

Board Meeting

Agenda

Date 29th June, 2007 10.30

Location: Ferrier Hall, City Hall, Cardiff

Apologies

1. Minutes of previous meeting on 30th March, 2007
2. Matters arising not covered on the agenda.
2.3.9 – Consultation with First Great Western
7.5 – Business Plan
3. Presentations:
New M4 project – Jeff Collins Welsh Assembly Government
4. Regional Transport Plan – progress (Planning Manager)
 - (i) - Outline Regional Transport Plan – consultation
 - (ii) - Draft Regional Transport Plan – content
 - (iii) - Car Parking Strategy
5. Financial Reports:
 - (i) Closing of 2006/7 accounts (*Appendix A to follow*) (Secretary)
 - (ii) Corporate Capital and Revenue allocations (Secretary)
 - (iii) EU Convergence Programme (Secretary)
6. Consultation Responses (Secretary)
7. Date of next meeting – Friday 5th October 2007 10.30am, City Hall, Cardiff.

Sewta Board meeting 29th June 2007

Item 1



Minutes Board, 30th March 2007

Location Ferrier Hall, City Hall, Cardiff. 10.30am

1. **Minutes of the meeting held on the 19th January, 2007**

1.1 The minutes were approved as a correct record.

2. **Matters Arising**

2.1 Min 3.5 Outline RTP-confirmation of submission to WAG
BB confirmed that the outline RTP had been submitted prior to the deadline of the 31st January.

2.2 Min 9.9 Junction 33-Request to WAG for Sewta to be represented on the Stakeholder Group
BB reported that a meeting with WAG would take place on the 2nd April. This should lead to a better understanding of the issues. He would report back to the next Board meeting.

2.3 Min 11.5 Main Line rail service

2.3.1 The Chair welcomed Tom Stables, the Commercial Director of First Great Western, who was attending to discuss the issues around the curtailment of the 15.15 service from London beyond Cardiff. CN set out the basic questions on which Sewta needed clarification. Firstly, was the service cancelled because it was not in the franchise, or to save a unit from the operation? Secondly, given the loss of 400 seats between Cardiff and Swansea, and the inevitable overcrowding, what discussions had been held beforehand between the DfT and FGW?

2.3.2 TSt confirmed that the service was not in the franchise; its curtailment at Cardiff had been decided on commercial grounds. The decision saved one HST unit per annum (£1.2m). The DfT had discussed the implications of the withdrawal with other operators (not FGW). FGW had recently entered into further discussions challenging the DfT decision not to include it within the franchise, but the DfT had confirmed that it had not wished, nor did not wish to specify the extension beyond Cardiff to Swansea of the 15.15 service from London. DB queried whether the introduction of the SPT by ATW, reducing the revenue allocation to FGW under the Rail Settlement Plan, was a factor in the decision. TSt acknowledged that it had been a factor.

- 2.3.3 JC queried whether the cost/benefit analysis of the decision had been limited to the company's costs, or whether it included an analysis taking into account the wider public interest. TSt answered this in terms of being willing to discuss options for re-introducing the service if funding was made available, but could not divulge details of the public benefits. There was then further discussion between TSt and JC on the real cost of re-introducing the service. TSt confirmed that the net cost (after revenue) of re-introduction would be £1m.
- 2.3.4 Councillor Voisey commented that ATW was doing its best to cater for the displaced passengers, but was now taking the blame for overcrowding. The public interest needed to be considered, but the episode had left an impression that FGW was not concerned about passengers west of Cardiff, and would rather terminate at Cardiff. He referred to comparable events in the West of England which had resulted in services being re-instated following a strong display of people power. TSt emphasized that FGW was committed to services west of Cardiff. He referred to the delays and disruption suffered on the route, but noted that there were currently more services to Swansea than historically. He added that the services re-introduced in the West of England had been due to a change in specification by the DfT; it was not due to FGW giving preference to the West of England. He also referred to the intention for FGW to provide an additional service to Swansea in future, via the airport. Councillor Teesdale queried whether the cost to restore the West Country services had been more or less than £1m. TSt believed that the cost was greater, as was the disruption experienced.
- 2.3.5 The Chair suggested that in future there should be closer consultation before such major timetable changes are introduced. TSt welcomed this, adding that the Severn Tunnel Junction service had been re-introduced as the result of subsequent consultation. CN expressed concern that this had been after the event and that though concerns had been raised at the outset, only the standard "comments noted" replies had been received to Sewta's initial response to the consultation on the proposed withdrawal-more regular contacts to discuss the ongoing situation would be welcomed. He asked whether the 17.55 Cardiff to London service was commercial or franchised, and whether this could work back from Swansea. TSt apologised for the first response, but added that the responses had led to discussion with DfT, resulting in some services being bought back by DfT. He was not able to answer concerning the status of the 17.55, but noted that there was not even time for the service to reach Bridgend and return.
- 2.3.6 DB referred to consultation on the December 2007 timetable. The method of consultation was confusing and it was not always clear what the question was; this had been the case with the 15.15 service the future of which had already been consulted on when the new franchise was re-drawn. There was room for improved consultation.
- 2.3.7 DHa asked about the remaining Severn Tunnel Junction services which had not yet been restored. TSt replied that these were being looked at as part of the December 2007 timetable changes.

2.3.8 Referring to the way forward, MRW suggested that more lobbying was needed to restore the 15.15 service from London beyond Cardiff. TSt agreed to explore options. Councillor Voisey considered that discussions between FGW and the Rail Working Group would be useful. The Chair thanked TSt for his response to suggestions of closer co-operation.

2.3.9 **The Board resolved that its Rail Working Group should determine the most appropriate forum in which to meet with FGW to discuss issues of common concern, leading to earlier, more meaningful consultations over any future service changes and that an annual invitation be extended to meet with the Board.**

3. **National Passenger Survey results-Sewta area**

3.1 SP presented the results of the October 2006 survey. These were compared with the October 2005 results, in order to eliminate any seasonal variations. The results now included FGW services for the recently revised franchise for the first time. For ATW the overall satisfaction rate of 80% was static. This lagged behind the figures for peer groups, partly due to shortcomings with the rolling stock-investment in new stock was needed. Looking at the Sewta area compared with all-Wales, the satisfaction was lower for making connections and crowding. This partly reflected the nature of the services. For FGW overall satisfaction was 77%, down 3% on the previous year. Train capacity and toilet facilities were a problem, but the change of franchise also affected the overall position. The Spring 2007 survey would be reported in June.

3.2 **The Board noted the results of the survey, and agreed to consider further surveys as they occurred.**

4. **Regional Transport Plan-progress**

4.1 JC referred to para 2.1 of the report, setting out the timescale to submission of the draft plan by October 5th. The Board meeting on the 28th September would not leave time to influence the final document. The effective deadline to influence the text would be the Board meeting on the 29th June. It was therefore intended to bring as much policy content to as possible to that Board meeting. There would be a caveat to the submission reserving the right to revisit any policy issues which arose after this. JC also referred to a recent meeting with WAG, which identified the need to strengthen the park and ride work, and develop the stakeholder consultation. This was being progressed.

4.2 Summarising the rest of the report, JC referred to the requirement to examine options and alternatives for nine topic areas, including carbon emissions and traffic levels. For most options the plan would chose the mid-point from a range. There were topics which were not regional, and could be left to individual authorities. A regional dimension was needed only when this resulted in added value, although WAG might have a view on some issues. JC then outlined the position with the roads study, Community Transport and consultation. Much of the work was being

carried out by consultants; Capita Symonds had been appointed to support the core team technically. Discussions were being held with SWWITCH and TRACC on the format of the plan. It was intended to publish the technical work as separate documents, and publish a short policy and programme document. JC then referred to the funding of the work. He noted that receipt of the funding bid for 2007/08 would be essential to complete the programme of work.

4.3 RGJ thanked JC for the presentations being made to senior members in each authority, which were being well received.

4.4 **The Board:**

(i) noted the contents of the report. Members agreed to comment as they saw fit.

(ii) agreed the report production schedule set out in para 2.1, leading to submission of the draft RTP by the 5th October.

(iii) endorsed the contents of paras 3.2-3.15, setting out the work to develop the outline plan into the draft plan.

5. **Financial Reports**

(i) Transport Grant Settlements

5.1 TC summarized the allocation of £36.5m, out of a bid of £49.5m. This was a 16% increase on the previous year. Sewta had received 64% of the total £101.4m allocation by WAG. For rail schemes, Sewta would receive all the funding being allocated in Wales for 2007/08. TC referred to the relative successes of the bids for bus priority schemes, interchanges, park and ride, walking and cycling and safe routes to schools. In some categories Sewta was unable to bid for significant sums, due to the restriction on bidding for new schemes. Sewta would need to have new programmes ready to bid for when the restriction was lifted, but this might not occur until the new RTP regime was in place.

5.2 **The Board noted the award, and welcomed the increased funding compared with the previous year.**

(ii) Corporate Capital and Revenue allocations

5.3 Pursuant to the provisions of Section 100 A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public were excluded from the meeting for this item of business on the grounds that there would be disclosure to them of exempt information under Paragraph 13 of Schedule 12 A, Part 1 of the above Act.

(iii) Convergence and Competitiveness Programmes

5.4 MB introduced the update on the Convergence Programme (West Wales and the Valleys) and the Competitiveness Programme (Cardiff, Monmouthshire, Newport and Vale of Glamorgan). The report set out the approach to the preparation of projects for Structural Funds finance. Within the new programmes there would be a number of Strategic Frameworks, linked to priorities and themes, to guide the preparation of projects for

submission. The Convergence Programme would deliver £1.3b and the Competitiveness Programme £95m. Information was now becoming available on the Framework for the Convergence Programme (Appendix 1). Sustainable Transport would be the main theme, but there would also be opportunities through other themes and priorities. It was not yet clear what opportunities there might be to bid for projects under the Social fund but there might be opportunities for revenue funding. This could now be linked to employment and skills, as Sewta and others had suggested in the consultation. Within the Convergence Programme a sum of £247m had now been agreed for Transport Access; a 50% increase on Objective 1.

- 5.5 RGJ queried the lack of a specific reference to the WSP in the report, and how the programmes would link to the RTP. MB confirmed that the aim was to get as close a fit as possible between the RTP and the approach to the convergence programme.
- 5.6 CN referred to the need for costed programmes to be ready at an early date. This would need funding to be available to work up schemes to the right level of detail. BB replied that discussions were being held with WAG seeking more flexibility in future funding to achieve this.
- 5.7 **The Board approved the approach to the preparation of projects for Structural Funds finance outlined in the report.**

6. Area Reports-Newport

- 6.1 BK first showed a DVD setting out the major developments in Newport, including the George Street commercial area, housing on the Old Town dock site, the River East Gateway, the Cambrian Centre (redevelopment of the railway station) and the town centre retail developments. He then turned to a more detailed map of the proposals. The footbridge across the river would greatly improve accessibility. There would be a smaller bus station at the Mall, with more stopping facilities around the centre. Queensway would become a boulevard, with a 20mph speed limit. There would be a new multistorey car park in Station Yard, and a new station footbridge which would be fully DDA compliant. Infrastructure costs would be £12m; the shopping centre would cost £40m. The Cambrian development would finish in August 2007; work would then commence on the shopping centre.
- 6.2 MB referred to the increase in floor space, and asked about the approach to transport investment. BK replied that there had been an initial transport study, covering a wider area than the city centre, and infrastructure work was being done at the outset.
- 6.3 Councillor Critchley referred to the partnership between the City Council and Newport Unlimited, which had enabled major issues such as the city status and the Ryder Cup to be addressed. The transport system was critical; the needs of the retail area were being met, but there were still major challenges to resolve at Newport East and Newport West.

7. Business Plan Issues

(i) Business Performance 2006/07

7.1 BB noted that the report covered the period up to December 2006. Monitoring was carried out through the Secretariat Management Group. Good progress had been made, particularly on the RTP, but difficult issues around the corporate finance needed to be resolved. (see Item 4(ii))

7.2 **The Board noted the good progress made in delivering the action plan.**

(ii) Business Plan 2007/08

7.3 BB introduced the draft Business Plan for 2007/08, noting that, due to the delay in resolving the financial allocations, the section on resources was incomplete. It was proposed to ask the Board to give delegated powers to the Chair and Vice Chair to approve the final plan. BB then summarized the contents of the plan, particularly the eight point action plan.

7.4 Councillor Voisey referred to the importance of the airport to Bridgend and Vale of Glamorgan, and asked that air issues should be included in the plan. There were also issues around the St Athan development and the north-south link. He suggested that the airport should be invited onto the Board. BB agreed that air travel had not been systematically approached, and suggested that the Policy Group should be asked to consider the issues and report back.

7.5 **The Board:**

(i) noted the content of the draft Business Plan, and, following Directorate approval, delegated the Chair and Vice Chair to approve the Business Plan on behalf of the Board.

(ii) Agreed to receive a further report on the issues which had been raised, particularly air transport.

8. Consultation Responses

(i) Putting Passengers First-reforms to improve bus services

8.1 CV referred to the consultation, and commented that Sewta generally supported the proposals, although the existing good relationships between the LAs and the operators in the Sewta area meant that there was already co-operation on many issues. The response had identified a number of areas omitted from the consultation. These included how to start new services (Kickstart), competition problems, how to increase frequency, and direct services, forcing operators to adopt LA proposals, dealing with episodic competition, safety and policing issues, and the use of high quality infrastructure.

8.2 JG commented that the CPT had given the proposals a cautious welcome. The position of the proposals in the Welsh Transport Act would be interesting, but he was pleased that central government recognized the

importance of partnership work. The CPT would be making its own response, but would differ from Sewta's response with regard to statutory control of fares, frequency etc.

8.3 Councillor Critchley appreciated that operators needed to be profitable, but making progress on integrated transport would need major investment. There needed to be a plan for improvement which ensured that all the organizations concerned worked together. Councillor Voisey referred to the need for Wales to have its own Traffic Commissioner. CV confirmed that this was in the response.

8.5 **The Board approved the response for submission to the DfT and WAG.**

Planning for Climate Change

8.6 JC introduced the report, which concerned the proposed changes to Planning Policy Wales(PPW) to better reflect how the planning process can help reduce the impact of climate change. Cardiff and Vale of Glamorgan had already produced detailed responses, and the draft Sewta response endorsed these, together with some additional comments. The main additions were to comment that PPW should refer specifically to the transport section of the Spatial Plan, and that the transport emissions from out of town developments should be identified. Sewta also considered that the review should be completed no later than 2008, in order to address a longer agenda of change.

8.7 **The Board agreed that the Sewta response to the consultation should:**
(i) Welcome a review of PPW to address the problems of climate change;
(ii) Point out that much of the Assembly review relates to buildings. There was very little reference to transport, despite it being one of the largest causes of carbon emissions, and the only one that is growing quickly.
(iii) Make a limited number of suggestions as to how the review can consider transport.
(iv) Note that Sewta wished to see an early and wide review of PPW to fully address a longer agenda of change. Further, that Sewta wished to be closely involved in that review and would promote, as part of the RTP, more detailed proposals to change PPW.

(iii) Coastal Tourism

8.8 BB outlined the response to the consultation on coastal tourism, which had been prepared by Vale of Glamorgan. The response emphasized the need to protect the resource as the primary concern/driver. Emphasis needed to change from motorised transport to include more environmentally friendly modes. "Eco tourism" could provide a major boost to the sector.

8.9 **The Board approved the draft response at Appendix A to the report for submission to WAG.**

(iv) Civil Enforcement of Car Parking

- 8.10 JC introduced the consultation response, noting that this dealt only with the regulations relating to civil enforcement of car parking, and not the issue of whether to adopt civil enforcement in preference to continued police enforcement. This issue would have to be addressed in the RTP, and given the reducing ability of the police to commit sufficient time to enforcement, Sewta's position on this would probably be positive, out of necessity. The stance of Sewta needed to reflect making best use of road space, and in this regard illegal parking was a long standing and major cause of delays to public transport. Illegal parking included abuse of Blue Badges. A major aspect of the consultation was the need to strengthen the current regulations in view of the increasing effectiveness of a minority of drivers at avoiding the intentions of traffic orders. The report outlined the basis of Sewta's proposed response in para 3.2.
- 8.11 JG stressed that parking enforcement was important to the bus industry across the whole Sewta area; not just in Cardiff. Councillor Voisey appreciated that civil enforcement was a delicate issue. He considered that a regional solution for all Sewta LAs should be considered. BB replied that this was included in the draft RTP.
- 8.13 **The Board endorsed the preparation of a response to the consultation which would incorporate:**
(i) Support for strengthened regulations
(ii) Recognition of the need to enforce parking regulations, using a civil enforcement system if appropriate.
(iii) A series of technical points aimed at improving the draft regulations. (These were being drafted).

Rhondda Cynon Taf LDP

- 8.14 JC referred to the LDP strategy set out in the report (para3.3). This was based on sound principles and reflected the developing RTP. However, he drew attention to the lack of resources within Sewta to respond adequately to consultations such as this, and the need to consider the financial issues this raised.
- 8.15 **The Board noted the content of the report and the intention to report back on the financial issues associated with increasing the Board's ability to respond to future consultations of this kind.**

9. Date of Next Meeting

- 9.1 This would be on Friday, the 29th June, 2007 at the Ferrier Hall, Cardiff.

Meeting attended by:

Name	Initials	Representing
Councillor T Williams		Caerphilly (Chair)
Councillor E Morgan		Cardiff
Councillor C Teesdale		Bridgend
Councillor M Voisey		Bridgend
Councillor W Smith		Merthyr Tydfil
Councillor K Critchley		Newport
Councillor E Hanagan		Rhondda Cynon Taf
Councillor J Cunningham		Torfaen
Councillor N Lewis		Torfaen
Councillor C J Williams		Vale of Glamorgan
John Gould	JG	CPT
Malcolm Howitt	MH	Arriva Trains Wales
Tom Stables	TSt	First Great Western
Simon Pickering	SP	Passenger Focus
Clive Rogers	CR	Blaenau Gwent
Rhodri Gwyn Jones	RGJ	Bridgend
Dave Beynon	DB	Bridgend
Mark Rees-Williams	MRW	Caerphilly
Chris Vinestock	CV	Cardiff
Dave Harris	DHa	Monmouthshire
Dave House	DHo	Merthyr Tydfil
Brian Kemp	BK	Newport
Charlie Nelson	CN	Rhondda Cynon Taf
Terry Shaw	TSh	Torfaen
Emma Harvey	EH	Vale of Glamorgan
Bob Brierley	BB	Secretariat
Justin Cooper	JC	Planning Manager
Martin Buckle	MB	Programme Manager
Terry Collins	TC	Secretariat
Phil Wall	PW	Secretariat

Apologies were received from:

Councillor D Owens	Blaenau Gwent
Councillor R Welch	Blaenau Gwent
Councillor M Nott	Bridgend
Councillor R Greenland	Monmouthshire
Councillor B Toomey	Merthyr Tydfil
Councillor E Heath	Newport
Councillor K Privett	Rhondda Cynon Taf
Leo Markham	Bus Users UK
Colin Eades	Bridgend
Paul Carter	Cardiff
George Jones	Rhondda Cynon Taf
Latif Kaderbhai	Rhondda Cynon Taf
Mark Adams	Rhondda Cynon Taf
Mike Hurley	Arriva Trains Wales

Sewta Board meeting 29th June 2007
Item 4(i)



Report To: Board 29th June 2007

Report Subject: Outline Regional Transport Plan – consultation

Report Author: Planning Manager

1. Purpose

1.1 To report to the Board the findings of the consultation on the outline regional transport plan.

2. Background/Present Position

2.1 Consultation on the plan began before it was officially handed to WAG on 31st January. The consultation period formally closed on 13th April, although we had further responses after then. These were accepted.

2.2 We have received 26 responses that contain more than 400 detailed comments. This is a disappointing response.

2.3 The general tone of the responses is favourable to the RTP. There are however some significant adverse comments:

- Overall, submissions suggest the balance of the report is right. There were as many submissions criticising the report for being too 'green' as there were that it was not 'green' enough.
- There were however some 'heavyweight' comments supporting the former view. SEWEF felt insufficient attention was paid to building new road capacity. SEWEF was also critical of some of the references to climate change, regarding them as polemics.
- Generally people like the layout of the document. It is easy to read and informative. A small number of readers were critical of parts of the report. Linkages within the report for instance were criticised.
- There were a number of requests for more detail on specific projects. There were requests, for instance, for individual cycle routes and railway stations. It must be remembered that such detail was not the intention of the report.
- There were requests for more on some statutory obligations, for instance the Crime and Disorder Act and the Habitats Directive.
- The responses implied much greater expenditure in every area of transport – public transport, roads, sustainable travel, highway

maintenance. We face a major problem is getting to people to accept the fiscal framework within which the plan will develop. The RTP will however remain aspirational in that it will assume higher levels of expenditure than at present. There will also be an alternative strategy based on lower levels of expenditure.

- 2.4 Sewta's chair, supported by some of his officers, met WAG to discuss the outline report on 19th April. WAG's written comments are contained in appendix A. This is considered part of the consultation exercise. Most of the comments are already being addressed. It should be recognised that much of the outline plan records decisions reached in the summer of 2006. We have moved on since then. WAG officials also expressed verbal concerns similar to those in the SEWEF response, to the effect that the outline plan paid insufficient interests to economic interests.

3. Proposal for action

- 3.1 The comments received should be a matter of public record. The spectrum they cover proves that it is impossible to meet all expectations. That would be true, even if budgets were not a problem. Financial constraints mean that not only will the plan not go in the direction everyone wants; that is impossible as different parties wish to go in different directions. We will not be able to go as far as some people wish either. Both problems are inevitable; Sewta can only seek to produce a balanced plan meeting as many conflicting requirements as possible.
- 3.2 It is proposed to forward the appendices to the parties whose comments the appendices contain. Providing they are satisfied with the contents, they will be posted on the Sewta website.
- 3.3 The redirection of the plan that is implied by those who criticise it for its 'green' content is more problematic. The plan accurately sets out what is needed to achieve, for instance, the Welsh Assembly's carbon emissions targets. The WTS and the RTP guidance are also clear that the RTP must pay much more attention to problems of social exclusion and safety than has been the content of previous transport plans. To adopt a plan based on catering for substantial increases in road traffic is contrary to all those intentions. We will however need to emphasise and draw out in detail, those parts of the outline plan aimed at addressing the need to maintain economic competitiveness. That work has already started.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1 The consultation process should continue at the rate set by the consultation reported here. Because of budget cuts, that will not be possible, although greater use can be made of the councils' own consultation schemes. The level of consultation on the draft plan will be less than the outline plan and will not conform fully to the requirements set out in WAG guidance. In that respect the draft RTP will be non-conformant. That is unlikely to prevent WAG from accepting it. Sewta may however be open to legal challenge on its draft plan, as regards its level of consultation.

5. Staffing/Personnel Implications

5.1 See 4.1

6. Consultation

6.1 In addition to receiving comments from the public and organisations, Council committees have received presentations on the outline RTP. As of the date of this Board meeting, presentations have been made to members (full council, cabinet or scrutiny committee) of Blaenau Gwent, Bridgend, Caerphilly, Monmouthshire, Newport, Rhondda Cynon Taf, Torfaen, Vale of Glamorgan Councils. A meeting with Cardiff members is scheduled and Sewta officers have maintained an on-going dialog with Newport's scrutiny committee. The feedback from these meetings identifies the issue of reconciling the local problems members face on a day to day basis with the need to tackle systemic regional deficiencies in the transport system. Overall, members recognise the importance of meeting both needs and the resultant requirement for compromise. Every member group recognises the value of working together; not one has presented opposition to the principle.

7. Recommendation

7.1 To note the comments made by correspondents and the comment on budgets in §4.1 above.

7.2 The Board is asked to endorse:

- The principle of producing a balanced plan;
- To draw out in detail those part of the draft plan aimed at improving economic competitiveness;
- The proposal to post the consultation responses on the Sewta website.

8. Reasons (Sewta Objectives)

8.1 The report supports Sewta's objective 7. That seeks to raise public awareness of regional transport issues.

Appendix A – WAG comments on Outline RTP.

Cllr Tom Williams
Chair of Sewta

Trafnidiaeth Cymru
Transport Wales

Eich cyf . Your ref:

Ein cyf . Our ref:

Dyddiad . Date: 19 April 2007

Dear Tom,

SEWTA OUTLINE REGIONAL TRANSPORT PLAN - DRAFT GENERAL FEEDBACK

The following comments set out our recommendations to develop the outline Regional Transport Plan (RTP) in to a full draft RTP by 5 October 2007. These represent our comments to the RTP.

Policy Context

It is recommended that stronger links are made to the 15 key outcomes of the draft Wales Spatial Plan (WSP). It is an important role for RTPs is connecting the key settlements to each other and to their own hinterlands.

It is recommended that the links to the delivery of the Wales Transport Strategy (WTS) outcomes building on the regional sections (Chapters 8 to 11) are strengthened.

Identification of problems and opportunities

The document includes a comprehensive account of problems in the Sewta region using data that has been gathered from a wide range of sources. The analysis and problem identification is strong. In order to develop the full draft RTP it is recommended that these problems are:

1. Broken down in to the major categories of environmental, social and economic to ensure that there is a balance of issues; and
2. Made more concise to summarise the key regional issues in reference to other relevant documents rather than repeating data.

This could be achieved by combining and editing some of the information provided in sections 1, 3 and 5. This would then form Stage 1 of the full RTP.

Development of Priorities and Objectives

This section should follow on from the identification of regional problems and policy requirements to demonstrate a clear development of priorities and objectives. This will strengthen prioritisation which could be further improved. It is recommended that sections 2 and 6 are combined and edited to form Stage 2 of the RTP.

Figure 2.1 maps the RTP priorities against WTS outcomes. This is a very useful way of demonstrating how the regional priorities address national policy outcomes. However, the areas highlighted as conflicting can detract from the key links when read by others, without an extensive awareness of transportation in the Sewta consortia. It is recommended that the table is amended to reflect key links and remove perceived conflicts.

There is some confusion evident between vision, priorities and objectives. These are seen on a scale of increasing level of detail. It is recommended that for the draft outline RTP these are clarified.

For development plans, we are encouraging visions and objectives to be more spatial and place specific to the consortia area geographical boundaries, so that they do not repeat or paraphrase national policy. It needs to be clear that the vision and objectives relate to Sewta specifically. It is recommended that the RTP vision and objectives are amended to reflect this and demonstrate sentiments in the WSP and WTS on a regional level.

Option Identification and Development

It is recommended that sections 8 and 9 are combined and edited to form part of Stage 3 "Option Generation" of the full RTP as per the RTP Guidance.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The monitoring section needs to be developed to show the core indicators and any sub-regional and secondary indicators. It is recommended that the monitoring framework include core regional indicators in addition to the national core indicators outlined in the WTS.

Cross Cutting Issues

It is recommended that the links to other national and local policies such as LDP, locational policies and so on are strengthened and this is currently a major area for improvement. It is also recommended that the connections to cross boundary issues are strengthened.

Other Key Comments

The Outline Regional Transport Plan is not the appropriate arena for comments on transport policy and guidance. There are separate processes of consultation in which these views should be aired. To develop the full regional transport plan, it is recommended that the focus be moved away from this.

There are some comments about delays to other documents such as RTP Guidance/ WTS Final Strategy/ WelTAG. No significant changes to Guidance or WTS are anticipated but the RTP must be able to cope with changes in circumstance. After all we are not asking for blueprint plans but strategies and programmes. There is likely to be further guidance throughout the plan preparation period on issues as they arise. In particular this summer we will have a new programme for the new Welsh Assembly Government and the results of the spending review. There may also be changes on various topics such as CO2 reduction strategies or bus regulation before the RTPs are finalised and they must therefore be prepared in a way which allows them to take these on board.

Key Recommendations

The following key recommendations have been made:

- The regional problems are to be summarised under social, economic and environmental from which opportunities can be developed;
- The regional vision, priorities and objectives to be developed following on from the identification of problems and opportunities;
- The monitoring framework to be developed incorporating the core indicators from the WTS in addition to regional core indicators;
- Cross cutting issues to be strengthened to link with cross border policies, LDPs and locational policies;
- The focus of the RTP to be on how the regional problems and national policy requirements will be addressed rather than how they will not be.

Yours sincerely,

T Griffin OAM
Head of Transport Planning Unit

Sewta Board meeting 29th June 2007
Item 4(ii)



Report To: Board 29th June 2007

Report Subject: Regional Transport Plan

Report Author: Planning Manager

1. Purpose

1.1 To inform the Board of progress in preparing the plan and to seek agreement to further key principles that will underlie the plan. The report is an officer's report and not Sewta policy until agreed by the Board.

2. Background/Present Position

2.1 WAG guidance requires that we produce a draft RTP by October 5th and the Final Plan by the March 31st 2008. The report sets out below the problems associated with that timetable. At this stage, we presume we must produce some kind of draft report in October and most of this report assumes that.

2.2 WAG has produced final guidance on how to produce the RTP, although without formal consultation. This guidance has been accepted by Sewta but with the caveats set down in item x.y to today's meeting. WAG has produced draft guidance on its plan and project appraisal tool, WeITAG. Sewta has accepted this guidance but with the caveats set down in item x.y to today's meeting. WAG seems unlikely to accept those caveats. WAG has yet to formally publish its Transport Strategy.

3. Proposal for Action

3.1 The four transport consortia have concluded it is not possible to produce plans that will comply with WAG guidance by March 31st 2008. The reasons are set out in a letter to the transport minister, Dr.Brian Gibbons. In summary the reasons are:

- 3.1.1 A budget shortfall (discussed elsewhere today);
- 3.1.2 The need to further consider how to handle the revenue consequences of integrated transport policy;
- 3.1.3 The unavailability of the Wales Transport Strategy in its final form;
- 3.1.4 Concerns about WeITAG (discussed elsewhere today);
- 3.1.5 The lack of a clear monitoring strategy.

We are discussing this with WAG directly and through WLGA. The

remainder of this report presumes we will not be able to delay production of a draft report in October.

- 3.2 Chapters 1,2,3 of the draft plan are available in their draft form. They need further work, but Board members are asked to comment on them as they stand if they wish. They are attached as appendix A.
- 3.3 The Road Safety strategy now has some draft policies. They need refinement but Board members are asked to comment on them as they stand if they wish. They are attached as appendix B.
- 3.4 Our consultants have completed phase 1 of the Roads study and have commenced phase 2. Consultants are also working on the detail of the bus strategy and the community transport strategy. These reports are due before the production of the draft plan but not in time to allow members to consider the study findings in the context of the draft plan.
- 3.5 Appendix C summarises the Rail strategy as it currently stands.
- 3.6 Appendix D summarises the Walking and Cycling Strategy as it stands.
- 3.7 The draft plan will contain policies on topics that remain the executive responsibility of individual local authorities. The policies aim at raising standards across the region but they are not binding. They provide guidance and targets for improvement. The policies as they currently stand are set out in Appendix E and are offered for comment and change.
- 3.8 The Board must provide direction on some other strategic matters. Members are asked to consider whether the following form a basis for directing important parts of the RTP.
 - 3.8.1 The Vision, Priorities and Objectives set down in the outline plan need not change (chapters 2,6 of the Outline RTP).
 - 3.8.2 Investment priorities must be based on an objective evaluation process and concentrate on the 5 year programme, rather than a longer timescale. We must make our investment decisions based on what needs to happen next not on what we will have to decide in 15 years time. Those short term decisions must however be consistent with our long term plans.
 - 3.8.3 Sewta supports the construction of the Church Village By-pass (now in the transport grant programme) and the completion of the Cardiff Peripheral Distributor Road (Board 15th July 2005).
 - 3.8.4 Sewta supports the construction of the new M4 south of Newport (subject of presentation to today's meeting).
 - 3.8.5 In order to make best use of resources, increases in investment in Community Transport will require more joint working in the CT industry (anticipated recommendation of our consultant on this matter).
 - 3.8.6 The RTP should include a business analysis of the value of increasing resources allocated to travel planning and Smarter Choices.
 - 3.8.7 The RTP should include the scope of potential Regional Transport

Planning Guidance. The guidance would have to be adopted by each planning authority to be effective.

3.8.8 The roads study consultants are likely to recommend that efforts on strategic highways aim at making the best use of the existing highway system. They are likely to recommend only a low level of investment in new local authority highways.

4 Financial Implications

4.1 These matters are discussed in another report to today's meeting.

5. Staffing/Personnel Implications

5.1 Because of limited staff resources, the draft RTP cannot include the necessary WelTAG assessments as required by WAG. Neither will it be possible, within existing staff budgets, to make many changes to the draft plan, when producing the final plan.

6. Consultation

6.1 Each local authority has reviewed the contents of the report and the various appendices. Earlier drafts have been changed accordingly. The content of this report will be further revised and refined but the Board's view on all the matters contained herein is sought.

6.2 As noted in §5.1, consultation on the draft plan will be severely limited. It is however proposed to present the draft plan formally to each local authority (Cabinet, Scrutiny or Full Council) as each authority wishes.

7. Recommendations

7.1 The content of this report will form the basis of much of the draft Regional Transport plan. The Board is asked therefore to consider the contents of the report and to comment and commend accordingly.

7.2 If WAG does not permit a delay in the production of the plan (see §3.1 above), the Board is asked to endorse the production of the draft RTP on the basis of this report, and the findings of continuing studies on road, bus and community transport. The Board does not meet again until the draft plan is to be published. Draft plan content that has not been considered by the Board but only by Members through their individual officer contacts will be noted accordingly.

8. Reasons (Sewta Objectives)

8.1 In pursuit of all Sewta's objectives.

Appendix A – Drafts of chapter 1,2,3 of draft RTP

Chapter 1 – Where we are

1.1 Sewta is an alliance of 10 south east Wales local authorities working with others to deliver better transport in south east Wales. We are constituted as a joint local government committee. Our original aim was to improve public transport in the region. The Transport Act (Wales) 2006 requires us to produce a regional plan for transport for all modes of travel. We produced an outline of the plan in January and we must produce the final plan by March 2008. Delivery of the plan starts on April 1st 2008. We have prepared this draft in accord with Assembly guidance v3 April 2007. This draft plan summarises many pieces of work, the details of which are contained in other documents. They are available on our web site. (sewta.gov.uk)

1.2 Our main transport problems are¹:

- 1.2.1 Social - too many people are excluded from fully participating in society because their transport is poor. The richest 10% of households spend as much on transport as the total expenditure of the poorest 10% of households. Life is very difficult unless one has access to a car. In many poorer households it is an expensive necessity. Public transport to the centre of Cardiff is good and fair to other larger town centres. Journeys across towns and between valley communities are generally difficult: journey times are often four times that of using a car. In rural areas public transport is even worse. Poor public transport is often cited as a reason for being unable to hold down a job. It is also a problem with the weekly shop and accessing leisure facilities in the evening and at weekends. Monmouthshire (19 wards) and the Vale of Glamorgan (11) dominate the list of the 40 wards with poorest access to facilities by public transport. The Valleys (24 wards) and parts of Cardiff (11) dominate the list of the most 40 socially deprived wards in the area.
- 1.2.2 Safety - people see the transport system as being unsafe. They fear the impact of motor traffic on their local communities. Speeding traffic on local roads is a major problem. Public complaints about this are one of the most frequent made to highway engineers. There are 5500 road traffic casualties each year in south east Wales. They cost the community £250m pa. The casualty rate per head of population is highest in Cardiff and Bridgend and lowest in Torfaen and Caerphilly. Safety of public transport is offered by some as an excuse for not using it, even though it is in fact safer than other modes of travel. Personal security at night on public transport is also seen as a problem. Many of these safety problems are perceived rather than real but the concerns are still there.
- 1.2.3 Economic - we have become over-dependent on the motor car. That leads to high levels of traffic congestion and consequently an inefficient transport system. Traffic congestion costs the local economy £600m pa. Many of our more

¹ This analysis relates broadly to the headings of social issues, the economy and the environment. The Outline RTP (chapter 3,5 and appendix A) provides a much fuller exposition of these problems.

important roads are close to capacity in the peak hour. Some operate in gridlock conditions in the peak and are at capacity through the day. Traffic congestion will grow much faster than any increase in road traffic. Unless we take effective action, within a few years, the cost will reach £1bn pa and go on increasing. Our roads, on average, carry three times the traffic of roads elsewhere in Wales. Consequently highway maintenance is a greater burden in this area than elsewhere and our roads are in worse condition than the rest of Wales. Building more and more roads is not an effective solution to these problems. Providing a sustainable transport system that meets our economic needs is one of the greatest challenges our plan must tackle. Our dependence on the motor car is also one of the main causes of poor health in the area. This has economic as well as social consequences. The problem is linked to a reduction in walking. Males walk 40% less than 15 years ago; females 25% less.

1.2.4 Environmental - carbon emissions hasten climate change. Transport accounts for between 20% and 30% of UK carbon emissions (depending on the data source) and that proportion is growing. The temperature rise that is forecast to follow the increase in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere varies from 1° to 4° this century. The latter is likely to be catastrophic, the former manageable. Wales’ contribution to the global carbon total is less than 0.01%. From that point of view, Sewta’s efforts will be ineffective. The counter arguments, apart from the moral question of why anyone should do anything if nobody else does, are twofold. First, the era of cheap oil is over and we cannot predicate our future on its continued cheap supply. The second is that continued reliance on road traffic for most of our transport needs is contrary to our social aims. The poor and disadvantaged benefit much less from the car than do the better off. There are therefore selfish and local reasons to reduce our dependence on the motor car. Motor traffic also degrades other aspect of the environment – noise, heritage, landscape, air quality and so on. Sewta has within its boundaries, inter alia, 11 air quality management areas, 300 listed ancient monuments, 25 special areas of conservation and more than 600 closed landfill sites. Transport impacts relate to our responsibilities in two ways. First, the level of traffic. Here our policies will reflect our traffic reduction agenda. Second, system management, maintenance and design can reduce the impact of the transport system on the environment. We therefore need policies that are sympathetic to good environmental stewardship.

1.3 The Wales Transport Strategy set outcomes that transport plans in Wales must achieve. We set out below our position on each outcome. The importance of the outcome (that is how important it is to transport) and the effect the plan can have on it (in terms of how much we can deliver to improve matters) are graded from major, significant, middling, limited to little. For example, improving connectivity within Wales and internationally is an important function of the transport system but Sewta is limited to what it can do, as most of the responsibility for action lies with others.

Outcome	Importance as a transport issue	Importance to the RTP
S1 (1). Improving access to healthcare	Significant outcome over which the plan can have a middling impact.	Much depends on what service providers do.

S2. (2) Improving access to education, training and life-long learning	Significant outcome over which the plan can have a limited impact.	Much depends on what service providers do.
S3. (3) Improving access to shopping and leisure facilities	Significant outcome over which the plan can have a limited impact.	Land use and service planning is very important.
S4. (4) Encouraging healthy lifestyles	Significant outcome over which the plan can have a middling impact.	Should be seen as part of a much wider agenda.
S5. (5) Improving the actual and perceived safety of travel	Major outcome over which the plan can have a significant impact.	A cornerstone of the plan.
F1 (6). Improving connectivity within Wales and internationally	Major outcome over which the plan can have limited impact.	Largely in the hands of others.
F2 (7). Improving the efficient, reliable and sustainable movement of people	Major outcome over which the plan can have a significant impact.	A cornerstone of the plan.
F3 (8). Improving the efficient, reliable and sustainable movement of freight	Major outcome	The plan can have only a middling impact.
F4 (9). Improving access to employment opportunities	Significant outcome over which the plan can have a middling impact.	Part of the wider agenda to increase job opportunities.
F5 <i>Ensuring centres of activity have viable catchments (additional outcome)</i>	Major outcome over which the plan can have a middling impact.	Seen as part of the wider regeneration agenda.
F6 (10). Improving access to key visitor attractions	Limited outcome	The plan can have only a limited impact.
N1 (11). Increasing the use of sustainable materials in the maintenance of Wales' transport assets and in the provision of new transport infrastructure.	Significant outcome over which the plan can have a limited impact. Mainly a system design issue.	Outline policies in the plan but no more.
N2 (12). Reducing the contribution of transport to greenhouse gas emissions	Major outcome over which the plan can have a significant impact.	A cornerstone of the plan but requires joint working.
N3 (12a). Adapting to the impacts of climate change	Middling outcome over which the plan can have limited impact. Mainly a system design outcome.	Outline policies in the plan but no more.
N4 (12b). Reducing the contribution of transport to air pollution and other harmful pollutant emissions	Significant outcome with a middling impact. Largely affected by operation of the transport system.	Outline policies but no more.
N5 (13). Reducing the negative impact of transport on the local environment - water pollution, soil loss and land contamination, noise and vibration, light pollution and links between communities	Significant outcome with a limited impact. Largely affected by operation of the transport system.	Outline policies but no more.
N6 (14). Reducing the negative impact of transport on our heritage – landscape townscape, historical environment and Wales' distinctiveness	Middling outcome with a limited impact. Largely affected by operation of the transport system.	Outline policies but no more.
N7 (15). Reducing negative impacts of transport on biodiversity and increasing positive impacts.	Significant outcome with a middling impact.	Largely affected by operation of the transport system, although reducing

		carbon emissions is significant.
N8. <i>Change public attitudes to the environmental impact of the transport system (additional outcome)</i>	Major outcome over which the plan can have a significant impact.	Success is essential to delivering many parts of the plan.

1.4 Our vision for the RTP is “to provide a modern, integrated and sustainable transport system for south east Wales that increases opportunity, promotes prosperity and protects the environment; where public transport, walking, cycling and sustainable freight provide real travel alternatives”.

1.5 Our priorities build on our vision. They tackle our main problems and they set the general direction of the plan by answering the question “what really matters?”

1.5.1 To improve access to services, facilities and employment, particularly by public transport, walking and cycling.

1.5.2 To provide a transport system that increases the use of sustainable modes of travel.

1.5.3 To reduce the demand for travel.

1.5.4 To develop an efficient and reliable transport system with reduced levels of congestion and improved transport links within the Sewta region and to the rest of Wales, the UK and Europe.

1.5.5 To provide a transport system that encourages healthy and active lifestyles, is safer and supports local communities.

1.5.6 To reduce significantly the emission of greenhouse gases and air pollution from transport.

1.5.7 To ensure that land use development in south east Wales is supported by sustainable transport measures.

1.5.8 To make better use of the existing transport system.

1.5.9 To play a full role in regenerating south east Wales.

1.6 Our RTP objectives are (not in priority order):

1.6.1 To ensure that communities have access to a good range of employment opportunities, particularly by public transport, walking and cycling.

1.6.2 To improve access to services and facilities, particularly by public transport, walking and cycling.

1.6.3 To achieve seamless interchange within and between modes of transport.

1.6.4 To achieve a modal shift towards more sustainable forms of transport for moving both people and freight.

1.6.5 To improve actual and perceived levels of personal security when travelling.

1.6.6 To improve the efficiency and reliability of the transport system.

1.6.7 To improve connections between the Sewta region and the rest of Wales, the UK and Europe by improving transport links that do not have an adverse impact on climate change.

1.6.8 To reduce traffic growth and traffic congestion.

- 1.6.9 To make better use of the existing road system.
- 1.6.10 To ensure that land use developments in south east Wales are supported by sustainable transport measures.
- 1.6.11 To regenerate town centres, brown-field sites and local communities through appropriate transport provision.
- 1.6.12 To reduce the number and severity of road traffic casualties.
- 1.6.13 To promote travel modes that provide for healthier lifestyles.
- 1.6.14 To reduce the dominance of motor traffic on the local street scene to the benefit of residents, pedestrians and cyclists.
- 1.6.15 To reduce the impact of the transport system on the natural and built environment.
- 1.6.16 To make the transport system more robust with respect to the consequences of climate change.
- 1.6.17 To reduce significantly the emission of greenhouse gases from transport.
- 1.6.18 To make the public more aware of the consequences of their travel choices on climate, the environment and health.

Chapter 2 – Regional and National context of the RTP

2.1 Our RTP is one of a set of plans. The Assembly has produced its Spatial Plan and Transport Strategy and the planning authorities are producing local development plans. Our RTP also relates to national economic, environmental and health strategies, the Heads of the Valley programme and the regeneration strategies promoted by the local authorities. There is also a UK Government imposed directive to reduce the levels of road traffic. This chapter explains the relationship between our plan and these other matters.

2.2 Sewta's area of responsibility is identical to the area covered by the Capital Region of the Wales Spatial Plan. That area plan sets out a powerful statement of what the RTP should strive to achieve.

2.3 "The overall objective is to enable people to have easy access to goods and services that support their economic and social life without damaging the environment. Current car usage trends point to increasing congestion within the area if action is not taken. The overall priority is therefore seen as making better use of the area's existing transport infrastructure, to deliver sustainable transport.

- The aim should be that all the key settlements should be linked to Cardiff or Newport by suitable high capacity public transport, operating at least four times an hour during the normal working day, so that passengers have the confidence to "turn up and go". Seating capacity should be sufficient to meet normal demand, reducing the need for passengers to stand;
- bus priorities measures should be developed on key routes to ensure buses offer rapid travel between the key settlements;
- stretching targets should be set for improving journey times by bus and rail between the key settlements;
- Bus services and community transport should link other communities to these main public transport corridors;
- The priority for road transport is to ensure that the existing road capacity is used with maximum efficiency. An approach to road-user charging should be developed for SE Wales as a whole, to reduce reliance on the private car. The timing of implementation will need to be judged so that improved public transport services are in place to offer car users realistic choice.
- The Welsh Assembly Government, Sewta and SWWITCH should work together to ensure that the 2 rail studies to be carried out in 2007 make explicit the short, medium and long-term options for improvements in rail journey times and in service standards across the South Wales region to London and Heathrow. The two studies are the Wales Route Utilisation Study (RUS) and the High Level Output Specification (HLOS).

The development and further future integration of Cardiff Wales Airport to the Capital region needs to reflect its current crucial role in providing international identity and its future role in responding to climate change challenges."

2.4 The RTP programme accommodates all these goals, although some of them such as the proposal for four services per hour from all key centres to Newport or Cardiff lie beyond our medium term plans stretching to 2018.

2.5 The Spatial Plan forecasts a housing demand of 108,000 new households in the area up to 2023. The local development plans will identify land sufficient to meet that demand. The RTP needs to include policies and proposals appropriate to meeting the transport pressures created by that new housing and the development that accompanies it. It is unclear at present how the RTP can effectively respond to these pressures. The answer however will require a balance of investment in all modes of transport, funded through a variety of sources. S106 agreements will have to figure highly in the programme.

2.6 The Spatial Plan identifies three areas in south east Wales. The RTP will contain policies and programmes that recognise their distinctions.

- The Heads of the Valleys Plus. This comprises the Heads of the Valleys programme area with the upper Ogwr valleys. It has a disproportionate amount of economic and social deprivation. It contains a lot of 'transport poor' people. It is an area of limited industrial development opportunity with significant heritage and tourism potential. The main transport artery is the improved A465. Dualling that road offers some economic development opportunities. Good communications southwards, both by road and public transport, are very important for this area. Communications between communities are poor. The strategy for this area provides opportunities to lever resources in ways not available to other areas. The area has a population of 272,000.
- The Connections Corridor includes most of Monmouthshire. The Heads of the Valleys bounds it to the north and the M4 (roughly) to the south. It has a population of 452,000. It has many of the southern coal field communities. It has been a successful focus for consolidated development in the boroughs of Rhondda Cynon Taff, and Caerphilly. The area has substantial commuting to the coastal belt; it also has a substantial industrial base. Traffic congestion here is a significant problem and cross-valley links are poor.
- The Coastal Cities Zone lies to the south of M4 and includes Cardiff and Newport. Both cities are large enough to be largely self-sufficient. Cardiff has areas of deprivation but has much the best public transport system in the south east of Wales. Traffic congestion is a major problem. The area has a population of 685,000. It includes all the major commuting areas in south east Wales and all the locations suffering acute development pressure. The regional planning effort in south east Wales concentrates largely on spreading more widely the development opportunities that might otherwise go primarily to the coastal zone.

2.7 The Wales Spatial Plan identifies fourteen key settlements. The Spatial Plan proposes much improved connections between them and to Cardiff and Newport. They are:

Aberdare Abergavenny Barry (and the corridor west to St.Athan) Blackwood (the only settlement without a passenger rail service) Bridgend Caerphilly Cardiff (the main regional focus) Chepstow Cwmbran and Pontypool (to be seen as one settlement with two foci)	Ebbw Vale (given special mention in the Spatial Plan with respect to its role in the Heads of the Valleys) Merthyr (given special mention in the Spatial Plan with respect to its role in the Heads of the Valleys) Newport (the second regional focus after Cardiff) Pontypridd Llantrisant (to be seen in future as a settlement of greatly increased importance)
---	---

2.8 The concept of the 'Networked City Region' implies good connections between these settlements and between the settlements and their immediate hinterlands. These connections will be improved but we must be realistic about what can be achieved. We will most easily improve the public transport connections along the main corridors to Cardiff and Newport. It is also reasonable to anticipate improved bus services that feed into the key settlements, provided appropriate levels of revenue support are directed at these services. Continued traffic growth will mitigate against improving intra-regional road connections, that is between the key settlements. We could not build roads quickly enough to keep up with the increasing levels of congestion caused by traffic increases. It will be even more difficult to provide public transport connections between, say, Aberdare and Abergavenny that begin to approach what the car offers. The Networked City Region must consequently be oriented towards an historic but improved pattern of north to south movements, augmented by a limited number of more local, stronger connections. It would be a mistake to assume the RTP can deliver a fully connected populace of 1.4m. It could only do so through a set of expensive and centrally directed fiscal policies supplemented by a highly centralised planning system. Neither condition is either deliverable or reasonable.

2.9 The Wales Transport Strategy suggests where south east Wales differs from the rest of Wales and offers direction for the RTP. It indicates:

2.9.1 Traffic congestion is worse here ;

2.9.2 Congestion is exacerbated by a lack of peak junction capacity;

2.9.3 Congestion on the transport system (all modes) causes unreliability;

2.9.4 There is great scope to give buses priority over other traffic;

2.9.5 There is more opportunity for modal change;

2.9.6 There is more opportunity to reduce carbon emissions from transport;

2.9.7 Freight traffic impacts considerably on the local environment;

2.9.8 Highway maintenance is a greater burden because of the number of heavy goods vehicles;

2.9.9 Social deprivation is worse than elsewhere in Wales but accessibility is better;

2.9.10 Tourism is most important to Monmouthshire, the western Vale and the Heritage Coast (they have lower levels of accessibility as well);

2.9.11 Travel planning is under-exploited in the area and car occupancy should be raised.

2.10 The outline RTP and other documents identify a number of themes that cut across other services in south east Wales. ('Other services' covers any provision that influences, or is influenced by, the regional transport system and over which Sewta has no executive power. Chapter 11 of the Outline RTP contains material relevant to this topic.)

Theme	Source	Action
Delivery of the Networked City Region	Prime requirement of the WSP	Partnership with others and orient RTP policies and programmes accordingly
Meeting strategic housing need for 108000 units	Prime requirement of the WSP	Strong interfaces with LDPs that reflect the detail of this need
Integrated transport plans for St.Athan- Barry, Cardiff to Tonyrefail and A465 corridors	Identified within WSP as corridors most benefiting from a holistic approach	Partnership with others and orient RTP policies and programmes accordingly
Regeneration as expressed in LDPs	Prime requirement of LDPs	Covered elsewhere in this chapter
Heads of the Valleys strategy	The strategy is a multi-agency initiative with local authorities at the centre	Partnership with others and orient RTP policies and programmes accordingly
Achieving sustainable economic growth	Essential requirement of a sustainable economy	Emphasis on sound basic provision of reliable transport services
Reducing business costs	Major aid to a healthy economy	Emphasis on sound basic provision of reliable transport services
Delivering Clinical Futures	WAG health agenda	Requires allocation of responsibilities where they can be most effectively discharged
Delivering the tourism strategy		
Improving education standards	Education Act 2002	Not a major part of the RTP
Reducing unemployment	Central to many WAG and Local authority policies	Improved public transport
Improving international connectivity	Wales Transport Strategy	Support for Heathrow Rail link. Support for WAG trunk road proposals.
Cross boundary links with other consortia	Basic requirement of joint consortia working	Concentrate on south Wales main line integration and bus services west of Bridgend
Improving north south connections within Wales	Core part of Wales Transport Strategy	Support offered to improve rail links. Opportunities to link this to local rail improvements.
Addressing the carbon agenda	Wales Environment Strategy	Deliver our travel reduction agenda
Improving other environmental conditions	Wales Environment Strategy	Best delivered by responsible discharge of basic local government transport provision

Improving local authority led transport services	RTP guidance and need to improve all aspect of regional transport	Adoption of appropriate standards and protocols
--	---	---

2.11 Local development plans replace unitary development plans. They will reflect the conditions that are local to each authority and must also recognise the regional dimension imposed by the Spatial Plan and the Regional Transport Plan. These regional plans will not dictate the content of the LDPs; neither can the LDPs operate in isolation from the context set by the regional plans.

2.12 The LDPs are likely to be characterised by:

- The southern plans will exploit the economic development opportunities offered by their location to serve not only their own populations but those to the north. North to south transport links will be very important in sustaining those opportunities.
- The plans for those authorities straddling the Connections Corridor will consolidate development in their southern parts and promote regeneration to the north.
- The authorities along the Heads of the Valleys will seek to expand their industrial and service base but recognise that in many respects better connections southwards must provide access to services and jobs for many of their people.
- Rural areas, mainly in Monmouthshire and the Vale of Glamorgan, require protection from over-development and planning controls that safeguard their environment.
- Transport policies supportive of the regional transport plan and its aims to encourage land use that reduces the need to travel by motorised modes, improve the local environment, provide much better public transport and make better use of the existing road system.
- Land use allocations that are not largely dependent on access by the motor car.

2.13 Regeneration lies at the centre of most planning and economic policy. The RTP promotes regeneration by supporting projects that facilitate betterment of existing land uses. Network management of the road system should be oriented both to making better use of the existing road system and helping regeneration. Management of the local road network will be most successful when seen as part of the wider regeneration opportunities promoted by a local authority. New road schemes will be considered where they are part of wider regeneration proposals but not where they only add peak hour capacity. We will favour public transport schemes that provide for sustainable economic growth through regeneration. We will develop our proposals for sustainable transport provision – walking, cycling and travel planning – within the regeneration frameworks adopted by the local authorities.

2.14 The RTP must deliver a broader range of schemes (several modes) for a wider range of agendas, one of which is regeneration. Regeneration is at the heart of many local development plans and the relationship between RTPs and LDPs is the most important of all the cross-cutting themes. How we deal with this relationship goes to the centre of the RTP.

(Author's note: para 2.15 is a summary of other proposals. It will need to be recast into 'report format')

2.15 Sewta recognises that local authorities control the regeneration agenda, and the S106 agreements that contribute so much to it. Sewta controls, or has influence over the funds and policies relating to transport infrastructure that can be significant for many regeneration proposals. The RTP must set out how Sewta intends to discharge those responsibilities. Wholesale support for all regeneration proposals is not possible, as resources to deliver them are limited. We must have a selection process, at a regional level, to identify regeneration proposals that have regional significance and therefore warrant Sewta's support. It is suggested we adopt the following process:

2.15.1 Regeneration proposals will normally be initiated through the LDPs. Other sources might include agents or parts of WAG and other strategies such as the Heads of the Valley programme. The first RTP will not include regeneration proposals, unless they are well advanced.

2.15.2 Sewta need not involve itself in regeneration projects not having a regional transport dimension. Sewta should establish rules against which regeneration proposals can be considered, where regional support is required. Those rules should be applied objectively by a group of officers drawn from all the authorities, supported if appropriate by representatives from the partners, including WAG. For a particular proposal, only those authorities not directly involved would make the recommendation that would then be considered by the Board. The decision would be a Board one and not made by officers.

2.15.3 The extent of the support would vary from a statement of general support through to an undertaking to finance an agreed part of the overall proposal. Support under the former condition would normally be forthcoming and only conditioned if the proposal were contrary to Sewta's overall objectives. Financial support would depend on the value of the proposal against competing Sewta projects currently being actively considered. Sewta would work with the Regeneration agencies to establish mutually acceptable programmes.

2.15.4 WAG should be asked to allow the inclusion of Sewta 'bids' for regeneration funding at short notice. Effectively projects receiving financial support under this arrangement would leapfrog other longer standing projects. This is necessary as regeneration projects are often opportunistic and arise at fairly short notice.

2.16 The RTP must also set a regional framework within which community strategies can develop.

Chapter 3 - Options

3.1 Sewta's RTP must complement the Assembly's national plans and the local development plans of its constituent local authorities. It must balance the competing needs of the economy and the environment, and address the problems of social exclusion. It must tackle the problems we currently face and the problems we might face in the future. It must produce a transport system fit for purpose. It must be realistic in what it aims to achieve and it must comply with legislation on the environment.

3.2 We believe it is possible to construct an RTP that reconciles these different requirements set by the environmental, social and economic agendas. A society that does not adequately address its social problems cannot operate economically, neither can one that ignores the environmental consequences of its actions. A plan that damages the economy is one that will not have the resources to deliver its social or environmental agenda. The competing aims must therefore result in a plan that is balanced, without siding too strongly with any one set of interests. As part of the plan process, we must however consider a range of strategic options. These help us determine how to produce a plan that is balanced.

3.3 We consider our options in five ways:

3.3.1 The investment balance we might seek in a set of strategic options (table 3.1).

3.3.2 How the strategic options might contribute to each of our objectives (table 3.2)

3.3.3 The advantages and disadvantages of the strategic options (table 3.3).

3.3.4 How each mode might contribute to the preferred strategy (table 3.4). This is based on table 8.3 of the outline plan.

3.3.5 The contribution intervention measures might make to our strategy (table 3.5). This is based on table 8.4 of the outline plan.

3.4 The strategic options (table 3.1) are a selection of possible directions that a Regional transport plan could follow. This is not an exhaustive list as any number of options exists. We could for instance consider options aimed purely at addressing problems of carbon emissions or highway safety or the needs of freight hauliers. Our strategic options consider four different policy bases and three levels of resources. The four policy based strategies include different aspects of transport policy but in different combinations. The three resource strategies assume different levels of spending and effort on transport. By analysing the strategies, we are able to identify how we might pull together a preferred plan that best solves our problems, meets our objectives and is consistent with other plans and policies. The strategic policy bases are:

3.4.1 A strategy that is highly oriented to building roads. This mirrors the policy of 'predict and provide'.

3.4.2 A strategy that is highly oriented towards improving bus and rail. This is oriented to improving bus and rail services and not much else.

- 3.4.3 A strategy based on restraining the demand for travel. Our outline plan proposed an option based purely on carbon emission targets. This is subsumed within the demand restraint option.
- 3.4.4 A strategy oriented towards improving accessibility. This too is public transport based but aimed primarily at tackling problems of social exclusion.
- 3.4.5 We base our preferred plan on a 20 year capital budget of £1.7Bn, that is £85m pa. (The basis of this is explained elsewhere in the plan.) The three resource based plans are:
- 3.4.6 The preferred plan. This is ambitious financially and in terms of a changed regulatory base. It seeks to achieve the aspirations of our stakeholders.
- 3.4.7 The best alternative. This is much less ambitious but goes some way to achieving our objectives. It is not intended to meet our aspirations.
- 3.4.8 A do minimum plan. This assumes little resource input to regional transport.

3.5 For each strategic option, table 3.1 allocates hypothetical resources to a range of expenditure heads. For instance, for the pro roads option, 80% of our resources would go on improving the highway system and 20% on public transport. Under the Accessibility Strategy, 80% would go on public transport with buses getting most of that. Nothing would go on the highway system, except what was spent on road safety. The expenditure based strategies envisage differing levels of resource input. The allocation to expenditure heads for the alternative strategy reflects that of the preferred strategy but at a lower level. The do minimum is more roads oriented. The preferred strategy allocation is indicative only at this stage. Later parts of this plan consider the proposed allocation in more detail.

3.6 We draw important conclusions from table 3.1.

Different patterns of expenditure accompany each of the strategies. They reflect the principle aim of each strategy.

- 3.6.1 The pro-roads strategy reflects our resource allocation of perhaps 15 years ago. All the other strategies (apart from the do-minimum) imply a substantial shift away from road building to other forms of expenditure. This change is consistent with Assembly policy.
- 3.6.2 The preferred plan will inevitably be a combination of one or more of the other strategies. We cannot be certain at this stage what the best balance should be precisely but we can make an estimate of what roughly it needs to be. The figures in the table suggest we will spend about £700m on highway improvements and rather more on public transport capital investment in the next 20 years. Cycling and walking would get about £50m over that period, road safety and demand restraint measures about £100m each and softer measures about £30m.
- 3.6.3 The preferred plan is ambitious in terms of the resources needed to deliver it.

3.6.4 The allocation in the preferred strategy is more oriented to highways expenditure than implied by the outline plan. This is a response to the consultation on the outline plan.

3.7 Table 3.2 shows how each strategic option meets our objectives. The scoring system is that proposed for WeITAG evaluations. Table 3.3 identifies the advantages (essentially strengths and opportunities) and disadvantages (weaknesses and threats) of the strategic options. The tables should be read together. We draw important conclusions from them.

3.7.1 No option is entirely without merit and the preferred plan should draw on all of them.

3.7.2 The pro roads option identifies the need to recognise that much of our existing transport system is dominated by road traffic. We cannot ignore the attachment many people have to the personal opportunities offered by the motor car. We undoubtedly need to reorient investment to other modes of travel and establish better links between transport planning, land use plan and public service planning. There is however some unavoidable traffic growth in the system and we have to deal with the problems that creates.

3.7.3 The pro public transport option points to the need for our investment in bus and rail to increase substantially. Sewta's established rail strategy and its emerging bus strategy are the kernel of those new programmes.

3.7.4 The demand restraint strategy has policies that cut traffic and move remaining demand towards more sustainable modes of travel. The importance of softer measures within this strategy identifies their role in the preferred plan.

3.7.5 The Accessibility option suggests we need to pay much more attention to provision of basic levels of accessibility to essential facilities and services for all, rather than increasing mobility through extended provision for the motor car for car drivers alone.

3.7.6 The three expenditure based options identify that we cannot achieve our aspirations without recourse to additional funds and changes in some of the regulatory base under which the transport system is currently managed and maintained.

3.7.7 The preferred plan will draw on the best elements of all the other strategies with the exception of the do minimum which we reject.

3.8 Table 3.4 sets out the likely role of each mode of transport in the preferred plan.

We have an emerging bus strategy that is being developed within the objectives set by the outline plan. That will provide a firm base for the bus part of the plan.

3.8.1 We have a rail strategy that has been developed within the objectives set by the outline plan. That provides a firm base for the rail part of the preferred plan.

3.8.2 The preferred plan will pay more attention to the improvements in national connectivity offered by coach services.

3.8.3 We have a cycling strategy within our combined walking/ cycling strategy. It has been developed within the overall emerging policies of the preferred plan. It provides a firm base for that part of the preferred plan.

3.8.4 Our walking strategy will be closely linked to the design and management policies of Sewta's constituent local authorities.

- 3.8.5 We have set our roads policy within the objectives of the outline plan. It also includes pragmatic measures to mitigate the worst effects of increased traffic and the worsening congestion that will produce.
- 3.8.6 We will develop policies to provide sustainable alternatives to the lorry, at the same time managing and developing the highway system with commercial interests to the fore.
- 3.8.7 We will incorporate within the preferred plan, a set of policies that improve safety for powered two wheelers and exploit their advantages.
- 3.8.8 Our interest in air transport should concentrate on surface access to airports. Similarly our interest in sea transport should concentrate on freight access to seaports.
- 3.8.9 The role of increased car sharing is part of the softer measures programme.
- 3.8.10 We are unclear about the business opportunities that exist for community transport, demand responsive transport, taxis and private hires. The preferred plan will contain policies and actions on these modes of transport but it also needs to promote studies that will closely identify their role in the preferred plan.
- 3.8.11 The preferred plan will not consider equestrians, pipelines or canal users, although the road safety strategy will briefly allude to road safety and equestrians.
- 3.9 Table 3.5 identifies how different intervention processes might help deliver the preferred plan.
- 3.9.1 The level of investment the preferred plan requires exceeds conventional sources such as transport grant. Road user charging, in addition to its role in influencing travel demand, must be a source of additional funds for transport. Without it, we cannot deliver the preferred plan.
- 3.9.2 We will not at this stage pursue a workplace charging scheme.
- 3.9.3 Carbon trading and changes in government fiscal policy will greatly improve the chances of the plan being effective. Indeed, the Government has set a requirement that transport services shift towards provision that requires more revenue support but with no proposals as to how the fund the change. Sewta lacks the capability to fund that change and it is not a matter that need concern the preferred plan. But without change by the Government, transport will be much less integrated and poorer than everyone wants.
- 3.9.4 The general restrictions on the use of planning obligations will remain. Sewta must produce regional transport planning guidance that allows planning obligations to be used more widely to resolve the transport problems developments create.
- 3.9.5 The preferred plan needs to integrate its parking policy with the regeneration and sustainable development aspects of local development plans.
- 3.9.6 Other providers of services within the public sector can help deliver integrated transport solutions to the transport problems their users face. That requires joint working between Sewta (or its constituent authorities) and these agencies.

3.9.7 New technology will play an important role in the plan, both to allow best use of the transport system and as a tool to improve aspects of the public transport system.

3.9.8 Highway Asset Management Plans and the Traffic Management Act are the domain of the individual local authorities. Both provide opportunities for individual local authorities to deliver those parts of the preferred plan for which they have direct and individual responsibility.

3.9.9 The preferred plan will be enhanced by changes in some parts of the regulatory framework for transport.

3.10 Our preferred plan rejects the predict and provide element of the pro roads option and also the do-minimum option. The former is not sustainable and is inconsistent with Assembly and emerging LDP policies. The latter does not deliver what is needed. The preferred plan is a combination of the other options. It includes substantial investment programmes for bus and rail. It proposes limited investment in the road system where that investment improves the performance of the network. It promotes investment in healthier travel choices, to integrate the transport system and to provide more informed and sustainable travel choices. It contains policies, protocols and standards related to the executive functions of local authorities having a regional transport impact. It makes specific reference to regional policies for car parking, road safety and community transport. It sets out how we can work in partnership with others so that their efforts can improve regional transport. Finally, we identify fiscal, legal and regulatory changes that will help deliver the plan's objectives.

3.11 In summary, the preferred plan is compatible with the Wales Spatial Plan and the Wales Transport Strategy. It will be based on:

3.11.1 The rail strategy as already agreed.

3.11.2 The bus and coach strategy as to be finalised.

3.11.3 The roads strategy as to be agreed.

3.11.4 The walking and cycling strategy as already agreed but still to be programmed.

3.11.5 Policies and protocols for revenue related function as required by the RTP Guidance.

3.11.6 An access strategy for air and seaports.

3.11.7 Softer measures and demand restraint policies based on the principles of Smarter Choices.

3.11.8 Car parking and road safety strategies.

3.12 The preferred plan presumes that a regional road user charging system will be introduced between 2015 and 2020, possibly based on a national system and on the wider use of planning obligations as defined in new regional transport planning guidance. It will also provide more detail about regulatory changes needed to deliver the preferred plan.

3.13 The best alternative plan will have the same programme of projects and the same policies as the preferred plan. It will differ in the important respect that it will have a lower level of resources and will therefore take longer to deliver. Some policies might not be deliverable because the financial or regulatory conditions might never be appropriate for their implementation. It would leave the transport system more dominated by road traffic than the preferred plan.

3.14 The draft plan will not set out in any further detail what the do-minimum entails as it implies failure and does not need a regional transport plan.

Table 3.1 Strategic Options: defined as percentage of Sewta "collective effort" (i.e a combination of policy direction, capital & revenue budget, and local authority non costed initiatives and services											
Risks affecting delivery of RTP & Strategic Transport Options				KEY							
1	Adoption of regional road user charging scheme;			*	Assume softer measure minimum is current baseline continued						
2	Use of planning obligations to fund regional transport improvements;			**	Assume road safety measures minimum is current baseline continued						
3	Revision of legislation to better co- ordinate integrated transport;				Priority elements within strategic option						
4	Revision of Planning Policy Wales ***;				Secondary elements within strategic option						
5	Addressing revenue account shortages;				Element not included in or minor part of strategic option						
6	Managing the trunk and local road networks as one;										
7	Non transport service providers considering transport consequences of their services ***.										
Revised Strategic Option	Definition	Roads Strategy	Rail Strategy	Bus Strategy	Cycling & Walking Strategy	Road Safety Improvements **	Demand Restraint measures	Softer measures *	Total	RISK to strategy success	
		Limited new major highways, local regeneration led road schemes and junction improvements	Shortlisted new stations and infrastructure aimed at capacity and frequency enhancements	Bus improvements focussed in 13 corridors combined with service enhancements , and accessibility improvements	Major increases in cycling and walking infrastructure	Concentrate on improvements at major accident locations and awareness	Cardiff Congestion Charging scheme plus Car Parking supply restraint & charging	For example travel plans, advertising campaigns			
1	Pro Roads Expenditure on highways dominate. Focus on forecasting demand for transport and meeting that demand largely by road based solutions and increased highway capacity. Anticipate road traffic continuing to grow as it has in the past. Very little is available for public transport investment in this model.	70	10	10	0	10	0	0	100	Over the longer term a continuing spiral of unmet demand for road transport inevitably leads to high environmental impact, congestion, and diminishing returns on investment.	
2	Pro- Public Transport Aims to deliver the critical elements of the Sewta Rail and Bus strategies and ensure that public transport has journey time and reliability advantages over the car. Congestion remains unaddressed other than through the provision of alternatives. Increased supply of road space not available	0	53	42	0	0	0	5	100	Increased investment in enhanced public transport alone is insufficient to ensure modal shift. Congestion continues to increase.	
3	Demand Restraint Aims to reduce reliance on the private car, encouraging car sharing and adjusted travel behaviour through supply constraint and fiscal measures. Limited increase in supply of public transport and increased road capacity is not available. Cycling and Walking measures are taken forward widely across Sewta area, as are Road safety and Softer measures. Policies oriented towards people reducing the need to travel, and encouraging	10	20	20	0	5	35	10	100	Transfer of private car journeys where supply is increased. Risk of economic uncompetitiveness needs further work. Hypothecation of revenue from fiscal measures for transport investment not ensured	

		local service provision, activity and opportunity									
4	Accessibility	The analysis below presumes that transport provision (and public expenditure) would be slanted to addressing the problems of social exclusion where it is caused by poor transport provision, and the safety and security concerns of the disadvantaged. Bus improvements concentrate solely on addressing improved access to opportunities and services by improved frequency and new service route provision. Current trends in all other aspects of transport continue.	0	25	55	10	10	0	0	100	Over provision of vehicle and service provision, inefficiency of operation and low benefit to cost ratio but improved "option value". Difficulty of securing investment in services for local communities, outside Sewta control
5	Preferred	This strategic option estimates the likely package of elements likely to figure in a regional transport plan and the balance of effort required for each. The option seeks to reflect the resources required between the key elements of the modal strategies being prepared by Sewta and also ensure that adequate provision is made for supporting and softer policy elements	40	23	20	3	6	6	2	100	
6	Alternative	This strategic option does not provide for 100% of resource and effort required to deliver to modal strategies and the RTP as a whole. It is a representation of a situation where limited funding is available yet the needs of the modal strategies and the supporting/softer policies still need to be addressed	28	14	14	1	1	1	1	60	
7	Do Minimum	This option assumes that transport is not a high priority and that many issues are allocated insufficient resources to properly solve problems, with the preferred approach being management and limited capital intervention. Costly and resource intensive measures are avoided	25	10	5	1	1	1	1	44	Management of problems leads to mounting longer-term problems. Cumulative impacts not addressed. Risk adverse approach to investment. Transport problems not sufficiently addressed

Table 3.2 Strategic options and how each contributes to our objectives

Objective / Strategic option	Pro roads	Pro public transport	Demand restraint	Accessibility	Preferred	Alternative	Do minimum
Improve employment access (1)	0	+	-	+++	+	0	-
Improve access to services (2)	-	+	-	+++	+	0	-
Provide seamless interchange	- - -	+++	+	+	++	+	--
Achieve shift to sustainable modes (3)	- - -	+++	+	+	++	+	-
Improve personal security	0	+	+	+++	+	0	-
Economic performance (4)	++	--	--	- - -	+	0	-
Improve connections in Wales and beyond	++	-	-	--	+	0	--
Reduce traffic and congestion (5)	--	0	+++	--	++	+	- - -
Make better use of existing system	-	-	+	--	++	+	--
Aid sustainable land uses developments	--	+	0	+	+	0	-
Aid regeneration	-	+	0	+	++	+	-
Reduce road casualties (6)	--	+	+	-	+	0	--
Promote healthier lifestyles (7)	- - -	+	++	+	+	+	0
Less dominant traffic in communities(8)	- - -	-	+++	++	+	0	-
Protect the environment	- - -	+	++	+	+	+	-
Make system robust to climate change (9)	0	0	0	0	+	0	-
Reduce greenhouse gas emissions (10)	- - -	+	+++	++	++	+	- - -
Increase public awareness	- - -	+	++	+	+	+	--

Notes:

Large beneficial (+++); Moderate beneficial (++); Slight beneficial (+); Neutral (0); Slight adverse (-); Moderate adverse (- -); Large adverse (- - -)

- 1 There is a huge imbalance in commuting to Cardiff, and a lesser extent Newport, from Rhondda Cynon Taf, Caerphilly and Vale of Glamorgan.
- 2 About 300,000 of Sewta residents have high health care dependency needs. About 250,000 have educational access needs.
- 3 Car drivers account for about 50% of travel mileage.
- 4 Transport costs account for between 15% and 20% of economic activity.
- 5 Traffic congestion costs the south east Wales economy £600m pa.
- 6 There are more than 5500 personal injury accidents on our roads each year.
- 7 South east Wales has one of the worst health records of any region in the UK.
- 8 Complaints from residents about speeding traffic are one of the commonest complaints made to highway departments.
- 9 The impact of the climate on the transport system will increase substantially in future.
- 10 Transport accounts for between 20% and 30% of carbon emissions.

Table 3.3 Strategic options in terms of their advantages and disadvantages

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Conclusion
<p><i>1 Pro Roads.</i> Expenditure on highways dominate. Focus on forecasting demand for transport and meeting that demand largely by road based solutions and increased highway capacity. Anticipate road traffic continuing to grow as it has in the past. Very little is available for public transport investment in this model.</p>	<p>Popular with motorists. Fairly good with respect to economic performance, as transport is currently so oriented towards road traffic. Recognises value of conventional economic surplus.</p>	<p>Encourages extra traffic. Not possible to keep on building the required road capacity. Very damaging to the environment. Socially undesirable. Poor on integrated transport. Bad for local communities and regeneration. Not sustainable and highly dependent on continued future oil supplies. A high risk strategy.</p>	<p>Out and out road building is not part of the preferred plan, although we will have to cope with some traffic growth in the future. Those parts of this strategy which maximise the effective use of the existing road system will be part of the preferred plan.</p>
<p><i>2 Pro public transport</i> Aims to deliver the critical elements of the Sewta Rail and Bus strategies and ensure that public transport has journey time and reliability advantages over the car. Congestion remains unaddressed other than through the provision of alternatives. Increased supply of road space not available</p>	<p>Achieves some of our environmental objectives. Addresses some accessibility problems. Chance to refocus the economy on a more sustainable path.</p>	<p>Will damage the economy unless planned carefully. Does not consider worsening short term traffic problems. Too little emphasis on road safety. Unpopular with many people who will see PT resources better spent on roads. Requires legislation regarding the Transport Act 1985. Also a need to ensure rail investment benefits locked into the strategy.</p>	<p>The public transport elements of this plan should be included in our preferred strategy but a strategy that is just pro-public transport leaves too many problems unanswered. Has significant revenue implications. The option might also require more road space for buses to operate on.</p>
<p><i>3 Demand restraint</i> Aims to reduce reliance on the private car, encouraging car sharing and adjusted travel behaviour through supply constraint and fiscal measures. Limited increase in supply of public transport and increased road capacity is not available. Cycling and Walking measures are taken forward widely across Sewta area, as are Road safety and Softer measures. Policies oriented towards people reducing the need to travel, and encouraging local service provision, activity and opportunity</p>	<p>Achieves many of our plan objectives but still very difficult to achieve as a standalone policy. Exploits advances in technology. Most helps those objectives benefiting from reductions in road traffic – safety, the environment, shift to other modes. Fiscal measures can contribute additional resources to fund alternatives to the private car.</p>	<p>Initial resistance will be strong. Could damage economic competitiveness. Public transport improvements may not be enough to cope with demand, thereby shifting capacity problems from one mode to another. Fails to address accessibility problems.</p>	<p>An aim of the plan. We must put in place now policies that achieve it. They will not however be enough by themselves. This option therefore makes a significant contribution to the preferred plan.</p>

<p><i>4 Accessibility</i> The analysis below presumes that transport provision (and public expenditure) would be slanted to addressing the problems of social exclusion where it is caused by poor transport provision, and the safety and security concerns of disadvantaged groups in society. Bus improvements concentrate solely on addressing improved access to opportunities and services by improved frequency and new service route provision. Current trends in all other aspects of transport continue.</p>	<p>Directed at specifically addressing accessibility problems and therefore successful in that respect. Would leave communities more locally focused and tightly knit. Fairly good for environmental issues, sustainable development and regeneration.</p>	<p>Unpopular with the motorists lobby. Requires high levels of expenditure on specific issues, at the expense of other matters. It does nothing for instance to address existing traffic congestion problems and does little to help road safety. Does not address the needs of the economy or people's aspirations for increased mobility.</p>	<p>Very much a single issue strategy, albeit an important one. The contribution of this strategy to the preferred strategy is in the concept of accessibility itself. That suggests we orient provision for personal travel more to improving access to services and centres of activity and less just to making it easier to move around. This is important for LDP regeneration strategies.</p>
<p><i>5 Preferred</i> This strategic option estimates the likely package of elements likely to figure in a regional transport plan and the balance of effort required for each. The option seeks to reflect the resources required between the key elements of the modal strategies being prepared by Sewta and also ensure that adequate provision is made for supporting and softer policy elements</p>	<p>By definition, the preferred plan must be one that tackles, to at least some extent, all the problems we face. By being balanced in this way, it provides future flexibility to respond to changing events. The preferred strategy changes the course of the ship, but only gradually.</p>	<p>There is a danger that the preferred plan appears as all things to all men. It will not meet any objective as well as the best elements of options aimed specifically at particular problems. The preferred plan also makes assumptions about finance and legislation, these changes being needed to deliver parts of the strategy. To an extent the preferred plan carries risks with it.</p>	<p>The preferred plan draws on parts of all the options 1 to 4 above. The remaining part of this report explains how that is to be done. It has significant revenue implications that arise from the investments in public transport.</p>
<p><i>6 Alternative</i> This strategic options does not provide for 100% of resource and effort required to deliver to modal strategies and the RTP as a whole. It is a representation of a situation where limited funding is available yet the needs of the modal strategies and the supporting/softer policies still need to be addressed.</p>	<p>The preferred plan assumes new funding sources come on stream over the next 10 to 15 years and there are some changes in legislation as well. The best alternative makes no such presumption. It has the same overall characteristics as the preferred plan but achieves much less.</p>	<p>The best alternative strategy carries less risk than the preferred plan but is otherwise similar. It has a high risk that it does not meet our transport needs.</p>	<p>This option is less ambitious than the preferred plan. It provides less investment in new transport systems and will consequently leave the transport systems more roads oriented than the preferred strategy. It would still have limited success.</p>
<p><i>7 Do minimum</i> This option assumes that transport is not a high priority and that many issues are allocated insufficient resources to properly solve problems, with</p>	<p>This option requires little direct investment. The resources required of more ambitious plans are available for use</p>	<p>This option is very poor. It does not address any of our underlying transport problems. Things will just get worse – much worse.</p>	<p>This option is not part of the preferred plan.</p>

the preferred approach being management and limited capital intervention. Costly and resource intensive measures are avoided	elsewhere in the economy. By allowing things to get gradually worse, it would not be very unpopular.	Every facet of society in south east Wales would suffer – the economy, the environment and local communities.	
--	--	---	--

Table 3.4 - Potential for different modes to contribute to the preferred strategy

Walking	Limited to shorter journeys – up to say 1½ miles. 25% of all journeys are walk only and walking accounts for part of nearly all other journeys. Very important for the health and carbon reduction agendas. Major concerns about safety, perceived as much as real. Improved design and better maintenance of street environments will provide many of the improvements.
Cycling	More limited market than pedestrians and requires longer continuous linear routes. Accounts currently for less than 1% of all journeys. For most journeys up to about 3 miles, cycling is time competitive, door to door, with all other modes. Must accept however that the cycling market is more limited than pedestrian.
Equestrian	Important for recreational use but not a general mode of transport. Not to receive special consideration on the RTP, although road safety strategy will include some mention of them.
Canal	Limited recreational use. Experiencing a renaissance in flatter England but not important in south east Wales. Has no part in the preferred strategy.
Bus (includes guided bus)	The mainstay of the local public transport system and yet bus accounts for only 5% of all trips and 4% of all travel mileage. For a variety of policy reasons (debated elsewhere) we must put more effort into expanding bus services and ensuring their greater use. The RTP must include the revenue implications of expanded bus use.
Coach	Has potential for inter-urban journeys, where rail is not available or fares are a significant factor. More contact needed with the industry. Coach traffic is too light to warrant more than a few special facilities. Should have the same priority entitlement as buses. Significant untapped marketing and information opportunities.
Community transport and demand responsive transport	An important service to a comparatively restricted market. Our consultants advise these services have expanded opportunities subject to better co-ordinated delivery arrangements. That requirement is likely to highly condition any recommendations on CT and DRT that the preferred strategy might contain.
Taxi and private hire	Taxis and private hire have about the same share of the travel market as cycling. They are particularly important for the evening social market. The industry is uncoordinated except in Cardiff where one booking consortium dominates the taxi market. Public sector involvement centres on regulation and the provision of ranks. Role in the preferred strategy is unclear.
Rail (includes light rail and tram)	Rail currently accounts for 1.5% of all journeys but 6% of travel mileage. Sewta's previously agreed rail strategy increases capacity by about 200%, allowing rail, in limited corridors, to provide a very effective alternative to the car for commuters and shoppers. The rail strategy should be part of the preferred strategy. The RTP must consider the revenue implications of expanded rail use.
Powered two wheeler	They are efficient users of road space and have an accident rate 10 times that of cars. Those two facts identify their role in the preferred strategy. Our traffic management policies should exploit the former issue and the road safety strategy should tackle the

	latter.
Private car	Car drivers account for more than 40% of all journeys and more than 50% of travel mileage. That continued dominance cannot be avoided. Much of our preferred strategy must mitigate the problems so caused. It will be one of the overriding themes of the preferred strategy, reflecting in our highway management strategy, our plans to expand rail and bus services, offers of sustainable alternatives to the car, increasing car occupancy and reducing the need to use the car through better planning.
Shared car	Increasing car occupancy is the one of the most effective ways of reducing traffic growth and congestion. The preferred plan must include a number of ways of achieving that.
Lorry	Lorries dominate the freight market (83% of freight tonne miles). The preferred strategy should seek to reduce that proportion but the continued efficient provision for the movement of freight has to be a central aim of the preferred strategy. Implementing the Wales Freight Strategy is the way forward.
Sea	Passenger shipping is limited to a few services around Cardiff Bay; they are not of regional significance. Freight shipping accounts for about the same market share as rail and pipeline 17% between all three). Freight access to ports is therefore a material factor is determining our highways and rail policies.
Pipeline	Pipelines are efficient and carbon friendly forms of transport but will not figure directly in the preferred strategy, except by inference where they offer an alternative to road and rail freight.
Air	Important for international connectivity; Sewta has expressed concern about carbon emissions for air travel. The preferred strategy need only concern itself with surface links to airports. In that respect Sewta seeks more attention to inbound business surface links than the current emphasis on outbound tourist links.

Table 3.5 - Role of intervention measures in our strategy

Road user charging	Has several potential roles. To an extent the preferred strategy will include all of them. Unlikely to have an influence before 2015. Cardiff's differently based road user pricing scheme might be implemented before then, as might charges on the new M4 south of Newport. Sewta is a partner in both those schemes but controls neither. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To ensure existing highway capacity is used more effectively; 2. To provide funds for improvements to the transport system; 3. To alter the balance of costs between different modes thereby making public transport (especially) more attractive; 4. To influence spatial planning decisions, making them more sustainable.
Carbon trading	Potentially very influential but outside the scope of the preferred strategy which can offer no more that support for the principle.
Workplace charging	Not currently part of Sewta's thinking but it is a definite option. Although it is not compatible with road user charging. At this stage, the preferred plan will include RUC proposals (post 2015) but workplace charging remains an option if the charging proposals fail. It has broadly the same impacts as those listed above for road user charging.
Parking policy	We are required to produce a regional parking policy as part of the preferred plan. That will comprise a set of policies and scheme based proposals. The general direction of the policy must be supportive of the principles driving the preferred strategy. The regeneration agenda, particularly in town centres, will figure in our parking strategy.
Smarter choices	These lie at the centre of soft measures in the preferred strategy. Travel planning is one of these. The business case for investing in

	smarter choices has to be proved but where it exists, the preferred strategy must be strong on these choices. Needs to become an integral part of all new development proposals.
Pricing travel	Other than through mechanisms under our control (road user and workplace charging), these lie outside the remit of the preferred strategy which can only draw attention to their importance as part of government fiscal and environmental strategy.
Planning obligations	WAGs position on the Barker Planning Gain Supplement proposals determines the extent to which planning obligations remain available as a mechanism to change the transport system. Obligations will remain under the control of the planning authority and can only be used to mitigate problems caused by developments. The preferred plan must ensure obligations are used as effectively as possible. It is likely to achieve that through the production of regional transport planning guidance, that guidance being adopted by all 11 planning authorities.
Regeneration and integrated land use and transport planning	The RTP is not a land use plan. The local development plans fit geographically below the preferred RTP strategy which itself fits below the Wales Spatial Plan. The preferred strategy must feed into the land use plans and draw from them, thereby ensuring compatibility at all levels of the planning process.
Legislative change in the public transport industry	The 1985 Transport Act makes effective integration of the public transport system very difficult. Those impediments must be removed and the current legislative review offers a way forward if bus services are to improve. Sewta is contributing to that debate but change is not in our hands and the preferred strategy must develop within the confines of legislation. The preferred strategy will however have to assume that the worst effects of the 1985 Act are removed.
Use of technology	Technology will effect two areas of the plan. First it will reduce carbon emissions from vehicles. We are assuming those benefits will be considerable but insufficient to achieve government targets without substantial interventions to reduce traffic in general, and car use in particular from what it would otherwise be. The preferred plan must therefore include strong policies and investments to reduce road traffic. These will take up the opportunities technology offers us. Second, technology has a role to play in improving traffic control, providing better public transport information, encouraging both home working and reducing travel away from workplaces and improving the distribution of goods. The preferred plan must exploit all those opportunities.
Management of non- transport public services	Sewta does not provide health, social, education, leisure or waste services. But these services create large amounts of travel. The preferred strategy must therefore include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offers to work closely with these service providers to improve transport provision to places where services are provided 2. Encourage service providers to minimise the travel needs of their customers by new ways of providing and locating their services. 3. Through the Smarter Choices agenda, work jointly to provide more sustainable transport solutions to users' needs.
Highway Asset Management plans and the Traffic Management Act	HAMPs and the TMA are the responsibility of the Highway Authority. Sewta should facilitate joint working on the production of plans to ensure service efficiency is maximised, expenditure is minimised and common standards are raised across the region.

Appendix B - Sewta Road Safety Strategy Suggested policies (31st May 2007)

WAG RTP guidance requires Sewta to produce a road safety strategy. The road safety strategy will comprise the finalised set of policies with supporting text and figures. The draft policies in that strategy are set out below. The text and figures are being prepared. They will describe how our strategy meets the requirements of the RTP guidance.

1 Introduction

Policy 1 Sewta will support each of the local authorities in south east Wales in producing and implementing their road safety strategies.

2 Personal Injury Collision and Casualty Data Collection

Policy 2 Sewta will work closely with the Police on the reporting of collisions and casualties and ensure effective liaison in all areas of common concern.

2.1 Casualty Reduction Targets

Policy 3 Sewta supports the Welsh Assembly Government targets for casualty reduction and ways to exceed them.

Policy 4 New National targets are likely to be set for a period post 2010. Sewta will co-ordinate a regional input to the debate on these targets.

Policy 5 Sewta will promote and support education, training and publicity, enforcement and engineering measures to reduce casualties on the road network.

2.2 Investigation/Intervention Criteria

Policy 6 Investigation Level – Sewta recommends that an initial screening of 5 or more (unweighted) reported personal injury collisions in a 100m diameter in one year would prompt investigation by the local authority.

Policy 7 Intervention Criteria – Sewta recommends that each local authority will agree an evidence based intervention criteria with their members.

Policy 8 Sewta will support technical developments and means of analysis of collisions and casualties that make better use of the available statistics to assess road safety problems.

3 Pedestrians and Cyclists

Policy 9 Sewta will encourage the management and development of the highway network to improve the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

Policy 10 Sewta will support the introduction of traffic calming measures and 20mph zones and limits to reduce vehicle speeds to a level appropriate to the local environment.

3.1 Pedestrian safety

3.1.1 Pedestrian training standards

Policy 11 Sewta will support pedestrian training schemes for all age groups, especially identified at-risk groups, and seek the resources required to implement them.

3.2 Cyclist safety

Policy 12 Sewta will develop and promote a network of safer, convenient cycle routes to provide access to places of work and education, community and public transport facilities.

3.2.1 Cycle training standards

Policy 13 Sewta will develop an inclusive best practice regional cycle training scheme that will identify and seek resources for delivery and ensure consistent standards for training and instructors.

3.3 Safer Routes in Communities

Policy 14 Sewta will continue to promote safer routes in communities and encourage the development of Travel Plans.

Policy 15 Sewta will promote the benefits of walking and cycling at schools to encourage greater participation.

4 Child passengers

Policy 16 Sewta will promote research into each class of casualty and will derive strategies based on these findings.

5 Young drivers

Policy 17 Sewta will promote good driving practice within this age range (17-25) by encouraging as many young drivers as possible to participate in initiatives which are aimed at raising individual driving standards and awareness.

6 Powered two wheelers

Policy 18 Sewta will promote good riding practice within this user group by encouraging as many riders as possible to participate in initiatives which are aimed at raising individual riding standards and awareness.

Policy 19 Sewta will support the management of highways space to better recognise the needs of powered two wheelers and will take account of relevant standards, guidelines and consultation processes.

Policy 20 Sewta will support national education, training and publicity campaigns related to powered two wheelers.

Appendix C - Sewta Rail Strategies

Rail travel plays a significant role in meeting the aspirations of the Welsh Assembly Government and the policy outcomes of the Wales Transport Strategy. Accordingly, Sewta has placed great emphasis on the development of rail strategies which are commensurate with the needs and aspirations of the travelling public.

The development and implementation of rail schemes remain subject to considerable lead times due to a range of practical and operational constraints. Accordingly, Sewta has developed rail strategies which reflect the complexities of the industry to ensure a robust and realistic programme of improvements can be delivered.

Two key strategy documents have been produced, covering the short term and the medium to long term periods. These are:

- Moving People – Improving Rail (2005 -2010)
- Sewta Rail Strategy (2009 2018) and associated Prioritised Investment Programme

The scope of each is considered individually.

Moving People – Improving Rail. The Next Five Years

This document outlines Sewta's five year plan for improving rail provision in the short term (2005 to 2010) reflecting changes to legislation and the structure of the rail industry.

The strategy recognises the need to deliver relatively 'quick wins' to sustain the increasing demand for rail travel (particularly for travel between the valley towns and Cardiff) while also creating new opportunities elsewhere.

To this end, four main elements were proposed:

- New Passenger Lines and Stations – Including the re-opening of the Vale of Glamorgan and Ebbw Valley Lines, and the provision of new stations at Brackla, Energlyn and Llanharan
- Increased Service Levels – Higher frequency through provision of additional rolling stock, combined with track and signal improvements to increase capacity
- Capacity and Linespeed Enhancements – Greater capacity through increased platform and train length, combined with enhancements to improve speed and reliability
- Improved Stations – Enhancements to a number of stations including Cwmbran, Newport and Queen Street (Cardiff).

Work is progressing steadily, with many measures completed, including the Vale of Glamorgan Line (which commenced operation June 2005) and the increase in frequency on the lower Rhymney Line (which became operational in March 2006). Capacity increasing projects, and the associated introduction of additional rolling stock, are currently being implemented on the Valley Lines to the north of Cardiff. Other schemes (such as the Ebbw Valley Line and Cwmbran Interchange) are also under construction.

The strategy also recognises the need for the financial commitment and strong partnership with key organisations such the Welsh Assembly Government, Network Rail and Arriva Trains Wales.

Sewta Rail Strategy (2009 - 2018)

Whilst the Sewta five year plan contains key elements to enhance service provision in the short term, it is recognised that a longer term strategy is also required to achieve the objectives of Sewta and the Assembly Government. Accordingly, the Sewta Rail Strategy has been developed to consider the

period 2009 to 2018. This provides continuity with the existing 5 year plan and the lifetime of the existing Wales and Borders franchise (which expires in 2018).

Following a review of national, regional economic and transport objectives, consultation was undertaken with regional stakeholders in order to agree the criteria against which strategy options would be assessed. The resulting criteria were:

- Preserving or enhancing the environment
- Improving safety and security
- Enhancing the economy and providing good value for money
- Improving integration between modes and policies
- Enhancing accessibility
- Improving regional connectivity between activity centres
- Reducing car travel
- Making best use of infrastructure
- Minimising adverse passenger impacts
- Ensuring deliverability through robust planning

Key passenger priorities were reliability and seat availability, while a number of infrastructure issues were identified which constrain the capacity of the existing network, in particular the Cogan Junction to Cardiff Queen Street section.

The strategy is designed to make better use of existing rail services, provide for passengers needs and achieve regional economic and social objectives. The key recommendations are:

- *Additional rolling stock* to increase peak capacity, with associated platform lengthening on the Barry Line.
- *Rolling Stock Renewal* to replace the ageing Pacer fleet, with associated improvements in fleet reliability and passenger experience.
- *Station improvements*, including information, security, access, facilities, with works being programmed to concentrate on larger stations or groups of smaller stations.
- *Additional Parking* to encourage greater use of existing services.
- *Reliability and capacity improvements* through implementation of network infrastructure improvements to reduce delays and improve mitigation of performance problems, specifically at Barry, Cardiff Central, Cardiff Queen Street, Cogan Junction and Llandaf Stations.
- *Frequency enhancements* on existing lines to meet passengers' expectations (of at least a half hourly service and a 'turn-up and go' service within the core journey to work area of Cardiff) and increase the transfer of car trips to rail. Specifically:
 - New half hourly local services on the Abergavenny and Chepstow Lines,
 - A second hourly service on the Ebbw Valley Line to operate between Ebbw Vale and Newport,
 - Additional services on the Rhymney Valley and Taff Vale lines to cope with additional passenger demand; and
 - An additional hourly service on the Vale of Glamorgan Line between Cardiff and Bridgend via Rhoose Cardiff International Airport
- *Investment in network capacity*, with significant investment required at and between Cardiff Queen Street and Cardiff Central Stations
- *Five new stations* on existing lines, to improve access to the rail network and provide rail travel opportunities reflecting land development, specifically at Caerleon, Coedkernew, Llanwern, Magor with Undy and St Mellons.

- *Network extensions and new stations*, with two schemes recommended:
 - Extension of the Ebbw Valley Line to Ebbw Vale Town Centre
 - Extension of Cardiff services beyond Pontyctlyn to Beddau, with new stations at Talbot Green, Llantrisant, Gwaun Meisgyn and Beddau; and
- Rail-link Bus Services to extend the reach of rail services to communities remote from the rail network, specifically in the valley communities north of Cardiff and Newport.

Prioritised Investment Programme

Following publication of the Sewta Rail Strategy a detailed programming exercise was undertaken to provide a robust implementation framework in support of funding applications to the Welsh Assembly and the Welsh European Funding Office.

The programme identifies that funding support is needed to develop schemes in the short term for medium / long term delivery, to develop packages of station improvements and to take up the enhancement option within the Cardiff, and to a lesser extent, within the Newport Signalling Renewal projects, and to plan for the funding requirements for delivery of the Sewta Rail Strategy.

In determining the priority of each project, account was taken of:

- The need to deliver the Wales Spatial Plan in terms of investment of transport to meet social, economic and environmental objectives
- The need to integrate some schemes with Network Rail Signalling Renewal Schemes in the region
- The timetable for land use development in the vicinity of stations
- Key stages of project development in accordance with Network Rail's Guide to Rail Investment Process (GRIP).

As a result, some higher priority measures are programmed later than others and vice versa, primarily due to the need to integrate enhancement schemes with other Network Rail investment in the area. A programme summary is contained in table 1

Table 1 Rail Strategy Prioritised Investment Programme Summary

Priority	Description	Key Elements
1	Completion of 5 year strategy	Outstanding elements (awaiting confirmation of funding), include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to provide increased passenger capacity at Queen Street • Introduction of half hourly frequencies on the Rhymney and Maesteg lines • New stations at Energlyn and Brackla Additional elements (awaiting confirmation of funding), include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures to improve reliability and capacity at Barry Station, Llandaff, Cogan Junction and on the Barry Treherbert Lines. • Additional rolling stock to meet further peak passenger requirements • New rolling stock
2	Queen Street North – Cogan Junction	Improved frequency and reliability of services through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional platforms at Cardiff Central and Queen Street • Remodelling of Cogan Junction • Turnback facilities at Caerphilly and Porth • Track and signal enhancements
3	Ebbw Valley Line Phase 2	Direct hourly service between Newport and Ebbw Vale, with the longer ten mile passing loop and new stations at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ebbw Vale Town centre • Cwm • Pye Corner
4	Improved	Additional services on following corridors:

	service frequencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abergavenny – Newport – Cardiff • Vale of Glamorgan • Chepstow – Newport – Cardiff
5	Station improvement and integration Measures	Package of measures at stations across the region including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station facilities, such as improvements to customer information, safety and security, waiting areas and toilets • Station access • Park and ride (new facilities and expansion of existing sites) • Rail-link bus services
6	Beddau – Cardiff network extension	Introduction of a half hourly passenger services on a former freight line, with new stations at <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talbot Green • Llantrisant • Gwaun Meisgyn • Beddau

Financial constraints are a major consideration in the delivering the programme; therefore Sewta commissioned a Funding Study to review and recommend the principal sources of rail funding, which included, the Welsh Assembly Government, European Grants and industry funding through the franchise and HLOS programme.

The Prioritised Investment Programme and Funding Study ensure the programme, while challenging, is financially and operationally robust.

Appendix E – Sewta Regional Walking & Cycling Strategy

Policy Objective 1: Strategic Integration

To ensure that regional and local transport and non-transport policies and strategies support the delivery of the regional walking and cycling strategy.

- Review relevant public service sector management policies and key national, regional and local policy mechanisms and provide guidance on how they can best support the delivery of Sewta's Walking and Cycling Strategy.
- Produce guidance to assist Planning Authorities to secure maximum provision for walking and cycling in new developments through Development Plan policies, planning decisions and planning obligations.

Policy Objective 2: High Quality Infrastructure

To develop high quality and attractive walking and cycling networks linking places where people live to places of employment, town centres and essential services through a series of linked region -wide programmes.

- Develop walking and cycling links to and within town and city centres.
- Develop walking and cycling access to employment, services, leisure and tourism activities in conjunction with travel plans.
- Develop the National Cycle Network and maximise its accessibility and usage.
- Develop walking and cycling links to and between public transport interchanges and maximise provision for cycle carriage on public transport, in conjunction with the Sewta Bus and Rail Strategies.
- Develop walking and cycling links to all types of centres including the expansion of Safe Routes to Schools Programme incorporating school travel plans.
- Establish at least one Liveable Neighbourhood pilot scheme, to influence adoption of good practice in the design of residential areas.
- Provide secure cycle parking to meet a range of needs at all key trip destinations.
- Maintain an attractive environment for walking and cycling through coordinating the improvement of local route maintenance regimes and providing sufficient revenue funding.

Policy Objective 3 : Making Better Use of the Transport System

To make better use of the existing transport system by giving greater priority to walking and cycling for local access.

- Enable better local access by walking and cycling through the provision of high quality facilities and other measures to overcome community severance and social exclusion.
- Re-allocate highway space to walking and cycling facilities as part of traffic management and road safety schemes.
- Provide safe walking and cycling facilities through the strategic control of traffic speed on both regional and local road networks.

- Provide walking and cycling facilities in conjunction with the Sewta Bus Strategy.

Policy Objective 4 : Technical Excellence

To improve professional expertise and promote technical excellence in the development of walking and cycling facilities and promotional activities.

- Review technical and design guidance relating to the provision of walking and cycling facilities and publish and promote guidelines on how to implement good practice.
- Develop a rolling programme of training for key transport and non-transport practitioners in the planning and design of walking and cycling infrastructure, to encourage implementation of good practice and increase inter-disciplinary skills and awareness.

Policy Objective 5 : Influence Travel Behaviour

To increase the number of people walking and cycling through practical 'soft' measures that encourage modal shift through travel behaviour change.

- Encourage walking and cycling through a programme of personalised (workplace) travel planning projects.
- Encourage walking and cycling through developing at least one area-based, individualised marketing pilot project.
- Develop programme of initiatives to promote walking and cycling through publicity, information provision and joint marketing with transport operators, through a range of media.
- Develop a regional programme of accredited cycle training in schools and for adults to meet National Cycle Training Standards.
- Encourage walking and cycling through developing area-based Active Travel projects.

Policy Objective 6 : Measuring Success

To establish a region-wide programme to monitor walking and cycling trips as part of the monitoring programme for the Regional Transport Plan.

- Conduct surveys to establish baseline data for walking and cycling to enable progress towards regional targets to be measured.
- Devise effective means to monitoring walking trips and establish regional targets for walking.
- Establish a regional network of automatic cycle counters including provision to support their continuous operation and maintenance.
- Establish a regional programme of annual user surveys to obtain comprehensive quantitative and qualitative data. .

Establish a unified system of data collection, analysis and report for the south east of Wales region.

Appendix E

DRAFT RTP policies on matters where the local authority retains executive control

Topic – relationship of RTPs to other plans, especially the LDPs

Vision:

To deliver an RTP that is consistent, compatible and complementary with other plans at a national, regional and local level.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Sharing of resources	Will happen as partners appreciate the added value to their own businesses of working together more closely.
Collaborative working and consultation with all stakeholders at all levels	Needs an effective stakeholder management programme within the RTP
Developing a longer term sustainable framework	Will emerge from the aggregate of other actions that are specified, with this suggestion as a key driver in the formulation of all policy.
The RTP must not be afraid to challenge the commitments in other plans where transportation issues or changed circumstances bring them into question	Requires continuous feedback loops between all plans. The planning process is a live one.
The RTP is to provide a checklist of transport considerations to be used in other plans regionally and beyond	Will require specific work. Best led by one local authority.

Topic – How can transport help regeneration?

Vision:

A region where a fully integrated transport system has provided the basis for sustainable regeneration.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Give priority to projects that are part of a regeneration package	To be reflected in Weltag appraisal process.
Invest in transport infrastructure serving deprived areas	To be reflected in Weltag appraisal process.
Presumption against out of town developments	To be reflected in planning guidance. May need regional transport SPG.
Major new generators of traffic must have a sustainable travel plan as a condition of planning approval	To be reflected in planning guidance. May need regional transport SPG.
Four trains per hour minimum on all routes	Long term WSP objective. Place in 'beyond 2020 rail strategy'.
Develop integrated transport hubs in town centres	RTP to record major locations and principle actions; details in LDPs.
Improve interchange at railway stations and access to stations	Part of rail strategy.
Improve town centre pedestrian areas and invest in public transport facilities	RTP to record major locations and principle actions; details in LDPs.
Transport infrastructure should not divide communities	RTP to contain a specific policy to this effect.
Reduce the negative impact of cars in residential areas	Best done through design standards and pro-pedestrian (and cyclist) policies in RTP.

Topic – Smarter choices, car sharing travel planning

Vision:

To promote and encourage working practices that ensure sustainable transport options are more appealing and preferable.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Ensure that all local authorities have travel plans that can be measured	All LAs to commit to producing and implementing travel plans in an agreed timescale.
Sewta should target industry to <i>deliver</i> travel plans through the planning process and to encourage use of public transport and a reduction in car parking spaces	Main Sewta policy. Possible bid for more travel planners. May need SPG.
Put examples of best practice travel plans on the website	Put plans on the website
Encourage inter-ticketing (and lobby for legislation) to allow operators to work together	Sewta to set up system and to lobby for change
Encourage LAs to negotiate deals for annual passes	Needs a model template agreement.
Ensure LA general policies are more complementary to travel plan policies	Action by LA, encouraged by Sewta.
Improve marketing of personal travel choices, thorough PTI Cymru and personalised travel planning	Bring PTI Cymru more into the main stream. Personalised travel plans require a substantial financial commitment.
Raise the public perception of how safe public transport really is	Specific campaign needed.
Raise public awareness of environmental issues and cost savings available through Smarter choices	Concentrate on CCTV, cleanliness, personal safety issues. Tackle the snobbery problem.

Topic: Winning Hearts and Minds

Vision:

To have changed the mindset and travel behaviour of the public

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Sewta will instigate a sustained high quality advertising campaign over a planned period selling appropriate messages	Needs careful planning. The workshop identified a list of subjects for the campaign.
Sewta will lead by example and promote travel plans, sustainable transport and public transport	Progress set out under other policies and actions.

Topic: Development control (highways and transport only)

Vision:

Sewta makes transport observations on major planning application to LPAs that are consistent, fair, contain appropriate mitigation and maintain safe and sustainable transport networks with adequate capacity and which fully support the objectives of the RTP.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Sewta will develop supplementary planning guidance	This underlies many other actions and policies.
A developer will be required to provide structured planning obligations to fund improvements to regional transport infrastructure and services to mitigate the transport consequences of development.	Will require regional SPG.

Obligations will reflect land values across the region.	
Sewta will provide development observations in support of the objectives of the RTP on regionally important applications and local applications with cross-boundary implications	Not complicated, providing the resources are made available. This would need either a dedicated resource or a panel of experienced LA DC officers available to comment.
Sewta will develop a highway network hierarchy to provide the basis for informing decisions regarding the control of access to the network	This is in hand.

Topic – Civil parking enforcement

Vision:

The observance of parking controls, assisted where locally appropriate by civil parking enforcement which achieves the safe and efficient movement of traffic and the use of kerbside space appropriate to the local area.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Sewta will support and guide local authorities to work collectively to deliver civil parking enforcement across local authority boundaries	A general statement of intent, not of itself requiring further action.
Sewta will work with other regional groupings to provide guidance on the operation of a civil parking enforcement regime	Will require production of appropriate documentation by a joint working party.
Sewta will develop a common adjudication service	Will require production of appropriate documentation by a joint working party.
Sewta will be mindful of the continued role of the police in enforcing traffic regulations	Would need to be reflected in general guidance of CPE.

Topic – highway maintenance, network management duty, street works and AMPs

Vision:

To ensure the safety and capacity of the network is managed in a sustainable manner.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
To develop a regional or national core set of standards and specifications	Requires a joint working group to develop this. Perhaps a 3 year project. CSS to be involved.
To identify opportunities for collaborative working and procurement across the region	Likely first task of joint working group.
Adopt regional key performance indicators and targets	Part of the overall programme of KPI and target development.
Co-ordination of <i>maintenance</i> of cross boundary routes through quarterly meetings, including sharing of information	Only requires setting up the necessary meetings framework. Might be part of NRSWA meetings round.
Establish a regional claims management centre	Establish the business case. Implement if desirable.

Topic – Management of the local streetscene including urban design

Vision: We will create local streets where people want to be by providing a high quality, safe and accessible streetscene that increases user confidence and the quality of life.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Sewta will highlight the importance of maintaining good streetscene	To be reflected in a general RTP policy, supported by more detailed policies.
The RTP will recognise that streetscene is largely a local issue and will restrict itself to	See next action point.

providing guidance and promoting good practice. Departures from standard will be supported by evidence.	
Produce guidance on streetscene management including examples of good practice	It might be possible to make extensive use of existing material.
Sewta will engage with key stakeholders and agree design, operational and maintenance standards	Part of the process of developing guidance.
Review South Wales parking guideline for their relevance to improving the streetscene	Part of a wider review.
All new residential developments will be designed to 20 mph or less	Requires a transition period but deliverable over (say) 5 years.
Recognise that streets are in use 24 hours per day	To be reflected in other policies and management practices.
Improve Sewta's links with the Design Commission for Wales	Setting up the link is easy; building on it is more difficult.

Topic: Traffic Management and traffic orders

Vision:

Traffic management will be used to improve road safety and make most effective use of road space.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Sewta should provide guidance input to the safety camera partnership	Requires someone to write it.
We need a regional diversionary route management strategy for dealing with the consequences of trunk road works	A scheme is already in place. Requires liaison with trunk road agents.
Sewta should develop advisory model TROs	Requires agreement on the subjects to be covered and then someone to draft them.

Topic – Major highway investment

Vision:

There should be a balance between maintaining, improving and developing existing highway infrastructure, and focussed investment in new and innovative schemes with environmental benefits to support the economy and regeneration of the region.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Identify the strategic highway network and maintain it to agreed standards	Faber Maunsell study doing the first. Setting standards is an excellent idea but one we should aim to deliver within say 3 years.
Investment in highway infrastructure will be targeted at those schemes which best meet the RTP objectives	Reflect in Weltag analyses.
Strategic network management will support strategic developments through the land use planning system and the LDPs	Mainly achieved through basic RTPs strategy being thus oriented and LDPs having more detailed policies appropriate to this action.
Strategic network management will underpin and develop local and regional economic, social and environmental opportunities	Directs much of the detail of the RTP highways section.
Identify sources of funding and investment	Work in hand. Planning obligations and RUC central sources.
Minimise the environmental impact of highway infrastructure and where possible improve ecological conditions	Appropriate to the design of individual schemes and the execution of LA maintenance duties in a manner friendly to the environment.

Topic – Bus operations and improvements, interchange, information, ticketing, park and ride

Vision:

To promote, deliver and enhance the travel experience by the provision of high quality, attractive, reliable, integrated, affordable, sustainable bus networks.

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
React to changes in forthcoming legislation review	Sewta to be involved in working with WAG through WLGA. Sewta to submit a response at the appropriate time.
Work with operators to develop bus network, infrastructure and priorities and common standards	Define what the standards are to be through a joint working group. Perhaps a 2 year project.
Embrace technology	Will be reflected in specific actions such as Smartcard, CCTV and RTI system developments.
Adopt holistic working within local authorities to encourage public transport friendly solutions	Internal actions within LAs needed. A general policy within the RTP will help obtain the necessary commitment.

Topic: Bus contracts and concessionary fares management

Vision:

To ensure consistent core standards of assessment, procurement and delivery and consistent delivery of WAG policies and aspirations for concessionary travel.

Policies and actions;

Proposal	How we might progress
Provide common core standards throughout the Sewta region	Bus group to identify what the standards might be
To maintain adaptability to local changes and circumstances	Local authorities discharging their responsibilities within context of regional policies
Work more closely with neighbouring authorities and transport providers	Requires more regular and formal contacts between these groups
Ensure passes are issued in a fair and timely manner	Consider more sharing or even centralisation of pass issue.
Adopt a consistent approach to eligibility assessment and operators reimbursement	The former needs regional guidance. The latter suggests revisiting the reimbursement formula. The fare base is more worthy of review than the reimbursement rate.

Topic – freight

Vision:

To provide a sustainable transport system with the freight needs of commerce and business in mind as a prime user

Policies and actions:

Proposal	How we might progress
Place a greater emphasis than hitherto on journey reliability	Will be delivered by some of the other proposals.
Place greater emphasis on keeping traffic moving, rather than speeding traffic up	Involves a change away from providing overtaking opportunities for private cars towards one of network management aimed at maximisation existing network capacity and utility.
Develop a strategic highway network that favours moving traffic over other users	Already part of the roads study work.

Encourage the provision of freight alternatives to the lorry	Easier said than done. Rail network capacity and competition with expanding passenger services is a very real point of conflict.
Adopt development control policies that keep traffic moving on the strategic highway network	All 10 LDPs to reflect a common set of DC policies, supported by consistent treatment of planning applications.
Adopt parking enforcement policies that keep traffic moving on the strategic highway network	Probably only deliverable through a regional CPE regime.
Highway maintenance practices will reduce the impact of highway maintenance and streetworks on moving traffic on the strategic highway network	Stricter interpretation of NRSWA legislation and a regional application of Traffic Management Act requirements.
Develop web based services to help lorry routing and locating major freight generation sites	Requires expansion of Sewta's web site to hold (and update) appropriate material. Requires funding, possibly from S106 income.
Provide, in conjunction with others, economic and sustainable transport infrastructure to sites, new and existing, where commerce and industry operates.	Part of the regeneration programme.
Provide a network of sites for overnight freight parking	Requires sites to be identified and developed. Requires funding, possibly from S106 income.