

Report on Results of Feasibility Consultation

Registered Topic: LTP2 (No 139)

This topic was registered by Cllr Tracey Simpson-Laird in May 2006. The following officers and/or members have been consulted about these topics and have provided a response based on their professional knowledge.

Response from the Executive Member for City Strategy

I feel that that there is no real value in progressing the LTP 2 as a Scrutiny Topic. As LTP 2 has been formally adopted by the Council and submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) and it is difficult to see how a Scrutiny Review of it would add any real value.

Provisional LTP 2 received a 'very promising' status from the DfT, making it officially in the top 16 in the country and there is no reason to suspect that mistakes have been made. As with LTP1, the format and process may change in line with changes to national transport policy over the 5 year period as required by the DfT. Delivery of the LTP 2 strategy is continually reviewed through approval of the capital programme at EMAP - this therefore gives an arena for any changes and discussion of existing and future.

On the specific points in the Topic Registration Form:-

“We need to understand if the right strategy has been adopted given the failure to consult on strategic options.”

The strategies that were chosen in the LTP2 were based on extensive public consultation which included the successful Tell Ann Campaign (covering all Ward Committee and Parish Councils), extensive distribution of questionnaires and face to face meetings with key stakeholders and residents for which the council was praised by the DfT. In addition when DfT disseminated good practice regarding public consultation, York was used as an example of just that, in DfT presentations to other Local Authorities. The LTP seeks to establish the individual strategies from which an emerging overall strategy will be developed. It needs to be flexible enough for the strategy to change with circumstances e.g the amount of funding the council receives or the emerging regional. LTP should not be looked at in isolation from other, wider, initiatives.

“Need to avoid repeating mistakes for LTP3”

This presumes we have made some, I would be interested to know where.

“Need to understand how certain schemes have been prioritised and see if adjustments to the strategy and spending profiles are needed to make the best use of LTP2 resources.”

Our priorities are set by the need to address a number of different issues. To a large extent these are set for us by the need to achieve targets within the LTP and therefore secure future funding based upon our performance. This very much restricts how and where we commit resources. The LTP itself sets out our spending profile over the 5 year period against which we are measured. Programmes are put together to meet strategic as well as local demands. Members have had the opportunity of shaping those programmes through the capital programme process.

“The LTP2 has failed to include local actions to address air quality in the five areas of the City identified as being in breach of air quality standards”

Our approach is to address the underlying cause of the poor air quality, less polluting vehicles, reductions in congestion, promotion of more environmentally acceptable vehicles, promotion of public transport, cycling and walking rather than introduce restrictions that would only redirect the problem somewhere else

“The LTP2 must be prepared in line with a strict schedule – which would therefore impose a clear timetable on the work of the scrutiny board on this topic.”

As already stated LTP2 has already been approved by Council and submitted to DfT in line with their timetable. If this is this an attempt to put together a process for delivering the plan then I think the way it is reported to Members already does this.

“This Scrutiny topic will analyse whether LTP will deliver the anticipated results and what the effect the 7% growth in traffic will be on travel times, business and air quality issues.”

We have set targets in the LTP against which we will be measured. Our ability to achieve those targets will depend upon the soundness of the various strategies, our ability to deliver them and the resources provided.

“Identify why in terms of the 2005 APR the authority only received a ‘fair’ assessment and what is needed to avoid it in the future.”

The reasons were highlighted by the DfT and are being addressed as LTP2 progresses.

“The Scrutiny Board should play an active part in consulting with residents.”

This must be for the Board to decide if this topic goes ahead. However, a new round of consultation on the LTP (if based on the previous extensive consultation) would require significant staff time which could be put to far better use developing proposals for addressing the issues through the adopted strategies in the LTP.

The issues have brought to Members on several occasions and continue to do so at regular intervals and there has been ample opportunity for Members to question and shape the process and content.

Response from Marketing and Communications

In July 2005, York's provisional five year Local Transport Plan (LTP) was submitted to the Department for Transport. The provisional plan highlighted issues that arose from the first stage of consultation undertaken in 2004. The main findings from this consultation revealed that reducing congestion, improving access to jobs, education and leisure and improving health by helping more people to walk and cycle are the city's top three priorities for transport policy.

To evaluate whether the draft plan reflects the needs of the city and how effective it will be at cutting traffic, improving accessibility and health, a consultation programme was drawn up to consult residents and local businesses (LTP2). In October 2005 residents and local businesses were invited to comment on the Plan via a self-completion survey. The surveys were posted to 351 local businesses in the city and residents were able to complete a survey at ward committee meetings or by picking one up from a council reception area, at the library or via the council's website.

A Better 4 York video was also available to give residents an outline of the plan before completing the survey. The video incorporated the Plan's main objectives and was shown at ward committee meetings and available to download via the council's website. A copy of the Plan was also available on the website.

11% of the 351 businesses invited to comment on the LTP2 plan completed a self completion survey (N=39) and 137 residents completed a survey. The research assessed residents' views about the plan's strategy for the whole city, rather than specific local areas. Overall, 81% of respondents supported the aims and objectives of York's Second Local Transport Plan.

Response from Policy Development Team

I don't have too much to add regarding this scrutiny topic, other than that I think issues identified in the scrutiny request would hopefully be being considered already e.g. learning from LTP2 to inform LTP3, especially as this issue has a high profile locally and nationally at the moment. Because of this high profile though, members may particularly want to find solutions and so scrutiny could create an added focus in doing this.

Response from Equalities Officer

Any evaluation of LTP2 needs to consider whether appropriate equality objectives and measures were identified and given sufficient priority

Members should consult with community forums representing people from disadvantaged communities (e.g. Older People's Assembly, BME Citizens Open Forum, Disabled People's Forum, LGBT Forum, and Inter-Faith Forum)

Report prepared by Barbara Boyce Scrutiny Officer Tel. 01904 551714	Report prepared August 2006
---	-----------------------------

For further information please contact the author of the report