

APPENDIX 2.

Proposed Worcester City Council comments on the Worcestershire's Local Transport Plan (LTP4) 2017 - 2030

LTP4 Strategy Comments

- 1. LTP4 COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION:** The City Council sincerely appreciates the consultation opportunities the County has provided. The City requests the County puts consultation responses on its web site and produces an analysis of responses in advance of making a final decision on the formal LTP including holding a County stakeholder conference to explore common areas and resolve areas of difference differences.

RESPONSE: The County should publish and analyse consultation responses and hold a stakeholder conference to finalise LTP4

- 2. A WORCESTER CITY VISION & PURPOSE FOR LTP4:** LTP4 should take as its starting point for Worcester City a vision of a strong and modern heritage city for the whole County. The South Worcestershire Development Plan 2016, the Draft City Master Plan 2012 and the newly agreed "City Plan" 2016, all seek a vision of a.."*successful and growing Cathedral and University City, including more homes, more businesses and jobs. A City with prestige tourist, education and retail attractions. A place that maintains its "city in the country" feel, its extraordinary valued heritage assets and its quality environment*".

RESPONSE: LTP4 should take as its starting point a Worcester vision of a "strong and modern University, Cathedral and heritage city for the whole County".

3. THE CITY CENTRE & THE M5 CORRIDOR

LTP4 TO RECOGNISE FULLY THE SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SWDP 2016) & THE LOCAL ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP (LEP) STRATEGIC ECONOMIC PLAN (SEP 2014):

The City Council would like LTP4 to fully reflect critical economic geography policies in SWDP and SEP as they relate to Worcester City. The City Council would firstly like to make it clear that it welcomes the County and LEP past and current support for City transport infrastructure, including along the motorway corridor, station improvements and the development of Parkway Station. The City also congratulates the County on its investments to date in City public realm and in cycling and bus facilities. However, a step change is now needed by both the County and the LEP in "**strategic City transport investment to develop mixed use regeneration and a strong commercial offer in the City centre**". This "place policy" is fully supported by both SWDP and SEP, but to date has been fully recognised and addressed by LTPs. The City now requests that LTP4 properly recognises the SWDP's requirement for "sustainable transport" to support City growth and success. The City also requests that LTP4 fully recognises the SEP's argument about the importance of the City – a City where business growth is needed both on the M5 corridor and through the regeneration of the centre, particularly for commercial development, and supported by fast access to the strategic rail and road network.

SWDP 2016

At page 9, LTP4 says that transport infrastructure and plans need to be “plan – led,...and promote sustainable development”. The City feels that LTP4 should honour this commitment. SWDP4 is a strong policy to “offer genuinely sustainable travel choices...reduce the demand for travel by private cars and stimulate cycling, walking and public transport”. SWDP 4, whilst correctly supporting Worcestershire Parkway Station and improving the arms of the Southern Link Road - also emphasises the delivery of ..”multi modal enhancements on all remaining key radial and orbital transport corridors in Worcester City”, in order to promote balanced City growth, both on its motorway corridor and in its centre. The absence of clear studies and funding packages to support such sustainable transport choices, in both growth areas is a significant LTP4 deficiency.

SEP 2014

The SEP at pages 8 and 9 explains that ...

” **Worcester city** – is the main urban area and civic and cultural centre of the county – it has the potential to develop as an ‘engine’ for growth. At present, the service sector in the city is currently underdeveloped given its location and position as the principal centre for the county ”

The SEP at Appendix F “City and Town Centre Investment Programme”, clearly sets out 2 of 9 critical infrastructure investments to support City centre growth which have not been fully addressed by County LTPs or LEP funding bids:

“Shrub Hill and Lowesmoor opportunity area	Long-term plan to see an area of the city around a refurbished railway station linked to Parkway and redeveloped as mixed-use commercial office location	Worcester City Centre Investment Programme	Feasibility	Early phase planning
Rapid Transit link	To link the city centre with Parkway station to drive accessibility and growth	Worcester City Centre Investment Programme	feasibility	Detailed design”

Council welcomes the new Worcestershire Parkway station and how it will bring "intercity travel" to the County. There is similar support for the new "rail and ride" proposals at Fernhill Heath and Rushwick. But, it is not yet clear how Worcester Parkway will connect and support City growth and investment. Good cycling and walking links are welcome, but they will not be good enough to support the investment link - travellers are unlikely to choose Worcester unless there is a fast and reliable (e.g. 5 min journey time) link to the Centre, including Shrub Hill. There needs to be an associated fast link (e.g. light rail) to ensure Worcester investment. LTP4 should immediately fund the exploration of such a link and then prepare funding bids for its delivery – this

should be a County wide priority, since in both policy and actual terms, the **City centre** is a critical County priority.

RESPONSE: The City Council welcomes the County's support to date for public realm and transport investment in the City. But there now needs to be a step change in "strategic City transport investment to develop critical mixed use regeneration and a strong commercial offer in the City centre".

The City now asks LTP4 to fully recognise the SWDP's requirement for sustainable transport to support a well – balanced, (i.e. edge and centre) City growth and success plan. And LTP4 is asked to recognise fully the SEP's designation of the City as the County's most important economic and cultural centre - where business growth is needed both on the M5 corridor for manufacturing and logistics and for mixed use and commercial development through the regeneration of the Centre by a "rapid transit access" to the strategic rail and road network.

4. THE CITY TRANSPORT STRATEGY: The City sincerely welcomes the County's commitment to produce a bespoke City Transport Strategy in partnership with the City Council. The City would like this to happen quickly and imagines that it will be a substantial task. At present in the draft LTP4 does not prioritise the development of a multi modal and integrated transport strategy for the City. If this is not given a priority in LTP4, the City would argue the County is not recognising the aims of SWDP and the SEP and it will take longer to address City congestion, air pollution and the growth of City development investment. Therefore, the County is requested to:

- a) prioritise sufficient resources to deliver the Strategy quickly and its subsequent implementation, to
- b) move the Worcester City Transport Strategy onto page 12 of the LTP4 to be part of the County's "Major Schemes for Funding" along with feasibility study work for "fast and modern links between the new Parkway Station and the City Centre".
- c) set out the proposed Strategy liaison and development process, including public consultation, and/or stakeholder forums
- d) and to agree that its scope can cover the matters raised by City Council Members set out in **Appendix 3**, and summarised below.
 - i) Strategy – "multi modal (all types of transport) and integrated"
The Worcester Transport Strategy should cover the whole City and not just the city centre. LTPs should recognise the overarching aims of the SWDP and SEP and their support for a strong and successful City Centre as a fundamental economic and geographic principle. The WTS should be **"multi modal and integrated"** as set out in and required by the SWDP. This is important because it clear from town and transport planning good practice, that if the City is too continue to grow and be successful, that cannot happen based only on ever more priority to cars – this must be

balanced with opportunities to use buses, rail, walking and cycling. The WTS, (and the LTPs) should not withdraw from using the word "sustainable" – this is the likely only solution to a successful City.

ii) Strategy - to address councillor, community and business concerns:
LTP4 makes much of the consultation it has carried out with businesses and residents and the City Council would like to see an analysis of this – it would help the Council better govern the City. The WTS should also be able to review and consider the 99 councillor concerns and issues produced by the 2 councillor events so far – these covered 18 areas:

- Review City traffic circulation and bridge crossings options
- Managing congestion and vehicle speeds and addressing air pollution
- "Clever traffic management" and traffic light re phasing to make traffic flow smoothly and allow pedestrian and cycle access
- Bus use and development for the City centre, links to County settlements and neighbourhoods in the City, particularly those in more deprived areas. Review options for the bus garage and strategic bus stops
- Improved facilities for cycling and for electric cars
- Developing travel plans that make a difference
- Working with schools to reduce the "school run"
- Exploring transport innovations like a Worcester version of "oyster travel"
- Car parking management, "park and ride" and "rail and ride"
- Better freight and coach management
- Exploring further rail and ride and the City's rail halts
- Resident's parking management and 20 mph zones
- Particular road routing ideas (e.g. how London Road could be used; Ketch improvement; housing estate road management)
- Improving Riverside access and use by residents, employees, visitors – and for food and drink, retail and leisure
- Using Superfast Broadband and new ways of working to reduce travel to work
- Further City centre pedestrianisation and with regard to Cathedral square – removing the access to the car park
- Exploring a strong commitment to car access and facilities as an option for City improvement and ongoing City success
- Immediate and step change in City Centre strategic transport studies and funding to balance what has been in place for the M5 Corridor

RESPONSE: The City sincerely welcomes the County's commitment to produce a bespoke City Transport Strategy in partnership with the City Council. The County is requested to:

- **Agree to prioritise sufficient resources to deliver WTS quickly and its subsequent implementation**
- **put WTS into the list of the County's "Major Schemes for Funding" on page 12 of LTP4 – along with feasibility work on making fast and modern links between Parkway Station and the City Centre including Shrub Hill**
- **set out the proposed WTS liaison and development process, including public consultation, and/or stakeholder forums**

- **agree that WTS's scope will cover all the matters raised by City Council Members set out in Appendix 3, and**
- **confirm that WTS would cover the functioning of the whole City and not just the City Centre and that it would be a "multi modal (all types of transport) and integrated" strategy.**

5. BUSES: LTP4 focuses on "road and rail" and has little to say on supporting buses. Buses should play a strong role in providing the City with an integrated and mixed transport network. As the City grows, its arterial roads will not be able to take more and more traffic – more and better buses will help the City grow well and more sustainably. The reduction in bus services in the last 2 years has had a significant impact in the City on lives of residents and their ability to access work, shopping and leisure activities.

RESPONSE: The City requests that the County recognises that the promotion and development of bus services play a particularly important part in reducing transport emissions; reducing air pollution and promoting greater equality of opportunity and access – three strategic national transport objectives which are also supported by the County Transport Objectives. The City will be interested to discuss bus initiatives with the County as part of the WTS. The reduction of bus services over the last 2 years has had a significant impact in the City on lives of residents and their ability to access work, shopping and leisure activities.

6. WALKING, CYCLING & ELECTRIC CARS: LTP4 addresses walking and cycling through its "active corridors" proposals on page 36. This is supported. The City would like the County go further and promote and support cycle and eBike hire schemes in the City and in all the County's main settlements. The City does not support LTP3 that relegates "cycle hire schemes to primarily a leisure activity". The City believes that cycling can play an important part of travel to work in a City like Worcester – the University Hire Scheme proves this. In addition the County's own Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2016-21 supports cycling as an activity for .."being active at every age". Cycling and walking help combat growing obesity; reduce air pollution; support community health & fitness and reduce travel costs – but a networked approach across the County would help address inter settlement congestion on our County/country roads as well as making our towns more pleasant. The SWDP Policy 4 E and F recognises the importance of electric vehicles for travel choices in the City.

RESPONSE: The City Council supports the Counties "active corridors" proposals. The City would like the Council to support further City Hire cycle/eBike schemes and electric car charging programmes to support a more healthy travel choice for leisure, shopping and travel to work.

7. PUBLIC REALM: LTP4 support's public realm improvements. This is welcomed and ongoing allocated funding should be identified in LTP4 for such improvements to Worcester City and all the County's key settlements. In addition, landmark projects like river bridges, walk and cycle crossings make the City more liveable and help attract investment.

RESPONSE: The City will continue to work with the County to promote improvements to public realm and further City Centre pedestrian and disabled access priority. Such public realm improvements are important ways to prioritise good health (walking and cycling) and to promote town centres as areas for growth and investment as opposed to out of town developments.

8. MANAGING CONGESTION: LTP4 supports improvements to congestion by adjusting traffic lights and improving junctions and car corridors to allow increased traffic to flow more smoothly - and the aim will be to better facilitate walking and cycling along these corridors also. LTP4 also reminds us that across the County single car occupancy is rising along with car usage, and that car congestion is a contributor to poor air quality. There seems to be a contradiction here. The City is concerned about how Worcester would be able to accommodate its necessary growth without some form of management of car use. The City supports projects to incentivise the conversion of car trips to more sustainable modes. County Transportation Officers at the Worcester councillor briefing on 11/1/17 confirmed that there was "no successful English City that did not have some form of car restraint to support its growth and environment".

RESPONSE: The County, along with the City, residents and businesses should explore sensible ways to manage growing car congestion and air pollution in the City centre.

LTP4 Project Comments

9. STRATEGIC TRANSPORT SCHEMES - South Worcestershire

SWST 1 – Parkway Rail Station: The City supports this project, but requests that County includes a study and appropriate implementation bids for a "rapid link to the City Centre and Shrub Hill"

SWST 2 – M5 Junction 6: The City supports this enhancement.

SWST 3 – Southern Link Road Phase 4 (Ketch to Powick): The City supports this project in principle. However, the City is concerned that without developing the Southern and Western Urban Extensions also with strong public transport, walking and cycling links to the City, they will:

a) not support City centre investment and

b) that the capacity of new road improvements will quickly be taken up by car growth with no great improvement in traffic flow.

This will also lead to west to east trips continuing to seek access across the City and Severn Bridge, simply adding to City Centre congestion and air pollution levels. Planning these urban extensions to be largely car based has required significant developer infrastructure costs which then impacts on the opportunity to provide much needed affordable housing. The City Council aims to look at these issues - at how congestion can best be managed and how more sustainable

development can be provided - with the County, through the Worcester Transport Strategy, the refreshed Master Plan and the One Town Review.

SWST 9/10 – Fernhill Heath and Rushwick Stations - Rail and Ride: The City supports investing in “investigating” these projects. But the City’s priority is for a Parkway – City Centre/Shrub Hill “rapid transit access” to be assessed and implemented first and for investment in an agreed Worcester Transport Strategy to also come first. Promoting growth and regeneration in the City Centre is the priority in both the SEP and the SWDP.

SWST 11 – Worcester Rail Re signalling/Reconfiguration: The City supports this project.

SWST 12 - Worcester – Western Link Road Scheme (A4440 Southern Link to B4204 Martley Road): The City is concerned about this scheme and would need to understand its purpose more before support could be given. This scheme was a surprise to the City despite regular officer liaison. On the surface this scheme seems to be a “Lower Broad Heath By Pass” to cope with existing traffic and the predicted new traffic from the Western Urban Extension and the proposed largely car based University Scheme at Oldbury Road. See also comments above at SWST 3.

SWST 13 – South Worcestershire Telematics: This project is supported.

10. STRATEGIC ACTIVE TRAVEL (OFF ROAD CYCLING) CORRIDOR SCHEMES - South Worcestershire

SWAT 1 – 15: In principle all these projects are supported, but the County must also support City cycle/eBike Hire Schemes and support safe cycling “on road” as a way of managing traffic congestion and supporting alternative travel to work choices.

11. WORCESTER PACKAGE

W1 – Worcester City Centre Transport Strategy: This project is supported and should be given the highest priority. See para 3.4 above. The City Council would like the opportunity to review, with the County and LEP, all projects W2 – 12 below, in the light of the City’s strategy comments set out above at 3.1 – 3.9. It would be important to do this as soon as possible. Initial comments on W1 -12 are as follows:

W2 and W5 - W12 Corridor Projects: In principle, all these projects are supported. City agrees that these corridors and junctions are often congested at peak times and school run times. In general terms LTP4 seeks “quicker journey times and reduced congestion” as the aim for all these projects. The City requests that these aims are applied to “multi modal travel” (buses, cycling and walking), along these corridors and not only to cars – as part of the assessment in advance of implementation.

W2 – Worcester Rainbow Hill/Astwood Road/Bilford Road/Blackpole Road Corridor Improvement

W5 – A449 Bromwich Road/A449 Malvern Road/Canada Way Corridor Improvements

W6 – East – West Axis Corridor Improvements

W7 – Wildwood A44/A4440 Nunnery Way/A4440 Swinsherd Way/Wildwood Drive Junction

W8 – A449 North of Worcester (Ombersley Road) Junction

W9 – A449 Grange Way/B4636 Newtown Road Junction

W10 – A4536 Blackpole Road/Cotswold Way Junction

W11 – Crown East (A44/A440/A4103) Junction

W12 – Red Hill – A44 London Road/A4 Whittington Road/Spetchley Road Junction

W3 & 4 - Foregate Street and Shrub Hill Stations – Improvements: This project is supported in principle. The City would like the County to commit to investigating and developing implementation bids for a “rapid transit access between the City Centre/Shrub Hill and the strategic road and rail network at Parkway”.