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Local Transport Plan Consultation Response Report

1.0 Introduction
1.1 The Local Transport Plan (LTP) sets the long-term strategy for transport delivery within Gloucestershire between 2015 and 2031. During its first formal review in 2014 a significant number of changes were proposed to the existing adopted document.

1.2 This LTP Consultation Response Report summarises the representations made to the LTP Consultation Document received during the six week public consultation held from 16th February to 27th March 2015.

2.0 The Consultation Process
2.1 At the outset of the LTP Review process it was determined that views from all stakeholders groups should be captured as part of the review process. To achieve this inclusivity a multi-layered consultation programme was delivered over a six month period.

2.2 The target audiences of stakeholders the review process aimed to engage included both internal and external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders included those members of staff that either implement the policies outlined in the LTP or oversee its delivery and management. Views from County Councillors were also sought to ensure the priorities identified through the review process matched those of the public and the wider organisation.

2.3 Views on transport were also sought from a range of external stakeholders including: transport operators, District and Parish Councils, Neighbouring authorities, Consultants, Environmental bodies, Transport bodies, Interest groups, Minority groups and the general public.

2.4 The initial phase of the stakeholder consultation commenced in July 2014 with an Information Sharing Event designed to inform stakeholders of the review process and capture headline issues on expectations for the LTP, alongside any specific schemes or issues stakeholders wanted to be considered.

2.5 Outputs from this event were summarised in a report which is available to download from the Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) website –

http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=61762&p=0

2.6 To supplement the views captured through the Information Sharing Event a series of officer working groups were held with internal stakeholders. Members of the Transport Planning team also meet colleagues from neighbouring local authorities to discuss any cross-boundary issues where a joint approach is required to manage existing and future transport demand.
2.7 The second phase of the stakeholder engagement commenced during October and November 2014. This included a series of local workshops with were directed towards transport professionals and local representatives with a specific interest in transport. The workshops were highly interactive and designed to encourage participation from those in attendance. They were attended predominantly by county, district, town and parish councillors, community stakeholders and representatives of transport providers and interest groups.

2.8 Once in attendance stakeholders were invited to form small working groups where local transport issues were introduced and a range of solutions could be discussed. Importantly, nothing was considered a ‘silly idea’ and all views were captured.

2.9 Outputs from the workshops were summarised in a report which is available to download from the GCC website –

http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=62562&p=0

2.10 Having reviewed the available evidence and considered the outputs from the previous phases of the consultation process an LTP Consultation Document was produced. A six week public consultation took place during February and March 2015.

2.11 A copy of the questionnaire used during this stage of the consultation process is provided in Appendix A.

2.12 Anyone could register their views and interests either via the County Council’s consultation portal; or by downloading the documents and questionnaire from the County Council’s website; or through accessing paper copies from libraries and council buildings throughout Gloucestershire.

2.13 Unfortunately some respondents found the on-line questionnaire unwieldy to access and respond to. Many therefore did not use the questionnaire as it was intended and instead expressed opinion, or else supplied a lot of related information and advice. This has resulted in a wide ranging and information rich repository of information which will be used to inform the LTP Review as it moves towards formal adoption.
3.0 **Summary of representations received**

3.1 Representations were received from 86 individuals or organisations. Unfortunately not all representations were attributable due to an issue with the online questionnaire portal. Where representations could be attributed to individuals or organisations the names have been listed in Appendix B.

3.2 Despite the breadth of information a number of strong themes have emerged which consistently endorse key views about transport and place in Gloucestershire. The rich seam of response is helping to ensure that the LTP is a robust and composite document that reflects the diversity of transport issues and needs within the County.

3.3 The broad messages from the public consultation include issues around:

- The importance of understanding the needs of all transport users;
- The diversity of transport challenge and opportunity across the county;
- The role of transport as an enabler for economic growth whilst managing congestion and journey time reliability.
- The need to seek mitigation measures to maintain a functioning transport network which offset the projected increase in transport demand derived from planned development.
- The priority for delivering a safe and sustainable transport system, integrating all modes, within the financial limits that exist.

3.4 The LTP public consultation process has sought to understand the level of support for the proposed changes relating to:

- The Link and Place hierarchy;
- The advisory Freight Map;
- Updated LTP policies;
- The prioritisation of transport initiatives in the context of the new Connecting Places Strategies (CPS) and;
- The removal of historic transport schemes from the highways register.

**The Link and Place Hierarchy**

3.5 Respondents were generally supportive of the proposed **Link and Place Hierarchy**, but concerns were raised about the classification of certain routes and the over-simplification of a complicated issue. This was particularly acute in relation to the classification of the A419 through Thrupp and Brimscombe as a ‘red’ transport link which denotes ‘Places for Traffic’, and the classification of whole towns as ‘green’ places for people, when towns also have to accommodate significant volumes of traffic movement.
3.6 Others note that a ‘green’ network may need to depict pedestrian and cycle routes as clearly as the roads for all traffic are shown (an interesting idea which may be useful at a more detailed level). There is a view that language is important in conveying the ideas of ‘Place’ and the role of streets in terms of both traffic movement and other activities which support community and safeguard quality of life.

**The Advisory Freight Map**

3.7 The *Advisory Freight Map* provoked a significant level of response. Some communities felt adversely affected where freight routes pass through their villages and towns. This is most keenly felt in the North Cotswolds (Moreton-on-Marsh and Stow-on-the-Wold), South Cotswolds (Lechlade-on-Thames), Stroud (A419 corridor) and Forest of Dean (Gorsley and Dymock) CPS areas. Each one of the affected settlements possesses a different set of characteristics and opportunities in terms of managing road freight.

3.8 There was recognition that the Highways England proposals to address the ‘Missing Link’ on the A417 will allow different freight transport patterns to arise which may offer benefits to some communities.

**Updated LTP policies;**

3.9 The eight new *LTP policies* and their intended aims received widespread support, but a number of comments were received centring on the need to streamline the text to make policy meaning more explicit, link the policies to targets and remove any contradiction with the LTP objectives.

3.10 There is a view that rail has under-utilised potential in Gloucestershire and that it should form a much more prominent role in the LTP for people and freight. There are concerns that the county is missing out on investment with fears that Gloucestershire may become a place that is travelled through by train and but not a rail destination in itself.

3.11 Requests were made to seek service improvements on the Bristol to Birmingham line given the planned capacity improvements currently being undertaken within the West of England (Filton four-tracking, rail electrification, rolling stock enhancements, MetroWest Phases One and Two, Bristol Parkway fourth platform).

3.12 Rail access is specific and restricted in the Forest of Dean CPS. Issues of social exclusion are frequently cited. Despite the fact that the Forest of Dean CPS is served by a rail station at Lydney there is a view that this is inconveniently located to a lot of Forest residents and the services, connections and station facilities are inadequate.
Requests were also made for consideration of Lydney station becoming a freight interchange with an expanded passenger role for the Dean Forest Railway.

3.13 There were calls for a significant investment in **bus** services and facilities to boost patronage. There was support for bus priority measures not just to improve bus journey time reliability, but also the wider productivity of the highway and by enabling the bus to be more competitive than the car.

3.14 Technology was also identified as a means to encourage bus use including the introduction of multi-operator SMART ticketing linked to Real Time Passenger Information.

3.15 Many comments were received regarding the value of bus services which cannot provide regular or round the clock services; and level of bus service subsidies provided which will be subjected to further funding constraints during the lifetime of the LTP.

3.16 There is significant support for **active travel** and particularly cycling, but respondents are very concerned about the lack of network coherence and about having to share road space with fast or heavy traffic.

3.16 The condition of pavements was also a key concern. There are also factors around people’s sense of personal safety and perceptions of distance and risk which affect the extent to which they can rely on walking as a mode. Poorly maintained pavements discourage the elderly from walking, which in turn can lead to exclusion.

3.17 A resounding perception is that walking and cycling should not be conflated as active travel, just because they are both active and healthy modes. There are significant differences in the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and ‘active travel’ can lead to a disposition towards shared use provision which might not always be beneficial to the end users.

3.18 A key theme of the representations received has been centred around the need for **integration**: integration between modes; between transport providers; policy makers and funders helping to underpin seamless multi-modal door-to-door trips.

**The prioritisation of transport initiatives**

3.19 The consultation document identifies packages of initiatives for each CPS area in a way that reflects the transport profile and needs within that area.

3.20 Respondents support the logic of this. However, many living in more rural parts of the County, such as the North Cotswolds CPS, as well as more isolated populations living in the dispersed geographical parts of the CSV CPS, are concerned that it is unrealistic to envisage a time between now and 2031 when measures to facilitate
mode shift could be realistically applied. To this is added the concern that rural areas are characterised by longer distances to destinations, with poor pedestrian and cycle facilities and fast roads.

3.21 These observations highlight the need for local area-addressed solutions to meeting transport need. It is a given that isolated communities are more car dependent, but there is a wide range of approaches to addressing people’s service and transport needs which may be locally appropriate.

3.22 In the more urban CPS areas of CSV, Stroud and Tewkesbury there is a groundswell of support for the CPS approach to enabling mode shift and transport integration. Within these locations there are much greater opportunities for transport integration and mode shift for greater numbers of trips. However, there is a real concern that projected levels of development, and the associated traffic and congestion growth, mean the need for higher mode shift is paramount and must be addressed unreservedly and effectively.

3.23 Stakeholders representing all of the seven CPS areas support a concerted and targeted effort to improve levels of access to public transport and active travel; they want the rail and bus networks to be optimised and cycle routes to be genuinely prioritised. However, there is a prevailing sense that time may run out and Gloucestershire could be disadvantaged economically; through unsustainable traffic congestion, under-utilised rail capacity; and inadequate bus services if LTP transport initiatives and policies are not delivered.

**The removal of historic transport schemes from the highways register**

3.24 There are three key concerns expressed by stakeholders in response to this:

- Cheltenham Northern Relief Road 1B2 & 4D (not being progressed) – is perceived to be vital to reducing severe traffic impacts through Princess Elizabeth Way and particularly in the light of the proposed JCS development allocations;

- Quality Bus Corridors (not being progressed) are necessary for the implantation of an LTP Strategy which supports public transport;

- The A429 [Fosse Way] (on hold) – fails to appreciate the nature of the problem which is articulated in depth in the response report
4.0 Consultation response tables

4.1 A Consultation response table summarises the key themes provided through the public consultation process and will help indicate where amendments can be made to address stakeholders’ concerns, advice and requests.

4.2 Due to the way in which representations were received it has not been possible to retro-fit the responses to the original questions posed.

4.2 A copy of the un-processed consultation report is available upon request.

4.3 Do you agree with the proposed Link and Place Hierarchy for 2031?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of comments received:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ideas around place making are supported, but the effects of traffic displacement from these places will occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a concern because the LTP appears to suggest the occurrence of future congestion even if all policies are successfully delivered, this combined with the proposed scale of new development will increases journey times, pollution, rat running, community degradation, reduced safety for pedestrians and cyclists. This will result in a vicious circle instead of virtuous circle if people then take to cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A46 through Rodborough and Nailsworth should be amber not red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A419 through Brimscombe and Thrupp and London Road into Stroud should be amber and green in parts. These are all residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding changing Dudbridge Road from red to amber, while maintaining Bath Road as a red, will funnel heavy traffic into narrow streets of residential area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rodborough to Minchinhampton road across the common should be green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The B4066 and Alkington Lane linking Sharpness to the A38 are the main lorry routes and incompatible with ‘Places for People and Traffic’. Alkington Lane is being destroyed by HGVs. (Repeated concern).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The maps provided do not show any ‘places for people’. Where is the green network? Even existing network isn’t shown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would welcome sea-change in an approach toward ‘places for people’ not places for traffic’. Language is important – ‘streets’ not ‘highways’ and ‘squares’ not ‘roundabouts’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To address these concerns an officer working group has been established to revaluate the scale of road classifications used providing a revised spectrum. It was agreed that the Link and Place will be a spate process and will not inform with the County Council’s Manual for Gloucestershire Streets hierarchy or Transport Assets Management Plan (TAMP). The spectrum will be a tool to assist community liaison in relation to the development of neighbourhood plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Link and Place hierarchy will sit within the LTP’s Highways Strategy with cross references to the LTP monitoring programme in relation to journey time reliability on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The Link and Place hierarchy will also be used inform other policy decisions including the advisory freight route map.

4.4 Do you agree with the proposed Advisory Freight Route Map?

Summary of comments received:

General Comments

• Advisory Freight Route Map (AFRM) should be mandatory not advisory under normal traffic conditions.
• Improve community consultation regarding Freight route designations
• There is a conflict between economic objectives (traffic) and the other objectives
• How enforceable is freight strategy? Will weight limits be enforced?
• Pleased to see ‘LorryWatch’ on the agenda
• As the AFRM actually directs freight traffic onto the Strategic Road Network what appraisal has there been of the impacts on key junctions of freight?

Routing issues

Central Severn Vale

• Inconsistency in the proposals for Cheltenham. There are four freight routes into Cheltenham including the proposed use of Princess Elizabeth Way, but the initiative to widen/ raise the railway bridge from Tewkesbury Rd to Poole Way is now dropped and an undefined bus gateway scheme into Lower High Street is being promoted. If the existing Freight Route through Boots Corner is to be lost the other routes will take more freight yet the widening of St James Street is to be dropped. Need for consistent thinking.
• Proposed 10 month trial at Boots Corner should allow sufficient time to consult with hauliers on viable options.
• East-west freight movements in Cheltenham should be directed along Swindon Lane and this should be improved. If not then revisit the Brewery Traffic Lights trial to reduce emissions from stop start traffic.
• Remove route to the Air Balloon from Cheltenham via Leckhampton. Alternatives exist via Brockworth or Severn Springs.
• The AFP suggests route will run along the A38 (Cole Avenue) over St Barnabus Roundabout onto A38 Eastern Avenue. This road is already operating beyond capacity and significant roundabout improvements would be needed before advocating as freight route.

Forest of Dean

• B4221 from Newent to Gorsley – under current AFM this is shown as for local freight only. On proposed AFM just shown as freight route. Links to M50 do not justify this as the junction is sub standard. Previous LTP figures showed 100 – 200 LGVs use the B4221
each day. The B4221 should be afforded the same treatment as the B4215 if LTP aims are to be met. The proposed AFM includes the B4222 from Kilcot to the county boundary. This is so inappropriate that where it enters Herefordshire signs have been erected warning of unsuitability for HGVs. Requests are being made to Herefordshire Council to introduce 7.5T weight limit. The proposed AFM shows no comprehension of local conditions.

- Improve Gateway Access to M50 from the B4221 on both sides.
- The AFP opens up routes that were previously local freight only.
- Improve the A40 west of Huntley instead of putting HGVs onto a B road?

**North Cotswolds**

- Vale of Evesham freight routing. Remove diversionary routing from Oxfordshire to Vale of Evesham and beyond routing via A40/A429 and restore old route A44 north to join at Troopers Lodge. Make appropriate highway modifications on this route to achieve this’
- East-west movement in the North Cotswolds from Oxfordshire to Worcestershire (Vale of Evesham) is distorted y failure to tackle pinchpoints on the A44 and the unnecessary diversion of lorry traffic via A40 & A429
- Oxfordshire CC want to divert HGVs away from Chipping Norton. Therefore disagree with A44 being shown as an advisory freight route between Moreton in Marsh and Oxford.
- Warwickshire CC want to see HGVs discouraged from passing through Warwickshire to access the M40 on the B4632. Instead use A429 of A46 corridors. Welcome discussion to secure this
- North-south movement on the A429 in the North Cotswolds suffers from congestion, especially during peak tourist periods, and delays due to pinchpoints at Stow on the Wold (where there is no redundancy capacity by alternative routes) and Moreton in Marsh, threatening the local tourist industry
- The A429 through Moreton in March is not fit to be a designated freight route. There is not satisfactory north-south alternative. Similar traffic on the A44 needs diverting away from Moreton in Marsh/ Fish Hill and Bourton on the Hill. Lorries and ‘space for people’ do not mix. East-west flows should freight should be redirected onto the A40. The railway bridge at Moreton in marsh should be shown as a severe constraint
- Remove HGV diversion down the A40 to reduce delays to buses and coaches on this corridor. SWOT analysis shows A40 gets heavily congested. May need to improve this route before agreeing it is the freight route.
- A40 to Northleach to A429 (Fosse Way) to Stow-on-the-Wold is agreed route instead of A44
- Once the Birdlip link is completed on the A417 freight should not be encouraged to use the A419 between Stroud and Cirencester.

**South Cotswolds**

- Seems untenable that a freight route is planned to go straight through Fairford – a designated ‘traffic and people place’. Redirect away from Fairford along the A419 and eastern spine road.
- Historically quarrying indicated this as a freight route. Quarrying is declining here now and can look to revising.
As an absolute minimum put weight restrictions in.

Stroud
- If the A417 pinchpoint is to be removed at the Air Balloon, why is the A419 (Cirencester to Stonehouse) still justified as a freight route. It is not dualed with several pinchpoints between Ashton Down and Stroud.
- The A46 from Kites Nest Inn to Wallbridge should not be a freight route; the road is too narrow and residential.
- There should be a spur off the A419 at the Aston Down roundabout to allow freight to enter and leave the Aston Down Site. At present freight is entitled to cross the environmentally sensitive NT Commons. The spur should be a dead end compelling Lorries to go and return via the A419.

Rail Freight
- Why are there no proposals to safeguard sites for rail freight depots. Serious omission at odds with NPPF paras 31 and 41
- Freight Strategy does not promote rail and the rail network is not even shown on the map. Into the future this is a big omission. (This is a repeated concern)
- E.g rail freight depot potential at Ashchurch, Lydney, Sharpness Docks, Quedgeley Dowmac Site, Gloucester Horton Road sidings, Gloucester Avoiding Line sidings on the eastern face of the triangle.

Facilities
- Need lorry layover at Barnwood. Elmbridge P&R could potentially include this.

Specific
- There will be more HGV traffic generated in re. to Javelin Park incinerator.
- Potential for ports and canals. This benefit is underestimated when consider congestion on A419.
- What about port & canal for bulk and fragile goods?
- Will be important to liaise with manufacturers of satnavs etc. and to provide advance communication to HGVs in order for the driver to make decisions.
- Freight map should show topography and congestion hotspots and pinchpoints. Plus information (on the ground- signage) to advise HGVs when they leave freight routes to penetrate into area of destination.

Response:
- The Advisory Route Map will be reconsidered in light of the representations provided.
- This will include the distinction between local and through routes, the update to the Link and Place map will inform this process.
- A separate Freight Strategy will be produced outlining more detailed proposals for managing freight travel within Gloucestershire.
- GCC has committed itself to working with Pie Mapping to develop a Freight Gateway platform to improve haulier awareness and encourage compliance with the advisory route information.
- Enforcement remains and issue, but the Lorry Watch component of the Freight Gateway platform could be used to provide the evidence to aid enforcement by the police.
4.5 Do you support the proposed LTP Policies?

Summary of comments received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTPP1 Network Management – Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lacks ambition. Meeting statutory duties is a default position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applaud but how to achieve greater engagement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fully support expeditious movement of traffic, but no reference has been made to sustainability in this context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Only covers the statutory duties of the county council, is this not lacking ambition and contradict the objectives of LTP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As noted by the Cheltenham Borough Council Walking and Cycling Scrutiny Task Group, health is a key output of transport interventions and policies; this is missing from this list of partners the county council will work with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too much emphasis on traffic movement and not enough on slower vehicle speeds which allow the safe movement of all highway users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs to address the use of materials in creating road surfaces that do not disintegrate quickly and create potholes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LTPP 1-2 (and appendix D) should ref to Local Plans and Neighbourhood Development Plans/ Village Design Guidance (SPA) and their on-street vehicle parking approaches as they have local standards – see Stroud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LTP 1.1 ‘Development will be resisted where mitigation cannot be demonstrated to meet other policies such as LTP Policy’ 1.1 i.e. where it will not deliver the ‘safe and expeditious’ movement of traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Essential to protect local residents where they only have on-street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Transport Asset Management Plan’ should include other hard and soft assets in addition to highways, such as parking, park &amp; ride/ cycle &amp; ride facilities , bus stops network – fleet/ rolling stock management – coverage and connections management. Suggest renaming to ‘integrated transport asset management plan’ to put emphasis on the willingness to act on the overall system, not in silos. This level of integration could lead to e.g. a joint management of parking fares and bus fares could be used to balance parking demand in favour of buses instead of cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1.3.2 Again default. Doesn’t need to be stated in policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy 1.4 Include a commitment to work with specialist bodies such as the Environment Agency and Highways England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of comments received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTPP2 Network Management - Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• When compared to the duties of Highways England there is a policy gap in terms of the need to ensure efficiency and value for money: Relates to the prioritisation of network capacity investment. This should be linked to the advisory freight map with the highest priority possible being given to a congested advisory freight route for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should commit to investment in strategic sustainable links to drive a modal shift in urban and inter-urban areas. The policy is heavily focused on vehicular transport not sustainable modes such as walking and cycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Tighten up. Explain how aspirations are to be met. Add targets etc.
• Prioritise active modes not speedier roads
• Policy is supported, but the onus is on the county council to speed up negotiations on S106 with applicants. Evidence indicates delay on county council negotiations.
• Should show understanding of the role of new and emerging technologies. They are likely to be in place by 2031.
• 2.2.4/5 Rail needs to make reference to improving stations as the gateways to the service and first impression to visitors
• 2.3 target timescale would help developers
• 2.3.1 refers to contributions. It states ‘To seek contributions from developers towards priorities and schemes contained within the Local Transport Plan where such obligations would satisfy the requirements of the existing Section 106 or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations (or any subsequent legislation)’. The wording ‘existing Section 106 or’ is superfluous; in fact there are no Section 106 regulations. We consider the existing words of P6e from LTP3 more appropriate and should be retained.
• 2.3.2 refers to ‘major developments’; it would be helpful to define what constitutes major development. Contributions can be pooled from 6 April 2015 – the maximum number of developments that can contribute to a scheme is five. This will limit the scope for negotiation
• 2.3.3 refers to ‘legal agreements’. The proposal is split into three paragraphs. The first paragraph us similar to P6g of LTP3; however we had reservations over the proposal under P6g to re-prioritise schemes and flexibility over the way contributions are used. This will not meet CIL regulations particularly after 6 April 2015.
• Welcome 2.3.3 ref to flexibility to prevent development being stalled. But ensure CIL Regs are adhered to. Object to 2nd and 3rd paragraphs. 2nd para is based on 2nd part of P6g. Object to inclusion of review clause. 3rd para refs to other funding sources. Development should only have to fund improvements to mitigate its impact and should not be required to fund existing deficiencies which are already identified and programmed for improvement. Concern is resources will be diverted to other schemes leaving the developer with larger contributions. Particularly relevant in view of the way funds for the period to 2012 are being allocated via the Single Local Growth Fund via the LEP. Re-write 2.3 to take into account requirements of CIL regs and arrangements for funding under SLGF.
• 2.5.3 Ensure innovative design does not ‘design out’ bus access. Add Stagecoach ‘Design Guidance’ to appendix
• 2.5.8 could be wrapped up in Policy 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of comments received:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTPP3 – Enabling New Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When compared to the duties of Highways England there is a policy gap in terms of the need to ensure efficiency and value for money:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relates to enabling new development. Although the JCS is well advanced there needs to be a policy of working with local planning authorities to influence the location, type and mix of future development such that development itself contributes towards the overall objectives of the LTP, in terms of reducing car dependence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New development must enable mode shift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Reflects Gloucester Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy, in particular policies INF1 and INF2.
• Should be drafted more positively, ‘GCC encourages innovative and attractive development’. The delivery of attractive development should be the default position.
• Travel choices will only be realistic if there is seamless transfer from one mode to another.
• Journey choices should include rail and the integration of rail and road
• Do the parking Boards exist? How are they going to be resourced?
• 3.1 Why are rail/ bus stations omitted? All highways should have priority bus lanes to ensure public transport is fast and efficient.
• 3.1 Needs a more positive approach and a light touch in re. to small scale development, for e.g. the standing advice to local authorities where 5 or less dwellings are served, the guidance on MfGS etc.
• 3.1 Wording is weak. Developers should more than ‘consider’. JCS policy INF2 requires that developers ‘assess the impact’. Amend to reflect JCS
• 3.1 needs to be re-written to take account of the representations made to better focus on the subject matter.
• 3.1.5 refs to ‘schemes on the local highway network’. Developer schemes are addressed under proposal 1.1.3 so Proposal 3.1.5 is superfluous.
• 3.1.6 refers to ‘sustainable modes of transport’. It requires that large-scale new development sites are located in areas where sustainable modes of transport are available. Recommend amend to read ‘….where sustainable modes of transport are or can be made available’.
• 3.3 – Promotion of Travel Choice in New Development – should require engagement between LPAs, developers and local public transport operators to ensure all new development is integrated into the existing public transport network
• 3.3.4 walkers and cyclists should have at least as much priority as motorised transport in delivery of new developments

Summary of comments received:

**LTTP4 – Network Connectivity**

• Woolly. Indicate resources required for a secure connective network.
• How can success be measured?
• The inclusion of rail is not explicit, policy reads as a reference to roads. Investment is needed to bring about station improvements.
• Too much emphasis on minimal congestion and competitive journey time
• Support inclusion of park and ride; however the likelihood of delivery without intervention by the county council is minimal.
• 4.1.1 add ‘provided this does not impact adversely on pedestrians and cyclists’
• 4.1.1 Too sweeping. Add ‘provided this does not impact adversely on pedestrians and cyclists
• 4.1.3 and station improvements which improve attractiveness of rail
• 4.1.3 support lobbying Network Rail for electrification of the Birmingham to Bristol route during control period 6 and improve services to Gloucester from the south-west
• 4.1.5 Implies cycling should be confined to a network rather than making roads (where
cyclists are legitimate users) safer. And refer to links between cycling and public transport

- 4.1.5 cycling should not be confined to a specific network AND refer to need to integrate cycling and pt
- 4.1.8 Extend to support the designation of Quiet Lanes where recreational use of minor roads is high
- 4.1.8 What are ‘quiet highway connections?’ and ‘prevent the exacerbation of community severance’? Plain English
- Enabling Travel Choice section refs to ‘key settlements’ and ‘minimum service frequencies’. What are they?
- 4.2.1 and 4.2.8 virtually identical so one is superfluous. Delete.
- 4.2.5 add ‘linked to centres of population’
- 4.2.6 add ‘linked to centres on population’
- 4.2.8 add ‘especially by active and public transport’ (it stands this is the same as 4.2.1)
- 4.3 Needs to include rural areas where travel distances are greater and taxi fares unaffordable.
- Policy 4.3 Include rural areas where travel distances are much greater
- 4.4.3 Flies in face of sustainable transport!
- 5.2 Condition/ absence of rural pavements discourages pedestrians and combined with fast/ heavy traffic. Road conditions deter cycling.
- 5.2.3 delete ‘where possible’. A non-continuous network is useless
- 5.3 Increasing levels of Physical Activity; Should read ‘GCC will actively work’ and cross ref to public health benefits. Don’t confine to ‘short distance trips’.
- 5.3.2 delete ‘where possible’ a non-continuous network is useless

Summary of comments received:

LTPP5 – Improving Health and Wellbeing

- Too much emphasis on minimal congestion and competitive journey time
- Encouraging active travel and use of sustainable modes requires the creation of high quality and attractive public realm, both links and places. This needs to be recognised in these policies and throughout the document.
- Do not conflate walking and cycling into ‘active travel. They are both healthy modes but they need different provision
- Waffle. Focus on healthier travel
- Add supportive text to explain how aspirations will be achieved and specifically indicate what resources are required to maintain ‘Health & Wellbeing’ etc.
- 5.1 safety would improve if speed limits were enforced – police don’t.
- 5.2 Condition/ absence of rural pavements discourages pedestrians and combined with fast/ heavy traffic. Road conditions deter cycling.
- 5.2.3 delete ‘where possible’. A non-continuous network is useless
- 5.3.2 insert ‘convenient’ after attractive
- 5.3 Increasing levels of Physical Activity; Should read ‘GCC will actively work’ and cross ref to public health benefits. Don’t confine to ‘short distance trips’.
- 5.3 Strong support for pedestrian environments – not just town centres – but all residential areas and routes to school
- 5.3.2 delete ‘where possible’ a non-continuous network is useless
Summary of comments received:

LTPP6 – Carbon reduction and the Environment

- Needs more targets and detail
- The creation of high quality streets and spaces and proper management of green infrastructure (including highway trees) is an important element managing air quality and noise pollution.
- Relates to carbon reduction and the environment. However, the sub policies only relate to Noise and Air Quality. Need to expand the policy coverage so that other aspects of minimising environmental impact are also included
- 6.1 Invest in updating street lighting to make a significant contribution to reduction in energy use and meet carbon targets. Add commitment to reduce road noise.
- 6.1 Road construction and design should be covered in policy.
- 6.1 Air Quality and Noise Pollution: too weak. Ref to need to reduce particulate emissions as a priority in urban areas. Link to positive links with sustainable modes of transport.

Summary of comments received:

LTPP7 – Enabling Travel Choice

- Worthless. Most people use googlemaps/ smart information/ navigational tools
- To effect change across all age groups the focus must be on seamless transfer between modes and ease of payment where relevant.
- 7.2 should also include rail-based public transport. People with cars use trains more than buses because of higher speeds and better ambience.
- 7.2 specify ‘minimum service levels for the rural bus network
- 7.2 Re-word to say ‘a road – and rail – based public transport system with improved integration and more parking spaces at stations’
- 7.4 Legislation should subsidise the young – it is they who are forming lifetime travel habits
- Digital technology to assist travellers must not exclude those without internet access and gadgets. No premium rate phone lines
- 7.5 School Transport: Should commit to creating safer routes for schools

Summary of comments received:

LTPP8 – Travel Information

- 8.1.1 / 8.1.1 (7.3). Simplify bus information especially for first time users – maps, explanations

General comments received:

- Policies should be more radical. Need SMART objectives not wooliness. Glos will be a forgotten county if doesn’t get rail hubs for example. Needs more direction and dynamism.
- Tighten up text. Lots of superfluos words like ‘adequate’:
- LTP fails to address impact of technological change:
- The policies associated with objective (table 3) should align with Policy LTPP3
- People need education on how to use Thinktravel websites etc and GCC should lead the way and set the example
- Must support uneconomic but socially necessary bus services
- Smart ticketing should be a condition of the public transport tendering and subsidy process
- This strategy needs to more strongly emphasise the importance of integrated transport and seamless travel. An Oyster Card approach
- Look at Oxford ‘Places for People’ and emphasis on P&R etc. Needs to get more direction and impetus
- Needs more vision. It won’t be easy getting people out of cars. Need a lot more sticks to make driving more expensive.
- Need for more emphasis on rail (repeated).
- Need real investment in mode shift e.g. free buses for workers, P&R linking smaller settlements, huge shift in culture and investment
- Cycling – encouraging this needs better road maintenance:
- Do not conflate walking and cycling as modes; they are both active travel modes but dissimilar in terms of their infrastructure and other requirements;
- Needs to show higher levels of integration even if GCC does not manage rail and bus provision
- Introduce 20mph in all residential areas – should be the default urban speed
- Develop a comprehensive network of cycle routes
- Create pedestrian friendly environments and routes in all urban areas
- Reduce accidents on non-urban routes
- Managing highways responsibly and safely does not feature strongly
- The need to drive mode shift in order for the LTP objectives to be realised is not coming through strongly enough. It is unequivocal.
- Cycle route improvements vital and note potential for proposed highway and junction improvements to adversely affect cyclists.
- Major issue is access to Cheltenham Spa Rail Station. Only station of size on Bristol-Birmingham route but suffers from location and very poor integration with other public transport facilities. Needs major re-think. Gloucestershire needs to be open to business and may need a new station on this line. CSV focuses on measures to manage traffic problems – needs proactive, long-term economic strategy which embraces rail.
- Need radical plan to reduce car usage in CSV and there is no plan to cause radical mode shift.
- Money is preventing more than tinkering and what will the ‘junction capacity improvements along the corridor’ amount to?
- Generally the large amount of money that will be spent will be on raising highway capacity nor easing congestion or damping demand. Sticking plaster approach.

Summary of comments received:
- The representations received are noted and policies will be updated accordingly where they are consistent with wider LTP objectives and other local and national policy guidance.
When finalised supporting text shall be included to justify the policy and explain the expected outcomes of the Policies.

Targets shall also be introduced to quantify the expected outcomes of the policy.

### 4.6 Are there any policy areas missing?

**Summary of comments received:**

- New Policy - Biodiversity – road verges have amenity and wildlife function. Highways England commits to enhancing and restoring its grassland area. Need similar policy for local roads network
- Add New Policy: Conserving and enhancing the landscape

**Summary of comments received:**

- Noted

### 4.7 Do you support the Central Severn Vale Connecting Places Strategy?

**Summary of comments received:**

**Highway**

- Will need new ring roads around Cheltenham and alleviate Tewkesbury Rd/ Kingsditch congestion
- Hoping that Cheltenham measures will increase permeability but some concern at this isn’t well enough understood. Increase permeability, quiet routes (laterally and longitudinally) and the improvement and extension of the Honeybourne Line through Cheltenham to Bishops Cleeve
- Support for M5 Junction 10 4-way junction improvements
- The A4019 initiatives include the construction of south facing slip sat M5 junction 10. JCS work has not identified a need for this scheme – nor has it considered the associated schemes that would be needed to accommodate the change in travel patterns that such a scheme would induce. The available evidence base does not therefore support the inclusion of the J10 scheme. The traffic management measures listed in relation to Churchdown and north Churchdown are presumably those tested in the JCS modelling work. The modelling work is incomplete and the case for the inclusion of such measures is yet to be made.
- Cheltenham congested at pinchpoint at northern relief road at Fairview rd and Sherbourne Street where the principal east/ west axis narrows to single lane.
- It is not possible to comment on the LTP before the proposed Cheltenham (Boots Corner etc.) proposals result in. Traffic modelling shows congestion will increase if full mitigation measures are applied. This is likely to be compounded in Cheltenham where highway capacity is being reduced at the same time as JCS development is coming forward.
- Note strategic role of A46 in linking the M69 near Coventry and the M5 at Ashchurch. The business case for improvements will rely on shared cross boundary vision. Multi-Agency Group to be established.
**Bus**
- Buses represent the most efficient possible use of road space and link and junction capacity.
- Need for INTEGRATION between modes/ hubs'/ information:
- The draft LTP should make a much clearer commitment to making the level of mode shift required a clear and transparent target. Without a target the plan lacks clarity and purpose and cannot provide a rigorous basis for both strategy and scheme formulation within the crucial CSV area. Vital in context of LTP and JCS time horizon of 2013:
- Winchcombe marooned. Smaller towns feel they get the brunt of traffic problems without the public transport opportunities to offset.

**Rail**
- Poor rail services to Worcester and Lydney as well as South from Gloucester and Cheltenham to Yate, Bristol Parkway (especially from Gloucester) and Filton Abbeywood
- Review the rail corridor between the Central Severn Vale, South Gloucestershire and Bristol given the capacity improvements currently being undertaken within the West of England (Filton four-tracking, rail electrification, rolling stock enhancements, MetroWest Phases One and Two, Bristol Parkway fourth platform).
- The review should embrace the potential for new stations at Charfield (identified within the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy adopted in 2013), Stonehouse (Bristol Road), and Hunts Grove, and in the context of potential rail service improvements including reduced journey times.
- Hunts Grove may curb car dependency at Quedgeley.

**Active Travel**
- Would welcome cycle route at Bishops Cleeve where there are high levels of employers and school travel
- Mode shift should be the main focus of transport strategy in CSV – IMPERATIVE
- Cycle lanes are not well used enough to justify their expense and Honeybourne Line cycle route is sterilising future rail opportunity.

**ThinkTravel**
- Cheltenham & Gloucester has large student populations with high car ownership and poorly located halls of residence. They are deterred from buses due to journey times. Need school, college and university travel plans
- Support for ‘park and change’

**Future growth**
- JCS – LTP is not specifically addressing the allocated housing sites transport issues. Three sentences on p.33 do not constitute a plan. Serious omission:
- It is noted that traffic as a result of the JCS will be ‘significant’. This is despite high levels of transport containment and an increased sustainable mode share assumption. It is not clear if the impacts of the JCS are mitigated. The process embarked on by the JCS team has concluded with a transport strategy which constitutes a very significant package of transport improvements and includes a number of potentially high cost items. The Highways Agency does not accept that the model accurately reflects the pattern of
traffic movement throughout the modelled area and therefore the scale of improvement at each location cannot yet be established to a satisfactory degree. It is therefore premature to consider if the CSV CPS meets the LTP objectives as the JCS strategy is yet to be determined.

- Ensure existing and new development is close to service provision so people can walk and cycle. Safeguard highstreets and retain employment sites.
- The highway is already at capacity. A radical approach is needed to offset current conditions and predicted demand. Don’t tinker – don’t focus only on increasing highway capacity. Get integrated transport – rail – P&R – the need is very great if economic, environmental and health objectives don’t start failing.

Flood resilience
- How will Objective 3 be met in CSV? More explicit policy response needed:

Specific Comments
- p. 29 final para states ‘In Gloucester continued regeneration projects are likely to present opportunities and limitations for the transport system’. What is the context of ‘limitations?’ Is regeneration limited by the transport system – if so shouldn’t this be addressed by LTP?
- p. 31 – 36 Explicitly set out that the scheme lists included in the CPS strategies for the CSV and Tewkesbury have been informed by the mitigation measures developed through the JCS transport modelling.
- p.31 GCC could also have a potential role to play as a delivery mechanism for behavioural schemes.

Summary of comments received:
- The representations received are noted and strategy will be updated accordingly where it is consistent with wider LTP objectives and other local and national policy guidance.

4.8 Do you support the Forest of Dean Connecting Places Strategy?

Summary of comments received:

Highway
- The A40 pinchpoint across the River Severn at Highnam and Over is cited repeatedly as a constraint which can contribute significantly to journey delay and reliability.
- In addition there are issues of freight transport through the Forest of Dean which is sandwiched between Central England, Wales, the M5 and the M50 motorways. Some of these routes are considered to be unsuitable – especially in the north forest, and there is a view that the A40 needs improvements to enable freight to default to it.
- Road safety on the A48 is a recurring concern and hard and soft measures to address this are seen as priorities.
- A40/Over roundabout causes severe congestion at peak flow – compounded by flooding on A417 Gloucester – Maisemore
- JCS modelled A40 roundabout and did not identify the need for a scheme at Over of the scale included in the Forest CPS. This part of Forest CPS can only be considered in
relation to JCS.

- Need third Severn Crossing for economy

**Bus**

- Maintaining good public transport access is a concern (ongoing bus review)
- Improvements to Lydney (existing air quality issues in Lydney – focus of residential growth)
- Severe problems of isolation and inadequate buses
- Bus services/ routes non-existent for trips such as Staunton (& Corse) - Ledbury
- Bus routes unacceptably bad - A417 example
- Mode integration – P&R at Maisemore to link through to Cheltenham

**Rail**

- Despite the fact that the Forest of Dean CPS is served by a rail station at Lydney there is a view that this is inconveniently located to a lot of Forest residents and the services, connections and station facilities are inadequate.
- Demand for travel from the Forest of Dean CPS into the West of England justifies planned investment in rail services under the recently extended Great Western franchise; this will see improved rolling stock introduced on the rail services connecting Cardiff and Bristol. Serving stations within South Gloucestershire as well as Severn Tunnel Junction, this can act as a P&R for people commuting from the Forest of Dean into South Gloucestershire and Bristol:
- Lydney Station should be considered for freight interface and Dean Forest Railway should be considered for public service potential.
- Cycles on trains/ buses to encourage mode shift in an area where distance, road conditions and topography should support this

**Active Travel**

- In terms of delivering the LTP CPS Strategy in the Forest of Dean it is noted that opportunities for walking and cycling are curtailed by topography, distance and road (without footway) conditions. Rail access is specific and restricted and bus services are poor or non-existent for many residents. Issues of social exclusion are frequently cited.
- Main roads have no footways

**Thinktravel**

- Potential for mode shift constrained but e.g. car share and more competitive bus and rail should be heavily promoted

**Summary of comments received:**

- The representations received are noted and strategy will be updated accordingly where it is consistent with wider LTP objectives and other local and national policy guidance.
4.9 Do you support the North Cotswold Connecting Places Strategy?

Summary of comments received:

**Highways**
- There are road capacity issues at certain times of the day and freight is repeatedly cited as an issue. Tourism is extremely important and traffic and parking management should not deter tourism or make visiting the area difficult.
- A429 (Fosse Way) concerns with volume and speed of traffic
- A429 section of Fosse Way, north of Cirencester to Northleach, should be included in the NC CPS area to ensure uniformity of treatment and action on this road.
- A429 exhibits constrained flow at pinchpoints not only at Unicorn Crossroads and Moreton-in-Marsh. Congested and slow moving
- p. 90-91 ‘These initiatives will be retained and reconsidered if the situation alters’ indicates no positive action will be taken. This is an abrogation of the LHA’s statutory duties under The Traffic Management Act (2004) to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic. Amend to ‘A429 (Fosse Way) – highway capacity improvements creating an increased number of passing lanes, plus resolve the impact of historical route convergence onto the A429 at Stow-on-the-Wold between Stow Hill Station Road and Tesco, and the highest traffic levels in the NC CPS, creating an extended pinchpoint and currently resulting in congestion and delay (subject to feasibility study)’. ‘A429 (Fosse Way) – highway capacity improvements creating an increased number of passing lanes (subject to feasibility study)’ is a watered down description of the problem.
- As it is not feasible to get people out of cars focus on freight/ parking in main towns/ buses where possible
- Moreton by-pass feasibility study
- Traffic congestion inhibiting tourism growth. Road infrastructure is ‘harming the Cotswold brand’
- Accessibility must be addressed by removing pinchpoints, providing more highway capacity (through the management and removal of freight) and improving traffic management and parking in the market towns
- Moreton-in-Marsh - Entire length of A429 north of Cirencester to exit point from County just north of Moreton-in-Marsh should be treated as an entity. This is not recognised in the SC CPS because the 2 roads join north of Cirencester. This route should be subsumed into the NC CPS with its boundaries slightly changed

**Bus**
- North Cotswolds including Stow on the Wold have particular ageing population demographics combined with inadequate public transport provision.
- Isolation
- A bus service does not make a location sustainable.
- Consider the hub effect of travellers from outlying villages parking in towns like Stow on the Wold then use pt to continue journey.

**Rail**
- Re-open Chipping Camden Railway Station
• Improve parking at stations eg Kingham
• Implications of travelling to other stations in Gloucestershire via the proposed Worcestershire Parkway. WP may improve connectivity across Gloucestershire or may compromise further redoubling of the n. Cotswolds line.

Active Travel
• Refer to National trails, RoWs and National cycle routes as they are so important to Cotswolds identity and economy.
• Main roads have no footways

General Comments
• Ref to Cotswold AONB Management Plan (2013-2018)
• ‘The Government’s door-to-door strategy .... should complete the quotation i.e. ‘the Government accepts that these limitations on applicability in NPPF para 47 which states ‘different policies and measures will be required in different communities ...’
• Note opportunities in urban and rural areas are very different
• P.46 amend bullet point 1 to ‘Tourism within Cotswold Market Towns, villages and countryside’. Insert new bullet point: ‘National Trust & other properties (Hidcote, Chastleton House, Snowshill, Sezincote etc)’
• Tighten the refs. To sustainable transport provision in the context of an area like the north Cotswolds
• Does not adequately express need for localism
• ‘Supply and Demand’ policies should be applied with care so tourism is not deterred or damaged.
• Para 3.3 add ‘the age imbalance is most marked in Stow-on-the-Wold with a well above average elderly population where 28% are aged over 65 years (compared to national average of 17%). This includes 13% over 75 years.

Specific Comments
• p. 49 Amend 2nd para in last sentence to start ‘the pinchpoints at Stow-on-the-Wold and’ and the railway bridge at Moreton-in-the-Marsh.
• p. 50 Para 2 last sentence conflicts with para 1 and is an attempt to insert cycling dogma in where not sensible. See Serial 7 page 101 notes concerning NPPF para 47. Insert new sentence. ‘However, it should be noted that the Government accepts these limitations on applicability in NPPF para 47 which states “different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport will vary from urban to rural areas”:’
• p. 50 Add new bullet point ‘In the longer term, but within the period of this plan, relief roads for Stow-on-the-Wold and Moreton-in-Marsh’
• p. 53 Amend 3rd entry concerning Oddinton Road junction to reflect comments against page 47 above ‘Impact of historical route convergence onto the A429 at Stow-on-the-Wold between Stow Hill Station Road and Tesco and highest traffic levels in theNC CPS creating an extended pinchpoint resulting in congestion and delay’
• p. 53 add need to improve access to north Cotswold Hospital Area wide initiatives:
• p.54 Add ‘Impact of historical route convergence onto the A429 at Stow on the Wold
between Stow Hill Station Rd and Tesco and highest traffic levels in the NC CPS creating an extended pinchpoint resulting in congestion and delay:

Summary of comments received:

The representations received are noted and strategy will be updated accordingly where it is consistent with wider LTP objectives and other local and national policy guidance.

4.10 Do you support the South Cotswold Connecting Places Strategy?

Summary of comments received:

Highways
- Respondents here cite issues of excessive freight movement, especially at Fairford and Lechlade.
- Safe routes to school in Fairford
- Cirencester – parking/ tourism
- Missing link passes though AONB and so must adhere to AONB guidance and see government guidance on the impact of roads on nationally protected landscapes.
- Page 2 onwards fails to identify Cirencester as node/ pinchpoint in the highway system. The ring road needs updating to red route well before 2031
- Traffic should not be completely discouraged in town centres or small town economies will suffer
- Promote tourist shuttle buses between NT properties, scenic areas etc.
- The role of the A361 through Lechlade-on-Thames should be identified. This is a key route for people travelling from Oxfordshire in to Swindon.
- The A33 / A429 junction accessing Kemble Station is a highway safety concern and this junction needs to be considered alongside any improvements to increase use at the station.
- Capacity issues with A433 junctions within Tetbury also need to be identified within the document.

Bus
- Cirencester – Kemble bus link

Active Travel
- Similar to the concerned raised in the North Cotswolds, there was a view that a strategy relying on mode shift to any degree lacked realism.
- Mention planned cycle route from Fairford to Lechlade
- Cirencester has a number of planned public realm plans – including improved sustainable transport links to Kemble station.
- Main roads have no footways
- Opportunities through development – cycle links at Chesteron
- Active travel in Cirencester may be increased and should be
- 3.4 Add Tetbury to Kemble cycle path – which is in Cotswold District Local Plan and draft Tetbury Neighbourhood Plan
• Add ref to this to ‘Opportunities for \Active Travel’
• Add cycle link between Tetbury and Kemble Station

**General Comments**

• The South Cotswolds is also affected by the draw effect of cross boundary employment opportunities in places like Swindon which leads to commuters travelling greater distances and decreased trip containment in this CPS.
• Image on p.56 is A417 in Lechlade not Fairford.
• Health agenda should link to green space and the natural asset

**Summary of comments received:**

The representations received are noted and strategy will be updated accordingly where it is consistent with wider LTP objectives and other local and national policy guidance.

### 4.11 Do you support the Stroud, Stroud Valleys and South of Stroud Connecting Places Strategy?

**Summary of comments received:**

**Highways**

• Concern that ‘red’ routes will be ‘no go’ zones for vulnerable road users. Highway is for all users and this applies to red routes.
• With regard to the proposed Oldbury New Nuclear Build and the cross-boundary impacts of this major construction project. these are likely to be particularly focussed on the construction phase of the project. They will include traffic impacts on the M5 and A38 corridors, including Junction 13 of the M5.
• The potential to move freight by rail and water will impact on the Bristol – Birmingham railway line and Sharpness Docks.
• The role that Junction 14 of the M5 plays in providing access to the strategic road network from some communities in Gloucestershire is recognised. Its need for upgrade may be reviewed should the Oldbury New Nuclear Build project be progressed.
• Valley roads severe conflict
• Places for traffic should at least be ‘places for people and traffic’. Only motorways should be for traffic predominantly.
• Motorway traffic should not divert via Stroud
• A419 needs to be 20mph at Thrupp. It severs a community and deters pedestrian and cycle levels

**Bus**

• Welcome commitment to work closely together on cross-boundary bus services linking communities in Gloucestershire and South Gloucestershire. There are many people who travel across the Council boundary (in both directions) to access health services as well as those who travel for employment purposes.
• Improve access to Bristol by public transport
**Rail**

- The need for improved rail services between Cam and Dursley Station and Bristol should be included in the review of rail services. Include opportunities for improving the rail services between South Gloucestershire stations and Cam and Dursley as well as Bristol.
- Reference is made to Charfield and Stonehouse (Bristol Road) railway stations being subject to the outcome of a feasibility study. Clarify whether this refers to the need for a feasibility study to be undertaken to establish the business case for these new stations, or has a study already been commissioned by Gloucestershire County Council to investigate the feasibility of these stations being built?
- Opportunity to build on the MetroWest projects being developed by the West of England authorities for implementation by 2021 by looking at the potential for future phases extending MetroWest rail services to Gloucester, and to take in the railway route between Gloucester and Severn Tunnel Junction. This would potentially create a loop service connecting Bristol South Gloucestershire, Gloucester and the Forest of Dean / Monmouthshire.
- Rail freight at Sharpness
- Additional rail services to London to support economic growth
- Connection to Bristol-Birmingham line at Stonehouse
- Electrification of Swindon to Gloucester line
- Rail – Cheltenham and Stonehouse stations need to become of greater strategic importance on the Bristol-Birmingham line. Need a ‘Rail Vision’ which improves the passenger experience door-to-door and integrates fully with other modes. Consider southern Parkway station
- Rail – rte-open Bristol Road Station in Stonehouse to facilitate mode shift

**Active Travel**

- Why is A46 Merrywalks not identified as a problem. Should be made more pedestrian and cycle friendly
- Cycle link between Wotton-Under-Edge and Charfield (can this not be added to schemes?)
- p.55 improve Stonehouse High Street to encourage more pedestrians.

**Thinktravel**

- Behavioural elements need to be stronger in expression and intention.

**General comments**

- Respondents unanimously support a multi modal and INTEGRATED approach to transport delivery. They want to see the focus of investment directed to rail, bus and cycle routes, as well as a concerted approach to including canal transport and especially on the Stroud to Chalford corridor.
- Strong commuter flow from the Stroud CPS towards the West of England
- East west links should be considered as well as north south
- Really build on LINKAGES between strategic and local economic areas, district and neighbouring authorities and modes – canal for freight and commute trips etc. these messages may have been stronger in previous LTP
- Works in relation to Type 1&2 need to be sensitive to the county’s historic townscapes/
landscapes and the setting of heritage assets. See John Hayes MP – a new aesthetic vision for the road network

- AND should be change in how transport is INTEGRATED. Transport corridors are a good idea and should support integrated demand led transport. Removal of administrative boundaries will be challenging.
- How will this tie into the emerging Stroud local plan?
- Concern about realities of offsetting future congestion in market towns whatever transport strategy is applied. Reality check. What are the instruments and capacity to deliver alternatives to private car?
- Include ‘environmental impact’ and ‘quality of life’ in the scheme selection criteria
- Sustainable economic growth objective p.11 table 1 omits the elderly – whose population will increase

Summary of comments received:

The representations received are noted and strategy will be updated accordingly where it is consistent with wider LTP objectives and other local and national policy guidance.

4.12 Do you support the Tewkesbury Connecting Places Strategy?

Summary of comments received:

Highways

- Tewkesbury town itself has experienced air quality issues in association with traffic on the A38; the A46 is regularly congested between the Teddington Hands roundabout and M5 junction 9.
- Significant concern that proposed development which will affect arterial transport routes in Tewkesbury has not taken into account the growth in transport journeys
- Changes to M5 j.9 may shift or displace traffic problems to other parts of the Tewkesbury and Ashchurch.
- 20mph in Tewkesbury Town Centre
- Reconsider by-pass

Bus

- East of borough exhibits particular problems in relation to accessing public transport
- Huge opportunity to integrate bus and rail and link business better to rail station (note barrier effect of M5 to the station and to general (east/ west) movement flows

Active Travel

- Respondents note the considerable potential and need transport modal shift especially for local trips to free up the strategic road network.
- Concerned that infrastructure like cycle paths is left to developers
- Due to Tewkesbury area layout improve pedestrian linkages – from Stonehills and Walton Cardiff etc.
**Rail**
- There is also potential for improved rail and rail freight
- Recognise poor quality rail station facilities
- Should the role of MoD Ashchurch as a rail freight facility be considered more carefully and not discounted until a decision on the site has been made?
- Will Ashchurch Station and the rail operating companies be willing to meet the travel demand arising in this area?
- Rename to Tewkesbury Parkway will help the station’s identity

**Future growth**
- Welcomes inclusion of JCS transport modelling in LTP
- LTP, JCS and TBP should be mutually reinforcing documents
- The future will need bold ideas

**Specific comments**
- P. 75 Include reference to the A438 in particular the approaches to the M5 j.9 and Shannon Way:
- p. 77 refer to active travel options too:
- p.79 set out the need to improve facilities at the station itself, including car parking, shelters, lighting, ticketing and signage. In addition, recognise the need to improve access to and from the station to the surrounding area:
- p. 79 Recognise that future development prevents opportunities to improve the provision of public transport by increasing its viability.
- p. 81 acronyms such as RTPI need to be written in full or put in glossary

**Summary of comments received:**
The representations received are noted and strategy will be updated accordingly where it is consistent with wider LTP objectives and other local and national policy guidance.

**4.13 Do you agree with the deletion of the schemes from the county’s Highways Register?**

**Summary of comments received:**
- Strong disagreement with deletion of Cheltenham Northern Relief Road 1B2 and Cheltenham Northern Relief Road 4D. Vital to reduce traffic on Princess Elizabeth Way which was a spine road for a council estate and is now a link road between the M5, A40, A4019 & A435/A46. Congestion impacts on quality of life for residents. The JCS proposes 8000 houses off the A4019
- Great concern at dropping of Quality Bus Corridors which sends completely the wrong message in context of LTP and mode shift. Repeated urge for its retention
- p. 90 Where is the description of the parameters or factors in the stage 2 assessment? Stage 3 (peer review) is equally opaque. Need clarity, openness and a published procedure. Add new column to table to explain ‘why’ to give clarity
- Two schemes listed as being “on hold” would be of interest to South Gloucestershire
due to their potential impact upon cross-boundary travel.

- The improvement of Junction 13 of the M5 would be relevant to some South Gloucestershire communities, and should be reviewed as part of the Oldbury Nuclear New Build project should that proceed, as this junction might have a role to play within the access strategy for that development.

- The New Severn Crossing linking the A48 and A38 could potentially have a significant impact upon the A38 corridor within South Gloucestershire, depending upon the location and layout of the scheme. Therefore, South Gloucestershire Council would need to be consulted early on should any proposal be made to change the status of this scheme from being “on hold” to being a firm proposal within the LTP.

**Summary of comments received:**

Following the review of the representations made through this public consultation an update to the scheme appraisal process will commence for all schemes. This is where all historic and proposed transport schemes are appraised based on the contribution and relevance towards achieving the updated LTP Outcomes.

The formal process for removing historic highways schemes from the scheme register is based initially on this reassessment.

Those schemes identified as no longer being relevant will be subject to a technical desk top review that considers each scheme in more detail. The outcome of this review will be to retain, amend or delete the scheme from the highways register. Where the recommendation is to amend or delete the scheme is subject to an internal consultation with GCC officers.

Responses to this consultation will be considered and the recommendation regarding the scheme status will be updated as appropriate. Once completed those schemes still assessed as being amended or deleted will be subject to an external consultation will take place with local stakeholders including GCC Members, District Members, Parish Council and District Council officers as appropriate. Having reviewed the comments received through this process a final recommendation will be made and a paper presented to Cabinet for approval.
Appendix A – Public Consultation Document

Consultation Document

Thank you for taking the time to respond to the first formal review of Gloucestershire’s third Local Transport Plan (LTP). The LTP sets the long term strategy for transport delivery within Gloucestershire from 2015 to 2031. Within this consultation document a significant number of changes have been made from the existing LTP which was adopted in 2011.

This consultation process seeks to understand the level of support for the proposed changes relating to:

- The proposed Link and Place Hierarchy for 2031;
- The proposed update to the LTP’s policies;
- The proposed prioritisation of transport initiatives in the context of the new Connecting Places Strategies (CPS); and
- The removal of historic transport schemes from the highways register.

N.B. You do not need to respond to all questions. Simply respond to whichever issues are of interest to you. See Appendix A of the LTP Consultation document to identify the Town and Parish’s in each CPS area.

Having your say

This phase of consultation will last for six weeks from 16th February until the 27th March 2015. You can register your views.

- Using the County Council’s consultation portal - [www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/consultations](http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/consultations)
- Downloading the documents from the County Council’s website - [http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ltp3](http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ltp3) and emailing your response to [ltp@gloucestershire.gov.uk](mailto:ltp@gloucestershire.gov.uk)
- Accessing a paper copy from Gloucestershire Libraries or Council buildings and sending a completed questionnaire to

Strategic Planning
Block 5, 1st floor
Westgate
Gloucester GL1 2TH
Gloucestershire’s - Local Transport Plan (2015 – 2031)

Consultation Questionnaire

About you

Do the views you are expressing here represent personal views or those of an organisation?

Indicate your response by ticking the appropriate box.

Personal:   
Organisation:

If you wish to be added to the LTP Stakeholder list please provide your contact details:

Question 1

Do you agree with the proposed Link and Place Hierarchy for 2031?

- Please see Section 1 (page 2) of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link and Place Hierarchy for 2031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Question 2a
Do you agree with the proposed Advisory Freight Route Map?

- Please see Section 2, Figure 5 (page 15) of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Freight Map</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Question 2b
Should any changes be made to the Advisory Freight Map?

Comments:
Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan 2015-2031 CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 3a
Do you support the proposed LTP Policies?

- Please see Section 2 (page 18) of the LTP Consultation document.
- Also see Appendix D (page 129) for detailed policy proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTPP1 Management - Network</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTPP2 Management - Network</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTPP3 Enabling New Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTPP4 Network Connectivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTPP5 Improving Health and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTPP6 Carbon Reduction and the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTPP7 - Enabling Travel Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTPP8 - Travel Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3b
Do you think there are any policy areas missing?

- See Appendix D (page 129) for detailed policy proposals

Comments:
Question 4a

Do you agree that the Central Severn Vale CPS identified meets the proposed LTP objectives?

- Please see Section 3.1 of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Objectives</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure conditions for sustainable economic growth in Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable communities to benefit from economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve and enhance Gloucestershire’s unique natural, built and historic environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create healthy, safe and engaged communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Question 4b
Do you agree that the Forest of Dean CPS meets the proposed LTP objectives?

- Please see Section 3.2 of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Objectives</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure conditions for sustainable economic growth in Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable communities to benefit from economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve and enhance Gloucestershire’s unique natural, built and historic environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create healthy, safe and engaged communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Question 4c

Do you agree that the North Cotswold CPS meets the proposed LTP objectives?

- Please see Section 3.3 of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Objectives</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure conditions for sustainable economic growth in Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable communities to benefit from economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve and enhance Gloucestershire’s unique natural, built and historic environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create healthy, safe and engaged communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4d

Do you agree that the South Cotswold CPS meets the proposed LTP objectives?

- Please see Section 3.4 of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Objectives</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure conditions for sustainable economic growth in Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable communities to benefit from economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve and enhance Gloucestershire’s unique natural, built and historic environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create healthy, safe and engaged communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4e

Do you agree that the Stroud, Stroud Valleys and South of Stroud CPS proposed LTP objectives?

- Please see Section 3.5 of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Objectives</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure conditions for sustainable economic growth in Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable communities to benefit from economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve and enhance Gloucestershire’s unique natural, built and historic environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create healthy, safe and engaged communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Question 4f

Do you agree that the Tewkesbury CPS meets the proposed LTP objectives?

- Please see Section 3.6 of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Objectives</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure conditions for sustainable economic growth in Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable communities to benefit from economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve and enhance Gloucestershire’s unique natural, built and historic environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create healthy, safe and engaged communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Question 4g

Do you agree that the Out of county CPS meets the proposed LTP objectives?

- Please see Section 3.7 of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Objectives</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure conditions for sustainable economic growth in Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable communities to benefit from economic prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve and enhance Gloucestershire’s unique natural, built and historic environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create healthy, safe and engaged communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Question 5
Do you agree with the deletion of the schemes from the county’s Highways register?

- Please see Section 4 (page 92) of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPS Area</th>
<th>Initiative type</th>
<th>Initiative description</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSV</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Quality Bus Corridor Tewkesbury-Bishops Cleeve-Cheltenham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Travel Choice - Car Club in Cheltenham &amp; Gloucester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>Cheltenham Northern Relief Road 1B2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>Cheltenham Northern Relief Road 4D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest of Dean</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Quality Bus Corridors - Various routes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cotswold</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Quality Bus Corridor - Moreton in Marsh-Cheltenham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cotswold</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Quality Bus Corridor - Cirencester – Gloucester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>A436 Ullenwood junction capacity improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A417 - Lechlade Bypass - New road scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cotswold Water Park Eastern Spine Road, Kempsford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Quality Bus Corridor - Cheltenham - Stroud - Gloucester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 6
Do you agree with the Asset Management Framework of documents?

- Please see Appendix C of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Objectives</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport Management (TAMP) Asset Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Question 7

Do you agree with the proposed Levels of Service for Highways Maintenance as set out in the Asset Management Strategy?

- Please see Appendix C of the LTP Consultation document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Objectives</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads and footways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway structures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage and surface water management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Question 8

Are there any further comments you wish to make regarding the LTP Review?

Comments:
Appendix B – Names of individuals and organisations that made representations

The list of respondents included within this appendix is not comprehensive. Unfortunately not all representations made using the online survey portal could be attributed to individuals or organisations. Where individuals have been listed the representations made may have been provided on behalf of an organisation, but this was not clear from the response report generated using the online questionnaire portal.

Councillors (County, District, Parish)

- Cllr. Tony Hicks
- Cllr. Adam Lillywhite
- Cllr. Nigel Moor
- Cllr. Shaun Parsons
- Cllr. Lyndon Stowe
- Cllr. Roger Whybourn

- Ashchurch Parish Council
- Elkstone Parish Council
- Fairford Town Council
- Gorsely Parish Council
- Linton Parish Council
- Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council
- Newent Town Council
- Rodborough Parish Council
- Stonehouse Town Council
- Stow-on-the-Wold Town Council
- Stroud Town Council
- Whiteshill and Ruscombe Parish Council
- Wincombe Town Council

Local Authorities

- Cheltenham Borough Council
- Cheltenham Development Task Force
- Cotswold District Planning Team
- Gloucester City Council
- Gloucestershire County Council – Highways Development Management
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Stroud District Council
- South Gloucestershire Council
- Tewkesbury Borough Council
- Warwickshire County Council
- West of England

**Transport Operators**

- Highways Agency
- Skybus
- Stagecoach West

**Interest Groups**

- Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign
- CTC Cycling Charity
- Gloucestershire Campaign to Protect Rural England
- Gloucestershire NHS Trust
- PFA Consulting
- Railfuture
- St. Pauls Road residents Association
- Shaping Stroud
- Stroud District Green Party
- Swindon Village Society
- Thrupp Primary School
- Transition Stroud

**Individuals**

- Roz Capps
- Mrs Sue Capener
- Rosie Clark
- David Crowly
- Mr Ian Edwards
- Mrs L Eyre
- John Firth
- Mr P Fitchett
- Mr K S Harrison
- Richard Hudson
- Mary Hutton
- Ms Heather Juniper
• Mr Ian Mannings
• Mrs Nicola Melville
• Mrs DMA Morley
• Mrs N Melville
• Ms Katherine Noble
• Mr Greg Pilley
• Ms Christine Prince
• Mrs C Reid
• Ms A Sach
• Nadine Smykatz-Kloss
• Mr Rohan Torkildsen