

Development of the Third Local Transport Plan – summary of consultation responses on strategic options to address local transport challenges

Introduction

The Local Transport Plan (LTP) sets out Nottinghamshire's transport strategy and outlines a programme of measures to be delivered over the short, medium and long term. The strategy covers all types of transport including public transport, walking, cycling, cars and freight. The current LTP runs out on 31 March 2011 and we are developing its replacement.

Priorities and challenges

In January and February 2010 consultation was undertaken to help determine Nottinghamshire's local transport priorities and challenges. The results of the survey supported all of the five national transport goals and identified 12 local transport challenges (as detailed below) which are currently being tested against the evidence the Council holds to determine if they are 'real' or 'perceived'.

- Challenges to **supporting economic growth**
 - Tackling congestion and making journey times more reliable
 - Improving connectivity to inter-urban, regional and international networks
 - Addressing the transport impacts of planned housing and employment growth
 - Encouraging people to walk, cycle and use public transport through promotion and provision of facilities
 - Supporting regeneration
- Challenges to **protecting the environment**
 - Reducing transport's impact on the environment (air quality, buildings, landscape, noise etc.)
 - Adapting to climate change and the development of a low-carbon transport system
- Challenges to **improving health and safety**
 - Improving levels of health and activity by encouraging active travel (walking or cycling) instead of short car journeys
 - Addressing and improving personal safety (and the perceptions of safety) when walking, cycling or using public transport
- Challenges to **improving accessibility**
 - Provision of an affordable, reliable, and convenient public transport network
 - Improving access to employment and other key services particularly from rural areas
- Challenges to **maintaining and improving existing infrastructure**
 - Maintaining roads, footways, public transport services etc.

Strategic options consultation responses

In June and July 2010 a second stage of consultation was undertaken to determine how people think we should address the local transport challenges. The consultation was undertaken with the public, County Council elected members, and a range of stakeholders including district and parish councils, local businesses, transport operators and interest groups. Table 1 below shows the number of responses split by each district in the county. It also shows the number of responses that were made by groups that represent the whole of the county, such as transport interest groups or organisations such as the NHS.

Table 1: Numbers of respondents

| District | No. of responses |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Ashfield | 78 |
| Bassetlaw | 65 |
| Broxtowe | 112 |
| Gedling | 111 |
| Mansfield | 67 |
| Newark & Sherwood | 101 |
| Rushcliffe | 121 |
| Whole county | 46 |
| Total | 701 |

Strategic options to address the transport challenges

Nine different strategic options, encompassing a range of activities, were consulted on. The survey asked people to tell us whether they thought each of the options should be given a high, medium or low priority to address the 12 local transport challenges. The survey also asked respondents which of the options they would choose if they could pick only three of the options. Where there are significant differences in the responses from different groups, types of respondent or between districts this has been included in the text below.

Table 2 below details the percentage of respondents that selected each of the strategic option as one of their top three options.

Table 2: The percentage of respondents that thought each of the strategic options would be one of their top three priorities

| Strategic option | Percentage of respondents |
|--|---------------------------|
| Public transport service improvements | 53% |
| Maintenance of roads, footways and bridges | 48% |
| Bus priority and infrastructure | 42% |
| Public transport interchange | 34% |
| Reducing the need to travel | 30% |
| Local safety schemes | 26% |
| Active travel | 23% |
| Demand management | 20% |
| New roads and local road schemes | 16% |

There is very little difference in the priority of the strategic options between each of the seven districts in the county. Similarly there is little difference in the priorities identified by different types/groups of respondents. There were, however, significant differences in the top three strategic options selected by stakeholders. Less than a third of stakeholders selected maintenance of roads, footways and bridges and less than a quarter selected local safety schemes in their top three strategic options.

Public transport service improvements

Public transport service improvements include improving bus and rail frequency, capacity and speed; addressing gaps and weaknesses in the public transport network; as well as promotion and marketing.

Table 3: The percentage of respondents that thought public transport service improvements should be given a high; medium or low priority to address the local transport challenges

| Strategic option | High | Medium | Low |
|---------------------------------------|------|--------|-----|
| Public transport service improvements | 65% | 29% | 6% |

- The majority of respondents from each district considered the provision of public transport service improvements to be a high priority
- With the exception of respondents from Bassetlaw, Gedling and Mansfield, over two thirds of respondents considered transport service improvements to be a high priority
- A higher percentage of female respondents, disabled respondents and stakeholders (almost three quarters of each group) considered public transport service improvements to be a high priority.

Maintenance of roads, footways and bridges

Maintenance measures include resurfacing roads and footways; strengthening bridges; and renewing lining on the road.

Table 4: The percentage of respondents that thought maintenance of roads, footways and bridges should be given a high; medium or low priority to address the local transport challenges

| Strategic option | High | Medium | Low |
|--|------|--------|-----|
| Maintenance of roads, footways and bridges | 57% | 36% | 7% |

- The majority of respondents from each district, with the exception of Rushcliffe, considered maintenance of roads, footways and bridges a high priority
- Respondents from Ashfield, Mansfield and Newark & Sherwood considered maintenance to be a higher priority than elsewhere in the county

- A higher percentage of disabled respondents (almost two thirds) considered maintenance to be a high priority
- A lower percentage of stakeholders considered maintenance to be a high priority.

Public transport interchange

Public transport interchange includes improved bus and rail stations in local centres; facilities at locations where people may connect to public transport; and park and ride facilities.

Table 5: The percentage of respondents that thought public transport interchange improvements should be given a high; medium or low priority to address the local transport challenges

| Strategic option | High | Medium | Low |
|------------------------------|------|--------|-----|
| Public transport interchange | 56% | 32% | 12% |

- The majority of respondents from each district, with the exception of Bassetlaw and Gedling, considered the provision of public transport interchange to be a high priority
- Public transport interchange is considered a higher priority for respondents from Broxtowe
- Very few respondents from Mansfield considered public transport interchange a low priority
- Similarly, very few stakeholders considered public transport interchange a low priority.

Bus priority and infrastructure

Bus priority and infrastructure improvements includes bus priority at traffic lights; bus lanes; improved facilities at bus stops; and improved ticketing to make it easier to use the bus.

Table 6: The percentage of respondents that thought bus priority and infrastructure improvements should be given a high; medium or low priority to address the local transport challenges

| Strategic option | High | Medium | Low |
|---------------------------------|------|--------|-----|
| Bus priority and infrastructure | 55% | 38% | 8% |

- The majority of respondents from each district, with the exception of Bassetlaw and Mansfield, considered the provision of bus priority and infrastructure to be a high priority
- A higher percentage of disabled respondents (two thirds) considered bus priority and infrastructure improvements to be a high priority.

Local safety schemes

Local safety schemes include measures to improve safety at sites that have a history of accidents; safer routes to school schemes; and community safety schemes.

Table 7: The percentage of respondents that thought local safety schemes should be given a high; medium or low priority to address the local transport challenges

| Strategic option | High | Medium | Low |
|----------------------|------|--------|-----|
| Local safety schemes | 52% | 32% | 16% |

- The majority of respondents from each district, with the exception of Broxtowe and Mansfield, considered local safety schemes to be a high priority
- Local safety schemes are considered a higher priority for respondents from Ashfield
- A higher percentage of female respondents and disabled respondents considered local safety schemes to be a high priority.

Reducing the need to travel

Measures which reduce the need to travel include development control; technology so that people can work from home; smarter choices measures; helping people access local shops and other services when walking and cycling; and environmental improvements to regenerate shopping areas.

Table 8: The percentage of respondents that thought measures that reduced the need to travel should be given a high; medium or low priority to address the local transport challenges

| Strategic option | High | Medium | Low |
|-----------------------------|------|--------|-----|
| Reducing the need to travel | 44% | 33% | 22% |

- Respondents from Bassetlaw considered reducing the need to travel to be a higher priority than elsewhere in the county
- A higher percentage of disabled respondents considered reducing the need to travel to be a high priority.

Active travel

Active travel improvements include providing footpaths and cycle lanes; measures to help people when walking, cycling and horse riding; travel planning; training; cycle hire schemes; and promotion and marketing.

Table 9: The percentage of respondents that thought measures to promote active travel should be given a high; medium or low priority to address the local transport challenges

| Strategic option | High | Medium | Low |
|------------------|------|--------|-----|
| Active travel | 42% | 36% | 21% |

- Active travel measures are considered a higher priority for residents of Broxtowe than the rest of the county.

Demand management

Demand management includes traffic and speed management; optimising traffic signals; controlling parking; and controlling where freight travels.

Table 10: The percentage of respondents that thought demand management measures should be given a high; medium or low priority to address the local transport challenges

| Strategic option | High | Medium | Low |
|-------------------|------|--------|-----|
| Demand management | 36% | 42% | 21% |

- Respondents from Ashfield and Bassetlaw considered demand management to be a higher priority than elsewhere in the county
- Fewer respondents from Mansfield and Newark & Sherwood considered demand management to be a low priority
- Demand management was considered to be a lower priority by respondents from Gedling and Rushcliffe
- A higher percentage of stakeholder respondents considered demand management to be a high priority.

New roads and local road schemes

New roads and local road schemes include making contributions towards new roads; and targeted capacity improvements on existing roads where there is congestion.

Table 11: The percentage of respondents that thought building new roads or local road scheme improvements should be given a high; medium or low priority to address the local transport challenges

| Strategic option | High | Medium | Low |
|----------------------------------|------|--------|-----|
| New roads and local road schemes | 26% | 33% | 41% |

- New roads and local road schemes were not considered a high priority by respondents from any of the districts but particularly those from Ashfield and Broxtowe
- Respondents from Bassetlaw and Mansfield considered new roads and local road schemes to be a higher priority than elsewhere in the county
- A higher percentage of disabled respondents (over a third) considered new roads and local road schemes to be a high priority.

The next steps

The 12 local challenges identified in the first stage of consultation and the priorities placed on the strategic options identified through the second stage of consultation (as detailed in this summary) will be used to help develop the County Council's long-term transport strategy.

Further information

For further information on the analysis of the Local Transport Plan consultation, please **email:** transport.strategy@nottsc.gov.uk or **phone:** 08449 80 80 80.