

Minutes of the meeting of the West of England Joint Committee Friday 2nd February 2018

Members:

Cllr Tim Warren, Bath & North East Somerset Council

Cllr Asher Craig, Bristol City Council

Cllr Nigel Ashton, North Somerset Council

Cllr Matthew Riddle, South Gloucestershire Council

Mayor Tim Bowles, West of England Combined Authority

1.	Welcomes and Introductions Chair Cllr Matthew Riddle, Leader of South Gloucestershire Council welcomed everyone to the Guildhall in Bath for the meeting of the West of England Joint Committee. He introduced his colleagues Cllr Tim Warren, leader of Bath & North East Somerset Council, Cllr Nigel Ashton, leader of North Somerset Council, Mayor Tim Bowles of The West of England Combined Authority, John McCormack, Interim Monitoring Officer for The West of England Combined Authority, and Tim Richens, Interim Director of Investment and Corporate Services at The West of England Combined Authority. Chair extended his welcome to Cllr Asher Craig of Bristol City Council who was attending the meeting in place of Mayor Marvin Rees who was unable to attend. 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.
2.	Apologies for Absence Chair passed on apologies from Mayor Marvin Rees of Bristol City Council. Cllr Asher Craig attended as a representative from Bristol City Council
3.	Declarations of Interest Under the Localism Action 2011 None were declared.
4.	Minutes Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting on 2 nd February 2018 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.
5.	Chair Announcements The Chair welcomed everyone to the Council Chamber in Bath for the West of England Joint Committee meeting, and confirmed that the following items would be discussed at the meeting; £17M investment in projects to boost local economic growth. To consider and approve the acceptance of a £1M grant from Government to deliver an Energy Hub for the wider South West region. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- An update on regional transport- The organisational framework for the West of England Combined Authority and the draft Business Plan.- Proposals to align the governance of the One Front Door programme with the WECA investment programme to ensure efficiencies- The budget outturn for the Local Enterprise Partnership and Invest in Bristol and Bath for the 16/17 financial year

<p>6.</p>	<p>Comments from Chair of Local Enterprise Partnership</p> <p>The Chair invited Professor Stephen West to address the Committee on the work of the Local Enterprise Partnership and LEP Board. Professor West stated that now the LEP board was established, the business community are keen to connect with leaders to put together a robust framework. He then followed by saying we must ensure our regional strategy is ambitious but realistic, and to ensure that we include housing, jobs and sustainable growth that everyone will be expecting. It was reported that we are seeing movement in funding for projects which was pleasing, although many are legacy projects and moving forward we should be aligning future investments to the new strategy being created. Professor West reiterated that we must target our efforts to win bids that are relevant to us, and stressed the importance of strategy moving us forward.</p> <p>Chair thanked Professor West and the LEP board who represent business in our area.</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 no questions had been received. The Chair confirmed that three statements had been received and invited attendees to speak in the order their statements had been received.</p>
	<p>David Redgewell, South West Transport Network, TSSA and Director of Bus Users (UK)</p> <p>Mr Redgewell addressed the committee to raise his concern surrounding the Regional Transport Board. He commented that although he has seen how successful they can be, he is keen to avoid creating multiple boards across the South West. Regarding local issues, Mr Redgewell expressed his concerns over MetroBus as he feels that more information should be available to the public to understand framework, bus frequency and be kept up to date. Additional concerns regarding air quality and transport links from Bristol Airport were also raised, as well as his opinion that the Portishead rail line should become a top priority.</p>
	<p>Dave Andrews, Chairman Bath Trams</p> <p>Dave Andrews was not in attendance. His statement regarding Why trams are likely the only practical solution to Bath’s congestion is appended to the minutes of the meeting.</p>
	<p>Christina Biggs, FOSBR</p> <p>Christina Biggs was not in attendance. Her statement regarding Rail Plan and Bus Strategy is appended to the minutes of the meeting.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Petitions</p> <p>No petitions were presented.</p>

9. LEP One Front Door Funding Programme

The Chair introduced a report that asked members to consider the following business cases seeking approval for funding from the Local Growth and Economic Development Funds:

- A39 Bences Garage Junction Improvement scheme
- Grow-On2 Temporary Building
- Nuclear Futures Open Innovation and Technology Centre
- Clevedon Cultural Quarter: Creative and Digital Business Hub
- Bath Riverside Enterprise Zone Team

Pete Davis was in attendance to provide any points of clarification on the report.

The Chair moved this recommendation, and confirmed Recommendations 1-5 required a majority decision of the four Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.

Cllr Tim Warren seconded the recommendation. He commented that he was extremely pleased to second this as there were big schemes planned that he felt will make a large impact to the West of England.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the four local authorities and Combined Authority Mayor.

Resolved:

- 1. Approve the Full Business Case for the A39 Bences Garage Junction Improvements scheme subject to land acquisition being undertaken and the supply of a detailed programme.**
- 2. Approve the Full Business Case for the Grow-On2 Temporary Building subject to the supply of a detailed design, cost plan and programme at RIBA stage 3, and securing planning consent.**
- 3. That based upon the funding request being beyond the Innovation thematic allocation, to seek an alternative proposal for the NUCLEATE - Nuclear Futures Open Innovation and Technology Centre project within an affordable envelope.**
- 4. That the Clevedon Cultural Quarter: Creative and Digital Business Hub is added to the LGF pipeline if supportive of regional priorities and should further funding become available.**
- 5. Approve the change requests for LGF schemes set out in Appendix 2.**

Recommendations 6 and 7 required a majority decision of the four Local Authorities.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the four local authorities.

	<p>Resolved:</p> <p>6. Approve the Full Business Case for the Bath Riverside Enterprise Zone Team subject to confirmation of the specific key milestones for the team.</p> <p>7. Approve the change requests for EDF and RIF schemes set out in Appendix 3.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Transport Update</p> <p>The Chair introduced a report that asked members to consider the following proposals for suburban rail in the West of England.</p> <p>The report provided information about a proposed Strategic Transport Body. It requests endorsement of the principles set out in the report and agreement for the Development Directors from WECA and the Local Authorities to bring back options for a Strategic Transport Body to a future meeting of this committee.</p> <p>Finally, members were asked to note the response sent on behalf of the region to the Department for Transport’s Major Road Network consultation.</p> <p>James White was in attendance to provide any points of clarification on the report.</p> <p>The Chair moved this recommendation, and confirmed these recommendations all required a majority decision of the four Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</p> <p>Cllr Nigel Ashton seconded the recommendation. He asked James White to provide a brief update, to which James responded a decision would be made end of May/June but there was no definitive news. Nigel commented that he has spoken to the Secretary of State, and is encouraged things are moving where there should be a decision made shortly.</p> <p>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the four local authorities.</p> <p>Resolved:</p> <p>14.1 The Committee is asked to endorse the principles for setting up a Strategic Transport Body as set out in section 3.3.</p> <p>14.2 The Committee is asked to delegate the Development Directors of the West of England Combined Authority and four local authorities to develop options for a STB and report back with proposals and timescales to this Committee. The Director of Infrastructure at WECA to be the lead officer.</p> <p>14.3 The Committee is asked to note the response as set out in Appendix One to the Department for Transport’s Major Road Network consultation.</p>

<p>11.</p>	<p>Operating Framework for West of England Combined Authority</p> <p>The Chair introduced a report that seeks agreement of the operating framework for the West of England Combined Authority for the year 2018-2019. This includes activity that is the responsibility of this Committee.</p> <p>The report highlights that longer-term work is being undertaken in discussion with Government to develop a Local Industrial Strategy for the Region.</p> <p>The draft business plan provides further detail of the activity to be undertaken in this financial year. Members were asked to delegate responsibility for agreeing the final version of this business plan to the WECA Chief Executive, in consultation with the constituent authority Chief Executives.</p> <p>Jessica Lee was in attendance to provide any points of clarification on the report.</p> <p>The Chair moved this recommendation (and included another rec – CHECK), and confirmed these recommendations all required a majority decision of the four Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</p> <p>Cllr Tim Warren seconded the recommendation.</p> <p>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the four local authorities.</p> <p>Resolved:</p> <p>12. It is recommended that the Committee agrees the operating framework for the West of England Combined Authority.</p> <p>13 It is recommended that the Committee agrees to delegate responsibility for agreeing the business plan to the West of England Combined Authority Chief Executive in consultation with the constituent authority chief executives.</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>Programme Governance for One Front Door</p> <p>The Chair introduced a report on proposed amendments to governance arrangements for the One Front Door funding programme.</p> <p>The report sets out an update on work that had been undertaken to align the existing reporting for One Front Door with those for the West of England Combined Authority Investment Funds, and proposals to make formal use of Directors and Chief Executive meetings to ensure robust arrangements are in place to ensure projects we have approved are delivered to time, quality and within budget.</p>

	<p>A report requesting formal delegations from the Joint Committee will be provided to a future meeting of this Committee.</p> <p>Chris Jennings was in attendance to provide any points of clarification on the report.</p> <p>Cllr Asher Craig asked Chris Jennings for timescales for delivery. Chris Jennings responded stating that he hopes to bring proposals to the next Joint Committee meeting.</p> <p>Members were asked to note the report.</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>Approve the South West Local Energy Hub Funding</p> <p>The Chair introduced a report that provided an overview of the scope and purpose for the South West Local Energy Hub.</p> <p>The report notes that WECA is proposed as the host authority and accountable body for the whole of the South West and will manage and administer the fund working closely with the South West partnership of LEPs.</p> <p>The report seeks member's approval for the use of a £1M grant from the Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy to deliver the South West Local Energy Hub programme.</p> <p>Tim Richens was in attendance to provide any points of clarification on the report.</p> <p>The Chair moved this recommendation, and confirmed these recommendations all required a majority decision of the four Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</p> <p>Cllr Nigel Ashton seconded the recommendation.</p> <p>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved:</p> <p>12. That the Committee approves acceptance of the grant funding and related expenditure for delivery of the SW Hub, with WECA acting as agent for the LEP as Accountable Body for this funding.</p> <p>12.1 That the detailed funding allocations and grant funding arrangements to be delegated to the LEP Chief Executive, in consultation with the WECA S151 Officer.</p>

14. Local Enterprise Partnership and Invest Bristol and Bath Outturn 2017/18

The Chair introduced a report that presented the revenue outturn budget monitoring information for the financial year 2017/18 covering the Local Enterprise Partnership and Invest in Bristol and Bath revenue budgets.

The report also requests that any specific underspends occurring within the Energy and Digital strategy work-streams are carried forward as one-off sums to fund any committed expenditure occurring in this financial year. It also recommends that an element of general underspend is utilised to fund the proposed Stepping-Up project.

Tim Richens was in attendance to provide any points of clarification on the report.

Chair informs members of a new recommendation that has been added, which was read as follows –

15.5 The remaining balance of underspend up to £150K is allocated to support the delivery of a bid on behalf of the West of England to the 5G Urban Connected Communities Project in 2018/19 with the detailed allocation of this funding delegated to the LEP Chief Executive.

Chair asked members for approval of this new recommendation, to which it was agreed.

With this new recommendation, Chair was happy to move the recommendation and confirmed that all recommendations required a majority decision of the four Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.

Mayor Tim Bowles seconded the recommendation.

Cllr Nigel Ashton asked for feedback regarding where the money will be allocated. Tim Richens agreed this will happen. Mayor Tim Bowles commented on the amendment, stating it was vital that we have capacity to work and make compelling bids that highlight us as a successful region. Cllr Asher Craig wanted to acknowledge and thank the LEP for the allowance of funding for the Stepping Up programme, and confirmed she will provide an update on their activity soon. She went on to state that there are 46 BME young leaders at current, to which Chair responded this is very encouraging. Mayor Tim Bowles agreed, and was keen to show his support.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously.

Resolved:

15.1 The LEP Budget as set out in Appendix 1, is noted.

15.2 A one-off virement of up to £150k be approved from underspending LEP Budget heads and increased income performance to meet the costs of increased Supplies & Services expenditure as set out in Para 3.1.3.

	<p>15.3 Any underspends on Digital and Energy strategy work-streams are carried forward to meet costs arising in 2018/19.</p> <p>15.4 Up to £50k of the remaining forecast underspend is earmarked to provide a LEP contribution the Stepping Up programme in 2018/19 onwards with detailed allocation delegated to the LEP Chief Executive.</p> <p>15.5 The remaining balance of underspend up to £150K is allocated to support the delivery of a bid on behalf of the West of England to the 5G Urban Connected Communities Project in 2018/19 with the detailed allocation of this funding delegated to the LEP Chief Executive.</p> <p>15.6 The IBB Budget as set out in Appendix 2 is noted and management be requested to seek to manage within existing allocated funding over the five-year funding term. Any EDF grant not drawn down in-year is ring-fenced to IBB activities and can be utilised in subsequent Financial Years subject to future Budget Approvals.</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>Any Other Item the Chair Decides is Urgent</p> <p>There were no urgent items. The Chair confirmed the next meeting will take place on Friday 1st June. The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance, and to Bath and North East Somerset council for allowing the use of Guildhall.</p> <p>The meeting was declared closed at 15.11.</p>
	<p>Signed:</p> <p>Date:</p> <p>Chair, West of England Joint Committee</p>

Public Forum

Statements Received

Statement	Name, organisation
1.	David Redgewell, South West Transport Network <i>West of England Transport Links</i>
2.	Dave Andrews, Chairman Bath Trams (Mike Godwin will be speaking on behalf of Dave Andrews) <i>Why trams are likely the only practical solution to Bath's congestion</i>
3.	Christina Biggs, FOSBR <i>Rail Plan and Bus Strategy</i>

Statement 1

David Redgewell, South West Transport Network

Light Rail around Bristol and Bath

We want to see the budget for the light rail consultation studies in the Greater Bristol area to be fully protected and support the principles of a light rail route to Bristol Airport as a top priority and later to Bath especially from Lambridge across the City to Newbridge which could then make use of the light rail corridor to Bristol through Bitton, Saltford, Kelston, Warmley to Yate and East Bristol via Mangotsfield, Staple Hill and Fishponds as well as linking into the RUH at Weston, the new Bath Spa Art & Design College at Weston Lock and Park & Ride sites which need to be co-ordinated with the Bristol Mayor's rapid transit project. The two schemes must link to Warmley and Emersons Green. Retention of Avon Valley Railway steam services at weekends. Provision should be made for a continuous cycle/walkway between Bristol and Bath where possible. The implementation of light rail will help bring the City region into line with EU emission and clean air targets together with clean fuel buses and taxi's.

The corridor to Odd Down is welcomed however the majority of the traffic is to the Somer Valley at Peasedown, Radstock and Mid Somer Norton and therefore an extension of a rapid transit system to this area would be beneficial. What evaluation of the Somerset and Dorset railway corridor has been carried out as Norton Radstock is an enterprise zone and needs public transport improvement.

The route to Bath University seems to have gradient constraints and requires considerable engineering works and it should also be noted that all LRT schemes approved in the UK have been conurbation wide eg Midland Metro (Birmingham - Wolverhampton), Greater Manchester, Nottingham and Croydon and will require DFT funding and approvals in the long term and in the short term to be in the Metro Mayors joint transport plan.

Bus/Rail integration

This is required at Bath Spa station and other locations where light rail might possibly connect with buses. Across Europe and Greater Manchester/London rapid transit is fully integrated into the bus network. We need to make progress on bus/rail integration at Temple Meads as the proposed Temple Gate stops do not work for passengers.

On rail we welcome the work on disabled access at Stapleton Road and Patchway but the Stapleton Road temporary ramps do not provide good access without grab rails.

There should be investment in MetroWest between Westbury, Bath and Bristol currently out for consultation with the DFT as part of the GWR franchise with First Group as the operator until 2022. This could include a business unit for Bristol and Bath, Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire & Greater Bristol.

SWTN also want to see the GWR franchise kept as one complete business unit and not split up as proposed by the DFT. The GWR IEP electrification programme should also be completed in the shortest possible time to assist with high technology rail job creation opportunities in the region together with the Henbury loop rail project serving the proposed Arena.

There should also be a Greater Bristol business unit within the GWR franchise with devolved powers similar to the West Midlands and Greater Manchester PTE's.

Bus proposals can be included as should future schemes eg light rail integration and the Overground rail project in Bristol.

Arena issues

A full transport plan would need to be drawn up with First Group on whichever site the Mayor and Metro Mayor decide.

Temple Meads Arena would require coach parking, MetroBus stops, coach stops in Avon Street, bus stops at this location and on Bath Road Park & Ride services from Brislington, Parkway, Portway, Ashton Vale, extra trains from Bath and West Wilts, Taunton, W-S-M, Cardiff, Newport, Patchway, Filton, Yate, Gloucester/Cheltenham, Severn Beach via Clifton Down, Henbury loop, Portishead and Swindon.

Regarding a shuttle train from Bristol Parkway to Temple Meads, taxi ranks, ferry terminal, service coaches and car parking including disabled.

Construction of Station Street and bus interchange at the Friary is required as part of the new University campus development at Temple Meads.

Brabazon hanger option

Potential Arena will require coach parking, MetroBus stops, coach stops, bus stops at this location and on Park & Ride services to Brislington, Parkway, Portway, Ashton Vale, extra trains from Bath and West Wilts, Taunton, W-S-M, Cardiff, Newport, Patchway, Filton, Yate, Gloucester, Cheltenham, Severn Beach via Clifton Down, Henbury loop, Portishead and Swindon. There should be 15 minute frequency services on the Henbury loop serving the Arena and 10 minute shuttle bus service on main routes to it.

The IET trains will need to operate from London and South Wales via Parkway to Filton North station for the arena, services from the South West, West Midlands to the Henbury loop station, coach parking will need to be provided, taxis, bus links Greater Bristol wide, links to Cribbs Causeway and hotels will need to be addressed.

We urge the City Council, WECA and Bristol Mayor's to address a full integrated transport plan for the Arena similar to those at Manchester Victoria/Wembley.

The Arena rail services will need to be included in the new rail franchise.

Bus strategy

There should be no cuts in bus subsidies but more investment in the local bus network with the Metro Mayor and these issues must be addressed alongside any light rail proposals in Bristol and Bath especially where services like the 16 from Bristol Parkway to Longwell Green via Lodge Causeway have already been cut leaving residents with no buses. The 510/511 bus services should

also be reinstated as part of an improved orbital bus network.

Passengers interchanging between bus/rail routes should have accessible toilet facilities on key routes with money for maintaining/cleaning bus shelters/bus bays. These should include facilities at Shirehampton Green, Eastville Park and Fishponds Park. One way to fund public transport would be to use money raised by parking fees instead of spending it on non transport infrastructure projects like pavement repairs. These toilets are also used by bus drivers and passengers on routes around Bristol. Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out regarding the closures and any new facilities. Of course in South Gloucestershire, BANES and North Somerset have protected these facilities as part of the network.

We remind you that the tourism industry in Bristol is worth £1.3 billion and we do not want the reputation damage to Bristol so these facilities including community toilets and private sector transfers must work.

WECA Transport Forum issues

We are concerned about the lack of progress for a rail and transport forum and the need to merge the congestion task force with any WECA group. We also must address the proposed Regional Transport Board.

On integration we are concerned about the lack of integration between MetroBus and the background bus network especially around North Bristol along the Bradley Stoke corridor.

DAVID REDGEWELL South West Transport Network/TSSA/Railfuture

We wish to see improvements to Patchway station to include CCTV, footbridge with lifts, waiting area and car park.

Bristol Temple Meads interchange and Station Street, improving bus stops near Temple Gate.

South Bristol Link requires MetroBus route to be implemented as a bus service and potentially as a light rail route to the Airport and Temple Meads.

MetroBus to be implemented between Aztec West, Parkway, UWE and Emersons Green. Support Thornbury MetroBus route stop[ping in Bradley Stoke area from 26th May as requested by First Group.

Cross boundary working on 20mph zones review with South Gloucestershire Council in East and North Bristol.

MetroWest extension to Henbury and St Andrews Road and reopening Portishead line.

Disabled access needs improvement at Stapleton Road whilst works are undertaking.

Integrated ticketing as part of bus strategy for ferry/bus and train.

We are still concerned that most public interchanges in Bristol have no public toilets unlike London, Birmingham and Manchester. We call for a review of the community toilet scheme urgently.

Bus service review requires a service 16 to be reinstated between Hillfields and Bristol Parkway and services 10 and 11 to Emersons Green from Shirehampton via Parkway.

Light rail priority is to Bristol Airport from Bristol Temple Meads and tram train around the local network and on the Bath Warmley line jointly with the cycleway onwards to Emersons | Green.

DAVID REDGEWELL SWTN

Statement 2

Dave Andrews, Chairman Bath Trams

Why trams are likely the only practical solution to Bath's congestion

(These statements are fully referenced on the Bathtrams.uk website)

No bus-only system has curbed congestion in any British city because car drivers will not accept cramped jerky buses (patronage declining at 1.5% for many years) as an alternative. (You can go to any congested British city to see this). [Runcorn was built around the bus in the 1960s](#) but usage is now down to around 5% - the same as in Bath. Utrecht which has no parking in the city and is bus-only [is re-installing trams](#) because the bus system is at capacity, and even the triple bendy buses cannot cope

Evidence repeatedly shows that car drivers will however accept gently moving, smooth, spacious (children and other users not crammed next to strangers) [street running trams/light rail and a sufficient number of car drivers have transferred in all 7 British tram re-installs to significantly ease congestion.](#)

The long-term (capital repayment and operational cost) of a tram per person km [is about half that of a bus](#); one driver cost is shared over more passengers, there is no engine or tyres to maintain and they last 40 years or more

Low operating costs means trams run at 6 min intervals 0600 to 2400 - "turn up and go", no waiting, high reliability makes them ideal for school children where the school run creates about 1/3 of rush hour congestion. The average 3 min wait between trams means that even cross-town, two tram trips are attractive for motorists and school children

Trams produce no pollution but even electric buses produce pollution from the toxic tyre particulates, brake dusts and ground up road tar, most pollution is from car exhausts

[Modern tram track](#) can be installed without major traffic disturbance

[France operates 57 tram lines in 33 cities all built in the last 30 years](#) these do indeed increase footfall and spend in town centres in the pleasant environment they create. [46 Tram Systems Installed in Europe Since 2000](#). 265 active tram systems [in Europe](#)

[There are 27 tram systems in Unesco World heritage cities](#), and about 140 tram systems in Europe with about the same length as is envisaged for Bath Trams. Modern trams do not require overhead wires. [All hills in Bath](#) are accessible to trams. Trams have a tighter turning circle, are [narrower than buses, and can pass closer together](#). Bath's heritage was based on trams from 1890 to 1939; visitors complain about traffic but visitors to Vienna and other trammed cities never complain about overhead wires but praise the trams and lack of traffic

Green Wave Traffic Light Pre-emption permits trams to move through traffic faster than other vehicles even with on-street running and this cannot be applied to buses – [the website explains this apparent paradox](#)

[Values of commercial property always increase near tram stops and encourage further serviceable development alongside](#) - their [inflexibility is an advantage](#) as it signals to developers that they are here for the long term

Many European cities have trams trundling through pedestrian zones and this is very acceptable to shoppers, who happily accept their presence - including [dining alongside the tracks.](#)

The carrying capacity of a single road with cars is typically about [1000/hour, 9,000 with buses but 40,000 for trams](#)

Research shows that Uber cars and Amazon vans are [already slowing traffic down and self-driving Ubers and vans cars will only make matters far, far worse](#) due to their cheapness and resultant ubiquity

Trams can carry much HGV goods into town [on off-peak vehicles as per many continental trams](#)

Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways (FOSBR)

Statement to West of England Combined Authority Committee and the
West of England Joint Committee Wednesday 18 April 2018



FOSBR continues to urge that WECA develop its own specific Rail Plan to balance the Bus Strategy, as part of the upcoming Joint Local Transport Plan, based on our suggestions in the FOSBR Rail Plan 2018.

FOSBR is delighted that WECA is carrying out a £2m study into Temple Meads, and asks that WECA engages with FOSBR and TfGB to ensure that Station Street is delivered as an initial phase and that a bus exchange on the Friary remains as a key part of the plans. This will ensure that Temple Meads has the infrastructure to host the Arena at this preferred location.

As another example of this, we would like to draw WECA's attention to the evidence we have submitted to the Great Western Franchise consultation in February 2018 in support of our proposal to restore commuter rail services to Pilning.

Document 1: A cost-benefit analysis by a UWE academic, David Williams, which sets out different scenarios of modal shift and the associated savings in carbon emissions and pollution and the consequent payback time for the £2m footbridge required.

Document 2: A map of the Pilning station environs with the proposed M49 junction

Document 3: An estimate of the possible ridership for Pilning from the Severnside commercial employment area

Document 4: An undertaking from the Cribbs Mall Transport officer to support a bus shuttle from Pilning to Cribbs should the passenger service be restored.

FOSBR continues to offer its resources and local knowledge to the JLTP.

Christina Biggs (FOSBR Secretary)



Pilning Station Footbridge Cost Benefit Analysis

February 2018

Dr David Williams.

About the Author:

Dr David Williams is a Research Associate at the University of the West of England. Dr Williams has a background in transport planning and assessment for local authorities in the West of England. This work was conducted in Dr Williams' own time for FOSBR and the findings are his own work and do not reflect the views of the University of the West of England.



CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Feasibility	3
Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	4
Assumptions	4
Calculation	6
Summary	7
Next Steps	7

Introduction

The Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways (FOSBR) have requested that a cost benefit analysis be completed to support their case for the installation of a new footbridge at Pilning station in South Gloucestershire, to the north west of the city of Bristol. The case is being made to the GWR Franchise consultation that closes on 21 February 2018. The original footbridge was removed in 2016 as part of Network Rail’s electrification programme¹ and it was deemed not cost effective to replace it due to the low number of passengers using the station, with just 230 people using the station in 2016/17². The low number of passengers, up from 46 in 2015/16, is due to the fact that the station is served by just two trains a week, at 0834 and 1534 on a Saturday. Network Rail has estimated that the installation of an equalities compliant bridge at the station will cost £2 million and FOSBR have requested that the installation of this bridge be included within the next stage of the GWR franchise after 2020.

Feasibility

Since Network Rail’s decision not to replace the footbridge in 2016 there have been several changes to transportation within the Greater Bristol area surrounding Pilning Station. Highways England has announced plans to construct a new junction on the M49 motorway that would provide greater access to the station. This new junction provides Bristol City Council with the opportunity to develop a Park and Rail site at the station, reducing trips into Bristol city centre. This is important as Bristol City Council is currently developing options for installing a Clean Air Zone (CAZ) within the city centre to comply air quality standards³. Developing Park and Rail facilities at Pilning station, through the construction of a pedestrian bridge and surface level car parking would provide a relatively low cost option compared to the construction of a new Park and Ride site served by buses. The new junction is expected to cost between £25m and £50m, but as yet no date has been set for its construction.

The second change to transportation in the Greater Bristol area is the proposed expansion of *The Mall* at Cribbs Causeway and the associated additional traffic this will have. Pilning railway station is situated 4.8km away from The Mall site. The Transport Review Group for the development’s travel plan have stated to FOSBR that if more frequent services were reintroduced to Pilning Station they would consider running a shuttle bus to/from the station to serve their customers who wished to travel by train, rather than car.

The final change comes from the businesses to the south of Pilning Station based at Severnside. SevernNet, a consortia of businesses on at Severnside, are interested in running shuttle buses for their staff to/from the station providing the services meet fit with current shift patterns. All three of these changes suggest that the re-installation of a footbridge at Pilning station should be considered as part of the next GWR franchise as they would provide benefits for

PROPOSED M49 AVONMOUTH JUNCTION⁴



¹ Sims, A. (2016) http://www.gazetteseries.co.uk/news/14587196.Rail_platform_and_footbridge_set_for_closure_in_Pilning/
² ORR (2018) <http://orr.gov.uk/statistics/published-stats/station-usage-estimates>
³ BBC (2017) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-bristol-40865101>
⁴ Highways England (2017) <http://roads/highways.gov.uk>



travel within the Greater Bristol area.

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)

The Department for Transport's Web-based Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTAG) provides advice on transport modelling and appraisal for highways and public transport interventions. This is based on HM Treasury's Green Book to explore a wide range of impacts from a transport intervention. Rail interventions are based on the same approach. For the purposes of this analysis three scenarios will be tested to demonstrate the benefits of installing the bridge. This will be based on the Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) and Nitrogen Oxide (NO_x) reductions from people travelling by train compared to driving within the Greater Bristol area. It is not possible to capture the wider economic benefits or social benefits of this scheme due to the lack of available data. The analysis is therefore designed to demonstrate the benefits in one area, emissions, with the request that WECA conduct a full CBA as part of the Joint Local Transport Plan for the implementation of the bridge in line with its inclusion in the next GWR franchise period.

Assumptions

As with any model a set of assumptions will be included. These will be outlined below.

The CBA will be based on the assumption that additional train services will be provided to/from Pilning Station by Great Western Railways as part of their next franchise to meet the demands of Severnside businesses and The Mall's customers. The table below includes the proposed services which would include 10 services a day in each direction. This number of services has been used for the CBA as it would provide services to serve shift patterns at Severnside and the majority of the weekend trips to The Mall.

The second assumption is based on the type of car that will be taken off the road. For this scenario the findings are based on a 1.6ltr Diesel Ford Focus, the most popular car in Britain. The Ford Focus emits 114 grams of CO₂ per kilometre⁵ and between 0.5 and 0.75 grams of NO_x per kilometre⁶. The cost of these emissions to the environment is approximately £0.05/kilometre⁷.

The CBA will test the three scenarios.

⁵ EU (2015) <https://www.energy.eu/car-co2-emissions/ford.php>

⁶ Emissions Analytics (2018) <http://equaindex.com/equa-air-quality-index/>

⁷ MyClimate.org (2016) https://co2.myclimate.org/en/portfolios?calculation_id=1045204&localized_currency=GBP



Scenario 1 – 10 passengers will use Pilning Station/train

Scenario 2 – 20 passengers will use Pilning station/train

Scenario 3 – 40 passengers will use Pilning Station/train

An assumption has been made that each of these passengers would travel 40km by car if they were not travelling by train.

The trains currently running this line run on diesel and therefore emit CO₂ and NO_x. These trains will be running on this line whether they stop at Pilning or not. The level of emissions per service is therefore negligible and has been discounted for the purposes of this analysis. Further research would need to incorporate these figures.

DAY	DIRECTION	APPROX TIME	PURPOSE
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0530	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0630	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0730	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0750	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0830	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	1330	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	1430	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	1600	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	1930	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	2030	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0530	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0630	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0730	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0750	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0830	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	1330	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	1430	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	1600	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	1930	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	2030	Serving Businesses at Severnside
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	0930	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1030	Serving the Mall



DAY	DIRECTION	APPROX TIME	PURPOSE
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1130	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1230	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1330	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1430	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1530	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1630	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1730	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1830	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	0930	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1030	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1130	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1230	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1330	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1430	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1530	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1630	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1730	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1830	Serving the Mall

Calculation

The calculations are based on the use of the station for 363 days of the year, with each person saving 40km of travel by car. The first table shows the financial benefits per day of the three scenarios. With scenario 1 an average of 10 passengers per train there is a £4,000 financial benefit for the local environment due to the emissions saved, with this increasing to £16,000 if there were 40 passengers alighting per train.

NO. TRAIN SERVICES/ DAY	NO. PASSENGERS/ TRAIN	TOTAL PASSENGER S/ DAY	DISTANCE BY CAR SAVED (40KM/ PASSENGER)	CO ₂ EMISSIONS SAVED/DAY (114G/KM)	NO _x EMISSIONS SAVED/DAY (0.625G/KM)	ENVIRONMENTAL SAVING/DAY (£)
20	10	200	8,000km	912kg CO ₂	5kg	£4,000
20	20	400	16,000km	1,824kg CO ₂	10kg	£8,000
20	40	800	32,000km	3,648kg CO ₂	20kg	£16,000

For the year the figures demonstrate that for Scenario 1, 10 passengers per train the environmental benefits would be £1.4m per year, with this increasing to £5.8m for Scenario 3, with 40 passengers per train.



NO. TRAIN SERVICES/ YEAR	NO. PASSENGERS/ TRAIN	TOTAL PASSENGER S/ YEAR	DISTANCE BY CAR SAVED (40KM/ PASSENGER)	CO ₂ EMISSIONS SAVED/ YEAR (114G/KM)	NO _x EMISSIONS SAVED/ YEAR (0.625G/KM)	ENVIRONMENTAL SAVING/YEAR (£)
7260	10	72,600	2,904,000km	331,056 kg CO ₂	1,815 kg	£1,452,000
7260	20	145,200	5,808,000km	662,112 kg CO ₂	3,630 kg	£2,904,000
7260	40	290,400	11,616,000km	1,324,224 kg CO ₂	7,260 kg	£5,808,000

Summary

The results show that if GWR were to provide 10 services a day to Pilning station and that if each train had 10 passengers either alight or board the service the environmental savings for the West of England area of installing the footbridge at Pilning at the cost of £2m would be paid back in under 18 months. In the most optimistic scenario (Scenario 3) this would be paid back in just under four months, in terms of environmental benefits for the Greater Bristol area.

The findings do not include any calculations of economic or social benefits of implementing this scheme, that would be added to this equation to demonstrate the full benefits.

This report concludes that providing GWR were prepared to run these services and work together with SevernNet and The Mall's transport plan team, it would be possible to provide these services and help reduce emissions CO₂ and NO_x in the Greater Bristol area.

Next Steps

The results of this analysis show that the provision of services and a new footbridge at Pilning station have the potential to provide an environmental benefit to the Greater Bristol area in terms of emissions reduction. Therefore this report recommends that the installation of a bridge and the introduction of services be considered for the next GWR franchise period by the Department for Transport.

The installation of the footbridge, additional trains, new junction for the M49 linking to Pilning station and a Park and Rail site to be delivered at the station should also be included for consideration at Pilning as part of the West of England Combined Authority's Joint Local Transport Plan. Once the scheme is included in both these plans it will be possible to conduct a full cost benefit analysis of the schemes to demonstrate the wider benefits the enhancement of this station can provide to the Greater Bristol area moving forward.

Employment density for Severnside Local Area

Author: Andrew. G. Short 27/2/17, for Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways.

Business area: Central park, Western Approach and West Gate.

HMG document 'Employment Density Guide (3rd edition Nov 2015)' issued by the Homes & Communities Agency suggest that a typical density of employees in 'regional Distribution Centres is 77 square metres (M²) per person average.

This is per Full Time Equivalent (FTE). This equates to a single shift through the average working week. The occupancy would thus be 2 persons per 77 per M² if everyone in every company worked a two-shift system, 3 persons per 77 M² for 3 shifts.

Brochures for the business areas quote:

Westgate development overall	4,000,000 sq ft.
Tesco (not in above) estimated	500,000 sq ft.
Central park development overall	3,775,000 sq ft.
Western Approach (estimated)*	3,000,000 sq ft

(* Brochure not available 16-1-17).

Red figures below from <http://sites.southglos.gov.uk/insouthglos/enterprise/avonmouth/key-facts/>

Total business building floor area	11,275,000 sq ft.
At 10.7 ft sq per M ² , this equates to	1,105,400 (1,323,630) M ²

At 77 M² per person, this equates to some 13,700 (17,190) FTE persons.

It is assumed that 50% of employees are on the businesses are on 2 shift and 15% on three shift. This equates to:

$$(13,700 * 0.35) + (13700 * 0.5 * 2) + (13,700 * 0.15 * 3) = 24,660 (30,941) \text{ FTE persons.}$$

Assuming an occupancy of 3/4 (allowing for vacancies, automation, sickness, business premises vacated, etc.) this gives a level of 18,500 FTE persons.

Thus on an average day, there could be 18,500 (23,200) persons commuting to and from the three distribution parks and to be targeted as possibilities for public transport (e.g. a 1% take-up of public transport equates to 185 (232) return journeys per day.

Cribbs Mall Transport Response to Representation by Christina Biggs

Summary of Representation

1. Dr Christina Biggs on behalf of Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways identified that the group is lobbying for the reintroduction of daily rail services to Pilning rail station approximately 4.8km from the Mall site. Dr Biggs identified that the station would require the provision of a new footbridge (apparently costed at £2 million) and suggested that the station could be used by those travelling to the Mall from Wales, with the Mall providing a shuttle bus service to collect/drop off visitors.

Response to Representation

2. Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure (CIL) Levy Regulations, 2010 states that:

“A planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:

- a. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*
- b. directly related to the development; and*
- c. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.”*

3. The pedestrian footbridge at Pilning rail station is not considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, nor is it directly related to the development. Furthermore, the cost of provision is not considered to be reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. This measure would therefore not meet the guidance set out in the CIL Regulations 2010, and cannot be required to be provided by the proposed development.
4. With regard to the shuttle bus to Pilning rail station, if the proposed development is granted planning consent the s.106 agreement requires that the Applicants make contributions towards sustainable travel. The use and spending of these contributions will be monitored through the Travel Plan, as overseen by the Transport Review Group (TRG). *If* more frequent rail services are reintroduced to Pilning station, the TRG will be able to consider the suggested shuttle bus measure and whether funding should be made available to support such a service.

Sent by email to Christina Biggs

November 2017