



Key Route Network Consultation

Powers and responsibilities for locally important roads

Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR



© Crown copyright 2021

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/opengovernment-licence/version/3/ or contact, The National Archives at www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/contact-us.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is also available on our website at
www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at
www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport

Contents

Introduction	4
How to respond	6
Freedom of Information	7
1. Current Key Route Network Landscape	8
Background	8
2. Proposals for transferring road powers to Combined Authorities	11
What will happen next	18
Annex A: Full list of consultation questions	19
Annex B: Consultation principles	20

Introduction

1. As part of a step change in levelling up how our towns and cities look, feel and operate for people across this country, metro mayors and Mayoral Combined Authorities (MCAs) have an important role to play in helping to create better connected, healthier and more sustainable communities. Mayors have strategic transport responsibilities, but limited and inconsistent powers over the most important part of their strategic transport network, their strategic roads.
2. Key Route Networks (KRNs) are a network of some of the most important roads in a combined authority for which an MCA and its constituent authorities both hold powers. KRNs are typically the busiest main roads; side streets do not, and some other main roads may not, form part of the KRN. The KRN landscape is complex with a mixture of arrangements across the country.
3. In London, Transport for London (TfL) has responsibility for their equivalent of KRNs, Greater London Authority (GLA) roads (also known as ‘red routes’ or the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN)) and the provision of a fully integrated public transport network. This is not the case for England’s other city regions but is an option which should be available to every city region. Outside London, mayors of combined authorities have responsibility for strategic transport but only limited highway powers over their KRNs.
4. We recognise that mayors and their city-region transport authorities need to be fully empowered to do their job. With this in mind, the Government is committed to enabling mayors to have the highway powers necessary to deliver on their wider cross-cutting transport priorities and make the changes that are necessary to ensure transport functions optimally across their city region.
5. In July 2020, the Government committed in ‘Gear Change’,¹ the Prime Minister’s cycling and walking plan for England to consult on increasing the powers of mayors over their KRNs, similar to the powers that already apply in London, with a view to enabling a more integrated and holistic approach across MCAs to the allocation of road space and new infrastructure, supporting improved traffic flow and more new cycling and walking infrastructure.

¹Gear change: a bold vision for cycling and walking: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycling-and-walking-plan-for-england>

6. In addition, the *Bus Back Better*² national bus strategy for England published in March 2021 sets out the need for Bus Service Improvement Plans to explain how traffic management and investment are used to prioritise buses. The National Bus Strategy also required local authorities to develop Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs) to enable them to access £3 billion new funding. In MCAs this will include the extent of their role over a KRN and how that is used to prioritise bus services.
7. This consultation seeks views on our proposed approach for giving mayors more decision-making powers and accountability over the management of their KRNs. The proposals in this consultation paper relate solely to MCAs.

² *Bus Back Better*, p.45: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bus-back-better>

How to respond

The consultation period began on 30 July 2021 and will run until 24 September 2021. Please ensure that your response reaches us before the closing date. If you would like further copies of this consultation document, it can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/dft#consultations> or you can contact KRNconsultation@dft.gov.uk if you need alternative formats (Braille, audio CD, etc.).

Please send consultation responses to:

Name: Robert Leiper

Address: North and Devolution Division, Department for Transport, 3rd Floor, Great Minster House, 33 Horseferry Rd, London SW1P 4DR

Phone Number: 0300 330 3000

Email address: KRNconsultation@dft.gov.uk

When responding, please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation. If responding on behalf of a larger organisation, please make it clear who the organisation represents and, where applicable, how the views of members were assembled.

Freedom of Information

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you want information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.

In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act (DPA) and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Data Protection

The Department for Transport (DfT) is carrying out this consultation to gather evidence on proposals to increase the powers and accountability of metro mayors and Mayoral Combined Authorities (MCAs) over their Key Route Networks (KRNs) similar to the Transport for London (TfL) powers that apply in London. This consultation and the processing of personal data that it entails is necessary for the exercise of our functions as a government department. If your answers contain any information that allows you to be identified, DfT will, under data protection law, be the Controller for this information.

As part of this consultation we're asking for your name and email address. This is in case we need to ask you follow-up questions about any of your responses. You do not have to give us this personal information. If you do provide it, we will use it only for the purpose of asking follow-up questions.

DfT's privacy policy has more information about your rights in relation to your personal data, how to complain and how to contact the Data Protection Officer. You can view it at <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/about/personal-information-charter>.

1. Current Key Route Network Landscape

Background

- 1.1 In London, the Mayor plays a vital role in developing and applying policies to promote and encourage integrated, safe, efficient and economic transport facilities and services to, from and within London. With this in mind, we want to empower metro mayors and their MCAs further to transform the connectivity between local urban areas by giving them the necessary decision-making powers and accountability over their KRNs.
- 1.2 A KRN covers a collection of locally important strategic routes intended to integrate highways across a city region, largely cutting across multiple local authority (LA) boundaries. This allows for roads to be managed in a strategic way to improve traffic flow, reduce congestion, introduce bus priority, or cycle infrastructure across a city region.
- 1.3 While in most cases KRNs may only cover a small section of an MCA's vast road network, they are essential for commuting, freight and logistics and a vital part of a prosperous local economy, benefiting all road users. For example, in the West Midlands Combined Authority nearly 50% of all traffic uses their KRN but it makes up only 7% of the actual roads across the West Midlands.
- 1.4 The implementation of KRNs across the country vary significantly and there is no standard approach. Many MCAs have defined the roads in their KRN administratively; only West Midlands has defined this in legislation. This complex landscape is a result of MCAs and LAs (who are the Local Highway Authority) reaching different agreements on powers, duties and the roads that make up a KRN.
- 1.5 Decisions, both on improvements to the KRN and on when MCAs can exercise their powers, are made administratively requiring agreement from all the constituent authorities that make up the MCA. To implement these, MCAs can use the limited powers they have but it often falls to the constituent authorities to deliver changes on the KRN. There are also some MCAs who have yet to determine/establish a KRN.
- 1.6 Although MCAs have responsibilities as the strategic transport authority on behalf of the mayor, they have only limited powers over their strategic highways, their KRNs. MCAs work in partnership with their constituent LAs to plan investment and manage their KRNs with each having distinct powers and duties. LAs (operating as the local highway authority) have a statutory duty to manage, maintain and service the local roads in their area, while an MCA (usually operating through its Passenger Transport

Executive) has strategic oversight and management of a KRN but with limited highway powers over the strategic roads.

- 1.7 An efficient, well-functioning road network is essential to make our city regions better places to live and to deliver economic growth. Giving mayors greater strategic control and accountability over KRNs will help move city regions across England more closely in line with how the road network is run in London, which could go some way to supporting greater levels of cycling and walking infrastructure and bus priority measures. This should help support a number of benefits, such as:

- Helping mayors deliver on their Local Transport Plans.
- A more consistent approach to delivery and highway standards across the city region.
- Effective management of traffic across major urban areas, especially in times of high demand and constrained capacity.
- Improved bus services, by integrating bus priority measures across an MCA.
- Easier active travel, by delivering new walking and cycling infrastructure that is linked up across a city region.
- Economies of scale, through the ability to procure and deliver on a cross-boundary basis
- Other wider strategic benefits include being able to set air quality targets on these routes, greater flexibility for service support, and improving performance and accountability.

The London model

- 1.8 By contrast to the complex split of powers between MCAs and LAs, the Mayor of London/Transport for London (TfL) have full responsibility for their equivalent of KRNs, (Greater London Authority (GLA) roads). In London, responsibility for managing London's road network is shared between TfL, Highways England, and the 32 London boroughs, plus the City of London. TfL manage the TLRN or London's GLA roads/red routes. The TLRN is a network of major roads that make up 5% of the London's roads, but carry up to 30% of the city's traffic.
- 1.9 London's system was set up in the Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999. The Act set a legal definition of the TLRN, defining them as 'GLA Roads'. The first GLA Roads were set up by an Order from the Transport Secretary and transferred to the Mayor of London when first elected. Under the Act, the Mayor of London has a duty to keep the system of highways and proposed highways in Greater London and the allocation of responsibility for that system between the different local highway authorities under review. This includes adding roads into the TLRN (designating them as GLA Roads) or taking them out of the TLRN (ceasing to be GLA Roads).
- 1.10 As the highway and traffic authority for the TLRN, TfL has powers to regulate how the public uses these roads, it can allocate road space for different types of vehicle, and is responsible for road maintenance and improvement. TfL has its own staff, resources, contractors and ICT systems to enable these functions. It is also responsible for operating and maintaining the, city's 6,000 plus sets of traffic lights, whether located on the TLRN or Borough roads.

- 1.11 London boroughs are traffic and highway authorities for local (non-GLA) roads. This governance model has allowed TfL to optimise services across London and introduce infrastructure on its network, such as cycle superhighways and the creation of bus lanes/corridors that cross borough boundaries. The GLA sets out TfL's powers and duties but TfL can delegate to agencies to act on its behalf. However, in the case of certain specified activities, that delegation is limited.
- 1.12 There is the opportunity as part of reforming the KRN landscape to place city regions on a similar footing to London and the responses we receive will help to inform this.

Challenges

- 1.13 Due to the nature of devolution deals, each MCA has different powers, responsibilities and capabilities in respect of how it manages its KRN – some statutory and others agreed administratively. This varied split of powers and responsibilities has created a complex landscape, in which it is difficult to fully integrate transport across a city region or make an MCA fully accountable.
- 1.14 We remain keen to standardise the road powers held by mayors for their KRNs, while decisions on how those powers are used are made locally. This should also increase awareness and clarity amongst the public about the role of mayors in highways and transport.
- 1.15 The current split of powers between MCAs and LAs has meant there is no clear responsibility or accountability over the KRN. This has often meant neither MCA nor LA have been able to make strategic investment decisions on the KRN or implement changes that would deliver on Local Transport Plans or on the priorities of a city region. To unlock the full benefits of a KRN, it is important that there is clear responsibility for decision making and management of the KRN in every city region.
- 1.16 Having limited and concurrent powers has proved difficult for MCAs when trying to drive strategic priorities and coordinate across the city region's constituent authorities. While both seeking to improve their transport networks, LAs and MCAs in some cases have competing priorities which has led to inaction. A key feature of the KRN is that it improves roads by integrating highways across a city region. This can improve traffic management, reducing congestion and therefore improving air quality. To realise these improvements, decisions on managing the KRN need to be made at a city-wide level.
- 1.17 As we recover from the Covid-19 pandemic and as we work towards net zero target, local areas need to have ambitious plans that help deliver a better transport network. It is important that mayors and LAs have the appropriate powers that allow them to deliver their ambitious plans.

2. Proposals for transferring road powers to Combined Authorities

- 2.1 Bringing the local strategic roads of MCAs into a single 'Key Route Network' has enabled a more central, strategic overview for managing roads across council boundaries outside of London. Prior to devolution this was difficult to achieve. This has been an important step in empowering local areas to deliver a good road network and to develop policies to reduce congestion, improve air quality, and to maximise investment. But we recognise that we need to go much further to level up our cities to have similar powers over their road network as London, so that we can achieve the following outcomes:
- More standardised powers over roads, enabling a consistent approach to delivery and highway standards across a city region
 - A more coordinated/holistic approach to managing roads, delivering local transport plans, and deciding on new schemes for city regions
 - The optimisation of services across a city region through the ability to procure and deliver on a cross-boundary basis
 - A more integrated and efficient approach across city regions to the allocation of road space and new infrastructure, supporting more new walking and cycling infrastructure and improved bus services
 - Effective management of traffic across a city region, reducing congestion and improving air quality
 - More standardised set of powers over roads, enabling all mayors to improve their KRNs
- 2.2 As referred to in the *Bus Back Better* national bus strategy for England, "MCAs and their constituent members will be expected to implement ambitious bus priority programmes and other road space reallocation measures, using all relevant powers available to them." Bus Service Improvement Plans will also need to explain how traffic management and investment are used to prioritise buses. In MCAs this will include the extent of their role over a KRN and how that is used to prioritise bus services. This may therefore require MCAs to have additional traffic management duties/operations.

- 2.3 *Gear Change*, the Prime Minister's cycling and walking plan for England, also sets out a vision to make England a great walking and cycling nation which includes better streets for cycling and pedestrians, placing walking and cycling at the heart of decision-making, empowering and encouraging LAs, enabling people to cycle and protecting them when they do with physical segregation from volume traffic.
- 2.4 The decisions MCAs make about their KRN have a key part to play in realising this vision. We want KRN to include the main cycling and walking routes where possible and to allow more efficient use of road space to the benefit of all road users. We also want to see cycling and walking routes that are well connected with wider public transport services, and are strategically planned to properly integrate across MCA areas with long term local development plans.
- 2.5 The Government is proposing KRN reforms to support the devolution of powers to local places. While looking to standardise the powers held by MCAs over their KRN, decisions on how the KRN should be used and how MCAs use these powers should and will be local decisions. The vital role of LAs on management of the KRN is maintained: the roads which form the KRN are agreed between the MCA and LAs, and how the KRN is used is determined by the area's Local Transport Plan, agreed by the mayor, MCA and all its constituent authorities.
- 2.6 A key part of achieving these outcomes involves creating an appropriate balance between the split of powers and operational duties for MCAs and their constituent LAs. There are varying degrees to which this can be done, which we think could have a transformative impact on the connectivity within and between local areas. We would welcome your views on the following proposals under consideration.

1. Providing mayors with additional highway management powers

- 2.7 We are proposing to empower city regions with the highway powers necessary to deliver on their transport priorities in a more integrated way. This would see mayors gain a range of highways powers and associated functions and duties making them the key decision makers for their roads and delivered by MCAs.
- 2.8 This arrangement not only addresses many of the challenges outlined in the previous chapter, but it will go some way to enabling a more integrated approach for city regions in driving their strategic priorities. It would allow for:
 - Key highway and traffic authority functions to be transferred from LAs to MCAs
 - Mayors to have strategic control over the KRN, deciding how it is used, and managing the network.
 - MCAs to have the capabilities to manage their road network.
 - MCA powers over KRN to be standardised, creating resource efficiencies and long-term economies of scale when coordinating and delivering schemes across a city region.

- 2.9 To ensure that the benefits of integrating the KRN across a city region can be realised, we believe that mayors should hold the key decision-making powers. The complexity of highways legislation means there is not a single or small group of powers which mayors could hold to become the key decision maker, so we have proposed that mayors would assume the Highway Authority functions over their KRN. This proposal would give MCAs strategic control over the KRN, while LAs will remain highway and traffic authority outside of the KRN.
- 2.10 In assuming Highway Authority functions, mayors would have the powers they need to decide on the allocation of road space, for example s.65(1) of the Highways Act 1980 or s.1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1974. Mayors would also be subject to the Network Management Duty. Beyond making decisions on the KRN, to be able to effectively manage and deliver changes on the KRN, mayors would be responsible for the range of powers and duties of a highway authority for their KRN.
- 2.11 We recognise that MCAs have differing capabilities and are not currently set up to be highway authorities. We are proposing a significantly greater role for MCAs in managing their KRNs with a view to creating a consistent approach to delivery and highway standards across city regions. But we are supportive of places having the flexibility, decided locally, to tailor powers/functions to their needs and capabilities. Therefore, we are also consulting on whether MCAs should hold these powers solely or should be able to delegate some of these roles (see the table below).
- 2.12 The table below proposes powers which mayors would hold for their KRNs, which include traffic management, highways maintenance, making traffic orders, road signage, managing parking and operating street works permit schemes, etc. We will welcome your views on these:

Functions	Comment	Delegable to local authority?
Highways maintenance	Mayors would determine maintenance and improvement requirements for the KRN. Delivery of this could remain with LAs and existing asset management arrangements	Yes – could be delivered under existing asset management arrangements.
Parking	Mayors to be responsible for rules and provision of parking on the KRN	No – decision making responsibilities on the KRN would remain with MCAs, while the implementation of changes would be delivered under highway maintenance arrangements.
Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)	Mayors to be responsible for TROs on the KRN, including for bus lanes, parking and loading restrictions, red routes, banned movements, cycle lanes, traffic signal junctions, crossings	No
Traffic signs and signalling	Mayors to be responsible for signs and signalling on the KRN	Yes – for maintenance and improvements to signs and signalling. These can be maintained under existing highway maintenance arrangements.
Street works and permits	Mayors to be responsible for managing street works and issuing permits on the KRN	No
Enforcement of traffic offences	Mayors to be able to hold enforcement powers under Part 6, Traffic Management Act 2004 (powers on bus lane contraventions already held by some MCAs)	Yes – it is preferable to ensure a single, integrated enforcement programme across a city region, irrespective of whether a road is on the KRN or not.

Table 1 Potential mayoral powers and functions for KRNs

Questions

Q1: Should, in your view, mayors hold highway authority powers for managing KRNs? Please explain why.

Q2: Which, if any, functions or powers do you think should be transferred to mayors, including those listed in Table 1? Please include any powers you think are missing.

Q3: With reference to the functions listed in Table 1, to what extent, do you think, transferring these functions will allow for effective management of the KRN? Please explain why.

Q4: Please explain what impact these changes could have for congestion, air quality, bus priority and cycling/walking infrastructure on the KRN.

2. Sole and concurrent highway powers

- 2.13 In devolution deals, mayors have been given limited powers over the KRN. In general, these have been shared between the LA and the MCA on behalf of the mayor. This should have provided greater flexibility by allowing MCAs to exercise the powers on behalf of LAs, applying them consistently across the city region. In practice however, concurrent powers have created a barrier to mayors using these powers as they are required to get unanimous agreement from all LAs before they can be used.
- 2.14 To remove this barrier, we propose that mayors hold highways powers over the KRN solely, making it clear that they are responsible and accountable for use of those powers. The ability to delegate some highways powers (see below) would ensure that MCAs have the capabilities to deliver this. LAs would still retain a role in deciding how the KRN is used as the Local Transport Plan is agreed by all LAs in the city region.
- 2.15 We are interested to hear your views on whether any highways powers for the KRN should be held concurrently by MCAs and their constituent LAs. Currently, where powers are held concurrently, they can only be exercised with the unanimous agreement of constituent authorities. If there are concurrent powers, we consider that their exercise should in future require majority, rather than unanimous, agreement of constituent authorities.
- 2.16 Whether powers are held solely or concurrently, it remains important that MCAs and LAs continue to work closely together. KRNs do not exist in isolation and need to be integrated with local roads (and in some cases with the Strategic Road Network managed by Highways England). LAs are vital in the development of Local Transport Plans that set out the areas' policy on use of the KRN. MCAs should consult LAs when decisions on the KRN will impact on local roads, and vice versa.

Questions

Q5: Should, in your view, mayors solely hold any highway powers over the KRN?

Q6: If powers are held concurrently, should the exercise of those powers be subject to

the majority agreement of constituent authorities or the unanimous agreement of constituent authorities? Please explain why you think powers should be distributed in this way.

2.17 This consultation focusses on the powers that mayors have over their KRNs.

However, to deliver fully integrated road networks, in some cases it may be preferable for mayors to hold highway powers for all roads in their area. For example, where integrated traffic signalling is being introduced, it may be sensible for mayors to hold those powers across all roads in the MCA area, rather than just over the KRN.

Question

Q7: Which, if any, highway powers should mayors hold for all roads in the city region? Please list the powers that should be transferred and the reasons why you think mayors should hold these.

3. Delegating highway powers

2.18 We have asked above whether mayors should hold additional highways powers and whether these should be held solely by them. In delivering such powers and functions, we want MCAs and LAs to have flexibility in how these are used. We recognise that additional powers and their associated duties may create new burdens on MCAs that they are not currently optimised for. In some cases, it may be preferable for LAs to continue to manage some aspects of the KRN, individually or on behalf of the MCA or other authorities in the city region. To address this, MCAs could be given the ability to delegate some of their functions back to the LA.

2.19 MCAs could be able to delegate some functions, for example highways maintenance, to the LA which is currently the highway authority. We believe there are a number of benefits to this approach:

- MCAs would have strategic oversight of their KRN but without needing to duplicate all the operational capabilities of LAs. If certain functions can be delegated to LAs then MCAs would not be required to build the full operational capability of a highway and traffic authority.
- Existing contracts for road maintenance can remain in place and new contracts covering the full KRN could be reached.
- Delivery could be delegated indefinitely or until the MCA wishes to deliver these duties itself.

2.20 Under this arrangement, it is expected that mayors would remain accountable for the KRN and would continue to exercise the decision-making powers over KRNs. These functions could vary by authority depending on local priorities and capabilities or could be consistent across MCAs and their constituent members.

Question

Q8: Which, if any, highway powers do you think should MCAs be able to delegate to LAs? Please explain the benefits and risks of doing so.

4. Mayors to have powers to direct an LA to deliver schemes

- 2.21 We have also considered alternatives to transferring highways powers to MCAs. Instead of mayors becoming the key decision-maker over the KRN, they could be enabled to intervene in highway decisions only where they consider it necessary. The existing roles of MCAs and LAs would be maintained but MCAs would have less strategic control than the previous options proposed. This power could be used, for example, to deliver the city region's Local Transport Plan or introduce cross-city bus priority measures from a Bus Service Improvement Plan.
- 2.22 For example, the Mayor of London has some limited powers to direct highway authorities, that apply on GLA roads and roads managed by London boroughs. Each London borough council creates a local implementation plan that will deliver the Mayor's transport strategy. The Mayor is able to issue a direction to a borough to amend their plan or instruct them on what their plan should include. For some other roads, there is an obligation on the Mayor and boroughs to consult and get agreement on changes that affect each other's roads.

Question

Q9: Should, in your view, mayors have a power of direction on the KRN, or in certain circumstances on other roads? In your response please indicate:

- in what circumstances such a power could be used, and
- the benefits and risks of doing so.

5. Power to take over a KRN route

- 2.23 KRNs are intended to improve local road networks with decisions made by local leaders. The roads that form a KRN have been agreed by MCAs and their constituent authorities and we believe that principle should continue. As local areas change, areas should be able to change which routes form part of the KRN.
- 2.24 In London the red route network is made up of GLA roads and GLA side roads, which are the roads designated as red routes by the Secretary of State for Transport. The Secretary of State can also grant the mayor responsibility for a route in certain circumstances, although this power has not yet been used. To ensure that locally significant roads can be managed as part of the KRN, mayors or constituent LAs could also be given the ability to request responsibility for a route by order of the Transport Secretary.

2.25 Where new schemes/improvements to the road network are unable to be agreed on by the MCA and its constituent members, this could solve local issues and prevent inaction. We anticipate that such a power would rarely, if at all, be used but could prove helpful nonetheless to ensure delivery of important transport priorities, particularly if linked to an agreed Local Transport Plan.

Question

Q10: Should, in your view, mayors and LAs be able to request from the Secretary of State for Transport that a route is added or removed from the KRN? Please explain the benefits and risks of doing so.

2.26 This consultation does not include an impact assessment as the proposals it contains affect the powers held by different local government bodies. They do not have an impact on business. While we expect the cost impacts of these proposals to be small, we wish to understand what costs and benefits the proposals may have.

Additional questions

Questions

Q11: What would the impacts of the above proposals be on affected organisations and road users? Please consider the costs, benefits, capabilities, staffing capacity and skill requirements of the organisation in your response.

Q12: What are the main issues with the way KRNs currently operate in your area?

Q13: What other actions beyond our proposals, if any, do you think are required to overcome the issues on the KRN?

What will happen next

A summary of responses, including the next steps, will be published within three months of the consultation closing on <https://www.gov.uk/dft#consultations>. Paper copies will be available on request.

If you have questions about this consultation please contact:

Name: Robert Leiper

Address: North and Devolution Division, Department for Transport, 3rd Floor, Great Minster House, 33 Horseferry Rd, London SW1P 4DR

Phone Number: 0300 330 3000

Email address: KRNconsultation@dft.gov.uk

Annex A: Full list of consultation questions

Question 1

Should, in your view, mayors hold highway authority powers for managing KRNs? Please explain why.

Question 2

Which, if any, functions or powers do you think should be transferred to mayors, including those listed in Table 1? Please include any powers you think are missing.

Question 3

With reference to the functions listed in Table 1, to what extent, do you think, transferring these functions will allow for effective management of the KRN? Please explain why.

Question 4

Please explain what impact these changes could have for congestion, air quality, bus priority and cycling/walking infrastructure on the KRN.

Question 5

Should, in your view, mayors solely hold any highway powers over the KRN?

Question 6

If powers are held concurrently, should the exercise of those powers be subject to the majority agreement of constituent authorities or the unanimous agreement of constituent authorities? Please explain why you think powers should be distributed in this way.

Question 7

Which, if any, highway powers should mayors hold for all roads in the city region? Please list the powers that should be transferred and the reasons why you think mayors should hold these.

Question 8

Which, if any, highway powers do you think should MCAs be able to delegate to LAs? Please explain the benefits and risks of doing so

Question 9

Should, in your view, mayors have a power of direction on the KRN, or in certain circumstances on other roads? In your response please indicate:

- in what circumstances such a power could be used, and
- the benefits and risks of doing so.

Question 10

Should, in your view, mayors and LAs be able to request from the Secretary of State for Transport that a route is added or removed from the KRN? Please explain the benefits and risks of doing so.

Question 11

What would the impacts of the above proposals be on affected organisations and road users? Please consider the costs, benefits, capabilities, staffing capacity and skill requirements of the organisation in your response.

Question 12

What are the main issues with the way KRNs currently operate in your area?

Question 13

What other actions beyond our proposals, if any, do you think are required to overcome Consultation principles

The consultation is being conducted in line with the Government's key consultation principles which are listed below. Further information is available at
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/consultation-principles-guidance>

If you have any comments about the consultation process please contact:

Consultation Co-ordinator
Department for Transport
Zone 1/29 Great Minster House
London SW1P 4DR
Email consultation@dft.gsi.gov.uk