

**West of England Partnership  
Planning, Housing and Communities Board  
4<sup>th</sup> April 2014**

## **Member & Public Forum**

Notice has been given for the following questions and representations:

### **Statements**

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>ITEM 1:</b> David Redgewell, on behalf of the South West Transport Network on the duty to co-operate and cross boundary working  | Pages<br>1 - 15  |
| <b>ITEM 2:</b> Alison Devonshire on behalf of the BS10 Group and Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways on the need for the Henbury Loop railway line and joint working between authorities | Pages<br>16 - 20 |
| <b>ITEM 3:</b> Gavin Smith on behalf of Transport for Greater Bristol Alliance on governance and the duty to co-operate   | Pages<br>21 - 23 |
| <b>ITEM 4:</b> Anne Lock on the duty to co-operate  | Page 24          |

John Malyckyj  
Place & Infrastructure Support Officer

## MetroWest, Economic Strategy for Transport and the Duty to Co-Operate in the South West of England

The final plans for Phase One of MetroWest are due to be completed later this year and concurrently to work their way through the Network Rail GRIP stages 1 to 9. As of writing, there remain serious questions about some elements of the plan. In particular, the retrenchment over the siting of Portishead station is very concerning as this will undoubtedly have a serious negative impact on future take-up of rail services. We need to know if pressure has been brought to bear on Network Rail and the ORR to look at a "Stop and Proceed" arrangement into the station, similar to the Barnstaple branch. The rail authorities need to be made aware of the detrimental effect of applying over-rigid safety protocol. We understand that £7m for a bridge is unaffordable in the current climate, but we equally need to be assured that the economic and social success of the Portishead project is not jeopardized by "red tape". In addition to optimum siting, the plan must include bus-rail interchange facilities and become the focus for transport in the town. The station site adjoining the Lidl car park provides easy pedestrian access to the town centre and shopping facilities, as well as the opportunity for convenient and visible bus/rail integration.

We have not yet seen evidence of a realistic MetroBus/MetroRail interchange at the proposed Ashton Gate station or integration with the Stadium, though we understand that this is currently out for consultation with

---

# South West Transport Network **Statement** for

*West of England Partnership Planning Housing & Communities Board  
on 4 April at City Hall*

---

the MetroBus plans. Under the duty to co-operate between North Somerset and Bristol City Council, we need clear planning around the Portishead railway line and associated infrastructure.

The current proposed service pattern for the Portishead line still does not include stops at Bedminster or Parson Street which for a headway of 17 minutes end-to-end as against 22 minutes does not seem to be especially critical, especially when set against bus timings and rush-hour car journey timings of an hour or more. There is also the question of integration with the Weston and Taunton line which the current service plan ignores. And finally, it should be pointed out that stopping trains in Bedminster and Parson Street provides gateway access from otherwise ill-served areas of South Bristol. In addition this helps towards the City Council's regeneration planning of South Bristol as per their core strategy and BaNES core strategy.

With the final adoption of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan, it is essential that a clear and defined provision is made for station sites on the Henbury Loop around Henbury, Filton (at North Platform) and Charlton Halt, and protect sites at Hallen and Chittening for future halt/s — which are likely to be required in the next phase of the Metro to meet huge future development in housing and employment (Sevenside Plan). A bus network solution alone to this access issue will not do and will end up trapped in yet more gridlock. Park-and-Ride and Bus-Rail interchanges must also be built into the plans to ensure the maximum benefit to the local populace and the greatest uptake of services.

---

# South West Transport Network **Statement** for

*West of England Partnership Planning Housing & Communities Board  
on 4 April at City Hall*

---

In the case of Charlton Hayes, it would be highly beneficial to the development of the emergent community if the building of the station and transport interchanges preceded the construction of the area (in very much the opposite way to how Bradley Stoke was allowed to develop without any public services).

It is also imperative that work is commissioned with Network Rail for extra holding sidings for freight trains around Hallen/Chittening, and to the north of Bristol Parkway.

The signalling on the Henbury line also needs to be upgraded as part of the Thames Valley Signaling Centre when Bristol signal box is transferred to Didcot.

We welcome the local electrification study of the Greater Bristol Metro and Filton Bank and the proposed new stations at Ashley Down and Horfield/Lockleaze, but this needs to be broadened to ensure that the study encompasses not only EMUs but tram-train operation for Henbury, the Severn Beach Line and Portishead once the 165 units are cascaded.

For future transport strategy, extensions to Taunton, Frome, Westbury, Warminster, Swindon and Gloucester/Cheltenham should be put on the agenda.

Under the duty to co-operate and the SHMA which would include BaNES, North Somerset, South Gloucestershire, Bristol, Mendip and western Wiltshire, the various transport boards which cover the Bristol and Bath travel to work

---

# South West Transport Network **Statement** for

*West of England Partnership Planning Housing & Communities Board  
on 4 April at City Hall*

---

area need to work together and dovetail their planning on transport and land use in the way that Newcastle and Gateshead work together or the various authorities in Greater Manchester. Using these examples, the way forward for this area would be a Combined Authority and Transport Board.

Within BaNES the emphasis needs to be on ramps and CCTV at Keynsham, a new station at Saltford, CCTV at Oldfield Park and new stations at Bathampton and Corsham with appropriate bus-rail interchanges and onward links to serve the new development areas within the core strategy (for instance from Keynsham to Whitchurch, South Bristol Hospital and the proposed Whitchurch Park-and-Ride).

The Somer Valley development which will see a large increase in residential and employment provision within Radstock, Midsomer Norton and Chilcompton, means that there is increasing pressure to provide a rail link to Radstock along the existing trackbed with a station in the town centre linking to a high quality bus/rail interchange within the NRR land. This is subject to Secretary of State call in on the plans, due to inadequate public transport provision. There is a clear duty of co-operation between BaNES, Mendip and Somerset County Council over the planning of this area.

The inclusion of stations at Charfield (for Wotton-under-Edge), Stonehouse Bristol Road (Bristol-Gloucester line) and Royal Wootten Bassett need to be built into neighbouring local authority and LEP economic plans. To this end, we would like to see evidence of this joint working in progress under the duty to co-operate.

---

# South West Transport Network **Statement** for

*West of England Partnership Planning Housing & Communities Board  
on 4 April at City Hall*

---

A clear plan for the delivery of new stations and lines needs to be drawn up. With the IEP being constructed through the Bristol area (on a timeplan driven by the DfT and the Welsh Government), timescales for construction or passive provision of local stations and related infrastructure need to be clear and coordinated with the IEP. If this is not done, the local rail project is likely to be marginalized, and therefore difficult and increasingly expensive to achieve. Even with Network Rail's confirmation of four-tracking at Filton Bank and the extra platforms at Bristol Parkway and Temple Meads and East Bristol Junction, the rest of the Metro is not included beyond Phase One.

Intermodal interchanges need to be prioritised at Bristol Temple Meads, Bristol Parkway, Filton Abbey Wood, Lawrence Hill, Clifton Down, Weston-super-Mare, Yatton, Nailsea and Backwell, Bath Spa and Oldfield Park. In the case of Temple Meads, "Intermodal" should include ferry services as well as local and Metro buses. Any new ferry services at Bath or along the Bristol Channel should also be dovetailed into the MetroWest system.

Beyond the major projects, the duty to co-operate needs to take account of the specific requirements of several local areas.

The rural hinterland to Bristol and Bath and within the counties of Somerset and Gloucestershire has transport networks and requirements which are significantly different from the urban areas, and need to be recognized and protected as such to allow access to jobs and services. Two examples would be maintaining bus services south to Wells, Street and Shepton Mallet and north to Dursely and Gloucester because these supply long-distance commuter and leisure services into and out of the city.

Tourism is a major determinant in the economic survival of the West Somerset coast and the Quantocks. The West Somerset Railway is an iconic tourist attraction which is currently owned and underwritten by Somerset County Council. In a cost-cutting measure, the Council is proposing to transfer the ownership of the infrastructure to a Railway Society. However, in light of the devastation which recent weather conditions have wrought on virtually every line in the South West (from Reading to Cheltenham to Penzance), there must be serious questions about how a private railway company could manage such an economically unpredictable and uninsurable piece of major infrastructure. This is a coastal line in part and has been washed away in the past. Other parts of the route are also liable to landslip, and there are numerous bridges, any of which is liable to bridge strikes or water damage.

We believe that, if Somerset wishes not to manage this asset, and given the fact we are almost certainly heading into a period of increasingly extreme and unpredictable weather due to climate change, the permanent way and associated infrastructure would be better protected by transferring the assets to Network Rail (who have both the wherewithal and the experience to deal with contingency and emergency planning) with a long-term lease back to the West Somerset PLC.

It should also be pointed out that Somerset County Council have themselves supported a bid through the Heart of the South West Transport Board and LEP to reopen the route to network trains along with the Okehampton line. This would allow for a year-round seven-day a week service to run through

from Bristol/Taunton to Minehead, opening up the line to serve other economic drivers beyond pure tourism.

South Bristol has traditionally been the poor relation in local planning and it would benefit the area enormously to create a local enterprise zone centered on Hartcliffe and Filwood hopefully including MetroBus/MetroRail links to Parson Street, Ashton Gate and Keynsham. A future option which would also benefit the area would be a Park and Ride facility at Flax Bourton on the Weston rail line.

On the overall strategy we are very concerned that the current plan displays an over-emphasis on aerospace and related industries, which may well not remain as major employers in the Greater Bristol city region. At the same time there appears to be a lack of focus on tourism which is not only one of the largest employers but also likely to see growth in the coming decades.

Finally, the lack of a combined transport authority for the city region is a severe hindrance to the delivery of high quality public services and also to giving local projects the clout and authority they need in the face of competition from treasury-driven planning and national strategies. When projects are brought to completion, the lack of an ITA means that maintenance is not necessarily followed through. Bristol Bus Station, Bath Bus Station and Cribbs Causeway are all good examples, where the fracturing of responsibility means that information services, toilets and cafés tend to be discoordinated rather than integral to the running of the facility. In all of the

---

# South West Transport Network **Statement** for

*West of England Partnership Planning Housing & Communities Board  
on 4 April at City Hall*

---

transport planning for our region, the lack of a transport authority with real powers is probably the greatest barrier to delivery.

David Redgewell

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

# The South West Rail Plan— an Opportunity for the West

In view of the continuing dislocation of the main rail artery to the South West of England, we need to know if the WEP and the Bristol Mayor are directly involved in pushing the Secretary of State and the Department for Transport along with the Prime Minister for the speedy reopening of the railway between Bridgwater and Penzance, without long-term line speed restrictions or other kinds of austerity planning. Are WEP working with the South West Councils, Cornwall LEP, Dorset and Somerset LEP, the Heart of the West LEP, Network Rail and the train operating companies as part of the South West Peninsula Rail Task Force?

We would also like to know how active the WEP have been in promoting the current and future infrastructure requirements of the local rail network as part of the plans for resilience and redesigning of the route with the South West Peninsula Rail Task Force. We need to ensure that suitable turnbacks, signalling options, track and station layout are included to ensure the speedy and straightforward implementation of the MetroWest plans.

Whilst, on the face of it, the majority of the Task Force's brief lies outside the WEP boundaries, the rebuilding of this line is nonetheless of vital and pressing concern to the economy of the local area, both in terms of the

mainline access and the tourism which this generates, and of local rail services across the Bristol conurbation which provides access to employment and social mobility.

There are significant issues about planning the MetroWest project into the redesign of the South West Mainline as track layout and signalling systems cannot be easily adapted once the plans are approved by the Secretary of State.

This may well be the best opportunity the WEP and the Mayor will get to see electrification extended to Weston, Taunton, Exeter and Plymouth, with the obvious implications for local services in the future, such as an electrified operation between Taunton and Swindon or Weston-super-Mare to Bristol Parkway. Indeed, electrification of the route between Parkway and Gloucester/Cheltenham is already built into the 2019-2024 Network Rail Control Period.

To date, there has not been the same kind of impetus to electrify the local rail network in the Bristol travel-to-work area as we have seen in the South Wales Valley Lines. This is an example of how the West and the South West Region are not being taken seriously in terms of major infrastructure development and in building a coherent local transport network. Ironically the current crisis may provide a little leverage to help redress this apparently endemic imbalance.

Electrification of local services between Portishead, Taunton, Weston-super-Mare, Severn Beach, Henbury, Gloucester/Cheltenham, Yate, Bath, Westbury, Frome, Warminster and Bristol, along with the rest of the MetroWest project would bring enormous economic benefit to the Greater Bristol area. The infrastructure project itself would create a significant employment boost, and the provision of a fast, efficient local rail network would not only improve journey to work times and the journey to work experience, but would of course attract new investment by employers to whom the quality and scope of local commuter access is often a deciding factor.

If the DfT and the Secretary of State are making a decision about the potential electrification of the South West Mainline as a core element in the upgrade, this will mean that the issue of electrified rolling stock for local services will certainly need to be addressed and it is very important that WEP and the Mayor are prepared for this eventuality. The local services on the Swindon—Bath—Bristol—Newport—Cardiff route are already being proposed for electrified operation using cascaded 319 units from ThamesLink. This will have implications for Chippenham, Corsham, Bathampton, Bath, Oldfield Park, Saltford, Keynsham, Bristol Temple Meads, Lawrence Hill, Stapleton Road, Ashley Hill, Horfield, Filton Abbey Wood, Patchway and Pilning stations in terms of remodelling the platforms and other facilities to meet the requirements of electrified stock.

As a final caveat, WEP and the Mayor need to be very clear that funding for restoration and remodelling of rail services to the South West must not

---

South West Transport Network **Statement** for  
*West of England Partnership Planning Housing & Communities Board*  
*on 4 April at City Hall*

---

be done at the expense of the existing plans for MetroWest and other aspects of the Greater Bristol rail network. We need to be very vigilant that funding for these measures involves new money and not diverted capital from currently programmed projects within the region.

David Redgewell

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

# Transportation and the Port Sale

We would like full consultation on the sale of the port and in particular on the disposal of any freight transport infrastructure—most especially the rail network within the port and the connections to the Network Rail line between Avonmouth and Chittening junction. We are also concerned about the rights of way for freight and passenger trains on the Henbury Loop and the Severn Beach rail lines in view of the new passenger service over the Henbury loop and the new container port at Avonmouth and associated new rail freight operations..

We are also concerned that the future of the Port Police operation in the Docks has not been clarified and needs to be clearly established.

# Bus Infrastructure

We welcome the report on Bus Infrastructure and the new shelters and disabled access arrangements across the Greater Bristol area, both for the Greater Bristol Bus Network and the MetroBus. However we would like to see real time information on the new bus shelters scheduled to be built across the network. We would like to see improved interchanges at Temple Meads, Old Market, Eastville Eastgate Centre, Broadmead, the

City Centre, Filton Abbeywood Station, Bristol Parkway, Cribbs Causeway and Keynsham.

We welcome the new bus network to Southmead and the revised network, but would like to see the following issues investigated urgently on transport deprivation. Replacement for the 25 service through St Pauls, to the Lockleaze bus gate, UWE, Bristol Parkway and Filton Abbey Wood stations. Improved links between Downend and Fishponds to replace the truncated portion of the service 5 route.

Extension of the 506 route from UWE at Bower Ashton to the Ashton Gate Park and Ride. Route 636 between Keynsham railway station and South Bristol Hospital needs to have significant service frequency improvements.

David Redgewell

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

## South West Transport Network

### **Statement to Joint Executive Committee**

April 4th 2014

With the new proposed role of the LTB in the context of the emerging SEP governance, we would support that the working arrangements in section 10 of the current assurance framework continues. This relates to meetings being held in public providing an open forum for debate and decision making and giving stakeholders the opportunity to attend and make representations.

We remain concerned that the proposed SEP governance structure risks being less democratic than the current arrangement.

We also strongly favour a future Combined Authority for the coordination of transport in the Greater Bristol area.

A report published recently by the Centre for Cities think-tank entitled *Breaking Boundaries: working together for economic growth*, calls for a move towards combined authorities. We think that this is indeed the way forward for Greater Bristol, including parts of Mendip, Wiltshire, Somerset and Gloucestershire. Surely a move in the direction of a combined authority would benefit the whole area immensely.

David Redgewell

## **BS10PPG, FOSBRA AND TFGB HAVE BEEN LOBBYING ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES FROM ALL FOUR AUTHORITIES TO BRING THE HL INTO PHASE ONE THESE ARE EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES WHY THE HENBURY LOOP SHOULD BE BROUGHT FORWARD**

BS10 Parks and Planning are a fully constituted group. We are part of the **Neighbourhood Planning Network (NPN)** it is a network of voluntary groups within the Bristol area, working together to help themselves and each other get better involvement in how their neighbourhoods are developed, through the planning system. We work closely with developers at the pre application stage to ensure local views and necessities of the area can be achieved. Our group is recognised by BCC as a stakeholder for our area.

We are not a anti house building planning group. We fully understand and appreciate the need for new homes and the need to get the economy moving

We are also part of the Bristol Parks Forum which was established by Bristol Parks as an umbrella organisation for community park groups and organisations in the city with an interest in their local parks and green spaces. The forum is supported by Bristol City Council but acts independently and is currently the only 'community voice' that is dedicated to all of Bristol's green spaces.

The Park forum's three main roles are:

- to offer an opportunity to share ideas and experience;

- to act as a consultation body for the Bristol Parks service and other agencies;
- to influence decision-making, including the allocation of resources.

**We ask that the WEP see the urgency of bringing the Henbury loop into phase one to cope with the 8,000 new homes planned on the Northern Fringe, we do not want another Portishead fiasco - where homes were built first and sadly constituents were left dealing with the chaos.**

**Mitigation such as a couple of road junction upgrades and maybe some traffic light control will not solve this colossal problem and I hope you share this need.**

**North Bristol Roads are already full to capacity. We will also have to factor into the equation opening of the New Southmead Hospital in May this year and the extra volumes of traffic this will generate.**

**The Metro-Bus is not a “one fits all solution”. Existing roads do not lend themselves to bus only routes. Even the Rapid Bus will be caught in this chaos. This scheme will mean only one thing, more pollution in Greater Bristol!**

**Integrated transport infrastructure needs to be installed before the houses are built.**

If residents move into the new developments without the availability of a good quality of public transport then, they will use their cars and create a traffic pattern that is very hard to break. This will encourage a trend of habitual car use. As such the railway upgrades should be considered as

priority – Then a two car family could become a 1 car, which will reduce the family expenditure and carbon footprint.

**BS10PPG applaud how Devon Council have achieved this with the Newcourt Rail Station. Freeing up their already congested roads and the regeneration was somewhat smaller than the CPNN.**

### **The Henbury Loop Railway must run in tandem of Metro West Phase 1**

Trains do not have to compete with other road users like buses. SGC should contribute a large share of the enormous home bonus fund (a conservative estimate based on band B Filton 2 bed = 54,181,440.00) they will get from government to part fund the shortfall.

WEP and the LEP should encourage SGC to commit additional funding to bring HL forward. Their windfall is North Bristol and the new residents of these homes downfall!

This will not only ease congestion but will result in better air quality for all.

We realise this bonus comes after the homes are built and can potentially be spent on anything within their area but we need a firm commitment of a contribution.

We need to protect our environment and rail is the way forward to low carbon

Developers stand to make a larger profit if they themselves become more proactive, and insist on both investing themselves in the stations and approach routes immediately (or certainly after

gathering in the profit from the first clutch of house sales), and doing the internal site design work necessary to facilitate this. BS10PPG feel that WEP/LEP should do everything they can to achieve this, not by legalities of the section 106 as this is probably all dealt with but by encouragement.

A huge housing estate feeding into multiple traffic jams, is not an attractive proposition for anyone. One feeding into a frequent, imminent, fast rail service - is a winner for everyone - those who will live there, those who profit by building it, and those transport operators who meet their needs. BCC should be actively involved .

**Take a lead from Devon County Council. A FORWARD THINKING COUNCIL– Regeneration of 3,500 and 16 ha of employment land = Newcourt Station. (1.5m came from New station Grant and developers contributions).**

**THIS CANNOT WAIT FOR PHASE 2 START DATE 2021, IT NEEDS TO RUN IN TANDEM WITH PHASE 1 TO BE IN PLACE OR WELL UNDER CONSTRUCTION, by which time half of the new homes and Enterprise Zone would have been completed. Planning application have already been submitted by two developers for 2100 homes.**

This is the mitigation package that North Bristol and surrounding communities need and deserve this before 2021.

## JOINT WORKING STATEMENT

I feel that a duty of care between SGC and BCC have been completely white washed and have not taken into consideration community involvement on the Northern Fringe. SGC completely ignored comments made to the SPD from BCC and the communities most affected by the Major regeneration of the CPNN.

Under the localism act 2011 the government has introduced new arrangements for strategic planning to support long-term sustainable economic growth. Under the '*duty to cooperate*' and the draft National Planning Policy Framework local authorities will continue to lead joint working to tackle the big issues that cut across administrative boundaries.

Section 110 of the Localism Act introduces a new '*duty to co-operate*'. This applies to all local planning authorities, national park authorities and county councils in England – and to a number of other public bodies. The new duty:

- relates to sustainable development or use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning areas, including strategic infrastructure provision;
- requires that councils set out planning policies to address such issues;
- requires that councils and public bodies to “engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis” to develop and implement strategic policies; and
- requires councils to consider joint approaches to plan making.

It was considered by WEP 14th March 2012 that the Planning, Homes and Communities Board should take the lead in co-ordinating joint working under the '*duty to co-operate*'.

Are the four authorities doing their own thing and the under the WEP heading putting a front sheet to say joint working has happened? This clearly has not happened in the case of the CPNN and I ask for an urgently review.

Alison Devonshire

BS10 PARKS AND PLANNING GROUP

## STATEMENT TO THE WEP/LEP PLANNING, HOUSING & COMMUNITIES BOARD, 4<sup>th</sup> April 2014

From Transport for Greater Bristol Alliance.

*I wish to speak to the Statement at the Board meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup>.*

### **Need for a democratic structure**

We take it as self-evident that the West of England needs to become a **Combined Authority** for planning and transport purposes, as is already every other of the core cities.

### **Unaccountability.**

The present structure of WEP/LEP involves almost no public accountability. Its impenetrable website is an exemplar of this. One can journey through the WEP website (which declares itself to be 'archive only' and 'may contain out of date information'), are led to the LEP site <http://www.westofenglandlep.co.uk/>, there follow a supposed theme via 'Transport & Infrastructure' (of massive import to landuse and planning), then 'Transport Investment', to 'MetroWest', and then arrive at – 'the requested page "/railprojects" could not be found.' This currently is typical of the WEP – but more particularly the LEP – approach to supposed consultation and public participation: tokenism and a near total lack of content.

I personally failed to find on the web the agenda or participation details for this 4<sup>th</sup> April meeting (perhaps I did not try for long enough).

The LEP site, which thus appears to have taken over from the former (poor) WEP site, and into which the latter now leads, does not invite public participation at all. All it does invite is contact from local businesses.

### **WEP/LEP's Statement of Community Engagement**

We would like to be given details of this. We believe any content to be illusory.

### **Duty to Co-operate**

WEP/LEP's 'Duty to Co-operate' is referenced on its website; it is the requirement of the Local Authorities – which should include Mendip and West Wiltshire which lie within the Bath journey-to-work area – to work and plan in an integrated manner. What is unclear is how this has influenced WEP/LEP's practices.

There are many areas where improved (or any) co-operation is badly required:

- Of great relevance to planning, the WEP/LEP Joint Local Transport Plan, is no less than four separate plans – albeit abutting – stitched into a single

document. It must be rewritten as a coherent single plan, with heavy involvement from the Planning, Housing & Communities Board.

- Filton Airport redevelopment, and associated infrastructure, should be jointly planned by Bristol and S.Gloucestershire.
- Bristol's 'Residents Only Parking' policy should impact upon the policies of the surrounding (commuter) authorities. This applies equally to Bristol's future options of 'Road User Charging' or a 'Workplace Parking Levy'. They all have implications for the future level of car commuting, and therefore of transport infrastructure, and thus landuse impacts.
- MetroWest (the local rail network expansion plans), including the landuse impacts of its proposed station sites, must be planned jointly. At present, Network Rail's Intercity Electrification Programme is in danger of blocking off desirable MetroWest developments re reopened and new stations, simply because the region is offering Network Rail and DfT no coherent Planning voice. Similarly, no coherent negotiation is occurring with Port of Bristol, who currently control the usage of both the Portishead and Henbury lines – lines of great importance to the region's housing development. In parallel, any proposed expansion of container facilities at the ports offers either an opportunity or a threat to MetroWest; this must be negotiated. The region should be putting in a 'tramtrain' bid for funding to DfT as a basic element of its infrastructure landuse/transport planning; this is the way the other core cities are going.
- In order to facilitate landuse developments, there should be joint negotiation with public transport operators including First Great Western and the bus operators.
- Rail/bus interchanges must be jointly planned. A particular instance is the improvement of Temple Meads, which in any other city would be a planned rail/bus interchange (one with massive landuse development implications). Another example would be Cribbs Causeway and its shuttle links into MetroWest.
- WEP/LEP needs a real Transport Board with a joint specialised staff, as in the other core cities. We also need a Director of Surface Access Travel, to help both Boards co-ordinate discussion of landuse/transport issues. The North Fringe has not so far been a success on this front, and currently is proposed by S.Gloucestershire to greatly expand in unchanged manner. The Highways Agency is already concerned about the M4/M5/M32 motorway capacity

impacts from excessive local traffic. MetroBus (BRT2/3), a grant-grabbing exercise done by WEP without the benefit of involvement from Bristol City Council's Public Transport team, has no community support, no operational funding (unless cuts in existing supported bus services) and few anticipated travel behaviour impacts – yet is being allowed to obstruct the coherent planning of MetroWest rail development. Housing developers themselves may wish to contribute to the development of MetroWest, as improving their product.

- We need planning and transport public Forums.

Gavin Smith

For Transport for Greater Bristol Alliance

(Lower Knowle Farm, Berrow Walk, BS3 5ES).

STATEMENT FOR MEETING OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND HOUSING, PLANNING & COMMUNITIES BOARD TO BE HELD AT CITY HALL ON FRIDAY, 4TH APRIL, 2014

David Redgewell has requested that I write to you with regard to the Agenda for the Meeting of the WoE Housing Planning & Communities Board. I was more than happy to do so as his message reiterated the plea made by me at the Transport Stakeholder Meeting held at BAWA last year. At that meeting, although unprepared for the opportunity, I took it to make a heartfelt plea that the WoE LEP should seek to work closely with that for Swindon & Wiltshire as they each took forward their bids for funding of transport projects.

At your meeting today, David seeks a clearly defined policy, or undertaking, on the part of the WoE LEP Communities Board that there will be clear and open co-operation not only between the authorities of Banes, Bristol, N.Somerset and S.Gloucestershire, but also the same clear and open co-operation with their counterparts in Gloucestershire, Wiltshire and Somerset.

Thank you for your consideration of this statement and we hope that it will be possible for it to be taken forward into Policy by this meeting of the Board.

Anne Lock

For David Redgewell