

# WEST OF ENGLAND COMBINED AUTHORITY: OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

## 22 September 2017

### DRAFT MINUTES

<b>1</b>	<b>ANNUAL BUSINESS</b>  ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR  Gill Sinclair, Deputy Monitoring Officer for the West of England Combined Authority opened the meeting and welcomed everyone to first West of England Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee. She requested nominations for Chair of the Committee.  Cllr Morris proposed Cllr Clarke. Cllr Gollop seconded the proposal. There were no other nominations.  <b>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously.</b>  Cllr Clarke took the Chair and requested nominations for Vice Chair.  Cllr Richardson nominated Cllr Ball. Cllr Morris seconded the proposal.  Cllr Clarke nominated Cllr Pearce. Cllr Gollop seconded the proposal.  The proposals were put to vote: Cllr Ball received four votes Cllr Pearce received six votes  <b>On being put to the vote Cllr Pearce was elected Vice Chair with six votes.</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>  Apologies were received from Cllr Mark Weston, Cllr Claire Hiscott attended on his behalf.
<b>3</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972</b>  There were no declarations of interest.
<b>4</b>	<b>MINUTES</b>  As this was the first West of England Combined Authority Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting there were no previous minutes to consider.
<b>5</b>	<b>ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC</b>  A question had been submitted by Christina Biggs to which a written response had been made available. A copy of the question and the response is included as an appendix A to these minutes.

	<p>Statements had been received from Cllr Lin Patterson, Christina Biggs and 2 from David Redgewell. The Chair invited attendees to speak in the order their statements were received, and noted that the statements will be included as an appendix B to the minutes.</p> <p>David Redgewell addressed the Committee on number of transport matters including his views on investment in the rail network. He felt there was a case to continue electrification and to support Metro West and to improve station access. He felt a bus review was required. He expressed concern that the West of England needed to compete with other regions to secure investment funding from Government.</p> <p>The Chair thanked David Redgewell for his comments.</p> <p>Cllr Lynn Patterson addressed the Committee regarding her concerns about transport in North East Bath, and specifically the 6/7 bus route. Changes to this were based on what was in her opinion a flawed survey. She felt the changes had impacted local shops and wanted to see improvements.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Cllr Patterson for her comments.</p> <p>The Chair asked David Redgewell for comment on second statement. David Redgewell addressed the Committee with his concerns about rail delivery. In his opinion WECA must focus on rail delivery and not be distracted by further studies which he felt should be split out from current delivery of Metro West, He felt it was crucial that discussions with Government do not confuse current and future (unfunded) projects and in his opinion the focus needs to be on delivery.</p> <p>Christina Biggs from FOSBR addressed the Committee. She expressed disappointment in the Joint Transport Study. She felt there was overemphasis on Metrobus and in her view the focus should be on suburban rail, and rail/bus interchange. She was anxious for the Portishead line to go ahead and reassured that discussions taking place between Network Rail and Bristol Port regarding use of the freight line. She would like to see the discussions about Henbury Loop reopened and to have further engagement.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Christina Biggs for her comments.</p>
6	<p><b>PETITIONS FROM MEMBERSHIPS</b></p> <p>None received.</p>
7	<p><b>WORK PROGRAMME</b></p> <p>Helen Edelstyn from WECA introduced this item which followed on from an informal scrutiny meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> July 2017 facilitated by the Centre for Public Scrutiny as which a long-list of areas to focus on had been identified including transport, housing and skills. Wider ‘framing’ questions had included the impact on local people, need for value for money and sustainability. Members will need to decide if these are correct and work with Chair and Vice Chair to develop a more detailed work programme.</p> <p>The Chair requested comments and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is limited amount of time to deal with a large number of subject areas</li> <li>- There is opportunity to consider broader issues at Scrutiny and task smaller groups to discuss and report back.</li> <li>- There was a proposal to hold an intervening skype/informal meetings in between formal meetings to discuss progress before reporting back to the public meetings</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There could be opportunity for the public to attend smaller group meetings where there are specific interests to discuss</li> <li>- There is the opportunity to use a mixture of approaches, including task and finish groups, enquiry days, sub-committees</li> <li>- There is a risk of superficially scrutinising everything and looking at nothing in detail and the need to identify where Scrutiny can make a difference.</li> <li>- There is a need to understand the remit of audit committee and how this complements scrutiny to ensure items are not missed</li> <li>- There was a proposal to hold meetings in different areas of the Region, ensuring that all meetings were close to public transport</li> </ul> <p>A number of specific areas that could be discussed were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A request to include more details on the skills agenda.</li> <li>- A request to include more about environmental impact</li> <li>- An opportunity to look at transport, reflecting on public forum statements</li> <li>- The opportunity to not only look at individual topics and projects, but also the overall effectiveness of WECA</li> </ul> <p>The Chair thanked Helen Edelstyn for her report noted the following actions:</p> <p><b>Action. A work programme discussion to be held at WECA, with Skype/Conference Call access for those unable to attend in person</b></p> <p><b>Action. Scrutiny meetings to be held in different venues across the Region within reach of public transport</b></p> <p><b>Action. Helen Edelstyn to work with Chair and Vice Chair to support development the work programme.</b></p>
8	<p><b>UPDATE ON INVESTMENT PROGRAMME</b></p> <p>Chris Jennings, Interim Head of Business and Skills from WECA, joined the meeting to provide an update on the Investment Prioritisation and an update on Skills.</p> <p><b>Investment prioritisation</b></p> <p>Chris Jennings introduced the paper and gave a brief summary to highlight the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The devolution deal provides £30m per year for 30 years which is not enough to do all the things that need to be done in the region. For example, the JTS identifies at least £9bn of potential projects just on transport. We need to work out most sensible way to invest this money and so that the whole investment package can be considered in totality.</li> <li>- The process is at an early stage of development. We are considering how we might use an economic model to help us best understand the economic impact of infrastructure schemes. We will also want to understand environmental impacts, inclusivity impacts and geographical nature across the whole region.</li> </ul> <p>During the discussion Chris Jennings clarified the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The economic model will focus on economic growth and other methods will be needed to look at for example environmental impacts.</li> <li>- The economic model is focused on infrastructure projects and will not be appropriate for business/skills projects.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project delivery might be commissioned to Local Authorities who were already providing input to develop business cases.</li> <li>- In response to concerns that the scope of the economic model did not include environmental, health and air pollution criteria, he confirmed that these factors are very important and the model only provides one piece of information to inform decision makers.</li> <li>- A number of the schemes to be considered are identified in the JTS and JSP and the process will be to work out the sequencing. Attention was drawn to the WECA decision on Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> September where £1.2m was approved to take forward business cases.</li> <li>- It is anticipated that the WECA Committee will wish to make further investment decisions ahead of a fully funded programme to start addressing some issues and would be important to involve scrutiny.</li> <li>- Whilst the JSP has not yet been agreed money has been released to take forwards business cases to ensure that schemes are deliverable, this will support the Examination in Public.</li> </ul> <p>Members noted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a risk that they will each have views on individual investments, but in this context they should be focusing on the rationale and process</li> <li>- There was a desire to look at social value and the impact onto communities</li> <li>- There was a need to ensure elements other than economic growth were being considered</li> </ul> <p>The Chair thanked Chris Jennings for his report.</p>
9	<p><b>UPDATE ON SKILLS</b></p> <p>Chris Jennings provided a short update on Skills, and reminded Members of the five skills elements in the devolution deal, noting that these vary in terms of powers and responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adult Education Budget</li> <li>- Apprenticeship Grants for Employers</li> <li>- National Work &amp; Health Programme</li> <li>- Employee Support Innovation Pilot</li> <li>- Co-ordination of Careers advice and guidance</li> </ul> <p>These were each discussed and the following points noted:</p> <p>Adult Education Budget:</p> <p>Chris Jennings reported that £17m annual spend is currently controlled nationally through skills funding agency. Devolution of this to WECA has been delayed pending government legislation and is now proposed from academic year 19/20. During 18/19 WECA will work closely with Government on transition arrangements. It was noted that a significant administrative process will be passed to the region to administer the £17m and that a large amount of this budget is to provide statutory provision.</p> <p>The following points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chris Jennings clarified that the Combined Authority region will administer the Adult Education Budget and WECA are discussing with government how staff will be funded and how this will work.</li> <li>- Clarification of the actual figure was requested</li> <li>- It was requested that Scrutiny be provided with minutes from the Skills Advisory Board</li> </ul>

	<p>- There could be opportunity to use existing staff from Local Authorities to support this new activity, but would require posts to be backfilled</p> <p>Apprenticeship Grants for Employers</p> <p>Chris Jennings reported that this has just completed. He confirmed that a performance report will be shared with Scrutiny Members.</p> <p>Work &amp; Health Programme.</p> <p>Chris Jennings confirmed this is nationally run programme by DWP. Officers in Bristol have been leading work, and WECA are working with Bristol to support this process. Contracts to be awarded soon.</p> <p>Innovation Pilot.</p> <p>Chris Jennings report that DWP has awarded WECA £4m to work with 3000 residents in social housing to support them to advance employment. Each Local Authority will deliver its own elements of the project, co-ordinated by a WECA project manager. This is an innovation pilot so by its nature the outcomes are unknown but there is agreement with DWP that the general focus is to support people progressing their careers.</p> <p>Careers Advice and Guidance.</p> <p>Chris Jennings confirmed this covers schools up to older residents. There are opportunities to join this up regionally and improve the offering but there are no actual powers provided to WECA.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Chris Jennings for providing an update at short notice and noted this will be an area that Scrutiny will look at in future. The following actions were agreed:</p> <p><b>Chris Jennings to circulate summary information to Members</b></p> <p><b>Chris Jennings to provide confirmation of the actual Adult Education Budget Figure</b></p> <p><b>Helen Edelstyn to arrange for minutes of the Skills Advisory Board to be provided to Scrutiny Members</b></p> <p><b>Chris Jennings to share the performance report for Apprenticeship Grants for Employers with Scrutiny Members</b></p>
10	<p><b>2017 / 18 BUDGET</b></p> <p>Tim Richens, Interim Chief Financial Officer at WECA, joined the meeting.</p> <p>Tim Richens provided an overview of the scrutiny process around the budget, noting that the budget that was approved in March for the 17/18 financial year was prior to the Mayoral Election and was agreed under interim arrangements.</p> <p>Tim Richens confirmed that the first audit committee will take place at the end of at September and that for the 18/19 budget development there will be clear role for scrutiny and that early proposals for the Mayoral and Combined Authority budgets will come to this committee.</p>

	<p>In response to a question regarding whether a section 25 report would come to scrutiny, Tim Richens responded this is a report that looks at reserves and balances of Local Authorities and in statutory regulations is only required for Local Authorities that raise a precept on Council Tax. WECA is not a precepting body and therefore that part of regulations doesn't apply. However, he agreed that is prudent for WECA to monitor reserves and balances and has included detail of this in his report.</p> <p>In response to a question as to how WECA budget planning would interact with the Local Authority budget planning processes (to avoid scrutiny reviewing a proposal that has already been enshrined in a local authority budget) Tim Richens assured the Committee that he is working closely with the Section 151 officers from all of the Councils to ensure budget timelines are aligned, noting that statutory timelines are set out in legislation for WECA.</p> <p>Tim Richens drew the Committee's attention to the two elements of the budget set out in the report:</p> <p>Mayoral budget (annex 1) which includes costs of Mayor and dedicated support. This money comes from a business rates retention pilot agreed with Government. It also includes the transport grants that used to go directly to the Authorities and Tim Richens confirmed that in the first year these were distributed straight back to the councils.</p> <p>Combined Authority budget (annex 2) applies to all functions across CA. The largest element is transport functions. In the first year these services were commissioned from the councils who were previously providing them. This budget also includes WECA running costs to support statutory functions including finance.</p> <p>In response to a query Tim Richens confirmed there is no overlap in the transport funding but there may be opportunity to realise some efficiencies for some elements of delivery in the future</p> <p>There was a discussion about why WECA does not have precepting powers and Tim Richens confirmed this was a local decision by leaders during the devolution deal negotiations with Government.</p> <p>There was a discussion as to whether senior officer appointments could be shared with Local Authorities, and whether Senior Officer pay should be discussed by Scrutiny or Audit Committee. The Committee concluded the scrutiny of costs would be appropriately handled at this Committee, leaving approval of final accounts to Audit Committee (and thus avoiding any conflict of interest).</p> <p>The Chair thanked Tim Richens for his report.</p>
	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 11.40 for a short break.</p> <p>The meeting readjourned at 12.05. North Somerset Councillors who are permitted to sit alongside (but not part of) WECA Scrutiny joined the Committee for the proceeding Joint Committee items.</p>
11	<p><b>WEST OF ENGLAND COMBINED AUTHORITY REGIONAL STRATEGY</b></p> <p>Jessica Lee joined the meeting to present an update on the development of a regional strategy. Which will set out aspirations for region and the intention is ultimately to use this to help guide decision making. She drew attention to a strategy discussion paper that has been published and explained that objective is to ensure broad support from partners across the region, including officers from authorities and business partners. She explained that at the point of a</p>

final strategy there will be a business plan and performance framework setting out how we deliver what is in the strategy and drew attention to the three pillars of the strategy:

- Supporting business to succeed
- Developing skills
- Infrastructure (transport, housing and digital infrastructure)

Jessica Lee noted that an online feedback form has been available which officially closes 27<sup>th</sup> September, but stressed that her team are keen to continue discussions with this committee and other interested parties to ensure final product is the right one.

In response to a question regarding how successful has engagement been, Jessica Lee confirmed that opportunities to engage have been publicised and there has been attendance at all the drop-in sessions, with an additional one scheduled at the science park. There have also been a series of roundtable discussions and discussions with LEP groups.

In response to question about use of different channels to promote the engagement, Jessica Lee confirmed that the promotion had largely been via the website and twitter, plus invitations to specific roundtable events. She agreed that attendance at drop-in sessions had been varied, with some better attended than others where people had genuinely dropped-in.

In response to a question regarding response targets, Jessica Lee confirmed that targets had not been set for responses. At the date of the Committee meeting about 250 responses had been received through the online portal. She explained that the challenge with presenting a high-level framework discussion document is it doesn't necessarily appeal to everyone but given nature of documents her team were reasonably happy with the response rates.

In response to comments from Members that they were unaware of the discussion, Patricia Greer, Chief Executive of WECA, confirmed that the team had offered to provide sessions with all councillors in each council. A session had been run in South Glos and they would be happy to run sessions with other Councils.

The Committee discussed the report and the following points were noted:

- A request that the responses to the discussion document be shared with Scrutiny Committee
- A suggestion that information be shared with Parish Councils
- Concerns that the document focused on high skilled jobs and needed to include lower skilled and vocational work
- A suggestion that for this and future engagements employers should be asked to promote this to encourage engagement
- Cllr Morris requested it be put on record she was not happy with the document or the stakeholder engagement process and that the CA should have set targets for responses
- A concern that most SMEs would not engage with this type of document.
- A concern that the number of individual responses online was small
- A need to ensure it is clear this was a discussion document not a full consultation.

In response to a comment about whether the discussion paper was inclusive enough, Jessica Lee confirmed that the engagement had helped to identify areas where more work was needed, of which this was one. She also confirmed that Trade Unions had not yet been approached for their views.

In response to comments about the number of individual responses, Patricia Greer clarified that it was never the intention for this to be a public consultation. The strategy presents a high-level framework and the target for engagement was businesses, universities and local authorities

	<p>across the region. It was agreed that full details of the business engagement would be shared with Scrutiny members.</p> <p>In response to a question about engagement with North Somerset Jessica Lee confirmed that she has been working with North Somerset Officers on the papers, engagement sessions have been held in North Somerset, and the strategy has been discussed with the LEP Board. Business engagement invitations have used LEP stakeholder lists.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Jessica Lee for her report. He concluded that some issues had been raised, in particular around the scope and approach to engagement and that further information had been requested during the discussion. The following actions were noted:</p> <p><b>Jessica Lee to explore opportunity to share information on the regional strategy with Parish Councils</b></p> <p><b>Jessica Lee to share information about business engagement with Scrutiny Committee</b></p> <p><b>Jessica Lee to share responses to the strategy discussion with the Scrutiny Committee</b></p>
12	<p><b>KEY ISSUES REPORT FOR JOINT SPATIAL PLAN (JSP)</b></p> <p>Laura Ambler joined the meeting to update the Committee on the timetable for the JSP and emerging policy framework. She noted that the JSP is statutory development plan document and has already had two rounds of public consultation. Her update today relates to the regulation 19 plan which is the final draft plan published for consultation before it is submitted to the Secretary of State. Once published for consultation there cannot be any substantive changes to the plan and it is submitted to the Secretary of State with the consultation responses.</p> <p>The report sets out the overall timetable which is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- October 2017. Draft to Infrastructure Advisory Board and Joint Committee.</li> <li>- January 2017 Consultation closes</li> <li>- March 2018 Submission to Secretary of State</li> <li>- Aiming to adopt JSP late 2018.</li> </ul> <p>Laura Ambler drew attention to the key issues that we are required to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Duty to co-operate. This is a statutory duty of four authorities. Consultation to date has shown strong co-operation and DCLG refer to this as an exemplary project.</li> <li>- Housing need. A previous draft document had indicated 102 thousand, but our housing target is 105 thousand. This is the scale of growth. This will include 32k affordable homes. Highlighted that delivery of this will be a critical issue</li> <li>- Quality of place. Needs to have strategic principles in place.</li> </ul> <p>Laura Ambler also drew attention to the emerging policy framework and the proposal to include seven policies which are set out in the report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Housing requirement from 2016 to 2036</li> <li>- Affordable housing targets and means by which this will be delivered</li> <li>- Employment land requirement</li> <li>- Placemaking, noting relationship between this strategic plan v local plans</li> <li>- Spatial strategy – strategic development locations, and any exceptional circumstances</li> <li>- Strategic infrastructure requirements, in particular transport</li> <li>- Strategic development locations</li> </ul> <p>The Committee discussed the document and noted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant infrastructure is required before any housing infrastructure can be built, so concerns whether the plan is deliverable</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns about housing numbers and whether enough affordable housing</li> <li>- Concerns about availability of key worker housing</li> <li>- Concerns about availability of employment land</li> <li>- Concerns about quality of any new housing and how we might influence this</li> <li>- Concerns that there is no mention of air quality, noting targets for reduction</li> <li>- There has been opportunity to engage frequently with the process</li> <li>- Confirmation that we are the first JSP to go through this type of inspection</li> <li>- Questions about how the consultation responses are managed</li> </ul> <p>Laura Ambler responded to the discussion and clarified the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deliverability. Transport Infrastructure costs for JSP mitigations are estimated to be in order of £2bn. Although ambitious it is realistic. We feel we can meet this because of technical work on JTS and work now commissioned. We must demonstrate plan is sound – reasonable and deliverable – so deliverability at heart of this plan.</li> <li>- Overall approach. We have engaged with planning inspectorate and have been seeking QC advice to ensure plan is sound.</li> <li>- Transport mitigations. Whilst there are road schemes the focus is on enabling public transport. Sustainable transport is something that we have built into the plan.</li> <li>- Housing need. We have considered the local housing statement and are taking this into consideration. The plan will demonstrate flexibility and contingency.</li> <li>- Affordable housing. This is built into the evidence base and it is based on the strategic development plan. Actual delivery will be built into local plans. (It was clarified it is not the purpose of the JSP to enable residents to bid to live in other authority areas.)</li> <li>- Key worker housing. This is included in evidence base – affordable criteria takes account of income, and disposable income after housing costs met. We aim to ensure our affordable housing is truly affordable.</li> <li>- Employment land. There is an intention to include employment land as small plots at strategic development locations.</li> <li>- Public Consultation. The final public consultation is on what the authorities believe is the final plan. These representations go direct to the inspector along with the final plan and the inspector may discuss these matters at the examination in public. This is therefore a meaningful consultation.</li> <li>- Air quality. Transport a significant part of JSP. Intention is to ensure that the additional homes have no negative impact. Looking at zero carbon targets as part of the placemaking policy. We will need innovative solutions to fund this and have been looking at viability work.</li> <li>- Quality of Housing. Louise Fradd, SRO for the JSP confirm we have looked at Cambridge model and we are looking closely at placemaking and to ensure we bring in the quality element.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair thanked Laura Ambler for her report.</p>
13	<p><b>JOINT TRANSPORT STUDY</b></p> <p>Bill Davies from WECA joined the meeting, accompanied by a representative from Atkins.</p> <p>Bill Davies confirmed that this study is currently advisory and does not at this stage represent the policy of the four councils. Next steps will be a public consultation in early 2018.</p> <p>Bill Davies explained that work on the Joint Transport Study has been in parallel with the JSP and consultations have been undertaken together. The objectives for study are in line with national guidance and include, emissions, accessibility, safety, quality of life, economic growth. Have looked at mix of transport and the importance of international gateways, port and airport. Consultation has asked for views on level of ambition, spend across different methods of</p>

	<p>transport, allocation of highway to public transport. We have seen strong agreement across main concepts.</p> <p>The Members discussed the report and noted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns that the report does not make any specific mention of air quality challenge in Bath</li> <li>- Opportunities to improve access to railway stations through public transport (Metrobus)</li> <li>- Concerns whether we are making the most of rail freight capacity</li> <li>- Ambition for 15-minute passenger service on the Severn Beach Line</li> <li>- Need for road schemes to spread prosperity to areas such as South Bristol rather than enable commuting through</li> <li>- Concerns that park and rides need to be linked up to railways</li> <li>- Concerns that an underground scheme may be a distraction</li> <li>- General concerns about air quality – we should be looking at a reduction in cars and move to innovative technologies such as driverless cars</li> <li>- Authorities will need to ensure the revenue implications of these capital schemes are understood</li> </ul> <p>Bill Davies responded to the discussion and clarified the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Air quality. We are looking at transfer of road space to more sustainable forms of transport, and also looking at how we can encourage a shift in transport (e.g. parking fees)</li> <li>- Rail Freight. We have discussed with rail colleagues who have highlighted that with reduction in coal transport there is more opportunity for rail freight from Avonmouth and there is an opportunity to create a freight distribution point to service the West of England. We are keen to develop these opportunities and shift more freight onto rail. In addition, dynamic motorway management on M4 and M5 will support distribution centres as it is likely that lorry based distribution will continue during the lifetime of this study. We are working with Network Rail and authorities to look at opportunities to bid for funding to enable a boost to rail freight capacity in the area.</li> <li>- Air Quality. We acknowledge there are issues in Bath (and Bristol) and will ensure this is reflected clearly in the report. There is a wide variety of movement through the city and through traffic needs to be addressed. As part of thinking need to look at how schemes can be integrated effectively into the environment. This is a challenge that the transport industry needs to take away.</li> <li>- Metrobus. Routes are designed to cater for full range of travel arrangements across the route. The purpose of routes from towns to urban areas is to improve public transport opportunities to encourage a move from driving.</li> <li>- Road schemes and economic impact. The testing has been focused on how schemes improve travel and accessibility. Transport connectivity in South Bristol for example needs to support access to opportunity.</li> <li>- Emerging technologies. Conscious that disruptive technologies are starting to appear and that there will be a very challenging transition period.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair thanked Bill Davies for his report.</p>
14	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>Cllr Davis queried where scrutiny of existing budgets was to take place, for example funding previously managed through the LEP. <b>The Chair agreed to seek clarification on the scrutiny arrangements for these budgets and to report back to the Committee.</b></p>

	<p>Cllr Morris requested that meeting dates were circulated. <b>Helen Edelstyn to ensure Scrutiny Members receive a list of meeting dates</b></p> <p>Cllr Gollop and Cllr Ball both requested WECA explore the use of Modern.Gov to distribute papers. <b>Helen Edelstyn to discuss with IT</b></p> <p>The meeting concluded at 13.59</p>
--	---

**Appendix A – Public Forum: Question with Answer**

**Appendix B – Public Forum: Statements**

## **Appendix A: Public Forum: Question**

**Christina Biggs, Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways (FOSBR)**

**1. What additions have been made to the transport schemes proposed in the December 2016 pre-consultation draft of the JTS, in response to the submissions from the public?**

**2. Safety of MetroBus bridges and entry flanges to guided busways**

*What trials have been made of the MetroBus bridge at Ashton Vale to make sure that the double-decker buses do not topple when mounting this steep and winding route over the rail line, and of the consequences to buses of missing the entry flanges into guided sections of the busways? Would the Metro Mayor be willing to be physically present in the bus when it is making trials at different entry speeds to make sure that badly trained or pressurised bus drivers are not putting themselves and the public at risk? Were there to be a fatal incident on a MetroBus guided busway would the Metro Mayor be willing to be charged for murder due to deliberate and irresponsible planning?*

**3. Portishead Line**

*Will WECA challenge the Portbury Dock on its alleged use of the freight paths and negotiate that during the works for Portishead Line that the weekend closures are from Friday to Monday inclusive, to maximise the efficiency of the engineering works? If the Port can prove it needs Monday or Friday running during this time, will WECA challenge the Portbury Dock to divert ships to Avonmouth dock, or use road freight?*

**4. Henbury Loop**

*Will WECA challenge the Port study costing of £128m for a bridge at St Andrews Gate level crossing, and request that the study scope is widened to consider a road bridge at St Andrew's Rd Station north of the conveyor belt terminus to provide the Port with alternative road access, to be funded from Network Rail level crossing elimination money? Will WECA carry out a survey to establish the precise amount of use that the Port of Avonmouth requires at St Andrew's Gate? Will WECA investigate the possibility of Henbury Loop trains reversing at Bristol Parkway both to increase ridership and to provide a clockface service that does not waste trainset rental time?*

**5. Thornbury Line**

*Will WECA attempt to gain access to the Grovesend tunnel beyond the bricked-up exit from the rail tunnel under the A38 (pictured) and to establish from Network Rail what their plans are for Tytherington quarry? Will WECA request Network Rail for an evaluation of the use of the fourth platform at Bristol Parkway as a passing loop for trains using Westerleigh Junction and learn about the technological advances in signalling that will considerably expand the capacity of the rail system for increased frequency? When investigating a Thornbury MetroBus, will it ensure a transit time to central Bristol to match the probable train transit time of 45 minutes?*

**Answer:**

1. What additions have been made to the transport schemes proposed in the December 2016 pre-consultation draft of the JTS, in response to the submissions from the public?

The Joint Transport Study (JTS) draft final report has taken into account the outcomes of the 2016 consultation. The consultation highlighted general support for the interventions proposed and accordingly the core elements have been retained. Some schemes have been removed or reviewed as a result of the consultation responses, and the status of other schemes clarified. Whilst the performance of other schemes suggested in the consultation was considered, they may not have demonstrated a robust business case. However, the support for investment in sustainable transport modes is reflected in the priority given to these modes in the study recommendations.

2. Safety of MetroBus bridges and entry flanges to guided busways

Metrobus is not a WECA project but I understand that comprehensive vehicle trials of the MetroBus bus-way between the Long Ashton Park and Ride site and Cumberland Road will be undertaken prior to the launch of the scheme, including the skew bridge over the Portbury Freight Line.

3. Portishead Line

Discussions are ongoing between Bristol Port and Network Rail on the constructability programme for the Portishead Line and it would be premature and indeed unhelpful for the West of England Combined Authority to intercede at this point.

4. Henbury Loop

The West of England Combined Authority has no plans to undertake any further work on extending services on the Henbury Line. The focus remains on delivering MetroWest Phase 2 with hourly services to a new Henbury station plus new stations at North Filton and Ashley Down and half hourly services to Yate with a possible extension to Gloucester.

5. Thornbury Line

As the Joint Transport Study draft final report concludes there is no realistic prospect of introducing new rail services to Thornbury there are no plans to undertake any further work. The Study considers that the proposed introduction of MetroBus will be a more effective means of connecting Thornbury to the North Fringe and Bristol.

## Appendix B: Public Forum: Statements

	Name, organisation
Item 1	David Redgewell, South West Transport Network, TSSA and Director of Bus Users (UK) <b><i>West of England Transport Issues</i></b>
Item 2	David Redgewell, South West Transport Network, TSSA and Director of Bus Users (UK) <b><i>West of England Transport Issues</i></b>
Item 3	Cllr Lin Patterson, Bath & East North Somerset Council <b>Save our 6-7 Bus Campaign based in North East Bath.</b>
Item 4	Christina Biggs, Friends of Suburban Bristol Railway <b><i>A reaction to Joint Transport Study September 2017</i></b>

**Statement 1**  
**David Redgwell**

If we are to proceed with a mass transit scheme we need to make sure the plans are realistic. The Light Rail Transit Association (Tram Forward) could advise on this as they have been involved in the Westway study and cut and cover tunnels such as those at Newcastle Upon Tyne and Hannover. I myself have been involved in the Trans-Clyde project in Glasgow but we must stay focused on MetroBus, MetroRail delivery and Better Bus A38 North to Thornbury and A370 to Weston-Super-Mare.

Other stakeholders could include RMT, TSSA, ASLEF, Unite, Network Rail, First Group, MTR and Stagecoach and a number of rail engineering firms. We must make sure that any mass transit scheme is fully integrated with MetroWest Phases 1 & 2 to Portishead, Bath and Gloucester including the Henbury loop. It should hub and spoke at Temple Meads and Broadmead.

Of course at Temple Meads we are dealing with a Grade 1\* listed building and a number of important heritage buildings including the George and Railway, Grosvenor hotel and Cattle Market Tavern.

In East Bristol we are looking at coal mine shafts as well as the River's Frome and Avon in Bristol and Bath.

We should be looking at the Midland Railway corridor between Bristol and Bath, North Somerset Railway to Brislington with a link to the new Hengrove housing estate and the new Bath tramway scheme as well as the Bristol Airport tram/train link on the A38 with a potential conversion of the South Bristol link road to include a tramway.

We must continue to fund disability access and station improvements.

Regards  
DAVID R

---

## **Statement 2**

### **David Redgewell**

#### West of England Transport

SWTN, Railfuture and Bus Users UK are very concerned about cutbacks to the electrification programme to Chippenham with no date for completion to Bristol via Bath or Filton Bank. The lack of investment in Temple Meads apart from 2 platforms for alteration within the IEP programme, the stopping of works at Lawrence Hill bridge and station, the lack of progress on platform extensions at Bath Spa, lack of a step free access programme at Stapleton Road, Lawrence Hill, Nailsea and Weston-Super-Mare (on hold until 2019).

At Temple Meads it is important that the new Station Street is built for good access to the new Temple Quarter University Campus and that the heritage buildings (including the Cattle Market Tavern) are protected.

It is very important that we continue with the Metro-West project

Concerns over the lack of progress on funding for East Junction, lack of scope for rolling stock from the Thames Valley and the loss of 9 units to Centro in May 2017 we need a clear rolling stock policy for the Greater Bristol area including the 11-15 HST's. The interface with South West Trains and how these projects fit in with Metro-West phases 1 & 2.

The new station site does not provide a transport interchange as suggested by Railfuture, TFGBA, Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways and the four rail unions. The new siting of Filton North station doesn't interchange with MetroBus, the A38 showcase bus routes to Thornbury and Patchway nor with bus route 18 to EmersonsGreen/Southmead Hospital and Avonmouth and route 82 to Yate.

We ask the WECA to reconsider the Filton North station site as this was rebuilt only a few years ago. Clearly the plan needs to link with the rail service through Henbury North to Avonmouth and Severn Beach and the new Cribbs Causeway development whatever that plan may be following the planning inspectors report.

We expect the plan to be fully designed with bus stops, shelters and raised kerbs and mobility impaired pavements and services including the public realm strategy included in interchanges.

We want MetroWest Phase 2 (Henbury loop) and the Gloucester line to be progressed as a top priority for WECA, Bristol Mayor and the Metro Mayor including Ashley Down, Charfield, Stonehouse stations and improvements at Gloucester.

The Henbury loop should have stations at Filton North, Henbury for Cribbs Causeway, Portway Park and Ride and improvements at Avonmouth. Our top priority is to see the Portishead railway line reopened for 100 million pounds including stations at Portishead and Pill protecting the site at Ashton Gate.

We need value engineering at Network Rail and these projects must be submitted for CP6. Saltford, St Annes and Corsham should be looked at as part of the study by Bristol City Council. WECA and the Metro Mayor should make a submission to Government for extra funding.

It should be noted that Lawrence Hill, Stapleton Road, Patchway, Pilning, Nailsea and Backwell and Parson Street are not disabled accessible, nor is Weston Super Mare and Cheltenham is without lifts.

On integration, we are very concerned after discussions between Transport Focus and First Group (RAIL and BUS Divisions) and Network Rail over bus/rail ferry integration at Temple Meads within the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone scheme. We note that Cambridge North station is fully integrated with local and MetroBus unlike Bedminster at present.

Integration should be at the heart of what WECA does.

The project has the support of Chris Grayling and Jeremy Corbyn nationally.

David Redgewell South West Transport Network, TSSA and Director of Bus Users (UK)

**Statement 3**  
**Cllr Linda Patterson**

Dear WECA,

Please could you register me to speak at the beginning of your meeting this Friday? It should be less than 5 minutes. I wish to represent the Save Our 6-7 Bus campaign based in north east Bath.

Please confirm.

Many thanks,

B&NES Councillor Lin Patterson  
(Green) Lambridge

**A Reaction to Joint Transport Study September 2017:** FOSBR welcome the determination of WECA to proceed with developing transport studies, but would challenge the assumption that the first of the schemes to be advanced should be MetroBus, Park and Ride and road bypass schemes.

**1. MetroBus:** We are alarmed at the proposed rolling-out of the MetroBus schemes to Thornbury, Severnside and Keynsham, when there are rail schemes in place for each of these destinations. We question the safety of the MetroBuses in the guided busways, especially when entering the flanges and mounting steep and curved bridges such as the one at Ashton Vale.

**2. Rail element:** We note that this study claims to have ambition and yet is only suggesting the same six new rail stations proposed in the December 2016 pre-consultation draft, and that the September 2017 version is explicitly excluding two rail schemes (Henbury Loop and the Thornbury Line) which are the most inspiring to the public.

**3. Henbury Loop** We are disappointed that the JTS has not challenged in any way the CH2MHill report in 2015 that was so damning of the Henbury Loop. FOSBR has in the past made several suggestions to address the perceived problems with the Henbury Loop, such as an idea to extend the route to reverse at Bristol Parkway, as this would complete it to clock-face. We would also want WECA to challenge the Port study £128m figure for creating a rail cutting at St Andrew's Gate level crossing, and would urge WECA to investigate alternatives such as a bridge at St Andrew's Rd Station north of the conveyor belt silo. Finally we note that Severnside industrial development is growing fast, and should give a better business case for the Henbury Loop, especially if opening a station at Chittinging.

**4. Portishead Line** We would like to participate in the re-scoping discussions on Portishead line, chiefly our idea of implementing our proposal for long weekend closures, given the present lack of use by Portbury Dock of their purchased freight paths. We are presenting data today that shows that the Port make very little use of their purchased freight paths and that principally the trains have been running on Tuesdays and Thursdays. If the weekend closures for works to the line were from Friday to Monday this would double the length of time during the line closures, and more than halve the number of weekend closures needed.

**5. FOSBR Rail Manifesto 2017 and MetroWest Phase 3 ideas** – we commend these to WECA, especially the key idea of interchange between rail and standard bus, by using painted bus 24 hour continuous lanes. We commend three other plans: the Mayoral Rail Manifesto 2016, the Good Transport Plan and our own Suggestions for the Great Western Franchise (attached).

**6. FOSBR Request:** We would therefore like to have meaningful discussions with WECA elected members and officers, Network Rail and GWR representatives, to obtain feedback on our FOSBR Rail Manifesto 2017 and for us to challenge the Joint Transport Study 2017 proposals, notably the refusal to develop major rail schemes such as the Henbury Loop and Thornbury Line. We also have suggestions for improving the current MetroWest Phase 1 and Phase 2 business cases.

**7. To this end we have booked a room at City Hall, Bristol, on Weds 4 October from 10.30am-12noon. We would like to invite WECA officers and elected members to meet FOSBR members where WECA can give us verbal feedback on the ideas in our FOSBR Rail Manifesto 2017 and respond to our challenges to the Joint Transport Study Final Report September 2017.**

## B Notes on specifics

### 1. Proposals at WECA Extraordinary Meeting Friday 15 Sept

**a. Staffing:** We note the proposal to engage Patricia Greer for £150kpa as Chief Executive. We welcome the initiative to engage staff for WECA but would ask qualified transport professionals should be engaged so as to reduce reliance on CH2MHill.

**b. Rail element:** We commend the suggestion of reopening Charfield and making improvements to Yate and Keynsham stations, but would suggest that WECA should start by maximising use of the existing 28 suburban railway stations, principally by enhancing **rail-bus interchange** – such as providing real time bus and train information at station and bus level for Lawrence Hill, Parson St and Clifton Down.

### 2. Specific schemes commended by FOSBR in FOSBR Rail Manifesto and MetroWest Phase 3.

**a. Pilning:** FOSBR notes that Network Rail have not replaced the footbridge removed in October 2017 and that this represented a very modest saving (£658,000); that Network Rail are now saying that a GRIP process costing the taxpayer £3-£5m will be necessary to replace the footbridge whether like-for-like (£1,064,000) or Equalities compliant (more than £2m). FOSBR argue that a GRIP process should not be necessary to replace the footbridge as this only removed in October 2016, and we continue to assert that Network Rail should fund this out of the savings from the delay in electrification to Temple Meads. Failing this, we consider that replacing the footbridge and providing adequate lighting would present a very modest first step by WECA as part of the new devolution deal to unlock the potential of this strategically located station which is both near to the proposed M49 junction and also 8 minutes away by road from Cribbs Causeway as well as cycling distance to Severnside employment. If the footbridge is replaced then a trial daily service can be instigated.

**b. N Filton Station location:** We also comment on the proposed relocation of the N Filton station 400m to the west as this will effectively dissuade use of this station by students and lecturers at SGS College Filton and a Park and Ride for the A38 commuters.

**c. Park and Ride should be on rail not on bus:** We wish to urge WECA to develop a coherent strategy for Park and Ride which uses rail stations for rapid transit (not just bus links) and a rail-bus interchange approach (such as at Filton Abbey Wood) which maximises use of the existing rail network. We also note the need for adequate disabled access for Patchway, Stapleton Rd and Lawrence Hill.

**d. Thornbury** – The proposed scheme of a MetroBus to Thornbury should not be advanced simply to rescue the MetroBus project, but to give Thornbury residents a meaningful transit time to the centre of Bristol. We suggest that reopening the Thornbury Line is a suitably ambitious scheme for MetroWest Phase 3 (to parallel the Portishead and Henbury lines for Phase 1 and 2 respectively) which would give transit times of well under an hour – if the MetroBus scheme to Thornbury is simply an add-on to the Aztec West branch, the necessary pinch-points on villages along the A38 would introduce delays not much better than with the existing bus.

We propose that the Thornbury rail station site at Grosvenor Road is optimal as it is adjacent to the majority of existing and proposed railway development and has an attractive prospect and entrance to the town. We have visited both rail tunnels under the A38 and M5 and can confirm they are in good condition. Rail capacity is much less an issue on a branch line and could eliminate the need for a turnback at Yate. The fourth platform at Bristol Parkway should also help with capacity at Westerleigh Junction, and recent advances in signalling technology should solve remaining capacity issues.

# Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways (FOSBR)

## Suggestions for MetroWest Phase 3



*To serve as a detailed proposal for the Enhanced MetroWest option from West of England (WEP) Joint Transport Study, and the Rail component of the West of England Devolution Deal March 2016; informed by FOSBR Jan 2016 Rail Map survey (800 respondents).*

### **MetroWest Phase 3 Executive summary:**

- **Reopen stations at Ashton Gate, Charfield, Coalpit Heath, St Anne's, Chittening, Salford, Corsham and Uphill, plus Park and Ride stations at Portway and Portbury.**
- **Extend local services to serve these new stations: Henbury Loop plus Clifton Down return; Weston super Mare to Chippenham via Corsham; Portishead to Cheltenham.**
- **Promotion of rail-bus interchange so that there is complete coverage of the West of England area for commuters wishing to travel to work by public transport.**
- **Station upgrades to include better waiting facilities, disabled access and CCTV.**

**Introduction:** MetroWest Phase 1 and 2 are together an exciting £100m local rail package, already funded under the City Deal and proceeding through GRIP stage 3. Phase 1 consists of reopening the Portishead Line (and reopening stations at Portishead and Pill) and hiring 6-7 extra trainsets to provide a half-hour clockface service from Bristol Temple Meads to Portishead, Avonmouth and Bath, with two of these being through trains. MetroWest Phase 2 consists of reopening Ashley Hill, North Filton and Henbury and hiring 2-3 trainsets to provide an hourly service to Henbury and an extra return service from Temple Meads to Yate or Gloucester.

This proposal also draws on the principles of the **Good Transport Plan for Bristol** by linking this rail backbone to other forms of sustainable transport, and suggests that this would give the commuters of the travel-to-work area a viable alternative to the private car and therefore deliver a permanent and significant reduction of the current critical-path road congestion.

### **Notes:**

1. **Governance:** For this comprehensive MetroWest to be effectively delivered, the Combined Authority arrangements should have a transparent and publicly accountable governance, with a team of transport planners to consult the public and stakeholders on developing a region-wide and ambitious sustainable transport strategy and to develop links with employers and schools to improve Bristol's transport options and reduce air pollution. Develop funding streams such as a workplace parking levy on car commuting.

2. **Rail-Bus interchange:** As rail cannot reach every community, make sure bus services call at local train stations, and provide signage to help passengers plan an integrated journey.

### **3. Suggested new train services for Phase 3:**

Henbury Loop linking to a Clifton Down return journey (using Clifton Down turnback) – this solves the time wastage involved in the of the 63 minute Henbury Loop trip and gives a more frequent service to Clifton Down;

Weston super Mare to Chippenham – to serve St Anne's Park, Salford and Corsham. This would avoid the need for a Bathampton turnback;

Portishead to Cheltenham via Yate and Gloucester (extension of the proposed Phase 2 service) – serving Coalpit Heath and Charfield - this uses the Filton Bank to allow fast trains to pass slow trains so no need for a loop at Coalpit Heath;

Commuter trains (initially peak-only and/or request) to serve Pilning, which would also provide a better service to and beyond Severn Tunnel Junction, using the passing loop at Pilning if necessary.

Uphill station could be served by Cross-Country trains and/or a local service round the Weston Loop. The service would depend on the location – whether Uphill itself, Uphill Junction or Locking.

## **B Specific schemes:**

### **1. Completion of Henbury Loop**

Network Rail are making this line suitable for passenger train diversions (“passengerisation”), which means there is no reason why a Loop service cannot be instigated during rail Control Period 6 (2019-2024). The infrastructure that would be needed to include Bristol Parkway should be investigated. The growing need for Severnside employee commuting should also be addressed by considering service enhancements to both Severn Beach and Pilning, as Pilning would have no implications for Port access.

### **2. Service and station upgrades:**

- Interchange hubs (including Park and Ride) connecting rail, bus, taxi, cycling and ferry routes;
- Rail and bus timetables to fit with each other and with working shift patterns;
- Extra rail services to Severn Beach Station at shift change times, in addition to the hourly service proposed by MetroWest Phase 1;
- Pilning station must not be closed: Services should be restored as a trial request stop for workers in Severnside, and to enable commuting from the Thornbury area;
- More rail-bus connections to serve Bristol Airport from stations such as Nailsea and Backwell;
- Filton Abbey Wood as rail-bus interchange for Southmead Hospital and Horfield;
- Temple Meads spatial development including rail-bus interchange on the Friary, taxi access, and access for bus services to and from South Bristol at the rear;
- Other rail-bus interchanges: Avonmouth, Pilning and Severn Beach for Severnside; Henbury for Cribbs Causeway; Bristol Parkway, Park and Ride at Portbury and Portway, and a Park and Ride at Pilning to serve both east and west-bound commuters should an M49 junction be completed;
- Full disabled access to all stations, including CCTV and waiting shelter facilities;
- Freight: realistic assessment of necessary train path frequencies so as not to inhibit planning for passenger routes that share freight lines (such as Portishead and the Henbury Loop). Reopen discussions with Port of Bristol on provision of 24-hour road freight access (eg bridge) to Port.

### **3. Station reopenings (in alphabetical order):**

**Ashton Gate** on the Portishead line, to serve the Stadium both for sports events and the proposed weekday conferences, Ashton Court events, the Winterstoke shopping outlets and car workshops, Spike Island and Hotwells residents; to connect to a MetroBus stop.

**Charfield**, which is favoured by S Glos to serve towns such as Wootton-Under-Edge and Thornbury;

**Chittening**: the previous site is on a National Cycle Network stub and is accessible to industrial estates both to the north (by public right of way) and south (via the cycle underbridge) of the station site. Station stopping patterns and connecting shuttle bus to be timed for workers' shift patterns;

**Coalpit Heath** (to serve Winterbourne and Emerson's Green);

**Corsham**, a long-term aspiraton of Wiltshire County Council;

**Saltford**, as promoted by the current station reopening campaign;

**St Anne's**, a more recent campaign to serve this urban area on the badly congested A4.

**Uphill**, to serve Weston General Hospital and Weston College; optimum location to be determined.

**4. Further phases:** Rebuilding lines to Thornbury and/or Clevedon; light rail for selected new routes; electrification of the MetroWest network, subject to technological advances such as battery trains.



**Transport for  
Greater Bristol  
Alliance**  
Campaigning for  
Integrated Transport



## Mayoral Candidate Public Transport Pledge April 2016

We the candidates for the Mayor of Bristol pledge to bring about a cleaner and less congested city of Greater Bristol, by basing our transport policies on the themes of the Good Transport Plan, and ensure that the majority of transport funding via devolution is dedicated to sustainable transport and local greener streets.

- 1. Governance:** Make sure any proposed West of England arrangements have a transparent and publicly accountable governance, with a team of transport planners to consult the public and stakeholders on developing a region-wide and ambitious sustainable transport strategy and to develop links with employers and schools to improve Bristol's transport options and reduce air pollution. Develop funding streams such as a workplace parking levy on car commuting.
- 2. Rail:** Make sure MetroWest Phase 1 (Portishead and half-hour "Unite the City" through services between Portishead, Severn Beach and Bath) is prioritised and delivered to the current schedule – making sure Network Rail keeps Filton Bank four-tracking to schedule, delivers the remodelling of Bristol East Junction and the proposed "passengerisation" of the Henbury Loop to deliver a minimum of a half-hour service to all current West of England stations. Immediately plan for future MetroWest phases.
- 3. Bus strategy:** Deliver a bus network that serves the whole city in a systematic and logical way, with smart ticketing, radial and orbital and suburban feeder routes, and with a frequent and reliable service. Safeguard and extend bus lanes (especially in the city centre) to increase passenger confidence for the daily journey.
- 4. Rail-Bus interchange:** Promote a Temple Meads Spatial Plan including the proposed passenger tunnel through to the Arena and an integrated rail-bus interchange on Friary. Investigate the development of rail-bus interchanges such as at Filton Abbey Wood and Nailsea and Backwell.
- 5. A fair deal for taxi drivers:** Representation on the planning team; permission to use bus lanes; fair licencing; a disabled taxi-card scheme.
- 6. Bristol Centre.** Celebrate this beautiful city by developing the Floating Harbour as a focal point, and create an iconic city centre free of unnecessary through traffic, pleasant and safe and easily navigable for cyclists and walkers of all ages.

Signed, the Mayoral candidates:




What we could achieve together



What we want to achieve

See a **significant increase** in the number of people using **public transport**



**Reprioritise the city centre** for **walking and cycling**, developing **major new routes** that help to link different parts of the city



Strengthen **local communities** through **innovative street design** that puts neighbourhoods and its **residents first**



Enable **all children** to have the option to **walk, scoot or cycle** to school and **play outdoors** where they live

# What we want to achieve

In the next 5 to 10 years we could:



See a growing proportion of **vehicles** on our roads that use **ultra low emission technology**

Develop and secure funding for a **clear, ambitious and deliverable plan** to achieve step-change in our **public transport infrastructure** and **walking and cycling networks** over the next 50 years

**Halt and reverse air pollution** caused by transport in our city and become a **European leader in air quality**



Create **pedestrianised areas** across the city centre with **open and dynamic spaces** for retailers that will help to ensure **economic vitality**

Double the number of people **walking or cycling** for **everyday journeys under 5 miles**



**Increase** the number of businesses who use **freight consolidation centres**



See the majority of people **walking, cycling** or using **public transport** for their **journeys to work**

Create a city where everyone embraces and celebrates the **culture of sustainable travel** and which sees **walking, cycling and public transport** use as the norm for the majority of journeys

**OBJECTIVE #6**

*Empower communities to help redesign residential spaces that work for everyone*



**OBJECTIVE #5**

*Reduce through traffic in the city centre to create a high quality, people-centred environment*



**OBJECTIVE #2**

*Implement a comprehensive and high quality walking and cycling network, making door-to-door journeys by foot and bike a reality*



**OBJECTIVE #1**

*Create a flexible, reliable and affordable public transport system that is integrated, simple to use and gets you from A to B on time*



**OBJECTIVE #8**

*Give children the opportunity to walk, scoot or cycle and play outdoors improving their health and wellbeing*



# A Good Transport Plan FOR BRISTOL

**OBJECTIVE #3**

*Increase the proportion of all low emission or shared vehicles on our roads and establish accessible refuelling points across the city*



**OBJECTIVE #9**

*Change the way that we travel as a city and show that sustainable and active travel can be easy and enjoyable for everyone in Bristol*



**OBJECTIVE #4**

*Continue improving the coordination and consolidation of deliveries to reduce the number of heavy goods vehicles on our roads and improve safety for all road users*



**OBJECTIVE #7**

*Give employees the flexibility and facilities to work from home and travel sustainably*



## Suggestions for Great Western Franchise 2020



Improving passenger experience and ease of use:

1. Minimise the number of Severn Beach trains making unscheduled turn-backs at Avonmouth and provision of alternative transport (such as taxi or minibus) when these turnbacks are made;
2. Guards on all trains for safety and passenger information (such as advising on buses and contacting taxis in case of cancellations and turn-backs);
3. Revenue collection – make sure the ticket machines are maintained and upgraded to prevent them malfunctioning;
4. Smart-card ticketing to include Oyster-style “carnet” pricing where people can buy 10 or 20 journeys with no restriction on having to spend them within the week or month;
5. Disabled access at Stapleton Rd, Lawrence Hill, Parson St and Patchway;
6. Provision for cycling – need for adequate cycle space on trains and number of carriages at peak times. Improved bike stand provision, starting at stations where demand is highest, such Redland, Montpellier, Oldfield Park, Stapleton Road, Clifton Down, Filton Abbeywood and Temple Meads. Cycle lockers should be provided at more isolated stations such as Filton Abbeywood and Stapleton Road.
7. Accessibility - as a minimum the franchise holder should be required to conduct an accessibility audit of all local stations and produce an action plan to resolve issues;
8. Provision of adequate station waiting facilities - this is needed at most local stations but is a particular problem at Yate, Clifton Down, Montpellier, Stapleton Road, Worle, Nailsea, and Oldfield Park.

## Rail-bus interchange:

9. Real-time and timetable signage information about both bus and rail timetables at both rail stations and bus stops, such as at Clifton Down, Lawrence Hill, Parson St and Stapleton Rd; well positioned bus stops adjacent and within sight of stations together with multimodal ticketing, signage and information to promote easy transfer between trains and buses.
10. Signs to enable modal interchanging and facilitate journeys, working with bus operators and the community to ensure each station is well signed from major/adjacent roads to all points of access. Signs at stations should clearly guide passengers to near-by bus services and amenities. Signs at bus stops or train stations should say where passengers might travel to, for example 'alight here for buses to Fishponds and Staple Hill'
11. Train timetables should also be placed at the entrance to stations or on nearby roads to encourage 'passing trade'. For example, timetables on the pavement on Lawrence Hill road... Station Road (by Gloucester Road arches) and Cromwell Road (Montpelier), "
12. Responsibility to develop bus-rail interchanges with WECA, bus companies, etc. including at Filton Abbeywood, Lawrence Hill, Stapleton Road, Temple Meads, Bedminster (at junction of Bedminster Down Rd and West St), Parson Street (we support the proposal to route the Airport bus via Parson St), and Keynsham.

## Timetabling new services:

13. Supporting delivery of MetroWest Phase 1 and 2, and planning for future phases of MetroWest, such as rail plans in the WECA Joint Transport Study and our own suggestions for MetroWest Phase 3.
14. Completing a 30 minute frequency to all currently operational stations not already in MetroWest Phase 1A or Phase 2, such as Bedminster and Parson St and Patchway, through additional stops on existing services;
15. A twenty or fifteen minute frequency peak commuter service for Temple Meads to Clifton Down;
16. Replacing the footbridge at Pilning and trialling a daily commuter service stopping at 07:52, with a return service in the early evening,

initially in the eastbound direction until the footbridge is replaced. In the meantime, Pilning 3rd stopping train on Sat afternoon sometime between 3:30pm and 5:30pm, and providing platform 1 lighting to enable this service to be used in the winter, and reinstating Pilning to the stations column of their online and printed timetables.

17. Reversing trains at Chippenham rather than Bathampton, to allow Corsham Station to be reopened. Trialling a twice-daily additional service from Chippenham to Bristol, stopping at Corsham, to arrive at Bristol between the current arrivals of 07:10 and 08:17, with a last train from Bristol to Chippenham no earlier than 23:00.
18. Futureproofing platforms and rolling stock on the Severn Beach Line, to enable 5-car trains to be used when needed, by ensuring selective door opening and through-train access on the trains and a plan for lighting the platforms for the full 5-car length as demand increases.
19. Restoration of scheduled stops at St Andrews Road, Lawrence Hill and Sea Mills on Severn Beach line;
20. Extension of Severn Beach line commuter services: we request that the 08.03 from Temple Meads and either the 16.03 or 16.35 from Temple Meads run through to Severn Beach instead of turning back at Avonmouth. This would give an hourly peak service to Severn Beach.
21. Plugging the gaps in the Severn Beach Line evening timetable - currently there is 93 minutes (109 minutes on Saturday) between the arrivals at Bristol Temple Meads at 20:34 (from Avonmouth) (20:26 from Severn Beach on Saturday) and 22:07 (22:09 on Saturday) (from Severn Beach); later last train from Temple Meads to Severn Beach.
22. Half hourly services between Filton Abbeywood and Stapleton Road/Lawrence Hill on Saturdays and Sundays (currently only on weekdays), and improving connections with the Severn Beach line, which are currently poor especially on Sundays. "Unite the City" local through services (eg Bristol Parkway direct to Parson St when the football is on) that minimise the need to change at Temple Meads or minimise connection times at Temple Meads;

# FOSBR Rail Manifesto 2017

FOSBR calls on the West of England Combined Authority, our MPs and councillors to secure funding for the following projects for Network Rail to deliver within Control Period 6 (2019-2024):

- four-tracking of Filton Bank and remodelling of Bristol East Junction;
- cross-regional plan for Park and Ride, prioritising Portway P&R;
- MetroWest Phase 1 to Portishead via Pill and a half-hour service from Avonmouth to Bath, as these are long overdue and urgently needed;
- MetroWest Phase 2 to Henbury, Yate and Gloucester via Ashley Hill;
- electrification to Bristol Temple Meads via Filton and Bath;
- Temple Meads Spatial Plan to include Station Street as a minimum;
- redeveloping and regenerating suburban stations for best use of land.

We also press WECA and the constituent local authorities to make sure the following is included in the Great Western Franchise 2020—2027/2030:

- maximising use of the existing local rail network by optimising public access to all local stations (disabled access, local signposting and cycle storage at stations and on trains, rail-bus interchange, shelter);
- multi-modal smart ticketing, with guards for safety on all trains;
- improve the timetable to complete a 30 minute service to currently ill-served local stations such as Parson St, Bedminster and Patchway;
- ensuring that the Phase 1 hourly service to Severn Beach is reliable;
- increasing service frequency to 20 or 15 minutes according to passenger demand, by providing passing loops such as at Sea Mills;
- replace the footbridge at Pilning to permit a meaningful commuter service, starting with a trial daily commuter service to build the business case for a Park and Ride serving the M49.

In the longer term, we also urge WECA to make sure the following are included in the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) and Joint Transport Study, and that these elements are funded by the 30-year devolution deal as a priority:

- JSP stations Horfield, St Anne's, Salford, Ashton Gate & Charfield;
- Completion of Henbury Loop and double-tracking Severn Beach Line;
- Adding FOSBR MetroWest Phase 3 proposals for five further stations at Coalpit Heath, Chittening, Uphill/Locking, Corsham & Long Ashton;
- electrification of local lines using hybrid or battery trains;
- extending the Tytherington freight line to Thornbury.

