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Introduction to JLTP4

Welcome to the consultation report on the West of England’s draft Joint Local Transport Plan 4.

We took the draft JLTP4 out to public consultation between 6 February and 20 March 2019 and received around 4,200 responses.

This document looks at the feedback we received; sets out what people in the region think and looks at next steps.

Thank you to everyone who responded. We appreciate the time people took to respond, and the wide range of views expressed. Your views will help ensure that a stronger and more collaborative JLTP4 emerges as a result.

What is JLTP4?

The Joint Local Transport Plan sets out the approach to the way transport will develop up to 2036 in the West of England, addressing existing and future transport challenges.

It’s our fourth transport plan and it sets out our aims to support clean and sustainable economic growth, address poor air quality and take action against climate change, enable quality public services and improve accessibility, create better places, and contribute to better health and wellbeing.

The plan is led by the West of England Combined Authority, working with Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire councils. It builds on previous work done in the West of England and involved collaboration with the Department of Transport, Highways England, Network Rail, public transport operators and other organisations.

It considers a wide range of options which could support sustainable and greener travel including cycling, walking, bus, rail, mass and rapid transit, and electric/autonomous vehicles. To do this the JLTP4 sets out to provide a well-connected sustainable transport network that offers greater, realistic travel choices and makes walking, cycling and public transport the natural way to travel. Trips into and within the West of England will be seamless, faster, cheaper, cleaner and safer. That’s our goal.

An advisory group, comprising representatives from around 20 transport operators and user groups, was set up to provide technical and professional advice.

The alignment and locations of schemes shown on this plan are purely indicative. Any schemes identified in JLTP4 would be subject to further detailed feasibility work and consultation, as well as requiring planning permission.

What you said

- 79% of respondents agreed with the challenges identified by JLTP4
- 65% of respondents agreed with JLTP4’s vision and objectives
- You told us you want to see new and improved railways stations and services
• You told us you want more priority for active and sustainable travel, creating a comprehensive and safe network to support active travel for shorter trips
• To help tackle congestion and air quality, you told us that you were supportive of reallocating road space for public transport, walking and cycling
• You told us you want to see a mass transit option developed for our region

We also asked you how you think transport improvements should be funded in future. Road User Charging or a Workplace Parking Levy were roughly two times more likely to be favoured than Council Tax or Business Rate increases.

You told us that you want to see bus services improved across our region.

Whilst the Transport Focus survey tells us that 85% of bus passengers services are satisfied with bus services, in this consultation it became clear that you don’t find services easy to plan, value for money and are concerned about their reliability. This is why we are doing more work on this through our Bus Strategy.

In the free text comments a number of people used the opportunity to highlight concerns about specific schemes – in particular the need identified in our draft plan for an orbital corridor to the south east of Bristol. The alignment and locations of schemes shown on this plan are purely indicative. Any schemes identified in JLTP4 would be subject to further feasibility work and consultation, as well as requiring planning permission.

Many of the free text comments reiterated support for the challenges and objectives identified by JLTP4.

This feedback will be used to help shape the final JLTP4, which will be considered by our West of England Joint Committee later in the year.

Next consultation steps

Following on from what you told us, we are also now running another two consultations which look in more detail at bus services, walking and cycling.

Bus services

We asked some questions about bus services as part of this consultation; following on from this we want your views on our Bus Strategy in later in the year. This will consider options to improve the performance of the bus network across the region and set out how further growth in bus usage can be encouraged, including proposals to create better, faster, more reliable and more accessible services.

Walking and cycling

We will also be running a consultation on our Cycling and Walking Plan – this is a more detailed plan which proposes investment in cycling and walking routes of £411 million over the next 16 years. It aims to provide high quality infrastructure to support our transition to a region where cycling and walking are the preferred choice for shorter trips.
Consultation approach
Given this is the most ambitious JLTP that has been produced by the West of England we wanted to ensure that as many people as possible had a chance to respond to the consultation on the document. As such, we were keen to explore new ways of engaging with the public to try to encourage those who do not usually take part in public consultations.

Priority simulator tool
We were aware of previous consultations that had been carried out in the region that had used a simulator tool to allow people to respond by allocating points to a set of policies and measures. This approach allowed those policies and measures to be prioritised in a meaningful way whilst at the same time helping to inform those people of the consequences of their selections.

This method was adapted for the JLTP4 consultation with the creation of a simulator tool that allowed people to have a ‘budget’ of 20 points and a maximum allocation of up to five points for each transport measure featured in the JLTP4 to identify what transport measures they would like to see prioritised. More points could be ‘earned’ by selecting any of the proposed funding measures that feature in the JLTP4, which in turn could be allocated to more transport measures. Through this simulator approach, people were given an insight into the challenge of prioritising transport improvements in the region with a limited budget and highlighted that in order to achieve more we would have to identify new ways to fund them. The simulator was used to gather responses on the types of measures that our people want to see prioritised as well as the level of support for measures to fund them.

Questionnaire
Accompanying the simulator, we were interested in capturing views on the proposed objectives and approaches as set out in the draft JLTP4. As such, a questionnaire was created, asking how strongly people agreed with the vision, objectives and approaches set out in the draft JLTP4. The questionnaire was available both online and in paper format (available at libraries) and allowed respondents to provide any additional comments in a free text section.

Webpage and video
We created a short video that summarised the JLTP4 and explained what it seeks to do, how the consultation works and what the next steps will be following the consultation. A dedicated consultation webpage was included on the Travelwest website. The webpage included links to the draft of the full JLTP4, a summary of the JLTP4, and an easy read version for accessibility purposes, as well as other key documents such as environmental and habitat reports and the previous JLTP4.

Digital campaign
Use of social media has the potential to engage with a considerably wider audience than traditional methods alone. At the time of the consultation, West of England authorities’ Twitter accounts had over 140,000 followers. Given the potential reach of our social media, the West of England
Combined Authority’s communications team led the social media activity/advertising via the Travelwest Twitter and Facebook accounts and drafted a social media toolkit for the West of England councils to coordinate their accounts. Over the course of the consultation, the social media activity exceeded over half a million views.

**Materials**

Posters, postcards and hard copies of the JLTP4 summary and the questionnaire were sent to the larger libraries and customer service points around the region. The posters and postcards contained the web address, encouraging people to complete the consultation online. The paper copies of the questionnaire were made available for anyone for whom accessing online information is difficult.

**Summary**

A summary of the draft JLTP4 was also created to make it easier for people to engage with the content. The document made available on the Travelwest website and hard copy by request.

**Easy-Read version**

Throughout the consultation process we engaged very closely with equalities groups and subsequently an easy read version of the draft JLTP4 document was created for people with a learning disability who like clearly written words with pictures to help them understand. These were made available on the Travelwest website, with hard copies available on request.

**Advisory Group**

To build upon the success of the JLTP3 an Advisory Group was established to provide technical and professional advice and guide the development of JLTP4. Comprising of key transport operators and providers, transport user groups, delivery partners and discipline experts two workshops took place. These provided the West of England authorities with advice on issues, challenges, types of interventions, areas of focus, and innovation and helped build on existing partnerships to continue improving the region.

**Stakeholder workshop**

The draft JLTP4 was launched to stakeholders in February 2019 at the Somerdale Pavilion in Keynsham. The event was attended by approximately 100 stakeholders from a range of organisations including transport operators, user groups, statutory bodies, campaign groups, health professionals, environmental organisations and academia. The purpose of the event was to:

- Provide an overview of the draft JLTP4 document, strategy and transport measures
- Explain the consultation and how feedback will guide the development of the final plan
- Stimulate discussion about the plan and gain some initial feedback
- Encourage people to spread the word about the consultation, including the priority simulator tool and questionnaire
Consultation results

Summary statistics

- 539,536 views on social media
- 67,443 views of our engagement video
- 11,200 website views
- 4,090 document downloads
- 4,192 responses, including:
  - Letters/emails: 1,979
  - Online questionnaire responses: 1,317
  - Paper questionnaire responses: 28
  - Priority simulator tool responses: 868

Questionnaire and priority simulator tool: overview

Respondents could complete the questionnaire (online or offline), the priority simulator tool (online only), or both. The simulator asked respondents to identify their priorities for specific measures, whereas the questionnaire asked respondents their views on the content of the Joint Local Transport Plan. The questionnaire included sections of the strategy and asked respondents how far they agree with each section.

Demographic information

The priority simulator tool attracted a significantly younger demographic and was slightly more popular with female participants as illustrated in the figures below.

Figure 1: Age of participants completing Questionnaire and Priority Simulator Tool
Figure 2: Gender of participants completing Questionnaire and Priority Simulator Tool
Questionnaire: multiple choice

How far do you agree with the challenges identified in the West of England JLTP4?

![Bar chart showing responses to challenges]
- Strongly agree: 24%
- Agree: 55%
- Neither agree or disagree: 11%
- Disagree: 6%
- Strongly disagree: 5%

How far do you agree with the vision and objectives identified in the West of England JLTP4?

![Bar chart showing responses to vision and objectives]
- Strongly agree: 16%
- Agree: 49%
- Neither agree or disagree: 17%
- Disagree: 10%
- Strongly disagree: 8%
How far do you agree with our approach for improving connectivity for trips beyond the West of England?

![Bar chart showing agreement levels](chart1.png)

How far do you agree with our approach for improving connectivity for trips within in the West of England?

![Bar chart showing agreement levels](chart2.png)
How far do you agree with our approach for improving connectivity for local trips in the West of England?

How far do you agree with our approach for improving connectivity for neighbourhood trips in the West of England?
To support the development of the Bus Strategy, we asked three questions about buses in the West of England:

How far do you agree that it is easy to plan and make a journey by bus in the West of England?

How far do you agree that bus services in the West of England are reliable?
How far do you agree that travelling by bus in the West of England is good value for money?

- Strongly agree: 3%
- Agree: 14%
- Neither agree or disagree: 25%
- Disagree: 30%
- Strongly disagree: 28%

### Questionnaire: free text box, email and letter

The graph below shows the most responded to issues in the JLTP4, by theme, received via email, letter, and the free-text section of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree with South East Bristol Orbital Corridor</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with challenges and objectives</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Development Locations are badly connected/in wrong location</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLTP4 is contradictory</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about budget gap and Plan’s affordability</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport needs better transport infrastructure to expand</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more detail of Banwell bypass</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 A38 corridor not justified</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banwell bypass in isolation would increase congestion/increase driving</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence for approach needed</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tickenham Road is not suitable for growth and requires a bypass</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride not needed at Whitchurch</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New roads will create congestion</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving public transport services should be a priority</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support new road building</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome/support of the document</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support measures for cycling</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority simulator tool: prioritising transport measures

Respondents to the simulator allocated up to five points to the transport measures they would like to prioritise in the West of England. The charts below show the average points allocated to each funding measure and each transport measure from most popular to least.

How people would increase transport funding

- Road pricing e.g. congestion charge to drive into specific areas
- Workplace parking levy
- Business rate increase
- Council tax increase

The charts show the average number of points allocated.
Where people responded from

We were keen to explore where people who responded to the consultation live to get a better understanding of the issues or priorities people face in different parts of the region. The maps below show how people would increase transport funding and where people responded from in the region.

Road pricing eg. congestion charge to drive into specific areas

Workplace parking levy
Business rate increase

Council tax increase
Improve bus facilities

Restrict polluting vehicles
How people would prioritise transport spending

- Provide new and improved rail stations and services
- Create a comprehensive and safe network to support active travel for shorter trips
- Reallocation of highway space to public transport, walking and cycling
- Construct a mass transit network
- Improve bus facilities
- Restrict the most polluting vehicles from areas of poor air quality
- Use technology to improve capacity of existing roads
- Use mechanisms to reduce dependency on private car use in urban areas
- Create a ring of Park & Ride sites serving the main urban areas
- Promote and expand the use of electric vehicles
- Expand the metrobus network
- Use technology to enable seamless journeys
- Improve road safety through road design and road-user training
- Construct and/or improve motorway junctions
- Improve the efficiency of freight movements
- Use technology to reduce the need to travel

Average number of points allocated
Where people responded from

We were keen to explore where people who responded to the consultation live to get a better understanding of the issues or priorities people face in different parts of the region. The maps below show how people would prioritise transport spending and where people responded from in the region.

Provide new and improved rail services

Create a comprehensive and safe network to support active travel for shorter trips
Reallocate highway space to public transport, walking and cycling

Construct a mass transit network
Improve bus facilities
### Priority simulator tool: free text box

The graph below shows the issues most frequently raised by people in the free-text section of the priority simulator tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active and sustainable transport need to be prioritised</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not supportive of new roads/new roads will create congestion</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the ambition of mass transit</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support planning for car use</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more commitment to cycling, including better segregation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current bus services are unreliable</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need reduced/subsidised/free bus fares</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support investment in buses</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graph showing the distribution of issues raised by people in the free-text section of the priority simulator tool.]
Stakeholder event: prioritising transport measures

We ran an adapted offline version of the priority simulator tool at the stakeholder event. Attendees were each given stickers and asked to allocate them against which transport measures they supported or opposed on a chart. 348 stickers were allocated, and their distribution is shown below.
Stakeholder event: facilitated discussions

Stakeholders were invited to provide feedback on the various aspects of the plan including the vision, objectives and challenges as well as the concept of the four connectivity levels and the policies, interventions and actions that were being proposed as part of these.

The facilitated discussions covered a wide range of issues which were grouped into three main themes:

Interchange and connectivity
- Most modes of transport (walking, bus, rail, e-bikes) cover multiple levels of connectivity to some degree, and all play a role in contributing to multi stage journeys.
- Facilitation of multimodal journeys requires the development of high-quality and attractive infrastructure including new rail stations and rail services, safe cycle routes, prioritised bus lanes and user-friendly and inter-modal transport hubs which also recognise the role of the taxi.
- Rural locations require some form of non-car transport provision
- Demand for orbital bus routes
- Public transport needs to be attractively priced with an easy to understand fare structure

Environment
- Building new roads will worsen carbon emissions
- Low carbon transport to the Airport is negated if airport expansion permitted
- Freight (HGVs) should be restricted within city centres
- Decision makers need to be bold about introducing potentially unpopular measures to restrict car use, e.g. Workplace Parking Levy for city centre employers to achieve the required mode shift.

Delivery
- Need to consider those with limited access to technology
- Behaviour change initiatives are low cost, and can be delivered quickly compared to infrastructure
- Tourism should be considered
**Methodology**

A wide range of people participated in the consultation. Different ways of consulting (e.g. priority simulator tool, questionnaire) resulted in slightly different demographics: the priority simulator tool was more popular with the 25-44 age range, and women, although overall slightly more men responded to the consultation than women. By making use of digital methods of consultation and targeting younger demographics when promoting the consultation on social media, we received greater representation in those age groups than other comparable consultations.