

Local Transport Plan - Questionnaire

Version	1.0 Document
Category	Transport Planning
Owner	Gloucestershire County Council
Target Audience	Public Consultation

Gloucestershire County Council is committed to equality and diversity. We want to eliminate barriers that prevent people accessing transport. To help identify measures that affect those people with protected characteristics, we ask you to share some of your personal details. Your post code helps us understand where feedback is coming from and personal details help us to understand whether there are barriers affecting specific groups of people.

The information which you share is supplied by you for the purpose of informing the Local Transport Plan. This information which you share is on an anonymous basis, so please take care not to include any information which may identify you directly.

Due to the anonymised basis of this questionnaire, Gloucestershire County Council is unable to respond directly to any concerns raised through this method. If you have any concerns, queries or complaints which you wish to raise with Gloucestershire County Council, please note the following points of contact: Transport Planning, Shire Hall, Westgate Street, Gloucester GL1 2TH, email: ltp@gloucestershire.gov.uk or telephone: 01452 425000

Introduction

Gloucestershire's Local Transport Plan (LTP) sets the long-term transport strategy for Gloucestershire up to 2041. It influences how and when people choose to travel so that individual travel choices do not cumulatively impact on the desirability of Gloucestershire as a place to live, work and invest.

This consultation seeks your opinions on our current 'area' and 'mode' based plans. You can answer questions on some or all of the plans.

Name of organisation: (if applicable)	Forest Economic Partnership
Post code: (this will not be published)	



Local Transport Plan consultation for plan period 2015 - 2041

1 Transport and you

The LTP revised objectives are to:

- Protect and enhance the natural and built environment
- Support sustainable economic growth
- Enable safe and affordable community connectivity
- Improve community health and wellbeing and promote equality of opportunity

1.1 How much does the impact of transport affect you?	High impact	Medium impact	Low impact	Doesn't affect me
Health impacts from transport related emissions and poor air quality	a			
Environmental impacts, such as transport emissions, noise, community severance and loss of biodiversity	b			
Lack of choice in how you travel resulting in car dependency or social isolation	c			
Affordability of public transport		d		
Access to public and community transport		e		
Frequency of public transport	c			
Highway safety such as vehicle speeds		f		
Safety (such as good lighting and natural surveillance as a pedestrian, cyclist or mobility friendly user)		f		
Congestion and journey time delays	c			

Comments:

A Poor air quality on A48 in Southern parts of the district. Increased due to Chepstow-related congestion.

b. A number of split communities with the volume of traffic on major routes in the district such as those on the A48. FoDDC has declared a biodiversity emergency in the district which may also relate to transport impact and density.

c. The transport volumes at the key pinchpoints of Highnam, Chepstow, Monmouth and Ross result from an over-reliance on cars often single occupancy due to the lack of alternative. Current bus timetables demonstrate the difficulties of travel within the district through the plotting of a simple journey from Coleford to say Vantage Point Business Village in Mitcheldean

d. If there is no service then cost is secondary because demand is unserved and the option not considered. Routes seem to be planned on history rather than opportunity.



Local Transport Plan consultation for plan period 2015 - 2041

e. Access is limited. 203 square miles has one train station to the South. Bus services are not interconnected. Community transport fills gaps but is significantly overstretched. Yet the location of a new hospital requires good public transport links to serve the best site for that hospital for ease of access.

f. The geography makes the roads high usage for trucks and cars often on narrow or hilly roads. This makes them less attractive for other forms of transport.

1.2 In light of the Council's commitment to be a carbon neutral county by 2050, would the following encourage your household/business to reduce transport related carbon emissions?	High impact	Medium impact	Low impact	None
Reduce the need to drive or travel (e.g. planning new development in sustainable locations or flexible working)	x			
Sustainable travel choice resulting in less car dependency	x			
Support travel behaviour change & improve Travel Planning advice	x			
Prioritisation and investment in active travel to improve health & wellbeing	x			
Mass public transport (such as guided busway)	x			
Demand responsive travel (such as Uber, e-bikes, taxis)	x			
Integrated transport hubs (such as park and ride with options to travel onward using car share, bus, bicycle, taxi and community transport with both rural and urban connectivity)	x			
Improved bus frequency and accessibility to public and community transport	x			
Rail infrastructure and improved rail services	x			
Electric vehicle charge point infrastructure	x			
Improved cycle infrastructure	x			
Improved pedestrian network (pedestrian and mobility user friendly)	x			

Comments:

Yes to all the above. Details can be provided on FEP's proposed Mobility as a Service (MaaS) project, our responses to train consultations. If it would be more helpful following our own Transport Study in 2020, we might even be able to rank these in order of priority.



2 Overarching Strategy

The Overarching Strategy details the vision, objectives and outcomes of the Local Transport Plan.

2.1 Do you have any comments to make on the revised LTP vision, objectives and expected outcomes?

2.1.1 Vision
A resilient transport network that enables sustainable economic growth by providing travel choices for all, making Gloucestershire a better place to live, work and visit.
Comments: FEP agrees this vision. Our own sub-group on Transport and Infrastructure has this vision: 'The District Plan guides future development that gives us the space to work, live and play. Once those uses are known we can consider the transport routes in the District to enable them to become fit for purpose. What is the practical new vision that defines the Forest we want to be and balances the use of space'.

2.1.2 Objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Protect and enhance the natural and built environment• Support sustainable economic growth• Enable safe and affordable community connectivity• Improve community health and wellbeing and promote equality of opportunity
Comments: Agree

2.1.3 Outcomes
Please refer to annex 2.0
Comments:

2.2 Do you have any comments on the revised overarching policies?
<i>(Policy titles are listed below. To read the detailed proposed policy updates as tracked policy changes, see Annex 3.0 in the full Draft Local Transport Plan (LTP).</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PD 0.1 Reducing Transport Carbon Emissions and Adapting to Climate Change



Local Transport Plan consultation for plan period 2015 - 2041

- PD 0.2 Local Environmental Protection
- PD 0.3 Maximising Investment in a Sustainable Transport Network
- PD 0.4 Integration with Land Use Planning and New Development
- PD 0.5 Community Health and Wellbeing
- PD 0.6 Thinktravel – Influencing Travel Behaviour

Comments:

Only comment is PD 0.6. Thinktravel was a project which appears to have ended in 2017 and therefore possibly legacy systems. There is limited information for the district. Is a focus on tourism the reason that the only cycleways shown are Forestry England's while even the Newent loop is ignored. Thinktravel does demonstrate clearly the issues of travel within the district by bus. Such digital solutions are good if kept upto date and accessible. This is one of the reasons for the proposed MaaS and Transport Study projects by FEP.

3 Mode Strategies

A Mode Strategy is a Policy Document which looks at the issues specific to each mode of transport across the county. Proposed policy updates bring each mode strategy up to date with revised national and regional policy and current local priorities. The addition of a Walk (PD6) policy document is in line with national guidelines on the development of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP). The revised Cycle (PD2) policy document also reflects LCWIP. Finally, the inclusion of Thinktravel, the brand for sustainable transport is now incorporated into the LTP.

Do you have any comments on the revised policies?

(Policy titles are listed below. To read the detailed proposed policy updates as tracked policy changes, see Annex 3.0 in the full Draft Local Transport Plan (LTP).

3.1 Public and Community Transport (PD1)

The Public & Community Transport (PD1) document sets out the policy for bus based public transport and includes community transport including the voluntary sector.

- PD 1.1 – Gloucestershire's Bus Network
- PD 1.2 – Improving the quality of the highway Public Transport Network
- PD 1.3 – Bus Priority
- PD 1.4 – Coach Travel
- PD 1.5 – Community Transport
- PD 1.6 – Transport Interchange Hubs
- PD 1.7 – Communicating Travel Information



Local Transport Plan consultation for plan period 2015 - 2041

Comments:

1.1 There are many significant issues related to the bus network in the District which require data not from current customers but also from potential customers to overcome core misconceptions and expectations about the services provided and what could be delivered. The missing Figure A hampers responses. While Table C increases anxieties as all services in the District must fall into category 3 which pre-supposes no viable commercial routes in the district due to the lack of urban centres. If subsidy is not possible for a route, it must therefore fail which of itself can undermine the creation of an integrated transport strategy. This creates a difficult scenario for the district. The underlying data shows an ageing population and increased car travel yet the Grand Challenge of Aging Society assumes longer home living where car driving may not be possible and a bus offers a low cost transport option.

We completely agree on MaaS as a data solution. Not least as it creates demand driven models and alternative integrated solutions which optimise traffic flows for those who live, work, study or visit the District.

1.5 presumptions are made about community transport. These voluntary organisations are overstretched and have just been hit by the PSV licence change. Given a potential for fewer buses from the previous sections is this deliverable?

1.6 & 1.7 It is surprising that no hub is proposed here for Lydney station with car and bus to rail and vice versa. And rail to rail for the Forest Railway. If there is a Severn crossing this need will grow. Thinktravel in its current form is poor for the District and underused. Improvements in access to public transport, timetables and routes information as timetables change, routes and connections including rail services improvements and the bus service to the station. It was pointed out that the bus does not tie up to both up and down trains even though there are minutes between and the station is very inhospitable at night.

3.2 Cycle (PD2)

The Cycle policy document sets out the strategic ambitions for cycle policy and reflects the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans.

- PD 2.1 – Gloucestershire’s Cycle Network
- PD 2.2 – Cycle Asset Management
- PD 2.3 – Active Travel: Safety, Awareness and Confidence

Comments:

2.1 There is no district cycle network so therefore how can it be promoted. Or put differently cycling is a key activity for the District but there is no shared map of all routes to enable wider take-up and the provision of enhanced facilities. There are opportunities across the District to create clean (business/study) and dirty (leisure) routes from the existing networks of roads, paths and tramways. These need to be mapped. The suggested routes are based upon presumption rather than data around the need for the trip. Presumption can make the case for both between and within settlement areas for different demographics.



Local Transport Plan consultation for plan period 2015 - 2041

2.2 Asset creation might be a reasonable ambition such as a complete digital map.

Cycling/ walking: Neighbourhood Plans have highlighted the importance of public footpaths for connectivity for outlying residents to access facilities especially where there is a main road without a pavement. The state of the footpaths was a concern. Cycle routes through the Forest to link to towns: Yorkley have Plans in the Forest Edge South NDP to develop a Multi Use Track from Parkend to Lydney. It will enable cyclists or walkers to get from the town to the rest of the FOD safely and also allow people from the rest of the FOD to access the town. This has proven popular in consultation with residents who can access school and work and businesses who see opportunities for retail and tourism. Newent and Dymock residents have said they are well connected by bus services but cycling connectivity is welcomed with an aspiration to get away from car usage as much as possible

3.3 Freight (PD3)

The Freight policy document outlines the transport policy for the efficient movement of freight while considering last mile deliveries. It proposed a revised Advisory Freight Route Map by introducing a route corridor weighting/hierarchy, based on existing HGV traffic flows, downgrading the status of certain routes, without altering the primary route corridors of national significance.

- PD 3.1- Gloucestershire's Freight Network
- PD 3.2 – Freight Journey Routing Information
- PD 3.3 – Driver Facilities
- PD 3.4 – Driving Better Practice
- PD 3.5 – Managing Deliveries in Sensitive Areas
- PD 3.6 – Rail and Water Freight

Comments:

This does not appear to consider the opportunities and potential impact of the Western Gateway and freight. Increased trade and traffic within this powerhouse will require an alternative route when the Severn Bridges are closed. Consider also the importance of freight and storage already as a key economic sector in the district despite the narrowness of its roads and restrictions by rivers.

A48 traffic and road safety – attention to issues in villages along A48 especially relating to traffic and road safety, flooding and width of road. Parish Plans for Aylburton and Newnham highlighted the A48 as a major concern for residents due to speeding, large (width & weight) lorries and air pollution. Alvington's recent NDP highlights evidences flooding and speeding traffic alongside extensive community consultation. The A48 was a priority for residents with regard to traffic and road safety. Villages along the A48 have reported that the road is not wide enough for today's lorries which often have to mount the pavements; traffic speeds through villages; an increase in traffic at peak times; difficulties commuting in and out of the Forest. Businesses and residents have also reported the deteriorating state of the roads.



Local Transport Plan consultation for plan period 2015 - 2041

3.4 Highways (PD4)

The Highways policy document sets the transport policy for the road network; strategic, major and local. It references policy; on road safety, on-street parking, highway safety, and the maintenance and resilience of the highway network.

- PD 4.1 – Gloucestershire’s Highway Network
- PD 4.2 – Highways Network Resilience
- PD 4.3 – Highways Maintenance
- PD 4.4 – Road Safety
- PD 4.5 – On-Street Car Parking

Comments:

There are major stresses on the network and maintenance that for many are summed up as potholes!

3.5 Rail (PD5)

The Rail policy document sets the rail strategy for the county in terms of improvements to; rail services, stations and rail infrastructure.

- PD 5.1 – Rail Infrastructure Improvements
- PD 5.2 – Rail Service Capacity Improvements
- PD 5.3 – Rail Station Improvements

Comments:

In the district significant use is made of Chepstow and Severn Tunnel Junction to access services to South Wales and to the East. Both impact on travel through Chepstow. Improvements therefore at Lydney through signalling and frequency of service may remove this need. It is essential to incorporate both these stations in a transport consideration.

5.1 Elsewhere there is reference to Metro West extensions through Gloucestershire. Nowhere does it mention the opportunity provided by a Third Severn crossing to link the District to this service. Given that the plans for the South Wales Metro potentially include Lydney as a place to turn around the trains; this is an opportunity missed to connect South Wales to Metro West and the Forest to Bristol or Gloucester. This rails crossing is explicitly mentioned in the Western Gateway proposal. Need also to consider an additional mainline station for the District.

5.3 There is a significant understatement of needs for Lydney station. There is the issue of the need for a bridge/underpass to provide safe crossing when the road barriers are closed and basic facilities given its annual use by some 0.25M passengers. The patronage for Lydney Railway station is up 24.7% from 2019. Ironically, the overflow car park is in urgent need of repair as the drainage is poor in the event of heavy rain. So even the basic facilities are deficient.

3.6 Walk (PD6)

The Walk policy document outlines the transport policy for a pedestrian network and the management of the pedestrian highway asset. It sets policy for pedestrian safety and the integration of the pedestrian rights of way network between settlements.



Local Transport Plan consultation for plan period 2015 - 2041

- PD 6.1 – Gloucestershire’s Pedestrian Network
- PD 6.2 – Rights of Way
- PD 6.3 – Pedestrian Asset Management
- PD 6.4 – Pedestrian Safety

Comments:

4 Connecting Places Strategies

A Connecting Places Strategy (CPS) is a ‘Link and Place’ approach that identifies a travel focused strategy area based on connections, moving away from the district based perspective (see *Overarching Strategy Table A & Figure C.*)

4.1 Do you have any comments on the strategic vision outlined in the following areas?	Comments Y/N
• CPS 1 – Central Severn Vale (Cheltenham/Gloucester/Tewkesbury)	
• CPS 2 – Forest of Dean	y
• CPS 3 – North Cotswolds	
• CPS 4 – South Cotswolds	
• CPS 5 - Stroud	
• CPS6 - Tewkesbury	

Comments:

4.1.11 The toll removal is not significantly addressed by the pressing need for an integrated transport strategy

4.2.4 Assumes community transport and its continued viability in the light of increased costs to PSV compliance.

4.2.7 the map on work trips shows wide disparities between the sub-areas in the District. Given they are also based on 2011 data which predates the creation of large developments in Lydney and Newent and the removal of tolls, we would urge caution on a presumption that most work within 2km from home. If this were the case why are there a significant commuting pinch points? Additionally broadband and mobile connectivity still remains poor for many not just some.

The 3 point ‘strategic’ vision for a plan running to 2041, is uninspiring with a focus on the A48 and Lydney as problems of today and not for the District as a whole. For example:



Local Transport Plan consultation for plan period 2015 - 2041

- use of rail will only ease the pinch point at Chepstow if those using Lydney Railway station are able to travel directly to Bristol rather than via Severn Tunnel Junction and if the services are more frequent to places like Newport or Cardiff. This then becomes a strong element in an integrated travel strategy.
- why is the Cinderford Northern Quarter spine road not given a higher priority given the need to connect the new college building with access to the A4136. This completes the road and fully unlocks the commercial potential of the Northern quarter thereby realising the initial investment. As the A4136 is an alternate route through the District, this should be given strategic priority alongside easing the A48 congestion

Given elsewhere in the strategy the impact of SMART on the urban areas and the digital potential, CPS 2 lacks any of that ambition to ensure an interconnected county of rural and urban. Digital is also an answer to the collection of some of the lack of data when combined with research into people's travel needs throughout the day and week given society is increasingly breaking down from a 9 to 5 work-study traffic flows. This behavioural change will continue and requires a fresh look at opportunities rather than the constraints of problem-solving the current. FEP looks forward to further working with GCC to resolve some of the missing data and achieving the over-arching objectives.

5 Monitoring

5.1 Do you have any comments on the target updates?

(Target titles are listed below. To read the detailed proposed target updates, (see Delivery chapter section 5.0), in the full Draft Local Transport Plan (LTP).

- PI-12b Reduce the number of older highway casualties
- PI-14 Reduce per capita transport carbon emissions (zero tonnes per capita by 2050)

Comments:

Any additional comments:

FEP recognises the constraints of these plans which are statutorily required but can only lay out visions. For the district of the Forest of Dean concerns are raised by some of the underlying assumptions in the Rural Ambition section and elsewhere in the documents. So from p24 onwards:

5.30 While tourism is an important sector for the Forest it employs just 7% of the workforce v 14% in the Cotswolds. Manufacturing employs 16% more akin to Stroud. These sectors have completely different transport needs and flows. Moreover 4% of the working population is in Transport and Storage which is the highest percentage for any district in Gloucestershire.



Local Transport Plan consultation for plan period 2015 - 2041

5.32 The Industry 4.0 opportunity is not just agritech. Currently 6% of the population are in the professional and scientific sectors already. There are very significant challenges on connectedness as shown in the FEP How Fast How Good is Your Broadband Study. It also includes mobile given the 9th March 2020 government agreement with the 4 mobile network operators on the Shared Rural Network which will deliver good 4G to 88% of the landmass by 2024 and to 90% of UK by 2026. NB 4G not the 5G being rolled out in urban areas now. This impacts directly on 5.34 data digitalisation.

5.36 The New Local Plan will define potential growth areas but recognises that many settlements are approaching capacity on essential services from the extra housing. It will also need to address the increased demand in the Southern Forest with the bridge toll removal and the avoidance of the creation of a Bristol commuter zone. All Forest of Dean NDP consultations have expressed a deep concern over infrastructure keeping up with the increase in housing. If services- schools, doctors, healthcare - do not meet the needs of the increasing population then road usage will increase. There was some concern over access to the new hospital and super surgery location in Cinderford when there is a significant increase in the population in Lydney. Parishes on the A48 further towards Chepstow appear to be using Chepstow and Bristol services e.g. people in Tidenham & Sedbury use Southmead or Chepstow hospitals which could increase with increased development and the location of the new Forest hospital. These journeys are usually by car. Newent and Dymock NDP consultations have highlighted cross border connection with Hereford to access services and shopping

5.37 The ambition might be more than 1 mainline station in the district given perhaps the need for a new garden village. Already there is a significant uptick in usage. The ORR data for 2018/19 shows a 24.7% increase in use to 244K. To put this in context in 2008 it was just less than 100K and only 60K in 1998.

5.40 A Chepstow bypass is required and should be strongly supported to alleviate multiple issues for an integrated transport strategy.

5.41 Studies need to be made into the suitable re-instatement of a rail/light rail plus pedestrian/cycle crossing between Lydney and Sharpness to reduce congestion at pinchpoints, increase resilience not least for the Severn tunnel and to exploit the Bristol and South Wales Metro opportunities within a Western Gateway. It is interesting to note that the crossing is argued for more strongly in the Stroud section and in Table 1 p33 only mentions Stroud against crossing

Figure C Does not address the issue of interconnectivity between towns and to key central resources especially by ignoring the A4136. How does the district access the new Hospital or Gloscol (Cinderford); Growthhub and 3000 jobs (Mitcheldean) or station (Lydney)

Table 1 Long Term Ambitions is very silent on the ambitions for the district. It is recognised that it's only relatively recently that these are being articulated more clearly through bodies such as FEP.

6 Personal information

