrastructure...). RT8 recognises a "...fundamental need..." to maintain existing assets and to halt further deterioration in the highway network. Whilst some visual and noise impact can be expected within the immediate vicinity during any construction works, the resultant stabilisation of slopes will constitute an enhancement to the local environment.</p> <p>Strengthening and reconstruction of existing walls "on line" reduces any additional land requirements to practically nil. The recovery of recyclable materials where possible e.g. the re-use of existing walling stone, particularly in the more rural areas, ensures that the environmental impact of any works are minimised and in many cases the visual impact is enhanced and local heritage maintained. This will also accord with the RSS policy EM8 (secondary and recycled aggregates). Where necessary sympathetic landscaping will be integral with work programmes and every attempt will be made to retain existing trees and preserve habitats.</p>
<b>Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)</b>	Conceptual
<b>Cost £</b>	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>Oldham MBC £20M</p> <p>Stockport MBC £5M</p> <p>Rochdale MBC £5M</p> <p>Tameside MBC £5M</p> <p><b>Total: £35M</b></p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Greater Manchester Authorities Highway Retaining Walls Strengthening Scheme
	<p>Some detailed costings are available for retaining walls inspected so far. Where information is not available the costs are based on retaining wall lengths and projections from current condition data.</p> <p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>Optimism bias has not been included</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost?</p> <p>None</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	<p>Please state numerically.</p> <p>An appraisal has yet to be carried out for this scheme, although as part of OMBC's Supplementary Major Maintenance Scheme Bid in 2001, an assessment of impacts in accordance with the NATA Appraisal Framework was undertaken resulting in a Cost / Benefit Ratio of 4.6.</p> <p>The work comprising this bid is of a similar nature to OMBC's original scheme.</p>
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits? N</p> <p>If so, please state result:</p>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>N/A</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Greater Manchester Authorities Highway Retaining Walls Strengthening Scheme
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p><b>Strategic Fit</b></p> <p>Maintenance of the existing infrastructure and making best use of existing resources are fundamental and recurring priorities throughout numerous strategy / policy documents including the Government's 2004 Transport White Paper, and the emerging new Regional Spatial Strategy / Regional Transport Strategy which will replace the NW Regional Planning Guidance. As these policy documents inform the GM LTP2, this scheme supports many detailed objectives contained within GMLTP 2 as highlighted above.</p> <p><b>Deliverability</b></p> <p>The joint approach will enable the development of corridor programmes where routes cross district boundaries (under a single tender, if desirable). This will also reduce costs for tendering and programme management etc. One of the district partners in this bid (OMBC) has a successful track record of delivering a sustained programme of retaining wall works with the completion in 2005/06 of an initial £14million work programme. Through an innovative partnering contract, very high standards of workmanship, value for money and completion to time and budget has been achieved. By working with all partners in this bid, this experience and expertise can be shared to maximise the benefits throughout the Greater Manchester region.</p> <p>On a practical level, given the general "on line" replacement or strengthening of existing walls, CPO's are not required and consequently the inherent delays, uncertainty and additional costs associated with CPO procedures are avoided, leading to much greater confidence of deliverability within set timescales.</p> <p>The substantial backlog of structural maintenance work on retaining walls can only be delivered at present through the submission of a Major Scheme Bid. The current formulaic approach to the block allocation of structural maintenance funding does not take any account of a local authorities retaining wall stock.</p> <p>Even if local authorities were to divert resources to addressing the retaining wall issue, the actual scale of the problem, the funds available and the pressures on the maintenance budget from the areas for which it was intended i.e. roads and bridges, preclude any real improvement being made. If a step change in the condition of the existing highway retaining wall stock in the region is to be achieved major schemes of this nature are urgently required.</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

### 4.5 Greater Manchester Urban Traffic Control (GMUTC)

Scheme Name	Greater Manchester Urban Traffic Control (GMUTC) Major Scheme
Promoting Authority	Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA)
Location of Scheme	State nearest village / town and district. (Include Grid Ref if known).  Greater Manchester
Scheme Description	E.g. Conversion of train station into bus/train interchange.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The implementation of adaptive traffic signal control (SCOOT) in networks of linked traffic signals that have not benefited from investment in SCOOT under district or bus priority schemes;</li> <li>■ Introducing safer and more efficient traffic control systems (MOVA) at isolated traffic signal sites that are not linked to the urban traffic control system;</li> <li>■ Continuing the renewal of obsolete traffic control equipment and introduction of new technology with safety and environmental benefits particularly signal controlled crossings; and</li> <li>■ The migration of the existing urban traffic control system towards a modern communications platform which will permit the implementation of a wide range of Intelligent Transport Systems throughout Greater Manchester.</li> </ul>
Local & Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –  Please Reference	(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).  More widespread public transport priority and better pedestrian facilities provided by Puffins (to replace Pelicans) to improve accessibility within the regional centre and town and district centres. (LTP2 3.3 objectives 1, 5& 7)  The introduction of SCOOT and MOVA will reduce the economic costs of travel delay in the network. LTP2 7.3 objective 6  (b) Social objectives (if applicable).  (c) Environmental objectives (if applicable).  Safety will be improved through improvements in traffic signal operation, equipment reliability and the adoption of modern cabling standards at installations. (LTP2 3.3 objective 2)  Air quality will improve through the reduction in congestion brought about by SCOOT. Public transport priority through SCOOT will encourage a switch to more sustainable modes. (LTP2 3.3 objective 3)
Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)	Business case submitted & awaiting programme entry / conditional approval.
Cost £	(a) Please state capital cost and price base.  £13.536m based on current year prices for the relevant year of funding during the LTP period – ie the figures include inflation.  (b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Greater Manchester Urban Traffic Control (GMUTC) Major Scheme
	<p>None</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost? (Estimate)</p> <p>No private funding is available for the scheme.</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	<p>Please state numerically.</p> <p>BCR=7.4</p>
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits? Y/N</p> <p>No</p> <p>If so, please state result:</p>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>No deterioration to the environment.</p>
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p>The essence of the GMUTC major scheme is to make best use of the transport network (a key aim of the greater Manchester Integrated Transport Strategy) and LTP2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Maximising the capacity of the highway infrastructure by using modern control techniques and new technology to provide more efficient traffic signal control;</li> </ul>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Greater Manchester Urban Traffic Control (GMUTC) Major Scheme
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="526 389 1327 443">■ Promoting more efficient forms of transport through increased priority to buses using pre-emption and thereby encouraging a modal shift;</li><li data-bbox="526 474 1327 528">■ Improving the standard of provision for pedestrians by upgrading obsolete traffic signal equipment and converting pelicans to Puffins or Toucans;</li><li data-bbox="526 560 1327 636">■ Replacing the UTC communications with higher capacity UTMC based digital systems to reduce current costs and to provide increased capacity and capability in the communications network to support the introduction of ITS cost effectively.</li></ul>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

### 4.6 Leigh-Salford-Manchester QBC

Scheme Name	Leigh-Salford-Manchester QBC
Promoting Authority	Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority
Location of Scheme	Leigh – Tyldesley – Ellenbrook – Salford - Manchester.  Manchester, Salford, and Wigan Districts.
Scheme Description	A 21km Quality Bus Corridor between Leigh and Manchester, 8km of which will be a segregated guided busway, with the remainder being predominantly segregated bus priority measures to deliver improved reliability and journey times. State-of-the-art, highly specified vehicles will operate along it. The proposal includes facilities to deliver level boarding along the full length of the corridor
Local & Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –  Please Reference	<p>(a) Economic objectives.</p> <p>To support increased levels of activity in the Regional Centre, Central Salford and Leigh (GMLTP Objective 1) by improving accessibility through an upgraded public transport corridor.</p> <p>To improve links with the wider Greater Manchester travel to work area (GMLTP Objective 7)</p> <p>To make best use of the transport system by facilitating full integration with the existing bus route network and reopening a disused railway for transport use (LTP Objective 8).</p> <p>(b) Social objectives</p> <p>To improve road and community safety, particularly for the most vulnerable users of the transport network (GMLTP Objective 2) by management of traffic on A580 and A6.</p> <p>To reduce social exclusion by providing better access to employment and other opportunities in the Regional Centre, Salford, and Leigh, through a fast and frequent bus service to areas which presently have poor connections and slow, infrequent services (GMLTP Objective 5).</p> <p>(c) Environmental objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To minimise the environmental damage caused by transport, by inducing modal shift from car to bus, thereby improving the quality of life &amp; the health of the local population (GMLTP Objective 6).</li> <li>● To support complementary land use and transport policies (GMLTP Objective 4) by providing a high quality bus service that encourages greater use of public transport. The scheme forms an integral part of development plans for Central Salford, where improved public transport is regarded as essential to support the area's regeneration plans.</li> <li>● Traffic on A580 and A6 will be managed so as to reduce congestion, improve reliability, and reduce the overall proportion of trips by car (GMLTP Objective 6) without detriment to the regeneration of centres.</li> </ul>
Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)	Provisional Acceptance in 2000, Remitted to the Regions in 2004
Cost £	(a) Please state capital cost and price base.

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Leigh-Salford-Manchester QBC
	<p>£42.3m, 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2003</p> <p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No, but 24% was included in calculating the b/c ratio.</li> </ul> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost?</p> <p>Not at present, but there may be some developer contributions in the future.</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	<p>Please state numerically.</p> <p>A ratio of 1.3:1 has been presented to the DfT. Recent work assessing the scheme over a 60 year period indicates a ratio of 1.9:1.</p> <p>Note that the b/c ratio relates to the end-to-end service only. Additional benefits are expected from other bus routes using short sections of the corridor to improve journey times or create new links.</p>
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?</p> <p>An Economic Impact Report has not been prepared but analysis for the AST concluded that the scheme will have a slight beneficial effect on the wider economy..</p>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>The results of the Environmental Assessment presented to the Public Inquiry in 2002 were:</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Leigh-Salford-Manchester QBC
	<p>Noise Level: Slightly adverse impact</p> <p>Local Air Quality: Slightly adverse impact</p> <p>Landscape: Slightly adverse impact</p> <p>Biodiversity: Slightly adverse impact</p>
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p>This scheme provides high quality public transport in a congested corridor with rapidly growing travel demands, where traffic is nonetheless insufficient to support a rail-based solution.</p> <p>It could form the starting point of a low-cost, county-wide BRT network radiating from the Regional Centre, covering corridors not served by the rail and Metrolink networks.</p> <p>Powers for the scheme have been obtained and delivery is expected to be relatively straightforward.</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

### 4.7 M60 JETTS QBC

Scheme Name	M60 JETTS QBC
Promoting Authority	Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority
Location of Scheme	North and North-West of Manchester City Centre, including the Districts of Salford, Bolton, Manchester, Oldham, Bury and Rochdale.
Scheme Description	A network of Quality Bus Corridors in the North and North-West of Greater Manchester.
Local & Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –  Please Reference	<p>(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>To support increased levels of activity in the centres of Bolton, Bury, Oldham, Salford, Rochdale and Manchester (GMLTP Objective 1) by improving accessibility through upgraded public transport corridors.</p> <p>To improve links with the wider Greater Manchester travel to work area (GMLTP Objective 7).</p> <p>To make best use of the transport system by facilitating full integration with the existing bus route network (GMLTP Objective 8).</p> <p>(b) Social objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>To improve road and community safety, particularly for the most vulnerable users of the transport network (GMLTP Objective 2) through traffic management that considers the needs of all road users, including pedestrians and bus passengers.</p> <p>To reduce social exclusion (GMLTP Objective 5) by providing better access to employment and other opportunities in Manchester, Bolton, Bury, Oldham, Salford, Rochdale, through fast, frequent and reliable bus services.</p> <p>(c) Environmental objectives (if applicable).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To minimise the environmental damage caused by transport (GMLTP Objective 3) by inducing modal shift from car to bus, thereby improving the quality of life and the health of the local population.</li> <li>● To support complementary land use and transport policies (GMLTP Objective 4) on the QBC corridors by providing a high quality bus service that encourages greater use of public transport.</li> <li>● By managing traffic on the QBC corridors so as to reduce congestion and improve reliability, to reduce the overall proportion of trips by car without detriment to the regeneration of centres (GMLTP Objective 6).</li> </ul>
Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)	Provisional Acceptance in 2003, Remitted to the Regions in 2004
Cost £	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>£21.6 million, 1998 prices.</p> <p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost?</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	M60 JETTS QBC
	No private sector contribution is anticipated.
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	Please state numerically.  2.4.
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?  An Economic Impact Report has not been prepared, but analysis for the AST concluded that the scheme would have a slight beneficial effect on the wider economy.
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.  This scheme has no detrimental effects on the environment.
<b>Supporting Information</b>	Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.  GMPTE has significant experience in delivering QBC schemes and the associated benefits have always been greater than expected.

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

### 4.8 Metrolink Extensions

Scheme Name	Metrolink Extensions
Promoting Authority	Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority
Location of Scheme	<p>Four extensions to the existing Metrolink Network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Manchester City Centre to Rochdale via Oldham;</li> <li>● Manchester City Centre to Ashton-under-Lyne via Droylsden;</li> <li>● Trafford Bar to Manchester-Airport;</li> <li>● St Werburgh's to East Didsbury</li> </ul> <p>The extensions cover the following districts: Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Tameside, Trafford.</p>
Scheme Description	<p>The extensions project would involve design, construction and operation of services from the new routes to and through the existing Metrolink infrastructure in Manchester City Centre:</p> <p>Manchester City Centre to Rochdale via Oldham consists of conversion of the existing Oldham Loop rail line to light rail operation with new-build sections in Oldham and Rochdale town centres (24km, 19 stops);</p> <p>Manchester City Centre to Ashton-under-Lyne via Droylsden consists of new segregated routes from Manchester Piccadilly station to Clayton and Audenshaw to Ashton town centre with a mixed street-running and segregated section through Clayton and Droylsden (10km, 11 stops);</p> <p>Trafford Bar to Manchester-Airport consists of former rail alignment from Trafford Bar to St Werburghs with a new-build largely segregated route from St Werburgh's to Manchester Airport via Sale Moor, Northern Moor, Baguley and Wythenshawe town centre (19km, 22 stops);</p> <p>St Werburgh's to East Didsbury consists of former rail alignment (6km, 5 stops);</p> <p>The extensions would connect the major town centres, residential areas and development sites in each corridor with each other, Manchester city centre and the other corridors to form the core of a high quality city-wide public transport network. Segregated sections are provided wherever possible to ensure attractive journey times.</p>
Local & Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme – Please Reference	<p>a) Economic objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>Regional Policy (RPG13):</p> <p>Metrolink is a scheme of regional significance. It will extend the provision of high quality public transport throughout Greater Manchester, in accordance with Regional Transport Strategy (SD9), and provide for improved integration of public transport, both for direct cross-city journeys using Metrolink and also with improved interchange to bus and rail services. (Integrating Transport Networks in the North West (T1)). The network would provide direct access to Manchester Airport from much of the region (to support transport links to the Region's airports (T5)).</p> <p>Local Policy (provisional LTP2):</p> <p>The Network extensions are also key to the achieving several of the LTP2 policies with regards to the economy. The network would provide direct access by high quality public transport from each of the four corridors to the regional centre and between each of the existing and proposed Metrolink corridors, thereby creating a step-change in the accessibility of existing centres of employment, regeneration sites and of the labour market to employment opportunities. As such, it clearly assists the following LTP2 policies.</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Metrolink Extensions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● (i) To support increased levels of activity in the Regional Centre, town and district centres and key employment areas and improve their environment, attractiveness, accessibility or safety.</li> <li>● (vi) To support increased levels of activity in the Regional Centre, town and district centres and key employment areas and improve their environment, attractiveness, accessibility or safety.</li> <li>● (vii) To improve links with the wider Greater Manchester travel to work area, the rest of the country and the rest of the world, for both passengers &amp; freight, in ways which are consistent with other objectives and in line with PSA objective 1.</li> </ul>
	<p>The proposed network makes efficient use of existing underused rail alignments and dis-used rail alignments. It enhances use of the investment in Phases 1 and 2 of the network and in the Ground Transportation Interchange at Manchester Airport. Overall, the scheme offers very good value for money with a BCR of over 2:1. It clearly accords well with LTP policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● (viii) To maintain, improve &amp; make the best use of the existing transportation infrastructure &amp; ensure all schemes offer long-term value for money.</li> </ul> <p>(b) Social objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>The accessibility improvements afforded by the Metrolink Network extensions are widespread. The network would serve many areas which exhibit high levels of deprivation and would provide much improved access to jobs and community facilities from these areas. The network would, by effecting a transfer from road use to public transport, lead to a reduction in the level of road accidents. The network, would also be designed and operated to create a safe, secure environment within which to travel. As such it meets the following regional and local objectives:</p> <p>Regional Policy (RPG13):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Promoting Social Inclusion through Urban Accessibility and Mobility (UR3)</li> </ul> <p>Local Policy (LTP2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● (ii) To improve road and community safety, particularly for the most vulnerable users of the transport network</li> <li>● (v) To improve accessibility by ensuring that the county's transport system meets the needs of all sections of the community, promotes social inclusion &amp; widens choice.</li> </ul> <p>c ) Environmental objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>The attraction of car users to an extended Metrolink network would contribute to efforts reduce car use and dependency in each of the corridors and in town centres and the regional centre. The network would also support sustainable patterns of developments less dependent on car access. As such it would fit well with the following regional and local objectives.</p> <p>Regional Policy (RPG13):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Air Quality (EQ2); Traffic pollution should be addressed by efforts to reduce the need to travel, reduce dependency on private cars and encourage the use of public transport.</li> </ul> <p>Local Policy (provisional LTP2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● (i) To support increased levels of activity in the Regional Centre, town and district centres and key employment areas and improve their environment, attractiveness, accessibility or safety.</li> </ul>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Metrolink Extensions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● (iii) To minimise the environmental damage caused by transport, particularly in terms of air quality, thereby improving the quality of life &amp; the health of the population in line with PSA Objective 3.</li> <li>● (iv) To develop complementary land use and transport policies which increase the proportion of trips by non car modes by: providing a high quality integrated public transport network; providing safe pedestrian and cycle facilities; ensuring new development can be served by public transport &amp; by reducing the number of trips to non-central locations.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● (vi) To support increased levels of activity in the Regional Centre, town and district centres and key employment areas and improve their environment, attractiveness, accessibility or safety.</li> </ul>
<b>Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)</b>	The extensions are designed to a high level of detail and capital costs reflect the views of private sector Bidders from the procurement exercise that concluded in 2004. The Phase 3 extensions originally had funding awarded in 2000 by DfT. Following the Secretary of State's announcement in July 2004, GMPTA has submitted its GMITS and is working with Government on the delivery of Metrolink as part of that strategy.
<b>Cost £</b>	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>£813m (2006 prices) (excluding optimism bias)</p>
	<p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>18% is added to the above costs for the economic appraisal of the scheme (and thus benefit:cost ratio)</p>
	<p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost?</p> <p>£50m from Manchester Airport plc as a commitment of 20% of the cost of the Airport line.</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	2.30:1 over 60 years operation from 2012
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?</p> <p>An Economic Impact Report has not been prepared. However, the planned network is integral to planned regeneration and supports employment growth in the city region. Key sites served include New East Manchester, Central Park, Ashton Moss and Kingsway Business Park on Phase 3 together with Manchester city centre and Salford Quays (via the existing Network). The network would also serve many deprived areas and Housing Renewal areas.</p> <p>As part of a future TIF bid, the impacts on GDP of the extensions are being assessed using emerging DfT guidance. They are likely to be significant.</p>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Metrolink Extensions
	(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>Yes</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>No major adverse impacts would occur. The extensions do not pass through conservation areas or impact on listed buildings. Environmental impacts during construction and operation would be minor and appropriate mitigation measures are planned.</p>
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p>The Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) and GMPTE have worked together for many years to develop an integrated approach to address economic and social problems within Greater Manchester and to plan for the future development of the area. Transport, land use planning and economic strategies have been developed in parallel and in conjunction with Regional Planning Guidance and the Regional Economic Strategy. The Local Transport Plan for 2006-11 sets out the transport strategy to deliver the broader aims for the sub-region. Metrolink investment is a priority to deliver these objectives.</p> <p>It should also be noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Metrolink is a key component of GMITS.</li> <li>● The network's strong fits with national, regional and local policies has previously been established in funding proposals approved by DfT.</li> <li>● The network serves many deprived wards in Greater Manchester</li> <li>● The physical deliverability of the system has been tested through the procurement process and considerable enabling works have already taken place.</li> </ul>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

### 4.9 Rochdale Interchange

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Rochdale Interchange</b>
<b>Promoting Authority</b>	<b>Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority</b>
<b>Location of Scheme</b>	Rochdale, Rochdale MBC  OSGR 389889, 413333
<b>Scheme Description</b>	Relocation of town centre bus station from under a multi-story car park (which will require demolition in the near future due to structural problems) to a nearby brownfield site.  Facilities in the new bus station will be an improvement on those currently available, and will include the provision of real time information
<b>Local &amp; Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –</b>  <b>Please Reference</b>	(a) Economic objectives  To support increased levels of economic activity in Rochdale town centre (GMLTP Objective 1) and potentially acting as a catalyst for further town centre regeneration.  To improve connectivity within Greater Manchester through enhanced bus / Metrolink interchange facilities (GMLTP Objective 7).  (b) Social objectives  To assist in enhancing social inclusion by providing improved public transport facilities that are more attractive to all sections of the community in one of the most deprived local authority areas in England. (GMLTP Objective 5).  (c) Environmental objectives  To encourage mode shift from car to public transport for journeys within the Rochdale area and to the Regional Centre when Metrolink is available. Will thereby assist in reducing traffic congestion (GMLTP Objective 6) and minimising environmental damage by transport (GMLTP Objective 3).  To support complementary land use and transport policies (GMLTP Objective 4) by supporting the regeneration and growth of Rochdale town centre.
<b>Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)</b>	A major scheme bid (Annex E submission) was submitted in July 2004. Further supporting information will be submitted.
<b>Cost £</b>	(a) Please state capital cost and price base.  £9.8m (2004 prices).  (b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?  No, but a project-specific value of 15% agreed with DfT is included in the calculation of the b/c ratio.  (c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost?

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Rochdale Interchange
	Opportunities for a private sector contribution will be explored through the town centre development partnership.
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	Please state numerically.  2.4.
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?  No
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?  No</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?  N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted?  N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver the scheme?  No</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?  N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?  N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.  None.
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p>Rochdale Interchange will provide a local and regional interchange point linking the bus station with both the Phase 3 Metrolink network and the Quality Bus Corridor network.</p> <p>Synergies also exist between the scheme and the Rochdale town centre masterplan. Releasing the current bus station site would enable the full scope of Rochdale's regeneration plans to be achieved, as the area has been identified as the preferred location for a central plaza in the town centre regeneration strategy.</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Rochdale Interchange
	Scheme would be designed to improve the local townscape and maximise perceptions of personal security.

### 4.10 SEMMMS Relief Road Scheme (RFA contribution to PFI)

Scheme Name	SEMMMS New Relief Road Scheme
Promoting Authority	Stockport MBC (Lead), Manchester CC, Cheshire CC
Location of Scheme	<p>State nearest village / town and district. (Include Grid Ref if known).</p> <p>Bredbury, Offerton, Hazel Grove, Poynton, Bramhall, Heald Green, Manchester Airport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Section 1: M60 Brinnington Interchange - Goyt Crossing: 391805E, 392181N to 392781E, 389578N</li> <li>● Section 2: Goyt Crossing - Offerton Road: 392781E, 389578N to 393355E, 387522N</li> <li>● Section 3: Stepping Hill Link: 392508E, 388139N</li> <li>● Section 4: Offerton Road - A6 Junction: 393355E, 387522N to 393358E, 385694N</li> <li>● Section 5: A6 Junction - Existing MAELR Central: 393358E, 385694N to 389244E, 383685N</li> <li>● Section 6: Poynton Bypass: 389865E, 383731N to 391111E, 380440N</li> <li>● Section 7: MAELR Central (Existing): 386780E, 384351N</li> <li>● Section 8: Existing MAELR Central to Styal Road Junction (Manchester Airport Eastern Link Road (West)): 385536E, 384432N to 383904E, 385052N</li> <li>● Section 9: Styal Road Junction - Manchester Airport Junction: 383904E, 385052N to 381983E, 385647N</li> </ul>
Scheme Description	<p>E.g. Conversion of train station into bus/train interchange.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Construction of a new relief road;</li> <li>● Complementary Measures – A package of proposals where traffic reductions present the opportunity to reduce the time or road space available to motor vehicles in favour of pedestrians and/or cyclists or to improve the quality of life in residential streets or town and district centres and mitigation measures, such as traffic management measures, on routes where traffic flows increase (in accordance with the overall SEMMMS Strategy); and</li> <li>● Environmental Mitigating Measures - Engineering and environmental measures to minimise the effect of the new relief road on the local communities, and surrounding natural habitat.</li> </ul>
Local & Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme	<p>(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).</p> <p><b>The Economic Impact Report</b></p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	SEMMMS New Relief Road Scheme
Please Reference	<p>The SEMMMS Road Scheme will bring about a reduction in the average travel time by road between Regeneration Areas and their hinterlands, with a resultant beneficial effect upon employment and investment. The Economic Impact Report indicates that the Relief Road will improve employment levels, attract inward investment and encourage the expansion of local businesses through an increased accessibility to markets and a suitable workforce.</p> <p><b>GM LTP Policies</b></p> <p>The Relief Road scheme will improve access for residents to key employment sites including Bredbury Industrial Estate, Manchester Airport and the New East Manchester area.</p> <p>The A6 is one of the most heavily used freight routes within Greater Manchester, which creates conflict on the road and associated freight movement on adjacent routes. The new road will provide an enhanced appropriate route for freight onto the strategic motorway network and to the various employment sites within the area and Manchester Airport, minimising delays for freight vehicles.</p> <p>The A6 and A523 provide links with adjacent areas into the Greater Manchester area. These areas include Cheshire and Derbyshire, providing employment and access to key facilities for people living in these areas.</p> <p><b>The Regional Transport Strategy Objectives</b></p> <p>The Road Scheme, and in particular the MALRW section, will support the gateway functions of Manchester Airport by providing improved access to the Airport for both private and commercial users.</p> <p><b>The Greater Manchester Integrated Transport Strategy (GMITS)</b></p> <p>GMITS is supported by the Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan, which has, as one of its key themes the promotion of a dynamic economy. One of the ways that the strategy identifies as addressing this theme is through measures intended to improve accessibility. By reducing congestion on the road network, public transport can be improved, leading to increased ability for people to access jobs and services.</p> <p><b>Aviation Policy</b></p> <p>RPG 13, Policy T5 recognises the importance of Manchester Airport in supporting economic growth, competitiveness and social progress. Growth of the Airport is also seen as a means of reducing the Region's reliance on congested Airports in the South East. The draft revision advocates that: <i>"local transport plans, together with the plans and programmes of the... Highways Agency, should recognise and support the various roles of the North West's airports, in particular, Manchester Airport as the North of England's key international air gateway."</i></p> <p>The Regional Economic Strategy (1999), produced by the Regional Development Agency, emphasises the importance of the Airport recognising its role in underpinning and improving the competitiveness of the North West and much of northern England. The Relief Road supports these aims by removing one of the airports main constraints to its growth - its accessibility. The success of this scheme will assist the airport in attracting new business and powering the economy.</p> <p><b>The Northern Way</b></p> <p>The Northern Way emphasises the importance of connectivity within the Manchester City Region and the larger region as a whole. The Relief Road plays an important role in this connectivity, as it improves the accessibility of the region, and also ensures that the motorways retain their strategic network role.</p> <p>(b) Social objectives (if applicable).</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	SEMMMS New Relief Road Scheme
	<p><b>Local Transport Plan- The Government's Shared Priority on Accessibility</b></p> <p>The road scheme will improve accessibility across the area by reducing community severance and linking communities with key employment sites including Manchester Airport and Bredbury Industrial Estate. It will also provide improved access to Stepping Hill Hospital.</p> <p>The new road will provide opportunities for new cycle, pedestrian and public transport links. Furthermore, by removing traffic from the existing network it will encourage the use of more sustainable modes on that network.</p> <p><b>Regional Spatial Strategy</b></p> <p>The Regional Transport Strategy element of the RSS aims to support regeneration and reduce social exclusion in the Manchester City Region through the development of effective, public transport networks. The Road Scheme, by taking traffic from the existing network, allows public transport services to be more efficient and therefore to play their full part in aiding social regeneration.</p> <p>(c ) Environmental objectives (if applicable).</p> <p><b>Local Transport Plan- The Government's Shared Priorities on Air Quality and Congestion.</b></p> <p>The SEMMMS Relief Road is intended to take traffic from the existing road network (rather than attracting new traffic), including much of the existing freight traffic. This will free up the existing road network, which will result in a reduction in congestion levels. Freer-flowing traffic, and the removal of large numbers of freight vehicles, will also have a positive impact on air quality, as traffic uses the non-residential Relief Road, rather than the existing road network in residential areas.</p> <p><b>The Regional Transport Strategy</b></p> <p>The RTS aims to reduce the wider environmental, social, health and quality of life impacts of road transport and infrastructure through the development of a structured approach to managing and improving the Region's highway network, with traffic encouraged to use the most appropriate routes wherever possible. The Road Scheme, by removing traffic from the existing road network, will improve air quality, especially in areas where congestion is now an issue.</p>
Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)	Annex E and PFI Expression of Interest submitted to DfT in July 2004, outcome awaited.
Cost £	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>Total scheme cost is £432.5 (excluding inflation) however, the Authorities have been requested to submit a PFI Expression of Interest. This was submitted in July 2005 and consists of the SEMMMS Road Scheme, highway maintenance on the road scheme and the adjacent A34 dual carriageway, and Stockport street-lighting. The PFI credits required would be £1,010,840 of which £34 million would need to be found from conventional funding i.e. The Regional Allocation to cover land acquisition, blight, environmental works and statutory undertakings</p> <p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>Yes. 15%</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost? (Estimate)</p> <p>Manchester Airport contribution - £7 million</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	SEMMMS New Relief Road Scheme
	Sainsburys development - (already built) £3.5 million
Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio	<p>Please state numerically.</p> <p>5.69</p>
Wider Economic Benefits	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Economic Impact Report produced and submitted to DfT as part of Annex E</p> <p>Found reduced congestion on key local routes. Improved accessibility between RA's and hinterlands leading to greater employment and inward investment in the RA's. Net Change in Employment: +887</p>
Primary Legislation	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted?</p> <p>N/A</p>
Transport & Works Act	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>No, but planning permission, CPO and Side Road orders will be</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
Environment & Other	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scheme is being built on an alignment which was identified decades ago and protected to allow the road scheme to be built and therefore the scheme will be built on a greenfield route.</li> </ul>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	SEMMMS New Relief Road Scheme
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Stages 1 and 2 of the Environmental Assessment have been carried out, and Stage 3 E.A is underway.</li> <li>● Measures are being investigated to mitigate against any environmental deterioration.</li> </ul>
Supporting Information	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p>The SEMMMS Study has been accepted by the relevant Local Authorities, AGMA, NWRA and Central Government. John Spellar (then, Minister for Transport) requested that the Local Authorities take forward the development of this road scheme when announcing the Government response to the Study.</p> <p>The scheme is part of SEMMM Strategy, and it is a clear recommendation of the Strategy that all elements (including the Relief Road) must be implemented in order to achieve the desired outcomes.</p> <p>Consultation on the Study shows 84% of respondents back SEMMMS</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation carried out with local conservation groups in order to ensure that mitigation proposals are as extensive as possible.</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

### 4.11 Yellow School Buses

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Yellow School Buses</b>
<b>Promoting Authority</b>	<b>Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority</b>
<b>Location of Scheme</b>	Throughout Greater Manchester
<b>Scheme Description</b>	<p>Will provide a bespoke home-to-school transport service for secondary school children, including Special Educational Needs pupils.</p> <p>Sixteen Yellow School Buses are already in use within Greater Manchester. The proposal is to provide an additional 160 single-deck vehicles to serve 85 schools.</p> <p>The vehicles would be highly visible, fully compliant with the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA), adhere to stringent emission standards, be equipped with seat restraints, CCTV, radio and PA systems and make use of Real Time Passenger Information and vehicle tracking systems. There would be clear codes of conduct for students, schools and operators with dedicated and specially trained drivers employed by the operators and children allocated to specific seats, with no standing allowed. The bus services would have localised pick-up points. These features should help eliminate anti-social behaviour.</p>
<b>Local &amp; Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –</b>	(a) Economic objectives
<b>Please Reference</b>	Makes best use of the transport system (GMLTP Objective 8) by improving the cost effectiveness of school transport provision and reducing the impact of school travel needs on the capacity and quality of the commercial bus network, so that the commercial network can better meet other travel needs.
	(b) Social objectives
	<p>Provides a home-to-school transport system that is accessible to all, thereby reducing social exclusion (GMLTP Objective 5). The scheme would target schools with attendance problems and assist social inclusion through use of DDA compliant vehicles.</p> <p>Reduces anti-social behaviour by children while travelling between home and school and delivering students to school ready to take full advantage of learning opportunities (also supporting GMLTP Objective 5).</p>
	(c) Environmental objectives
	Inducing modal shift from car to bus for home-to-school trips thereby assisting in reducing congestion (GMLTP Objective 6), reducing traffic accidents – especially those involving children – (GMLTP Objective 2) and minimising environmental damage (GMLTP Objective 3).
<b>Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)</b>	Major Scheme bid submitted July 2004, and subsequently remitted to the region.
<b>Cost £</b>	(a) Please state capital cost and price base.
	£25.1m (2004 prices). This covers vehicles, infrastructure and set-up costs.
	(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?
	No. – but b/c ratio includes 32% for the fixed infrastructure element of the scheme.
	(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost?

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Yellow School Buses
	No private sector contribution is anticipated towards the capital cost.
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	Please state numerically.  2.1.
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?  No
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?  No.
	(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?  N/A
	(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted?  N/A
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	(a) Are Transport & Works Act Powers required to deliver the scheme?  No.
	(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?  N/A
	(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?  N/A
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.  None.
<b>Supporting Information</b>	Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.  A low cost option comprising fitting existing vehicles with enhanced features was appraised and found to be less effective at achieving modal transfer. The existing Yellow School Buses in Greater Manchester have significantly reduced the number of home-to-school trips by car, reduced the number of reported incidents of anti-social behaviour and provided a cost saving to Local Education Authorities.  Consultation has demonstrated widespread public support.

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

### 4.12 Altrincham Interchange

Scheme Name	Altrincham Interchange
Promoting Authority	Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority
Location of Scheme	Altrincham, Trafford MBC.  OSGR 377000, 387900.
Scheme Description	Redevelopment of interchange to improve accessibility; security; passenger comfort; and information.
Local & Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –  Please Reference	<p>(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>To support increased economic activity (GMLTP Objective 1) in Altrincham town centre by improving its attractiveness and accessibility.</p> <p>To improve connectivity within Greater Manchester through enhanced bus / Metrolink interchange facilities (GMLTP Objective 7)</p> <p>(b) Social objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>To reduce social exclusion (GMLTP Objective 5) by providing transport facilities that are accessible to all.</p> <p>(c) Environmental objectives (if applicable).</p> <p>To induce modal shift from car to bus, rail and Metrolink, there by assisting in reducing congestion (GMLTP Objective 6) and minimising environmental damage (GMLTP Objective 3).</p> <p>To support complementary land use and transport policies (GM Vision Theme 4) by providing high quality facilities that encourage greater use of public transport.</p>
Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)	Major scheme business case submitted in 2004.  Major scheme proposal for LTP2 drafted.
Cost £	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>£16.2m, 2002 prices.</p> <p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>No, but 24% is included when calculating b/c ratio.</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost? (Estimate)</p> <p>No private sector contribution is anticipated.</p>
Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio	Please state numerically.

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Altrincham Interchange
	2.5
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?</p> <p>No</p>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>The scheme involves demolition of the existing station building which is a site of some industrial archaeological interest. However, the existing interchange is in need of upgrade and repair, so upgrading the facilities will enhance the general streetscape.</p>
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p>The scheme complements plans for renewal of Phases 1 and 2 of Metrolink, for which DfT funding has been awarded.</p> <p>The strategy also complements wider LTP2 Integrated Transport measures aimed at reducing car use and increasing the use of public transport.</p> <p>It is anticipated that further information will be submitted to DfT by 2007. Subject to availability of funding, implementation could begin in 2008/9, with opening in 2010/11.</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

### 4.13 Wigan Inner Relief Road

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Wigan Inner Relief Road</b>
<b>Promoting Authority</b>	<b>Wigan Council</b>
<b>Location of Scheme</b>	North and West of Wigan Town Centre
<b>Scheme Description</b>	<p>WIRR involves the construction of approximately one kilometre of new single carriageway route between A49 'Saddle' junction and Frog Lane on the western side of Wigan Town Centre. WIRR will complete the IRR around the western side of Wigan Town Centre linking with existing sections of the IRR opened in 1987 (River Way, North Way and New Market Street).</p> <p>A new access road will be built to serve the Miry Lane Employment Zone. Access to this area is currently very poor, particularly for commercial vehicles, which have to negotiate a network of minor roads between Wallgate and Frog Lane.</p> <p>All new junctions will include bus priority measures and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. In addition to this new improved facilities will be provided for Non-motorised users along the full length of the scheme.</p>
<b>Local &amp; Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –</b>	(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).
<b>Please Reference</b>	<p>The proposals are aimed to assist existing and new businesses by regenerating the existing employment and residential areas on the western side of the town centre including the Miry Lane Employment Zone and the Pagefield Renewal Zone.</p>
	(b) Social objectives (if applicable).
	<p>The social benefits are to:</p> <p>Support urban regeneration and return disused / under-used land to effective use.</p> <p>Strengthen, modernise and diversify the town centre economy in environmentally sustainable ways.</p> <p>Reverse population and economic activity decentralisation.</p> <p>Make Wigan town centre a more attractive, safer and healthier places to live and work.</p>
	(c) Environmental objectives (if applicable).
	<p>Protect and enhance the built and natural environment.</p> <p>Improve safety for all travellers.</p> <p>The proposals will improve accessibility in and around Wigan Town Centre for all modes of transport and reduce the number of unnecessary vehicle trips around the existing sections of the IRR; improving road safety, traffic flow and environmental conditions in the town centre, particularly during weekday peak periods.</p> <p>It will also reduce traffic volumes on existing town centre routes, particularly A49 Wallgate, Pottery Road and River Way, which will reduce air and noise pollution and improve conditions for buses, pedestrians and cyclists in the town centre.</p>
<b>Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)</b>	The scheme was given 'Provisional Approval' status by GONW in December 2002. In December 2004 the scheme was referred to the region for regional prioritisation.

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Wigan Inner Relief Road
	<p>Planning permission was first granted in September 2003. Subsequently revised and resubmitted following amendments to the planning boundary – planning permission granted for revised boundary in July 2004.</p> <p>CPO/SRO was made in October 2004 but was subsequently withdrawn due to the scheme being referred to the region.</p>
<b>Cost £</b>	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>The latest estimate of the capital costs is £24.5M (last updated September 2005 to include optimism bias).</p> <p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>An optimism bias of 31% has been applied.</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost? (Estimate)</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	<p>Please state numerically.</p> <p><b>BCR = 3.8</b> (last updated September 2005)</p>
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?</p> <p>WIRR will assist with the development of the Westwood SRB site located adjacent to the B5238 Poolstock lane. As such it is considered to deliver positive 'Potential Regeneration Benefits'.</p>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● (a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme? No</li> <li>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for? N/A</li> <li>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded? N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Wigan Inner Relief Road
	There is no green belt land or listed buildings required to deliver the scheme. The scheme also has minimal impact on natural wildlife habitats.
<b>Supporting Information</b>	Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.  As detailed in the July 2002 Annex E submission

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

### 4.14 A5225 Access Wigan

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>A5225 Access Wigan</b>
<b>Promoting Authority</b>	<b>Wigan Council</b>
<b>Location of Scheme</b>	M6 (jct. 26) to Wigan and then Atherleigh Way
<b>Scheme Description</b>	<p>AccessWigan is a Regeneration and Transportation project of strategic importance for both the Council and the borough. The aims of the project are:</p> <p><b>Economic Development and Regeneration</b> - Modernising the economic base of the borough</p> <p><b>Improved Quality of Life and Social Inclusion</b> - Creating quality employment opportunities</p> <p><b>Environmental improvements</b> - Reducing traffic congestion and strengthening the borough's image</p> <p>A catalyst for the success of the project will be the civil engineering works, the construction of a new 13km highway and associated public transport measures. This highway, previously known as A5225, will link the M6 at junction 26 with the Wigan town centre and will also provide a link from Wigan to the periphery of Atherton and Leigh.</p>
<b>Local &amp; Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –</b>	(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).
<b>Please Reference</b>	<p>Improved accessibility will bring about the regeneration of a number of sites in the borough (with an estimated employment potential of 9,200 new jobs), all of which are brownfield. Without the highway works development of these sites would be limited. Failure to develop these sites would require a search for sites with good highway access, leading to intrusions into open land.</p>
	(b) Social objectives (if applicable).
	<p>The aim is to create quality employment opportunities close to our main residential areas, targeting employers and industries that are able to use and develop the skills which are available in our active workforce.</p> <p>The aim is also to offer employment choices and to achieve income-growth for our residents and to create a safer, more secure neighbourhood in which to live and work.</p>
	(c) Environmental objectives (if applicable).
	<p>Protect and enhance the built and natural environment.</p> <p>Reduce traffic volumes on existing town centre and peripheral routes, particularly the A577, which will reduce air and noise pollution and improve conditions for buses, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<b>Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)</b>	Currently preparing Outline Business Case, planning application and Major Schemes Business Case.
<b>Cost £</b>	(a) Please state capital cost and price base.
	Estimated Capital Cost = £83.4M (at 2005 prices)
	(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage? Yes 31%.

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	A5225 Access Wigan
	<p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost? (Estimate)</p> <p>Negotiations continue to secure private sector funding.</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	Please state numerically. <b>BCR = 9.7</b>
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The benefits of Wigan Access, by bringing reduced transport costs; shorter travel times and increased reliability will see increases in both the scale and quality of economic activity within the Borough. In particular, the following benefits will be secured:</p> <p>For existing firms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Reduced travelling times and congestion will reduce transport costs, making them more competitive.</li> <li>● Reduced travelling times will enable them to service wider market areas from Wigan.</li> <li>● Greater accessibility to much of the Borough will increase property values, increasing asset bases.</li> <li>● It will be easier to recruit staff because of the increased potential catchment area and easier (and cheaper) travel.</li> </ul> <p>For developers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sites will be more attractive to a wide range of occupiers from within and outside the Borough.</li> <li>● Values will increase, making development easier and (more) profitable.</li> <li>● Higher quality (and better paying) users will be attracted to the sites benefiting from the improved access.</li> </ul> <p>For new investors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Perceptions of sites in Wigan will improve due to easier and faster access.</li> <li>● Sites will be considered for investment which would have been previously dismissed.</li> </ul> <p>The outcomes from this will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● New sites, which are currently unattractive to developers, will be brought forward. These sites lie along the route of the A5225 and are currently hindered by poor access.</li> </ul>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	A5225 Access Wigan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The quality of demand for these new sites and existing sites will improve, with office and high quality industrial uses taking a larger share of development. These have higher employment densities and generate jobs, which pay at higher levels than jobs in, for example, distribution.</li> <li>● The scale of development in the area will increase, creating additional local employment opportunities.</li> </ul>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>No</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>On completion of the works, the long term impacts, once mitigation measures are in place and established, are anticipated as ranging from moderate adverse to slight beneficial with the proposed route providing improved links between new developments and the surrounding area. There will also be opportunities to introduce mitigation measures which will improve the outlook for many of the surrounding residential areas. Much of the area should be upgraded.</p>
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p> <p>A full environmental and transport assessment will be completed by December 2005. Supplementary information will be available at that time.</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

### 4.15 Rail Rolling Stock

Scheme Name	Additional Railway Rolling Stock
Promoting Authority	Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority
Location of Scheme	The additional capacity will primarily benefit passengers travelling to the Regional Centre (Cities of Manchester and Salford). Their trip origins will be located throughout Greater Manchester and also elsewhere in the north-west.
Scheme Description	<p>Purchase of additional railway rolling stock to lengthen presently overcrowded peak period services. It is anticipated that the stock will comprise new two-car units similar or equivalent to the present class 150.</p> <p>This scheme will provide additional peak period capacity on the following routes by adding the new units to those presently used to provide 4-car trains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Leeds/Bradford – Manchester Victoria</li> <li>● Todmorden – Manchester Victoria</li> <li>● Huddersfield – Manchester Victoria</li> <li>● Blackpool – Manchester Piccadilly/Victoria</li> <li>● Liverpool/Warrington – Manchester Oxford Road</li> <li>● Buxton – Manchester Piccadilly</li> </ul> <p>A total of 14 new two-car units are proposed to be used to strengthen 12 train services in each peak period, allowing for typical availability rates.</p>
Local & Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –	(a) Economic objectives
Please Reference	<p>To support continuing growth in economic activity within the Regional Centre of Manchester and Salford and key centres of Bolton, Stockport, Manchester Airport, by increasing public transport capacity where demand exceeds the present supply (GMLTP Objective 1).</p> <p>To improve connectivity within Greater Manchester (GMLTP Objective 7) and also key commuter routes from outside the county.</p> <p>To make best use of the transport system (GMLTP Objective 8) by facilitating increased usage of the existing railway network. Use of the network has been increasing since the mid 1990s and demand now exceeds capacity on many services leaving passengers unable to board.</p>
	(b) Social objectives
	To support the economies of the Regional Centre and town centres (GMLTP Objective 1) which offer good access to people without a car.
	(c) Environmental objectives
	To induce modal shift from car to rail for longer distance commuting into Greater Manchester. This will contribute to reducing congestion (GMLTP Objective 6) and minimising environmental damage (GMLTP Objective 3).
Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)	Outline appraisal carried out.

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Additional Railway Rolling Stock
	Draft major scheme proposal prepared.
<b>Cost £</b>	<p>(a) Please state capital cost and price base.</p> <p>£29m, 2005 prices based on £1.8m per two-car set and 15% procurement costs.</p> <p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>No, but 11% included in calculation of b/c ratio.</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost? (Estimate)</p> <p>No private sector contribution is anticipated.</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	3.6
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?</p> <p>No</p>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver to the scheme?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>No adverse environmental impact is anticipated.</p>
<b>Supporting Information</b>	Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Additional Railway Rolling Stock
	<p>The additional rolling stock will complement LTP rail station improvement schemes at Bolton (interchange), Salford Central, Rochdale and Stalybridge.</p> <p>It is anticipated that further information will be submitted to DfT by 2007. Subject to availability of funding, procurement could begin in 2008/9, with delivery and introduction into service in 2010.</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

### 4.16 Stockport Interchange

Scheme Name	Stockport Interchange
Promoting Authority	Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Authority
Location of Scheme	Stockport, Stockport MBC  OSGR 389231, 390177
Scheme Description	<p>A new interchange on the existing bus station site providing enhanced facilities for passengers (e.g. better information and less noise and air pollution in the passenger waiting areas) and a bus-only bridge across the River Mersey to avoid buses conflicting with the main pedestrian route to the town centre.</p> <p>These plans are an integral part of the town centre masterplan that seeks to provide a sustainable development framework for the next 10 to 15 years.</p> <p>The proposed design will enhance passenger safety by reducing bus / pedestrian conflicts and maximise the perception of personal security.</p> <p>The proposed design allows for a small increase in bus movements initially and cost-effective extension as and when additional capacity is required.</p>
Local & Regional Policy Objectives addressed by Scheme –	(a) Economic objectives (if applicable).  Supports increasing levels of economic activity in Stockport town centre (GMLTP Objective 1).
Please Reference	Improves connectivity within Greater Manchester through enhanced bus interchange facilities (GMLTP Objective 7).
	(b) Social objectives (if applicable).  Assists in enhancing social inclusion (GMLTP Objective 5) by providing improved public transport facilities that are more attractive to all, especially vulnerable sections of the community. (GMLTP Objective 2)
	(c) Environmental objectives  Encourages modal shift from car to public transport for journeys to, from and within Stockport. Will thereby assist in reducing traffic congestion (GMLTP Objective 6) and minimises environmental damage by transport (GMLTP Objective 3).  Supports complementary land use and transport policies (GMLTP Objective 4) by supporting the sustainable growth of Stockport town centre. The improved bus station is seen as fundamental to the town centre masterplan's planned modal shift of visitors and other town centre users away from the private car to forms of public transport.  The proposed bus station redesign enables the adjacent riverside area to be opened-up as an area of attractive public realm.
Scheme Status – (Conceptual, Business Case etc)	Major scheme Business Case for LTP2 already drafted.
Cost £	(a) Please state capital cost and price base.  <b>Interchange:</b> £9.6 million (2005 prices)  <b>Bridge:</b> £6.4 million (2005 prices)

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries

Scheme Name	Stockport Interchange
	<p>(b) Does cost include any optimism bias and if so what percentage?</p> <p>Cost does not include optimism bias nor does it include risk allowance. At this stage no QRA has been undertaken, thus the optimism bias would be in the region of 44%/32%.</p> <p>(c) Is private sector funding available for scheme, and if so, what proportion of the total capital cost?</p> <p>No private sector contribution is anticipated towards the capital cost.</p>
<b>Scheme Benefits:Cost Ratio</b>	<p>Please state numerically.</p> <p>An ongoing economic appraisal is being undertaken using stated preference results. It is anticipated that the BCR will be between 2.25 and 2.85 with 44% optimism bias and no QRA. (These figures exclude the costs and benefits of the bridge at this stage.)</p>
<b>Wider Economic Benefits</b>	<p>Has an assessment been made of Wider Economic Benefits?</p> <p>No.</p>
<b>Primary Legislation</b>	<p>(a) Is Primary Legislation required for the scheme?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>(b) If legislation is required, has it been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Has Primary Legislation been enacted? Y/N</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Transport &amp; Works Act</b>	<p>(a) Are Transport &amp; Works Act Powers required to deliver the scheme?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>(b) If TWA powers are required, have they been applied for?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>(c) Have TWA powers been awarded?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<b>Environment &amp; Other</b>	<p>State if scheme will involve any deterioration to the environment e.g. use of green belt or demolition of listed buildings etc.</p> <p>None.</p>
<b>Supporting Information</b>	<p>Please include any additional facts which may assist the Regional Transport Forum to assess this scheme against strategic fit and deliverability.</p>

## Major Schemes Summaries 4

Scheme Name	Stockport Interchange
	<p>The existing bus station has been refurbished so as to make best use of the existing facilities, but the design standards are poor and discourage potential users of public transport. The new design standards will provide a facility that can enhance the local townscape and provide a better environment for users. Over 17,500 people per day use the existing bus station.</p> <p>The improved bus station is seen as fundamental to the town centre masterplan's planned modal shift of visitors and other town centre users away from the private car to forms of public transport.</p> <p>The interchange site is sufficiently large to incorporate a Metrolink stop in the future.</p>

## 4 Major Schemes Summaries