

User ID	Doc Ref	Key Issues Raised	Where this issue has been raised in JLTP3
0127	E500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Many of the statements in the plan show a lack of regard for the significant majority of people living in the West of England who currently and for the major part of the scope of the plan use and will continue to use the car as their prime mode of transport. •Cars are and will continue to be considerably more convenient particularly in rural areas •Why must the car not be the first choice for distances beyond ½ mile or in hilly terrain it is the obvious first choice •Cars are considerably more efficient and cleaner than previous and will by hybrid or other new technologies become VERY clean and therefore should not demonised as wrong •Where is the <i>[supplementary]</i> document on cars and the work being done to improve the flow of traffic •any attempt to limit their <i>[car]</i> use will penalise residents in the area particularly the older and infirmed who make up a significant percentage of this area 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. However the importance of car travel is not ignored and the JLTP3 includes a range of measures to improve the operational efficiency of the highway network and to plan for its ongoing maintenance. Councils work with the rail industry to improve train travel but have little direct influence on the cost of rail fares. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. The JLTP3 aims to improve air quality by better management of the highway network, encouraging alternatives to the car, encouraging use of lower emission vehicles and promoting 'eco driving' training. Incorporating the needs of people with mobility problems is a theme which runs throughout the JLTP3 with needs considered at all levels.</p>
0785	E501	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The key pedestrian destinations would appear to be school, work and shops so pedestrians should feel that walking to work, shops or school is a pleasant experience in order for them to re-discover how convenient it is •the environment for pedestrians continues to worsen though blocked pavements, dangerous pedestrian crossings and competition with cyclists for pavement space •In Bristol the council are actively worsening the walking environment by: encouraging pavement parking through increasing numbers of very wide pavement areas with dropped curbs failing to police the blocking of pavements with bins and rubbish or commercial signs placing street furniture such as new signs and bins in staggered patterns blocking narrow pavements encouraging cyclists onto pavement areas with no control failing to use cameras to ensure it is safe to cross traffic light junctions and stop drivers jumping red lights 	<p>Walking is recognised as a healthy, low cost, non-polluting, low carbon mode of travel and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car.</p>
1031	E511	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't understand why the documentation talks about putting in new bus lay bys when recently the A4 has seen the removal of bus lay bys and moving bus stops so they stick out into the road, where they used to be out of the way •The buses now have to stop at the edge of the road causing other transport to wait until it's clear for the vehicle to pull out. If you want buses to run more smoothly let the drivers have a chance to pass them (that included other buses) so they can get to the bus lanes with greater ease • why is First the only bus service that will benefit from the changes, they have a strangle hold on the city, charge too much and have poor reliability 	<p>Bus lanes, where appropriate, increase the reliability of services and reduce journey times for commuters. An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. Through partnership working with the operators and subject to funding the councils are seeking to increase bus patronage and improve the viability of services so that the level of fares does not deter existing and new public transport users.</p>

0562	E502	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The questionnaire does not have a free text area to add additional comments. •The coach service being considered to Bristol Airport just provides links to the railway for ongoing passengers. No consideration is given to providing say a mini bus service to support the local surrounding population. We would much prefer to avoid the high parking charges at the airport. •Charges at Park and Ride should be per car not per passenger. For two or more it is cheaper to drive and park in Bristol to shop. For a family of four it is not cost effective. This would also encourage car sharing to the park and ride. •Car parking at local stations should be free. •Rail ticket prices always increase at an above inflation rate. •The experience of local rail travel is not always pleasant. A survey of train passenger loading, timetable needs of passengers and comforts (protection from the elements - wind and rain) be undertaken. •Park and Ride during major events in Bristol such as those around the harbour often stop too early. •There should be policy to install electric charging stations for electric cars at petrol stations, major shopping areas and business areas. Otherwise the range of an electric car is too limiting. 	<p>The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. An expanded role is foreseen for bus and rail services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of bus services to meet needs over the next 15 years, and enhance rail passenger and freight services. Councils aim to encourage the use of Park and Ride and balance the price of fares with the wider costs of congestion and pollution caused by parking in the city centre. The JLTP3 supports the provision and management of parking as part of an integrated transport system through enforcement to help traffic flow, managing demand and promoting sustainable modes. Councils work with the rail industry to improve train travel but have little direct influence on the cost of rail fares. The JLTP3 proposes to work with others, subject to funding, to provide charging stations for electric vehicles. The JLTP3 supports widening the choice of long distance coach routes, use of bus priorities and improved parking.</p>
0558	E503	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showcase bus routes - there are no extra services. Indeed the frequency of services at off-peak times and weekends has been reduced. If services are inadequate at less popular times of day, people will find other means of transport. • Real-time information - a fine idea, but it must be what it says and reliable; and the public bodies whose business is to promote public transport should take in interest in this. • Supported bus services - When considering which routes to support financially, or to encourage bus operators to provide, it is pointless to concentrate only on existing services; and factors such as topography and clusters of both housing and places of employment should included. 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas.</p>
0786	E504	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •there is far too little provision of rail transport, reflected in the current staggeringly low figure of 1.5% rail commuting to work •there is no strategic road plan, with result that a) Bristol has no inner or outer ring road b) there is no rapid driving route from N Somerset or Bristol to Bathc) far too much freight traffic is forced to travel on local roads in Bristol •there is no integration of public transport, particularly between rail and bus •bus service is slow, expensive and unreliable •aim to emulate the transport provision of the Tyne-Wear conurbation •inadequate provision of community transport for Older People in Bristol •virtually no mention of <i>[cycle-train-cycle]</i> commuting in your document, though demand and use is growing and should be encouraged 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for bus and rail services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic including lorries. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the bus operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years, and with the rail industry to enhance passenger and freight services. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. The JLTP3 sees an expanded role for both rail and bus services in the next 15 years and further integration between them and walking and cycling.</p>

0359	E505	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •include something to address difficulty of using scooters etc, particularly in giving mobility to the young •include a higher than present requirement for non motorised transport provision in new developments •ensure that horse riding is included in the document •design walking and cycling into all development <i>[and]</i> enable development of home zones •Now that the RSS has gone, where is this new development in JLTP? •The significance of walking to tourism and quality of life •Public transport should be seen as linking towns to countryside, as well as linking rural dwellers to the towns •lower cost options should be considered, best value not just best practice. Example of this was Sustrans' DIY streets compared to traditional engineered Home Zones •What is plan B? (if not as much finance) •What can we do to help you get a major transport scheme for walking and cycling? Who would work on it? 	<p>The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. Walking is recognised as a healthy, low cost, non-polluting, low carbon mode of travel and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. Councils work with the rail industry to improve train travel but have little direct influence on the cost of rail fares.</p>
0786	E506	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is a lack of creative, ambitious thinking in the present strategy •The aim should be to shift large numbers of people from road to rail, and the bus/tram strategy will fail to do this because it cannot ultimately escape the congestion of road space in the city centre of Bristol •In Tyneside the authorities took a decaying local rail network and with some capital investment transformed it and the quality of service and movement/ accessibility in the sub-region there, along with improved interchange at stations with the road system, on which greatly increased rail ridership had freed space. I see no sign of this thinking for Bristol. Every existing rail line should be considered for upgrading and improved interchange •increase commuting by boat from Hotwells & Ashton Gate to the Centre and as far as Barton Hill, Netham/ St Annes. Large numbers of people commute by water in Bangkok •in Bangkok the Skytrain system was built although it involved in sections building above the centre of main roads; I suspect that that would be the only real solution to the transport mess that is Bristol Centre •improvements and sections of new link would massively improve cheap movement, integration and reduce car congestion and pollution. Why no real radical thinking like this in the WoE Strategy? 	<p>The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. The role of ferries in serving both commuter and tourist travel will be strengthened in the final JLTP3.</p>

1011	E507	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Smarter Travel Choices (STC) 'Soft' packages of sustainable travel initiatives as recently trialled in the DfT Sustainable Travel Towns pilots have proved successful in cutting car trips and increasing the use of sustainable modes: walking, cycling, public transport and car sharing •funding for many transport projects, particularly large capital projects will be in very short supply for the foreseeable future •it clearly makes sense to prioritise initiatives that will make better use of existing infrastructure and cut traffic. Smarter Travel Choices initiatives will do this at limited cost •also help deliver other local priority objectives like health, access to services and cutting carbon emissions •we are campaigning for the DfT to introduce as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review process, a specific, revenue and capital 'Challenge Fund' that local authorities can bid for funding to support STC schemes. If you require further information on this campaign or feel you could help in any way please do let us know 	<p>The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 encourages car sharing as a way of reducing peak period traffic and associated congestion and carbon emissions. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car.</p>
0342	E508	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •the cycle path from Bonnington Walk in Lockleaze through to the MoD and Hewlett Packard sites is in a very bad state •we at Hewlett Packard that cycle in using the above mentioned cycle path, have been waiting for the promised connection between the MoD and the Redrow building development, which will reduce our journey time into work •All of these problems (and more!) put many people off cycling and encourages them to keep using their cars 	<p>The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 recognises the importance of managing our transport assets within the available budgets. Cycling is promoted as a healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car.</p>
1013	E510	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •My daughter, age 20 has a disability affecting her mobility. She can access public transport with help but needs to use community transport to get door to door •she is not allowed to use Bristol Dial a Ride as we are not Bristol council tax payers [<i>she works in Bedminster</i>] •Similarly, if she wants to get to Bath we can only use Mendip Ring and Ride which will take her to the park and ride at Odd Down in Bath and then she has to use the park and ride into the centre of Bath 	<p>We (B&NES Council / West of England) do encourage groups to co-ordinate their services and work across boundaries where possible.</p>
0298	L705	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Farmborough Good Neighbours (FGN) is a well used service in the village providing about 150 free lifts a year to various doctors and dentists surgeries as well as taking villagers to a variety of hospitals •they need new and probably younger volunteers who can help out the current group 	<p>We (B&NES Council / West of England) note that there are community initiatives in specific areas. We welcome them in principle, we encourage them to follow best practice and we are happy to make their contact details available on our (B&NES Council) website. B&NES Council is aware of Farmborough Good Neighbours and their contact number is listed on the Community Transport pages of the B&NES Council website.</p>

1012	E509	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • funding should be spent on promoting and attracting new business into Bristol • I cycle to work practically every day and have no issues excepting where there is a rapid bus route this does cause me grief so I avoid it and use a parallel route that although busy with cars and lorries has more space and no buses and road users more tolerant!! • The car industry is changing and cars are becoming less pollutant so I think that this will take care of emissions in the long term. I think that this is the area that pressure should be directed and not on the individual car owner by local councils • There are a number of areas where better management (don't assume it's all down to the car driver) could help the city reduce its carbon footprint [<i>switch off building lights at night, solar heating panel grants, all new buildings should be sustainable with solar panels, rain water collection and wind turbine, remove/switch off traffic lights</i>] • better planning and use of land • re-evaluate rapid bus routes to ensure other vehicles aren't held up behind a waiting bus causing more pollution • Scandinavian road layouts (shared space) • better use and access of the river and harbour (e.g. to canoe to work) • I did not complete the questionnaire because it doesn't give alternatives 	<p>The JLTP3 looks ahead 15 years and recognises the importance of how transport interventions and investment decisions support economic growth as well as carbon reduction and other environmental objectives. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. However the importance of car travel is not ignored and the JLTP3 includes a range of measures to improve the operational efficiency of the highway network and to plan for its ongoing maintenance, and the JLTP3 also puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The role of ferries in serving both commuter and tourist travel will be strengthened in the final JLTP3. The questionnaire has been designed to find out what issues are important to people and where investment should be focused.</p>
1671	E516	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it seems the infrastructure cannot easily be shared by its multiple users, pedestrians, cyclists, bikers, motorists without danger and conflict. • The absence or fragmentation of cycle lanes often forces cyclists onto pavements where they have to seek refuge from dangerous traffic, which in turn represents a danger to the pedestrians • Motorists are also frequently tempted to push cyclists off the road in order to maintain their speed • bikers are also resented by motorists as obstacles - we could try and adopt a code inversely proportional to road users' vulnerability whereby people should always give way to a more vulnerable group. Hence motorists should always give way to bikers, bikers to cyclists and cyclists to pedestrians. Motorists would obviously have to give way to all other road users 	<p>Walking is recognised as a healthy, low cost, non-polluting, low carbon mode of travel and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The JLTP3 has been expanded to highlight the role of powered two wheelers (motorcycles, scooters and mopeds) in widening travel choices without contributing to traffic congestion. As riders are more vulnerable to collisions than many other road users the JLTP3 aims to improve their road safety.</p>

1039	E512	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Trains/trams do not climb inclines at all well. Bus remains the most realistic means of mass transportation about the former Avon county area •Any success from your plan is in the hands of First Bus (First). You need to bring the Transport Commissioner on board •You are coy about who the 'range of social, economic and environmental partners' are • [UWE] campus is well served by buses and they do not have much effect on the hordes of cars waiting to enter/exit the site at peak times. There's lots of parking but somehow students still manage to park in Filton Cemetery lay-by •if you get your plan.....then CO2 reduction will follow • The problem is usually not with the data but with the interpretation of the data •do not take up this foolish idea (shared space) from the Netherlands that the highway authority removes all signs and definition of footpath (kerbing) from road •your vision will list more restrictions on the private car along with some more unhappy road changes and lots of bus lanes •your concern with parking at Cribbs Causeway and in the centre of Bristol has probably arisen from a similar need [similar to speed camera introductions] for control and obedience •traffic signals do not always improve traffic flow. It is noticeable that cars move away from signals not as a block but one slowly after the other •Bristol would not function without the private car, First could not cope and would not try to •It is unlikely that other bus operators would wish to provide services just for the peak periods •Traffic flows reasonably well in the holiday period. Already we have seen an unsubtle attempt to blame school-run mums for a lot of the congestion. Have you done a proper, statistically valid survey to find the truth of that conjecture? •most business parking in the centre of Bristol appears to be reserved for management, who won't give a fig for what you say or do and will most certainly move to circumvent any restrictions you impose •South Gloucestershire Council persist with 2+ lanes despite evidence that they achieve nothing •Were I to travel from South Bristol to North Bristol via Temple Meads, which roads north may I use? Buses get caught in all these road restrictions, or hadn't you noticed •Encourage more widespread and realistic competition for First •my feeling is that if time can be saved, then it should be, especially in the peak periods. To do this will require the agreement of the Traffic Commissioner. Faster turnaround does mean that the same number of buses could carry more passengers in the same time-frame. Create enquiry points at the bus stop and encourage enquiries to be made to some central point not to the driver of the first bus that appears. Expect as many as possible to prepay their bus fare. Forbid standing •it's amazing how many parked buses as well as postmen, taxis, delivery drivers and even private motorists block [bus lanes] 	<p>The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. The JLTP3 supports the provision and management of parking as part of an integrated transport system through enforcement to help traffic flow, managing demand and promoting sustainable modes. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians and supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. However the importance of car travel is not ignored and the JLTP3 includes a range of measures to improve the operational efficiency of the highway network and to plan for its ongoing maintenance. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. Bus lanes, where appropriate, increase the reliability of services and reduce journey times for commuters. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 foresees, subject to funding, the introduction of a West of England-wide 'smart' travelcard to speed up boarding times and reduce barriers to improved integrated ticketing. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 refers to possible demand management measures such as congestion charging or workplace parking levies but no specific proposals are put forward. No specific proposals are put forward but the potential role of measures is recognised with a view to assessing their costs and benefits. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. The JLTP3 recognises the importance of managing our transport assets within the available budgets.</p>
------	------	--	--

E512
continued

- buses are slow to accelerate, the fleet car is quite often in front of and stopping the bus before it can move across a give-way line. Your plan is – more expensive traffic signals?
- South Gloucestershire Council (SGC) appears quite keen on bus lanes. I cannot say that my progress by bus around their district has been in any noticeable way aided by such features
- As cyclists can be very slow, one cyclist can build quite a queue behind him as he peddles slowly along, on wonders if in peak times they should be using bus lanes
- Improve across city routes: improve interchanges. Cut long delays between buses first thing in the morning
- If you do not wish me to travel to either place by car, then give me a reasonable alternative that does not take all day
- travelling across the city is frustrating and slow
- Have more equal intervals between bus arrivals where more than one route shares the same roads
- remove the burden of route enquiries from the bus driver to a more central place
- I find bus travel information adequate, clear and easily readable but then I can read tables. I do find that the timetable matches reality much as a work of fiction mirrors reality. I ascribe this to the action of traffic, driving regulations, etc. rather than deliberate sabotage by the driver. In general I find the drivers courteous and helpful; they do have to put up with some terrible behaviour from passengers. I am aware there is information to mobiles but it looks to be no more than a repetition of the timetable, delivered by computer. Someone all-at-sea needs cheap personal contact with someone who knows the city
- Information is everything: tell everyone: get it right: keep it right
- I do like the live information boards. They are very useful, extend them to every stop. Edinburgh has a compact LCD version which appears at most stops
- The 77 route no longer uses stops on Pen Park Road. The stops still exist with an announcement in poor English stating that the stop is no longer in use. Some of these notices have been vandalised. Does anyone check that the notices are still in place and readable
- The new shelter's seat looks nice and better than the current red version but the current shelters are in good condition and their seats are adequate. Do we really need to spend all this money on something that is only marginally necessary? It is unlikely to attract new passengers. Cutting the time between buses to a maximum of five minutes might just attract more custom
- whilst installing these new shelters any existing bus lay-by is partially or wholly removed. Why?
- Why not seriously try to persuade employers to institute flexible working or stepped start/finish times?
- Keep Bridge Valley Road closed, closure has made a large positive difference to traffic flow at that major bottleneck

Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration.

E512 continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Those blocking a road should sign a diversion: make scaffolders and builders take responsibility for problems they cause •Bristol should limit parking and rigorously enforce those limitations on roads like Gloucester Road, Whiteladies Road, for both private vehicles and delivery drivers •being awkward for its own sake is unlikely to deter cars from the central area: the rich will pay, or more accurately get their company to pay, any fees/fines. Everybody else will try and find a way round any restrictions and mostly succeed •Comfort on buses •If you wish people to walk, make it a more pleasant and rewarding experience •Keep cyclists off the pavement, especially in central areas •Customer friendly pedestrian crossings.....These "new" Puffin crossings are impossible; I have been trained by the passage of years to look across the carriageway for the green man and listen for the beeping noise.....How do the unaccompanied blind cope? •Make diggers in the footpath consider pedestrians properly. •Properly sign cycle lanes •Train cyclists, require them to have insurance and give them proper cycle paths; not sharing the footpath and not starting and stopping in the middle of nowhere. Prosecute them that ride on the foot-path •Improve road signage •Major roundabouts in South Gloucestershire are festooned with 30mph signs. You should improve road signage for everyone and remove directions from the road surface to the roadside or overhead where we may all read them without having to wait for a vehicle to move •In respect of widespread 20mph zones within the city, the evidence is not available that lower speeds will materially affect accident rates •Trams and trains have fewer stops than buses and Bristol railway lines tend to be distant from places people wish to go •Edinburgh has a decent bus service and Bristol could learn from it. Why do we want a tram? 	
0800	T800	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •does not agree with the proposals for Queen Square/St Mary Redcliffe as she believes this area is safe as far as cyclists are concerned •strongly advocates installing a cycle lane from Park Row to Stokes Croft. There is no bus that goes from there to the BRI and cycling the route at the moment is lethal, especially in the place where railings have been built for the safety of pedestrians. It is so dangerous that she has to end up cycling on the pavement •believes that young people are scared of cycling round the Triangle and the result is cyclists on pavements. It would be good to have bike lane in this area as well. She especially likes the ones they have in New York which are raised to prevent cars from using them 	<p>The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes.</p>

1105	E513	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •the land bordered by Westerleigh Road, The Ring Road & Pucklechurch Road could offer the opportunity for a large Park & Ride / Official Car share parking area (with a motorway link??) •a fleet of bendy buses or trams could operate on specified routes with limited stops but to major destinations, Frenchay Hospital, Cabot Circus, Temple Meads, The Centre, UWE, Abbeywood, Filton (College / Airbus / Rolls Royce), Parkway Station & The Mall at Cribbs Causeway. •By making an out of town hub, local buses can have routes that travel strategically from the centre out to the hub and so less buses would be in the central areas •If a hub could be created in four areas around the city and buses could travel from hub to hub as well as to the major bristol destinations again bus numbers would drop •Instead of rural buses and intercity coaches entering the city, they could terminate at the most convenient hub, travellers could then transfer to the most appropriate bus / tram which could cut journey times (eg travel from Weston s Mare to Cribbs Causeway Weston to hub near Avonmouth hub near Avonmouth to Cribbs, no need to go into the congested centre) •An efficient, regular, CLEAN, bus service would be used •we don't mind bus lanes if there are a good number of buses actually using them. •make more use of the Ring Road with the Public Transport, seeing as you've already spent the money on the 2+ lane and bus lanes in that area. 	<p>The JLTP3 includes details of Major Transport Schemes for which the four authorities are working towards securing funding. The 'North Fringe to Hengrove Package' is one of these Major Transport Schemes for which a bid for £168m was submitted to government in March 2010. This scheme seems to incorporate the ideas suggested. Whilst funding availability remains uncertain, the authorities agree that there is a crucial need for these major investment programmes in order to support the area's economy and regeneration and to improve access to jobs and services.</p>
1106	E514	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The South Bristol Link looks good on paper, but as it does not link up with the motorway it seems to me to be a lot of money for a relatively small gain (in comparison to the size of the project) •Widening the A4 at Brislington should be the first priority. It is unbelievable that the main road between two cities should be allowed to bottleneck like this, plus have a large car park discharging onto it at the narrowest point at regular intervals in the rush hour •My view is that all the Brislington park and ride does at the moment is shift congestion & fumes from one place to another, not reduce them at all. BUT it won't work unless the road is widened right up to Lidl (the junction with the inner ring road) - you would have to do it all the way, or not at all. •Buses are all very nice but people only use them if they have to, and spending millions on swanky new stops won't encourage lots of new people to abandon their cars, due to flexibility issues - multiple journeys/stops etc •The price of Bristol buses is (and has always been) extortionate compared with many northern cities. •Trains are by far the best answer, but unfortunately Bristol trashed most of its routes after Beeching so unless someone can think up a way of getting a proper line to Bradley Stoke etc it's a non-starter •A bit of lateral thinking is required due to the hilly terrain & limited building corridors •How about making Bristol the Motorbike City?? •What above COVERED stands for motorbikes all over the city?? (that wouldn't cost much !) •How about subsidised training? •users of bikes under 125cc should NOT have to pay a road tax fee - they use far less fuel than the zero-rated small cars 	<p>The JLTP3 envisages investment in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. Bus lanes, where appropriate, increase the reliability of services and reduce journey times for commuters. Councils aim to encourage the use of Park and Ride and balance the price of fares with the wider costs of congestion and pollution caused by parking in the city centre. An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. Through partnership working with the operators and subject to funding the councils are seeking to increase bus patronage and improve the viability of services so that the level of fares does not deter existing and new public transport users. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. The JLTP3 has been expanded to highlight the role of powered two wheelers (motorcycles, scooters and mopeds) in widening travel choices without contributing to traffic congestion. As riders are more vulnerable to collisions than many other road users the JLTP3 aims to improve their road safety.</p>

E514 continued		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •More should be made of the fact that motorbikes can use our bus lanes - this isn't the case everywhere I believe, and would encourage more people to learn if it was widely publicised 	
1670	E515	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Public transport is an issue that not only disabled people, but women across the region raise as a key barrier to accessing a whole range of services and facilities on their own behalf and as parents and carers etc. •In lower income households with or without a single car, women are much less likely to enjoy unrestricted access to private transport, and other forms of transport such as cycling are inappropriate for many journeys they need to make. •I do hope plans are in place to undertake a more inclusive consultation at an early stage, in compliance with the public equality duties relating to disability, gender and race. 	<p>Officers from many different disciplines across the councils have been involved, including equality teams. As part of the consultation and to help us draw up the early drafts, we have a Transport Commission that is chaired by Rachel Robinson of the Care Forum and includes representatives of the Local Access Forums, the local PCT's and NHS, Passenger Focus , as well as representatives from the local councils, the bus and rail companies and other passenger groups. In July we held our Annual Transport Forum with over 100 attendees representing a wide cross section of the local community. As part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Plan, a full Health Impact Assessment and an Equalities Impact Assessment is carried out and is available to read on-line and I'm sure you will have seen the list of chapters in the plan, including those that cover Equality of Opportunity; Safety, Health and Security; and Quality of Life. At least one council has held a special session for adults with Learning Difficulties. The four councils are very much aware of the importance of access to a range of transport options for people and, as you can see from the above, are trying to gather opinions and ensure input from every sector of our community.</p>
0183	L700	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •We are disappointed that our views were not sought either in the preparation of the March 2010 draft or after it was published •The draft cycling strategy is very general, and needs to be more specific •It is disappointing that after ten years, the JLTP3 strategy has little new to say. •The level of detail in the JLTP3 first draft cycling strategy contrasts unfavourably with the level of detail given to other modes.....it contains very little in terms of specific measures and programmes for boosting cycling [<i>unlike bus and rail</i>] •It should cover a longer time period (than the five years implied in the draft JLTP3 cycling target to 2015/16) •should set out the strategic cycling priorities for the WoEP area [<i>time wise, geographic priorities, sectoral priorities regarding types of cycling investment</i>] •In addition to outcome targets, the JLTP3 should also set output targets for cycling – for example, for developing the strategic cycle networks, developing hubs / interchanges with public transport, providing cycle training, and so on •cycling has a greater potential than most other modes to fulfil the strategic goals of the JLTP3 •previous LTP's have ranked cycling as the second highest priority in the 'hierarchy of modes of transport' •we would like to see a major scheme for cycling included as one of the top JLTP3 priorities •The Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy.....has now reached the first draft stage. One of the objects of the Strategy is to feed into the JLTP3 	<p>Cycling is promoted as a healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. The JLTP3 sees an expanded role for both rail and bus services in the next 15 years and further integration between them and walking and cycling. Through design and planning standards the JLTP3 will ensure that safe, secure, accessible and appropriately located cycle parking is provided.</p>

0180	L701	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The main criticism of [section 2], and indeed the whole document, is the complete lack of ambition •No reference to promoting a shift to low emission vehicles and low emission systems eg. Tram / rail car / Lt rail •The bullet needs to be bitten on reducing the use of cars for commuting in particular. The years of “encouragement” through JLTPs 1 & 2 have not worked, it is time for more positive discrimination in favour of public transport through road space allocation and parking control •There should be a specific reference to rail as an existing but under used transport asset •Air Quality improvement needs the same robust approach to modal shift in town centres •no reference to promoting a shift to less polluting transport •no innovation in access to sensitive areas •no effort to promote mixed use of space •Rail based systems can achieve what roads cannot in sharing space with pedestrians and cycles and accessing areas in an environmentally acceptable manner •in favour of Plot 6 becoming a central regional transport hub •welcomes the adoption of the target to reduce CO2 emissions. In order to achieve the....target, firm policies are needed to reduce traffic levels in Bristol and maintain access by encouraging a shift to low carbon transport such as walking, cycling and public transport •Instead of striving to serve areas of economic growth as included in the Draft RSS.....the brave and radical approach would be to say that we have manifold environmental problems including climate change, air quality, areas crying out for regeneration etc. On top of this, peak oil is a looming •we should be concentrating our transport provision on enabling and encouraging brownfield and infill development to increase housing density and make the provision of local services more viable thus aiming seriously to reduce the need and distance required to travel to work •too much included on improving roads •welcomes the focus of the JLTP on safety, health and security but is concerned that measures to improve air quality will be insufficient to meet standards set out in the National Air Quality Strategy •a combination of restrictions on car traffic through traffic management and parking restraints, coupled with improvements to public transport •Improvement in security will come about through measures to encourage the use of public transport •Air quality is easily measurable and can be used to monitor progress in modal shift generally and other benefits, such as CO2 emissions reduction derived from it •there should be much more emphasis on long term Rail planning with Portishead in particular prioritised •Cycling supplementary document - lack of detail, no sense of deliverability, funding in its own right, need to emphasise cultural aspect more, build on Cycling City work •[Parking supplementary document] needs to toughen up and actually confront robustly the issues of road space restriction / reallocation and parking restriction 	<p>The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions, and sees an expanded role for both rail and bus services in the next 15 years and further integration between them and walking and cycling. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. The JLTP3 aims to improve air quality by better management of the highway network, encouraging alternatives to the car, encouraging use of lower emission vehicles and promoting ‘eco driving’ training. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 refers to possible demand management measures such as congestion charging or workplace parking levies but no specific proposals are put forward. No specific proposals are put forward but the potential role of measures is recognised with a view to assessing their costs and benefits. The JLTP3 supports the provision and management of parking as part of an integrated transport system through enforcement to help traffic flow, managing demand and promoting sustainable modes. Walking and cycling is recognised as a healthy, low cost, non-polluting, low carbon mode of travel and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. Following issues raised during engagement the JLTP3 vision has been expanded with a what would it look like on the ground section added to Chapter 2. Indicators will be used to measure and monitor our progress towards meeting the JLTP3’s objectives. Suitable targets may in due course accompany each indicator. Uncertainty over funding means it is not possible to set indicators at this stage. Chapter 12 in the JLTP3 sets out a possible range of indicators. It is anticipated that indicators and targets will be included in the three year Delivery Plan.</p>
------	------	---	--

0300	L702	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •fails to recognise that Bath faces very serious economic, social, environmental and health challenges, and that inadequacies in the city's transport infrastructure are a major part of the problem •Public transport in the city is unreliable, infrequent and expensive •There are significant areas of deprivation in the city and these are poorly served by existing public transport and/or are blighted by excessive traffic. •It is often said that Bath has the potential to be Britain's most walkable city, but the lack of provision for pedestrians (and also for cyclists) means that most people cling to their cars. •The main requirement in Bath is to bring about a substantial reduction in the level of traffic, particularly through traffic. •The draft JLTP refers to a number of plans or programmes, but none of these will deliver the scale of change required •The transport infrastructure must be upgraded to a satisfactory standard before there is any question of expanding the city to cope with population increase, and then must be upgraded to provide for each development. •The Bath Transport Package (BTP) represents a vital first step towards tackling the problems of traffic and pollution in Bath •it is essential to develop other measures to reduce traffic coming into the city, to cut down on through traffic, and to restrain visitor parking •Virtually all interests in Bath have welcomed the Council's Public Realm & Movement Programme (PRMP).....The PRMP should be accelerated and extended to include the most important heritage areas from the Holburne Museum to Queen Square and Royal Crescent. •We are concerned that there is degree of circularity in the various documents dealing with transport matters....Such measures (listed in the draft AQAP as 'Possible Future Actions') should in fact be addressed through the JLTP and presented together there •"A thriving, healthy city, with a modern transport infrastructure serving residents, businesses and visitors". The Plan should set out the specific measures necessary to realise this vision. •Specific paragraph revisions suggested (see full letter for details) 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. Through partnership working with the operators and subject to funding the councils are seeking to increase bus patronage and improve the viability of services so that the level of fares does not deter existing and new public transport users. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. Cycling and walking is promoted as a healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road, and puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. The JLTP3 supports the provision and management of parking as part of an integrated transport system through enforcement to help traffic flow, managing demand and promoting sustainable modes. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 aims to improve air quality by better management of the highway network, encouraging alternatives to the car, encouraging use of lower emission vehicles and promoting 'eco driving' training.</p>
0594	WEB35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The University of the West of England will wish to contribute more fully to the ongoing consultation for JLTP3. •achieve modal shift at lowest cost; which is best achieved by continuing the Cycling City investment programme •Network management particularly refers to further introduction of 20mph zones and road maintenance; which indirectly positively affect cycling; walking; road safety and noise & air pollution •Smarter choices are also excellent value for money if best practice is adhered to. 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car, and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The JLTP3 aims to improve air quality by better management of the highway network, encouraging alternatives to the car, encouraging use of lower emission vehicles and promoting 'eco driving' training. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car.</p>

0300	L704	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •congestion and air pollution from traffic, are a top concern for Bath residents •Attractive public transport in all areas, with positive measures to encourage its use. •Better facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. •Availability of realistic alternatives to the private car. •A setting in which the historic and architectural icons of the World Heritage Site can be seen and appreciated properly •Good air quality •Demand management to reduce the volume of traffic. •Development of east-west and north-south bypass routes. •Measures to keep HGVs out of the centre of the city •improvements need to be delivered through a Masterplan for Transport in Bath •the draft fails to recognise that Bath faces very serious economic, social, environmental and health challenges, and that inadequacies in the city's transport infrastructure are a major part of the problem •Visitors and goods need to be able to move freely around the city. This requires a firmer level of management than is currently applied •The BANES Core Strategy envisages substantial growth in employment and population. The figures may need to be adjusted now that the Regional Spatial Strategy has been withdrawn, but major expansion seems inescapable •There are very high levels of traffic pollution throughout the city's main road network •The high volumes of traffic have a major impact on the overall appearance and amenity of the city. Pollution and vibration from vehicles is taking its toll on the fabric of the historic buildings •Public transport in the city is unreliable, uncomfortable, infrequent and expensive •Bath has the potential to be Britain's most walkable city •We welcome the emphasis in the JLTP on the public realm and demand management, and the prospect of traffic-free city centres •measures to reduce incoming traffic, to cut down on through traffic and to restrain parking •The Bath Transportation Package will have no effect on through traffic •There need to be more routes, especially in the south west part of Bath and other areas which are currently poorly served, and buses need to run later in the evening •Fares need to be attractive•Improved school bus services •Encouragement of alternatives to the private car, including car-sharing and car clubs •Extension of the Public Realm and Movement Programme to the wider area between the Holburne Museum, Bath Spa Station, Queen Square and Royal Crescent 	<p>The JLTP3 has been updated to reflect suggested changes to sections 2.1.3, 4.6.4,3, 6.1.21 and 9.1.9.</p> <p>The more recent consultation response from xxxx raises a number of issues, many of which are covered in alternative documents such as the Public Realm and Movement Strategy and encompass work that is ongoing (along with the draft supplementary documents). Investigation of additional transport links including the A36/A46 link are in Box 11a Plans and Aspirations for other Significant Transport Schemes.</p> <p>Air quality targets are based on projections provided by government re nitrogen dioxide emissions and must be realistic. There is national consensus for these projections being over optimistic, given recent trends. The target for 2010 is part of a declining projection trajectory line that follows empirical evidence of an overall increase since 2004. For example, if the current level is 80µg/m³, then setting a target of 40 µg/m³ for the next year can have the affect of disengaging strategic work from the reality of the situation. We have a legal obligation to work towards these targets (but not a legal obligation to meet them).</p>
------	------	--	--

L704 continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reducing the volume of traffic by means of parking policy and traffic management. The use of congestion charging should be considered •Proper enforcement to keep HGVs on permitted routes in Bath •HGV restrictions or a toll on Cleveland Bridge to encourage HGVs to take other routes such as the A350 •Improved signposting to discourage traffic from using the centre of the city as a through route; action with satnav providers to ensure that route restrictions are taken into account •Greater use of the A420 as a bypass for east-west through traffic •A bypass/link road to the east of Bath to remove north-south through traffic, on a less damaging route than the previous proposal •A ban on tour coaches which drive around the city without stopping •A comprehensive rather than piecemeal approach to traffic issues, and integration of transport and planning policies 	
0183	<p>E517</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Experience of the Cycling City project and of work over the last decade tells us that good intentions are not sufficient in themselves •Problems that need to be overcome occur in the translation of policy into practice and in some cases a lack of understanding of design criteria, expediency in going for the soft option and fear of public backlash, for instance when safer junction layouts result in longer traffic queues •an approach that inherently gives precedence to cyclists and other vulnerable road users, and treats roads as public spaces for the benefit of residents and not as freeways for motor traffic passing through •concentrated attention on professional development and motivation as soon as possible, to saturate practitioners (including external consultants) with the best of continental practice, and encourage a “can-do” approach to replace the decades of inherently car centred indoctrination •Intensive programmes focussing on walking and cycling as a central part of the strategic solution to travel demand would represent better value for money. The role of walking and cycling in the delivery programme needs much greater emphasis. •The target to increase cycling by only 76% to 2015/16 is too modest.....The target should be increased to a greater proportion of the eightfold Chief Medical Officer’s target also mentioned in the document. The target parameter should be defined in terms of mode share, with a target of 9% of journeys by 2015 •To the cyclist (of any period) however, the cycle network is the whole road network (motorways excepted), supplemented by a small mileage of cycleway. A cycle route is any route that can legally be taken in going from A to B •Lessons will be needed from the Dutch or Danish model, whereby motor traffic always gives way to cycle traffic, so the cyclist does not lose momentum •To change the dominance of motor traffic it will be necessary to re-engineer junctions and roundabouts and change traffic management to prioritise for cycle traffic speed •Perceived safety is very important to cyclists, and even more so to those who do not ride bikes but might think of doing so. It will be necessary to work to the best design practice for cycle traffic in road and cycle track infrastructure, and then give a bit extra 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. It supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling.</p> <p>Funding for major schemes has been significantly reduced following the Comprehensive Spending Review. The government has recently announced the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, which provides local authorities the opportunity to bid for capital and revenue expenditure to promote sustainable transport initiatives including cycling.</p> <p>The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. The Supplementary Document will be updated and revised during 2011 to take into account issues and ideas which emerged from the JLTP3 engagement.</p> <p>Indicators will be used to measure and monitor our progress towards meeting the JLTP3’s objectives. Suitable targets may in due course accompany each indicator. Uncertainty over funding means it is not possible to set indicators at this stage. Chapter 12 in the JLTP3 sets out a possible range of indicators. It is anticipated that indicators and targets will be included in the three year Delivery Plan.</p> <p>As with targets the uncertainty over funding mean a one year indicative Delivery Plan for 2011/12 is proposed with headline figures only. A full three year Delivery Plan 2012/13 to 2014/15 will be produced by autumn 2011 when the funding position is clearer.</p>

E517 continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The provision for cycles in the network should be consistent in design. If there is a segregated cycle track it should last a reasonable distance – several miles continuously •Shared pavements are worthwhile in some locations – for instance where people congregate, for shops or other attractions, and near cycle parking stands, but not as part of longitudinal routes •We would like a minimum of 2m wide cycle lanes adopted as the standard means of allocating road space for cycling in the LTP area where traffic conditions require, except for high speed roads where an adjacent high quality cycle track (not shared pavement) should be provided •The absence of cyclists on a road should be taken as indicating that changes are needed •altering the balance of road space to provide for cycle traffic can and should often be accomplished by reducing the provision for motor traffic, for instance marshalling traffic into two lanes instead of three •Cycling is a sociable form of transport.....The width allocation for cyclists should allow for cyclists to ride two abreast wherever possible •there is the need for a proper asset management plan for the whole network aimed at ensuring that maintenance meets the needs of cycle traffic •We are concerned about the potential impact of Bus Rapid Transit on existing cycling/walking infrastructure and corridors, for instance the Ashton Vale-city centre route has substantial implications at a number of locations. The LTP should not be dependent on programmes that are detrimental to cycling •Bristol in particular could be promoted with complementary infrastructure as a base for local cycling day trips with the advantages of being in a cosmopolitan city •New development should have effective master-planning giving distance/time priority to walking/cycling with each site over 200 dwellings/ 1000m2 of employment (say) having its own design brief •The JLTP3 should include a definite commitment to a major cycling scheme bid, to be implemented at the beginning of the programme 	
1848	E519 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A metro network could be developed •2 major opportunities are lost the redevelopment of Cabot and Bath shopping centres which could have been developed as metro central stations •Keynsham should have an underpass. Le Havre has a long underpass which takes traffic away from the central area. •carve out an underpass road with ease under the relatively gentle inclines of the areas around Brislington, Keynsham and Bath • traffic congestion around Keynsham is increasing and it is now impossible at peak times to leave the Chandag Road easily, as the tail back from Bath traffic creates a procession closing off the exit junction •a lateral approach to planning on infrastructure to relieve the pressure of traffic between Bath and Bristol and, as a minimum, signs clearly directing traffic to the bypass and away from the town centre 	<p>The integration of rail and bus facilities at Southgate Shopping Centre is an important objective. The listed building status of Bath Spa station limits the extent of work that can be carried out, but further improvements are planned. Cabot Circus is more remote from Bristol Temple Meads station, which directly serves the Temple Gate office development. The JLTP3 supports the development of Greater Bristol Rail Metro across the West of England with greater train frequency between Bath, Weston-super-Mare, Bristol Temple Meads, Bristol Parkway and Yate and improved access to stations. JLTP3 also supports the expansion of bus rapid transit routes serving Bristol and Bath. Under passes are very expensive to construct. An underpass for Bath was considered in the 1960's but was rejected. Keynsham already has a bypass, which is effective at removing through traffic. Traffic management measures such as yellow box markings may assist traffic congestion around Keynsham at the junction with Bath Road/Chandag Road. Signing will ensure traffic uses the most appropriate roads.</p>

1847	E518	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •agree with and support the submission by CTC RtR and Bristol Cycling Campaign •include a strong commitment to a major cycling scheme bid, to be implemented at the outset of the programme •The Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy produced by Ove Arup & Partners in Sept 2010 should be adopted as a key guidance document •76% is far too modest a target for the increase in cycling by 2016 •The plan should encourage highways planners to change their approach to design & maintenance such that roads are considered to be public spaces for the benefit of residents and not as freeways for motor traffic, giving precedence to cyclists and other vulnerable road users •Cyclists have a limited power output. So Councils' practice must take account of this fact and cycle traffic design must allow cyclists to keep moving •The design approach to cycleways should be as for roads, and designers should not incorporate obstructions that they would not put in a road •The current practice of looking to provide the lowest standard that can be read into "Cycle Infrastructure Design" guidance will need to end 	<p>Cycling is promoted as a healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The JLTP3 recognises the importance of managing our transport assets within the available budgets. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.</p>
1849	E521	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Council is opposed to the reference to a new road link between the M5 and South Bristol being included because of its environmental impact. It also cannot see any point in wasting money investigating this in the current economic climate 	<p>This link was identified by the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study; 2006. It is appropriate for the partnership to retain it in JLTP3 as a potential major scheme subject to further investigation into its merits and impacts.</p>
2321	E522	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •difficulties my partially sighted husband regularly experiences on busy pavements along Gloucester Road in Bishopston, where cyclists still ride on the pavement and, worse, across busy pedestrian crossings being used by children •hundreds of cyclists around Bristol have no lights or suitable clothing whereby they can be easily seen in the dark •People in other parts of the country don't ride on pavements •who is going to ensure that the law is obeyed? 	<p>The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes.</p>
2350	E523	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Expand the 20s Plenty Areas for all residential areas •Enforce the 20s Plenty law, through use of traffic calming, CCTV and fines •More commitments needed for city wide / area wide cycling schemes •Higher targets for helping people to move from car based travelling to public transport, cycling and car sharing •More commitments to make roads more 'cycle friendly' •Make cycle paths more friendly for cycle users 	<p>The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car.</p>

1850	E520	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Too long has "the sacred cow of traffic flow" dominated traffic engineers' thinking. It is long out of date. Instead, worship a "sacred cow of the transport hierarchy" which puts pedestrians, bicyclists and buses at the top, where cars and lorries used to be. •Site bus stops where most needed by bus passengers. •Bus stops in Bristol are too far apart. Adopt shorter distances between stops as in London. •Until traffic congestion no longer makes it impossible for buses to stick to timetables, help bus companies offer a frequency of "every 10, 15, 20 ... etc minutes". Thus they set off at the specified frequency and controls enable them to avoid getting early. •Ensure all bus stops have shelters. •Improve public transport information systems - all modes - all companies - all maps. •Plan for a public transport hub near Temple Meads (e.g. Plot 6) (reserve the site) •Relocate Bristol Coach Station at or nearer the Transport Hub. •Grit pavements when icy. •Spend more on facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. •Introduce shared taxi / minibus systems as in many other countries. •Rationalise and amalgamate the many bus services - most of which are 'private' but paid for out of taxes. •Introduce a PTA. •Don't wait for a PTA, appoint sub-regional public transport co-ordinating staff. •Make light-controlled pedestrian crossings more responsive to pedestrian demand. •Take action to make pedestrian subways feel less threatening. •Control parking on sidewalks. •Establish where exactly pedestrians are alarmed by bicyclists and take steps to alleviate, other than banning bikes (or pedestrians!). •Make more clear the bicycle routes in traffic free areas. •Abandon "Cyclists Dismount" signs. •Sketch out routes for future facilities - trams, underground, metros etc. •Consider rail or tram from Hub to Airport •Send top planners to Holland, with instructions to find their way around by public transport, then do same in Bristol area. •Extend 20 mph areas •Do not abandon camera speed traps. 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. Walking and cycling is recognised as a healthy, low cost, non-polluting, low carbon mode of travel and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car. Ways to further enhance transport governance and delivery using existing transport powers will be looked at. The JLTP3 recognises the importance of managing our transport assets within the available budgets. The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. The JLTP3 encourages car sharing as a way of reducing peak period traffic and associated congestion and carbon emissions. Ways to further enhance transport governance and delivery using existing transport powers will be looked at. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The JLTP3 supports the provision and management of parking as part of an integrated transport system through enforcement to help traffic flow, managing demand and promoting sustainable modes. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. The JLTP3 supports the Airport Surface Access Strategy in promoting and facilitating increased use of public transport by airline passengers and staff travelling to and from Bristol Airport including enhancement of the Bristol Flyer service and a potential extension of the proposed rapid transit system to serve the airport.</p>
------	------	---	---

E520 continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Ensure income from speeding fines is seen to go towards transport systems. •Ensure bicycle lanes are kept clear of litter especially broken glass. •Support and listen to pedestrian and bicyclist organisations such as CTC, RtR, Bristol cycling Campaign, and "Walk'. •Introduce measures to reduce motor traffic, by carrot as well as stick. e.g. free Park and Rides. •Improve and extend local railway network. •Free 10-minute shuttle bus Temple Meads, 'Centre', Triangle, BRI, Temple Meads. •Allow emergency services and buses to cross Centre from Princes St to Park St. •Make most radial main roads one-way except for buses motor bikes and bicycles. •Make roads north and south of river one way. •Restore overhead bypass near Temple Meads. •Enforce speed limits. •Employ mobile parking enforcement officers. •Amend parking policy to maximise traffic flow not primarily to raise funds. •Hold public enquiry type process after every KSI. •Do NOT spend funds on improving main road routes but spend on road junctions to smooth traffic and facilitate bicyclists and pedestrians. •Major expenditure on rail, tram, transport hub, etc. •Do NOT spend funds on raised pavements at bus stops. inter alia these reduce flexibility - the main advantage of buses. •Do not spend funds on real time arrival indicators. These are not needed if service is frequent and reliable. •Do NOT spend lots on expensive JLTP documents as last time, then largely ignore the recommendations. •DO spend funds on implementing the JLTP. •If no congestion charging then reduce and make more expensive parking. But not in the evenings. •Educate the public on transport costs and alternatives. Justify constraints. •Publicise effects of improvements 	<p>The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. Councils aim to encourage the use of Park and Ride and balance the price of fares with the wider costs of congestion and pollution caused by parking in the city centre. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic.</p>
2459	E524 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •four phase strategy has been developed in the context of the Cycling City area. However, we believe that the underlying thinking for prioritising resources is applicable to the wider West of England area and urge that this work is carried •build upon the strategy with a major scheme bid, with the necessary technical work being carried out to support such a bid •The cycling policies set out in the draft JLTP3 have not been substantively reviewed and developed since JLTP2. We therefore also urge that the policies are updated in the light of the submitted strategy •We ask that the relevant Council officers' group work closely with cycling advocates in implementing the JLTP3 cycling proposals to reflect these comments. The writers and their associated organisations are willing to cooperate with them in any way possible •we are exploring the logic of a possible joint cycling and walking bid 	<p>Walking and cycling is promoted as a healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. Through design and planning standards the JLTP3 will ensure that safe, secure, accessible and appropriately located cycle parking is provided. The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 sees an expanded role for both rail and bus services in the next 15 years and further integration between them and walking and cycling. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm.</p>

2497	E525	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •I firmly believe that cycling should be given far greater prominence in transport planning, for its health and environmental benefits, to reduce congestion and pollution and to generally make the city a nicer place to live and work •include a firm commitment to a major cycling scheme bid, to be implemented at the beginning of the programme •Ove Arup & Partners' Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy of Sept 2010 should be adopted as a guidance document in the JLTP •The target increase in cycling of 76% by 2016 is too low •you need to show that people are shifting from cars to bikes, so a target of proportion of all journeys would be better. The target should match that in the Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy by Ove Arup and Partners, i.e. 9% of all journeys by bike by 2015. (It was 4% in 2008) •The plan should commit highway engineers and designers to change their design & maintenance approach to one that treats roads as public spaces for the benefit of residents •The councils should work to the best design practice for cycle traffic in road infrastructure, and then give a bit extra •In referring to "cyclist" the councils' practice must take account of the very low power output the human body - and apply the golden rule for cycle traffic design: make sure the cyclist can keep moving •The design approach to cycleways should be the same as for roads, except that the width is less. Designers should not incorporate obstructions that they would not put in a road 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. Walking is recognised as a healthy, low cost, non-polluting, low carbon mode of travel and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.</p>
2499	E527	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Ove Arup & Partners' Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy of Sept 2010 should be adopted as a guidance document in the JLTP •councils should work to the best design practice for cycle traffic in road infrastructure •the target increase in cycling of 76% by 2016 is too modest •you need to show that people are shifting from cars to bikes, so a target of proportion of all journeys would be better •commit highway engineers and designers to change their design & maintenance approach to one that treats roads as public spaces for the benefit of residents and not as freeways for motor traffic passing through - and gives precedence to cyclists and other vulnerable road users •include a definite commitment to a major cycling scheme bid, to be implemented at the beginning of the programme •take account of the very low power output the human body - and apply the golden rule for cycle traffic design: make sure the cyclist can keep moving •The design approach to cycleways should be the same as for roads, except that the width is less. Designers should not incorporate obstructions that they would not put in a road 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians and aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and this could include the re-phasing or removal of traffic signals where this would help vehicular flow without significantly disadvantaging pedestrians or cyclists. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.</p>

2498	E526	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Can I urge the immediate adoption of JLTP2½? •creating a real interchange at Temple Meads could correct a long-term error •The recent interchange at Old Market is effectively, for lack of better, the interchange between bus and rail at Temple Meads station There should be signs for pedestrians to indicate the walking route •A rapid sort-out of bus stops in the Centre.....to make them more user friendly and convenient •a revamp of Eastgate Centre to take all inbound buses to call at the same or adjacent bus stop, similarly all buses bound for Lockleaze to call at the same or adjacent bus stop •Green Salad boxes contain a medley of catch phrases tossed together with no explanation of how they fit into the overall scheme. They need a sprinkle of verbs •Meaning of “targets”. Numbers not given for targets •The most important goal of JLTP3 must be to curb, reduce, stop, reverse if possible global warming/climate change •the document shows much of the damage is done by transport, so it is proper that emphasis must be on reduction of petrol/gas/diesel dependent vehicles •Recent increases in cycling and measures to encourage it are to be welcomed •There is much emphasis on walking (for good and practical reasons) but in Bristol City the department dealing with Rights of Way is much under-resourced so that schemes are kept waiting several years •Rail improvements are to be encouraged •The Portishead line should be enabled to take light rail connecting with the main line and with a reopened station at Ashton Gate •The “Bristol Metro” should be developed to make rail commuting a real alternative to use of the car •Road traffic noise needs to be addressed, particularly near motorways •Bus travel would be made much more pleasant if all stops had shelters •A better distribution of travel timetables would be an encouragement to passengers •Bristol is to be congratulated on the recent interchange at Old Market •Why cannot Eastgate have a sensible scheme comparable to that at Old Market? •Bristol Centre is becoming increasingly chaotic [<i>in terms of which bus service which stops</i>] •It is not clear whether there is a regular arrangement for the NHS to be informed of changes to public transport in case these might affect access to NHS services •Yate shopping area and Cribbs Causeway interchanges seem quite sensible. Kingswood interchange is usable •The pattern at Marlborough St bus station is good and should be used as a template for future bus interchanges including Plot 6 and a redeveloped Bristol City Centre 	<p>The JLTP3 sees an expanded role for both rail and bus services in the next 15 years and further integration between them and walking and cycling. Bus services are an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. Re-opening the Portishead rail branch to passenger services is included in the JLTP3 programme of major transport schemes subject to funding. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas.</p>
2500	E528	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •support the concept of grading for footpaths of Regional - District - Local importance (similar to motorway - A & B roads) 	<p>Walking is recognised as a healthy, low cost, non-polluting, low carbon mode of travel and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians.</p>
2536	E529	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •I found the plan difficult to read •Overall I should say that I am disappointed •I would very much like to see some quality segregated cycle ways giving fast direct routes between towns and villages 	<p>A number of new cycle routes have been established in the north fringe as a result of Cycling City funding, for more information please visit: http://www.betterbybike.info/completed-schemes The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety</p>

E529 continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •the bigger travel+ picture does not explicitly show cycle ways •Cycle use in the area is so low that small targets (ie to plan talks of a 76% increase in cycle journeys) are not going to make any difference to the quality of life •Planners have to be thinking in terms of ten times as many cyclists, ie 1000%, and this must be achieved through better arrangements than just expecting cyclists to share the road with 40mph 44 tonne lorries •the results of the Cycling City money have been very disappointing •More investment is needed, this time not in festival events and web pages but in real routes •The Badminton Road from Downend to Yate is three lanes wide and could easily include a segregated cycleway •There is good practice and good design on display in the Netherlands and in Denmark, please don't follow the examples of Sustrans, Cycling England or Boris Johnson •Parking at shops and at railways stations must be challenged •How much ground is given over to tarmac? How does this compare to green spaces? •Pleasant walk ways need to be created and maintained in such a way that it is a better experience to walk to a local amenity than drive •reduce the space given over to the car (both as roads and parking) and give that space back to the people •The Bradley Stoke area should get special attention as it is fenced in by the motorway network and there are very few opportunities for people to walk from the area 	<p>risks for those who choose to travel on the road and supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling as well as putting emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car.</p>
0344	E530 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •We are pleased to see the plan contains a number of references to joint working across the public and private sector •We welcome your Vision to 2026 for a transport system that strengthens the local economy, improves access, ensures alternatives to the car are a realistic first choice being affordable, safe, secure, reliable, simple to use and available to all •Such a vision is complementary to the aims of the Highways Agency and in particular our aim to deliver, subject to funding approval, Managed Motorways to the M4 and M5 around Bristol •If the JLTP3 can provide effective alternatives to the car and reduce the number of local trips on the SRN then the benefits provided will be available in the longer term •In assessing draft Local Transport Plans, we are committed to working within the Government Policy Framework •pleased to note within JLTP3 that it 'does not exist in isolation' •It is important that JLTP3 fully reflects the Local Development Frameworks for the West of England •The Agency is unable to fund works necessary to mitigate the impact of development on the SRN •pleased to see that the JLTP3 fully deals with the 5 key transport goals •Reducing the need to travel and providing alternatives to the private car, including smarter choices, are particularly welcome •it might still be helpful to give a clearer picture of priorities for the measures and major schemes identified within the plan that would be progressed first •it may be that the smarter choices identified will play an even bigger role in achieving the plan's objectives 	<p>The JLTP3 looks ahead 15 years and recognises the importance of how transport interventions and investment decisions support economic growth as well as carbon reduction and other environmental objectives. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car.</p>

2537	E533 L706 L707 L710	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •welcomes the statement at 2.3.1 that the West of England Partnership is working with neighbouring authorities, including Wiltshire, to identify cross boundary transport issues•the most concentrated demand on the highway network continues to be the journey to work and tackling congestion in peak periods remains a major challenge. This is particularly true in the eastern Bath area•We are concerned that B&NES has not rigorously assessed these issues in a truly collaborative effort with Wiltshire Council•enhanced rail services are needed to serve the West Wiltshire - Bath corridor.....an additional station at Corsham •The VPA recommends that increasing the provisiori for passengers to carry bicycles be included in any review of rail services •major station regeneration scheme will be delivered at Bath Spa •welcome the work being done, through South West Regional Freight Forum, on routes for cross- boundary HGV movements•the drawing up of a Cotswolds AONB Highway Guidelines and Transport Protocol by a Transport Group made up of officers from the relevant local authorities •strategy to introduce a revised hierarchy of roads to direct different kinds of traffic onto the most appropriate routes, including HGVs •<i>[re: Port of Bristol proposals]</i> We welcome these developments •strongly recommends that the above considerations regarding the DSCT be set out explicitly within the JLTP •the work being done on cross-boundary HGV movements, and the introduction of a revised hierarchy of roads to direct HGVs on to the most appropriate routes, should reflect the above considerations regarding the A36, A46, A350 and A34 •encourage B&NES and Wiltshire to work more closely to manage traffic on the A36/A46 and the A350 corridors, in order to reduce the impact of HGVs on Bath and other settlements •welcome the inclusion of an assessment of potential cross-boundary environmental issues in the SEA. However, there is no mention of the impact of the DSCT •need for effective collaboration between the two authorities and would like to see both the level of that collaboration and its transparency, significantly improved •supports the overall strategy of <i>[reducing carbon emissions]</i> •We encourage the West of England councils to enhance further their vehicle fleets and work with others towards achieving greater use of more fuel-efficient vehicles and provision of the infrastructure required for the wider introduction of electric cars and other vehicles •supports the overall strategy of <i>[supporting economic growth]</i> •The VPA supports the overall strategy of <i>[contributing to better safety, health and security]</i> 	<p>2.3 Commuting - We have recently started to work with major employers in order to help / update their travel plans and ensure they are robust. Any new developments are assessed through the planning process and where required they must submit a travel plan for approval and then implement it in the work place. This often forms part of a planning condition or a legal agreement.</p> <p>2.3 Rail - We work with the rail operators where possible to lobby for improvements for services.</p> <p>5 - B&NES has recently bid for part funding for electric charging points as part of a joint bid by the Wales and South West Consortium. This bid was unfortunately unsuccessful but we are investigating other avenues of funding that could potentially exist.</p> <p>BTP - Park and ride expansions will ensure that there is adequate supply of parking on the periphery of the city. Expansions will accommodate vehicles that would otherwise be driving into the centre adding to our air quality and congestion problems.</p> <p>BRT - This scheme forms part of a wider goal to reduce congestion in Bath and will provide an alternative to the car. This scheme will not be abandoned.</p> <p>Further rapid transit routes - These will not be removed from the JLTP3. They would work to creating a more complete rapid transit network across the city.</p> <p>A36 / A46 link - We are investigating all potential options that could have a positive effect on the traffic through Bath.</p>
------	------------------------------	--	--

E533
L706
L707
L710
continued

- In particular, we welcome the stated aim of ensuring that the policies and measures in the Bath Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) are integrated with those in the JLTP3
- supports the various HGV emission reduction, freight logistics and demand management measures which are outlined in the B&NES draft Bath AQAP
- welcomes the discussion of the Cotswolds AONB and of the initiatives to address transport issues in the area
- welcomes the statement at 9.1.20 that the JLTP3 aims to support the World Heritage Site Management Plan
- welcome the strategy to maintain and enhance the historic town and city centres, conservation areas and villages
- the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride - fails completely to protect the superb landscape setting of the WHS
- supports elements of the BTP, i.e. creation of a more pedestrian and cyclist-friendly City centre, improved nine bus routes to Showcase standard and introduction of active traffic management with real time information to direct drivers to locations where parking spaces are available
- We do not object to Park and Ride schemes as such but have mixed feelings about the expansion of the City's existing Park and Rides
- Key elements of the BTP fail to contribute to the achievement of any one the five JLTP goals - the VPA is strongly opposed to the creation of a new Park & Ride on Bathampton Meadows to the east of the City and the linked Bus Rapid Transit scheme

- The VPA recommends that B&NES abandon the discredited Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride scheme which, if implemented, could also be the catalyst for further incremental degradation of the whole landscape environs of Bath
- We recommend that B&NES conduct a serious review of Park and Ride options, including the Charmy Down site
- The VPA recommends that B&NES abandon the proposed BRT scheme
- We recommend that further Rapid Transit routes in Bath be removed from the JLTP
- we would oppose any future suggestion of a Park and Ride on the A36 south east of Bath and recommend that the B&NES/West of England Partnership abandon all aspirations for such a scheme
- welcome the removal of this highly controversial scheme [A36/A46 link road] from the revised vision to 2026
- the disproportionately damaging impact of HGVs (noise, vibration, air pollution, fabric of urban infrastructure) on the city can be tackled by other measures which would remove more HGVs (through N-S. E-W & local) than a link road and we therefore, strongly urge their implementation
- strongly recommends that B&NES impose a north-south through-HGV ban on Cleveland Bridge or the A36 Warminster Road
- include explicit commentary on specific measures to manage traffic in and around Bath, with particular reference to imposition of an HGV ban and implementation of other related measures

2661	E531	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is a conflict between goals which is demonstrated in the wish to support economic growth whilst retaining a healthy natural environment •PCAA has supported the Bus Rapid Transit (particularly phase 2 to the airport) and the South Bristol Link road but would emphasise that the link will give only limited relief to Parishes such as Barrow Gurney from increased traffic from Bristol airport •The airport has one of country's lowest proportions of passengers gaining access by public transport - contrary to policies in the present Local Plan and certainly contrary to the aims of JTLP 3 •The PCAA believes that North Somerset Council has failed in its responsibilities to ensure surface access improvements surrounding the airport which would prevent further negative impacts on neighbouring parishes and quality of life for residents – one of the JTLP goals. To alleviate this problem the Association calls for improvements to Winterstoke Road in Bristol as a priority •supports the following projects; a Barrow Gurney Bypass and the Orange route •do not support investigations of additional transport links which would include a new road between the M5 and South Bristol as we believe that this should not become part of the JTLP 3 due to environmental impacts 	<p>It is the partnerships view that more efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure [such as increasing capacity on the rail network] can support economic growth without the need for additional infrastructure that could be detrimental to the natural environment. Where new infrastructure is required full environmental impact assessments are undertaken, detriments identified and mitigated against. When the future of the major scheme bidding process, or its successor, the future of the South Bristol Link and funding levels though the JLTP3 become clearer, the partnership will need to reassess their position on all major projects. It should be noted that under the terms of the airport expansion planning consent that the airport will make substantial financial contributions to the South Bristol Link and Ashton Vale to Temple Meads major projects. Should these projects not proceed the airport will make contributions to as yet undefined transport infrastructure improvements. The South Bristol Link was identified by the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study; 2006. It is appropriate for the partnership to retain it in JLTP3 as a potential major scheme subject to further investigation into its merits and impacts.</p>
0146	E534	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has consistently and vigorously supported the Bath Transportation Plan and would urge the West of England partnership to do all it can to bring this to fruition •vital that improved links are created between Bath and both the expanding Bristol Airport and the increasingly important Science Park •would like to see the local authorities co-operate to improve marketing and ticketing on the present route to the Airport and in time to see a direct bus route established •Substantial investment is required to improve access from outlying areas of North East Somerset which suffer high levels of out commuting •remain convinced of the need for a link from the A36 to the A46 and are disappointed it does not feature in the draft plan •supportive of actions which encourage cycling and walking where practicable 	<p>Support for Bath Transportation Package, walking and cycling is noted.</p> <p>An Airport Transport Forum meets regularly to take forward the Airport Surface Access Strategy. This includes marketing and ticketing initiatives. A direct bus route between Bath and the Airport will be provided when 9 Million Passengers Per Annum use the expanded airport.</p> <p>The Airport Surface Access Strategy specifically includes the following measures referred to in the draft JLTP3.</p> <p>The Ashton Vale to Temple Meads Bus Rapid Transit</p> <p>The South Bristol Link Road</p> <p>Freight Consolidation Centre</p> <p>At present there are no detailed plans for improving public transport access to the proposed Science Park at Emersons Green.</p> <p>A central objective of the draft JLTP3 is to improve accessibility to the main employment centres including Bath particularly by public transport. The Bath Transportation Package helps to achieve this by improving and expanding Park & Ride Services and the Greater Bristol Bus Network improves accessibility by bus between Radstock/Midsomer Norton and Bath.</p> <p>However, the extent to which bus services to rural areas can be improved beyond these major projects depends to a large degree on the investment in bus services and tender prices provided by commercial bus operators and support from central government through for example Rural Bus Grant, Concessionary Fares and Fuel Duty Rebate.</p> <p>Despite the congestion and carbon reduction benefits of the A46-A36 Link the environmental impact of the route is likely to be significant and will only be considered as a last resort. The focus of the JLTP3 is to investigate alternative measures to reduce congestion through improving and promoting more sustainable modes of transport, such as walking, cycling and public transport. However the possibility of restricting HGV traffic from using Cleveland Bridge will be considered.</p>

2662	E532	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •support the fourth bullet point in Box 2c (alternatives to the car) •Recommended addition to Box 2c - To ensure that within the principal urban areas car ownership is a choice and not a necessity •Chapter 7 – Recommended additions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · An explicit recognition that a substantial proportion of the population, particularly in the larger urban centres, lives without a car by choice. · A principle, that citizens have the right to choose to live without a car, and that the councils will aim to facilitate that choice. · A commitment to a study examining the travel patterns, travel needs and difficulties encountered by people who live without cars in the area, leading to a plan to address these problems, particularly gaps in the urban public transport and cycling networks. •We support all of the Future Plan Ideas in Box 9c, particularly the first bullet point: ‘Traffic free historic town, village and city centres’ •We would like to see a more specific commitment to <i>[removing traffic from Bristol City Centre]</i> •We believe there are a number of sites, particularly around Temple Meads station, which would be ideally suited to new carfree developments •We support the ideas in Box 9c, and suggest the addition of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · An explicit commitment to removing through traffic (apart from buses and bicycles) from Bristol City Centre · A commitment to support the development of carfree new neighbourhoods in areas well served by public transport, e.g. the development sites around Temple Meads station •support the commitment in 6.1 to reduce parking levels •support the statement in 6.12 about the damaging effects of large-scale free parking in out-of-town developments such as Cribbs Causeway, and support the call for central Government to give greater powers to local authorities to control parking in these circumstances •question the statement in 6.20 that reduced parking “should be applied at journey destinations rather than where people live”. We believe this statement is based on a misreading of evidence from elsewhere in the country (and overseas), and needs to be differentiated •Supplementary Document on Parking: We support paragraphs 6.1 and 6.12.Paragraph 6.20 should be replaced with a statement that: Residential parking controls can, and should, be used to reduce car ownership levels and to improve the urban environment in those locations where demand exists for carfree living, and where parking can be controlled. These are principally in inner urban areas, and suburban and smaller town centres which are well connected to PT 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. Residents' parking zones help ensure that residential streets are not overwhelmed by on-street commuter parking. People choosing to live without a car has been added to Chapter 7. Development of European style ‘car free’ new neighbourhoods in areas well served by public transport has been added to Future Plan Ideas in Chapter 9.</p>
------	------	--	---

2675	E535	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The target increase in cycling of 76% by 2016 is too modest •The target needs to show that people are shifting from cars to bikes •The target should match that in the Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy by Ove Arup and Partners, i.e. 9% of all journeys by bike by 2015 •commit highway engineers and designers to change their design & maintenance approach to one that treats roads as public spaces for the benefit of residents and not as freeways for motor traffic passing through •gives precedence to cyclists and other vulnerable road users •apply the golden rule for cycle traffic design: make sure the cyclist can keep moving •The design approach to cycleways should be the same as for roads, except that the width is less. Designers should not incorporate obstructions that they would not put in a road •Contractors should be advised on the dangers of placing temporary signs,.....on adjacent foot/cycle paths 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.</p>
0189	E536	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •broad support for JLTP3 strategy subject to points raised in letter •formal planning permission expected shortly for expansion of airport to handle up to 10 million passengers per annum •JLTP3 recognises that airport contributes to economic growth; please note re-branding to 'Bristol Airport' •JLTP3 recognises most but not all the proposals in the Airport Surface Access Strategy •Bristol Flyer to be made more frequent and extended to serve Bath and Weston-super-Mare; new high quality low floor buses recently introduced •Ashton Vale to Temple Meads rapid transit and South Bristol Link are key to achieving better public transport links to airport: need to make every effort to maintain major scheme programme •should be improved integration at Bristol Temple Meads station between rail and the Flyer service •local community concessionary travel scheme proposed for Bristol Flyer •consolidation centre proposed for airport deliveries; JLTP3 makes no reference to mail freight •staff travel plan aimed at reducing single car occupancy 	<p>All points noted, however, the need to keep the document short and concise may mean not all references can be made.</p>
0334	E537	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •welcome general JLTP3 approach and move from 5-year plan to long term vision •link between JLTP3 and LDFs welcome but over dependence on RSS and LDFs may compromise long term viability of JLTP3 •comprehensive and integrated transport network needed to underpin economic growth •projected growth in North, Eastern Fringe and Severnside requires effective orbital transport link •stronger JLTP3 proposals needed for Bristol Airport development, particularly improved links to Bristol and Bath city centres by extending Ashton Vale- Temple Meads rapid transit route •keep up momentum with major scheme programme; would welcome further discussion if Comprehensive Spending Review significantly alters programme; give priority to schemes that improve access to growth opportunities in South Bristol •principle of demand management supported but central Bristol workplace parking levy proposal 	<p>The JLTP3 looks ahead 15 years and recognises the importance of how transport interventions and investment decisions support economic growth as well as carbon reduction and other environmental objectives. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 sees an expanded role for both rail and bus services in the next 15 years and further integration between them and walking and cycling. The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion</p>

<p>E537 continued</p>	<p>would be an additional taxation on business rather than an effective way of tackling congestion or reducing carbon emissions. Five reasons: 1. Bristol lacks attractive public transport network to provide an alternative to car-based travel (particularly for commuters from rural areas and those working shifts without an explanation) without a clear explanation of how revenue generated would be used to significantly improve the transport offer; 2. no reward to people choosing to travel outside congested peak times and could encourage continued car use; 3. damage competitiveness of city centre businesses and encourage firms and staff to relocate; 4. ignores considerable effort made to tackle traffic congestion, e.g. more flexible working; 5. double taxation as business already contributes enormously to funding of public services-extend park and ride opening hours to facilitate more flexible working-more encouragement needed for use of more sustainable forms of car transport: provide electric car charging points</p>	<p>bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. The JLTP3 refers to possible demand management measures such as congestion charging or workplace parking levies but no specific proposals are put forward. No specific proposals are put forward but the potential role of measures is recognised with a view to assessing their costs and benefits. Councils aim to encourage the use of Park and Ride and balance the price of fares with the wider costs of congestion and pollution caused by parking in the city centre. The JLTP3 proposes to work with others, subject to funding, to provide charging stations for electric vehicles. The JLTP3 supports the Airport Surface Access Strategy in promoting and facilitating increased use of public transport by airline passengers and staff travelling to and from Bristol Airport including enhancement of the Bristol Flyer service and a potential extension of the proposed rapid transit system to serve the airport. References to electrical car charging points have been strengthened in Chapter 5.</p>
<p>E538 continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •welcome general JLTP3 approach and move from 5-year plan to long term vision •link between JLTP3 and LDFs welcome but over dependence on RSS and LDFs may compromise long term viability of JLTP3 •comprehensive and integrated transport network needed to underpin economic growth •keep up momentum with major scheme programme; give priority to schemes that improve access to growth opportunities in South Bristol, taking account of European good practice e.g. Bordeaux, Copenhagen and Freiburg •promote smartcard scheme as a 'low cost, high value' initiative requiring strong co-operation across West of England and delivering positive change in a relatively short term period •principle of demand management supported but central Bristol workplace parking levy proposal would be an additional taxation on business rather than an effective way of tackling congestion or reducing carbon emissions. Four reasons: 1. Bristol lacks attractive public transport network to provide an alternative to car-based travel (particularly for commuters from rural areas and those working shifts without an explanation) without a clear explanation of how revenue generated would be used to significantly improve the transport offer; 2. no reward to people choosing to travel outside congested peak times and could encourage continued car use; 3. damage competitiveness of city centre businesses and encourage firms and staff to relocate; 4. ignores considerable effort made to tackle traffic congestion, e.g. more flexible working •extend park and ride opening hours to facilitate more flexible working •expand car club initiative to include rural areas •provide electric car charging points 	<p>The JLTP3 looks ahead 15 years and recognises the importance of how transport interventions and investment decisions support economic growth as well as carbon reduction and other environmental objectives. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 sees an expanded role for both rail and bus services in the next 15 years and further integration between them and walking and cycling. The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. The JLTP3 foresees, subject to funding, the introduction of a West of England-wide 'smart' travelcard to speed up boarding times and reduce barriers to improved integrated ticketing. Councils aim to encourage the use of Park and Ride and balance the price of fares with the wider costs of congestion and pollution caused by parking in the city centre. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 proposes to work with others, subject to funding, to provide charging stations for electric vehicles. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. The JLTP3 refers to possible demand management measures such as congestion charging or workplace parking levies but no specific proposals are put forward. No specific proposals are put forward but the potential role of measures is recognised with a view to assessing their costs and benefits.</p>

2677	E539	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Partnership represents large employers with total 40,000 staff; would like to join Transport Commission to provide direct voice to business in N Bristol •Partnership has twin objectives of expanding economic activity whilst mitigating carbon emissions and other pollutants •need to re-examine plans in light of funding reductions and planned increases in employment to give priority to orbital public transport links across north Bristol •no provision made for smarter choice interventions such as work hubs or travel management associations; area travel plan to be adopted by Partnership in early 2011 •new sources of funding need to be considered in view of impending reductions in Government funding, e.g. Plugged in Places and Low Carbon Economic Area- Hydrogen Highway •emergence of LEP if linked with JLTP could facilitate faster delivery of transport improvements, tapping into regional growth funding and reducing reliance on Government funding by pooling of CIL or equivalent tariff systems 	<p>The JLTP3 looks ahead 15 years and recognises the importance of how transport interventions and investment decisions support economic growth as well as carbon reduction and other environmental objectives. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to improve air quality by better management of the highway network, encouraging alternatives to the car, encouraging use of lower emission vehicles and promoting 'eco driving' training. An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. The JLTP3 foresees, subject to funding, the introduction of a West of England-wide 'smart' travelcard to speed up boarding times and reduce barriers to improved integrated ticketing. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 proposes to work with others, subject to funding, to provide charging stations for electric vehicles.</p>
0447	E540	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •encouraging to see refs to peak oil •question need for South Bristol Link •increases in rail capacity (more tracks, signalling, electrification) needed more than high speed rail: main line services are already fast •rail capacity improvements would benefit local and long distance rail travel •safeguard former Bristol-Mangotsfield and Radstock-Frome lines for possible reinstatement •rail quicker and more convenient for many urban journeys than car or bus •frequent rail services needed on both existing and reopened lines •parking at small stations should remain free •more rail freight terminals needed and disused ones safeguarded; rail access should be considered in major new industrial developments •electrification would benefit rail freight and passenger services, improve air quality and safeguard energy supplies •at least part of rapid transit network should be rail-based •tram trains could provide links between heavy rail network, e.g. Clevedon-Yatton, Bristol-Whitchurch-Radstock •Callington Road major scheme would prejudice possible reinstatement of Bristol-Radstock rail line 	<p>The JLTP3 envisages investment in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. As economic conditions improve the JLTP3 aims to work with the rail industry to enhance passenger and freight services. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. An expanded role is foreseen for rail freight services to supplement and provide an alternative to road freight. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car.</p>

0489	E541	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •JLTP3 strategy fits well with RDA objectives, national priorities and LSP aims and is broadly supportive of MAA objectives; make links with LSPs, MAA and LEP more explicit •Stronger, more explicit links needed to transport strategies of neighbouring authorities and more emphasis on improving long distance connectivity (i.e. Bristol Port, airport, managed motorway scheme and rail electrification) •funding and partnership arrangements should be clarified, e.g. relating delivery to Infrastructure and Investment Plan, potential joint commissioning through LEP or LSPs, consideration of benefits of ITA •framework for major scheme prioritisation needed to take account of Government spending review •JLTP3 may need reviewing after LDF spatial strategies have been adopted; meanwhile other relevant strategies should be used to provide a context •JLTP3 strategy should be linked to aims of proposed LEP, alignment of end dates would be beneficial •consider stronger emphasis on transport and tourism via a Visitor Management Strategy •RDA commissioned Travel Smart initiative: JLTP3 should include objective to change mode split supported by targets e.g. bus speed, reduced single car occupancy trips, walking and cycling •link Bristol Metro proposals to strategic rail priorities In RDA 2010 'growth prospectus'; give more prominence in Supporting Economic Growth chapter to longer distance rail measures e.g. electrification, high speed rail •consider reviewing case for major scheme programme against emerging LDF spatial strategies and LEP objectives •place West of England smartcard proposals in context of SW-wide ITSO scheme •JLTP3 should include more references to carbon reduction initiatives such as Plugged in Places, Hydrogen Highway, Green Bus Fund and links with other projects e.g. rail electrification, high speed rail, Cycling City •more references needed to additional funding sources and scope for bid to Regional Growth Fund or Tax Increment Funding •more references needed to scope for video conferencing and area wide travel plans or more formal Travel Management Associations (e.g. North Bristol Travel to Work Partnership initiative) 	<p>The JLTP3 looks ahead 15 years and recognises the importance of how transport interventions and investment decisions support economic growth as well as carbon reduction and other environmental objectives. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. The JLTP3 foresees, subject to funding, the introduction of a West of England-wide 'smart' travelcard to speed up boarding times and reduce barriers to improved integrated ticketing. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 proposes to work with others, subject to funding, to provide charging stations for electric vehicles. The JLTP3 puts forward a number of comprehensive schemes that are needed to significantly improve transport in the West of England. Because of their size and complexity they can only be funded with substantial support from the Government through the national 'major scheme' programme. The JLTP3 has been updated to include more detail on the emerging Local Enterprise Partnership. References to electrical car charging points have been strengthened in Chapter 5. Securing funding from other sources has been added to Chapters 10 and 11.</p>
2692	E542	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •broadly agree tone of Cycling SD but strategy not ambitious enough: better designed cycle routes, permit cyclist to use shortest routes, more priority at junctions •construct new railway stations (e.g. Winterbourne, Coalpit Heath, Saltford, Long Ashton, Ashley Down, Horfield, Lockleaze) with associated rail capacity enhancements: cheaper than new rapid transit routes •where rapid transit routes are developed they should carry cycles 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. An expanded role is foreseen for rail services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve the JLTP3 aims to work with the rail industry to enhance passenger and freight services. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations.</p>

2693	E543	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy of Sept 2010 should be adopted as guidance document •cycling target is too modest, include target for mode share •JLTP3 should include commitment to an early cycling major scheme bid •roads should be treated as public spaces with precedence given to cyclist and other vulnerable users •cycling infrastructure should be better designed, ensuring that cyclist can keep moving 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.</p>
2679	E544	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •more could be done to encourage cycling •Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy of Sept 2010 should be adopted as guidance document •cycling target is too modest •cycling infrastructure should be better designed, ensuring that cyclists and pedestrians have higher priority •make it less attractive to use cars unnecessarily, e.g. by restricting traffic routes through city centre •cultural change needed, more car-free city and town centres and 20mph zones 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling and on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.</p>
2678	E545	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •welcome broad cycling aims •modal shift target in Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy of Sept 2010 should be adopted •roads should be treated as public spaces with precedence given to cyclist and other vulnerable users •cycling infrastructure should be better designed, ensuring that cyclist can keep moving •continue Cycling City provision of training, bike maintenance and additional facilities for cyclist 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. Through design and planning standards the JLTP3 will ensure that safe, secure, accessible and appropriately located cycle parking is provided. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.</p>

2682	E548	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •vision, goals and challenges should explicitly include support for biodiversity: plan should be strengthened to reflect legal duty towards biodiversity in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 •roadside habitat protection and enhancement proposed in JTAMP needs to be reflected in Delivery Plan and in targets and monitoring section of plan •measures to help wildlife adapt to climate change need to be reflected in Delivery Plan and in targets and monitoring section of plan •objectives of North Fringe to Hengrove package not clear 	All points noted, however, the need to keep the document short and concise may mean not all references can be made.
2680	E546	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •questionnaire not helpful - goals are complementary and all deserve attention •5 key goals are improvement on 4 JLTP2 priorities; welcome greater emphasis on active travel and quality of life •welcome frequent references to walking •walking target needed, not costly or difficult •Walking SD lacks costed proposals and hard data on barriers •RoWIP implementation and reducing barriers to walking and cycling represent should be high priority as relatively low cost high value schemes •generally support public transport improvements which can aid walking •concerned about rapid transit schemes that would spoil popular walking routes •traffic congestion in Bath could be reduced by provision of more school buses 	The questionnaire has been designed to find out what issues are important to people and where investment should be focused. Walking is recognised as a healthy, low cost, non-polluting, low carbon mode of travel and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. Through school and further education travel plans and other 'smarter choice' initiatives the JLTP3 aims to promote and facilitate alternative ways of children and students getting to school or college other than by car.
2681	E547	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •should include firm commitment to early cycling major scheme, return on investment better than other schemes •more could be done to encourage cycling •cycling target is too modest: modal shift target in Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy of Sept 2010 should be adopted •roads should be treated as public spaces with precedence given to cyclist and other vulnerable users •cycling infrastructure should be better designed, ensuring that cyclists and pedestrians have higher priority •provision should be made for both safe on-road and off-road cycling 	Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. Through design and planning standards the JLTP3 will ensure that safe, secure, accessible and appropriately located cycle parking is provided. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.

2683	E549	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •lacks any radical vision for providing affordable public transport as an alternative to the car; Yate-Bristol bus fares too expensive •look at flexi-minibus/ shared taxi for more flexible and responsive approach •people with limited mobility expected to reduce reliance on private transport, taking a disproportionate share of climate change burden •responds to new areas of economic growth such as Emersons Green Science Park without adequately addressing current congestion problems and associated environmental costs •does not address excessive travel times for work journeys Yate to Bristol and North Fringe •fails to address additional travel pressures that will arise from new residential growth areas such as Yate: no co-ordination with S Glos LDF core strategy, only small park and ride and rail turnback proposed to deal with extra commuting; failure to include major road proposals to cater for future traffic, town bypass needed; •no specific provision to tackle congestion within Yate as proposed for Weston Package •overcrowding on rail services from Yate, extra trains and coaches needed •does not address inaccessibility of health care for Yate residents: excessive journey time to A&E at Southmead, public transport provision needs to be made •does not address need not only to provide infrastructure for residential growth but also sustaining affordable public transport in long term 	<p>The JLTP3 recognises the cost of bus travel is a serious issue and this has been confirmed by the consultation. Buses are privately operated but the Council has scope to support services that are not commercially viable. The cost of fares is set by the operator however the JLTP3 confirms we are seeking Quality Bus Partnerships with the operators which will seek to agree maximum fares. There is synergy between to Core Strategy and the JLTP3. Both documents support the other. The JLTP3 sets the broad strategic direction of policy across the whole West of England area. It includes major transport schemes but not detailed transport proposals for future development sites. These are contained in the Core Strategy. The Yate/Sodbury Package which is detailed in the pre submission publication draft Core Strategy lists a series of improvements to the local transport network for this area. This document can be viewed at:</p> <p>http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/A0A262EE F59E 4DA5 AE17 344EB504F7B7/0/CS_FULLL.pdf</p>
2684	E550	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •should include firm commitment to early cycling major scheme, return on investment better than other schemes •cycling infrastructure should be better designed, ensuring that cyclists have higher priority •should take full account of Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy of Sept 2010 •bus services should be speeded up •should introduce OysterCard type ticketing 	<p>The aspiration of an "Oystercard type" system is noted. As part of a £2.2m award of Department for Transport (DfT) funding to support the rollout of ITSO smartcard schemes, the West of England authorities are procuring on-bus ticketing machines and other related equipment which will be loaned out to operators of self contained supported services. At present the authorities are considering how best to pursue the development of a wider smart ticketing/e-money scheme, to build upon the activities above and the smartcard ticketing plans of bus operators. A smartcard scheme covering Wessex Connect bus services was launched in December 2010. This trial has been introduced through a partnership between Bristol City Council, the University of the West of England (UWE), University of Bristol and Wessex Connect. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.</p>

2685	E551	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •more could be done to encourage cycling and walking, redressing the bias towards motorised traffic •should include strategic approach to cycling schemes, delivering one route at a time rather than focusing on softer options •cycle routes should be primarily on road, requiring carriageway re-allocation and potential loss of on-street parking but would deliver more protected lanes to ensure that cyclists and pedestrians have higher priority •road design should reduce the number of traffic lanes to reduce competition •support 20mph zones; Bristol should have 5mph for side roads and 50mph for motorway and ring road •cycling target should be dropped in favour of implementing excellent infrastructure 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes.</p>
2686	E552	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •more could be done to encourage cycling and walking, redressing the bias towards motorised traffic •should include strategic approach to cycling schemes •cycle routes should be primarily on road, requiring carriageway re-allocation and potential loss of on-street parking but would deliver more protected lanes to ensure that cyclists and pedestrians have higher priority •support 20mph zones; Bristol should have 5mph for side roads and 50mph for motorway and ring road 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes.</p>
2687	E553	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •broadly supportive •plan must ensure that consequences of an expanded Bristol Airport are fully addressed •support rapid transit to serve S Bristol and urge that it be extended to serve the airport •plan fails to take account of future traffic growth on A38 between airport and Bristol •strongly support Barrow Gurney Bypass to supplement South Bristol Link and address environmental impact of airport traffic on local roads; bypass should be implemented early if the South Bristol Link does not go ahead or is seriously delayed •plan should not ignore CO2 emissions from international aviation and shipping; plan should show how reductions in other transport emissions will compensate for the disproportionate emissions from aviation: blanket speed limits may be appropriate 	<p>North Somerset Council considered the planning application in the appropriate manner as supported by the Secretary of State. The planning consent conditions and section 106 agreement address the issues of an expanded airport, rather than the JTLTP which is predominantly a transport strategy document. Support for the Barrow Gurney bypass noted. Note the Major Scheme Business Case for the South Bristol Link predicts 10600 annual average daily traffic in 2016 if South Bristol Link is not built and 7100 aadt if South Bristol Link is built on the B3130 through Barrow Gurney. When the future of the major scheme bidding process, or its successor is known, when the future of the South Bristol Link and funding levels though the JLTP3 become clearer, the partnership will need to reassess their position on all major projects. Aviation transport does not fall within the remit of the JLTP3. All other points noted.</p>

0320	E554	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •rail needs more prominence in plan •Portishead railway branch should include stations at Ashton Gate and Pill •railway tracks need reinstatement at Filton Bank an between Temple Meads and Parson Street •stations should be considered for the Henbury Loop at Filton North, Henbury and Hallen •Metro concept needs more precise definition, identifying all stations which need at least a half hourly service •Metro should allow for half hourly service to Avonmouth via new Bath/ Clifton Down and Henbury Loop services-all Metro services should be clockface •more should be said about re-opening stations on existing lines with a map showing specific proposals and local authorities taking the initiative •bus/ rail interchanges should be developed at specific local stations with appropriate signing and through ticketing-the strategy document should include the Severn Beach Line as an example of good practice 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for rail services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve the JLTP3 aims to work with the rail industry to enhance passenger and freight services. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. The JLTP3 sees an expanded role for both rail and bus services in the next 15 years and further integration between them and walking and cycling. The JLTP3 foresees, subject to funding, the introduction of a West of England-wide 'smart' travelcard to speed up boarding times and reduce barriers to improved integrated ticketing. A new rail map Figure 6.2 has been added to Chapter 6 of the JLTP3.</p>
2689	E555	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •more could be done to encourage cycling, especially for inexperienced and nervous potential cyclists •provision should be made for both safe on-road and off-road cycling, including appropriate shared pavements •better designed cycle parking needed; provision of parking at Bristol Temple Meads station needs expanding •cyclists should have higher priority in road user hierarchy •increased footfall at Temple Meads not fully recognised •more should be said about re-opening stations on existing lines, cheaper than new rapid transit schemes •plan should allow for increased rail capacity to cater for existing and re-opened stations •major residential growth areas should be served by enhanced rail services 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road. The councils will work subject to funding with partners to provide cycle training, education and publicity initiatives. Through design and planning standards the JLTP3 will ensure that safe, secure, accessible and appropriately located cycle parking is provided. An expanded role is foreseen for rail services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve the JLTP3 aims to work with the rail industry to enhance passenger and freight services. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic. The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm.</p>

2690	E556	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •lacks any radical vision for providing affordable public transport as an alternative to the car; Yate-Bristol bus fares too expensive •look at flexi-minibus/ shared taxi for more flexible and responsive approach •people with limited mobility expected to reduce reliance on private transport, taking a disproportionate share of climate change burden •responds to new areas of economic growth such as Emersons Green Science Park without adequately addressing current congestion problems and associated environmental costs •does not address excessive travel times for work journeys Yate to Bristol and North Fringe •fails to address additional travel pressures that will arise from new residential growth areas such as Yate: no co-ordination with S Glos LDF core strategy, only small park and ride and rail turnback proposed to deal with extra commuting; failure to include major road proposals to cater for future traffic, town bypass needed; •no specific provision to tackle congestion within Yate as proposed for Weston Package •overcrowding on rail services from Yate, extra trains and coaches needed •does not address inaccessibility of health care for Yate residents: excessive journey time to A&E at Southmead, public transport provision needs to be made •does not address need not only to provide infrastructure for residential growth but also sustaining affordable public transport in long term 	<p>The JLTP3 recognises the cost of bus travel is a serious issue and this has been confirmed by the consultation. Buses are privately operated but the Council has scope to support services that are not commercially viable. The cost of fares is set by the operator however the JLTP3 confirms we are seeking Quality Bus Partnerships with the operators which will seek to agree maximum fares. There is synergy between to Core Strategy and the JLTP3. Both documents support the other. The JLTP3 sets the broad strategic direction of policy across the whole West of England area. It includes major transport schemes but not detailed transport proposals for future development sites. These are contained in the Core Strategy. The Yate/Sodbury Package which is detailed in the pre submission publication draft Core Strategy lists a series of improvements to the local transport network for this area. This document can be viewed at:</p> <p>http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/A0A262EE F59E 4DA5 AE17 344EB504F7B7/0/CS_FULL.pdf</p>
2691	E557	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •more should be spent on cycling in Bath with firm commitment to early cycling major scheme, return on investment better than other schemes •cycling target is too modest: modal shift target in Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy of Sept 2010 should be adopted •cycling infrastructure should be better designed, ensuring that cyclist can keep moving •Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy should be adopted as guidance document 	<p>Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 aims to enhance off-road facilities for cyclists whilst reducing road safety risks for those who choose to travel on the road.</p>

2688	E558	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •state of the art multi-modal interchange needed at Temple Meads, making use of Plot 6 •PTA needed to make a real difference •more emphasis needed on smartcards and real time passenger information•traffic reduction should be a real ambition to meet a range of goals •plan should refer to importance of land use planning, sustainable communities, local food production and distribution, and 'low traffic' business as well as digital infrastructure •plan should refer to city-wide 20mph zones as a way of saving lives and reducing carbon emissions •rail passenger services to Portishead and on Henbury Loop should have greater priority 	<p>The JLTP3 sees an expanded role for both rail and bus services in the next 15 years and further integration between them and walking and cycling. They are an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Ways to further enhance transport governance and delivery using existing transport powers will be looked at. The JLTP3 foresees, subject to funding, the introduction of a West of England-wide 'smart' travelcard to speed up boarding times and reduce barriers to improved integrated ticketing. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. Re-opening the Portishead rail branch to passenger services is included in the JLTP3 programme of major transport schemes subject to funding. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic.</p>
0552	E560	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •goals should be prioritised: quality of life; reduce carbon; support economic growth; equality of opportunity; safety, security and health •references to GBSTS should be deleted, not least because underlying circumstances and outlook have changed 	<p>All points noted.</p>
2895	E562	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •access to health service one of top priorities in 2009 N Somerset survey •ageing population, decline in public transport in rural areas and reduction in local services storing up severe access problems for people who are no longer able to drive •getting to health appointments is real issue for those lacking, or not able to use, public transport; Patient Transport Service only available for those with defined medical need and taxis costly •JLTP3 should properly recognise role of community transport, Dial a Ride and volunteer car schemes and prioritise resources to support them •not clear if Table 7.1 on healthcare access included GP surgeries which many users find difficulty reaching •parking at hospitals is costly and difficult for community car schemes: NHS need to facilitate access for these schemes •support focus on healthy exercise but many older people may need a lot of help and support 	<p>The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. The JLTP3 recognises that rural residents have particular accessibility problems and sees a greater role for community transport in meeting needs that cannot be met by conventional bus services.</p>

2893	E559	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •JLTP3 vision not clear •agree that access needs of rural areas are challenging and need innovative approaches to reduce need to travel by car •support direction and intent of plan re public health and recognition of health benefits of active travel •SEA suggests strategy is out-scored by 'demand management' and 'smarter choices' packages: more evidence needed that strategy has been optimised •HIA will need reviewing to reflect JLTP3 changes flowing from Government spending review; unclear why longer term positive effects on health are considered to be less certain than those in short/ medium term •car trips under 5 miles produce disproportionately greater emissions per distance travelled than longer trips •not clear why car demand is reduced or managed through highway improvement and maintenance •does out-commuting issue apply to Yate as well as Weston-s-Mare? •agree need to align JLTP with S Glos LDF and public transport active travel encouraged in new development •look forward to detailed proposals in relation to 'peak oil' •support rapid transit proposals but funding problems may require short term focus on improving existing bus network with bus priority and bus lane enforcement •no specific demand proposals are put forward for S Gloucestershire; 'layered' approach to demand management is reasonable in principle but concerned that time lag in monitoring targets could mean that demand management is not applied strongly or early enough •support clear plan on parking charges to support health benefits •support speed management and 20mph zones to re-forge communities, encourage children's outdoor play and foster walking and cycling •new housing should be well planned with low speed streets •rights of way should be protected and safeguarded 	<p>The JLTP3 recognises that rural residents have particular accessibility problems and sees a greater role for community transport in meeting needs that cannot be met by conventional bus services. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 supports a safe and attractive environment for cycling. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. The JLTP3 proposes, subject to funding, a bus rapid transit system designed to provide a fast and attractive form of public transport. Like a tram it will use lengths of segregated track and extensive priority measures to avoid congestion. Having the ability to operate both on and off street, and linking to park and ride, rapid transit has an inherent flexibility to provide access to a wider range of key destinations. The JLTP3 supports the provision and management of parking as part of an integrated transport system through enforcement to help traffic flow, managing demand and promoting sustainable modes. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. Through design and planning standards the JLTP3 will ensure that safe, secure, accessible and appropriately located cycle parking is provided. Through design and planning standards the JLTP3 will ensure that safe, secure, accessible and appropriately located cycle parking is provided. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car.</p>
------	------	---	---

E559 continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •access to stations on foot and by cycle should be improved •refs to Cycling City are misleading as it finishes in March 2011. Would support cycling major scheme •concerned about access to Southmead Hospital from S Glos rural communities; no mention made of Cossham Hospital or Yate Hub Centre •support transport user hierarchy which should be applied to all transport projects •further clarity needed on extent of investment proposed for smarter choices within major schemes and confirmation that proportion of JLTP3 Delivery Plan investment to be put into smarter choices, including active travel, would not be reduced in the event of budget cuts •Chapter 10 on Implementation Plan lacks clarity •little time to re-consult after Government spending review: re-prioritisation of JLTP3 investment likely to be difficult •monitoring needed of behavioural change •KSI data should be related to each mode's rate of exposure to accident 	
2894	<p>E561</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •fundamental objectives not clear, health is integral to delivering an efficient transport system •need to plan for reduced travel and reduced travel distance: better access to local services, achieving remote connectivity; NHS will need to take account of travel needs in planning future services with more outpatients appointments and peripatetic services •need to reduce barriers to active travel through infrastructure and behavioural interventions •need to 'future proof' by building resilience against climate change and peak oil: focus on local access, active travel and efficient public transport-strengthen links with spatial planning •all schemes should be checked for delivery of active travel and public transport provision, children's independent mobility and other aspects of health; investment should not be approved for schemes that would damage health •create safe attractive walking and cycling conditions •welcome management of parking as a measure to attract people to active travel; demand management should replace old road building aspirations; re-allocation of roadspace and use of price mechanisms for moving and/or parked vehicles are essential; research shows that a road user charge would be acceptable and not harm business •protect smarter choices programmes from budget cuts, need to resource voluntary behavioural change and make use of social psychologists •emphasise that economic competitiveness needs efficient use of the road network, not an expansion; focus on prosperity rather than growth per se •small scale walking and cycling schemes offer best value for money; can be delivered faster than other schemes •support extension of freight consolidation to Bath; potential for future NHS participation 	<p>Walking is recognised as a healthy, low cost, non-polluting, low carbon mode of travel and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas. The 15-year strategy includes 'smarter choice' initiatives, subject to funding, to inform people about the range of travel choices available and promote alternatives to the car. An expanded role is foreseen for rail and bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys and the resultant congestion and carbon emissions. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car. The JLTP3 has important links with Local Development Frameworks and urban design both through planning to reduce the need to travel and also to improve the environment and public realm. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. The JLTP3 road safety strategy stresses the importance of education, publicity</p>

E561 continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •new development for housing and jobs should include upfront public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure topromote low carbon healthy travel from outset •serious concerns about Weston Package new road capacity proposals •facilate lift sharing in rural areas •highway maintenance should improve opportunities for walking and cycling •integrated ticketing across all operators and modes for both urban and rural areas would help remove barriers to public transport use •road safety should be integrated with other goals; extend 20mph zones to enable greater walking and cycling •concerned about enforcement of speed limits in light of Road Safety Grant cuts; carry out publicity campaigns directed at anti-social behaviour •develop ways that UTC can be use to encourage modal shift; use variable message signs to promote non-motorised travel •insufficient attention given to children's activity, ensure children can travel independently •acutely aware that NHS needs to be an examplar of healthy travel through its own staff's travel choices •support cycling major scheme; •promotion of cycling and walking should be encouraged across whole of the West of England •walking strategies should be drawn up integrated with cycling strategies; support protection and enhancement of rights of way •re-opening of Portishead railway important •local government health responsibilities from 2013 point to need for significant collaboration between health and transport planning 	<p>and education programmes, especially for vulnerable road users, and of targeted engineering schemes. The JLTP3 supports the provision and management of parking as part of an integrated transport system through enforcement to help traffic flow, managing demand and promoting sustainable modes. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic including lorries to improve efficiency and reduce volumes of goods vehicles through consolidation of deliveries. The JLTP3 envisages investment in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. The JLTP3 foresees, subject to funding, the introduction of a West of England-wide 'smart' travelcard to speed up boarding times and reduce barriers to improved integrated ticketing. The JLTP3 encourages car sharing as a way of reducing peak period traffic and associated congestion and carbon emissions. The JLTP3 recognises the importance of managing our transport assets within the available budgets. Re-opening the Portishead rail branch to passenger services is included in the JLTP3 programme of major transport schemes subject to funding. The JLTP3 refers to possible demand management measures such as congestion charging or workplace parking levies but no specific proposals are put forward. No specific proposals are put forward but the potential role of measures is recognised with a view to assessing their costs and benefits. The importance of independent travel for children has been added to the Active Health Strategy in Chapter 8.</p>	
2897	E564	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •provision for interchange should take account of whole journey, i.e. cost or other barriers to individual parts of a trip •unrealistic for some people, especially in rural areas, to give up car ownership: journey planning should be improved to facilitate use of alternatives to the car for some journeys •more reference should be made to powered two wheelers •rapid transit routes should be capable of being adapted for light rail •concerned about phasing of major schemes, i.e. Emerson's Green and Nibley park and rides •significant updating may be needed when Government's localism agenda becomes clearer 	<p>The intention is for the JLTP3 to recognise the importance of the 'whole' journey. The Plan has been amended to include a new vision which highlights the importance of the 'whole' journey. A reference has also been inserted in Chapter 9. The role and importance of new technology is referenced throughout the JLTP3. The Plan will be flexible to take account of future changes. A specific reference to assessing the scope for using future mobile phone technology for journey planning is included in chapter 6. A new section on powered two wheelers has been included in chapter 6. A new reference to enabling BRT can be upgraded to light rail should funding and technology allow in future has been included. There is no phasing included in chapter 11. Other than to outline the stage the major schemes have reached. This section has therefore not been amended. The strategy document has been amended to reflect as much as we know at present about the new Government agenda. We recognise this will continue to evolve and there will be an opportunity to refresh the JLTP3 next year.</p>

2896	E563	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •needs to be more visionary •rapid transit routes should be capable of being adapted for light rail •S Glos issues not well identified, including trips associated with The Mall and the North Fringe •more attention should be paid to walking, including targets for commuting and access to schools •use of mobility scooters needs to be accommodated •provision for interchange should take account of whole journey, i.e. cost or other barriers to individual parts of a trip •more emphasis should be put on park and share sites at motorway junctions, e.g. M4 J18 •more reference should be made to powered two wheelers •concerned about phasing of major schemes, i.e. Emerson's Green and Nibley park and rides •significant updating may be needed when Government's localism agenda becomes clearer 	<p>The JLTP3 has been amended to reflect these comments as follows:· A new vision has been included to reflect the long term vision the Plan is moving towards. · A new reference to enabling BRT can be upgraded to light rail should funding and technology allow in future has been included.· Paragraph 1.1.2 amended to include The Mall at Cribbs Causeway.· Paragraph 6.1.2 has been edited to reduce length and reflect the Government's emerging agenda. Specific place references no longer included.· Emphasis on walking (and cycling) are key to meeting the JLTP3 objectives. A walking target is being considered.· A reference to access for mobility scooters has been included in chapter 7· The intention is for the JLTP3 to recognise the importance of the 'whole' journey. The Plan has been amended to include a new vision which highlights the importance of the 'whole' journey. A reference has also been inserted in Chapter 9.· The scope for Park and Share sites in South Glos is included in the Parking Supplementary Document and sites are named. A new reference has been included in chapter 6.· The role and importance of new technology is referenced throughout the JLTP3. The Plan will be flexible to take account of future changes. A specific reference to assessing the scope for using future mobile phone technology for journey planning is included in chapter 6.· A new section on powered two wheelers has been included in chapter 6.· There is no phasing included in chapter 11. Other than to outline the stage the major schemes have reached. This section has therefore not been amended.· The strategy document has been amended to reflect as much as we know at present about the new Government agenda. We recognise this will continue to evolve and there will be an opportunity to refresh the JLTP3 next year.· 1.1.6 amended to take on board comment.</p>
2691	E565	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •more should be spent on cycling in Bath with firm commitment to early cycling major scheme, return on investment better than other schemes •cycling target is too modest: modal shift target in Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy of Sept 2010 should be adopted •cycling infrastructure should be better designed, ensuring that cyclist can keep moving •Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy should be adopted as guidance document 	<p>Funding for major schemes has been significantly reduced following the Comprehensive Spending Review. The government has recently announced the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, which provides local authorities the opportunity to bid for capital and revenue expenditure to promote sustainable transport initiatives including cycling. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. With grants from Links to School and Connect2 funding, capital expenditure on cycle projects in B&NES in 2010/11 is forecast to be around £2m or £11/capita.</p>
2899	E569	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Mall unlikely itself to contribute significantly to peak hour traffic due to long opening hours and ability of customers to choose when to shop •improved accessibility to The Mall by public transport more effective than car park charging •car park charging at The Mall precluded in foreseeable future by lease arrangements and would put retail warehouse parks and leisure facilities at competitive disadvantage; limited public transport options in the evening 	<p>The JLTP3 supports the provision and management of parking as part of an integrated transport system through enforcement to help traffic flow, managing demand and promoting sustainable modes. An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. The JLTP3 aims to make it easier for people to get to work, to college, to the local hospital or health centre or to other facilities by public transport, cycling or walking, especially for those in disadvantaged groups or areas.</p>

0257	E570	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •welcome reference to AONB Management Plan; add 'tranquillity' to special qualities •Protocol and Guidelines are separate documents; suggest that highway guidelines be referred to in Network Management and Freight supplementary document 	<p>New section on the Cotswolds AONB, with reference to the Transport Group and the Highway Guidelines / Transport Protocol added to the Network Management Supplementary Document. References to Cotswolds AONB activities added to the Freight and Rural Transport supplementary Documents.</p>
0498	E566	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •JLTP2 vision must be revisited, plan needs to be truly aspirational and focusing on key issues of health, climate change and economic prosperity (rather than economic growth). Underlying principles of plan not clear •supports cycling major scheme bid•modal shift supported; stated principle should be not to increase road capacity •demand management measures should be considered to reduce urban congestion: include residents' parking schemes, with more innovative approach to charges, and levy on business car parking in central Bristol •would welcome extension of 20mph zones across all urban residential areas; 'home zones' and 'DIY streets' could promote active travel and street play •support smarter choices options, low cost with high returns; value for money should have more priority; major schemes should focus on public transport and encouraging walking and cycling •would welcome more partnership and community working •targets should be more challenging and aspirational: aim should to have no KSIs; Bristol CO2 reduction target should be applied to whole of West of England; target for all journeys under 5 miles being made by foot, cycle or public transport should be more ambitious; should be target for reducing short and long stay parking in central urban areas •technology has not yet provided a solution to reducing carbon emissions- focus should remain on behavioural behaviour; carbon emission impact must be top priority in scheme appraisal •plan should be more positive in ambition to change travel patterns in rural areas; West of England is quite compact with many villages within quite short distances of services in towns and cities with potential for modal shift •extend traffic free paths to provide more links between villages, towns and cities •traffic speeds on local roads are a barrier to increasing walking and cycling •asset management should include infrastructure for pedestrians and cycling •new development should have low car parking provision and car modal share •provide cycle parking close to car club parking bays •consider adopting Ove Arup Greater Bristol Cycling Strategy as guidance document 	<p>Funding for major schemes has been significantly reduced following the Comprehensive Spending Review. The government has recently announced the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, which provides local authorities the opportunity to bid for capital and revenue expenditure to promote sustainable transport initiatives including cycling. The Draft Cycling Supplementary Document sets out the cycling strategy in more detail and is based on the same principles as the Ove Arup strategy. However the Cycle City spend per capita per year on cycling schemes at £11/yr is significantly greater than the UK average of £1/yr and therefore depends on significant additional funding being found. Demand management, smarter choices, 20 mph limits, reducing carbon emission and promoting sustainable transport are all key parts of the JLTP3. Indicators will be used to measure and monitor our progress towards meeting the JLTP3's objectives. Suitable targets may in due course accompany each indicator. Uncertainty over funding means it is not possible to set indicators at this stage. Chapter 12 in the JLTP3 sets out a possible range of indicators. It is anticipated that indicators and targets will be included in the three year Delivery Plan. Following issues raised during engagement the JLTP3 vision has been expanded with a what would it look like on the ground section added to Chapter 2. Formal engagement (4,500 responses) on the JLTP3 showed that 41% of respondents wanted to focus on supporting economic growth in the first three years of the plan. 27% wanted investment to focus on public transport (largest response) and 5 out of 6 Focus groups also made it their top priority. As with targets the uncertainty over funding mean a one year indicative Delivery Plan for 2011/12 is proposed with headline figures only. A full three year Delivery Plan 2012/13 to 2014/15 will be produced by autumn 2011 when the funding position is clearer. The Delivery Plan will be guided by JLTP3 objectives. The major transport schemes in Chapter 11 are key to supporting JLTP3 and wider community strategy objectives. All schemes have an important role in supporting economic growth and improving access to jobs and services. On road safety the Department for Transport will be issuing a new policy framework in 2011. The JTLTP3 will be reviewed accordingly. The suggestion for cycle parking adjacent to city car club spaces is a good one and will be added to the Parking Supplementary Document.</p>
0193	L708	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •fails to give due attention to importance of freight transport: should have separate section; importance recognised in Network Management & Freight supplementary document •Avonmouth/ Severnside is important distribution and logistics locality: new road system needed to serve the anticipated potential with direct link to M49 and reduce pressure on M5 J18 to enable it to serve existing and new development 	<p>Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic including lorries to improve efficiency and reduce volumes of goods vehicles through consolidation of deliveries. An expanded role is foreseen for rail freight services to supplement and provide an alternative to road freight. Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration.</p>

2898	E567	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •disappointed about lack of references to Radstock and its transport challenges, including congestion, car commuting and air and noise pollution •Radstock regeneration should be a priority, ideally placed as a tourist centre •too road orientated: little regard to renewing and improving rail links: branch to Frome should be reopened, providing link to Bath quicker than bus at peak times; new road in Radstock would be contrary to good planning •SEA pays no attention to local area biodiversity; flood risk should be taken into account •more attention should be paid to rural and semi-rural communities and links beyond West of England; treat Radstock and Midsomer Norton as distinct communities •transport planning not joined up, bus services being reduced, expensive (including Bath park and ride), gaps in timetables, unreliable and slow •investigate satellite park and ride sites on approaches to Radstock linked by dedicated buses to major city park and ride sites 	<p>Radstock is identified in draft JLTP3 as a key development location. A central objective of the draft JLTP3 is to improve accessibility to the employment centres and development sites by public transport.</p> <p>The Greater Bristol Bus Network will improve accessibility by bus between Radstock/Mid Somer Norton, Bath and Bristol. The Bath Transportation Package also helps improve accessibility by improving Park & Ride Services. The creation of satellite park and ride sites is an innovative idea, but is unlikely to be cost effective as those who have access to a car are more likely to drive direct to cheaper Park & Ride services convenient to their destination on the edge of Bath or Bristol.</p> <p>The extent to which bus services can be improved beyond these major projects depends to a large degree on the investment in bus services and tender prices provided by commercial bus and support from central government through for example Rural Bus Grant, Concessionary Fares and Fuel Duty Rebate.</p> <p>Reinstatement of Frome branch line was put forward for consideration by Network Rail during the Route Utilisation Strategy consultation, but apart from being noted as an aspiration, this proposal was not adopted as part of the strategy. Consequently there is little or no prospect of obtaining funding for reinstatement of the line due to the high capital cost in the region of £40-£50m. The route however remains protected in development plans.</p> <p>The Bellway Homes development, which included plans for remodelling the town centre and re-routing traffic, will not be implemented. However it is possible that another development may adopt these proposals in the future.</p> <p>The results of the Flood Risk assessment will be taken into account in any future transport infrastructure proposals.</p>
0418	E568	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •HIA Appendix C well grounded but not same as formal HIA •should reflect evidence in 2010 Marmot Report on integration of planning, transport, housing, environmental and health systems •welcome new Transport and Health Forum 	<p>All points noted, however, the need to keep the document short and concise may mean not all references can be made.</p>
0480	E574	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •SEWTA's Regional Transport Plan was approved in 2009, a number of policies support your objectives •cross-boundary rail links are a priority for SEWTA and support in principle is given to the Greater Bristol Metro project; important not to underestimate rail passenger growth •additional rolling stock needed for Cardiff/ cross-Bristol rail services •SEWTA's proposals for rail-based park and ride facilities at Severn Tunnel Junction and Chepstow Interchange would benefit West of England •support GBBN, including corridors of interest to South East Wales 	<p>An expanded role is foreseen for rail services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve the JLTP3 aims to work with the rail industry to enhance passenger and freight services. The JLTP3 aims to create, subject to funding, a Greater Bristol Metro of enhanced half hourly cross Bristol train services and re-open the Portishead branch for passenger traffic.</p>

2900	E571	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •no real commitment shown to low or no carbon transport system that does not depend on oil; vision needs to be stronger with shortest journeys having highest importance •Bath Package does not address city's problems, city centre parking and park and rides encourage driving, at odds with promoting public transport; car use can be discouraged by closing South Gate car park and not expanding park and rides •bus services are expensive, poorly co-ordinated and are slowed by congestion; some routes have duplicated services; more responsive services are needed •welcome consideration to health and wellbeing but some references are woolly •pleased to see rapid transit proposals; but scheme in Bath Package would share congested roadspace •park and ride benefits drivers and is not public transport •bus priorities may need to inconvenience drivers •CO2 emission reduction needs to meet Climate Change Act 40% target, has to be even higher because transport emissions nationally have grown by 11% since base date; little is said about actual targets •supports cycling major scheme bid; cycling target for areas outside Cycling City are disappointingly low; safety needs improving •there should be a walking target and proper monitoring •give thought to transport authority extending into Wiltshire 	<p>As national government is substantially reducing transport funding to local authorities (both capital and revenue) it must expect consequential reduction in transport projects / public transport with a detrimental effect on national CO2 reduction targets. Targets including cycling need to be achievable. Setting a walking target will be extremely difficult. Discussions around the target are ongoing. For clarity, walking as a mode of transport is walking to work for example. Pedestrian activity generally takes place in town centres where people are walking between shops and 'milling about'. The vision needs to be achievable. A no carbon transport system is a very long term target, not something that can be achieved within the lifespan of this JLTP3. As with many cities, Bath was not designed and built when the car was the dominant mode of transport which has led to the congestion that we are used to. The Bath Package will not address the problems alone. It is part of a series of on going measures that we are working on to make Bath an even better place to live, work and visit. Local Authorities have very little influence over bus fares. We continually work with service providers seeking to make improvements where necessary. Southgate car park is privately owned and therefore we cannot close it down. Where required we work with our neighbouring authorities to address any transport issues that have arisen.</p>
2498	E572	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •major concerns about proposed bus link from Romney Avenue Lockleaze to development in S Glos 	<p>Consultation on the Romney Avenue bus link took place. South Glos. Council have no objection in principle to the alternative route around the north of the development being suggested in this response. There are, however, constraints affecting the alternative route that do not arise on the Romney Avenue route. These are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alternative route would require 3rd party land outside of the control of either Bristol City Council or South Gloucestershire Council and there is no guarantee that this would come forward in the foreseeable future. • Using the proposed route (through Romney Avenue) would allow more efficient timetabling of existing bus services which serve Gainsborough Square (which has a large catchment) without the need to be re-routed . • Neither route would have a material change of impact on residents of Lockleaze (i.e. it would simply impact a different set of residents).
3087	L709	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •major concerns about proposed bus link from Romney Avenue Lockleaze to development in S Glos •like to see back lanes behind houses made more accessible for walking and cycling •loss of bus services in Horfield area 	<p>Network management plans are being drawn up to reduce journey delays and define routes for strategic traffic. Congestion bottlenecks will be tackled and the JLTP3 envisages investment, subject to funding, in highway infrastructure where needed to support new development or regeneration. An expanded role is foreseen for bus services as an efficient way of carrying large numbers of people in preference to individual car journeys. As economic conditions improve, the JLTP3 aims to work with the operators to enhance the quality, coverage and frequency of services to meet needs over the next 15 years. Walking and cycling are promoted as healthy, low cost and low carbon alternatives to the car and the JLTP3 puts emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians.</p>

3088	E575	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •rapid transit should be extended to include Thornbury, Yate and Chipping Sodbury •orbital bus route serving Southmead and Frenchay Hospitals should be extended to Thornbury •cycleway development should be extended to Thornbury 	<p>Given funding constraints there are no plans within the life of the JLTP3 to extend Rapid Transit to Thornbury, Yate and Chipping Sodbury. However, the proposed rapid transit system is intended to allow vehicles that meet the required quality specification to access the network. Hence, Rapid Transit or showcase quality buses from Yate/Chipping Sodbury can access the North Fringe Hengrove network at the Ring Rd and use it into Bristol. There are no plans for Rapid Transit along the A38 corridor in this plan period, but there is the showcase route that runs to Patchway, and the Core Strategy Rural Package proposes that this be extended to Thornbury (Policy CS7). The details of the orbital bus routes to serve Southmead and Frenchay have not been concluded at the time of writing the JLTP3. Discussions are currently taking place between Bristol City Council, South Gloucestershire Council and the Health Trust with a view to maximizing the benefits of developer funding from the redevelopment of Southmead Hospital. Should further funding become available to promote and extend cycle schemes in South Gloucestershire Council area consideration will be given to schemes within the towns.</p>
------	------	---	--