



Minutes of the meeting of the West of England Joint Committee 30th October 2017

Members:

Cllr Tim Warren, Bath & North East Somerset Council
Mayor Marvin Rees, Bristol City Council
Cllr Nigel Ashton, North Somerset Council
Cllr Matthew Riddle, South Gloucestershire Council
Mayor Tim Bowles, West of England Combined Authority

<p>1.</p>	<p>Welcome & Introductions</p> <p>Cllr Matthew Riddle, Leader of South Gloucestershire Council and Chair of the West of England Joint Committee, welcomed everyone to the Guildhall in Bath for the second meeting of the West of England Joint Committee. He introduced his colleagues Cllr Tim Warren, Leader of Bath & North East Somerset Council, Mayor Marvin Rees of Bristol, Cllr Nigel Ashton, Leader of North Somerset Council, Mayor Tim Bowles of the West of England Combined Authority and Professor Stephen West, Chair of the Local Enterprise Partnership.</p> <p>The Chair drew attention to the fire evacuation procedure and reminded attendees that the meeting was being webcast live, and that a recording would be available on the website following the meeting.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>No apologies had been received.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011</p> <p>Professor Stephen West declared an interest in Agenda Item 10, One Front Door Funding. One of the items being considered was the Bristol VR Lab. He is Vice Chancellor at the University of the West of England which has an interest in the VR Lab.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting on 28th June 2017 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</p> <p>The Chair thanked Cllr Warren and colleagues at Bath and North East Somerset Council for hosting the Joint Committee and confirmed that the following items would be considered at the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timetable for consultation on the publication version of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan, and its subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for examination in public • Proposals for £35 million pounds of investment into a number of innovative infrastructure projects which aim to stimulate economic growth, support business investment and create jobs in the West of England • An update on Transport, including the MetroWest project • Next steps for the Joint Local Transport Study • The budget outturn for the financial 17/18
<p>6.</p>	<p>COMMENTS FROM CHAIR OF LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP</p> <p>The Chair invited Professor Stephen West, Chair of the Local Enterprise Partnership, to address the Committee.</p>

	<p>Professor West spoke about the role of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). He noted that role of LEPs, and their relationship to Combined Authorities, is being reviewed across the UK. He considered the West of England LEP offered an opportunity for business leaders to engage with the four unitary authority leaders and the Combined Authority. He noted that the West of England LEP is currently refreshing its Board membership and will shortly be advertising to identify leaders from business and university communities, particularly those with experience of industry sectors that we want to grow in the region. His view was that the LEP needs to think and operate strategically and move forward at pace to support delivery of the industrial strategy. He considered the Joint Spatial Plan and Joint Transport Plan were very important in terms of setting future direction. He noted that the business community recognise this is a strategy that will need to be refreshed and revisited on an ongoing basis and as things change over the 20/30 year period.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Professor West for his comments.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC</p> <p>The Chair thanked everyone who had submitted items to the public forum.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that 21 questions had been received, ten of which had originally been submitted to the West of England Combined Authority meeting earlier that day, but had been referred to the Joint Committee. Written answers had been made available at the meeting and would be appended to the minutes of the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that 12 statements had been received and invited attendees to speak in the order their statements had been received.</p> <p>Before inviting speakers, the Chair clarified that the Joint Spatial Plan is a plan of the four unitary authorities and not the Regional Mayors' plan.</p>
<p>7.1</p>	<p>Colin Gardner, TRAPP'D</p> <p>Mr Gardner spoke about the JSP and expressed concern that in his view this focuses on ring of strategic sites which in his opinion are unsound. He felt the Infrastructure Advisory Board meeting the previous week had not taken account of the points raised by the public speakers in attendance. He expressed concern that the JSP focus on houses and doesn't include transport. He felt that transport and infrastructure needed to be a pre-requisite for development. He understood the constitution of the Joint Committee excluded the Regional Mayor from voting on the JSP, but drew attention to election promises made by Tim Bowles regarding Buckover.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Mr Gardner for his comments.</p>
<p>7.2</p>	<p>Cllr Claire Young, South Gloucestershire Council</p> <p>Cllr Young spoke about the JSP. She noted five strategic locations in JSP were in in South Gloucestershire. In her opinion development is overly concentrated in</p>

	<p>some areas. She expressed concern with proposals that might see communities spanning busy roads. In her opinion a full review of greenbelt should have been undertaken at the start of the study. She was particularly concerned about proposals for the West Yate area which she understands is one of the narrowest parts of Greenbelt in the UK. She also expressed concern about the amount of affordable housing being provided. In her opinion this is not a sustainable plan.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Cllr Young for her comments.</p>
7.3	<p>Chris Parker, Thornbury Resident</p> <p>Mr Parker spoke as resident of Thornbury and member of FOSBR to request a rail extension to Thornbury be considered. In his opinion the JTS shows all transport improvements rely on the A38 which he feels presents capacity issues and that we should be maximising all transport modes available to us. He noted that the proposed station at Charfield is 6-7 miles from Thornbury. In his opinion a local solution was needed to include Thornbury and he felt there was a potential station site close to the town centre which would keep traffic off the A38. He concluded by requesting a feasibility study for Thornbury, or assurance that its exclusion now would not mean it couldn't be revisited during the life of the plan.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Mr Parker for his comments.</p>
7.4	<p>Christina Biggs, Friends of Suburban Bristol Railway</p> <p>Ms Christina Biggs addressed the committee and expressed concern that in her opinion a number of schemes had not been included in the Joint Transport Study, for example the Thornbury Line and Henbury Loop. She was concerned that there might not be opportunity to consider such schemes at a later stage. She noted that in her opinion the timetable at Westbury Junction could be amended to accommodate additional services.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Christina Biggs for her comments.</p>
7.5	<p>Martyn Hall, Thornbury Resident</p> <p>Mr Hall was not in attendance. His statement regarding a feasibility study for Thornbury Rail is appended to the minutes.</p>
7.6	<p>Nikki Jones, Independent Researcher/ Writer on Energy</p> <p>Ms Jones was not in attendance. Her statement regarding air quality and greenhouse gasses is appended to the minutes.</p>
7.7	<p>Peter Connors, Villagers Against Local Intended Developments (VALID)</p> <p>Mr Connors spoke about the JSP. He expressed concern about the proposed development of 1800 homes in Coalpit Heath area which in his opinion is unsustainable in terms of transport, access to health, social care and education. He considered that this would be building on one of the narrowest sections of</p>

	<p>greenbelt which is needed to protect the character and identify of the village, including impact on landscape and heritage. He urged the committee to take account of the concerns raised by VALID and abandon plans to develop in the Coalpit Heath area.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Mr Connors for his comments.</p>
7.8	<p>Sophie Spencer, Campaign to Protect Rural England, Avonside</p> <p>Ms Sophie Spencer spoke in support of the combined approach to JSP and JTS but raised concerns that a consistent approach was needed across the four authorities. She felt a set of policies was needed to show that commitments had been made. She felt it was vital to look at need for truly affordable housing and to have policies to assess and deliver housing need. She considered a phased approach, which prioritised brownfield development, should be taken and that a full and formal review of greenbelt across the west of England was essential. She expressed concern about air pollution and the potential for new roads to generate more traffic.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Ms Spencer for her comments.</p>
7.9	<p>Nigel Bray, Railfuture Severnside Branch</p> <p>Mr Bray was not in attendance. His statement regarding the Joint Transport Study is appended to the minutes.</p>
7.10	<p>Martin Garrett, TfGB</p> <p>Mr Garret was not in attendance. His statement regarding Transport is appended to the minutes.</p>
7.11	<p>Geoff Mills, Motorcycle Action Group</p> <p>Mr Mills was not in attendance. His statement regarding the Joint Transport Study is appended to the minutes.</p>
7.12	<p>David Redgewell, South West Transport Network, TSSA and Director of Bus Users (UK)</p> <p>Mr Redgewell spoke to raise concerns about accessibility to local stations provided by Network Rail including Weston Super Mare, Backwell, Patchway and Stapleton Road. He considered that we need a fully accessible rail network but in his opinion a national infrastructure provider would not be able to provide this. He also expressed concerns about accessibility to Bristol Temple Meads and the distance between the station and bus stops.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Mr Redgewell for his comments.</p>

	<p>The Chair thanked everyone who had spoken at the public forum, and those who had submitted statements but had been unable to join the meeting. He confirmed that all statements would be appended to the minutes of the meeting.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>PETITIONS</p> <p>No petitions were presented.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>WEST OF ENGLAND DRAFT JOINT SPATIAL PLAN</p> <p>The Chair introduced a report presenting the publication version of the Joint Spatial Plan for Members' consideration. He drew Members' attention to comments received from West of England Combined Authority Overview & Scrutiny Committee and from the Infrastructure Advisory Board in relation to this report.</p> <p>The Chair noted that as a result of further discussions with the Unitary Authorities an amendment to the wording of Policy Three had been tabled. [A copy is appended to the minutes as an appendix]</p> <p>The Chair invited Laura Ambler, Interim Head of Housing and Planning at WECA, to give an overview of the plan.</p> <p>Laura Ambler gave a brief overview of the publication plan and the timetable. She reminded the Committee of the challenge faced by the West of England to create attractive places and maintain and enhance quality of life. She confirmed that, recognising the importance of a supporting transport infrastructure, the Joint Spatial Plan had been developed in parallel with the Joint Transport Study.</p> <p>Laura Ambler drew the Committee's attention to three stages of consultation undertaken to date, and to the proposed timetable for this next stage of public consultation, following which the plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State and subject to examination in public. She drew attention to para 3.1 in cover report which sets out key issues from the previous public consultation which included affordable housing, quality of homes and place, building sustainable communities and infrastructure to support growth.</p> <p>In relation to the tabled revisions to policy three, which relates to affordable housing targets, Laura Ambler confirmed the changes are at paragraph 4 which now states 'for Bristol' rather than 'within Bristol' and provides clarification at paragraph 20 that delivery mechanisms will be determined through a Joint Supplementary Planning Document, options to be explored will include nomination rights and financial contributions to be held in a West of England housing central fund.</p> <p>Laura Ambler reminded the Committee of the continued joint working which demonstrates our duty to co-operate, and confirmed that officers had also worked closely with neighbouring authorities and key infrastructure partners</p>

The Chair thanked Laura Ambler for her comments and drew members attention to the four recommendations in the report.

The Chair moved the recommendations.

Cllr Tim Warren seconded the recommendations.

The Chair invited members to speak to the item.

Cllr Tim Warren extended his thanks to officers from the four authorities who had worked on the plan and to others in the room who had engaged with this including developers and campaigners. He reflected that whilst he did not like everything in this plan there are key issues to address in the region, in particular housing. There is not enough housing and it is too expensive. He applauded the Joint Transport study which identifies the infrastructure needed to support delivery. He noted the need to deliver 105 thousand houses and the current joint working to supply the houses from the core strategy. He acknowledged that there will be some decisions and developments that will more popular than others. He noted this plan now goes to out to further consultation.

Cllr Nigel Ashton raised concerns that the people this will affect most are members of the public who will not have access to this in a meaningful way. He felt that some of the specific policies would benefit from further explanations to make them meaningful. For example, policy 3 on affordable housing doesn't mention affordable housing anywhere other than Bristol. He hoped that further information could be made available to the public to help with understanding of some of the decisions Members are being asked to make.

Mayor Marvin Rees welcomed the progress made on the JSP. He noted this is about our response as an area. Clearly there will be differences, but through the geography and travel to work area there was a shared interest in sustainable development. He felt this was an opportunity to identify those shared challenges and work together to meet them. He considered providing housing is a basic function and he felt Government will judge the Region's competence and ability to work together to deliver. He noted that there were risks in the document and suggested these could be scored.

Cllr Tim Warren noted that in B&NES there has been feedback to the Executive at each step. He felt the plan would help to address the risk of applications for developments where we don't want them to be.

Professor Stephen West noted that the LEP has had input into consideration of the plan. He commended the authorities for working together to develop the plan. He suspected everyone would have a different view about what was good and not good. He noted that UK is expanding and growing and that this part of the UK is attractive. He felt it was important to ensure that affordable housing and infrastructure is considered in a coherent way as part of wider consultation. He suspected that plan will continue to evolve. He felt the plan would enable a strategic conversation to create sustainable, coherent communities, to regenerate spaces that need regenerating, to think about future infrastructure and how to influence behaviours. He concluded that this plan presents an opportunity to do things differently and be ambitious.

The Chair reflected that as leader of South Gloucestershire Council this is one of the most difficult decisions he has been presented with because it refers to large numbers of new homes. He noted that the plan spans 20 years and therefore by implication the numbers are big. He also noted the five yearly reviews. He noted that transport takes a long time to put in place and that infrastructure at these locations will be key. He noted that government is pushing for more housing to be build and that our need is growing due to greater longevity, more single people and a poor supply of housing over the last few years. He commented that younger people are increasingly delaying buying houses due to the costs and that the ratio of income to house prices has risen to a factor of 8 in South Gloucestershire.

The Chair continued to say he had been pleased to receive the Infrastructure Advisory Board and Scrutiny comments. This is the first plan of its type and infrastructure should be in place to support delivery. He felt it is the Members' responsibility to challenge developers to ensure infrastructure is in place, including emerging infrastructure such as superfast broadband.

The Chair noted that several people at the public forum had mentioned that only a few locations had been chosen and he wanted to challenge this. and he wants to challenge this. We have already allocated 60000 homes and the JSP looks to allocate a further 44000. In South Gloucestershire this includes the old Filton runway site and the plan also looks at increasing urban living and non-strategic sites. He confirmed that Members will continue discussions with government regarding affordable housing delivery. He was also pleased to see reference to the new Oldbury power station which will bring both construction and permanent jobs to the region.

The chair reminded Members that as indicated in the report, and in line with the constitution, a decision on the recommendations in this report required a unanimous decision of the four local authorities. He reminded members of the four recommendations in the report:

On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously

Resolved:

The West of England Joint Committee:

1. Endorsed work already undertaken to prepare the JSP
2. Considered the comments received from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Infrastructure Advisory Board
3. Recommended to Bristol City Council, Bath and North Somerset Council, South Gloucestershire Council and North Somerset Council; ("the Councils"), as the parties responsible for the JSP, that the JSP Publication plan is published for consultation
4. Endorsed the timetable for the consultation, and if the plan is ready for the subsequent submission of the Plan to the Secretary of State for examination in public

10. INVESTMENT PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Chair introduced a report seeking approval for funding through the Local Growth Fund for schemes across the West of England, together with change requests relating to schemes within the One Front Door programme.

The Chair moved the recommendations

Cllr Tim Warren seconded the recommendations

The Chair invited members to speak to the item.

Cllr Tim Warren noted it was great to see such investment going to the West of England

Mayor Marvin Rees noted it was good to see momentum. Government will look for places that are pressing forward with economic development and sustainable inclusive items

Mayor Tim Bowles welcomed the recommendations and was particularly pleased to see opportunity to develop new technology. He noted the Colston Hall transformation and role that the arts plays in the regional economy. He also noted the innovative technologies including the VR Lab. He welcomed the mix of investment.

Professor Stephen West noted that these investments are also designed to lever further investment across our region and that we need to continue to focus on delivery. He felt it would be important to ensure that links are made with other funding sources for example for digital infrastructure and fast fibre.

Cllr Nigel Ashton endorsed Professor West's comments especially about leveraging further funding. He agreed it was important to get on and deliver and invited committee members who had not yet done so to visit to see outcomes of funding in North Somerset.

The Chair noted that infrastructure funding in South Gloucestershire has been greatly appreciated.

The Chair extended thanks to Pete Davis for his work on the report and moved to the vote.

For Recommendations 1-8 the Chair reminded members that in line with the constitution, and as indicated in the report, the four local authorities and the West of England Combined Authority Mayor could vote on Recommendations 1-8

On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously

Resolved:

The West of England Joint Committee agreed to:

- a) Award Programme Entry to the Weston-Super-Mare Town Centre Transport Enhancement Scheme with an updated FBC to be submitted should NPIF

	<p>funding be secured</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Approve the Institute of Advanced Automotive Propulsion Systems (IAAPS) FBC subject to a) land acquisition and transfer of ownership. b) RIBA stage 3 design and updated cost plan and c) planning consent being secured. c) Approve the Colston Hall Phase 2 Transformation Project FBC subject to a) securing planning consent and b) providing a clear explanation of the collaboration activities with other cultural institutions in the region. d) Approve the Open Programmable City Region (OPCR) – Bristol Infrastructure and research projects FBC with £4.1706m of LGF funding, without the Bottleyard Project and with the CAV project to be delivered jointly by SGC and BCC, subject to a) all UA’s signing letters of intent to enter into the Collaboration Agreement to enact the joint governance and b) BCC and SGC signing a further agreement to work together to deliver the CAV project. e) Award Programme Entry to the Quantum Technologies Innovation Centre with an updated FBC to be presented once the project has reached design to RIBA Stage 3. f) Approve the Bristol VR Lab FBC subject to the supply of a detailed risk register. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan to be finalised. g) Approve the OBC for Bristol SETsquared Centre Urgent Expansion and invite an FBC noting the identified issues to address. h) Approve the change requests for LGF schemes set out in Appendix 2. <p>For Recommendation 9 the Chair reminded members that in line with the constitution this was a vote by the four local authorities</p> <p>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously</p> <p>Resolved:</p> <p>The West of England Joint Committee agreed to approve the change requests for EDF and RIF schemes set out in Appendix 3.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>WEST OF ENGLAND TRANSPORT UPDATE</p> <p>The Chair introduced a short report providing an update on progress towards producing the new Joint Local Transport Plan and on the West of England MetroWest project. He noted the report sets out the timescales for production of the Joint Local Transport Plan, including public consultation in spring 2018. He also noted that an outline business case with regards to MetroWest Phase 1 will be brought to the December Joint Committee.</p> <p>No members spoke to the item.</p>

	<p>The West of England Joint Committee noted the approach to producing the Joint Local Transport Plan and noted the MetroWest Phase 1 update.</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>WEST OF ENGLAND JOINT TRANSPORT STUDY</p> <p>The Chair introduced the final report of the West of England Joint Transport Study which was commissioned and funded by the four West of England Unitary Authorities and part-funded by Highways England. He noted that the report sets out a Transport Vision which comprises a programme of interventions across all travel types to achieve a shift from the car and to develop an efficient and resilient transport network and that work has been undertaken alongside the development of the draft Joint Spatial Plan.</p> <p>The Chair noted the report asks the Committee to endorse the Joint Transport Study final report to enable the its schemes and interventions to be included in an updated West of England Joint Local Transport Plan which will be published for consultation from Spring 2018.</p> <p>The Chair moved the recommendations</p> <p>Cllr Nigel Ashton seconded the recommendations</p> <p>The Chair invited members to speak to the item</p> <p>Cllr Tim Warren extended thanks to officers for work carried out across all the authorities. He noted there were certain things that caused him concern in the study, but he considered it was best to leave them in the plan as they were indicative and he felt this was a good start. For example there are issues over stations e.g. Salford. If we are to keep traffic off the roads we need to look at train, light rail, trams. MetroWest will be a great help and if we can expand this that would be great.</p> <p>Cllr Nigel Ashton noted some of these points had been raised in the public forum and needed to be taken into account.</p> <p>The Chair invited Bill Davies, Project Manager for the Joint Transport Study to give a short update to the Committee.</p> <p>Bill Davies provided further clarification about Thornbury Station and the Henbury Loop. He drew attention to pages 71 and 72 of the report which give more detail about challenges of specific stations and passenger enhancement items. He noted there is £1bn of investment highlighted in the report and in appendix A there is a further breakdown of investment around rail service improvement, including service frequency and rolling stock.</p> <p>Bill Davies also highlighted that the JTS is a technical study. It does not form policy. Endorsement of the findings enables their inclusion in the JLTP for consultation but Members are not being asked to endorse all the schemes at this stage and further public consultation will help to inform the final plan.</p> <p>Cllr Nigel Ashton asked that longer term aspirations such as Thornbury and Henbury Loop still be considered in the new Joint Local Transport Plan so that they can be assessed and consulted upon.</p>

	<p>Mayor Marvin Rees agreed that it was important to keep the future vision in mind when developing these plans and to join these up with Bristol planning.</p> <p>The Chair moved to the vote and reminded members that as indicted in the report, and in line with the constitution, the voting on the recommendation in this report is for the four local authorities and the West of England Combined Authority Mayor</p> <p>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>The West of England Joint Committee endorsed the Joint Transport Study Final Report to enable the consideration of its schemes and interventions in the forthcoming, draft update to the West of England’s Joint Local Transport Plan for consultation from Spring 2018.</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>REVENUE 2017/18 – OUTTURN MONITORING APRIL 2017 TO SEPTEMBER 2017</p> <p>The Chair introduced a report presenting the revenue outturn budget monitoring information for the West of England Joint Committee for the financial year 2017/18. He noted this includes the West of England Local Enterprise and Invest in Bristol and Bath revenue budgets.</p> <p>The Chair noted the report also seeks approval to a one-off budget virement to meet the anticipated costs to develop a digital strategy for the West of England and agreement to allocate new grant funding to develop an energy strategy.</p> <p>The Chair moved the recommendations</p> <p>Cllr Tim Warren seconded the recommendations</p> <p>No members spoke to the item.</p> <p>The Chair moved to the vote and took each recommendation in turn:</p> <p>Recommendation 15.1 required no vote and members noted the LEP budget.</p> <p>For Recommendation 15.2 the Chair reminded members that in line with the constitution a vote on this recommendation was by the four local authorities,</p> <p>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously</p> <p>Resolved:</p> <p>The West of England Joint Committee agreed that a virement of up to £50k be approved from underspending LEP Budget heads to meet the costs to fund the Digital Strategy as set out in Para 3.1.4.</p> <p>For Recommendation 15.3 the Chair reminded members that in line with the constitution a vote on this recommendation was by the four local authorities.</p>

APPENDIX 1 - Public Forum – Questions with Written Answers

Green Party Councillor Group, Bristol City Council

Response to questions from the Green Party Councillor Group, Bristol City Council to the West of England Combined Authority meeting on 30 October 2017 which have been referred to the West of England Joint Committee.

On Metrobus:

2. WECA has a generous budget at present and has the capacity to make some difference in the region. As Metrobus is a shared enterprise run by WECA members, could the authority take some pressure off Local Councils by supporting any further Metrobus costs through its own budget?
3. Is anything being done to improve Metrobus connectivity with existing services to better incorporate it into existing transport infrastructure? Currently it seems there is no interchange with buses from Portishead – will this be addressed in future?
4. At present I understand that only First Bus will be permitted at Long Ashton Park and Ride. If this is correct and buses from other companies will not be able to use Long Ashton, does the Authority agree that this is highly inefficient and if so what steps will be taken to sort it out?

Answer:

- 2) Under the existing governance and grant funding agreements any cost increases must be funded by the constituent authorities.
- 3) The initial MetroBus routes being built are designed to provide direct routes to key destinations around the area, enabling thousands of people to access employment, education and leisure opportunities from densely populated areas. The routes connect areas of future growth and development and will enable passengers to navigate the region quickly and reliably. It is hoped that after the initial services settle down, operators will change timetables to integrate more fully with MetroBus services. Already further MetroBus extensions are being planned and the evolving network will form a major part of a wider integrated transport scheme planned for the region as part of the new Joint Local Transport Plan.
Regarding the connectivity between Portishead services and MetroBus: the bus stop on Clanage Road, as the Portishead bus service reaches the Cumberland Basin, is just 208 metres and a two-minute walk away from the MetroBus stop at Ashton Gate.
- 4) Currently the Park and Ride at Long Ashton is a contracted bus service run by Bristol City Council. This will be replaced in the new year by the new MetroBus service that will link the Long Ashton Park and Ride with Spike Island, Temple Meads, Cabot Circus and the City Centre. Providing that they agree to the terms set out in the Quality Partnership Agreement between the West of England Councils and the operators, any operator can run a MetroBus service along this route. The Long Ashton Park and Ride will continue to be used by other bus companies like Bristol Community Transport who run services every 15 - 30 minutes to Clifton and Redland; and every 20 -30 minutes to Southmead Hospital. Also, providing they meet the specific criteria, other bus operators will be able to use the MetroBus guided busway at the Park and Ride to improve the speed and reliability of their services.

Green Party Councillor Group, Bristol City Council

Joint Committee Meeting

Census data indicates that of those driving to work in Bath and Bristol, just over 40% live within 5km of their workplace – a distance that would be a 20 minute bike ride. Encouraging these commuters to cycle by establishing a good cycling network is therefore an easy win – delivering significant reductions in local traffic for all road users, reducing the multi-million pound impact of congestion on the local economy, improving air quality and commuter health.

1. Does the Authority/Metro mayor recognise the strategic importance of cycling infrastructure in tackling congestion?
2. Will the Combined Authority fund a Local Cycling Walking Infrastructure Plan as soon as possible to identify the key cycling and walking improvements required?
3. Will the Authority/mayor recognise the strategic importance of cycling as a mass mode of transport and put it on an equal footing with bus and rail through a MetroCycle programme?

A study of 86 road schemes published this year found that almost all of the new roads built failed to either relieve congestion or boost local economies – in fact researchers found that traffic increased more rapidly in areas with new roads, as pressure on adjoining roads increased. This is due to the problem of induced demand, which is a phenomenon well known by transport planners and documented in repeated studies but all-too frequently overlooked by politicians. Quite simply if you build it, they will come – trying to cure traffic congestion by adding more capacity is like trying to cure obesity by loosening your belt.

4. Does the authority recognise that constantly building new roads would be reinforcing a failed cycle of car-centric transport planning and increased congestion?
5. How will awareness of these problems be reflected in WECA's transport planning priorities?

The draft Joint Spatial Plan highlights a need for 18,800 affordable homes in Bristol, this equates to 56% of the total building in the next 20 years. Additionally Bristol's Medium Term Financial Plan shows an increase in 18 - 21 year olds of 12,000 of whom many will be students due to the expansion of the University of Bristol so if we take half (not first years nor overseas who live in halls) that's another 19% rooms/homes in Bristol. Presumably Bath has similar pressures.

It is noted that the draft Joint Spatial Plan doesn't require balanced communities (unlike Bristol's current and proposed future Local Plan). Its absence in the JSP could be an acceptance of reality, a mistake/oversight or deliberate policy.

6. What is WECA's policy towards achieving balanced communities including people not able to afford the ever increasing rents and students living within the community?
7. One key approach would be to provide cheap and fast transport to areas outside the cities where land is cheaper. What is WECA's policy towards transport pricing (and speed) to enable the poorer among us to afford to get into the cities to work?

On the Joint Spatial Plan:

8. In the Joint Spatial Plan there is clearly an intention to build some of the 103,000 houses planned on land that is currently classified as Green Belt. How many houses will be built on that land? Is the mayor aware of the strength of feeling that this decision will generate amongst the citizens of the West of England?
9. Can the committee more carefully define what is meant by 'affordable housing' in the Joint Spatial Plan? In the current planning guidance this can range from the very affordable 'social rented' housing to the much less affordable 'intermediate housing'. Will the proportions of each of these be agreed before the Plan is approved? If not; why not?
10. How will the Combined Authority achieve the stated aim of reducing carbon by 50% by 2035 (as against baseline of 2014) while at the same time building 103,000 homes and large swathes of associated infrastructure?
11. The Joint Spatial Plan states that 'all development proposals will be required to demonstrate long term climate resilience'. What will be the process that allows that to happen? Do you agree that the following range of criteria all need to be incorporated:
 - Low energy consumption
 - Renewable energy generation (heat or power)
 - Water conservation (plumbing fittings and landscaping)
 - Rainwater collection
 - Sustainable drainage of plot and any paving runoff
 - Storm robustness of property eg roof not blowing off
 - Summer shading to reduce overheatingAnd do you agree that therefore to demonstrate long-term climate resilience they all do need to be satisfied?

Answer:

1-5 & 7)

The West of England authorities recognise the role of cycling (and walking) in making better use of our highway capacity, tackling health issues, supporting vibrant communities, and increasing accessibility to those without accessibility to private or suitable public transport options. The Joint Transport Study includes a target to increase the mode share of cycling and walking journeys to work across the four authorities from 19% to 25%, equivalent to a corresponding increase in the number of these trips by two-thirds compared to 2011.

The new Joint Local Transport Plan will actively seek to build on the significant increases in cycling experienced across Bristol and other parts of the region in recent years, through measures including strategic cycling corridors, roadspace reallocation, creating more attractive places and streets, and consideration of vehicle charging options to improve air quality and control levels of congestion. It also needs to (in partnership with the Joint Spatial Plan and Local Plans) try and reduce the length of trips required to access employment and key services, and even remove the need to travel where possible. The overall transport strategy will require consideration of additional highway capacity to reallocate space on existing routes to more efficient and sustainable modes including cycling, on key transport corridors, and acknowledge that we also need to accommodate for trips more suited to other modes.

We have been successful in securing £86,000 of funding from the Department for Transport to prepare our Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. We will be seeking input from a wide range of stakeholders and delivery bodies to ensure that it gains full local support and becomes integrated in further spatial and transport planning decisions across the region.

Answer (6-11)

6. The Joint Spatial Plan is being prepared by the four Unitary Authorities, through the statutory plan making process. The Mayor does not have a vote on the JSP as it is not a WECA plan. The JSP specifically seeks to deliver sustainable growth as set out in the spatial strategy at policy 2 and place-making principles at policy 5.

8. Approximately 0.65% of Green Belt land is anticipated to be released to deliver the JSP growth. Policy 2 of the draft JSP outlines the spatial strategy to deliver the JSP growth. Additionally, policy 7 defines the policy framework for each Strategic Development Location. These policies provide information on the delivery of growth for the Joint Spatial Plan. The council Leaders and Mayor of Bristol are aware of the concerns raised and strength of feeling. The JSP sets out the exceptional circumstances for release of Green Belt.

The Joint Spatial Plan is being prepared by the four Unitary Authorities, through the statutory plan making process. The Mayor does not have a vote on the JSP as it is not a West of England Combined Authority plan.

9. Affordable housing provision to meet need is defined in national policy and includes social rent, and low cost home ownership or shared ownership products. The definition of Affordable Housing within the JSP builds upon the national definition, as it makes a clear link between local house price to local earnings.

The SHMA identifies the need for each tenure type by local authority and this will be reflected within each authority's Local Plan policy framework.

All evidence base documents are located on the Joint Planning website:
<https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti>

10. The Joint Spatial Plan is being prepared by the four Unitary Authorities, through the statutory plan making process. The Mayor does not have a vote on the JSP as it is not a West of England Combined Authority plan.

With regards to the JSP and the Joint Transport Study (JTS). These ambitious documents provide the strategic framework of which the local plans will then follow with more detailed policies. The JTS sets out a Vision to achieve no increase in carbon because of the focus on more active modes of travel (cycling, walking) and public transport.

Policy 5 of the JSP outlines the commitment to a combined West of England carbon reduction target to reduce absolute Carbon Dioxide emissions by 50% by 2035, from a 2014 baseline. Additionally, policy 7 of the JSP sets out each Strategic Development Locations policy framework. Local Plans will need to ensure robust policies to assist in providing the detailed framework against which to consider development proposals.

11. The JSPs vision and spatial strategy recognises the importance of working on key issues across boundaries whilst seeking to respect the character and identity of our individual communities and to make places more innovative, competitive, connected, diverse and healthy. Key principles have been developed that ensure the JSP incorporates strategic priorities for economic, environmental and social sustainability. These accord with the 3 pillars of sustainable development and are intended to articulate the West of England's ambition and focus for creating high quality places that fulfil and realise these objectives.

The JSP strategic level policy framework sets out the commitment within policy 5, 6 and 7 to deliver many of the themes discussed above. Through the Local Plan process these frameworks will be adhered to and more detailed assessment and site-specific policy will be developed. Local Plans will need to ensure robust policies to assist in providing the detailed framework against which to consider development proposals. The criteria above will be considered by the Authorities.

Friends of Suburban Bristol Railway

Response to questions from the Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways to the West of England Combined Authority meeting on the 30 October 2017 which have been referred to the West of England Joint Committee

Joint Committee

- 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 analyses and trials have been done for the MetroBus bridge at Ashton Vale to make sure that the double-decker buses do not topple on this steep and winding route, and of the consequences to buses of missing the entry flanges into guided sections of the busways? (Note that flange entry accidents with 'detrackments' have occurred in operation on the Cambridge busway with single deckers.) Were there to be a design related fatal incident on a MetroBus guided busway what responsibility would fall on WECA officers and elected members? Is WECA aware of current concerns about structural deterioration of the Cambridge busway track, and renewed legal action?
- 3. Portishead Line**

Will WECA challenge the Portbury Dock on its lack of use of the freight paths and negotiate that during the works for Portishead Line the weekend closures are from Friday to Monday inclusive, to maximise the efficiency of the engineering works?
- 4. Henbury Loop**

Will WECA:

 - a. Challenge the CH2MHill calculations of Henbury Loop BCR due to low ridership and the "double punishment" assumption of 30 years train subsidy for the Loop alone, and update these calculations to take account of recent growth in Severnside, updated CPNN plans, and extra ridership for a new station at Chittening?
 - b. 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 DfT or Network Rail level crossing elimination money?
 - c. Carry out a survey to establish the precise amount of use that the Port of Avonmouth requires at St Andrew's Gate level crossing?
 - d. Revisit the possibility of Henbury Loop trains linking to other regional services, or reversing at Bristol Parkway (using the fourth platform at Parkway and considering doubletracking the Filton Diamond) to increase ridership and provide a clockface service that does not waste trainset time?

5. Thornbury Line

Will WECA:

- a. Attempt to gain access to the Grovesend tunnel beyond the bricked-up exit from the rail tunnel under the A38 and establish from Network Rail what their plans are for Tytherington quarry now that they have been clearing the freight line?
- b. Ask 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 study technological advances in signalling that will expand the capacity of the rail system for increased frequency?
- c. When investigating a Thornbury MetroBus, will it seek a transit time to central Bristol to match the probable train transit time of 45 minutes?

6. Current operations – Class 166 introduction problems

Introduction of the class 166 units on the Severn Beach line has been plagued by delays and cancellation, officially said to be due to using the Severn Beach Line over the summer for a flawed training/familiarisation programme for drivers from the whole region, possibly braking and other issues.

- a. What questions has WECA asked about these problems and what answers have been provided?
- b. What liaison arrangements does WECA have with the rail industry concerning local and national services? Have these been effective in this case?

7. Regional rail plan

Can WECA provide a statement on current and likely dates for GW electrification milestones and any related issues for local and mainline services? Will WECA prepare a regional rail plan for short, medium and long term (as set out in the FOSBR Rail Manifesto 2017), and give specific provision in the Joint Transport Study and Joint Transport Plan for investigating all the stations suggested by FOSBR and other rail groups

Answer:

Note the responses to questions 1. to 4. are those provided in response to the Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways questions submitted to the West of England Overview and Scrutiny meeting on 22 September 2017

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

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

Our 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.

Bristol City Council has commissioned a study into potential future enhancements to MetroWest and suburban rail services in the West of England. The study will carry out a high level assessment of network capacity and will consider services on the Henbury Line. The work is currently awaiting completion of the latest timetable work for MetroWest Phase 1 which will then form the base timetable for the study.

Answer:

6. Current operations - Class 166

Great Western Railway has produced an Action Plan for improving service reliability on the Severn Beach Line addressing rolling stock, infrastructure, stations, train crews, operational and train planning issues. Officers from the West of England local authorities, WECA and the Severnside Community Rail Partnership are being kept informed of progress.

7. Regional rail plan

Electrification of the Great Western Main Line to Bristol Parkway will be completed by December 2018.

Network Rail and the Department for Transport have provided no indication as to when electrification from Thingley Junction (west of Chippenham) to Bath Spa, Bristol Temple Meads and Bristol Parkway via the Filton Bank will be delivered.

The first of the new Intercity Express Trains (IET) went into service on 16 October 2017. The full IET timetable will start in December 2018 following electrification to Bristol Parkway and the four tracking of Filton Bank.

The new Joint Local Transport Plan will include rail proposals. Consultation on the draft Plan is expected to take place from Spring 2018.

Public Forum**Statements Received**

	Name, organisation
Item 1	Colin Gardner, TRAPP'D <i>Joint Spatial Plan</i>
Item 2	Cllr Claire Young, South Gloucestershire Council <i>Joint Spatial Plan</i>
Item 3	Chris Parker, Thornbury Resident <i>Inclusion of Feasibility Study for Thornbury Rail in JTP</i>
Item 4	Christina Biggs, Friends of Suburban Bristol Railway <i>A general case for rail</i>
Item 5	Martyn Hall, Thornbury Resident <i>Inclusion of Feasibility Study for Thornbury Rail in JTP</i>
Item 6	Nikki Jones, Independent Researcher/ Writer on Energy <i>Two urgent crises: air quality and greenhouse gases</i>
Item 7	Peter Connors, Villagers Against Local Intended Developments (VALID) <i>Joint Spatial Plan</i>
Item 8	Sophie Spencer, CPRE Avonside
Item 9	Nigel Bray, Railfuture Severnside Branch <i>Joint Transport Study</i>
Item 10	Martin Garrett, TfGB <i>Transport in WECA; the need for a rethink</i>
Item 11	Geoff Mills, Motorcycle Action Group <i>West of England Transport Update and Join Transport Study</i>

Statement 1

Colin Gardner, TRAPP'D

West of England Joint Committee 30/10/17**Statement by TRAPP'D**

Last week I attended the Infrastructure Advisory Board to make a statement on behalf of TRAPP'D about our member's dismay on being ignored in the previous round of the JSP consultation. I was joined by about seven other speakers, all making valid, well thought-through pleas pointing out important flaws in the logic of the JSP, and Matthew would do well to note that every one of the speakers was from South Glos.

For the most part there was a theme from this disparate group that the focus on a handful of "strategic sites" – satellite development as we would call it - is unsound.

In a metaphor for the overall process of the JSP the Committee then proceeded to congratulate itself on holding the meeting in public, but completely ignored everything that speakers from the public said – not even acknowledging the points raised or pausing to comment on why members beg to differ.

The Committee then spent some time quite rightly emphasising the importance of ensuring that infrastructure and transport must be delivered before the housing is developed. This is something we have been pushing strongly for, but alas there was no discussion about how this will actually be achieved. We have long been concerned that the JSP is a plan and the JTS is just a study, which means that you get the houses, but you dream about the transport. For the largest sites, such as Garden Villages, we can see how it *might* be possible to make the proposed transport and infrastructure a prerequisite before housebuilding starts, and if this is now your policy then great, but we remain highly sceptical about Authorities being prepared to walk away from their prized big developments if transport funding is not forthcoming. So, we wait to hear how you will copper bottom this sentiment.

For the other so called strategic developments – market towns peppered with medium sized 300-plus house developments – we see no such protection in the JSP. We just have the same old words about S106 contributions that *might* go towards schemes X, Y or Z. This is no change from the current policy, and we have no reason to believe we will see any commitment to put in place necessary infrastructure and transport as a prerequisite to building.

The second problem with the fine words about transport is that there is nothing in the JTS or JSP about how effective the proposed solutions will be. Thornbury is one of the worst served towns for non-car transport and one of the problems is that it simply takes too long to use the bus service to get to work. In TRAPP'D we have just conducted a survey of the use of the bus from Thornbury into Bristol in time for a nine o'clock working day, and found six buses carrying a mere 109 passengers. Promising more of these, or worse, promising that existing services will re-route to serve the new development will just not work.

For the larger developments such as Buckover it seems to be taken as read that the Metro Bus will resolve all the congestion problems, but there is nothing in any of the documents to say what proportion of the population will use this as the normal commuting method – we suspect the best case is less than 30% which means this development will result in literally thousands more cars trying to use the A38 to get work every day.

I said earlier that my last experience of speaking at these committees was a fruitless exercise, so you may be wondering why I am bothering this time. However, my plan for this meeting is to set the bar low, to seek something that is absolutely in the gift of someone at this meeting.

We understand that the constitution of this Committee has been conveniently set up to exclude the Mayor having a vote on the JSP today. However, during his election campaign Tim Bowles made a promise. He said “I am calling for this development to be stopped. If I am elected these plans will be reviewed. I am saying ‘no’ to Buckover”. What the people of Thornbury would like to hear from you today, Mr Mayor, is for you to repeat your election promise, for the record, in this Committee. Surely that’s not too much to ask?

Statement 2

Cllr Clair Young, South Gloucestershire Council

Statement on Item 9, Joint Spatial Plan

Cllr Claire Young, South Gloucestershire Council

I would like to raise the following concerns regarding the approach taken to meeting our sub-region's housing needs in the draft Joint Spatial Plan.

Loss of Green Belt

The approach seems to have been to identify where you want to put the development and then argue that the need for houses is a very special circumstance to justify the release of Green Belt in that location. A better approach would have been to undertake a full review of the Green Belt, locating development in those areas that make the least contribution to the five purposes of the Green Belt and designating new areas of Green Belt to compensate for those lost.

The Coalpit Heath and North West/West Yate developments are in one of the narrowest stretches of Green Belt in the West of England, which makes an important contribution to stopping Bristol, Yate and the villages in between coalescing. I am concerned that the Green Belt may become so degraded by the losses proposed that it becomes difficult to maintain the status of the remainder in that area.

Overconcentration of development in a few locations

I believe the JSP overly concentrates development in a few locations. We have already seen the dangers of that with the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy. Developers say that the market cannot bear homes being brought to market as quickly as the plan requires, so demand more land is released to enable the council to maintain a 5 year land supply.

From a resident's point of view, concentrating new development in just a few locations puts pressure on the infrastructure and services in those areas. Disproportionate increases can also fundamentally change a community's identity. For example, 1,800 homes at Coalpit Heath and 1,200 at Charfield would more than double the size of those communities.

Meanwhile a vicious cycle develops, in which those areas where development is not proposed miss out on new infrastructure and are deemed unsustainable for new homes, so missing out on future infrastructure. This leads to stagnation and an inability to respond to local need.

In the previous consultation I commented that it was contradictory to exclude areas to the east of Bristol on the grounds that "Bristol has historically predominantly grown north and eastwards" but then promote major extra developments to the north and north east.

Failure to rebalance our sub-region

One of the strategic priorities set out in the JSP is to "ensure more inclusive growth and life chances for all, across the West of England, and improve accessibility to jobs." Within the sub-region, I believe more still needs to be done to address the historic imbalances between the more economically successful areas north of Bristol and the more deprived areas in South Bristol and Weston-Super-Mare. Within South Gloucestershire, those living in the priority neighbourhoods of Kingswood, Staple Hill and Cadbury Heath need improved access to employment areas like the Science Park and the North Fringe.

Place making concerns

Another strategic priority is that the JSP should through “a place making approach promote places of density and scale with a range of facilities and which encourage healthy lifestyles and cultural wellbeing.” I have a number of concerns that this priority is not met by the plan:

- The existing sense of place in villages like Coalpit Heath and Charfield is not protected by promoting development that will dominate the existing settlements.
- Lack of clear separation between communities hinders community identity and recreational access to the countryside - the proposed employment land would end the clear separation between Westerleigh and Yate, Nibley and Engine Common would be linked by the north west Yate development and Buckover would be only a field or two from the edge of Thornbury.
- Building communities that are bisected by busy roads hinders community cohesion and makes it difficult for people to get around on foot and bicycles – the north west Yate development would be bisected by the busy Iron Acton bypass, that would only get busier if linked to a Frampton Cotterell and Winterbourne bypass, and Buckover is bisected by the A38.
- Where development has already happened in an uncontrolled way, as at Thornbury, pressure on existing services is immense and new homes are already being built beyond the accepted walking distances from the town centre, so people find it easier to drive elsewhere.

There is a clear intention that urban intensification should be complemented by town growth, garden villages and village extensions. However, the plan as it stands clouds the distinctions between these different elements of the strategy. There is very little separation between, for example, the extension to the west and north west of Yate and the SDL proposed at Coalpit Heath, or between the garden village proposed at Buckover and the extensions to Thornbury.

Transport infrastructure

The strategic priority to ensure that new development is properly aligned with infrastructure and maximises opportunities for sustainable and active travel is not delivered.

- Lack of firm transport requirements for the SDLs in South Gloucestershire - for Buckover, for example, it talks about “consideration being required to ensure the A38 can continue to act as an effective relief road to the M5 without detriment to the new resident’s health & wellbeing”. This needs more than consideration, a properly prepared plan would include clear proposals for achieving these apparently incompatible aims.
- Lack of clarity about transport proposals – for example, residents are already asking for more details of the Winterbourne and Frampton Cotterell Bypass and more information is needed about how people will access a new railway station at Charfield.
- Lack of integration with other transport proposals – for example, there is no explanation of how all the new development in the Yate/Coalpit Heath area is expected to access the motorway network.
- Inadequate local access – for example, Badminton Road/Frog Lane, Roundways and Woodside Road are completely inadequate for accessing the proposed Coalpit Heath development.

Affordable housing

In my response to last year's consultation I said there needed to be a greater focus on Affordable Housing and the proposals on that have moved in the right direction. I remain concerned however that the proposed strategy will still favour large developments by the major builders, building to maximise profits rather than meeting housing need. Action is needed from Government to prevent "landbanking" and stop developers from being able to negotiate down the Affordable Housing provision on viability grounds. It is galling for people to see much-loved green fields being covered in houses they and their families cannot afford to buy or rent.

Conclusion

With the mismatches between the strategic priorities and the proposed developments and the poor approach taken to removing land from the Green Belt, I do not think this is a sustainable plan as it stands.

Statement 3

Chris Parker, Thornbury Resident

Inclusion of Feasibility Study for Thornbury Rail in JTP

As a resident of Thornbury, I am writing to ask if you could consider including in the Joint Transport Plan (JTP) the provision for a feasibility study for rail to return to Thornbury, or state that its exclusion does not exclude it from being considered at a later date during the life of the plan.

The reasons why I am calling for this are:

It is my understanding that a Thornbury Rail Link is being completely bypassed from the JTP, even though the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) is proposing an additional 4-5000 new homes in Thornbury and Buckover.

[4-500 homes in Thornbury itself (on top of the c.1000 homes currently consented or under construction). Then there's the 3500 homes planned for Buckover also in the JSP.]

Any transport improvements are welcome for Thornbury and it's great that a MetroBus is planned, however this relies on road and uses the existing A38 corridor and north fringe, as will all the traffic created by the new homes. With a reliance on the A38 corridor in the JTP, whilst a key arterial route, we should be looking to maximise all modes of transport open to us. Once the A38 is clogged (accident/breakdown/M5 diversion etc) this certain gridlock caused ripples throughout the area and is detrimental to regional productivity. Summer Saturdays on the A38 between Falfield and Almondsbury are in my experience some of the worst examples of gridlock here due to people trying to avoid the M4/M5 interchange.

Railway at Charfield

A rail station is proposed in the JTP for Charfield. This is approximately 7 miles north from Thornbury and 4-5 miles from Buckover. A similar distance from Thornbury to Bristol Parkway, which therefore represents no particular gain to the town.

If we are trying to get people to switch transport modes to a local public transport network, a station at Charfield isn't particularly convenient to get to from Thornbury. It's not walkable and it requires a vehicular transfer, bus or car, (bus links that would have to be created/funded by the Plan) and either way with extended transit times that are not attractive to commuters making connections. It's certainly a 30mins or so cycle from Thornbury, I've done it myself, and is potentially unpleasant on the A38 (as a cyclist). I'd recommend all involved in pulling the plan together to try cycling in to Aztec West or to Charfield

from Thornbury, just to experience it. I'm not an inexperienced cyclist by any means however I do not feel safe on the A38, and trying to get someone who is more faint of heart to change their habits will certainly be a challenge and I'm interested to see what changes to this cycle route the plan will bring.

If you drove a car from Thornbury to Charfield Station, why would you drive north to catch a train back south to Bristol? (Extra cost and time). If you were going north to Gloucester, why would you drive 7 miles (10-15mins) to Charfield station when you cross right over the motorway junction that you join when you drive to Gloucester that takes only 30-35 mins door to door? Where's the benefit in switching? It is my view that a Charfield station won't deliver a successful solution for Thornbury traffic. For the JTP to really work we need a truly local rail network.

A real local railway solution within the town boundary

That's why Thornbury Rail should be considered. There is a potential station site less than a mile from the town centre, but thanks to Thornbury's geological make up, it's also in walking distance for a great

deal of the town, and certainly within an easy cycling distance of all the town, is accessible from an existing bus route and would be extremely accessible by bike/bus/vehicle from Buckover garden village (10/15mins cycle max).

Furthermore, with a railway station within the town boundary and on the west side of the A38, this would alleviate a great deal of traffic leaving the town at peak times, thus reducing exit pressure at Grovesend Road and Alveston Road, let alone allowing for the potential of less vehicular traffic on the A38 corridor from Falfield to Aztec West. That has to be an objective of the JTP when the JSP is planning so many houses in the Thornbury area? The two don't seem to join up. MetroBus (as yet an unproven mode in Bristol) a Charfield rail station with a few local connections to Thornbury and a strategic cycle route doesn't sound like as coherent a travel plan as it could be for the likely number of movements that will be unleashed on the area during this time.

I am extremely disappointed that WECA has ruled out even considering a feasibility for Thornbury rail, and as a resident think that the town should at least be afforded the courtesy of a feasibility study in the plan with (if successful) a view to safeguarding a potential station site so that future generations can benefit from the foresight. If it cannot do this, it should at least place some form of clause in the plan that say a feasibility study can be made during the life of the plan.

What do we know?

We KNOW as a town we are going to grow. We KNOW there will be more traffic movements. We KNOW we need to be more sustainable. We KNOW rail can deliver mass transit. Why put it all on road on the A38?

I appreciate there are a number of arguments for and against a rail connection coming back to Thornbury, and I don't intend to outline them all here. Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways (FOSBR) have a response to these arguments and are submitting their own response to the JTP. However, the reopening of the Thornbury line was costed at £38million in the Halcrow 2012 study. The line is under preparation for freight operation to Tytherington once again, the line could be brought back under the A38 to the top of Midland Way where a station could be situated.

Conclusion

Could we urge a common sense approach be applied to the JTP with regards the Thornbury area and can we at least look at the feasibility of rail and therefore have the potential to deliver a multimodal JTP for Thornbury that doesn't just rely on bus, car and the A38 corridor, or could there be a clause added to allow for further investigation?



Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways (FOSBR)

Statement to WECA Committee and Joint Committee, Monday 30 October 2017

A general case for rail (with some local examples and technical points)

1. **A regional network already there:** It has been well established that the West of England has a problem with congestion and air quality. The Joint Transport Study showed that the public primarily want to see improvements in the provision of public transport. FOSBR has a vision for a regional public transport network that starts with the existing 28 suburban rail stations, extending it by adding intermediate stations and bringing existing freight lines (Portishead, Henbury and Thornbury for Phase 1, 2 and 3 respectively) back into passenger use. We see rail as the natural, already-existing backbone to a cross-regional network, and would urge that bus schemes serving areas out of reach from rail should link into the rail network with effective rail-bus interchange at stations and be seen as complementary. Rail is increasingly a popular mode of travel with young people and the natural choice for visitors to the region as it is the only mode with a single network.
2. **Capacity:** We would contest Network Rail's assertion that the rail network is used up to capacity. Four-tracking on Filton Bank will unlock capacity, and passing loops and extra platforms at stations can also be introduced to allow fast trains to overtake slow. We would urge WECA to make sure that key rail schemes such as Bristol East Junction are brought forward. We have seen, during the course of MetroWest Phase 1, that junctions such as Parson Street can be remodelled to improve capacity, and that although timetables are tightly linked across the national network, the approach using RailSys can yield several different model timetables (such as the six different scenarios in Phase 1). Eventually, single tracks such as on the Severn Beach line can be redoubled. Finally, the capacity of a given service can be improved by adding extra carriages, or introducing larger carriages such as the new Class 166s, and in a decade or so we anticipate that London-underground style "moving block signalling" will enable trains to run with less time between them. So the assertion in the Joint Transport Study that, as only 6% of Bristol commuters take the train, the rail network does not have the capacity to make a significant difference, does not need to be true. Standing by a rail line, even with trains every 10 minutes or so, should make it obvious that, if slow trains are provided with adequate passing loops, the trains should be able to run more frequently. Maybe the future is more stopping trains (which are still far faster than the car) with occasional fast trains to connect the region, with freight trains only at night.
3. **Part of a national system:** The main advantage for rail is that it is connected to a national network and it could be said that this interconnectivity is also its weakness, at least at the planning stages, for the reasons given above. But once a new service is up and running, the Department for Transport will generally take the running costs into the next franchise (for the Severn Beach Line, gradually over five years), thus potentially releasing revenue funding for the next phase. Extra trains have been introduced to fill gaps in the timetable (such as the evening service on the Severn Beach Line) or semi-fast trains can be coaxed to make more stops at intermediate stations (as has been done at Parson Street).
4. **Interconnectivity:** Another strength of rail is its capacity to connect several modes. Cycles can be used on a train, and passengers can connect between trains and buses at interchanges, assisted by real-time information. Folding cycles, Yo-bikes, taxi-boats on waterways and landscaped "golden miles" can all interchange seamlessly and cleanly to rail stations, as outlined in the Sustrans-led Good Transport Plan.
5. **The far future:** A sustainable future must involve a shift from private to public transport. People use broadband to work from home but also should be thinking in terms of living near their place of work and at the least planning to live where they can commute by public transport. But this will only be possible if a regional transport plan should make sure that all centres of habitation will be within walking distance of a bus and cycling distance of a train station, and that in general cars should be banned from shopping and commercial centres. Trains are the future in Europe: why not here?

Personal Statement for Inclusion of Feasibility Study for Thornbury Rail in JTP By Martyn Hall, Thornbury Resident

Personal statement from Martyn Hall, resident of Thornbury

I am a resident in Thornbury and myself and many other people would like to strongly consider including the Thornbury Line as part of the Joint Transport Plan or at the very least that it will be included very soon.

The reasons are:-

People in Thornbury are fed up of the bus service which cannot be relied upon, is bumpy , noisy , dirty , cold / hot and when asked if they would use the train to get to Bristol or Yate the answer is always yes if the station was at Grovesend Road Roundabout. Trains are much cleaner smoother and basically much nicer to travel on.

With the Joint Spacial Plan's proposal of 4-5000 new houses in Thornbury and Buckover the need for a transport system that bypasses the roads should be a requirement and not ignored. Therefore the rail link to Thornbury which was originally cost at £38,000,000 a few years ago , seems to be over the top now , since Network Rail have already done a lot of work up to the quarry in Tytherington. This means there needs to be less than a mile of track added through the centre arch of the tunnel under the A38 and a field purchased to provide an area for a station and car park etc. The cost for this has to be a lot less than the original quote and therefore becomes more viable than the metro bus along the A38.

Another point to note is the A38 from May to September gets grid locked with cars coming off the M5 motorway is bound to interfere with the Metro Bus which would have to run alongside or along the A38 at points. The A38 itself would have to be resurfaced for any bus to be smooth and quiet and that alone runs into millions and quite frankly people are fed up with the current bus service and no-one I talk to wants the bus and would use it.

The Thornbury line would be used by people wanting to travel to Bristol / Yate to save taking their car and in the current climate has to be strongly considered since you have to reduce emissions.

Another point is that even if you created a separate lane for the metro bus , there are lots of cyclists who would also use the lane and therefore would hold the bus up since there wouldn't be room for the bus to move around them with traffic next to the lane being the A38 is getting busier.

A railway station at Charfield is all well and good for the people in that area but it's not an option for the people of Thornbury since it is the same distance as Bristol Parkway but in the wrong direction.

What do we know

Thornbury is increasing in size by thousands and therefore so will the traffic. There are a lot of teenagers learning to drive every year increasing the traffic even more.

**Personal Statement for Inclusion of Feasibility Study for Thornbury Rail in JTP
By Martyn Hall, Thornbury Resident**

The use of the current bus service is poor to useless since the times when people need to use them , they are late or don't turn up and this happens a lot making people late for work etc so they can't rely on the bus service.

Speaking to various people they say the rail service needs to be brought back especially as there is an easy option just on the top of Grovesend Road and if it was there they would use it. There are people who work in town and the train is the perfect option for them and they were extremely happy when the line to Tytherington was being sorted.

The traffic along the A38 gets grid locked every so often so no bus will be able to run on time etc.

A train service would enable people to leave their cars at home to travel all over the country thus reducing traffic on the main roads and towns.

Currently the whole of the A38 requires resurfacing to make it smooth and quiet which has been ignored for years now.

Conclusion

There is a definite requirement for the Thornbury Line to be looked at especially since the line up to Tytherington has been worked on by rail track leaving less than 1 mile to reinstate with a field being purchased and the use of the centre tunnel. To ignore this in this day and age would be a sheer act of lunacy so to speak. With the growing size of Thornbury the use of Railway and possibly metro bus has to be looked at , but please bear in mind the railway can be electrified therefore meeting more of the environmental requirements.

At the very least this railway has to be seriously looked at and not just saying you will but actually look at it since lots of people in Thornbury want it and they are being ignored.

Martyn Hall
Resident of Thornbury
26 October 2017

Statement 6

Nikki Jones, Independent Researcher/ Writer on Energy

Two urgent crises: air quality *and* greenhouse gases

The UK faces two urgent crises: climate change and air pollutants. Because of recent court cases, all focus is on the latter. However, the UN is telling us clearly that we have **just two years to make the decisions to stay below 1.5 degrees, and just 5 – 10 years to stay below 2 degrees**. What we do now is critical. There is nothing safe about 2 degrees, and all projections are that we are heading for **4 – 6 degrees by the end of the century, a level at which our society – and most life – will not exist**.

As Professor Sir David King, the government's former science adviser has stated recently, explaining [Plan B's legal action against the government](#), 'The best available science tells us the **risks of crossing tipping points rise very sharply between 1.5 and 2°C**. And that means the UK cutting emissions to zero.' We need to stop using fossil fuels.

It appears likely that Client Earth will be challenging the government for a third time on inadequate air quality plans. They have also stated they may challenge the government over its failure to deliver a meaningful Clean Growth Plan that will keep the UK within our legally binding carbon budgets. Success in these cases will impact both local and regional authorities.

WECA transport

It is urgent that citizens are given **viable alternatives to the private car and that the fuel sources for those alternatives are genuinely clean**. Reliable, frequent public transport is key, combined with policies that deter the use of cars. By clearing the congestion, noise and pollution off our streets, they will become attractive to pedestrians and cyclists, allowing more pleasant and healthier living in the area. [Oxford](#) and London are among the many cities moving ahead fast with forceful plans.

Working with what we've got

Given the urgency, we need to **work with the infrastructure we have, and improve it**. We do not have 15 years or more to implement whole new modes of transport such as underground travel.

We have a viable rail network. The Severn Beach line has demonstrated how, with the right policies, poorly used lines can quickly become well used and profitable. It is essential that the Portishead line, closed stations throughout the area, the Henbury Loop and the Thornbury line are built / upgraded so that they become reliable passenger carriers. Bus transport needs to be reviewed so that sensible rail/bus and bus/bus interchange points are established. Buses need to be electrified. Hydrogen fuel cell/ electric hybrids – as used in London – would be a genuinely clean alternative if the H is from excess clean power.

Nikki Jones MSc, Independent Researcher / Writer on Energy

Statement 7

Peter Connors, Villagers Against Local Intended Developments (VALID)

Joint Spatial Plan

I am one of a number of residents from Coalpit Heath who have applied to speak at these meetings on behalf of **VALID – Villagers Against Local Intended Developments** - which is an action group campaigning against the proposals for thousands of homes to be built in Coalpit Heath & the surrounding area over the next 20 years if the proposals currently in the West of England Joint Spatial Plan are approved. The group was formed because local residents are extremely concerned that the plans put forward to develop up to 1800 more homes in our area are unsustainable due to grossly inadequate infrastructure in terms of roads, public transport links, access to health and social care services and access to the education.

Our concerns are very similar to those expressed in South Gloucestershire's existing JSP and the only aspect that has changed in the ten years since it was adopted as council policy is that infrastructure is now under even greater strain than it was at that time and we argue is at breaking point at this moment.

There are currently approximately 1,400 houses in Coalpit Heath. The proposed addition of 1,800 would more than double this. Traffic on the A432 Badminton Road already grinds to a halt at peak times, the local primary school and secondary school are at capacity, although there is a small doctor's surgery on the Badminton Road it is inadequate in capacity and our nearest health centre is two miles away, Frome Valley Medical Centre, where three week waits for appointments are currently the norm. The disproportionate scale of this proposed development would lead to the loss of Coalpit Heath's Village identity as it would become part of a ribbon stretching more or less continuously from Downend through to Yate.

Building at Coalpit Heath and around Nibley would be in one of the narrowest sections of green belt in the West of England and would lead to Coalpit Heath and Yate virtually coalescing. The JSP claims that the spatial strategy aims to minimise the impact on the Bristol and Bath Green Belt but this proposal would impact dramatically on Green Belt just where it is needed to preserve the character and identity of our village.

Other aspects to consider are:

- The poor transport infrastructure – increased congestion on local roads, inadequate bus services with no room to put bus/cycle lane through Coalpit Heath. An increase in noise pollution. Given this, what exactly will, “connection to a new metrobus system,” as claimed in the proposal mean in practice?
- 1800 houses – over 3000 more cars – the current proposal to direct all this traffic onto the Badminton Road through existing narrow side roads – many of which do not and cannot be amended to have pavements.
- Our Local services are already overstretched – especially schools and health services.

- We will lose access to green space for recreation at a time when it is more important than ever to encourage walking and other forms of exercise for health reasons.
- The impact on the landscape – the land east of Roundways where housing is proposed is raised so development would be prominent and impact on views and privacy.
- There will also be an Impact on local heritage, including the historical Mining Dramway
- This development could cause drainage problems and increase the risks of land subsidence due to historic coal mining. There is a well-documented network of mine workings at the western end of the site and a network of ancient drainage aids at the eastern end taking water from the Ram Hill area and the area around the railway.
- The huge ecological impact of our wildlife, including many birds on the Red list such as the Skylark which nests in the fields adjoining Roundways.
- The JSP has concentrated proposed development in a few locations, placing disproportionate pressure on these communities. The arguments they have put forward for not developing at other locations, about heritage, traffic congestion, loss of green space and green belt all also apply to Coalpit Heath.
- None of the proposed developments would take place in isolation and each would have a cumulative impact on the ability of the infrastructure. The additional houses in Yate will add to the traffic flow on Badminton Road already at capacity and this would be further stretched by 1800 more houses in Coalpit Heath. The feasibility study for the proposed Junction 18a whether sited at Emersons Green or Pucklechurch shows that traffic flows would increase in the area south of Yate and north of the M4 precisely the area affected by the Coalpit Heath development.

In their recent press release on West of England Spatial Plan proposals the leaders of the four councils have said that they

“..share the value residents they place on their local environment, landscape and biodiversity because it is part of what makes our region the place we want to live.”

If the council leaders are serious about this intention we would urge that they take into account the arguments and concerns raised by VALID and abandon plans to develop in the Coalpit Heath area.

Statement 8
Sophie Spencer, CPRE Avonside



Statement submitted to the West of England Joint Committee

30th October 2017

1. Thank you for the opportunity to submit our views on the Draft West of England Spatial Plan and Joint Transport Study. CPRE Avonside is the local branch of the larger charity, the Campaign to Protect Rural England. We believe that a beautiful, thriving countryside is important for everyone, no matter where they live.
2. We are supportive of the combined approach to planning brought about by the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) process and Joint Transport Study. **If we are going to solve the challenges we face locally, and still retain what makes this area special and attractive, we need a consistent approach across the four authorities; and we want to see a commitment to this at a high level. We will also be looking for a set of policies that ensure that the commitments that have been made in the JSP and Transport Plan can be delivered.**
3. We support Strategic Priority 1 and the commitment to boost the supply of affordable housing. The quote by Dr Hugh Ellis, Head of Policy, TCPA, is what we should to aspire to in the West of England: *'The first priority for planners and politicians should be to create places which provide for the health and wellbeing of everyone throughout their lifetimes'*. **It is vital that we look past the overall housing numbers and differentiate between housing need and housing demand. Current obstacles, such as viability testing, mean that if we aim to meet overall housing demand, we are unlikely to meet the very real needs for truly affordable housing**

that exists locally with a market orientated approach. To supply the right homes in the right places we need clear policies to specifically assess and deliver housing need, including looking at non-market interventions.

4. We support Strategic Priority 4 - *'To protect and enhance the sub-region's diverse and high quality natural, built and historic environment and secure a net gain in biodiversity. To prioritise development on brown field locations, optimise densities and retain the overall function of the Bristol and Bath Green Belt'*. **A phased approach, strong brownfield first policies and place making will be necessary to deliver priorities without damaging the environment. We are concerned by the numbers of houses that are to be sited on green-field locations and within the Green Belt. We believe that a full and formal review of the Green Belt across the West of England is essential to ensure land use is 'future proofed' and 'rural proofed'**
5. Finally, to Strategic Priority 3, climate change and poor health. We are concerned about current levels of air pollution in Bristol and Bath, but also in other places across the West of England where we might assume the air is cleaner. We welcome the recognition of our over-reliance on the private car. However, we note the Joint Transport Study sets a target in its vision for 'no overall increase in the number of trips by car across the sub-region in the context of 105,000 new homes delivered by 2036' (p4). This suggests that the levels of air pollution and congestion that we currently experience are acceptable as it effectively envisages no change. Unfortunately, even this low target looks unachievable given the figures for new housing in less than accessible locations, and the numbers of new roads planned. Our recent CPRE report, ['The End of the Road? Challenging the road-building consensus'](#), demonstrates how road-building is failing to provide the congestion relief and

economic boost promised, while devastating the environment. At the same time, our research finds that new roads actually generate more traffic – often far above background trends for the longer term. Strategic Priority 2 will need to ensure the link between the need for economic growth and jobs provides an opportunity to focus development where it is most needed within Bristol, Bath and Weston-super-Mare and market towns that have services to support sustainable growth. **We want to see clear policies that reverse this over-reliance on roads and road transport and ensure that development and infrastructure are aligned. Without this we cannot hope to address the critical issues and deliver on the strategic priorities.**

Sophie Spencer, Director, CPRE Avonside

Statement 9

Nigel Bray, Railfuture Severnside Branch.

Local Joint Transport Study

Railfuture welcomes the continuing development of MetroWest and the pragmatic approach to the reopening of the Portishead line. We strongly support extension of MetroWest to Gloucester in conjunction with Gloucestershire County Council, as a new station at Stonehouse Bristol Road would transform connectivity between the Stroud and Bristol areas.

However, we do not believe that the Joint Transport Study should give priority to the advancement of road-based schemes such as MetroBus. There has been a massive growth in rail travel in the West of England in the past 20 years. Recorded passenger journeys at the 12 railway stations in Bristol have grown from 4.1 million in 1997/98 to 12.4 million in 2015/16 according to the Office of Rail and Road. This is almost certainly greater than the national trend.

This gives us confidence that the Portishead and Henbury lines would be well supported. It also demands very serious consideration in the JTS of reopening stations such as St. Anne's Park and Salford. Greater Bristol is poorly served by local rail services when compared with other major UK conurbations and it is time to put this right by giving priority to rail investment.

We are equally very concerned that further examination of a Henbury loop service should not be excluded from the Joint Transport Study. We are not convinced that usage of a Henbury loop service would be low or that it would require a high level of subsidy for 30 years.

Loop passenger services are well established in a number of urban networks, including London, Glasgow, Southampton and the Tyne & Wear Metro. Their network benefits, and hence attraction to users, are greater than for purely linear routes because journeys from intermediate stations to the city centres can be made in either direction. Thus, an hourly service is effectively half-hourly between many pairs of stations. The distance from Henbury to Temple Meads would be longer via Avonmouth than via Filton but if the first available train was going the longer way round, this may well reach the destination sooner than waiting for the next train via the shorter route.

A Henbury loop service would link stations in West Bristol with those on the northern fringes. Avonmouth and Filton Abbey Wood both serve major centres of employment, so it is difficult to believe that patronage of a loop service would generate few additional journeys compared to the proposed spur route.

The 63-minute journey time for a Henbury loop service has been quoted as a reason why it could not be worked with one train set. However, it may be possible to accelerate timings with the Class 165 and 166 trains being cascaded to the West of England and which are already operating on the Severn Beach line.

We would like WECA to challenge the claim by Bristol Port that a loop service would require construction of a cutting at St. Andrews Gate costing £128 million. Cheaper alternatives need to be investigated, as with MetroWest Phase 1. We need a pragmatic passenger reopening of the Henbury loop also.

Transport in WECA; the need for a rethink

You have before you the statements of FoSBR and others, begging for you to start work on the first stages of rail network suitable for a modern European conurbation, which will help to end the suffocating domination of car travel in this region.

And yet, according to some interpretations the draft West of England spatial and transport plans envisage a reduction of only 600 commuter car journeys per year by 2036. This is unacceptable. Instead of planning for the removal of cars from our lives, as progressive transport authorities are now doing, your plans still envisage more roads.

What is required is to join up our public transport network: decent conventional bus services, with reorganised direct bus routes, focused around interchange hubs and connectivity with rail stations.

We need to reduce road building, and deter car parking(*1) in town and city centres; and promote an electrified MetroWest; and journeys by tram and tram train, reorganise bus routes, bus hubs and bus rail interchanges (*2) at every rail station, introduce modern integrated ticketing, and promote active travel to deter the car journeys that are destroying our environment and health.

Some proposals for tackling cars and reorganising buses are contained in these footnotes.

1. Cars and parking

Disincentivize parking with a Work Place Parking Levy.

Prevent temporary car parks on vacant land in urban areas.

Expand residents only parking schemes (=commuter exclusion zones)

Promote Park and Ride bus and rail schemes along arterial approaches to built up areas: not everyone lives close to a rail station or convenient bus route.

2. Buses

Given the present legislation, the most effective method for bringing about the re- organisation of bus services, and

integrated ticketing is through the use of franchising powers by the West of England Combined Authority.

Martin Garrett

on behalf of TfGB

Statement 9

Geoff Mills CMILT, Motorcycle Action Group

This Statement is in respect of Items 11 'West of England Transport Update' and 12 'West of England Joint Transport Study' on today's agenda.

MAG responded to both rounds of consultation on the Transport Study setting out how motorcycles and scooters can play a positive role within an integrated transport policy. When the Study was considered by the Joint Transport Board in February 2017 we submitted a statement drawing the Board's attention to the Study's continued omission of any reference to motorcycles within the Transport Vision.

We note that motorcycles do now merit more of a mention but, apart from featuring in the modal split figure on p15 and a brief reference in the network management context on p43, the reader has to wait until p101, Section 12.3.6 'Other Forms of Travel' for the only significant reference. Although the final version of the Study contains much which MAG supports and we broadly support the statements made in 12.3.6 we challenge the Study's assumption '..that the mode split for journeys by powered two wheelers will not significantly change in the future from the current low base..' (p102). On the contrary, with the increase in population and employment and consequent travel growth exceeding the proposed increase in highway capacity, there is scope for a significant increase in motorcycling's mode share.

In our previous statement we drew attention to the European Parliament's, OECD's and various transport plans' recognition of the potential contribution of motorcycling to sustainable mobility and to the Study's objectives through space saving, congestion reduction, and providing a convenient, lower cost/environmental impact alternative to private cars. We would also draw your Committee's attention to the analysis and recommendations in 'Realising the Opportunity: A Motorcycle Safety & Transport Policy Framework' published on October last year. This document been produced by a partnership between the National Police Chiefs' Council, the Motorcycle Industry Association and Highways England. Among the relevant actions are:-

Action 21 – To Seek a 'Level Playing Field' Approach to Ensure Proportionate Support for Motorcycling Within Both Safety and Transport Policy

Action 22 – To Encourage Policy Making Improvements to Incorporate Motorcycling Into Transport Policy

The Joint Transport Study's Vision '..has the principle of improving travel choices, and in so doing, helping to reduce car dependence, tackle congestion and improve resilience on the transport network' (p93). Motorcycling can make a positive contribution to all of the 5 Challenges identified particularly Travel Choices and Congestion. MAG therefore looks to your Committee to recognise motorcycling as part of the solution in the new Local Transport Plan to be published in 2018.

Geoff Mills CMILT
MAG Western Region

Statement 12

David Redgewell, SWTN/TSSA and Bus Users UK

Temple Meads

We are very concerned that despite assurances in the current plans that there would be adequate space for all buses travelling through Temple Gate including MetroBus that on Friday 20th October 2017, we were advised that the buses would first of all be dispersed for 12 weeks whilst the bus platform was being built on the main A4 Bath Road and that the No.1 & 904 to Brislington would be moved away from the station to Victoria Street and Redcliffe Way. This is too far for people with luggage, pensioners, disabled people and those with children.

Bus Users UK, Transport Focus, SWTN, TFGBA and FOSBR were all assured that we would have a bus/rail interchange at Temple Meads on Temple Gate and in future on the Friary with ferry link. To our shock it now appears there will not be enough bus space on the Bath Road in the final scheme and the present bus stops which will now need to be retained may now become cycleways. As this is a design/build/operate contract we would request an urgent scrutiny of the plans by WECA Scrutiny Panel and Place Scrutiny/OSSM on Bristol City Council.

Please would you advise us as the plan to close bus stops comes into place from 26th October 2017 and the alternative stops may in future become permanent well away from the station defeating Government policy on bus/rail integration. A good example of best practice in the new bus station at Penzance.

Stapleton Road station

We are still concerned about a lack of progress on disabled access to the platforms, waiting shelters and poor state of the approach road which has recently been flooded and not acceptable for wheelchair users and passengers with luggage. Station lighting is also not working on the approach road.

I would also like to recommend that members of OSMB and the WECA Joint Committee undertake a site visit outside of Temple Meads train station to see the length of these distances and access problems for themselves.

The Bristol Rail Resilience Study that is being undertaken has gone very quiet and it is hoped this is still being completed – can this be confirmed please?

DAVID REDGEWELL SWTN

POLICY 3 – THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET

- 1. The Affordable Housing Target for the West of England for 2016-2036 is 24,500 net new affordable dwellings. Delivery of Affordable Housing, in a range of tenure and unit types, is a significant priority in all residential development.**
- 2. Affordable Housing is defined as social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing provided to households whose needs are not met by the market with regard to local incomes, house prices and rents.**
- 3. On residential developments delivering 5 or more dwellings or sites larger than 0.2ha, whichever is the lower, a minimum target of 35% Affordable Housing to be delivered on site is required. This applies to both C3 and self-contained C2 residential developments, including older persons and student accommodation.**
- 4. Every opportunity will be taken to maximise the delivery of affordable housing within Bristol. The provision of Affordable Housing on the SDLs, and other strategic locations within or well related to the Bristol urban area, must contribute to the Affordable Housing need of Bristol through on site provision, with the option for off-site contributions in locations less well related to Bristol. Offsite contributions will be retained for the delivery of Affordable Housing ~~within~~ for Bristol for a maximum of ten years or to the end of the JSP period whichever is the later.**
- 5. Where it is demonstrated that viability prevents the delivery of Affordable Housing policy requirement without public subsidy, the agreed quantum of Affordable Homes to be delivered without subsidy will be stipulated in the planning agreement. In these circumstances any reduced provision of Affordable Housing must still contribute to the affordable housing need of Bristol as set out in paragraph 4. Further mechanisms will be used to require the applicant to engage actively with the local authority to identify alternative forms of investment or public subsidy to deliver Affordable Homes above this base provision up to policy compliant, target levels.**
- 6. All Affordable Housing tenures should include provision to remain at an affordable price in perpetuity for future eligible households (based on local incomes and house prices) or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable provision.**

APPENDIX 3

Reasoned Justification for Policy 3

6. The Wider Bristol and Bath SHMAs identified an Affordable Housing need of 32,200 net new dwellings. Based on the Affordable Housing supply, available funding and other interventions an additional 24,500 (76%) Affordable Homes is set as the strategic target of this plan.
7. Affordable Housing is given a significant priority in the plan because of the scale of the need and historic low delivery rates. The target reflects the commitment by the Unitary Authorities to maximise Affordable Housing delivery across the West of England.
8. It will achieve this by:
 - Requiring a minimum of 35% Affordable Housing on all sites delivering 5 or more dwellings or sites larger than 0.2ha, whichever is the lower. This is justified by the high level of need and the shortfall in past delivery, and the consequent need to maximise delivery from all possible routes.
 - Maximising delivery via planning policy on site at nil public subsidy.
 - Maximising delivery via planning policy at nil public subsidy on the Strategic Development Locations (see Policy 7) as a specific priority.
 - Requiring policy compliance with the expectation that where it is unviable to provide the full policy requirement at nil public subsidy, public subsidy or other forms of investment will be sought and secured to make up the shortfall in order to demonstrate that every effort has been made to deliver full policy compliance.
 - Maximising use of HCA funding, other public subsidy and other forms of investment.
 - Requiring AH to be provided that meets the needs as evidenced by the Wider Bristol and B&NES Strategic Housing Market Assessments 2016 update or further updated evidence, in the full range of AH tenure types and unit mixes.
 - Maximising delivery through higher densities in urban locations.
 - Maximising delivery by reviewing and where appropriate, bringing forward sites for affordable housing that are currently allocated for other uses.
 - Requiring AH to be provided on self-contained C2 residential accommodation, including older persons housing and student accommodation, justified by the high level of need and the shortfall in past delivery, and the consequent need to maximise delivery from all possible routes.
 - Requiring on-site delivery of Affordable Housing. In exceptional circumstances, where it can be robustly justified, off-site provision or an equivalent financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision may be acceptable, for the provision of affordable housing.
9. In light of the particularly substantial need for Affordable Housing in Bristol, the provision of AH on the SDLs and other strategic locations within or well-related to the Bristol urban area must contribute to the affordable housing

APPENDIX 3

needs of Bristol via on-site provision with the option of off-site contributions in locations less-well related to Bristol. Delivery mechanisms will be determined through a Joint Supplementary Planning Document; options to be explored will include:

- nomination rights.
 - financial contribution to be held in a West of England Housing central fund and which can be retained for a maximum of ten years or to the end of the JSP period, whichever is the later, in order to maximise the opportunity to spend.
10. The 4 UAs have sought to maximise the provision of AH as far as possible, making it a priority in the formulation of the spatial strategy and increasing the overall supply of housing in order to increase AH supply. Whilst the identified needs for AH will not be fully met, this strategy will entail a substantial boost in the supply of Affordable Housing for the sub-region and will result in a step change in provision.