



---

## Decision Session - Executive Member for City Strategy

2<sup>nd</sup> March 2010

Report of the Director of City Strategy

### City of York's Local Transport Plan 3 - Stage 1 consultation results and preparations for Stage 2 (options and impacts) consultation

#### Summary

1. This report outlines the development of York's Third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) to cover the period from 2011 onwards. In particular it:
  - summarises the findings of the first stage of consultation in respect of setting the context for transport in York, the future transport challenges it faces and the possible actions that could be taken to tackle the challenges, and
  - Sets out the approach for undertaking the second stage of consultation for putting forward four options, together with an overview of their likely achievements against objectives and their impacts, to generate support and agreement for the strategy and the degree of the strategy's application in LTP3.

#### Recommendations

2. That the Executive Member for City Strategy is recommended to:
  - i. Note the content of the report, particularly the analysis of the Stage 1 consultations and Annex C which sets-out the four options to put forward for the Stage 2 consultation in April 2010.
  - ii. Approve the options proposed in Annex C, to form the basis of the Stage 2 (options and impacts) consultation.

Reason:

To enable the commencement of the second stage of consultations required to prepare the city's Local Transport Plan 3.

#### Background

##### Duty, guidance and influences for producing LTP3

3. The duty to produce LTP3 and the guidance for preparing it were previously reported to Decision Session, Executive Member City Strategy (DCEMCS) on 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2009.

4. Some of the key points in the guidance, relevant to undertaking consultation for LTP3, are:
  - Local authorities are accountable to their communities rather than to the Department for Transport (DfT) for both the quality of the transport strategies prepared and for ensuring effective delivery;
  - LTPs need to include a longer-term (20-year) transport strategy and shorter term policies and implementation plans;
  - Local authorities need to have a clear view of their own strategic goals and their priorities for dealing with the different challenges they face;
  - The duty, introduced in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, to involve citizens in local decision making and service provision, and
  - The five national goals under the DfT's 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport System' (DaSTS) replace the shared priorities (in LTP2), thus
    - i. Tackle climate change;
    - ii. Support economic growth;
    - iii. Promote equality of opportunity;
    - iv. Contribute to better safety, security and health, and
    - v. Improve quality of life.
5. In addition to referring to the duty and guidance for producing LTP3, the same DCEMCS report referred to other national, regional and local influences that would shape LTP3.
6. The main national influence cited was the target, established in the Climate Change Act 2008, to reduce UK greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% by 2050.
7. The main local influences cited were the City's Sustainable Community Strategy and the emerging Local Development Framework.
8. It was with due regard to the duty, guidance and influences, that, at the DCEMCS on the 20<sup>th</sup> October 2009, the three-stage consultation strategy for preparing the City of York's LTP3 was approved. A revised version of the consultation strategy, to take into account the amended process for reporting Stage 1 consultation responses (at DCEMCS) is shown at Annex A.

#### Stage 1 consultation process

9. Consultations commenced with an officer from the Council's Transport Planning Unit attending the Equalities Impact Assessment Fair, on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2009. At this event the officer facilitated a workshop to:
  - Identify the various forms of transport for the movement of people, goods (commodities) and information;
  - Discuss the way in which York might change over the next 20 years (setting the context);
  - Identify transport challenges for the future
  - Generate potential solutions (actions)
10. Council officers attended three further meetings in November 2009 to undertake a similar exercise. The meetings attended were:

- Without Walls Board 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2009
- York Quality Bus Partnership (workshop) 24<sup>th</sup> November 2009
- CoYC Officer Workshop 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009

11. In the week commencing 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2009, the ‘2010 Budget consultation and Towards a new Local Transport Plan’ questionnaire leaflet (available as a background document) was distributed to residents, citywide. The leaflet contained a draft vision for transport (slightly modified, due to space requirements) to the draft vision approved at Decision Session Executive Member for City Strategy on the 20<sup>th</sup> October 2009. It then described the context for York before presenting a series of questions enquiring how important the various transport challenges and actions that could be taken to tackle them were to York’s residents.
12. The deadline for returning the questionnaire was 18<sup>th</sup> December 2009. The analysis of the responses is available as a background document.
13. In parallel to this, council officers continued to attend various events and convened a series of stakeholder workshops, facilitated by independent consultants, as listed below, to present, to those attending, the opportunity to cover the issues listed in paragraph 9.

- Four ‘stakeholder’ workshops 4<sup>th</sup> (2no.), 10<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> December 2009
- Inclusive York Forum 7<sup>th</sup> December 2009
- York Environment Partnership Transport sub-group 14<sup>th</sup> January 2010
- Young Persons’ Focus Group 14<sup>th</sup> January 2010
- York taxi / PHV operators’ meeting 29<sup>th</sup> January 2010
- York Independent Living Network focus Group 1<sup>st</sup> February 2010

## **Summary of Stage 1 Consultation results**

### Questionnaire

14. Over 12,000 responses were received (14% response rate). The key findings were:
- over two-thirds of residents supported the draft vision;
  - seven out of ten residents thought supporting the economy is the most important goal for transport;
  - four out of five thought congestion is the most important transport challenge facing York and three-quarters thought travelling within and around York to be the most important;
  - nearly three-quarters thought improving public transport is the most important action, closely followed by making better use of the transport networks and managing the amount of traffic entering the city;
  - less than half thought building new transport networks to be important;
  - more than two-thirds of trips are less than 3 miles;
  - just under one quarter of respondents usually travel in and around York by bicycle, and
  - the majority of public transport trips appear to be made by people not travelling to work.

## Stakeholder workshops and other meetings

15. Some of the main points coming out of these were:
- supporting the economy and contributing to the quality of life were thought to be the two most important (DaSTS) key goals for transport, with climate change, equality and safety and health being equal third.
  - LTP3 to link with wider policies as LTP3 is an enabler to meeting the wider needs and aspirations of York;
  - the city has a leadership role;
  - York needs to look outwards to the rest of the area around it;
  - how ambitious should we be with a reducing budget and can we deliver?
  - Focus on the existing situation and what / where we can build upon [what we already have / have done];
  - the current business model for bus provision is flawed – it needs to be customer focused, not franchise focused;
  - York has an ageing population, therefore more pedestrians and more people dependent on public transport;
  - people who are disabled, elderly or otherwise disadvantaged are not able to share in York's prosperity;
  - out of town destinations have poor access;
  - there is insufficient public transport in the evening;
  - there was support for managing the amount of traffic on the roads, including demand management;
  - make better use of what we have, but provide new (e.g. dualled ring roads), where necessary;
  - winning hearts and minds for reducing the need to travel and changing travel behaviour will be a challenge, but a behaviour change programme (including positive – not preaching – campaigns) is essential;
  - spatial planning and an area based approach is advocated;
  - traffic regulations need better enforcement;
  - York should ensure it is a very coach friendly city;
  - seating at and seating/rest areas between bus stops will improve the situation for people with mobility impairments;
  - more crossings of the River Ouse are needed;
  - trial new things to see if they work before either implementing them fully or rejecting them,
  - is the city's ICT capacity sufficient (including broadband) – is there a strategy?
  - and,
  - increase active travel (cycling), particularly for children.
16. A more detailed record of the consultation workshops and meetings is available as a background paper.

## **Stage 2 'Options and Implications' Consultation**

17. An objective-led 'strategy approach' as shown in Annexes B and C has been devised for taking LTP3 forward to the next stage of consultation on options and their implications. The draft 'Primary Goals', 'Challenges' 'York Transport Objectives' and 'Strategy Approach' have been derived from:
- the national goals for transport identified in DaSTS,

- the influences and needs of the Sustainable Community Strategy and the Local Development Framework (see also paragraphs 6 and 7),
  - other objectives within the Leeds City Region Transport Strategy, and
  - the outcomes from the Stage 1 consultation.
18. In addition to the above, the Transport Objectives and Strategy Approach have been selected to harmonise with the emerging 'North Yorkshire and York Transport Strategy', currently being prepared by North Yorkshire County Council in partnership with City of York Council.
19. In setting objectives, due regard needs to be given to the level of finance available to implement measures to achieve them. Setting the desired level of achievement too low may lead to non-compliance with UK legal requirements (climate change target), whereas setting them too high may be unrealistic due to funding constraints. To this end, four Options have been devised, reflecting the specific transport objectives for York in view of the possible levels of future funding, with a focus on tackling climate change by addressing congestion. The particular focus on these two objectives reflects the legally binding national target enshrined in the Climate Change Act 2008 (see paragraph 6) and the most important transport challenge cited in the consultation responses (see paragraph 14).
20. The four options, presented in Annex C; are:
- Option 1 - 'low level of investment / minimum change'  
(in the order of £33 million over 10 years)
  - Option 2 - 'medium level of investment / moderate change'  
(in the order of £47 million over 10 years)
  - Option 3 - 'high level investment / significant change'  
(in the order of £63 million over 10 years)
  - Option 4 - 'very high level of investment / substantial change'  
(in the order of £200+ million over 10 years)
21. The options are intended to represent the short-to-medium term strategy (for the next 5 to 10 years) for setting corresponding action plans in pursuit of the longer-term (20-year) transport strategy for the City, which will also be an integral part of LTP3. It is also intended that consulting on these options will ascertain the appetite for change to transport in York and what level of intervention might be acceptable. It is not intended to consult on specific measures at this stage. The outcome will be used to inform the preparation of the draft LTP3, which is due to be issued for consultation in the autumn of 2010.
22. A common 'strategy approach', comprising eleven consequential elements, applies to each of the four options. Each successive option either implements more of the elements within the strategic approach or increases the degree of implementation of the elements, compared to its predecessor. However, as the performance against the stated objectives (scored on the basis of + = positive change, N = neutral / no change or - = negative change, with the number of +s or -s showing the degree of change) increases with each successive option, so does the risk of failing to deliver, due, principally, to greater uncertainty of funding.

23. The order of investment shown for Option 4 has the greatest degree of risk associated with securing funding. The inclusion of a road user charge linked to a low emission strategy / low emission zone(s) might enable the Council to raise funding to implement higher-cost actions such as dualling the A1237. The consultation leaflet will reflect this and also describe how any road user charging scheme must be carefully considered to evaluate its effect on the local economy and ensure its viability and value for money.
24. It is intended that a consultation leaflet/questionnaire containing these options will be distributed to York residents with the April 2010 issue of Your City.
25. In order for residents to make a fully informed decision on which option to pursue, the consultation leaflet will also include the likely impacts of each option, not only in terms of how each one performs against the objectives, but also how deliverable each option is, bearing in mind uncertainties of funding and how it might otherwise affect them. Whilst the likely achievement against the objectives has already been estimated, the impacts that might otherwise be expected are still being assessed at present, but will be determined for when the Assistant Director City Strategy, in consultation with the Executive Member City Strategy, approves the consultation document for distribution within the April 2010 issue of Your City (note the Decision Session Executive Member for City Strategy on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2009 granted delegated powers to the Assistant Director, in consultation with the Executive Member City Strategy, to issue consultation documents for pre-consultations on the Draft LTP3).
26. Should residents elect to pursue a higher intervention option, beyond the level of funding that ultimately is forthcoming, further refined (hybrid) options may need to be carried forward into the draft LTP3 to best meet prioritised objectives. The outcomes from the stage 2 consultation will be a consideration for determining the degree of refinement needed.
27. At the meeting of the Council on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2010, a motion pertaining to the introduction of 20mph limits was submitted for consideration. The Council requested the Executive Member [City Strategy] *'Ensure that the 'total 20' approach adopted in Portsmouth forms a key part of the consultation on the third Local Transport Plan for the City of York'*. The consultation leaflet will, therefore, also include a question seeking the residents attitudes to 20 mph zones. Choices might include a city wide 20 mph zone, several zones avoiding main roads (with signage implications highlighting), and the current policy of applying the most appropriate limit to the characteristics of individual roads. The costs associated of implementing 20mph limits will also be stated, as will the views of the Police regarding enforcing speed limits. A separate question testing people's approach to the use of vertical traffic calming measures (road humps) will also be included.
28. In addition to the consultation leaflet/questionnaire the workshops / focus groups and attendance at meetings undertaken in the stage 1 consultation will be repeated to discuss many of the issues in greater depth.

#### Further work

29. It is also acknowledged that in parallel to undertaking consultations more work will need to be done in preparing the draft LTP3. This will, amongst other things, include:

- Setting the relative priority for each of the 'Primary Goals' and 'City of York Transport Objectives',
- Evidence gathering to identify the baseline position for setting targets for the objectives, and
- Assessing the spatial aspects of LTP3 and how it contributes to the Local Development Framework for delivering the spatial development of York.

## Corporate Objectives

30. LTP3 is a cross-cutting document that encompasses and contributes to all of the council's outward facing corporate priorities.

## Implications

31. This report has the following implications:
- **Financial** – There are likely to be revenue costs in the order of £18,000 for producing, distributing and analysing the stage 2 consultation leaflet / questionnaire for preparing LTP3.
  - **Human Resources (HR)** – The Transport Planning Unit will arrange and coordinate the stage 2 consultation with support from Marketing and Communications.
  - **Equalities** – LTP3 will be subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment.
  - **Legal** – There are no implications at present.
  - **Crime and Disorder** – There are no implications at present.
  - **Information Technology (IT)** – There are no IT implications at present.
  - **Property** – There are no implications at present.
  - **Sustainability** – It is anticipated that LTP3 will develop and implement sustainable transport solutions.
  - **Other** – No comments.

## Risk Management

32. In compliance with the Council's Risk Management Strategy the main risk associated with preparing LTP3 is a 'reputation' risk due to the Council not undertaking consultations on LTP3 in compliance with Government Guidance. This could, ultimately, undermine the validity of the LTP3 produced.
33. Measured in terms of likelihood and impact, the likelihood is remote and the impact is Major. The risk score for the recommendation is, therefore, less than 16 and thus at this point the risks need only to be monitored as they do not provide a real threat to the achievement of the objectives of this report.
34. The extensive and inclusive nature of the consultations undertaken to date have been well received by stakeholders and government agencies. If the same

extensive and inclusive approach is carried forward into the Stage 2 consultation the risks will not be any greater than predicted.

35. As the degree of strategy application increases through the sequence of options, the risk of failing to deliver, primarily due to lack of certainty of future funding, increases as does the risk of raising public expectations. The Stage 2 consultation leaflet/questionnaire will need to make these risks clear to the residents.

### Ward Member comments

36. Not appropriate at this stage.

### Non Ruling Group Spokespersons' comments

37. All Members, including Non-Ruling Group Spokespersons were invited to participate in the Stage 1 consultations and will, similarly, have the opportunity to participate in the Stage 2 consultations.

### Contact Details

#### Author:

Ian Stokes  
Principal Transport Planner  
Transport Planning Unit  
Ext. 1429

#### Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Ray Chaplin  
Acting Assistant Director (City Development &  
Transport)  
City Strategy  
Report Approved  Date 16 February 2010

Wards Affected

All

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

### Background Papers:

Guidance for the publication of LTP3, DfT, July 2009  
Decisions Session, Executive Member City Strategy 1<sup>st</sup> September 2009, Item 11  
Decisions Session, Executive Member City Strategy 20<sup>th</sup> October 2009, Item 12  
'2010 Budget consultation and Towards a new Local Transport Plan'  
Leaflet/questionnaire  
2010 Budget consultation and Towards a new Local Transport Plan' questionnaire  
analysis  
Workshops / meetings summaries

### Annexes

Annex A LTP3 Consultation strategy (modified to show change in procedure for reporting Stage 1 consultations).  
Annex B Strategy Objectives matrix  
Annex C Strategy Option evaluation matrix