Carrington Relief Road

Intro – OPENING SLIDE

Andrea: **Welcome to the Amey Consulting Presentation of the Options Appraisal Report for the proposed Carrington Relief Road.**

Slide 2 - welcome

Andrea: **I will start by introducing your presenters for the presentation.**

I am Andrea Robinson and I am joined by my colleague Becky Heyes – we are both Chartered Engineers with a number of years' experience of major projects between us and have access to a wide-ranging team of specialists within our organisation.

Becky: **Hello, I am Becky Heyes and I would like to start by outlining Amey Consulting's role in this project**

As Provider of Professional Engineering Services to Trafford Council for the past few years, Amey Consulting has previously been involved in the Carrington Relief Road project, providing technical support to Trafford Council such as preparation and submission of the Outline Business Case to Transport for Greater Manchester, carrying out network traffic modelling and ground investigations.

Andrea and I got involved in the scheme in Summer 2020 to carry out a review of the route options. Having no previous knowledge of the project, this has allowed us to take an independent, holistic approach to appraising the options. Our work resulted in the Options Appraisal Report, which is what we will cover in this presentation.

Andrea: **The Purpose of the Presentation**

Today we would like to discuss the Options Appraisal Report we completed in October 2020 and has recently been approved by Trafford Council, and is now available on their website.

Previously, work developing a prospective layout for a new relief road had been undertaken by private developer partners.

The Council would now be the promoter of the project and wanted a fresh independent review of how the overall network improvements could be met and how a new link could be provided.

As part of this presentation, we will also update on current position of the project and outline the next steps for Spring / Summer 2021.

Becky: **Housekeeping**

This Presentation will last around 30 minutes and will conclude with contact details for the Project Team, for any questions to be raised around this report and the project in general.

This first Engagement event will be available for four weeks through the Trafford Council CRR Web page, for anyone to view and allow for submission of any queries.

Any questions which are outside of the scope of this project, such as those relating to the wider Greater Manchester Spatial Framework, known as the GMSF, will be directed to the appropriate teams within Trafford Council or Greater Manchester Combined Authority.

It should also be noted that responses to individual queries will not be provided by the Project Team. However a 'Frequently Asked Questions and Answers' document will be available on the Trafford Council CRR Web page in the week after completion of the engagement period. This will then be updated on a regular basis as the project develops.

SLIDE 3 – background to the Project

SLIDE 4 – Location Plan

Andrea: **Need for the Scheme**

The need for a relief road in principle has been around for over 15 years; it is mentioned in several previous Council policy documents, including the Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan from 2006, also as Policy 'SL5 - Carrington' in the Core Strategy of 2012 which required new road infrastructure to relieve congestion on the existing A6144, and has remained an objective through several Council administrations to the present day.

Carrington, Partington and Sale West are also identified as key areas for regeneration in the Trafford Council Development Plan: Core Strategy document, adopted in 2012.

SLIDE 5 – background & GMSF

Becky: These three locations are also linked to the proposed Greater Manchester Spatial Framework, the GMSF. With Greater Manchester's Plan for Homes, Jobs, and the Environment: the GMSF is the strategic spatial plan for Greater Manchester and sets out the strategic planning policy framework for the whole of the city-region. This will provide the key strategic point of reference to guide developments across the city-region.

This Plan is about creating jobs and improving infrastructure to ensure the future prosperity of Greater Manchester and focuses on making the most of Greater Manchester's brownfield sites, prioritising redevelopment of town centres and other sustainable locations. It will also enable Greater Manchester to meet its Local Housing Need, promote a new approach to town centres, support wider strategies around clean air, walking and cycling and underpin the ambition to be a carbon neutral city-region by 2038. It supports the creation of resilient, liveable places where walking and cycling are the obvious choice for shorter journeys, where facilities and services are accessible and close at hand and where the past dependency on the car is superseded by a reliable and responsive public transport system.

New Carrington is identified as a strategic site in the 2020 Draft GMSF, which requires development to mitigate the impact of traffic generated on the strategic, primary and local road network.

The New Carrington site is an important element of the GMSF as it is located within a strategically important area in Greater Manchester, close to Port Salford. It provides an opportunity to deliver a development of significant size and enable the redevelopment of a large area of brownfield land, building upon the existing allocation in the Trafford Core Strategy. The site will deliver a new community that links to the existing Carrington, Partington and Sale West areas and provides improved transport, social and green infrastructure. The new development will create a distinct, attractive place which capitalises on the industrial history and prominent landscape features on the site.

Andrea: The proposed relief road would add much needed capacity to the local transport network and would become the primary gateway to the development site from the M60 via the Carrington Spur.

It would also relieve pressure on the A6144, which suffers from severe congestion in the peak periods, enhance the environment along the route by reducing air pollution and noise, as well as enabling other treatments to improve the quality of the streetscape for pedestrians and cyclists.

These benefits alone are enough to justify investment in the scheme, but in addition the relief road acts as a spine road and opens-up connections to other parts of the site for road users, buses and cyclists.

SLIDE 6 - Locality

Andrea: **Locality Assessment**

Within the wider context of this project, Trafford Council has commissioned a Locality Assessment for the proposed GMSF, New Carrington allocation, to identify and test network infrastructure interventions that will assist in delivering the New Carrington allocation, and address the concerns highlighted in the 2019 public consultation on the previous draft GMSF.

The Locality Assessment considers the overall development, in phases, for the New Carrington allocation, however detailed Transport Assessments will be required to support individual development proposals at the planning application stage.

Within the New Carrington allocation, it is acknowledged that there is a need for a new strategic network capacity improvement between Carrington and the Carrington Spur to support the development proposals. This link referenced as the Carrington Relief Road would need to reduce congestion and adverse environmental effects that are currently experienced along the A6144 Manchester Road corridor.

Becky: **New Carrington Masterplan**

A Masterplan framework for the New Carrington site has been prepared by Trafford Council, working in partnership with key landowners on the allocation. Most landowners on the site include HIMOR (Carrington Ltd), Manchester United Football Club, National Grid, National Trust, Redrow and United Utilities.

This vision for New Carrington will deliver holistic regeneration for Partington, Carrington and Sale West, through significant housing, industry and warehousing, manufacturing, new community facilities and green infrastructure, in addition to road infrastructure improvements. New Carrington has the potential to meet significant Greater Manchester-wide housing and employment needs, in a sustainable location, on a brownfield site, which will also deliver localised regeneration and place-making benefits.

The masterplan indicates how the site can be delivered in terms of timescales and phasing, to assist in the delivery of much needed housing, employment and infrastructure. It takes account of the GMSF evidence base documents and the draft GMSF 2020. New Carrington policy has been informed by the Masterplan.

Current master-planning for the sites envisages the scheme being delivered within three primary phases and is an ongoing process.
All these strategic considerations outlined above, serve to reinforce the need and benefits for the relief road.

All the documentation mentioned above is available on the website, and where possible the Carrington Relief Road project page held on Trafford Council's website will link to these, should you wish to review these further.

SLIDE 7 - Objectives

Andrea: **CRR Scheme Objectives**

The scheme objectives were set during the preparation of the Outline Business Case to TfGM, these being:

- Providing access and capacity within the transport network to enable the housing and employment growth;
- Improved public transport and active travel provision to existing areas which are poorly served and to housing and employment growth areas;
- Reduction in traffic using the A6144 Manchester Road through Carrington village and using the Isherwood Road / Manchester Road Junction;
- Improved journey times across Carrington, between Common Lane and Isherwood Road;
- Improved cycling connectivity, including reduced journey times and journey ambience between the Carrington Spur and Common Lane.

These objectives were defined collaboratively with key stakeholders, including HIMOR and in discussion with TfGM. Early work developing the options was undertaken in conjunction with major landowners and developers, and traffic modelling has demonstrated that the proposed relief road will be necessary to provide sufficient network capacity to redevelop the brownfield sites.

SLIDE 8 – Next Section

Becky: **Development of the Options**

In carrying out an assessment of potential options, it is important to record the overall objectives of any scheme based on extensive work undertaken to date. This work has included the development of the Core Strategy, the GMSF and Masterplan, and from these processes a wide range of problems were identified, over and above a simplistic need for additional road capacity.

Carrying out an appraisal at this stage gave The Council an ideal opportunity to validate or challenge any previous assumptions and, more importantly, enabled a period of design development with much improved public engagement.

It is important to make clear that at this relatively early stage of project development, this appraisal considered high-level engineering criteria with the aim of primarily identifying options which could reasonably be ruled out at this stage.

Examples of certain limitations of detail included not being able to fully take advantage of site geotechnical survey data, or detailed environmental site surveys. These were delayed due to the Lockdown in early 2020. In these and similar situations, the report relied on established data which, whilst sufficient for the purposes of this study, would inevitably need further detailed investigation at the appropriate time.

Where the scope of the report is limited by the need to carry out further design and assessment work, it identified what those should be in any options which were shortlisted or recommended for further evaluation.

SLIDE 9 – Design Considerations

Andrea: There were six routes under consideration in the Options Appraisal, **Options A to F.**

These six options were a combination of previously considered routes, and newly identified prospective routes that were developed to challenge previously adopted layouts.

Considering each route from west to east, within the scheme boundary, these options have been developed using highway alignment design software and are based on the general minimum design criteria set out within Section 2.2 of the Options Appraisal Report.

The basis of the option appraisal was a single carriageway road, typically with a proposed nominal carriageway width of 7.3 metres. A segregated footway / cycleway, typically 5 metres in width would be provided on both sides of the route over its full length, as a minimum requirement. All route options have been assessed against this footprint.

It is expected that the road space will be widened to provide additional lanes on the approaches to any proposed traffic signal-controlled junctions to minimise congestion at these junctions.

A 'Do Nothing' option was not considered appropriate for this project, given the strategic requirements for the relief road.

SLIDE 10 – Option A to F

Becky: The routes under consideration in the Options Appraisal Report are shown on the plan on screen – **Proposed Route Options A to F.**

Running quickly through each of the six options:

SLIDE 11 – Option A

Option A, is an online option running partially centrally and partly to the north of the site, with a total length of 4.5km.

The route commences to the west at the existing junction of the A6144 Manchester Road with the A1 and follows the length of the existing A1; this existing priority junction is upgraded to a new signalised junction with the potential for a free flow southbound left turn lane;

At the eastern end of the A1, a new signalised junction is proposed where the A1 meets Isherwood Road;

Isherwood Road is then improved between the A1 junction to the junction of A1644 Manchester Road / Carrington Lane / Isherwood Road to the north;

Improvements to the Carrington Lane / Isherwood Road junction would be made to provide free flow southbound left turn lane;

Improvements to the section of Carrington Lane, between the Isherwood Road junction and Carrington Spur, would also be made, including alignment improvements to reduce the severity of the bends;

Finally, realignment of Carrington Spur / Banky Lane junction is proposed.

SLIDE 12 – OPTION B

Andrea: Next, a southern and northern route were considered.

Option B is the most southern option with a total length of 4.7km and is predominantly off-line, traversing agricultural fields and the Carrington Moss.

SLIDE 13 – OPTION C

Andrea: **Option C** is the most northern option, partially located to the north of the current A6144 alignment, with a total length of 3.8km.

SLIDE 14 – OPTION D

Andrea: **Option D** - this option is 3.9km in length and follows the same route as Option A for most of its length, apart from the western end where it diverts from the A1 in a north western direction, with the objective of avoiding the Burford Bridge.

SLIDE 15 – OPTION E

Becky: **Option E** has a total length of 3.3 km, making it the shortest option. The route commences at A6144 Manchester Road approximately 300m west of the existing access to the Business Park, the road alignment runs in a south easterly direction for approximately 350m to a new junction with the A1, where the route joins the existing A1 alignment;

The route then follows the alignment of the existing A1 industrial estate Road to a new realigned signalised junction to the south of the existing junction at Isherwood Road;

East of Isherwood Road, the route crosses open fields, skirting south of existing electricity pylons to meet Carrington Lane at the end of the Carrington Spur.

SLIDE 16 – OPTON F

Finally, **Option F** which uses the whole length of the existing A1 route through the industrial estate, from the A6144 to Isherwood Road, before following the same route as Option E to Carrington Spur. It has a total length of 3.9km.

SLIDE 17 – Tech Appraisal

SLIDE 18 – Tech appraisal

Andrea: **Technical Appraisal**

Each route option was assessed for suitability against the same design parameters as outlined below. These are in no particular order and no weighting was given to the parameters.

- Availability of Land
- Ground Conditions
- Utilities Equipment – both public and private, for the former Shell site
- Environmental & Protected Species Habitats, which included the following areas;
    - Air Quality
    - Cultural heritage
    - Landscape & visual
    - Biodiversity
    - Noise and vibration
    - Materials Assets and Waste
    - Population and Human Health
    - Road Drainage and the Water Environment
- Public Rights of Way

- Watercourses and Drainage

- Public Transport and Sustainable Travel

In considering the route options, we also considered other information, including topography, and Uses of the Relief Road (lorries)

Becky: **SLIDE 19 – Appendix D Table**

Within the report, each route option was described and then considered in terms of 'pros' and 'cons', generally against the scheme objectives outlined earlier.

A summary table was prepared for each scheme, as shown on the screen and a more detailed comparison table was provided as an Appendix to the report (as Appendix D).

Within the option appraisal process and as outlined in the report, no evaluation of other potential strategies, such as not constructing any new infrastructure, was considered, on the basis that all indicative work carried out to date on the Future Carrington GMSF indicates a requirement for significant highway network improvements.

SLIDE 20 – OTHER STRATEGIES

It is also widely accepted that the following conditions will continue to prevail or worsen:

- Route remains congested with slow journey times and associated risks with safety and environmental;
- No improvement to access to potential industrial and residential development sites;
- No stimulus for development;
- Areas remain in state of dereliction;
- No economic benefits for area;
- Existing poor pedestrian and cycling facilities;
- No opportunity to improve public transport infrastructure to improve connectivity to the wider area.

However, it is noted that not constructing any new infrastructure protects greenbelt land of Carrington Moss and avoids the traffic impacts of construction work.

SLIDE 21 – SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

Andrea: Next, we will run through a summary of the six options with some pros and cons:

Option A

This online improvement option provides a relief road to remove the majority of traffic from Carrington Village itself but it is unclear as to whether it is able to improve the existing road network between the Isherwood Road junction and Carrington Spur and will increase traffic using the Isherwood Road / Manchester Road Junction.

There is a risk that the two required major traffic signal junction's mid-way along the route may lead to congestion and not provide the journey time reliability required for significant public transport enhancements. There may be speeding and overtaking issues using the whole A1 route due to its long linear alignment and the width constraints at Burford Bridge will need to be overcome. In addition, there are land ownership issues to overcome, which may lead to lengthy land negotiations and the possibility for Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO), which add significant risk to the project. Significant on-line improvements are likely to result in a long construction programme and severe traffic disruption during construction. However, as this route largely follows the existing road network it requires the least disturbance to the Greenbelt

Option B

The Option B route provides full relief to Carrington Village but fails to properly serve the proposed industrial development site. As one of the longer routes, this option is likely to provide a poor cost / benefit value due to costs associated with building the majority of the alignment within Greenbelt land and Carrington Moss and hence additional earthworks requirements and potential remediation costs, etc.

Because of the high cost, environmental impact and relatively poor access to parcels of land identified as future development sites, it was recommended that this option is not developed further.

SLIDE 22 – OPTIONS C & D

Becky: **Option C**

This option provides relief to the Carrington Village area but fails to serve the proposed industrial and development sites. Due to buildability issues and excessive costs to construct crossings over the River Mersey, along with the requirement to purchase additional third-party land, this option it was recommended this option is not developed further.

Option D

As described in Option A, this option also does not significantly improve the existing road network between the Isherwood Road junction and Carrington Spur and is likely to increase traffic at the Isherwood Road / Manchester Road junction. There is a risk that the two required major traffic signal junction's mid-way along the route may lead to congestion and not provide the journey time reliability required for significant public transport enhancements.

In addition, there are land ownership issues to overcome, which may lead to lengthy land negotiations and the possibility for Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO), which add significant risk to the project. Significant on-line improvements are likely to result in a long construction programme and severe traffic disruption during construction. However, as this route largely follows the existing road network it requires the least disturbance to the Greenbelt.

Whilst this route could be beneficial in avoiding the Burford Bridge crossing, it does not provide relief to the entire Carrington village area.

It was therefore recommended that this option is not developed further at this stage. However, there is potential to revisit this route option should there be no agreement over the Burford Bridge Crossing.

SLIDE 23 – OPTIONS E & F

Andrea: **Option E**

Whilst this is the shortest option it requires a new section of road at its western extents. This new section of road will require demolition of some of the existing Carrington Business Park and does not bypass the entire Carrington Village area.
It was therefore recommended that this option is not developed further at this stage. However, there is potential to revisit this route option should there be no agreement over the Burford Bridge Crossing.

Option F

This option is one of the shortest options and provides relief to Carrington Village from through traffic. It reduces traffic using the Isherwood Road / Manchester Road junction but will require development through Greenbelt land. This option provides a desirable route if the speeding and overtaking issues using the whole A1 route due to its long linear alignment, and the ownership issues and width constraints at Burford Bridge can be overcome.

SLIDE 24 – final two options

Becky: **Summary of the two options to be taken forward:**

Option A and Option F are the two options which are still under consideration to determine which has the greatest cost / benefit value.

Option A (in red) is an online option running which uses the whole length of the existing A1 route through the industrial estate, before heading north along Isherwood Road and then east using Carrington Lane to Carrington Spur. It has a total length of 4.5km.

Option F (in brown) again uses the whole length of the existing A1 route through industrial estate, but then to the east of Isherwood Road, the route crosses open field skirting south of existing electricity pylons to meet Carrington Lane at the end of the Carrington Spur. It has a total length of 3.9km.

SLIDE 25 & 26 – NEXT STEPS

Andrea: In order to determine a preferred option, there is a need to focus on the distinction between the two route options and to increase understanding of the requirements and risks associated with both options.

Whilst some risks will be inherent to both routes, others will be specific to / or vary for each route.

So considering these risks for each route:

Becky: **Option A Risks**

Compulsory Purchase Order / Land Acquisition Requirements

The existing A6144 Carrington Lane (between Isherwood Road and Carrington Spur) will require widening and realignment at some locations to meet geometric design requirements. An initial exercise has been carried out to look at the extent and nature of the land acquisition. It is likely that lengthy land negotiations and potential CPO purchases present risk into the project both in terms of costs and delivery to programme.

Isherwood Road / A6144 Junction

Previous transport planning studies suggest capacity and safety issues at the junction between the A6144 and Isherwood Road. As Option A utilises this junction there is a risk these issues cannot be sufficiently reduced. Further traffic modelling and outline design work is required to understand the improvements that can be made to this junction.

Environmental

There are a significant number of well-established hedgerows and mature trees that would require removal to widen and realign the A6144 Carrington Lane, and to a lesser extent along Isherwood Road. This could present environmental and ecological issues. This risk will be understood better once the Environmental Scoping Report is available.

Lack of Dualling Capacity

The utilisation of the A6144 Carrington Lane means there is little to no possibility of any future improvements to dual the route along this section. This option does however provide the opportunity to provide a route through Carrington Moss in the future to increase capacity, provided future developments on the moss do not constrain this route.

Online Construction

Significant on-line improvements to a Key Route Network whilst keeping it open to traffic are likely to result in a long construction programme and severe traffic disruption during construction.

Option F Risks

Compulsory Purchase Order / Land Acquisition Requirements

Agricultural land to the east of the route could result in protracted land negotiations. It is likely that lengthy land negotiations and potential CPO purchases present risk into the project both in terms of costs and delivery to programme. These requirements will need to be investigated further in the outline design phase.

Environment

Environmental issues of building through the greenfield site

There are a series of risks which are common to both options:

Road Network

Both options carry the risks associated with using the existing A1 route and will require land at the western side, to provide an improved junction to theA6144 Manchester Road. Further evaluation of transport modelling is required. This will include testing junction and link capacities, and journey time reliability.

Burford Bridge

Both Options cross the existing privately owned Burford Bridge on the A1. This alignment carries risk due to the constrained width over the current structure and uncertainty over the legal status of the bridge. It is envisaged this risk can be reduced through further

discussions with the landowner and a review be undertaken to understand these legal issues, along with an assessment of demolition and outline development of an at-grade solution.

A1 Alignment

Both route options follow the straight alignment of the A1. There is a perceived risk that this long, straight stretch may lead to issues with speeding and overtaking, leading to traffic accidents. This risk will need to be considered during the outline design and methods to discourage this behaviour should be implemented.

Statutory Undertakers Services

There are numerous Statutory Undertakers Services along the route. A summary of the known services is included in the report. Further investigation into the requirements for diversion and protection of services will be required when considering the outline design for the options

Andrea: **Summary / Next Steps**

Availability of Land - Further dialogue with HIMOR is ongoing, along with the land agents who represent the landowners or tenants', to fully understand the existing legal agreements that are in place and how these impact the remaining two route options.

Ground Conditions - further intrusive ground investigation surveys will be carried out for the widening option, and the impact of their findings should be considered for both remaining route options.

Environmental & Protected Species Habitats - An Environmental Scoping Report will be completed for both Options A and F to determine the impact of each route.

Utility Equipment – Further investigation into the requirements of rationalisation of the services within the route corridors will also be carried out.

Public Rights of Way - Consideration for non-motorised users is being reviewed with a Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review. The purpose of this review is to facilitate the inclusion of all walking, cycling and horse-riding modes in the highway scheme development process from the earliest stage, enabling opportunities for new or improved facilities and their integration with

the local and national network(s). Given the number of existing pedestrian, cycling and horse-riding opportunities within the area, this review is likely to be extensive.

Public Transport and Sustainable Travel – Continued engagement with TfGM to ensure public transport enhancements meet the aspirations.

Watercourses and Drainage - Further investigations will be carried out to fully establish the existing drainage networks prior to development of any proposed drainage design.

Burford Bridge: Further investigation and discussions with the landowner regarding demolition of this bridge are being progressed to reduce the risk value.

Engagement: The Stakeholder Management Plan is being updated, and public engagement strategy developed further, outlining timetable for engagement events, such as this.

Development of Outline Design – the design of the two preferred options is being developed to outline design both horizontally and vertically in line with current design standards.

Last Slide

Becky

We hope this presentation has been informative and answered some of your questions on the Carrington Relief Road Scheme. Further information is available on our webpage and we will be adding to this over the coming weeks and months.

If you have any further questions, or if you would like to be kept up to date with developments, please get in touch using the **CRR@amey.co.uk** email address.

Unfortunately, we will not be able to respond to your questions individually but we will be answering your questions in further engagement sessions and with a Q&A document which will be added to the website in March.