

By e-mail: [adrian.jones@northwaleswildlifetrust.org.uk](mailto:adrian.jones@northwaleswildlifetrust.org.uk)

**Ein Cyf / Our Ref:** AW/ls  
**Eich Cyf / Your Ref:** 27.06.2025  
**Dyddiad / Date:** 09 July, 2025

Dear Mr. Jones

**RE: The North Wales Regional Transport Strategy**

Thank you for your correspondence dated 27 June 2025, which you describe as a supplementary objection to your consultation submission on the draft North Wales Regional Transport Plan.

We have carefully considered your correspondence, in particular your view that the draft Plan should be removed from the agenda of the 30th June 2025 meeting of the North Wales CJC Strategic Transport Sub Committee (and re-tabled at a subsequent meeting). As requested, we gave an oral report on the content of your correspondence at the Strategic Transport Sub Committee, and had in advance circulated copies of it to members and officers of the meeting. Whilst we provided an outline response to the contents of your objection during the meeting, we feel it is important to respond to your letter in full and in writing. The remainder of this response provides our position in relation to your three grounds of objection in turn.

Your view that the item on the draft Regional Transport Plan (RTP) should be removed from the agenda was not supported, and the reasons are outlined in the three grounds you raised below.

**Ground 1 (that papers for the meeting were not released to provide sufficient time for informed decision making)**

The sub-committee makes recommendations to the Corporate Joint Committee, and as such is not a decision-making forum. The sub-committee was asked to recommend to the Corporate Joint Committee that the draft RTP be submitted to Welsh Government. The Corporate Joint Committee will sit on 18 July, with approval reserved to the Welsh Minister. The RTP is aspirational identifying transportation need across the region and policy development to support solutions. The Plan is not and cannot be indicative of support by the Corporate Joint Committee of any specific scheme.

Members of the sub-committee and Corporate Joint Committee have had extensive involvement in the development of the draft RTP and consultation process with access to all the relevant documentation and regular briefing. It is a matter for each Authority, but the CJC is aware that some Authorities may also have taken the matter through their own Executives.

Whilst it is accepted the published documentation is voluminous its contents is not new to Members, and as advised the three clear working day statutory publication period was adhered to.

**Ground 2 (that Appendix 6 of the agenda should not have been redacted)**

Your view is that the item should have been removed due to your objection to the absence of Appendix 6 of the agenda, which you suggest “purports to be a detailed consideration of our objection by Arup.” We consider you may have confused Appendix 6 of the Consultation Report with

Appendix 6 of the Agenda. For clarity, Appendix 6 of the Consultation Report has not been redacted and has been prepared to help demonstrate how feedback to the consultation has been taken into account. Whereas Appendix 6 of the agenda is an exempt document, which relates to Regional Transport Delivery Plan Appendix B2 [Interactive Tool] Local Authority Delivery Perspective. As explained in the agenda information: “There is an acknowledged public interest in openness in relation to the use of public resources and related financial issues. It is also acknowledged that there are occasions, in order to protect the financial interests of public authorities that matters related to commercial information need to be discussed without being publicised. This would be contrary to the wider public interest of securing value for money and the best overall outcome. The elements that have been redacted represent a proportionate response to this request while preserving the right of the publication to obtain information about an important regional plan, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.”

For clarity, the Regional Transport Delivery Plan and its appendices do not contain information relevant to the A55/A494/A548 Flintshire Corridor. As detailed in the Guidance to Corporate Joint Committees on Regional Transport Plans (2023): “For each high-level intervention identified in the RTP, the RTDP should set out the specific schemes proposed to deliver them. These should only include proposals for schemes that are within a local authority’s remit and should not, for example, include schemes relating to the rail or trunk road network.”

Ground 3 (that the consultation report contains a factual error in its reference to highway schemes examined as part of the Welsh Government’s Roads Review process)

Firstly, we consider it is important to provide the context for the Regional Transport Plan including aspirations for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Many of us rely on our A roads to get around. The trunk road network in our region comprises the A5, A55, A458, A470, A483, A487, A489, A494, and A550. The SRN provide the main economic arteries for North Wales and are an important link for local towns and communities. The SRN in North Wales is managed and maintained by the North and Mid Wales Trunk Road Agent and the Welsh Government. This means that the CJC and local authorities in North Wales have no direct influence over the SRN. However, it is important that the Regional Transport Plan sets out options to address transport related problems on the SRN and highlight regional aspirations for strategic roads as these are key to supporting our wider connectivity aspirations for North Wales. As such we have engaged with the Trunk Road Agent and the Welsh Government to help understand their priorities and plans, to inform the Regional Transport Plan’s ‘strategic road network aspirations’, including highway maintenance programmes, capacity and safety improvement projects across and connecting North Wales. We have presented SRN aspirations and not SRN policies, because the CJC has no direct influence over the SRN.

Your consultation submission to the draft Plan consultation focused on an objection to the inclusion of the A55/A494/A548 Flintshire Corridor Improvements. However, the draft Plan in its SRN Aspiration 3, supports the Welsh Government reviewing the case for strategic highway schemes where these can provide wider benefits and enhance facilities for sustainable travel (noting priority routes are the A494/A55/Flintshire Corridor and the A483 Wrexham). The draft Plan does not seek to support any previously proposed scheme, but supports a sustainable solution to the transport related problems as are described in the draft Plan. Any optioneering, environmental assessment, consenting and delivery of any SRN scheme lies with the Welsh Government.

During and since the consultation, we have continued to engage with the Welsh Government on matters in connection with the SRN. This has helped ensure the latest version of the draft Plan, as was presented at the Strategic Transport Sub Committee, clarifies their latest position. That, in summary, is the Welsh Government has confirmed the A55/A494/A548 Flintshire Corridor

Improvements are not currently being progressed and it will be commissioning a Route Strategy to consider potential interventions to the identified challenges and issues along the corridor.

In your supplementary objection you suggest that the highway schemes examined as part of the Welsh Government's Roads Review process were "not open 'paused'; they were cancelled", including a screengrab from and weblink to the Welsh Government's project website for the A55 A494 A548: Flintshire corridor. The Welsh Government's web page does not apply either term, instead it sets out how "Following the review's recommendations, we will not be going ahead with proposed improvements to the A55/A494 A548 Flintshire corridor." It then explains the 'background' and sets out details of 'previous plans included'. In advance of the draft Plan consultation, we engaged the Welsh Government in relation to the drafting of the relevant aspiration 'SRN Aspiration 3'. The Welsh Government confirmed they were content with the terminology as was then applied. Whether 'paused' or 'cancelled', the fact is that it is the Welsh Government's decision as to whether to proceed or not with any proposed improvements to the A55/A494 A548 Flintshire corridor. We are therefore content that the consultation report does not contain a factual error, and there was no evidence to support removing the item from the agenda.

After considering the discussion and recommendations made during the Strategic Transport Sub Committee, we intend to make a further amendment to the Regional Transport Plan. The change is set out below, with amendments shown in ~~strikeout~~ and underlined text. This seeks to clarify, as far as possible, the Regional Transport Plan's SRN Aspiration 3 and status of the relevant development work being led by the Welsh Government.

*"SRN Aspiration 3: The case for delivering ~~selected~~paused strategic highway schemes should be reviewed, particularly where these can provide wider benefits and enhance facilities for sustainable travel. Priority routes are the A494/A55/Flintshire Corridor and the A483 Wrexham.*

*The Welsh Government has confirmed that the previous plans for A55/A494/A548 Flintshire Corridor Improvements are not ~~currently~~ being progressed following the recommendations of the Roads Review and it is currently in the process of commissioning new work to develop a Route Strategy for the A55/A494 which will identify the challenges and issues along the corridor along with potential interventions to address them. This includes confirmation from the Welsh Government that it has commissioned a study (WelTAG Stages 1 and 2) to consider network operational challenges, resilience and road safety between Junction 14 and 18 on the A55".*

I hope that this letter has helped and if you have any further concerns, I trust that we can continue to have an early and open dialogue to support understanding.

Yours sincerely,



**Alwen Williams**  
Chief Executive

