

**West of England  
Joint Scrutiny Committee  
8 December 2014**

**Member & Public Forum**

Notice has been given for the following representations:

**Statements**

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>ITEM 1:</b> David Redgewell on behalf of South West Transport Network on bus services, service and infrastructure investment, interchanges and the need for transport powers for the Bristol Travel to Work Area. | Pages<br>1 - 8 |
| <b>ITEM 2:</b> Christina Biggs on behalf of Friends of Suburban Bristol regarding MetroWest Phases 1 and 2.  | 9 -10          |
| <b>ITEM 3:</b> Martin Garrett on behalf of Transport for Greater Bristol Alliance on Temple Meads Interchange.   | 11 - 12        |
| <b>ITEM 4:</b> Brian Price regarding skills issues.  | 13             |

**John Malyckyj  
Place & Infrastructure Support Officer**

*Bristol City Council Full Council 11 November 2014*

*BaNES Transport Committee 11 November 2014*

*South Gloucestershire Planning and Transport 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Cabinet 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Full Council 13 November 2014*

*Bristol Place Committee 17 November 2014*

*West of England Partnership Scrutiny and Transport Board December meetings*

## Bus Service Review

We are concerned about the proposed reductions to bus subsidies across the Greater Bristol Network which will result in the loss of evening and Sunday services. Last year's changes to the subsidy structure in Bristol have proved to be a great success and are starting to bring the bus network into full public acceptance. Given this progress, we need now to protect the core network and in particular the advances which have been made to off-peak, Sunday and night services. This along with Residents Parking Schemes and improvements to rail services has led to a growth of 17% in public transport uptake, which represents one of the greatest modal shifts in Bristol transport over the last fifty years.

If significant savings have to be made, they should most certainly not be made at the expense of perceived accessibility (which is closely related to service level). We would recommend instead that the Council look at privatisation of the city's Park and Ride services which could indeed provide valuable additional services along major corridors. There is good evidence to suggest that privatisation would be financially viable as it has been in other cities.

It would be devastating and highly embarrassing to the city to be seen to be cutting public transport during its tenure of the European Green Capital

---

# South West Transport Network **Statement** for

---

*Bristol City Council Full Council 11 November 2014*

*BaNES Transport Committee 11 November 2014*

*South Gloucestershire Planning and Transport 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Cabinet 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Full Council 13 November 2014*

*Bristol Place Committee 17 November 2014*

*West of England Partnership Scrutiny and Transport Board December meetings*

award, At this time we are going to demonstrate hybrid buses, special trains on the Henbury loop and Portishead line, a tourist trail with Shaun the Sheep, Keep Sunday Special events with public transport and cycling themes and a cheaper ticket on the bus and rail network over the school holidays.

We are especially concerned about the secondary bus network (the routes which feed into and out of the trunk network), and which exists mainly on the support of local authority and UWE finance.

Loss of the following services has been and will be a serious blow to the communities who rely on them.

- The 25 (which has cut St Paul's, Montpelier and St Werburgh's off from Bedminster, Southville and Lockleaze/Horfield—a catastrophe in view of the RPS implementation in the pipeline—though some reinstatement is planned once the Romney Avenue BusGate eventually opens
- The forthcoming cancellation of service 20 (withdrawing services from Golden Hill, Henleaze, Southmead, and the BRI Oncology Centre, now partly replaced by limited services on 520, 508 and HospitalLink, but without Sunday and evening provision)
- Withdrawal of Service 15, again disconnecting Henleaze, Golden Hill and other parts of North Bristol.

---

## South West Transport Network **Statement** for

---

*Bristol City Council Full Council 11 November 2014*

*BaNES Transport Committee 11 November 2014*

*South Gloucestershire Planning and Transport 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Cabinet 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Full Council 13 November 2014*

*Bristol Place Committee 17 November 2014*

*West of England Partnership Scrutiny and Transport Board December meetings*

The new 72 is only a partial replacement for the 15 and 20, and is clearly more targeted on students specifically rather than as part of the wider Bristol community.

- 11 which is now rerouted via Cumberland Road, removing connection from Temple Meads, Bedminster and Southville (the new 12 perversely covers a similar route but is curiously dispatched along Hotwell Road, again avoiding both Temple Meads and Southville).
- 312 Thornbury to Fishponds via Bristol Parkway and UWE (proposed withdrawal January 2015), partly replaced by Service 83, but without early morning or evening provision.
- 207 Thornbury to Dursley: now a limited community transport service, with no provision for disabled access.

These plans need to be urgently reviewed in conjunction with First and Wessex, UWE, The University of Bristol Hospital Trust and North Bristol NHS Trust.

Further subsidy cuts (unless cut from Park and Ride) will further exacerbate these problems and spread the disconnection across other areas of the city at a time when bus services are being radically improved by the operators (and in the shadow of MetroBus). We are also aware that there are proposals to cut the neighbourhood policing team at BTP covering the

---

## South West Transport Network **Statement** for

---

*Bristol City Council Full Council 11 November 2014*

*BaNES Transport Committee 11 November 2014*

*South Gloucestershire Planning and Transport 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Cabinet 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Full Council 13 November 2014*

*Bristol Place Committee 17 November 2014*

*West of England Partnership Scrutiny and Transport Board December meetings*

rail and bus networks in the Greater Bristol area, which is a matter for further concern.

Furthermore, we simply cannot cut bus services and passenger route options at the same time as bringing in RPS across the city.

## Service and Infrastructure Investment

Upgrades are required in Weston-super-Mare, Bath, service 21 (Weston-Taunton First Somerset), South Gloucestershire and Gloucestershire services, services 5, 6, 7, 17, 40, 41, 78 and 79.

Better connections are needed at Avonmouth station (and for future reference, Portway Park and Ride) with the 41 bus service. The loss of the station buildings at Avonmouth (promoted by Network Rail as a safety issue), should be resisted so that they could be adapted for passenger interchange use on the Henbury Loop

There has been no marketing of the new services in Bath, Kingswood, Gloucestershire/South Gloucestershire from 2 November, by the Councils, or First Group.

---

# South West Transport Network **Statement** for

---

*Bristol City Council Full Council 11 November 2014*

*BaNES Transport Committee 11 November 2014*

*South Gloucestershire Planning and Transport 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Cabinet 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Full Council 13 November 2014*

*Bristol Place Committee 17 November 2014*

*West of England Partnership Scrutiny and Transport Board December meetings*

Bus stops and bus shelters still have outdated information across the whole of the network. Graffiti is also an issue which needs to be given increased vigilance

Bus Priority in Old Market and Temple Meads (Bristol), Eastville Interchange, Avon ring road, Cribbs/Patchway new neighbourhood, Bath, Filton and Patchway (A38)

The Bristol-Gloucester corridor needs investment and a coherent service as do Bristol-Street/Shepton Mallet and Bath-Street/Shepton Mallet

Governance of transport policy in the city region needs full public consultation with the aim of establishing a body with the expertise and clout to be taken seriously by civil servants, ministers, and government with better prospects for funding and finance. This can be based on turning the West of England Transport Board into a fully-fledged delivery authority along the lines of Centro and Transport for Greater Manchester.

## Interchanges:

The city region needs to develop a range of passenger-friendly, efficient and comprehensible intermodal interchanges. In the recently-published plan for Temple Circus, there is almost no acknowledgement of Temple Meads' significance as one of the most important interchanges in the

---

## South West Transport Network **Statement** for

---

*Bristol City Council Full Council 11 November 2014*

*BaNES Transport Committee 11 November 2014*

*South Gloucestershire Planning and Transport 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Cabinet 12 November 2014*

*BaNES Full Council 13 November 2014*

*Bristol Place Committee 17 November 2014*

*West of England Partnership Scrutiny and Transport Board December meetings*

whole of the South West. Almost all bus stops are retained in their current positions, except for two in the Friary. This provision needs to be modelled on the access levels achieved at Liverpool Street or Bath. A fully-worked interchange next to and incorporated with the undercroft is surely a basic requirement for such a focal transport hub. Further provision should be made in front of the Bristol and Exeter building, which not only provides space for effective interchange, but also offers a very public image of how different transport modes meet and work together.

Other interchange points are: Weston-super-Mare station, Bath bus station (which needs improvements to signage and the café), Bristol Parkway, Filton Abbey Wood (needs bus provision and signage to the retail park), Cribbs Causeway Bus Station, Henbury and Filton North stations, Yatton, Bedminster and Parson Street, East of Bath Parkway, Kingswood town centre, Keynsham station, South Bristol Hospital, Yate Park and Ride (new MetroBus extension), Clevedon town centre, Portishead station, Radstock station and UWE Bus Station.

David Redgewell

**South West Transport Network** – Tel 07814 794953

# **The need for transport powers for the Bristol Travel to Work Area**

***Statement to the WoE Transport Board and Joint Scrutiny on 10th  
December 2014***

***and***

***South Gloucestershire Council and Bristol on 10th Dec and Bristol full  
council 16th.***

We are aware of George Osborn's statement on 2nd December asking for the city regions to come up with suggestions for improving governance and taking forward devolution. As the Bristol Travel to Work area is the largest non-metropolitan area without transport delivery powers we need to find a way of delivering on the ground the kind of public transport services that are devolved in Greater Manchester, Sheffield and the West Midlands. We note with interest the investment into the railways of the North, with devolved powers over Northern rail and the Trans Pennine Express, and money to invest in new trains to replace the 1980s aged Pacer fleet. The northern railway executive, consisting of 32 councils and the transport authorities of the northern cities have been given powers to jointly specify the rail franchises, set fares and specify station improvements including 'access for all' programs and interchange facilities. The Manchester City Region and the NE Combined authority are to be given full powers also to run their bus services. This is like London which of course has been very successful in running public transport for many years.

It is true that we have had some success with the Bristol bus network, the Weston transport package and the Bath transport package, and that government are to fund at least one of our Metrobus routes. However we are still well short of the integrated public transport network that we need but grateful for any funding from London that we can get. The lack of funding over years, some would say decades, means that progress with the Bristol Metro – local rail – is still precarious, and our rolling stock still antiquated and in very short supply. We are as always at the mercy of Network Rail, the DfT and developer contributions. We can never be sure that new services and stations are really going to be delivered, and remain patient but accustomed to being told 'in the future' again and again.

We have the West of England Partnership but this is a partnership and not a formal arrangement with the governance and powers to be able to instruct government agencies in the specification of our local bus or rail network. It is quite a different situation from the conurbations mentioned earlier.

While urban areas coordinate buses right across the area, in the Bristol Travel To Work area this is done by separate local authorities with the result that a joined up system is harder to achieve. Bus time tables, bus priority, integration with rail, up-to-date timetables and modern payment systems would be better all done right across the whole area. Equally we have no control of the main transport interchanges such as Bath Spa, in Bristol, UWE, and at Cribbs Causeway. These are not owned and run by the West of England Partnership, but variously and jointly owned by different

organisations such as transport companies, network rail, local councils, a shopping mall, and so on.

On rail it is pretty clear that whilst mainline electrification is welcomed, the project will not deliver local rail improvements to the Bristol area. While strategic rail to London is being funded, the Department for Transport tend to have a very tight budget for local rail in the South West with insufficient money to do even disabled access at stations still without it, put in waiting shelters, car parking etc.

Other urban areas are getting local rail improvements, but we are struggling. The lack of a body to specify local rail is key. The current situation whereby civil servants and ministers in London specify Bristol's local railway system needs to change. We need more control in the actual delivery of new infrastructure and new services, such as the Portishead line, Henbury Loop, new stations, better trains, more carriages, not to mention bus interchange, policing of the railways, payment mechanisms, and son on.

The need for a formal and combined authority is really essential. The time is right – the government is encouraging us. A Combined Authority would allow us to coordinate and run all public transport, the local road system and walking and cycling right across the city region. It makes complete sense. Other cities are going this route because they know that it is the way to get real investment from the government, and because ultimately it makes economic sense. It is also best for passengers.

In view of this we need to prepare a bid for central government accordingly - we need to make our case. To this end, campaigning groups in the area hope to present a short paper to the West of England Partnership in January 2015 in order to encourage everyone to move together in this direction.

David Redgewell



## **Preamble**

FOSBR is encouraged that both MetroWest Phase 1 and 2 are being progressed and would urge the elected members of the four partner authorities to support the plans financially. We note the following issues that need attention for the next iteration of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 plans:

### **1. MetroWest Phase 1 subsidy funding**

FOSBR note that the WebTag estimate of £1.9m for the annual subsidy needed for MetroWest Phase 1 as calculated in the Preliminary Business Case and recently endorsed by the WEP Joint Transport Board is acknowledged to be unduly pessimistic. FOSBR consider that the lower (+/5%) figure of £1.1m per year = £275k per council per year is more realistic, given the high actual footfall on lines such as the Severn Beach Line and the newly reinstated West Wilts Swindon-Melksham line. FOSBR would urge WEP to use the data from these success stories to revise upwards the likely footfall and therefore to negotiate with DfT to accept the lower subsidy. FOSBR would recommend that the leaders of the four partner authorities negotiate soon the allocation of the subsidy with each other and engage soon in their individual budgeting processes to set aside the appropriate revenue sums in the 2015/6 budget, with a view to WEP using this income between 2015 and the delivery date of 2019 to invest in the staffing and governance of MetroWest.

### **2. Ashton Gate**

FOSBR note the reference in the MetroWest Update to the difficulty in building a business case for this station due to occasional large events and low footfall from residents. However, FOSBR would urge WEP to consider the footfall that could well arise from the employees and customers for the large concentration of stores in Winterstoke Road, including car repair workshops where car drivers may well wish to leave their car for an extended period and travel by public transport. FOSBR also urge WEP to consider the wide range of uses that the stadium is aiming to host in the week, not just football games but potentially conferences, music events and rallies, as well as the regular footfall that could arise for users of Ashton Court leisure facilities. FOSBR also urge WEP to consider the “civic pride” impact of a modern rail station within walking distance of two such high-capacity venues that serve such a wide area.

FOSBR would therefore urge WEP to be more specific in the promise to “future-proof” the Metro West , by ensuring that the timetable currently being worked up has enough slack to accommodate a “ghost” stop at Ashton Gate until the station is built. FOSBR would urge Halcrow in its New Stations study on Ashton Gate adopt a “can-do” approach to this in the view of the high popular demand and political status of Ashton Gate, and for WEP to seek suitable sources of funding for the infrastructure required.

### **3. Bedminster**

FOSBR note that Bedminster is being considered in the plans for MetroWest Phase 1 (although not in the favoured options), and that the proposed Portishead train could stop at both Parson St and Bedminster. FOSBR continue to urge that Bedminster is included in the favoured option due to its capacity as a rail-bus interchange and its excellent disabled access.

### **4. Ashley Hill and Horfield&Lockleaze**

FOSBR note that CH2M are undertaking work on Ashley Hill and Horfield, in addition to the high level New Stations Halcrow study commissioned by Bristol City Council. FOSBR notes the large likely footfall from the City of Bristol College and the Gloucester Rd cricket club for the former and Southmead Hospital, Lockleaze

residents and Horfield Leisure Centre for the latter. FOSBR understands that the gradient issues cited early in the study can be solved by a combination of derogation of the gradient and curvature standards and judicious partial engineering-out of the gradient and curvature, which require additional capital costs. However, FOSBR would challenge the requirement for ongoing extra staffing costs due to the relatively low gradient. FOSBR would urge Halcrow and CH2M to consider the likely effect of these two stations on reducing congestion on the A38 corridor which is already severe and likely to become worse when the CPNN is built. FOSBR urge WEP to think holistically about the considerable benefit of an efficient suburban rail network across the Bristol travel to work area in causing permanent modal shift, including a direct service from Yate to Horfield. FOSBR continue to request at the least passive provision for both Ashley Hill and Horfield, but not for the securing of passive provision to result in more delay to the building of these much needed stations.

## **5. Filton Bank**

FOSBR note the current issues with poor disabled access to Stapleton Rd, Lawrence Hill, Filton Abbey Wood and Patchway and would urge WEP to take the opportunity of the four-tracking on Filton Bank to secure better disabled access for suburban rail services as well as IEP.

## **6. Henbury Loop**

FOSBR fully support the plans for the new stations at North Filton, Henbury, Ashley Hill and Horfield as part of the Henbury Loop. FOSBR are much encouraged that Network Rail have commissioned a study funded by the Port into possible infrastructure around Avonmouth and St Andrews Rd to resolve the concerns of the Port with regard to the interaction of road and rail freight with present and future passenger services on the Henbury Loop. FOSBR would urge WEP to press for an efficient infrastructure and timetabling solution to this Port traffic issue and to secure the necessary capital funding for this as part of MetroWest Phase 2. In view of the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood Scheme currently at the planning application stage and subject to Section 106 "Framework Agreement" negotiations between S Glos Council and the developers, FOSBR would urge WEP to recognise the considerable benefit that a regular rail service would have both to the developers and to the inhabitants of the new build, and therefore to bring MetroWest Phase 2 into tandem with Phase 1 so that the rail stations are built before the new houses, so that the inhabitants of CPNN start their residency with good travel habits from the start.

## **Summary**

FOSBR are fully in support of the MetroWest Phase 1 and 2 plans and continue to urge that WEP stand by the plans as originally drafted by Halcrow, and actively seek the funding of infrastructure solutions to ensure delivery of the original vision in its entirety, and therefore the maximum modal shift to rail for the congested Greater Bristol Area.

Christina Biggs  
FOSBR

## **A STATEMENT FROM TRANSPORT FOR GREATER BRISTOL ALLIANCE**

### **Temple Meads interchange.**

TfGB would like to draw attention to the continued absence of published plans for this.

- TfGB and the other transport and amenity groups that we represent have long awaited a masterplan for a transport hub at Temple Meads, and we would like to flag up our concern that this still remains the subject of rumour and conjecture.
- Indeed there has also been apparent reluctance by council planners to engage with our groups.
- References to the retaining of the existing badly located and scattered bus stops recently displayed on the map of the proposed transformation of the Temple Circus area published in Bristol 24/7 on 29th Oct have also added to the disquiet.
- Ideally the bus interchange should be on one site adjacent to the proposed new main entrance to Temple Meads Station with a wide public open-air concourse between the station and much of the length of Friary.
- This would present easy choice of fastest bus services to rail passengers and allow TM to also act as a bus-bus interchange (facilitated eventually by transferable ticketing and smart cards) in the same way that the bus hubs at Cribbs and at UWE Frenchay already do.
- However we recognise the practical difficulties for buses to/from the Wells and Bath Road directions and we welcome the possible use of the land adjacent to the junction of Lower Approach Road and Temple Gate for stops for these routes, provided that the location of buses to/from Wells and Bath Road directions is clearly signed with an attractive walking route from the main bus hub and the rail station.
- The new concourse area adjacent to Friary should promote walking access to the ferry terminal, the river-side walk and the bridges across the river.
- We strongly recommend the use of Temple Back East as part of a through route for those buses to/from Temple Way though the interchange and Friary.
- This will increase the capacity of the interchange, speed up any buses to/from the Temple Way directions, remove some buses from the inevitable congestion around the new road junction for one part of their journey, and avoid the old-fashioned look of a spur interchange.
- We note with concern that Temple Back East is currently earmarked as a primary

pedestrian route rather than a through approach for buses. The parallel river-side walk to Temple Way is a more attractive approach to and from Temple Way and removes pedestrians from the noise and fumes of vehicle routes.

- Finally we note that the **modal split and interchange models** being used in replanning Temple Meads station are essentially 'trend planning', using basically the existing observed modal split. This is unrealistic, and fails to take into account:
  - a. the need to actively discourage the use of the private car and promote public transport and other modes to access the station, rather than following present patterns.
  - b. the need to plan for modal shift from cars, brought about by the planned improvements in public transport.
  - c. the mayor's Residents Only Parking programme;
  - d. the intended development of MetroWest as a city rail system.
  - e. the potential for a Workplace Parking Levy (as in Nottingham) or Road User Charging (as in London).
- A greater range of buses serving Temple Meads (and the future Arena) is part of the solution. This would reduce passengers' current necessary reliance on the taxis and drop-off vehicles which currently block the station approach.

Martin Garrett

on behalf of Transport for Greater Bristol 13 November 2014

Statement for JSC 8<sup>th</sup> Dec at BAWA

I am pleased to see that you have received answers to the questions you posed at your last meeting but disappointed in:

1. Not getting clarification of the issues for the 25-49 age-group mention in response to the South Bristol.
2. The response to the request that “the LEP produce an annual report with a financial statement and skills key performance indicators” was “the creation of the Investment Board which reports to the Strategic Leaders Board”. Apart from this not being a clear answer to the request, in my view it is wrong because of the diagram on page 42 of your papers.

I had anticipated that the “Detailed Business Plan that was being produced at the time of the last SLB, which would be reported to the next meeting of the Strategic Leaders Board” would be available for scrutiny by you and myself. Apparently not, although referred to in the appendix.

Brian Price