

4. Developing the Strategy

How the Strategy was developed

- Setting the scene.
- Vision, objectives, problems and opportunities.
- Other plans, policies, programmes and partnerships.
- Corporate priorities and local initiatives.
- Future joint working.
- Working with local partners.
- Development of options.
- Evidence and analysis.
- Strategic Environmental Assessment.
- The approach.

4.1 How the Plan was Developed

- 4.1.1 Chapter 1 set the scene and the context for the JLTP. The characteristics and some of the problems of the JLTP area were highlighted as well as the Government's four Shared Priorities for transport. Figure 1.3 demonstrated the wide range of plans and programmes linked to the JLTP including regional planning issues and the GBSTS.
- 4.1.2 Chapter 2 took the visions and objectives of these other plans and programmes and used them to help shape the direction of the JLTP. Through linking their common themes of sustainability, integration, tackling congestion, promoting alternatives to the car, accessibility, reducing accidents, the environment and the economy, a vision and objectives for the JLTP were put forward. Focused around the four Shared Priorities of congestion, accessibility, road safety and air quality, as well as an overall aim to improve the quality of life, they give a clear sense of direction and purpose to the plan.
- 4.1.3 Chapter 3 took the four Shared Priorities to graphically illustrate the sheer scale of the problems facing the JLTP area

including the demands that will arise from economic growth and the sustainable communities agenda. The Chapter also highlighted the issue of asset management and the need for higher standards of maintenance. It is not all problems though and, as Chapter 3 points out, there are considerable opportunities for change. It is, then, these opportunities that the JLTP aims to seize through the ambitious and challenging range of Action Plans in the following chapters on congestion, accessibility, road safety, air quality and asset management.

4.1.4 These in turn have been shaped by a wide range of other influences including:

- Impact of other Plans, Policies, Programmes and Partnerships;
- Core priorities and local initiatives;
- Future joint working;
- Working with local partners and outcomes of public and stakeholder consultation;
- Development and analysis of different options; and
- Strategic Environmental Assessment.

4.1.5 The distributional impact of schemes, for example the way the costs and benefits affect people and places differently, has also shaped the plan. We recognise that the impact will vary according to age, gender, ethnic group, health, skill and location.

4.1.6 It is suggested in the Treasury Green Book that distributional issues are largely correlated to income. As outlined in Chapter 3, deprivation is significant in a number of locations in our area, for example where there are concentrations of low income residents or where incidences of people with long term illness are high. There are also pockets of deprivation in rural areas. Where appropriate, actions will be focused on these areas, for example road safety where a link can be demonstrated between deprived areas and above average casualty rates (go to Chapter 7).

4.2 Other Plans, Policies, Programmes and Partnerships

4.2.1 Across the South West Region there is a comprehensive range of other plans, policies, programmes and partnerships to take into account. The JLTP will make a vital contribution towards delivering the positive outcomes set out in these strategies (go to in Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 - How the JLTP will Contribute to other Plans, Policies, Programmes and Partnerships

Plan, Policy, Programme, Partnership	JLTP Contribution	Links to Chapters
Integrated Regional Strategy	Translating integrated working into local context; taking account not just of transport but other quality of life issues.	5 - 10
Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)	Transport infrastructure to support growth in Strategically Important Cities and Towns of Bristol, Bath and Weston-super-Mare.	5, 6, 10, 11
Regional Transport Strategy (part of Regional Spatial Strategy)	Investment in transport systems in Strategically Important Cities and Towns. Measures to increase social inclusion. Working with partners to improve inter-regional connectivity. Reducing the need to travel, sustainable travel choices, rural accessibility and demand management all key parts of JLTP (go to Box 1B).	5 – 10
West of England Partnership and the Sub-Regional Spatial Strategy / Joint Structure Plan	Shared Transport Vision, development proposals and for period to 2011 need for sustainable modes as realistic first choice. Range of transport measures and schemes to support spatial planning in line with RSS policy SR10.	5 - 11
Sustainable Communities Plan	Contribution to the delivery of the Sustainable Communities Plan (go to section 3.8).	5, 6, 10, 11
South West Regional Environmental Strategy 2004 - 2014	Transport measures and schemes to recognise JLTP area's high quality environment.	5, 6, 8, 10, 11
South West Economic Strategy	Transport infrastructure to support business needs, tackle congestion, improve conditions for long distance rail and road travel and assist with regeneration of disadvantaged areas.	5, 6, 10, 11
South West Regional Housing Strategy and Delivery Plan	Working with land use planners and developers to manage the demand for car travel and to promote safe, sustainable transport in housing developments. Contributing to the Sustainable Communities Plan (see above)	5, 6, 7, 10, 11

4. Developing the Strategy

Plan, Policy, Programme, Partnership	JLTP Contribution	Links to Chapters
'Towards 2015'- Regional Tourism Board for South West of England	Assisting destination management focused on Greater Bristol, Bath and Weston-super-Mare.	5, 6, 9 10, 11
Local plans and emerging local development frameworks for the four Councils	Development proposals linked to new and improved transport infrastructure and services. Parking standards to promote sustainable transport. Range of transport measures and schemes to support spatial planning in line with policies in Chapter 4 of RSS.	5, 6, 7, 8, 10
Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study	Recommendations evaluated and where appropriate incorporated into JLTP.	5 - 11
Bristol/Bath to South Coast Study for the A36/A46 corridor local to Bath	Bath Package Major Scheme Bid.	10
Port of Bristol and Bristol International Airport (2003 White Paper 'The Future of Air Transport')	Transport services and new infrastructure required to support expansion plans. Working with the airport operators on the emerging master plan and surface access strategy.	5, 6, 10, 11
2004 White Paper 'The Future of Rail' and the Great Western Mainline route utilisation strategy 2005	National rail strategy set by Government. Partnership working with new Greater Western franchisee	5, 6, 11
Community strategies	Quality of life issues and transport aspirations from the four Local Strategic Partnerships. Major accessibility, road safety and air quality concerns to be addressed.	5 - 11
Local Area Agreements	Delivering local accessibility, road safety, sustainable transport, healthy communities and economic development objectives.	5 – 8, 10, 11

4.3 Corporate Priorities and Local Initiatives

4.3.1 In preparing the JLTP each of the four Councils have secured the involvement and commitment across all their corporate sectors and functions. Use has been made of cross-cutting officer groups to provide the corporate dimension to the JLTP. Each of the four Councils has its own set of corporate priorities, a vision for its area. Ensuring the JLTP can help realise these visions is key not only to the success of the corporate priorities but also the wider role the JLTP plays. Transport facilitates better public services and hence improves life chances. Incorporating these corporate priorities, as Table 4.2 illustrates, places the Plan firmly in the wider context.



High Quality Streetscape: Thornbury Cross

Final Joint Local Transport Plan 2006/07 - 2010/11

Table 4.2 - Corporate Priorities linked to JLTP

Corporate Priority	JLTP Contribution	Targets met
Well-being/Communities - address challenges faced by new and growing communities; needs of older people; local housing.	Shared priority focus on accessibility, helping people get around and access to key services and facilities.	LTP1a, LTP1b
Health - improve the health of people and reduce inequalities in health.	Targeting promotion towards individuals, schools and businesses, supported by enhancements to the local environment, to encourage more physical activity.	LTP1a, LTP4
Environment - take responsibility for our environment and natural resources.	Major emphasis on promoting alternatives to the car, influencing travel behaviour, demand management. Air Quality Management Areas and Action Plans	LTP2, LTP3, LTP4, LTP5, LTP6, LTP7, LTP8 Local 1, 2 and 3
Safer communities - reduce crime and the fear of crime, reduce violence, and improve road safety.	Improving the quality of life through better design and maintenance of public spaces, crossings and footways. Shared priority focus on road safety and child accidents.	BVPI 99x, BVPI 99y, BVPI 99z, BVPI 187
Education - improve life chances and ensure all children and young people are given encouragement and opportunities to learn.	Shared priority focus on accessibility to education. Incorporating travel awareness, environmental impact and road safety into the curriculum.	LTP1a, LTP4, BVPI 99y
Increasing prosperity/regeneration - increase local job opportunities and share the benefits of prosperity across the whole of the JLTP area.	Shared priority focus on accessibility and congestion improving transport opportunities for, and attractiveness of, regeneration areas.	LTP1b, LTP7
Continuous improvement - achieve more with the same resources.	Shared priority focus ensures maximum impact for those living, working and visiting the area. Development of joint working and delivery mechanisms will achieve further efficiency savings and improved value for money.	LTP1, LTP7, BVPI 223, BVPI 224a, BVPI 224b, BVPI 187

4. Developing the Strategy

- 4.3.2 Prior to the start of the JLTP process the four Councils were already engaged on work to improve their Local Transport Plans. Bristol City Council's Integrated Transport Best Value Review is one example. Through a comprehensive round of conferences and workshops with interested bodies and organisations, ways to enhance scheme delivery were identified. This experience has proved invaluable in drawing up an effective implementation programme for the Final JLTP.
- 4.3.3 South Gloucestershire Council has undertaken a Fundamental Service Review on Congestion. Extensive research over an 18 month period produced a 'Framework for Dealing with Tackling Congestion'. In effect this is a toolkit, a set of measures to choose from, depending on the congestion problem. The entire Framework has been built into Chapter 5 Tackling Congestion.
- 4.3.4 North Somerset Council's transport service was recently inspected by the Audit Commission. The service was judged as "Fair" with "Promising prospects for improvement" and the Council has since developed an improvement plan. This identifies opportunities to improve engagement with stakeholders, consider more effective approaches to procurement and develop a more effective road safety plan. These opportunities have also fed into the JLTP and assisted in the development of the future joint working arrangements.
- 4.3.5 This drive for continued improvements is based on already proven track records in project management and delivery. We have coordinated complex multi-million pound European Commission funded projects that are subject to detailed scrutiny in project and financial management. Progress made by South Gloucestershire has been recognised through its award as Centre of Excellence for scheme delivery. This wide-ranging expertise will be drawn upon. This will be

important not only to deliver the basic integrated transport programme, and any enhancements allowed by extra funding, but also the proposed major schemes.

4.4 Future Joint Working

- 4.4.1 Investment is required in a broad range of areas including bus, rail, park and ride, rapid transit and also roads. All are critical to support economic development as well as tackling the impacts of large volumes of traffic on particular communities.
- 4.4.2 A package of major schemes is being developed. This has been shaped by the outcomes of the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study, Regional Funding Allocation and consultation on the Final JLTP (go to section 4.5). Achieving the Plan's overall objectives and vision requires the whole range of major schemes to be delivered.
- 4.4.3 We recognise the task of successfully delivering major schemes should not be underestimated. The Greater Bristol Bus Network bid submitted in July 2005 has allowed us to develop joint delivery arrangements that will ensure our ability to secure and deliver other major schemes in the future. This is essential if our future highway and public transport infrastructure aspirations are to be met (go also to section 11.1).
- 4.4.4 The overall long-term approach to transport is aimed at providing an integrated solution that links transport with other social, environmental and economic outcomes and aspirations.
- 4.4.5 Our proposals also have a regional significance. By securing sufficient measures at the JLTP sub-regional level we can relieve demand and capacity problems on the strategic transport network, fulfilling its function linking the South West and South Wales with the rest of the UK. We can also contribute to delivering the Regional Transport Strategy and support the Regional Spatial Strategy.

4.5 Working with Partners

4.5.1 We have placed great emphasis on working with local partners in the development of the JLTP strategy. Consultation with partners began in Summer 2004 and continued right up to the completion of the plan (go to Box 4A). Results from events and consultation in Spring and Winter 2005 have been incorporated into the Final Plan.

4.5.2 There were five main elements to each of the public consultations held in Spring and Winter 2005. These included:

- Questionnaire via consultation document and website;
- Detailed responses from organisations;

- Detailed comments from individuals via questionnaire, letters and feedback forms;
- Joint Transport Forum and stakeholder workshops; and
- Workshop/briefing sessions with Parish Councillors.

4.5.3 In addition there has been a wide range of focused consultation with organisations and key stakeholders. These include Joint Scrutiny Committee, Transport Plan Commission, Highways Agency, public transport operators and neighbouring authorities.

Box 4A – Consultation and Engagement with Partners

JLTP Consultation Leaflets

The leaflets produced in Spring and Winter 2005 provided an easy-to-read but comprehensive overview of ideas and proposals with a freepost questionnaire seeking further views. They were made available through Council offices, libraries, local interest groups and businesses. Over 60,000 leaflets were distributed and the document and questionnaire made available on the website (www.greaterbristoltransportplan.org). To date the website has received over 50,000 hits. It allowed people to complete the consultation response forms electronically and a number of people chose to engage in this way.

Member and Parish Councillor seminars/ briefing

A wider audience of Councillors was kept informed through a combination of briefings and seminars agreed by the Executive Members and information sheets produced by the JLTP Team.

Joint Scrutiny

A Joint Scrutiny Committee made up of elected Members from the four Councils was established. It has monitored and assessed the development of JLTP strategy and made recommendations, with a particular focus on the sub-regional context and strategic issues.

Transport Plan Commission

This small focused grouping has representatives of key sectors including business, education, regeneration, sustainability, health and rural interests. The Provisional JLTP and the findings of the public consultation were considered by the Commission. They also raised areas of concern for further consideration. For example, the Councils commissioned an independent CO₂ assessment of the proposals following a recommendation made by the Commission.

Joint Transport Forum

Supplementing the local forums of the four Councils, a Joint Transport Forum was held on 14 March 2005 focusing on the four Shared Priorities. A successful second forum was held on 30 November 2005. It considered potential major schemes, funding priorities and the Accessibility Strategy.

4. Developing the Strategy

Stakeholder consultation

Consultation with key stakeholders has gone hand-in-hand with parallel consultation on the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study and the Regional Spatial Strategy, giving a unique opportunity to take an integrated approach to strategic spatial planning and transport policy formulation.

JLTP focus groups

Focus groups were held with a representative cross-section of the local population. Key transport issues and themes were discussed and explored.

Joint media strategy

Prepared by the four Councils' press officers. Media coverage is vital to ensure maximum exposure of the JLTP. Press enquiries and media briefings will continue to play an important role in raising the profile of the JLTP beyond its submission in March 2006. The emphasis will shift toward delivery of the strategy rather than preparation of the plan itself.

Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs)

Consultation and briefings were held with all four LSP lead officers, followed by consultation meetings with all four LSPs. Ongoing dialogue continues on common priorities for promoting economic, environmental and social well-being (Go to Box 1F).

Cross boundary transport planning with neighbouring authorities

Regular meetings and ongoing discussions are taking place over cross- border issues with Somerset, Gloucestershire, Wiltshire and Monmouthshire.

Provisional JLTP – July 2005

The Provisional JLTP was circulated widely for comment. Summaries of the document have also been circulated. Comments made on the document have been considered and have helped inform the preparation of the Final JLTP.

4.6 Development of Options

- 4.6.1 The scale of the problems facing the JLTP area in terms of congestion, development pressures, air quality, road safety and accessibility, requires urgent action. As part of the consultation process for the development of the Provisional JLTP three options were developed based on different levels of funding (go to Box 4B).
- 4.6.2 Option A continues as we are, based on DfT financial planning guidelines. Option B takes a step forward with two bus-based Major Scheme bids. Option C proposes a radical move towards congestion charging to fund major improvements. Public opinion was sought on the three options.



Portway park and ride

Box 4B - Funding Options

Option A – £12 million per year

This assumes that the JLTP receives the annual allocations from the Government but no additional funding from local or national sources.

This option would enable a start to be made on tackling problems but would be insufficient to address the aspirations and needs of the JLTP area.

Option B – £25-35 million per year

One of the key advantages of a JLTP is that through working together, we have a far stronger voice in seeking additional funding from the Government and negotiating for increased investment from the private sector.

This option assumes a JLTP partnership with the main bus operator First to secure significant improvements through two 'major scheme' bids to the Government. These are to improve bus infrastructure through the delivery of "showcase" bus routes.

With increased funding, additional investment in road safety, walking, cycling and improving air quality can take place but would still not be sufficient to meet the growing transport needs of the area.

Option C – £60-100 million per year

Higher levels of funding could be accessed through the Government's new Transport Innovation Fund. The Government, however, has indicated that this will only be available to those who consider managing the demand for travel through things like 'congestion charging' (as in London) or other innovative measures.

Under this option there would be large improvements to public transport, walking and cycling including introducing high quality kerb-guided bus routes, improved local rail services, new bus services, new park and ride sites and significant funding for developing safer walking and cycling routes and possible road schemes.

The scale of problems in the JLTP area means that serious consideration must be given to this option.

4.6.3 Options A, B and C are for capital expenditure. This leaves open the question of the revenue funding required. Tackling accessibility, for example, is likely to be revenue intensive, supporting new, expanded and innovative public transport services. Expanding concessionary travel will also require more revenue support. Revenue expenditure, and new ways to fund it, will have to be identified and built into all three options. The scale of this task and the financial commitment involved should not be underestimated.

4.6.4 As outlined in section 4.5, extensive consultation was undertaken during 2005 with views expressed on the options via written submissions, stakeholder forums, public exhibitions, the website and the consultation questionnaire.

4.6.5 It has been clear from the responses that Option A is not considered as a viable option for the JLTP. At the same time Option B and Option C have both received strong support in written responses and in the questionnaire.

4. Developing the Strategy

- 4.6.6 Of the 1553 questionnaires returned during the Spring 2005 consultation period, Options B and C were “strongly supported” or “supported” by 54% and 62% respectively. Option A received only 24% for the two categories combined (go to Figure 4.1).
- 4.6.7 In contrast 41% were against Option A whilst only 15% were against Options B or C (go to Figure 4.2).
- 4.6.8 On the basis of these responses we have dropped Option A and have progressed with the two initial Major Scheme bids as set out in Option B. Given the views expressed on Option C, we have continued to consult on this option and have since been successful with a Transport Innovation Fund bid (go to Chapter 5).
- 4.6.9 In terms of priorities for JLTP expenditure the questionnaires showed a clear view that bus-based solutions are preferred in the short term (Figure 4.3). Rail also received strong support and this was clearly represented in written and verbal responses from the public and stakeholders. Walking and cycling also received strong support from the respondents. This has been reflected in the JLTP implementation programme (go to Chapter 11) where these measures are prioritised for funding.
- 4.6.10 In taking forward Options B and C, further consultation was held in Winter 2005. Given the support shown for the first two major schemes in Option B it was decided

to seek views on further potential major schemes to develop in the next five years. These could be taken forward independently or in the context of demand management as proposed under Option C.

- 4.6.11 In July 2005 the DfT announced details of the new Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) with funding starting at £290m in 2008/9 rising to over £2.5bn by 2014/15. In response to the March consultation results we submitted a bid for development funding from the TIF Pump Priming Fund. In November 2005 we were awarded £1.5m by the DfT to assist with investigative works (go to Chapter 5).
- 4.6.12 The consultation in November sought views from Councillors, Parish Councillors, stakeholders, members of the public and other interested parties on which possible future Major Scheme Bids should be investigated further.
- 4.6.13 The results of the November workshops, Joint Transport Forum, exhibitions and the questionnaire show considerable support for a ‘second generation’ public transport major scheme bid.
- 4.6.14 It is also recognised that if we receive additional ‘performance’ funding from Government we would possibly need to stretch some of our targets and prioritise where this money should be spent. Views were sought on these issues in Winter 2005.

Figure 4.1: Support for Funding Options




Figure 4.2: Views Against Funding Options





Figure 4.3 - Priorities for Joint Local Transport Plan Expenditure



4.6.15 The November consultation showed there was strong support for spending additional funding on improving buses, trains and taxis. Any extra funding awarded to the area should be focused on stretching these targets (go to 11.3 Enhanced Integrated Transport Programme).

4.6.16 The workshops and questionnaires also sought possible solutions to a number of accessibility planning scenarios based around emerging Action Plans (go to Chapter 6 for more information).

4.7 Evidence and Analysis

4.7.1 The preferred long-term strategy set out in the JLTP has evolved over many years. Its roots can be traced back to the Bristol Integrated Transport and Environmental Study (BRITES) of the early 1990's. This study identified that positive investment in alternatives like public transport needed to be coupled with some form of demand management either through parking or road pricing in order to tackle congestion and meet a range of

accessibility, environmental (including air quality) and safety-related objectives.

4.7.2 Various options were tested that brought together different public transport investment and demand management options. For the long term some form of rapid transit with road pricing was the most effective package but options that looked at investment in bus corridors coupled with parking measures also performed positively. Other restraint measures like a physical cordon did not perform well and have not featured in strategies since then, including the JLTP. Investment in walking and cycling, park and ride and rail was also identified as critical to ensure that a broad range of alternatives was available to the car. Critically, it was shown that these alternatives needed to be developed prior to introduction of more challenging demand management options like road pricing.

4.7.3 BRITES was updated throughout the 1990's and the first round of Local Transport Plans were very much based on

4. Developing the Strategy

its conclusions. Improvements to the bus, rail and walking and cycling networks are now being delivered and all are showing encouraging signs of growth.

- 4.7.4 However, it was recognised in 2002/ 2003 that a new strategic assessment of the transport in this area was needed as a range of new issues had emerged since the BRITES work of the early 1990's. For example significant housing and employment growth has occurred in the Bristol North Fringe and Bristol International Airport has expanded rapidly. The Government Office for the South West therefore commissioned the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study in late 2003 with funding from the four Councils, the Highways Agency and the Regional Development Agency.
- 4.7.5 Interestingly, the draft recommendations from GBSTS (December 2005) have shown similar results to the BRITES work of the early 1990s in that the most effective strategies are the ones that effectively combine investment in public transport with some form of demand management. GBSTS has demonstrated that comprehensive investment in showcase bus corridors performs strongly. The JLTP therefore prioritises investment in showcase bus corridors and this is also supported by experience gained in the first LTPs where growth on showcase corridors has been strong. These results also supported the early submission of the Greater Bristol Bus Network Major Scheme bid with the Provisional JLTP.
- 4.7.6 The GBSTS draft final report, December 2005 sets out the longer term strategy linked to spatial development scenarios. Draft GBSTS recommendations cover the period up to 2031 and provide the context for the longer term strategy for this area.
- 4.7.7 GBSTS shows that if nothing is done between 2003 and 2031 there will be a 21% rise in car trips during the morning peak. At the same time bus levels drop by 14% because of increased congestion on the road network which produces a worsening of bus journey times and hence a reduction in competitiveness.

- 4.7.8 The GBSTS strategy (December 2005) and the JLTP response focuses on 5 main areas:

1) Measures to encourage alternative modes

GBSTS shows that as part of a package of measures 'smarter choices' could deliver up to a 9.7% fall in car trips by 2031. It embraces approaches ranging from workplace and school travel plans, individualised travel marketing, car clubs, home shopping, teleworking and teleconferencing. Many of these measures are seen as critical if short car trips are to be removed from the highway network.

The JLTP embraces this approach with walking, cycling and 'smarter choices' are seen as key ways of reducing the number of journeys made by private car. This forms a key strand of Chapter 5, 'Tackling Congestion'. During the first LTP period we have piloted a number of innovative approaches aimed at winning 'hearts and minds'. The JLTP strategy is to build on successful work, both locally and best practice elsewhere. We will continue to develop effective marketing, communication and information strategies that ensure maximum impact is achieved from investment in 'capital' schemes and that the benefits of such schemes are 'locked in'.

2) Public Transport measures

The recommendations from GBSTS have shown similar results to the BRITES work of the early 1990s. It found that providing additional capacity for public transport or cars does not solve the pressures created by traffic growth. The most effective strategies are the ones that successfully combine investment in public transport with some form of demand management. GBSTS has demonstrated that comprehensive investment in showcase bus corridors

and park and ride performs strongly. The strategy of the JLTP seeks to mirror the GBSTS Final Report.

In the short term the GBSTS recognises the need for immediate investment in showcase bus routes and park and ride. It supports the approach taken with the Greater Bristol Bus Network bid submitted in July 2005 and the public transport focus of the Bath Package.

The GBSTS identifies that conventional bus alone will not be sufficient to provide an attractive alternative to the private car. It promotes the development of a 'second generation' Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system for the JLTP area. This has been incorporated in the JLTP with the first route being developed as part of the Bath Package major scheme bid. In the longer term a network of routes has been suggested and Chapter 10 sets out the timescale and phasing of development of this network. The network will be designed not only to address existing traffic problems but to support regeneration and sustainable development in line with the West of England Partnership's vision.

3) Highway measures

The GBSTS stresses the importance of making best use of existing infrastructure before embarking on extensions to the highway network. This approach is embedded throughout the JLTP, in particular in Chapter 5, Tackling Congestion and Chapter 9, Asset Management.

With the traffic growth predicted by the GBSTS there is, however, a need to develop some additional highway capacity for key parts of the strategic highway network. The GBSTS has identified a number of specific schemes that have a positive appraisal when considered at a strategic level. Investigating the detailed costs and benefits of these and developing them

for submission as major scheme funding bids will require large sums of money and require extensive staff resources. Chapter 10 sets out how further development of these will be undertaken over the period 2006 - 2016. The JLTP approach is consistent with that identified by the GBSTS and provides a framework for longer term investment decisions both locally and regionally.

4) Freight measures

Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) trips are forecast to grow by 55% during peak hours between 2003 and 2031. Within the GBSTS strategy there is a transfer of HGV traffic onto strategic roads from more minor roads due to improvements in the strategic network.

Building on this the GBSTS identifies three main ways of reducing the impact of freight movements:

- Freight consolidation
- Freight routes
- Rail freight

Consolidation centres, route signing and driver information are built into Chapter 5. The JLTP also recognises the need for improved rail freight facilities, particularly at places such as Avonmouth/Sevenside as new development comes on stream,

5) Demand management measures

The GBSTS recognises that, with key guidance awaited from Government about TIF and the lack of clarity about any possible national charging scheme, further work is needed to develop a detailed demand management strategy. Recognising this, the GBSTS identifies a potentially phased approach for demand management covering:

Short /medium term:

- Range of parking measures

4. Developing the Strategy

- Exploration and introduction of localised charging schemes in urban areas

In the long term:

- Continuation of parking measures
- Comprehensive congestion charging, with the system extending across the complete highway network in the study area and perhaps representing part of a national scheme. Such a scheme could potentially replace any existing schemes
- Ultimately to a satellite-based technique

4.7.9 Chapter 5 sets out how we have successfully secured £1.5m Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) development funding. This allows us to investigate and further understand the potential package of demand restraint and public transport improvements that could form a TIF bid. The consultation for this JLTP linked explicitly the need to investigate 'restraint' measures if JLTP objectives are to be realised and significant additional funding secured from Government.

4.8 Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) Process

4.8.1 To assist with its decision-making process on funding decisions for major transport schemes the Government announced in 2005 a new system of Regional Funding Allocations (RFA) prioritisation. This process asks the Regional Assembly to consider all the potential major schemes being considered for the next 10 years. In total 8 major schemes were identified as being strategically important in the period up to 2016 with a further 10 schemes recognised as strategically important but requiring further work. Further details on this process and the schemes identified are included in Chapter 10.

4.9 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

- 4.9.1 The high quality of the environment in the JLTP area is one of the main factors in its attractiveness for inward investment and growth. This applies to both the natural environment, with the Cotswold and Mendips Hills Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the Ramsar rated Severn Estuary and the Avon Gorge to the built environment with its rich Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian heritage.
- 4.9.2 Alongside the preparation of the JLTP a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been carried out. The SEA aims to identify the main environmental effects of JLTP transport policies and plans. Firstly an SEA baseline and scoping report was produced and consulted on by the statutory environmental bodies. This formed the basis of the SEA Environment Report that has been produced separately and consulted on through the JLTP and with the statutory environmental bodies.
- 4.9.3 The SEA environment report takes the three funding Options A, B, C (go to Box 4B) and examines their transport (Table 4.3) and environmental (Table 4.4) impacts. JLTP schemes likely to be implemented in the 5 year period to 2011 are included. Primarily these are for the bus-based major scheme bids, park and ride, cycling and walking schemes and initial steps toward demand management.



Severn Beach Railway alongside River Avon

Table 4.3 - Transport Effects of the Alternative Options

	Option A No Major Schemes	Option B Major Public Transport Package	Option C Initial Demand Management Scheme
Car Mode Share AM Peak	90.1%	89.3%	89.0%
Bus Mode Share AM Peak	6.8%	7.6%	7.8%
Vehicle Kilometres Cars & Light Goods AM Peak	2.237m	2.226m	2.228m
Average Vehicle Speed Cars and Light Goods AM Peak	37.2km/hr	37.5km/hr	37.4km/hr

4.9.4 Options A, B and C were chosen to show what can be achieved with different funding levels. Alternative strategy options were rejected on the grounds of funding, deliverability, cost effectiveness and not contributing enough to the Shared Priorities.

4.9.5 As Table 4.3 shows the major public transport package in Option B, with 10 bus showcase corridors, is forecast to increase bus mode share and reduce the car mode share. Car km travelled fall as a result. Option C with an initial demand management scheme continues these trends

4.9.6 Table 4.4 shows the impact of Option B on most environmental measures is considered likely to be positive. On Option C this is more so still. In many cases the amount of change over the Local Transport Plan period is likely to be small. Table 4.4 compares the environmental effects of the three options in 2011 with the expected change without any interventions.

4.9.7 On air quality, the worst conditions in the JLTP area are to be found in inner Bristol and Bath. These are the areas on which most of the showcase routes converge, and which are therefore likely to feel the most benefit in terms of air quality from Options B and C. For traffic congestion it

appears unlikely that any significant reduction in congestion can be achieved through interventions without the public transport package in Option B. Overall Option C is considered the most beneficial of the three tested in environmental terms followed by Option B.

4.9.8 The Environmental Impact Assessments for the Greater Bristol Bus Network major scheme bid identifies 30 locations where bus priority carriageway widening is required. Most of these are relatively short. Some will have effects on rural and urban landscapes, the settings of buildings, trees, hedges, walls, verges, adjacent pedestrian routes, severance and archaeology. Remedial actions are proposed in all cases.

4.9.9 In five locations some impact is expected on sites protected for wildlife. Detailed consideration will need to be made for all these sites. The bid also involves new bus shelters with lighting at many bus stops. This will have slight effects in increasing light pollution.

4.10 The Approach

4.10.1 Starting with the work in Chapters 1, 2 and 3, backed up by and linked to other plans and core priorities, and building upon work with local partners, and the development of options, the JLTP starts to emerge (go to Box 4C).

4. Developing the Strategy

Table 4.4 - Expected Effect of Alternative Strategies on Environmental Indicators

Effect	Indicator	Expected Change				Reference in JLTP
		Without Intervention	With Option A	With Option B	With Option C	
Air quality; dirt	NO ₂ , Benzene Particulates	◆	●	★★	★★	Chapter 8
Noise, vibration	roadside noise	◆	●	★	★	Section 8.8 and paragraphs 3.5.11 – 12
Road accidents	killed / seriously injured; slight	◆	★	★	★★	Chapter 7
Physical fitness	% walking + cycling	◆	★	★	★★	Paragraphs 3.7.2 – 5
Community severance	no current indicator	◆	◆	●	◆	Paragraph 3.7.17
Accessibility	% of households with access to facility	●	★	★	★	Chapter 6
Traffic congestion	Delay minutes per person daily	◆	●	★	★	Chapter 5

Key:

●	little change expected	★	some improvement expected
◆	some worsening expected	★★	significant improvement expected
◆◆	significant worsening expected		

4.10.2 The linkages between the four Shared Priorities (go to Table 3.1) mean there is considerable overlap and some repetition between them. If we tackle congestion, for example, we go a long way towards improving air quality. In the following chapters it is necessary, even at the risk of repetition, to bring out these linkages to demonstrate how the JLTP fits together.

4.10.3 As described in Section 2.3, delivering our transport vision for the JLTP area requires significant effort and investment to address past problems and cater for

future needs. Within the provisional financial planning guideline the emphasis has to be on making better use of existing infrastructure. The two major schemes also have this objective. In terms of future major schemes, given the time it takes to prepare and build major road and rail schemes, these will generally not be completed until after 2011. Preparatory work, however, could start over the period 2006 - 2011, which is why long-term issues need to be considered now.

Box 4C

The Strategy

The specific interventions will be refined with inputs from GBSTS and the Regional Spatial Strategy. Asset management and value for money are key elements underpinning the strategy.

