

**Board Meeting  
Agenda**

**Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> June 2020 - 14:00 to 16:00**

1	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	14:00-14:05
2	<b>Minutes and actions from the previous meeting</b>	14:05-14:10
3	<b>Public Participation</b> ○ Questions or Representations from Members of the public in line with the Board's Public Participation Scheme	14:10-14:25
4	<b>CV-19 – STB update on response and recovery</b> ○ Verbal update provided by David Carter of SOG	14:25-14:45
5	<b>Update from Associate Members</b> ○ DfT ○ Highways England ○ Network Rail ○ Peninsula ○ Transport & Business Forum Chair	14:45-15:10
6	<b>Strategic Transport Plan</b> ○ Paper A – Ben Watts – Gloucestershire County Council	15:10-15:30
7	<b>Transport Evidence Base update – Strategic Modelling</b> ○ Paper B – Ewan Wilson - BCP Council	15:30-15:35
8	<b>Regulatory Review of Future Mobility</b> ○ Paper C – Allan Creedy – Wiltshire Council	15:35-15:40
9	<b>2020/21 Work Programme</b> ○ Paper D – Peter Mann - WECA	15:40-15:45
10	<b>Communications Update</b> ○ Verbal update – Arina Salhotra – Sphere Marketing	15:45-15:55
10	<b>Any other business</b>	15:55-16:00

**Date of next meeting – Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> September – 13:00 to 14:00, location TBC: Wiltshire Council, Trowbridge / Virtual Meeting.**

## **Recording and Broadcasting Information**

Wiltshire Council may record this meeting for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website at <http://www.wiltshire.public-i.tv>. At the start of the meeting, the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being recorded. The images and sound recordings may also be used for training purposes within the Council.

By entering the meeting room you are consenting to being recorded and to the use of those images and recordings for broadcasting and/or training purposes.

The meeting may also be recorded by the press or members of the public.

Any person or organisation choosing to film, record or broadcast any meeting of the Council, its Cabinet or committees is responsible for any claims or other liability resulting from them so doing and by choosing to film, record or broadcast proceedings they accept that they are required to indemnify the Council, its members and officers in relation to any such claims or liabilities.

Details of the Council's Guidance on the Recording and Webcasting of Meetings is available on request. Wiltshire Council privacy policy can be found [here](#).

# Western Gateway - Sub-National Transport Body

## MINUTES

Meeting	Date	Time	Location
Shadow Partnership Board	Wednesday 4 <sup>th</sup> March 2020	14:00-16:00	Kennet room, County Hall, Trowbridge

### Attendance:

Present:	<p>Cllr Bridget Wayman, Wiltshire Council (chair)                      Cllr Joanna Wright, Bath and North East Somerset Council                      Cllr James Tonkin, North Somerset Council                      Cllr Nigel Moor, Gloucestershire County Council                      Cllr Ray Bryan, Dorset Council                      David Carter, West of England Combined Authority                      Elizabeth Mills, West of England Combined Authority (minutes)                      Sarah Beatrice, West of England Combined Authority                      Nick Evans, West of England Combined Authority                      Ben Watts, Gloucestershire County Council                      Colin Chick, Gloucestershire County Council                      Andy Whitehead, South Gloucestershire Council                      Arina Salhotra, Sphere Marketing                      Julian McLaughlin, Bournemouth, Christchurch &amp; Poole Council (BCP)                      Colin Medus, North Somerset Council                      Parvis Khansari, Wiltshire Council                      Allan Creedy, Wiltshire Council                      Andrew Davies, Bristol City Council                      Alexis Edwards, Bournemouth, Christchurch &amp; Poole Council                      Jim Stewart, Chair for Dorset LEP and Chair of WG Transport and Business Forum                      Alice Darley, Highways England                      David Glinos, Department for Transport                      Matt Hayward, Network Rail                      Andrew Wiles, Peninsula STB</p>
Apologies:	<p>Cllr Kye Dudd, Bristol County Council,                      Cllr Stephen Reade, South Gloucestershire Council                      Nuala Gallagher, Bristol City Council                      Mayor Bowles, West of England Combined Authority                      Cllr Toby Savage, South Gloucestershire Council                      Cllr Andy Hadley, Bournemouth, Christchurch &amp; Poole Council                      Peter Mann, West of England Combined Authority                      Emma Blackham, South Gloucestershire Council</p>

Summary of Actions & Decisions	Allocated to
<p><b>DECISION:</b> Those present agreed to the proposed letter being sent to the Chair of WGP.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> CC to share email to explain the alignment between the STB and the WGP with the Chair for approval.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> all agreed to recommendations in paper A and no amendments made.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> all agreed to recommendations in paper B and no amendments made.</p>	<p><b>CC ASAP</b></p>

<b>Summary of Actions &amp; Decisions</b>	<b>Allocated to</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> BW to circulate draft Port Access Study to Members and requested comments to be returned by Friday 13 <sup>th</sup> March.	<b>BW 06/03/20</b>
<b>DECISION &amp; ACTION:</b> all agreed to recommendations in paper D subject to the requested amendment, BW to update accordingly.	<b>BW ASAP</b>
<b>ACTION:</b> Senior Officer Group to consider whether changing the name of the STB is necessary and discuss alternative options ahead of the next Board meeting.	<b>SOG 30/03/20</b>

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Notes / Actions</b>
1.	<b>Welcome and apologies</b> – noted above.
2.	<p><b>Minutes and actions from previous meeting</b> Discussed the Western Gateway (Powerhouse) (WGP). JM confirmed on behalf of Cllr Hadley and BPC, a report will go to April's Cabinet to note the local authority's position with the respective local Powerhouses and to request a steer.</p> <p>Cllr Bryan on behalf of Dorset Council shared they are minded to join but will await the decision of BCP as they are closely aligned.</p> <p>CC provided position from the WGP. He confirmed he has been pushing for STB recognition. He noted WGP and the STB have different geographies and agendas however he pointed out the need for alignment to avoid duplication of work. He raised the suggestion of a letter, to be written from the STB Chair to the WGP Chair, putting forward the proposal that STB officers attend WGP meetings and the equivalent to be offered at STB at Board meetings.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> Those present agreed to the proposed letter being sent to the Chair of WGP, and</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> CC to share email to explain the alignment between the STB and the WGP with the Chair.</p> <p>Cllr Wayman approved the minutes from the last meeting - no objections raised.</p>
3.	<b>Public Participation</b> - No questions or representations in line with the Board's Public Participation Scheme submitted.
4.	<p><b>Joint STB Liaison meeting update</b> PK feedback from meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> February hosted by DfT (was due to be with Director General Patricia Hayes but was led by her Directors). He noted main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chancellor budget announcement will look at short term rather than longer term investment but there will be further engagement later in year.</li> <li>• Grant Shapps, Secretary of State for Transport, is keen for transport investment/improvements to be sponsored by MPs so the STB will need to consider this engagement going forward.</li> <li>• Williams Review is still to be published but should be accompanied by a detailed framework.</li> <li>• PK explained the 2-phase funding arrangement going forward. One phase would fund "core functions", and the second for "additional" functions to be agreed with individual STBs (activities that can be taken away from UAs for efficiency, for example). It was noted the funding discussion will be tabled on the next National STB agenda in April.</li> </ul>

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Notes / Actions</b>
	<p>DG added that the funding decision is still with Ministers for approval, but their hope is to make announcements for the current and next financial year following the Budget announcement on 11<sup>th</sup> March.</p> <p>AC shared that at the National STB meeting it was proposed to hold a meeting between STB Chairs and Transport Ministers in April/May.</p>
5.	<p><b>2020-21 Work Programme and proposed changes to the STB Structure (paper A)</b></p> <p>DC explained the reasoning for this proposal is that as we're an established STB we want to formalise roles to show capabilities and readiness to receive further funding. He noted the paper sets out finances, our priorities, the Strategic Transport Plan and work already progressing.</p> <p>DC shared that the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) have a procurement framework which can be utilised to ensure value for money when hiring consultants, as well as project management and admin resource that can support the STB and be a central point for public interface. He explained the proposal of setting up a project management team to be funded by the authorities.</p> <p>Cllr Moor noted the roles are part time and questioned whether this was sufficient resource. DC explained this was calculated from the funding available.</p> <p>Cllr Wayman noted the summary of roles and duties and asked how this is overseen by the Board. DC confirmed the team will report to the Senior Officer Group and views on the proposed the work programme would be agreed by the Board.</p> <p>AD provided comment on the work programme; Highways England would be keen to discuss the interface between the STB strategic corridors and HE's route strategies for mutual benefit, referencing table B. PK confirmed this would be welcomed.</p> <p>DG raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If DfT are able to provide funding, there will be regular reviews and he questioned whether this has been taken into consideration in respect of resourcing and management, as he pointed out it would be efficient to not have to set up new meetings.</li> <li>• In respect of the Strategic Transport Plan – DfT might encourage the STB to look further to 2040 or beyond.</li> <li>• He noted that since the bids for STB funding were submitted, workstreams have evolved (such as strategic cycle routes) and this would need to be discussed should funding be made available. DG clarified that DfT funding is aimed at outputs as opposed to funding staff per se.</li> </ul> <p>BW added that the bid was submitted before the National STB meeting where the decarbonisation agenda was raised as a national issue and other new items emerged from the Transport and Business Forum.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> all agreed to recommendations in paper A and no amendments made.</p>
6.	<p><b>STB board charring arrangements for 2020/21</b></p> <p>Cllr Wayman noted that charring was set out for a year and confirmed she was happy to continue. Cllr Moor seconded, and no objections raised.</p> <p>Cllr Wayman nominated Cllr Moor to continue as vice chair, this was seconded by the other</p>

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Notes / Actions</b>
	<p>Members and no objections raised.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> Agreed for Cllr Wayman as Chair and Cllr Moor as Vice Chair to continue for the next year.</p>
7.	<p><b>Rail Strategy (paper B)</b></p> <p>AE led and noted the background to this study, that the Board in June 2019 set out a request to pursue an area wide Rail Strategy and explained this paper delivers the first phase. This is a draft strategy, setting out rail issues and conditional outputs laid out in 5 themes: choice, decarbonisation, social mobility, productivity &amp; growth – which will inform future schemes. The second phase looks at the scheme information in detail with regards to rail investment proposals, working with NR &amp; rail operators. Phase 2 would be looking to start, subject to Board approval and confirmation of financial position, from April 2020 until July 2020.</p> <p>DG noted the importance of working with neighbouring STBs and he was also interested in the timespans being considered in the second phase. AE confirmed all the neighbouring STBs have been involved in the workshops for this strategy and in respect of timescales they are looking up to 2043 in line with rail future planning.</p> <p>DC shared that himself and colleagues met with Midlands Connect to work with them on key corridors. PK added that a request has been received from the Chair of Midlands Connect to meet with the Western Gateway STB Chair which will be followed up accordingly.</p> <p><b>DECISION:</b> all agreed to recommendations in paper B and no amendments made.</p>
8.	<p><b>Port Access Study (paper C)</b></p> <p>BW confirmed the draft report now available on request for comment, but an executive summary has been provided in the Board papers. He shared the aim to finalise the report by the end of March.</p> <p>BW explained how the consultants prepared report including meeting with representatives from the Ports in our geography to understand challenges. He added they have also considered existing surface access studies to assess whether they are strategic enough to inform this study.</p> <p>BW confirmed the outcomes of this report will inform the STB Strategic Transport Plan and future commissions.</p> <p>Members agreed that as the executive summary was minimal that they all requested a copy of the draft report.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> BW to circulate draft Port Access Study to Members and requested comments to be returned by Friday 13<sup>th</sup> March.</p> <p>Recommendations noted and no amendments made.</p>
9.	<p><b>Strategic Transport Plan update (paper D)</b></p> <p>BW explained the original intension for today's Board meeting in respect of this item was to seek approval for the first stage of strategic consultation on issues and options. He continued that following concerns by UA officers that the consultation would infringe on the launch of local transport plans and BCC mayoral elections the timetable has been revised. It was agreed that adoption of the Strategic Transport Plan in September is paramount and therefore suggesting forgoing the initial consultation and having just one 6-week consultation (May/June 2020). He explained ideally approval would be sought before going out to consultation</p>

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Notes / Actions</b>
	<p>however because of the frequency of Board meetings (next one scheduled in June) the ask is for delegated authority to be granted to the Senior Officer Group to go out to consultation. In respect of the consultation format, he confirmed in order to maximise on the consultation there will be an online platform, 3 consultation events as well as input from the Transport and Business Forum. He added that latter met in January and have already fed into the draft.</p> <p>Considered the recommendations in the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. To agree with a one stage public consultation process for the Inaugural Strategic Transport Plan</li> <li>II. To note the timeframe of the proposed six-week public consultation period and planned stakeholder engagement (Monday 11th May to Sunday 21st June 2020)</li> <li>III. To delegate authority to the Senior Officer Group to approve the publication of the draft Strategic Transport Plan ahead of the six-week public consultation period</li> </ol> <p>Members requested recommendation III be updated to include that the draft report be circulated and signed off by Members ahead of the consultation commencement.</p> <p><b>DECISION &amp; ACTION:</b> all agreed to recommendations in paper D subject to the requested amendment, BW to update accordingly.</p> <p>Cllr Moor requested that climate change be referenced in appendix A. BW confirmed it will be addressed in the Strategy. Cllr Wayman shared her understanding that each scheme would have an environmental assessment. DC suggested adding a note explaining this is always subject to emerging national policy and legislation, that we can set out objectives, but these are subject to change. DG seconded this comment and confirmed DfT do plan to set out their decarbonisation policy later this year. Cllr Wright questioned whether it would be appropriate to hold off preparing a Strategy until the policy is provided and DC explained that it would be more appropriate for the Western Gateway Strategic Transport Plan to be ready to feed into the comprehensive spending review/devolved funding process.</p>
10.	<p><b>Communications update</b></p> <p>AS fed back that there has been some media coverage on the 2 funded schemes. She confirmed all of this has been covered on the Western Gateway STB webpage.</p> <p>AS noted, the confusion from several parties on the two different Western Gateways and shared the hope that this will resolve in time as the two bodies continue to liaise with each other.</p> <p>AS fed back that in January the second Transport and Business Forum was held and attendees welcomed the opportunity to feed into Strategic Transport Plan consultation.</p> <p>AS noted, the following future events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ITT Hub event – a shared STB exhibition stand - May 2020.</li> <li>• CIHT conference – David Carter representing - 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020.</li> </ul> <p>AS confirmed the Western Gateway STB now has a twitter account @westgatewaystb</p> <p>AS explained the intension that the new Programme Management Team will look into the possibility of the secretariat managing the STBs domain name in future. She noted the website is currently one page hosted through GCC and it would be preferable to have a separate site.</p> <p>Cllr Wright raised the confusion around the name and proposed the STB change its name as soon as possible to avoid further efforts and money being invested and wasted.</p>



<b>Item No</b>	<b>Notes / Actions</b>
	<p>CC suggested adding “Transport for...” at the beginning to make it clearer which Cllr Moor seconded. No consensus was agreed and Cllr Wayman requested the Senior Officer Group to consider and return this discussion to a later Board.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Senior Officer Group to consider whether changing the name of the STB is necessary and discuss alternative options ahead of the next Board meeting.</p>
11.	<p><b>Update from Associate Members</b></p> <p><b>DfT</b>  DG confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They have a new ministerial team - Baroness Vere leads for devolution matters, including STBs.</li> <li>• For rail there is the “Restoring Your Railway” programme (aka reversing Beeching) which he shared links to in his email update (circulated ahead of Board meeting). He noted the new stations funding round is £20m for whole of England.</li> <li>• In respect of buses they have invited EOIs for funding for 20-21 financial year and he noted there is a workshop being held in the next week which colleagues may wish to attend. He added there is also other funding opportunities for Buses and Walking &amp; Cycling.</li> <li>• He confirmed the announcement made on MRN and LLM funding included 2 schemes for the Western Gateway STB region, the announcement included support for the A350 Melksham Bypass and the A338 Southern Salisbury Junction Improvements in Wiltshire. Other LLM / MRN proposals submitted to DfT remain under consideration.</li> <li>• He noted the budget announcement scheduled for 11<sup>th</sup> March and the dates for comprehensive spending review should be confirmed later in the year.</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways England</b>  AD confirmed HE are coming to the close of RIS1 funding period and are awaiting RIS2 announcement. She explained work on their strategic business plan and delivery plan to be completed subject to this funding announcement.  She added they are starting to consider RIS3, route strategies, and a workshop with STBs on 20<sup>th</sup> March to get their input is being held which she understood some colleagues present were invited to.</p> <p><b>Network Rail</b>  MH confirmed the December 2019 timetable has settled in successfully and the next new timetable (minor improvements) are due in May 2020.  He confirmed the government have agreed to fund Bristol East Junction, will unlock future services and improve reliability as a whole, delivery is due to start next year.  He confirmed the STBs Rail Strategy and continued liaison will feed into their future strategic planning.</p> <p><b>Peninsula STB</b>  Board meeting scheduled for tomorrow. Continue to work on the short-term transport strategy – not due to be published until 2021. Have produced an Economic Connectivity report already. Noted they are procuring jointly their strategy commission. PRTF – will continue.  Meeting tomorrow – scoping meeting for Exeter to Bristol corridor – DC flagged should have a WG STB attendee at that meeting.  <b>ACTION:</b> Accepted this suggestion and will take that request back.  DC explained the original principle was that the STBs would jointly commission the report, so we can have input on the scope and feed back to their board.</p> <p><b>Transport &amp; Business Forum</b></p>



<b>Item No</b>	<b>Notes / Actions</b>
	<p>JS acknowledged at the forum the confusion over the two Western Gateway's but otherwise concluded it was a very constructive meeting. In respect of the Strategic Transport Plan, there were comments raised on its links to other spatial plans, decarbonisation and Brexit. He also noted comments received regarding the need to differentiate between freight and passengers, and parking as an incentive to use rail. He confirmed the strategic corridors were considered in detail. He concluded that there was a strong appetite for future forums and the intention is to hold one in the summer but at a new location.</p>
12.	<p><b>AOB</b> – no items raised.</p>
<p><b>Date of Next Meeting:</b> Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> June - 14:00 to 16:00 - Kennet Room, Wiltshire Council, Trowbridge</p>	

## Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body

### Board Meeting

#### Paper A

Date **18<sup>th</sup> June 2020**

Title of report: **Draft Short-Term Strategic Transport Plan**

Purpose of report: **To seek approval from the Board to publish the draft Short-term Strategic Transport Plan.**

#### **Recommendations:**

The Board is recommended:

- i. To approve the draft Short-Term Strategic Transport Plan (provided as a separate attachment to this report) for publication
- ii. To note the amended stakeholder engagement process

#### **Introduction**

- 1.1 The Board on the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020 delegated authority to the Senior Officer Group to commence a public consultation on the Western Gateway's inaugural Strategic Transport Plan (STP). Following this meeting the Coronavirus Pandemic has impacted everyone.
- 1.2 The Western Gateway Senior Officer Group took the decision to change the public consultation process outlined previously to the Board in response to the impact of the Coronavirus Pandemic. Social distancing restrictions have removed the possibility of physical workshops taking place and, with many stakeholders facing issues responding to the crisis, it was felt that any form of consultation was ill-timed and likely to generate a negative response.
- 1.3 As the UK begins to move into the recovery phase and consider the future it is felt that the timing to undertake a public engagement process is appropriate. There is no longer any form of consultation planned, but the draft document will be available for stakeholders and members of the public to engage should they feel it is appropriate.
- 1.4 The title of the document has also changed. At this time flexibility is required by both National and Local Government to respond to the Coronavirus Pandemic and as such the document title has been changed to reflect the

present rather than a future in which there remains so much uncertainty at the time of writing it. The document is now called the 'Short-Term' STP. Once approved it will continue to be monitored and reviewed by officers to ensure sub-national policy remains relevant with national and local policy.

### **Short-term Strategic Transport Plan (2020-2025)**

- 1.5 The Short-Term STP covers a 5 year time frame up to 2025 and reflects existing funding commitments. The pragmatic decision to focus on this timeframe enabled a plan to be produced within a short timeframe which demonstrates collaborative working across the STB. In addition to identifying sub-national transport priorities the document will also be used as a lever to attract Government funding. Attracting financial support will enable the STB to increase its independence, extend its regional evidence base and develop a long-term Strategic Transport Plan.
- 1.6 The STP sets out the role and function of the Western Gateway STB. It also identifies a set of objectives focussed around Economic, Social and Environmental outcomes. Seven spatial strategies have been outlined. This includes three urban hubs and four strategic corridors.
- 1.7 This approach enables local authorities to continue to lead on the development of transport solutions within the hubs separately from the STB. Where the proposed hub schemes support the key outcomes of the STB these will be supported by the STB. This process is different for the four strategic corridors where the STB will lead on the production of the transport strategy and will work with local authorities to build consensus regarding the prioritisation of scheme delivery.

### **Increased prominence for the role of cycling as a strategic mode of transport**

- 1.8 The role of cycling has always been recognised by the STB, but this had previously been in the context of short-distance trips or when accessing passenger transport facilities. At the time of writing the STP the impacts of the coronavirus pandemic on travel demand are not understood, but the decision taken to support the reallocation of highway space to support walking and cycling within urban centres does present a once in a generation opportunity to deliver a lasting transformative change.
- 1.9 In response to this policy development, the role of cycling as a strategic travel choice is lifted from its existing context within the urban hubs to be given greater prominence as a mode choice enhancing inter-urban connectivity. At the time of writing the STP the location of these routes is not known and the need for a study to recognise Sub-national priorities has been identified as a future study to inform future interactions of the STP.

## Public Engagement

- 1.10 Listening and understanding the views of stakeholders is an essential part of any plan-making process. As stated within this report the process previously outlined to the board regarding how these views were to be captured had to be revised to respect social distancing restrictions and sensitivities regarding the pandemic.
- 1.11 The way the STP has been drafted now informs stakeholders of the role of the Western Gateway and repackages existing funding commitments at a sub-national level where schemes support the outcomes identified within the plan. The proposed engagement process will not specifically seek the views of stakeholders or indeed their endorsement; it simply provides an opportunity to comment on the plan should they feel it appropriate.
- 1.12 It is proposed that the revised engagement process will formally commence on the 19<sup>th</sup> June and close on the 31<sup>st</sup> July. This provides a window of 6 weeks for stakeholders to comment on the draft plan. The document will be published on the STB webpage - <https://westerngatewaystb.org.uk/> and stakeholders will be invited to email feedback using the STB email address.
- 1.13 Publicity regarding the process will be targeted at all stakeholders that form part of the Business Transport Forum, the emerging Strategic Partnership Groups or have indicated in the past that they would like to be kept informed of any updates from the Western Gateway STB.
- 1.14 An engagement report outlining any responses received and how officers intend to respond will be circulated to members after the engagement process closes in August. This will enable the opportunity to consider any changes to the document ahead of the planned approval in September 2020.

## Next Steps

- 1.15 Despite the Short-Term plan not being finalised there is an overriding need to commence work on the Long-Term plan. The structure of the long-term plan will complement the short-term plan and continue to focus spatially on the hubs and corridor concept. A number of Western Gateway studies have been identified and the recommendations from these studies will feed where relevant into the strategic corridor plan. To ensure stakeholder engagement through the production of the Long-Term plan, four strategic partnership groups will be created to oversee the production of the corridor plans. It is proposed that updates on the progress of the corridor plans become a standing item at board meetings to ensure Members are fully briefed on the progress made.
- 1.16 The aim is for the Long-Term plan to be adopted by March 2023. During the process of producing the plan - and as social distancing restrictions return to

normal - it is intended that several rounds of consultation be undertaken in order to ensure the views of stakeholders are considered both in terms of the emerging evidence base and the scheme priorities identified. A high-level timeframe for the production of the Long-Term plan is outlined below:

<b>Autumn 2020</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve short-term Strategic Transport Plan</li> <li>• First meeting of Strategic Partnership Groups to discuss evidence required to support long-term Strategic Transport Plan</li> <li>• Submit 3 year funding ask to Department for Transport</li> </ul>
<b>Winter 2021</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second meeting of Strategic Partnership Groups to agree future commissions</li> </ul>
<b>2021/22</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake studies</li> </ul>
<b>Spring 2022</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete studies</li> </ul>
<b>Autumn 2022</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal consultation on Long-Term Strategy Plan</li> </ul>
<b>Spring 2023</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board approval of Long-Term Strategy</li> </ul>

## **Consultation, communication and engagement**

2.1 The Senior Officer Group has been fully consulted and engaged through the drafting of the Strategic Transport Plan and proposed public engagement process.

## **Equalities Implications**

3.1 No adverse impact on any protected groups.

## **Legal considerations**

4.1 The Western Gateway STB remains an informal non-statutory partnership.

## **Financial considerations**

5.1 During 2019/20 a budget of £10,000 for consultancy support was allocated to assist with the production of the corridor and hub narratives included within the plan.

5.2 There have been additional officer costs linked to the plan production. These will be covered under costs linked to the Programme Management team.

## **Conclusion**

6.1 The draft Short-Term Strategic Transport Plan is proposed for publication on 19 June to enable a six week stakeholder engagement process to commence. The outcomes of the engagement process will be shared with the Board before seeking approval of the final document.

**Contact Officer**

Ben Watts, Project Support Officer (Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body)

[ben.watts@gloucestershire.gov.uk](mailto:ben.watts@gloucestershire.gov.uk)

## **Western Gateway Shadow Sub-national Transport Body**

### **Board Meeting**

#### **Paper B**

Date **18<sup>th</sup> June 2020**

Title of report: **Strategic Transport Modelling Review**

Purpose of report: **To provide an update on a review of strategic transport modelling and evidence requirements to inform the Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body's Long-Term Strategic Transport Plan**

#### **Recommendations:**

The Board is recommended to:

- I. Note the review of current evidence base and modelling capabilities identifying gaps and issues and future requirements carried out by the Western Gateway's Transport Officers Group.
- II. To agree to allocate up to £25,000 to commission a study during 2020/21 to identify the most suitable transport modelling tools for the Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body to extend its existing evidence base and inform the Long-Term Strategic Transport Plan (STP).

#### **Background**

- 1.1. To inform the production of the Long-Term Strategic Transport Plan (STP) 2023-2050 it is essential to extend the existing transport evidence base.
- 1.2. The Short-Term STP for the Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body (STB) was reliant on existing evidence produced by its constituent local authorities to inform their Local Plans and Local Transport Plans.
- 1.3. As the Western Gateway STB develops its thinking around future planning it is important that it adds value to the regional evidence base by undertaking a number of long-term strategic modelling scenarios. The outputs will be used to understand the cumulative impacts of planned growth across the Western Gateway area and changes made to policy in response to the climate change emergencies declared.
- 1.4. To gain an initial understanding of the existing transport modelling approaches used by Western Gateway authorities the Transport Officer Group has carried



out a review of the existing transport models used by its members with a view to understanding future requirements.

## **Modelling review**

- 1.5. The review has established that there is a wide range of models, strategic and microsimulation, used by the authorities. The four strategic transport corridors and the three transport hubs outlined in the Short Term STP will likely have different requirements when identifying long-term strategy outcomes. It is clear that the determination of a preferred option to inform the STB's future modelling need is complex.
- 1.6. Most local authorities have or operate in a partnership that provides access to a regional, strategic multi-modal transport model (using the software SATURN) that is used for the assessment of major schemes and Local Plan development. It is noted that these have been used to appraise submitted MRN and LLM schemes along with the relevant Regional Highways models operated by Highways England. In terms of regional rail or highways models, some of the four strategic corridors in the STP overlap with more than one of the regional models used by key agencies, e.g. Strategic Corridor H1 – South East to South Wales spans both Highways England's South West and South East's models.
- 1.7. The review has noted that there are multiple issues observed by the membership. SATURN models are expensive to develop and maintain and need to be periodically updated. Some of the SATURN models used by members currently require updating in order to ensure robustness. Current best practice suggests base models should be updated every five years.
- 1.8. It is clear that the impacts of Covid-19 are such that collection of any meaningful data that represents 'normal' conditions is virtually impossible for the foreseeable future. Industry experts are completely uncertain of when transport behaviours may return to normal, if at all. In which case, it is imperative that the Western Gateway considers all possible tools and innovative approaches to developing a robust evidence base that may not be based on traditional modelling techniques.
- 1.9. There are alternative approaches to strategic and localised transport modelling such as Land Use and Transport Integration (LUTI) models which examine land allocations and potential for transport connectivity rather than the traditional approach of modelling impacts of proposed developments on highway networks. Further details are provided in the Transport Modelling report provided in Appendix B.

1.10. Given the nature of the STB's remit and the corridors and hubs approach set out in the Short-Term STP, the need for multi modal modelling tools may require increased partnership working with key agencies such as Network Rail and Highways England.

1.11. To inform the content of the Long-Term STP it is advised that a study should be commissioned to investigate future transport modelling and evidence requirements for the STB. This study will assess issues and options relating to future modelling options and establish an appropriate and proportionate approach to developing an extended evidence base. It is envisaged that this could be achieved for circa £25,000.

1.12. The Transport Modelling report included in Appendix A provides:

- Assessment of modelling and analytical tools available
- Next steps for planning our future modelling requirements to inform the next STP.

### **Equalities Implications**

1.13. No adverse impact on any protected groups.

### **Legal considerations**

1.14. The Western Gateway SSTB is an informal non-statutory partnership.

### **Financial considerations**

1.15. It is estimated that a study in future modelling requirements for Western Gateway STB should be in the region of £25,000.

### **Conclusion**

1.16. The Transport Officers' Group has reviewed the transport modelling capabilities and future requirements and concluded that further work is needed to identify the most suitable modelling tools for the Western Gateway STB to extend its existing evidence base and inform the Long-Term STP.

### **Contact Officer**

Ewan Wilson – Programme Management team – [ewan.wilson@bcpcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:ewan.wilson@bcpcouncil.gov.uk)

## **Appendix A**

### **Western Gateway - Sub-national Transport Body**

#### **Transport Modelling Review – June 2020**

It is essential that the STB has an up to date and robust evidence base with which to appraise and assess the impacts of the priorities and schemes set out in the Strategic Transport Plan. Ultimately any bids to government for future funding will be subject to analytical scrutiny in order to determine effectiveness and value for money. In order to identify future needs with respect to transport modelling and evidence, the Programme Management Team has, in partnership with the Transport Officers Group (TOG), carried out a review of its Local Authority members' modelling capabilities and approaches along with gathering views on future needs and issues to consider.

The review has demonstrated that across the Western Gateway area, members currently employ a range of modelling software programmes and approaches to modelling and estimating the impacts their proposed transport schemes. It is clear that identification of future modelling requirements to inform the next STP 2023-2050 are complex and requires further work.

#### **Current Modelling Approaches**

Most member authorities have a strategic transport model for their main urban areas, or county wide area, using the software programme - 'SATURN' which has highways and public transport modelling capabilities.

Member authorities also tend to use other local models to test the impacts of local schemes using programmes like VISSIM or Paramics. Other programmes such as 'LINSIG' are employed for analysis of junctions and roundabouts in relation to development, however these are local matters for respective highway authorities determining planning applications and are not considered 'strategic' and thus not within the scope of this review.

All members have identified strengths and weakness with strategic modelling such as SATURN. There is consensus that SATURN modelling can be effective in assessing the impacts of major schemes, cumulative development in Local Plan making and that its outputs are well used and understood. Historically SATURN modelling has been successfully used to assess the costs and benefits of schemes in business case development and has been a key part of the evidence base and supported many successful funding bids to the Department for Transport.

#### **Challenges**

While SATURN has recognised benefits, TOG has agreed that this approach has some weaknesses. SATURN models are notoriously expensive to maintain and update with new data. SATURN models do not always accurately reflect exact conditions at specific locations such as junctions or links but are more appropriate for looking at a strategic study area. In this regard SATURN outputs have been subject to challenge.

Other challenges with SATURN were highlighted - use of Granular computing across vast areas is difficult and creates model noise. Very large models operate more effectively as a

buffer, with simulation restricted to particular corridors, with outputs provided for input into smaller models.

Table 1 below summarises responses from TOG representatives with respect to modelling issues.

Table 1 – Model Summary

Model Software/Approach	Strengths	Weaknesses	Other info
SATURN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good for strategic work and business cases.</li> <li>• Large and complex model updated periodically to focus on particular schemes.</li> <li>• Well known software</li> <li>• Dynamic, coverage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not so good for very localized modelling.</li> <li>• Expensive and a long and complex process to update the model – it therefore may not be the best fit for all schemes or can become outdated.</li> <li>• Clients can think the model perfectly represents traffic on every road on the network.</li> <li>• Very poor GUI.</li> <li>• Visual outputs</li> <li>• Model run needs high spec SATURN license which restricts the model user parties.</li> <li>• County wide coverage increases model noise and restricts stability of cordon</li> <li>• Outputs require a significant amount of time, which would be mitigated through Power BI based file output which aren't currently accepted by DfT.</li> </ul>	Issues with misleading results with due to smoothing of junctions and zones

PARAMICS Micro-Simulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good for assessing localized impacts as models tend to be smaller and individual vehicles are modeled</li> <li>• Visible presentation and Air Quality modelling (Devizis model only)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can be used for Strategic modelling, but generally use Saturn (if available)</li> <li>• Requirement to use other modelling tools, e.g. LinSig, to gain data for all aspects of a modelled network</li> <li>• Capability to model MOVA networks with accuracy.</li> <li>• Outputs in tangible black and white data common across other modelling e.g. RFC</li> <li>• Calibration of stop line saturation flows – requires systematic changing of driver inputs and application</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good for localized Junction Modelling</li> </ul>
TRACC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good for high-level analysis</li> <li>• Excellent GUI</li> <li>• Accessible PT accessibility modelling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulties with managing data types and sources. Loses styling when exporting QGIS.</li> <li>• Does not accurately reflect likely commercial economics of applying new services</li> </ul>	Could benefit from plugins
South East Dorset Modelling	Shared costs Agreement on model's fitness for purpose	Working out fair share of contributions from each party. Model not equally useful to all parties	
LinSig	Good GUI. Able to test signal timings and junctions.	Weak for priority junctions	
TRANSYT	Relatively straightforward to use	Struggles with complex/multiple junctions	
VISSIM	Visually output strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very expensive and hard to manage for complex junctions/area studies</li> <li>• Static assignment</li> </ul>	
VISSIM	Visual outputs	Static assignment	

## TOG Views

Some feedback has identified appetite for alternative approaches to future modelling. Such as use of a Land Use/Transport Interaction (LUTI) style model to move on and recognise some of the interaction of transport on land use. While a transport model requires inputs of land-use which have been forecast exogenously, land use/transport interaction, (LUTI) models generate their own forecasts of land-use dependent on input land-use policies and the changes in accessibility brought about by conditions on the transport system. Further information on LUTI models is provided in Appendix A.

There are options to use a 5 stage model to bring in behavioural factors and a hybrid model level to deal with the boundary problems between macro and micro areas. E.g. BCP Council is currently looking at entering into joint LUTI model with Dorset.

Some TOG officers suggested preference for switching to scenario planning but back-casting from the preferred scenario as to what is needed to be developed and test those measures rather than continue with traditional approach of modelling the status quo plus x%

for growth. As a Regional organisation, seeking forecast years within current plan periods is not considered suitable by some and as such the STB should seek to model years post 2050, i.e. beyond current TEMPRO forecasts, to establish a preferred transport position and set policy to achieve this. Use of nearer forecast years would simply establish perceived inevitabilities without a steering mechanism.

Other views suggested STB may be better seeking a layered modelling approach with a regional model calibrated across cordons with Local Authority models.

Origin and Destination (OD) studies are becoming increasingly difficult and their obtrusive nature together with the often one day snapshot fails to provide the quality of data that would benefit an understanding of mobility across the region. Affordable access to reliable OD and Journey Time data provided on a stable and readily accessible platform would enhance our ability to better understand demands and predict flows. Utilization of MND data or similar 'Big Data' should be investigated on a regional basis.

## **Conclusion**

It is clear that there are a wide range of stakeholders both for highways and public transport that use differing models for differing purposes. Consideration should be given to liaising with the Department for Transport on future modelling and evidence requirements for STBs. Given the Western Gateway's remit as a STB concerned with strategic transport issues on a regional basis and that the STP is founded on a four Strategic Corridor and three Urban Hub approach; the modelling requirements for the next STP are complex.

In the interests of defining the best approach to developing understanding of our core modelling capabilities and future requirements, it is proposed that a study is commissioned into future transport modelling and evidence requirements for the STB. This study will assess issues and options relating to future modelling needs in partnership with key stakeholders and establish an appropriate and proportionate approach to developing our evidence base in order to inform the next STP 2023-2050. It is envisaged that this could be achieved for circa £25k.

## **Note on Land Use and Transport Integrated Model**

### **Introduction**

This note describes issues with developing land use and transport integrated models and is derived from a note provided to Dorset and BCP Councils by consultants WSP.

Land use models can forecast the activities of households, jobs and developers. The outputs from the model will provide a rich source of information planning authorities in their policy decision making processes.

The land use model can be developed using a modelling suite in the CUBE platform developed on sound academic econometric principles and is used internationally.

### **Overview**

Land use models forecast the development of space and the corresponding distribution of land use activities that occupy these spaces. The land use modelling processes are representations of how various actors make decisions which ultimately influence markets. These decisions in the Land use system ultimately have a resultant effect on travel demand and hence influence the supply of transportation services and infrastructure.

It is also worth noting that transport has an influence on the decisions made by these market actors. The markets in the land use system include property, labour, products and transport. The actors are the developers, firms, residents and transport infrastructure & service providers. The transport elements are applicable when you have a full LUTI system.

Land use modelling uses the effects of the changing costs of travel (ultimately referred to as “accessibility changes” in modelling terms) to simulate the responses/behaviours/actions of the various markets actors and forecasts the effects on the markets. There is always an interaction of the processes within the land use model. These interactions mean that one market can affect other markets and decisions of some actors can also affect the actions of other actors.

Land use and economic policies influence transport demand and subsequently transport supply. It is therefore critical to fully understand the land uses in question when developing transport policy.

Conventional transport models, like SATURN models, have traditionally used predefined planning data (Mostly from NTEM or other similar data) to inform the demand for travel. These have mostly been fixed planning data in any given scenario. A typical conventional transport model will fail to adequately capture the displacement effects of residents and jobs that result from accessibility changes in the transportation system. The residents and jobs constitute the trips ends of the travel demand, therefore any resultant relocations are important in some transport impact assessments or policy appraisals. While this limitation is not an issue in itself in transport appraisals according to DfT TAG guidance especially when calculating Transport user benefits etc, there are times when planning authorities or policy makers have expressed interest in being able to fully understand the effects of their proposed policies on the transportation system and vice versa the spatial effects of transportation on their development plans.



## Benefits

Land use model and LUTI model outputs can be used in various ways. Some of the key benefits of these models are:

- Testing core strategies – Planning authorities may be interested in testing variants of planning strategies. The land use model will have the functionality to format planning policy inputs as planning constraints within which future development can occur. The model simulates the development market and determines uptake of land. Transport interventions that are expected to unlock sites can be modelled and the development impacts analysed using a land use model. The LUTI application can help the authority to understand the impacts of their strategic policies.
- Spatial impacts of proposed policies – spatial demographic and economic impacts of policies can be demonstrated with the land use model. Households by type or jobs by sector etc will form part of the outputs from this land use model. These outputs can be used for very detailed analysis. These headline impacts can also serve as inputs to inform strategic outline business cases for major schemes that are expected to have impacts on the economy and distribution of land uses. Developers will be able to demonstrate the impacts of their planned development.
- Promoters can use LUTI models to meet formal requirements for appraisals involving dynamic travel demand – where variable demand is required this model can be an appropriate tool. Within a set scenario, households and jobs from the model can provide the correct trip ends for the transport model.

## **Western Gateway Shadow Sub-national Transport Body**

### **Board Meeting**

#### **Paper C**

Date **18<sup>th</sup> June 2020**

Title of report: **Future of Transport – Regulatory Review**

Purpose of report: **To advise the Board of the STB's response to the national Regulatory Review of Future of Transport**

#### **Recommendations:**

The Board is recommended to:

- I. To approve the Western Gateway's submission to the Department for Transport Regulatory Review on the Future of Transport

#### **Background**

1.1. The government has issued a 'Call for Evidence' as part of a wider Future of Transport Regulatory Review which was announced in March 2019 as part of the Industrial Strategy - Future of Mobility. The call for evidence seeks views from stakeholders on micro-mobility vehicles, flexible bus services and mobility as a service (MaaS) and was published in March 2020.

#### **Call for Evidence**

- 1.2. Sub-national Transport Bodies (STBs) and local authorities are submitting responses to the regulatory review. In addition Transport for the South East (TfSE) is collating a joint STB response and will submit this on behalf of STBs outlining the potential role that STBs can play with respect to these issues.
- 1.3. The STB Transport Officers Group has prepared a response to the issues raised in the review. A report on the STB's response is provided in Appendix A.

#### **Western Gateway response**

1.4. There was broad agreement across the Western Gateway authorities on the topic outlined in the review. However, there is some variation of views on certain aspects. All authorities acknowledge the enormous potential micro-mobility vehicles have for increasing transport choice and environmental and

social benefits of reducing trips made by car. There is also potential for micro-mobility to greatly enhance safe transport choices post Covid-19.

- 1.5. The Western Gateway authorities acknowledge the need for robust frameworks to ensure safety. Concerns included; risk of increased take up of Micro Mobility Vehicles (MMV) detracting from walking and cycling with impacts on public health, the short lifespan of some MMV products with potential for cluttering of streets and challenges over waste, conflicts between users on road/pavements due to a lack of suitable infrastructure such as cycle lanes, liability in case of accident, enforcement of legislation and resource implications. There are also issues related to digital technology with respect to inclusiveness, consumer protection and competition law.
- 1.6. Each constituent authority faces its own unique, local challenges, which they are best placed to make informed decisions on. In particular, mobility in urban and rural settings tends to face fundamental differences in challenge and opportunity, which must be acknowledged.

### **Equalities Implications**

- 1.7. No adverse impact on any protected groups.

### **Legal considerations**

- 1.8. The Western Gateway SSTB is an informal non-statutory partnership.

### **Financial considerations**

- 1.9. There are no financial implications of submitting the STB's response.

### **Conclusion**

- 1.10. The STB welcomes the opportunity to comment on the regulatory review of innovative and emerging modes of transport. The STB agrees there are huge potential benefits that can assist with the longer-term aim to decarbonise the transport sector to net zero by 2050 and transform transport choices for people. It also acknowledges there is a unique role for STBs to play in driving forward innovations in transport and mobility through their close partnership working with local transport authorities, LEPs, and other strategic stakeholders. The issues raised in the Call for Evidence highlight several potential challenges acknowledging that regulation will be key in clarifying liability, restrictions and enforcement in order to provide a safe, consistent environment for all. The STB also acknowledges that each authority has unique challenges in which it is best placed to make informed decisions, particularly with respect to differences between urban and rural authorities.

**Contact Officer**

Ewan Wilson – Programme Management team – [ewan.wilson@bcpcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:ewan.wilson@bcpcouncil.gov.uk)

## **Appendix A – Western Gateway response – Future of Transport**

The Western Gateway STB welcomes the opportunity to comment on the regulatory review of innovative and emerging modes of transport. The STB agrees there are huge potential benefits that can assist with the longer-term aim to decarbonise the transport sector to net zero by 2050 and transform transport options for all social groups. It also acknowledges there is a unique role to STBs to play in driving forward innovations in transport and mobility through their close partnership working with local transport authorities, LEPs, and other strategic stakeholders.

The issues raised in the Call for Evidence raise several potential challenges and risks. Effective regulation will be key in clarifying liability, restrictions and enforcement in order to provide a safe, consistent environment for all. The STB also acknowledges that each authority has unique challenges in which it is best placed to make informed decisions, particularly with respect to differences between urban and rural authorities.

### **MicroMobility**

There was broad agreement across the Western Gateway authorities on most issues however there is some variation of views on particular aspects. All authorities acknowledge the enormous potential micro-mobility vehicles have for increasing transport choice, huge environmental and social benefits of reducing trips made by car. There is also potential for micro-mobility to greatly enhance transport choices post Covid-19.

Each constituent authority faces its own unique, local challenges, which they are best placed to make informed decisions on. Micro-mobility is likely to have considerably more potential take up in urban areas than rural. Flexible bus service on the other hand are likely to be key aspects of transport choice in rural areas if decarbonization is to be achieved.

The Western Gateway authorities believe that micro-mobility vehicles (MMV) are likely to play an increasingly important role in providing additional transport choices for urban mobility. There is clear merit in restricted, permitted MMV use in promoting active neighbourhoods that prioritise people over cars and certain key corridors with protected infrastructure. MMV will play a key role in transport development and decarbonisation up to 2050 and beyond.

For instance, the WECA Future Transport Zone submission included micro-mobility stations, as mini-transport interchanges that connect first and last mile trips by active or micromobility modes onto public transport corridors, for example secure bicycle/scooter parking, electric vehicle charging, real-time information & ticket purchasing and pedestrian route mapping all at one busy bus stop or train station.

These areas aim to observe fewer motor vehicles and lower vehicle speeds. They will be areas where drivers can expect to interact with people, pedestrians and cyclists. It should be expected that micromobility will form an important, lower-

carbon and more space-efficient part of this mix.

MMV is likely to provide more space-efficient and affordable transport options and thus could offer greater accessibility in financial, physical and social terms. They also penetrate urban space more efficiently due to size and versatility. There would clearly be benefits from MMV being permitted, provided that it can be evidenced that they can be used safely.

However until there is clarity on regulatory frameworks; unrestricted, permitted use on standard, classified urban roads is likely to represent safety risk to vulnerable users and unless specific routes with protected infrastructure or 20 Mph safe zones are developed, there may be excessive risk to Highway Authorities in supporting unrestricted use on the carriageway. There is a mix of views on this.

It was generally considered that micro-mobility vehicles would broadly be acceptable on roads with lower speed limits such as 20mph, or roads with low vehicle flows (based on AADTS). However, it is recognised that it may be necessary to ban some classes of micro-mobility vehicles based on local conditions (e.g. some may be inappropriate on roads where there are multiple lanes for instance). However, to answer this question in more detail, more information about each type of micro-mobility vehicle, for instance, details such as their maximum speed and braking abilities would be required.

There may be a safety risk for all road users if MMV were permitted on roads with higher speed limits.

In terms of Traffic Regulation Orders, it may be easier to create national legislation in presumption of allowing the use of these vehicles on lower speed limit roads, but then for local authorities to consider banning them in problem areas or where their use becomes a problem.

There may also be times when it is safer and more appropriate for MMV users to use footways. However, there were mixed views on this point. In this case there must be clear guidance regarding the road user hierarchy to encourage a safe environment for all users, especially pedestrians. A potential approach for a trial could be setting categories according to speed and relative stability to determine which vehicles should be permitted on the road.

**Speed and agility:** Micro-mobility vehicles such as scooters/skateboards can travel as fast as pedal bikes /e-bikes so could be permitted on the road if rode safely and in places where it was safe to do so.

**Infrastructure design and flexibility:** Micro-mobility vehicles should be enabled to have maximum permeation to attract the user and could become the quickest most efficient green mode of transport that has extensive network of routes on and off the road with the opportunity to connect to high frequency public transport.

The standard width and integral design of a shared use path /cycle lane/segregated route are key along with how pedestrians and micro mobility users interact.

Consideration needed for commuter/leisure & utility needs where there is a difference in speeds. Assurance of pedestrian safety would have to be considered

and designed carefully where lanes akin to London's super highway' (akin to Motorways) would have to be considered to enable all users of all abilities and speeds to use the facilities. They would also need to enable safe crossing points.

With the right infrastructure, micro-mobility, could negate the need to travel by car for trips under potentially 20km in rural or urban areas. The propensity to cycle model for instance, would need to be re-evaluated for each micro mode.

## Benefits

- Could replace large number of trips by car of short journeys. This would reduce emissions leading to better air quality, improved urban environments, increased economic vitality, reduced congestion, better connected communities etc.
- Could generate increase in demand in bus/rail use through MMV used as mode of first/last mile connection to and from bus/rail journeys. Integration of MMV with public transport is a key issue for this review.
- Offers affordable mobility for socially disadvantaged groups.
- Overcomes challenges associated with topography as a barrier to using active travel modes in some circumstances.
- Health benefits: Studies have also shown that users of e-bikes cycle further and do just as much or more exercise than a conventional pedal cycle because they feel more confident to cycle further on more adventurous longer excursions and have the fitness to ride more regularly<sup>1</sup>
- Important role in local parcel delivery/e-commerce.
- Efficient in terms of energy use, road space and materials to produce these vehicles.
- Re-allocating road space to these type of vehicles may encourage healthier streets and environments.
- May be useful in areas where public transport options are limited both as an alternative to public transport and as a means to access public transport

## Risks

- Actual and perceived risk of accidents and potential road safety issues.
- Quiet – E-scooters create little noise which is positive for reducing noise pollution but creates potential for pedestrian conflict on footways. Silent running of electric micromobility vehicles and lack of awareness signaling

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S259019821930017X>



(horn/bell) may leave those with vision impairments vulnerable to conflict.

Evidence:

<https://ajuntament.barcelona.cat/bicicleta/en/noticia/new-regulation-for-personal-mobility-vehicles-and-bikes-with-more-than-two-wheels>

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-50189279>

<https://airqualitynews.com/2020/03/05/e-scooters-the-impact-their-legalisation-would-have-in-the-uk/>

[https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/safe-micromobility\\_1.pdf](https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/safe-micromobility_1.pdf)

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-01-21/lime-scooters-cause-issues-for-vision-impaired-residents/10731510>

- Could replace journeys currently made by bus if cheaper than bus tickets. Could lead to services being less viable.
- Could replace journeys currently made by walking and cycling – health and obesity issues.
- Safety on roads – issues relating to indicating, training, helmets, insurance.
- Lack of suitable competency training (such as Bikeability) for many micromobility vehicles.
- Street clutter and hazards leading to disadvantaging vision impaired or mobility restricted pedestrians. Abandonment of hire micro-mobility vehicles, or irresponsible parking creates an unexpected hazard for vulnerable pedestrians, particularly the vision impaired, leading to disorientation or injury, especially for those that choose not to use long canes. Only a small percentage of vision impaired users have a guide dog that may lead them around these obstacles.
- Many of the scooters appear to have limited life spans and this could lead to a significant increase in electronic waste and the needless generation of electricity with associated environmental impact. Some form of regulation to ensure that users can replace parts (particularly the battery) would help to reduce this.
- There is evidence from the Netherlands of MMV using the cycle facilities with some MMV users using their faster acceleration to weave in and out of cyclists creating a hazard. However this is anecdotal.
- Pedestrians already encounter hazards with cars parked on footways, mobility scooters and cycles unofficially using their designated space. This is a particular problem for the elderly and disabled who are unable to take quick evasive action, may have poorer hearing and are more susceptible to falls resulting in injury.
- Shared MMV schemes – if market is unregulated there could be multiple operators with multiple registration methods which would be confusing. Clear guidance on parking, speed limits and smart technology embedded should be requirement.

- MMV use for people with disabilities on footways has potential to cause confusion –there need to be clear and consistent regulation set by central government so that regulation is consistent across different LAs.
- Shared E scooter schemes are likely to impact significantly on the taxi industry.
- Enforcing road traffic laws. Extra pressure on police and LA Enforcement officers
- Proliferation of use and regulation vacuum leads to Insurance/public liability concerns. This was evident in Barcelona in particular and was addressed by the introduction of a bye-law.

### **Should micromobility vehicles should be permitted, if any, on roads, lower speed roads, and/or cycle lanes and cycle tracks?**

In terms of segregated cycle tracks or shared paths, suitability may depend on factors such as the width of the path and how the path links to the road network and this should be up to local authorities to judge. It is not viable to restrict micromobility vehicles to cycle tracks / shared use paths only since: a) there is no continuous network of such paths and this would promote illegal use on the footway, and; b) many paths may be unsuitable for their usage.

- Electric scooters

Acceptable for lower speed roads, but there may be speeding / intimidation issues if these vehicles are used on cycle lanes / shared use paths / tracks.

- Electric skateboards

Dimensions of skateboards may cause an issue for use in cycle lanes / shared use paths / tracks, and their movements (i.e. weaving could be intimidating or dangerous to other roads users). Also, there may be a lack of control in terms of braking.

- Self-balancing vehicles

Unsuitable for most roads although maybe suitable on lower speed roads. Again, there may be some sort of dimensions issues with cycle lanes and shared use tracks.

- Electrically assisted cycle trailer

Appropriate on cycle lanes / shared use paths / tracks.

- Segway

May be appropriate for cycle lanes, shared use paths / tracks and lower speed roads but depends on dimensions, frame design etc.

- Other (please specify)

## **MMV Standards and Design issues**

Different vehicles will have different characteristics and one set out regulations may not best fit all of them. There should be a degree of tailoring. Perhaps regulations should broadly align with the type definitions given by the International Transport Forum which categorise micromobility vehicles by their weight/mass and speed.

[https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/safe-micromobility\\_1.pdf](https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/safe-micromobility_1.pdf)

All MMV should have lights and reflectors.

Standards may be dependent on the speed each vehicle can reach. Vehicles must be limited to 20mph if allowed for use on a cycle track / shared use path.

All vehicles allowed on roads / cycle tracks, should be equipped with brakes.

If use of MMV according to the definition 'small mobility devices' for 1 or 2 people is the criteria, practical regulation and design standards will be almost impossible. It is more critical to determine the areas they can be used rather than legislation to cover their design. A MMV according to the criteria is no different to a powered cycle and these are not regulated. If regulation of the vehicle becomes the issue any lobby group encouraging MMV will also seek legislation and regulation of bicycles, which is detrimental.

Lack of space to carry personal belongings i.e. a conventional bicycle can accommodate baskets, panniers and trailers for transporting belongings etc, however e-scooters/balance vehicles cannot do this and may require belongings to be carried which may affect the users ability to move as easily and as safely. Some are therefore limited to being point to point mobility tools only and nothing more.

It is believed that regulations would be necessary and accepted that they should be proportionate to the risk. Some e-bikes and e-scooters can travel at speeds above those categorised as EAPCs so limiting the speeds of them may be required.

Potential difficulty in enforcing some of the requirements such as helmets especially for hop on hop off vehicles like e-scooters where the user would have to carry a helmet with them at all times. Germany in their micromobility regulations have only recommended the use of a helmet rather than make it a requirement.

Outcomes should support the Police and Local Authorities to protect citizens whilst ensuring fair and open competition.

Test sites and/or pilot solutions should be developed to enable innovation of real-life solutions, test and evolve innovation to establish robust evidence through monitoring and evaluation to understand what works and what doesn't work.

Micro-mobility should be regulated which provides clear rules and context for legal, financial, user safety and regulatory purpose. These should be based on things like power, eligibility location for usage, and usage worthiness.

The use on the road should be determined by a regulatory parameters which determines where they can be used based on evidence collected as part of testing and evaluation. It may be appropriate for an MOT type annual review to check usage worthiness unless it is being operated by a business as a service provider.

### **Flexible Bus Services**

Western Gateway welcomes consultation given potential impacts of flexible bus services on our rural areas. With Climate Emergencies declared in many of our Local Authorities and the government's commitment to decarbonisation of transport it is essential that flexible bus services have a key role to play in reducing trips by car.

The regulations should continue to apply to all three categories of service to allow for operator's and bus user's flexibility. While travel to and from hubs simplifies operations for service providers there remains demand to travel to non-hubs (a-many-to-many model) which we also need to cater for.

There should be a flexible registration process. Also, as some operators will be community transport providers, monitoring and the regulatory framework should accommodate (all) their operating models.

The existing regulations pose no particular problems when designing and delivering a flexible bus service. If at the outset the focus is on identifying areas of demand and unmet need, then naturally geographical areas will be defined through this process. The registration of fixed services as an element of the flexible operation is important to some user groups who prefer to have a regular timetabled bus service and would otherwise not use a totally flexible on demand bus.

The area of operation for a flexible bus service should be defined by its geographic area.

### **Is the 20 minute time window to arrive at each passenger pick-up appropriate?**

When involved in intentions to remove tendered/supported bus services, the Council suggested community transport as an alternative, from the responses it was evident that most of the users of supported routes, the elderly, would rather have a regular conventional bus even if it ran only say every 2 hours, than need to make arrangements to access demand responsive transport.

Flexible services should remain accessible to all user groups. The elderly are likely to be a big potential user group, particularly in rural areas with above average proportions of over 65's. The elderly are far less likely to use smartphone apps and therefore will want the reassurance that the bus will turn up on time within a specified window. There also remain significant mobile coverage issues in rural areas that make connecting to smartphone apps difficult for some users.

Geographic considerations/differences of urban/rural areas should be made. There should be an option to broaden the window that needs to be available especially for rural areas.

### **Real time updates**

This may be prohibitively difficult and expensive.

Real time updates are clearly desirable but not totally essential to the successful delivery of a service, especially if the service is demonstrably reliable.

Real time is however an important part of journey information and an important method for passenger reassurance. Councils should be part of this work and cooperate with operators to ensure real time is a realistic option for all. This would include sourcing machines and assisting with installation among other things. It should be acknowledged by councils that some operators will need more support than others.

### **How could the carriage of more ad-hoc bus passengers be encouraged without impacting negatively on the service received by passengers who have booked in advance?**

There will be many time critical journeys such as for work, health appointments and connections with other transport services where delays would have important consequences for these customers. Many customers will want the security of pre-booking and having a guaranteed arrival time for such journeys. Therefore the systems used need to take these constraints into account and only accept ad hoc bookings that would not introduce a delay.

In rural areas the dispersed nature of demand means that flexible services generally have to cover large areas. There is a trade-off to be made between service coverage and service frequency, and as such the ability to accept ad hoc journeys is diminished due to longer journey times.

A limit could be placed on the carriage of ad-hoc passengers, limiting to those passengers who will not extend the journey time by an unreasonable amount. This 'amount' would likely be a percentage of the booked-in-advance planned journey's existing mileage of the journey and/or existing journey time.

### **What sort of fare structure do you think should apply to flexible bus services?**

Through any fares and pricing mechanisms we would want to be able to encourage the use of sustainable forms of transport. It's important that flexi buses use a fare structure that is similar to traditional public transport services so that there is integration of tickets available and so that flexible bus services are viewed as part of the wider public transport network, not as something separate. This should include accepting concessionary fares and offering multi operator through tickets.

We wouldn't want to penalise customers when they travel on a shared journey or at peak times, as encouraging the highest number of customers to use the service on the fewest journeys is the most cost-efficient way to operate.

The peaks are when the roads are most congested so encouraging people to use buses at these times rather than penalising them financially makes far more sense. This could be done through season tickets or multi trip carnet tickets which discounts regular travel, which is particularly useful for commuters.

A simple, integrated and zonal fare structure should be applied.

### **Do you think there should there be less rigid registration requirements around notice periods for flexible bus services?**

It's important to ensure customers are protected against operators making short notice changes to services that detrimentally affect their journeys. If someone is reliant on that service as their only means of transport it's important that they are given sufficient warning that a service might be withdrawn or altered so that alternatives can be sought. It also ensures that local authorities have enough time to step in should an operator withdraw and there is a social need to provide a replacement service of some kind.

Yes, there should be as short as possible registration window, whilst allowing for mobilization and information to be disseminated to passengers.

### **Do you think we could use flexible bus services to improve transport in rural areas?**

The community transport sector fills some of the gaps and caters for a wide range of transport needs, but particularly focus on people who find using public transport difficult, the elderly and disability groups. The community sector is not meeting the needs of commuters' trips to work and other regular travel and as such fails to fulfil this unmet need in areas where there is no public transport provision.

Flexible bus services clearly have a role in rural areas. However, it should be recognised that there are higher costs associated with operating in rural areas and lower revenue returns so it is highly unlikely that flexible services will be delivered commercially and will require ongoing subsidy. Integration with the wider public transport network is essential to ensure that the different types of service complement one another rather than compete against each other. This requires

coordination at a local level and strong partnerships between local authorities and local operators.

Bus travel is important to many vulnerable residents and is often their only mode of transport. Anything that increases the travel options for those people is welcome.

### **What do you think would be the correct requirement for Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks on flexible bus services?**

Currently in Dorset drivers who work solely with children to mainstream or SEN schools and adults to day centres are DBS checked. Drivers on public services may have clearance but it is not mandatory unless the main purpose of the route is to carry school children as part of a contract. Taxi companies and CT companies who work for us are expected to have clearance for any driver who might work on our contracted routes.

The drivers of flexible services have much more personal direct contact with customers. They act as customer service agents who will be the primary information source for lots of customers such as the elderly who are less likely to use the internet or mobile apps. With the use of smaller vehicles and working in more remote rural locations, it's appropriate that all drivers of flexible service vehicles should be required to have DBS checks from a safeguarding point of view.

It's also appropriate for all vehicles to carry onboard CCTV. This has proved invaluable where a customer's conduct has been a concern to other passengers and the drivers or when dealing with a customer complaint relating to a driver, providing vital information that supports the investigation.

Yes, the checks should apply. The services need to be safe, especially considering that services could include a high proportion of passengers who are isolated, and that children should be able to use the services as well in a safe and secure manner.

## **MaaS**

### **Role of LAs**

There is a role for Local Authorities to provide a co-ordination – umbrella structure giving local identity and resource. Legislation does need to be reviewed as currently if strictly applied, co-ordination of activity between transport providers is against competition law.

LAs could offer a registration service for operators that use the MaaS platform. Central government must provide the regulatory framework that MaaS Platforms and operators must adhere to.

They need to have a regulatory rule to ensure integration between different types of services from a user perspective e.g. through-ticketing.

Central, Local Government and other transport authorities should help to ensure that data is provided between transport operators and MaaS providers. This will ensure interoperability which is key to MaaS success. This can be achieved by policy interventions including setting standards for data sharing and effective collaboration between stakeholders.

Relevant authorities also need to protect their ability to control MaaS marketplace by controlling the operations of MaaS providers to ensure any market failures can be corrected. Licensing or accreditation measures could achieve this.

Central Government should ensure that there is a common platform to work from and clear indications as to what is expected of a MaaS platform. Without some sort of universalism there may be multiple platforms which may then lead to confusion or misunderstanding affecting the use experience.

Central Government should have a role in a single Mobility Services Layer for capturing mobility providers information by building on the Open Bus Data Hub that can be expanded to capture any mode of transport. Central Government is best placed to regulate the overall quality and availability of data. Potentially could provide a mobile app that support the option selection & purchasing layer which enable citizens to plan personal travel for themselves.

There is a danger of widening the equality gap for people if access to fast network speed and up to date mobile devices is required.

A code of practice for Mobility as a Service industry would be useful to include data standards, data sharing protocols, data usage limitations

### **Standardisation**

There does need to be some standardisation, in a similar way to ITSO which oversees integrated ticketing. One BCP example is that Beryl bike information is available on both local bus operators apps. This has happened because both More Bus and Yellow B use the same app developer – Passenger. If they did not, this would be unlikely to happen.

Central Government must lead in terms of legislation, with Local Government empowered to create local schemes. Leaving wholly to the market and industry risks distortion and an overly commercial, non-co-ordinated approach.

The biggest barrier to integrated ticketing is currently the financial protocols and methodology to assign revenue. There would need to be an independent body to oversee this. The technology to deliver the products, aside of financial considerations is there.



The introduction of multi-operator ticketing is hampered by the reluctance of service providers to share data that is perceived to be commercially sensitive.

The means of how MaaS is to be implemented is also a barrier. Travel cards are becoming less prevalent due to the rise in smartphone and app technically combined with the ability to use contactless payments direct from the phone. Subscription and Pay as you go can be provided via the app/contactless payment on the go. However, this limits the produce to those who have a smartphone, internet access and an ability to play contactlessly via their phones. Other members of society may not have access to such services and therefore may be excluded from travelling with the same ease. This would be in contrary to local and central government ambitions for accessibility for all.

For a fair and open Market for business to innovate in MaaS, is DfT prepared to enable differing pricing options for businesses based on service contracts offered by the mobility providers which enables citizens to differentiate between MaaS applications, and look at a combined package? This would be regulated in order to ensure all sectors of society and consumer benefit, GDPR compliance is maintained and data is encrypted.

Post COVID-19 will have significant impacts on wider travel patterns and the transport network as a whole. Affordability in review of economic impact is likely to change travel models, particularly against a backdrop of aiming for carbon neutrality in the transport sector.

### Competition

MaaS platforms could be owned or purchased by firms that also own operators and aggressively price out other operators using the platform. There is scope for monopoly power leading to excessive high prices that lead to a less than perfectly competitive market for mobility. There is also scope for MaaS platform owners excluding certain users from using their service unless they enter into an agreement which could have distributional implications

There may be a range of providers offering similar products with out some form of unification. Competitors may focus on certain markets and methods. Some MaaS models focus on a subscription based approach. This excludes all potential users that either cannot afford a subscription-based approach. It may also exclude those without access to the internet or smartphones.

### **Does the current framework for consumer protection need to be expanded to include liability for multi-modal journeys?**

Consumer Protection. Currently is fairly well developed for rail – delay repay, but less so for bus services, if the bus doesn't turn up there is no statutory protection for

consumers. Although consumer protection is desirable, the complexities of interlinking various modes with overall protection may influence the viability of schemes.

Yes, the consumer must know who is liable should their journeys be affected. Clarity on whether the individual operator is liable or the MaaS provider is liable is needed and which channels the user needs to take in order to obtain compensation.

Could Mobility as a Service present any particular accessibility and/or inclusivity concerns which might be difficult to address through existing regulations? If yes,

MaaS arrangements should use best practice from elsewhere, but there should not be a requirement for any different consideration compared to other non-transport based activity being developed on similar platforms.

MaaS would suggest that access to a smart phone and/or internet access is required. Some deprived residents may not have the ability to access those so there is a risk of exclusion. Likewise some vulnerable residents such as those with disabilities may need specific journey adaptations. These are all issues that were raised during WMCA's trial of MaaS. MaaS must be inclusive and accessible to all.

**Are there any specific, urgent areas of the regulatory framework that you feel we are not addressing through the eight workstreams already announced for the Future of Transport Regulatory Review?**

There needs to be clarity and consistency with respect to enforcement. It will be confusing for MMV users to legally Scoot to the train station, travel to another town and then attempt to use their E scooter to find the regulations are completely different if set by LAs. There also needs to be clarity with respect to the Police's role and the level of expected application.

## **Western Gateway Shadow Sub-national Transport Body**

### **Board Meeting**

#### **Paper D**

Date	<b>18<sup>th</sup> June 2020</b>
Title of report:	<b>2020/21 Work Programme and Financial update</b>
Purpose of report:	<b>To provide an update on the emerging work programme and budget position of Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body for 2020/21.</b>

#### **Recommendations:**

The members of the Board are recommended to:

- I. Note the emerging work programme for 2020/21
- II. Note the indicative budget allocation for 2020/21

#### **Introduction**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Shadow Board on the emerging work programme and budgetary position of the Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body (STB) in 2020/21.
- 1.2 To date the Western Gateway STB has received no financial support from the Department for Transport (DfT) and remains 100% reliant on contributions made by its local authority members. This approach differs from the more established STBs where significant central Government funding has been provided.
- 1.3 At the March 2020 board it had been understood that an announcement regarding funding for 2020/21 was imminent. Unfortunately, no announcement was made, and the Coronavirus Pandemic has resulted in any funding allocation for 2020/21 being highly unlikely.
- 1.4 Despite this work has continued and extra capacity has been brought in to support the 2020/21 work programme. The creation of a new Programme Management Team has provided much needed resource and enabled multiple work streams to progress.

## **2020/21 Work Programme**

- 1.5 The 2020/21 work programme is focused on completing the Western Gateway Rail Strategy and the Board agreed to the commissioning of phase 2 of this work in March 2020.
- 1.6 As outlined in Paper B it is considered a priority to commission an additional study to identify the most suitable transport modelling tools to extend the existing evidence base. The outcome of this study will inform the future DfT funding ask and enable the STB to progress with its Long-Term Strategic Transport Plan.
- 1.7 Other priorities for 2020/21 include the completion of the Short-Term Strategic Transport Plan, forming the Strategic Corridor Partnership Groups and developing an improved digital offering. Most of this expenditure will be covered by the cost of the Programme Management Team.
- 1.8 Should any additional funding become available there is a list of studies identified to address gaps within the existing regional evidence base. Studies include:
  - Strategic Cycle Routes Strategy
  - Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy
  - Freight Strategy
  - Strategic Bus and Coach Strategy
  - Last Mile Access strategy to key passenger transport termini
  - Input into the National Decarbonisation Strategy
  - Future Mobility options for Rural Transport

## **2019/20 Financial Year**

- 1.9 It is anticipated that Gloucestershire County Council will be able to confirm the 2019/20 budget outturn position in July 2020. The total budget for 2019/20 was £203,660. It is forecast that there will be an underspend of approximately £40,000. This funding will be transferred to WECA in its capacity as Accountable Body in 2020/21 once the budget position is confirmed.

## **2020/21 Financial Year**

- 1.10 The 2020/21 Revenue Budget for the Western Gateway STB is formed by the combined £180,000 local authority contribution and any underspend from the previous year.
- 1.11 Without the 2019/20 financial position confirmed it is not possible to accurately forecast the 2020/21 position. The information provided in Table A should therefore be considered as indicative.

**Table A – Indicative 2020/21 budget allocation**

	<b>Income</b>	<b>Forecast Spend</b>
Local Authority income	£180,000	
2020/21 underspend	£40,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£220,000</b>	
Rail Strategy Phase 2		£63,900
Strategic Modelling Review		£25,000
Programme Management Team costs		£90,000
Communication strategy		£20,000
Unallocated		£21,100
<b>Total</b>		<b>£220,000</b>

### **Medium Term Financial Plan**

- 1.12 A revised multi-year funding request to the DfT will be submitted in Autumn 2020. This will differ from the 'ask' submitted in November 2019 and will reflect the progress made by the STB over the past 12 months and the additionality the STB could bring to the Sub-national agenda. A report on this issue will be brought to the Board in September 2020 for consideration before any formal submission is made.
- 1.13 When local authority members agreed to join the STB in 2018, they agreed to provide financial contributions initially for 3 years. This agreement ends in March 2021. To agree any level of local funding for 2021/22 it will be necessary in September 2020 to review the cost of the annual local authority contribution to assess if it continues to provide value for money. At this stage it is anticipated that a further three year funding commitment will be sought from local authority members to match-fund the funding request to the DfT.

### **Consultation, communication and engagement**

- 2.1 This update has been discussed by the Programme Management Team.

### **Equalities Implications**

- 3.1 No adverse impact on any protected groups.

### **Legal considerations**

- 4.1 The Western Gateway STB remains an informal non-statutory partnership.

### **Financial considerations**

- 5.1 The budget considerations are set out in this report.

### **Conclusion**

- 6.1 The Board is recommended to note both the emerging work programme and indicative budget allocation for 2020/21.

**Contact Officer**

Peter Mann, Secretariat Lead (Western Gateway Sub-national Transport Body)

Peter Mann [Peter.Mann@Westofengland-CA.gov.uk](mailto:Peter.Mann@Westofengland-CA.gov.uk)