

**WEST OF ENGLAND**  
Combined Authority

BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET  
BRISTOL  
SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE

**Minutes of the  
West of England  
Combined Authority Committee  
on  
Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> April 2018**

**Members:**

Mayor Tim Bowles, West of England Combined Authority  
Cllr Tim Warren, Bath & North East Somerset Council  
Mayor Marvin Rees, Bristol City Council  
Cllr Matthew Riddle, South Gloucestershire Council

---

1.	<p><b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, drew attention to the evacuation procedure and reminded everyone that the meeting was being webcast.</p>
2.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>Mayor Marvin Rees has sent his apologies, Cllr Asher Craig attended in his stead.</p>
3.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011</b></p> <p>None.</p>
4.	<p><b>MINUTES</b></p> <p><b>Decision:</b></p> <p>That the minutes of the meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.</p>
5.	<p><b>CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS</b></p> <p>The Chair extended his thanks to Bath and East North Somerset Council for hosting the meeting in Guildhall.</p> <p>The Chair gave a brief introduction of the meeting's agenda, noting it will cover the operating framework and business plan for 2018-19. The operating framework sets out the region's priorities for 2018/19, and forms the basis of WECA's business plan. It will also inform the regional response to the Government's Industrial Strategy. The business plan sets out where the region will focus its time and money during 2018/19 to benefit its' residents.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the key priorities for the West of England Combined Authorities are Transport, Housing and Skills. WECA have already allocated millions to kick-start improving the region's busiest routes – including rail, road and walking/ cycling. It plans to improve the suburban rail in areas and working alongside the Government and Network Rail to ensure there are more and better services. The Chair explained the new government funding announced earlier this month will be going to help progress housing development sites and will be working alongside constituent councils and housing associations to deliver more affordable homes.</p> <p>The Chair stressed the region needs to give locally-grown talent every opportunity to secure employment, by making sure they have the right skills for businesses. WECA's new project is Future Bright who will support around 3000 residents, who are receiving in-work benefits, into more secure and rewarding careers.</p> <p>The Chair noted there would be discussion regarding new investment for the region. This includes £5 million to trial a superfast 5G network at tourist attractions in Bristol and Bath.</p>
6.	<p><b>COMMENTS FROM CHAIR OF LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed Professor Stephen West.</p> <p>Professor West gave a brief explanation of the role of the LEP, it is an Advisory Board made up of Business and Universities which supports the Local Authorities and West of England Combined Authority and advise them on arising matters.</p>

	<p>The LEP is focusing on three main areas when it thinks of economic growth for the region that is sustainable: Infrastructure, Housing and Employment &amp; Skills. Professor West stressed the importance to agree the Operating Framework for the region as this will help shape the strategic plan. He welcomed the partnership with the Local Authorities alongside BEIS and Government.</p> <p>Professor West asked the Board to give future thought regards to capacity and capability for the region, this would then ensure the region was together in being consistent and win further bids from government.</p>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC</b></p> <p>No questions were submitted.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that 7 statements had been received and invited attendees to speak in the order their statements had been received. All statements are attached in Appendix 1.</p>
<b>7.1</b>	David Redgewell spoke regarding his concerns that the interchange at Bristol Temple Meads is not fit to purpose and that buses were being moved further away from the train station. He also raised his concerns that Bus Shelters have been damaged all around the region and this was dangerous for those who use the buses. He believed there is a need for a Transport Forum for the region that should be led by WECA to discuss transport issues.
<b>7.2</b>	Adam Reynolds spoke of how in his opinion WECA has not focused on cycling and walking within their Infrastructure plans. He felt that other Combined Authority Mayors are doing much more for cycling and walking for their regions.
<b>7.3</b>	Mike Godwin presented on behalf of Dave Andrews, he spoke of how in his opinion Trams had a great number of benefits to the traffic congestion within Bath city centre. In his opinion this option would help reduce levels of congestion to help benefit the local tourism trade.
7.4	Cllr Chris Warren spoke of how in his opinion WECA should be pushing for Saltford Station to be re-opened sooner, that the Combined Authority should be championing this infrastructure project at political level.
7.5	David Kernek spoke of how in his opinion the number 6 & 7 Bus Service in B&NEs is important for connecting communities and should not be removed. Stressing that alternative routes are not possible for the elderly and disabled.
7.6	S Katrina Billings spoke of how in her opinion the air quality should be a concern for the whole region and it could be seen from all previous statements to the Committee. To have better quality of transport would lead to better quality of air for the region.
7.7	Christina Biggs was not present at the meeting, her statement will be included within appendix 1.
<b>8</b>	<p><b>PETITIONS</b></p> <p>None</p>

9.	<p><b>Transport Update</b></p> <p>The Chair introduced the report requesting the Committee consider the report on proposals for suburban rail in the West of England. It asks for approve a of the set out proposed allocations of an additional £1.24m pothole funding for 2017/18.</p> <p>The Chair moved the recommendations in the report.</p> <p>Cllr Warren seconded the recommendations. He was delighted to see this report coming to the Committee, it would encourage people to use trains more and decongest the roads. Noting he also welcomed the Pothole Funding.</p> <p>Cllr Riddle also welcomed this report as it showed the region was continuing its debate and discussions with Government. Noting that the region has a wide and expansive of historic track that could be used to form new communities and reflected in the Joint Spatial Plan. He also noted the Pothole Funding will be welcomed following the snowy weather recently.</p> <p>Cllr Craig echoed the comments from her colleagues and noted the commitment from Bristol City Council regarding suburban rail and strengthening the rail links within the region. She was pleased to see additional funding has been given to address the potholes following recent bad weather.</p> <p>Professor West agreed with his colleagues.</p> <p>The Chair moved to the vote, and confirmed that in line with the constitution for the three recommendations required a majority vote of the three Local Authorities.</p> <p><b>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the three Local Authorities.</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted the proposals for suburban rail in the West of England.</li> <li>2. Approve the Mayoral allocations of Pothole Action Fund grants totalling £1.24m to the constituent councils as set out in the table at paragraph 3.2 in the report.</li> <li>3. It requested the S151 Officer make corresponding adjustment to the Mayoral Budget for 2017/18 together with the associated capital grants.</li> </ol>
10	<p><b>Operating Framework Development</b></p> <p>The Chair introduced the report requesting the Committee to agree the West of England Combined Authority operating framework for this financial year. It was noted a similar report will be considered at the Joint Committee meeting as the operating framework covers activity that is responsibility of that Committee as well.</p> <p>The Chair noted the operating framework sets out the priorities for 2018/19 and forms the basis of WECA's business plan. The report highlights that longer-term work is being undertaken with Government to develop a Local Industrial Strategy for the region. The draft business plan sets out the key activities that WECA will deliver over the 2018-19 period.</p> <p>It includes plans to bring further investment into transport, homes and skills to ensure the West of England is at the forefront of growth and innovation, where economic, cultural and environmental diversity is celebrated and forms the foundations of prosperity for all.</p>

	<p>The report also asks to delegate responsibility for agreeing the final version of this business plan to the WECA Chief Executive, in consultation with the constituent authority Chief Executives.</p> <p>The Chair noted that an additional resolution was agreed:  <b><i>The West of England Combined Authority agreed that the final version of the business plan would be reported back to the West of England Combined Authority for approval.</i></b></p> <p>The Chair moved the recommendations in the report.</p> <p>Cllr Craig seconded the recommendations. Cllr Craig welcomed the plan, raising her only concern is to ensure that terms of good practice are in place with regards to risk assessment and equality assessment before the plan goes forward and is approved.</p> <p>Cllr Riddle stated he was glad that this plan was in the public domain as it showed great ambition for the area and gave detail to where money will be invested in the future. He stressed that public health is important for the region to focus on and this plan will help enhance this for the whole region. He also stressed it was critical that infrastructure in in place for those areas of development within the Joint Spatial Plan and to continue working alongside government to get investment to those areas.</p> <p>Professor West echoed Cllr Riddle’s comments on public health, noting that it should not be brought in too late for the discussions. In his opinion Public Health should be engaged with the region to work alongside this framework.</p> <p>Cllr Craig seconded Professor West’s comments that public health should be included within the discussions.</p> <p>The Chair moved to the vote, and confirmed that in line with the constitution recommendations 1-3 required a majority vote by the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</p> <p><b>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the three Local Authorities.</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agree the operating framework for the West of England Combined Authority.</li> <li>2. Agree to delegate responsibility for agreeing the business plan to the West of England Combined Authority Chief Executive in consultation with the constitute authority chief executives.</li> <li>3. Agree that the final version of the business plan would be reported back to the West of England Combined Authority for approval.</li> </ol>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE FOR INVESTMENT FUND</b></p> <p>The Chair introduced the next report on proposals to align the governance of the West of England Combined Authority Investment Fund with that of the One Front Door programme to ensure there is a single, robust process in place to monitor and manage what will be a portfolio of upwards of £1.65bn by 2046.</p> <p>The report further proposes making formal use of Directors and Chief Executive meetings to consider programme performance and make decisions according to set delegations and notes that a report detailing the delegations and thresholds will be provided to a future meeting of this Committee.</p>

	<p>The Chair moved the recommendations in the report.</p> <p>Cllr Riddle seconded the recommendations.</p> <p>Cllr Warren noted he was happy to support and asked for there to be clear ownership and accountability.</p> <p>Cllr Craig echoed Cllr Warren’s comments, noting it was important to align this process and recognise the initiative impact on the whole region and this will bring benefits to the region.</p> <p>Professor West agreed with his colleagues that the framework that is in place will move forward to help grow the region and emphasised that without clear delegations in place there a risk that work can be delayed.</p> <p>Cllr Riddle noted that Freezing Hill was a good example of cross-border working.</p> <p>The Chair moved to the vote, and confirmed that in line with the constitution for recommendation 1-2 required a majority decision of the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</p> <p><b>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the three Local Authorities.</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approve the changes for the Investment Fund programme and set out in Appendix A and notes the current progress and issues; and</li> <li>2. Noted the intention to develop delegations to enable effective and efficient programme management.</li> </ol>
12	<p><b>5G PROJECT FUNDING ALLOCATION</b></p> <p>The Chair introduced the next report on the 5G Smart Tourism project being funded by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. He noted this will bring £5 million to trial some exciting technology at the region’s top tourist attractions, whilst looking at wider and longer-term benefits for the region and the UK. Smart technology holds the key to a more advanced, sustainable and smart future which will revolutionise the way people all live, travel and work.</p> <p>The report seeks approval for the use of the capital funding allocated to West of England Combined Authority for the project.</p> <p>The Chair moved the recommendations in the report.</p> <p>Cllr Craig seconded the recommendations. She continued that this was great for the region to have secured this funding for 5G Smart Tourism going forward, noting she was very excited for the region.</p> <p>Professor West was also supportive and welcomed this opportunity to test new digital technology in the region, noting that this was only the ‘tip of the iceberg’ as 5G has huge potential to deliver benefits to residents and businesses throughout the region.</p> <p>Cllr Riddle welcomed this and noted that South Gloucestershire was very open to working with WECA as 5G progresses.</p> <p>Cllr Warren echoed this colleagues’ comments.</p>

	<p>The Chair moved to the vote, and confirmed that in line with the constitution for recommendation 14 required a unanimous decision of the three Local Authorities.</p> <p><b>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the three Local Authorities.</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Accepted the £5M DCMS capital grant offer to deliver the 5G Smart Tourism project, and the inclusion within the 2018/19 WECA approved capital budget to fund capital grants to partners to deliver the project and WECA costs as lead partner.</li> </ol> <p>The Chair moved to the vote, and confirmed that in line with the constitution for recommendation 15 required a majority decision of the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</p> <p><b>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Agreed that the detail funding allocations and capital grant funding arrangements to be delegated to the WECA Chief Executive, in consultation with the WECA S515 Officer.</li> </ol>
13	<p><b>MAYORAL AND WECA BUDGET OUTTURN REPORT</b></p> <p>The Chair introduced this reports update on the projected spending for 2017/18 against the budgeted estimates for the Mayoral and WECA budgets. It shows a positive position with spending generally running below estimated levels and makes provisions for how any underspending will be dealt with as part of the financial year close. In particular, it proposes to ensure funding is carried forward to meet agreed commitments particularly for transport feasibility and business cases, together with recognising that likely underspending on concessionary travel will be returned to the relevant constituent councils during the course of the year ahead once final details are confirmed.</p> <p>The Chair also noted the report also updates on a number of positive developments and new funding streams that have been announced since the 2018/19 Budget was approved in February.</p> <p>The Chair also noted that the West of England Combined Authority been made aware of an error in the government calculations for grant funding related to its Business Rates Pilot and it will continue to work with government officials to understand the details and basis of this error and how it will be dealt with.</p> <p>The Chair moved the recommendations in the report.</p> <p>Cllr Warren seconded the recommendations.</p> <p>The Chair moved to the vote, and confirmed that in line with the constitution for recommendation 15.1 required a majority decision of the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</p> <p><b>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted the Mayoral Fund and WECA revenue and capital budget outturn forecasts as set out in Appendices 1,2 and 3 are noted.</li> </ol>

The Chair moved to the vote, and confirmed that in line with the constitution for recommendation 15.2-15.6 required a unanimous decision of the three Local Authorities.

**On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the three Local Authorities.**

**Resolved:**

2. Any underspends on the JSP Scheme Development or Transport Feasibility Studies Mayoral budgets are carried forward to 2018/19.
3. That, subject to the final outturn position, £310k is carried forward to fund Transport Work Packages (£160k), HR support costs (£60k) and further ICT implementation costs (£90k) in 2018/19.
4. That an earmarked reserve is established for any net underspends on Integrated Transport Authority functions with the intention of revising the Transport Levy to be revenue neutral on constituent councils, as soon as practicable after final outturn.
5. That an earmarked reserve is established for Business Rate Retention income with the remainder of the outturn WECA surplus being set aside in a General Fund reserve.
6. The updates provided for the 2018/19 Budget was noted.

The Chair moved to the vote, and confirmed that in line with the constitution for recommendation 15.7 required a majority decision of the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.

**On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.**

7. That the detailed allocation of Housing Capacity Funding will be delegated to the WECA Chief Executive in consultation with the WECA Mayor and the WECA S151 Officer, and in accordance with the grant offer conditions.

**14. WEST OF ENGLAND COMBINED AUTHORITY (BUSINESS RATES SUPPLEMENTS FUNCTIONS) ORDER 2018**

The Chair introduced the final report that requests consent to a West of England Combined Authority (Business Rate Supplements Functions) Order 2018.

The Chair stressed that giving consent to this Order is not in any way, a decision to implement a business rate supplement, it would simply provide the option for this to be considered in the future.

As part of part of the arrangements for devolution and the establishment of combined authorities, the Government committed to give the West of England Combined Authority Mayor the power to place a supplement on business rates to fund infrastructure. But only with the agreement of the local business community

Consent to the Regulations will also need to be given by each of the constituent councils.

In addition to the specific requirements to consult with business for such a supplement to be approved, any proposal would first be subject to usual WECA governance approval as part of the Mayoral Budget process.

	<p>The Chair noted an additional resolution was agreed:</p> <p><b><i>The West of England Combined Authority agreed to amend the West of England Combined Authority Constitution to reflect that any agreement to implement a business rate supplement is subject to a unanimous vote.</i></b></p> <p>The Chair moved the recommendations in the report.</p> <p>Cllr Riddle seconded the recommendations, noting he was supportive of the further recommendation. Noting that this action would only be taken in the future if it required and it would be debated at a WECA Committee.</p> <p>Cllr Warren noted he supported this recommendation and thought it would only be implemented in the future if it was completely necessary.</p> <p>Cllr Craig agreed with her colleagues.</p> <p>Professor West stressed that the Business community lobbied hard for this devolution deal and this is part of the package. It should be seen as an opportunity if and when it is required.</p> <p>The Chair moved to the vote, and confirmed that in line with the constitution for recommendation 1-3 required a majority decision of the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</p> <p><b>On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously by the three Local Authorities and the Combined Authority Mayor.</b></p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gave consent to the West of England Combined Authority (Business Rate Supplements Functions) Order 2018.</li> <li>2. Delegated to the Chief Executive, the authority to make all related decisions and provide written authority to the Secretary of State of consent to the West of England Combined Authority (Business Rates Supplements Functions) Order 2018.</li> <li>3. Agreed to amend the West of England Combined Authority Constitution to reflect that any agreement to implement a business rate supplement is subject to a unanimous vote.</li> </ol>
<p>15.</p>	<p><b>ANY OTHER ITEM THE CHAIR DECIDES IS URGENT</b></p> <p>There were no urgent items.</p> <p><b>The meeting closed at 14.18.</b></p>
	<p><b>Signed:</b></p> <p><b>Date:</b></p> <p><b>Chair, West of England Combined Authority</b></p>

## Public Forum

### Statements Received

Statement	Name, organisation
1.	David Redgewell, South West Transport Network <b><i>West of England Transport Links</i></b>
2.	Adam Reynolds, Cycle Bath <b><i>Cycling Infrastructure</i></b>
3.	Dave Andrews, Chairman Bath Trams (Mike Godwin will be speaking on behalf of Dave Andrews) <b><i>Why trams are likely the only practical solution to Bath's congestion</i></b>
4.	Chris Warren, Saltford Parish Council <b><i>Saltford Station and MetroWest</i></b>
5.	David Kernek, Camden Media <b><i>6 &amp; 7 First Bus Services in North-East Bath</i></b>
6.	S. Katrina Billings <b><i>Green Infrastructure Plan</i></b>
7.	Christina Biggs, FOSBR <b><i>Rail Plan and Bus Strategy</i></b>

Statement 1

**David Redgewell, South West Transport Network**

**Light Rail around Bristol and Bath**

We want to see the budget for the light rail consultation studies in the Greater Bristol area to be fully protected and support the principles of a light rail route to Bristol Airport as a top priority and later to Bath especially from Lambridge across the City to Newbridge which could then make use of the light rail corridor to Bristol through Bitton, Saltford, Kelston, Warmley to Yate and East Bristol via Mangotsfield, Staple Hill and Fishponds as well as linking into the RUH at Weston, the new Bath Spa Art & Design College at Weston Lock and Park & Ride sites which need to be co-ordinated with the Bristol Mayor's rapid transit project. The two schemes must link to Warmley and Emersons Green. Retention of Avon Valley Railway steam services at weekends. Provision should be made for a continuous cycle/walkway between Bristol and Bath where possible. The implementation of light rail will help bring the City region into line with EU emission and clean air targets together with clean fuel buses and taxi's.

The corridor to Odd Down is welcomed however the majority of the traffic is to the Somer Valley at Peasedown, Radstock and Mid Somer Norton and therefore an extension of a rapid transit system to this area would be beneficial. What evaluation of the Somerset and Dorset railway corridor has been carried out as Norton Radstock is an enterprise zone and needs public transport improvement.

The route to Bath University seems to have gradient constraints and requires considerable engineering works and it should also be noted that all LRT schemes approved in the UK have been conurbation wide eg Midland Metro (Birmingham - Wolverhampton), Greater Manchester, Nottingham and Croydon and will require DFT funding and approvals in the long term and in the short term to be in the Metro Mayors joint transport plan.

**Bus/Rail integration**

This is required at Bath Spa station and other locations where light rail might possibly connect with buses. Across Europe and Greater Manchester/London rapid transit is fully integrated into the bus network. We need to make progress on bus/rail integration at Temple Meads as the proposed Temple Gate stops do not work for passengers.

On rail we welcome the work on disabled access at Stapleton Road and Patchway but the Stapleton Road temporary ramps do not provide good access without grab rails.

There should be investment in MetroWest between Westbury, Bath and Bristol currently out for consultation with the DFT as part of the GWR franchise with First Group as the operator until 2022. This could include a business unit for Bristol and Bath, Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire & Greater Bristol.

SWTN also want to see the GWR franchise kept as one complete business unit and not split up as proposed by the DFT. The GWR IEP electrification programme should also be completed in the shortest possible time to assist with high technology rail job creation opportunities in the region together with the Henbury loop rail project serving the proposed Arena.

There should also be a Greater Bristol business unit within the GWR franchise with devolved powers similar to the West Midlands and Greater Manchester PTE's.

Bus proposals can be included as should future schemes eg light rail integration and the Overground rail project in Bristol.

### **Arena issues**

A full transport plan would need to be drawn up with First Group on whichever site the Mayor and Metro Mayor decide.

Temple Meads Arena would require coach parking, MetroBus stops, coach stops in Avon Street, bus stops at this location and on Bath Road Park & Ride services from Brislington, Parkway, Portway, Ashton Vale, extra trains from Bath and West Wilts, Taunton, W-S-M, Cardiff, Newport, Patchway, Filton, Yate, Gloucester/Cheltenham, Severn Beach via Clifton Down, Henbury loop, Portishead and Swindon.

Regarding a shuttle train from Bristol Parkway to Temple Meads, taxi ranks, ferry terminal, service coaches and car parking including disabled.

Construction of Station Street and bus interchange at the Friary is required as part of the new University campus development at Temple Meads.

### **Brabazon hanger option**

Potential Arena will require coach parking, MetroBus stops, coach stops, bus stops at this location and on Park & Ride services to Brislington, Parkway, Portway, Ashton Vale, extra trains from Bath and West Wilts, Taunton, W-S-M, Cardiff, Newport, Patchway, Filton, Yate, Gloucester, Cheltenham, Severn Beach via Clifton Down, Henbury loop, Portishead and Swindon. There should be 15 minute frequency services on the Henbury loop serving the Arena and 10 minute shuttle bus service on main routes to it.

The IET trains will need to operate from London and South Wales via Parkway to Filton North station for the arena, services from the South West, West Midlands to the Henbury loop station, coach parking will need to be provided, taxis, bus links Greater Bristol wide, links to Cribbs Causeway and hotels will need to be addressed.

We urge the City Council, WECA and Bristol Mayor's to address a full integrated transport plan for the Arena similar to those at Manchester Victoria/Wembley.

The Arena rail services will need to be included in the new rail franchise.

### **Bus strategy**

There should be no cuts in bus subsidies but more investment in the local bus network with the Metro Mayor and these issues must be addressed alongside any light rail proposals in Bristol and Bath especially where services like the 16 from Bristol Parkway to Longwell Green via Lodge

Causeway have already been cut leaving residents with no buses. The 510/511 bus services should also be reinstated as part of an improved orbital bus network.

Passengers interchanging between bus/rail routes should have accessible toilet facilities on key routes with money for maintaining/cleaning bus shelters/bus bays. These should include facilities at Shirehampton Green, Eastville Park and Fishponds Park. One way to fund public transport would be to use money raised by parking fees instead of spending it on non transport infrastructure projects like pavement repairs. These toilets are also used by bus drivers and passengers on routes around Bristol. Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out regarding the closures and any new facilities. Of course in South Gloucestershire, BANES and North Somerset have protected these facilities as part of the network.

We remind you that the tourism industry in Bristol is worth £1.3 billion and we do not want the reputation damage to Bristol so these facilities including community toilets and private sector transfers must work.

#### **WECA Transport Forum issues**

We are concerned about the lack of progress for a rail and transport forum and the need to merge the congestion task force with any WECA group. We also must address the proposed Regional Transport Board.

On integration we are concerned about the lack of integration between MetroBus and the background bus network especially around North Bristol along the Bradley Stoke corridor.

DAVID REDGEWELL South West Transport Network/TSSA/Railfuture

We wish to see improvements to Patchway station to include CCTV, footbridge with lifts, waiting area and car park.

Bristol Temple Meads interchange and Station Street, improving bus stops near Temple Gate.

South Bristol Link requires MetroBus route to be implemented as a bus service and potentially as a light rail route to the Airport and Temple Meads.

MetroBus to be implemented between Aztec West, Parkway, UWE and Emersons Green. Support Thornbury MetroBus route stop[ping in Bradley Stoke area from 26th May as requested by First Group.

Cross boundary working on 20mph zones review with South Gloucestershire Council in East and North Bristol.

MetroWest extension to Henbury and St Andrews Road and reopening Portishead line.

Disabled access needs improvement at Stapleton Road whilst works are undertaking.

Integrated ticketing as part of bus strategy for ferry/bus and train.

We are still concerned that most public interchanges in Bristol have no public toilets unlike London, Birmingham and Manchester. We call for a review of the community toilet scheme urgently.

Bus service review requires a service 16 to be reinstated between Hillfields and Bristol Parkway and services 10 and 11 to Emersons Green from Shirehampton via Parkway.

Light rail priority is to Bristol Airport from Bristol Temple Meads and tram train around the local network and on the Bath Warmley line jointly with the cycleway onwards to Emersons | Green.

DAVID REDGEWELL SWTN

Statement 2  
**Adam Reynolds**

**Cycling Infrastructure**

I am speaking on behalf of Cycle Bath and Bristol Cycling Campaign both of which actively campaign for better cycling infrastructure. As a software engineer and data scientist I have been able to leverage my skills to analyse the Census 2011 WU03EW "Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work" data set. I can tell you that of the 153,623(125,908+27,715) Bristol and Bath car commuters, **18.9%** [28,989 (24,396+4,593)] live within a 20 minute walk of work, **42.1%** [64,678(56,277+8,401)] live within a 20 minute cycle of work, and **61.7%** [94,800(83072+11728)] live within a 20 minute electric bike ride of work.

I have already had a meeting last year with Mayor Tim Bowles to emphasise these statistics, highlighting the work Transport For London are doing around Strategic Cycling Analysis ( <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/strategic-cycling-analysis.pdf> ) as well as presenting the [www.pct.bike](http://www.pct.bike) and [www.cyipt.bike](http://www.cyipt.bike) tools, both of which have been funded by the DfT. Transport For London recently stated that cycle lanes move 5 times as many people per square metre as car lanes. A single bi-directional protected cycle lane is the equivalent of installing a 5 lane motorway through a city. The investment in gold standard cycle infrastructure in the City of London has resulted in the majority of traffic on the roads now being people cycling.

On top of this we have estimates that congestion is costing Bath and Bristol businesses £55 million per year and costing individuals residents upwards of £1,500 per year in time and costs. We're talking congestion costs reaching almost £300 million per year across Bath and Bristol, and god knows what costs the NHS are incurring due to air pollution and obesity.

Yet WECA transport policy seems to be simply about junction 18A of the M4, buses, and trains. There is no recognition that walking and cycling play any role in tackling congestion. Unlike other regional mayors, there is no dedicated cycling commissioner. Funding for cycling has been bundled with walking, and combined, is only 5% of the budget, or a paltry £400m. The Greater Manchester Mayor has committed to invest £1.5 BILLION in cycling alone. If WECA did the same per head of population it would be **£500M** on cycling alone.

Cycling as a form of transport offers significant benefits to tackling congestion and improving public health. The Mayor can tackle congestion cheaply by simply identifying all Key Road Network routes where significant numbers are travelling to work by car that could travel to work by bicycle in under 20 minutes and prioritise the building of good separate protected space for walking, cycling, and driving along these routes over the provision of on-street parking.

When will WECA get serious about tackling congestion and improving the health of the population? Where is WECA's cycling vision? Where is our Cycling Commissioner? Where is our Chris Boardman? Where is the commitment from WECA to deliver healthy streets? Why does the mayor seem obsessed with cars, buses and trains, when 60% of workers live

within an easy electric bike ride of work? And while we're at it, where's the identification of key cycle routes to schools with upwards of 30% of rush hour traffic being the school run? Why is WECA's transport policies not answerable to Public Health? Why is there nobody from the NHS invited to be involved in defining transport policy?

We are almost one year into Mayor Tim Bowles term in office and cycling simply does not seem to register on his radar as a solution for tackling congestion and improving the health of the population. I can only compare his progress to that of other Mayors and currently it feels glacial and very timid when looking at what other Mayors are achieving.

Statement 3

**Dave Andrews, Chairman Bath Trams**

**Why trams are likely the only practical solution to Bath's congestion**

*(These statements are fully referenced on the [Bathtrams.uk](http://Bathtrams.uk) website)*

No bus-only system has curbed congestion in any British city because car drivers will not accept cramped jerky buses (patronage declining at 1.5% for many years) as an alternative. (You can go to any congested British city to see this). [Runcorn was built around the bus in the 1960s](#) but usage is now down to around 5% - the same as in Bath. Utrecht which has no parking in the city and is bus-only [is re-installing trams](#) because the bus system is at capacity, and even the triple bendy buses cannot cope

Evidence repeatedly shows that car drivers will however accept gently moving, smooth, spacious (children and other users not crammed next to strangers) [street running trams/light rail and a sufficient number of car drivers have transferred in all 7 British tram re-installs to significantly ease congestion.](#)

The long-term (capital repayment and operational cost) of a tram per person km [is about half that of a bus](#); one driver cost is shared over more passengers, there is no engine or tyres to maintain and they last 40 years or more

Low operating costs means trams run at 6 min intervals 0600 to 2400 - "turn up and go", no waiting, high reliability makes them ideal for school children where the school run creates about 1/3 of rush hour congestion. The average 3 min wait between trams means that even cross-town, two tram trips are attractive for motorists and school children

Trams produce no pollution but even electric buses produce pollution from the toxic tyre particulates, brake dusts and ground up road tar, most pollution is from car exhausts

[Modern tram track](#) can be installed without major traffic disturbance

[France operates 57 tram lines in 33 cities all built in the last 30 years](#) these do indeed increase footfall and spend in town centres in the pleasant environment they create. [46 Tram Systems Installed in Europe Since 2000](#). 265 active tram systems [in Europe](#)

[There are 27 tram systems in Unesco World heritage cities](#), and about 140 tram systems in Europe with about the same length as is envisaged for Bath Trams. Modern trams do not require overhead wires. [All hills in Bath](#) are accessible to trams. Trams have a tighter turning circle, are [narrower than buses, and can pass closer together](#). Bath's heritage was based on trams from 1890 to 1939; visitors complain about traffic but visitors to Vienna and other trammed cities never complain about overhead wires but praise the trams and lack of traffic

Green Wave Traffic Light Pre-emption permits trams to move through traffic faster than other vehicles even with on-street running and this cannot be applied to buses – [the website explains this apparent paradox](#)

[Values of commercial property always increase near tram stops and encourage further serviceable development alongside](#) - their [inflexibility is an advantage](#) as it signals to developers that they are here for the long term

Many European cities have trams trundling through pedestrian zones and this is very acceptable to shoppers, who happily accept their presence - including [dining alongside the tracks.](#)

The carrying capacity of a single road with cars is typically about [1000/hour, 9,000 with buses but 40,000 for trams](#)

Research shows that Uber cars and Amazon vans are [already slowing traffic down and self-driving Ubers and vans cars will only make matters far, far worse](#) due to their cheapness and resultant ubiquity

Trams can carry much HGV goods into town [on off-peak vehicles as per many continental trams](#)

Statement 4

**Chris Warren, Saltford Parish Council**

**Saltford Station and MetroWest**

When our MP Jacob Rees-Mogg, a strong supporter for re-opening Saltford railway station, delivered our petition containing over 2,000 signatures to Parliament in April 2012 we knew our station would not be re-opened overnight. We would need to be patient. However, despite cross-party support, the lack of political will to push this forward has been disappointing and frustrating; our patience is wearing thin.

In the intervening 6 ½ years since we started our campaign in November 2011 the case for our station has strengthened, not diminished. Concerns have grown over peak time traffic congestion on the A4 that will worsen as more housing is added to Keynsham East putting more commuters onto the local roads leading into Bristol and Bath.

To reopen the railway station and incorporate Saltford into a new improved Metro West link between Bristol and Bath is a no-brainer - a modern solution to the mass movement of commuters. But it still seems beyond our grasp because the commitment from local political leaders is not strong enough to drive this forward.

Since 2011 the Saltford Station Campaign has lobbied extensively whilst residents have maintained their strong desire to get their station back; all 11 Parish Councillors on Saltford Parish Council were elected in May 2015 on a pro-station agenda and this was on a high turnout vote (76.4%).

A station at Saltford has appeared in numerous transport planning documents for the West of England Partnership as part of the Metro West project whilst planning documents from Network Rail have shown passive provision for a reopened station.

Initial studies by Halcrow consultants provided enough evidence for B&NES Council to commit up to £100,000 to undertake a High Level Option Assessment and fund the development of the project to about stage 2 of the Network Rail GRIP process (Governance for Railway Investment Projects). This High Level Option Assessment was commissioned from CH2MHill and the report was completed in 2013.

The Benefit/Cost ratio was calculated at a “reasonable” 2:1 based on 20% contingency and standard assumptions about platforms. For every £1 invested there is a “monetised” benefit to society of £2; and this is before monetised environmental benefits are factored in.

Independent computer modelling, from CH2MHill consultants in 2013, indicated that there would be at least 203,700 trips per annum (2 way movement) and 647 trips per day made by 325 individuals. Most potential users will be local to the station.

On weekdays there are over 10,000 people within 2 miles (3km) of the station site; that is 4,200 at Saltford, 1,000 at Corston and Newton St. Loe, and over 5,000 students and staff on site at Bath Spa University’s Newton Park Campus.

Saltford station, sitting alongside the A4, the river and cycle-path is a great destination for recreational activities and amenities in the Avon Valley. Furthermore, the 29,000 vehicles

passing the Salford station site each day shows the need to transfer commuters from road to rail.

So, what needs to be done?

The previous B&NES Council administration had included £250K in the budget for 2016/17 and 2017/18 to take the Salford Station project forward to GRIP stages 3 and 4. However, consultants have not yet been commissioned. The reason for the delay is the need for Network Rail's confirmation that provision can be made in the timetable for a half hourly stop at Salford before GRIP stages 3 and 4 can be commissioned.

Yet despite repeated requests from the station campaign and assurances from B&NES that they are on the case, nothing is happening. No-one is championing this infrastructure project at the decision-making political level with the drive and determination required to get the re-opening of our station back on track.

On behalf of Salford, the daily commuters stuck in traffic between Bristol and Bath, and for those who don't or can't afford to run a car - especially the younger generation, and the students and staff at Bath Spa University, please make a high level representation to Network Rail as soon as possible.

The question that needs to be put to Network Rail is not "Can a half hourly stop be incorporated in the railway timetable for Salford?" but "When can a half hourly stop be incorporated in the railway timetable for Salford, and if it is not possible now, how soon can this provision be made so that we can plan for the re-opening of Salford Station?"

Statement 6  
**S Katrina Billing**

**Green Infrastructure Plan for the Region**

As a concerned environmental activist (with breathing problems) I salute the West of England's plan to "make one of the UK's most prosperous regions. . .even better". My purpose however is to highlight the fact that much of the plan focuses on what could be called the "harder" aspects of planning; the acknowledged and identified challenges for the region ". . .productivity and skills, housing and transport" whilst promoting economic growth for the region.

There is, within the plan, very little emphasis on the "softer" aspects of our quality of life in the West of England. Perhaps it is a good point to define what "even better" actually means. I acknowledge that a Green Infrastructure Plan will look at environmental mitigation of future development across the region, however my concern is that its remit may not be broad enough.

My areas of concern:

**1. Air Quality**

I am heartened to read in the minutes from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on Jan 31st that "It was agreed that air quality would be added to the forward plan." also that the committee has asked for clarity about the role of Weca in establishing clean air zones. My concern is that Weca has adopted a supporting rather than leading role in this arena, when it has been noted that the issues of increased traffic affect much of the region. Once the expansion of the region takes place this will surely increase. Furthermore Cllr Steve Pearce has acknowledged that air quality is a regional issue and that areas such as South Gloucester have not received a directive from Government to establish a local clean air plan. Finally I welcome and concur with the statement made by Dave Gray to the Scrutiny Committee on 31st January.

**2. Health**

Dave Redgewell pointed out in his statement, at the January meeting, that "There is no Greater Bristol health policy." Whilst he points out that there is a need for new hospitals, which I am sure is true, I ask that Weca does not lose sight of the fact that appropriate planning can impact on the health and well-being of the populace.

As part of the London Healthy Urban Environment development the NHS states that producing a health impact ensures that health and well-being are being properly considered in planning policies and proposals.

"The impacts of major development proposals on the health and well-being of communities should be considered, for example through the use of Health Impact Assessments (HIA)."

<https://www.healthymbanddevelopment.nhs.uk/>

It is common knowledge that exposure to air pollutants has been linked to suppressed lung growth, asthma, heart disease, foetal brain growth damage and the onset of diabetes. Air pollution from traffic and industry is considered to be leading to the premature death of more than three million people a year. Globally, that's more than malaria and HIV/Aids combined. <https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2016/jul/05/how-air-pollution-affects-your-health-infographic>

### 3. Trees

This third area impacts heavily on the previous 2 items. The UN World Health Organization (WHO), states that about 90% of the global population living in cities in 2014 was exposed to particulate matter that exceeded the WHO air quality guidelines. It is a fact that both rich and poor are exposed to the dangers but whatever the lifestyle it is people living near the source or on busy roads who are more exposed and who's health is ultimately more affected.

**Ironically many of our schools are located near known major poor air quality locations.**

In a recent study in the USA by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) it was found that planting trees is a cost-effective way to tackle urban air pollution. Dr McDonald, the author of the study, which focused on the use of trees in 245 cities around the world compared the cost-effectiveness of trees with other methods of cooling and cleaning air. "The average reduction of particulate matter near a tree is between 7-24%, while the cooling effect is up to 2C (3.6F)." It's important to note, he went on to state "On that front, trees are cost competitive with other options. . . When you change a bus from diesel to gasoline, for example, you reduce particulate matter pollution, and trees are certainly in the same ball park."

It is worth mentioning at this point while the Green Infrastructure plan is focusing on "supporting resilient ecosystems and biodiversity, reducing and managing flood risks, improving mental and physical health" that caring for existing and planting new trees can go a long way to assisting in this process. Dr McDonald explored how much increasing the number of trees would improve the environment. Staggeringly he states "We found that there was a lot more scope there. All of the cities we looked at, if all the people in them spent an extra US \$4 a year on planting trees, you could **save between 11,000 and 36,000 lives each year**. This is mostly **as a result of having cleaner air**."

When you consider all the benefits that street trees can provide to society, there is a strong business case for increased societal investment.

- A study in California found that for every \$1 spent on tree planting and maintenance, urban trees deliver 5.82 in benefits.
- A study of 10 cities in the US found that urban trees move enough particulate matter to reduce particulate matter to reduce annual health impacts significantly
- In a 2014 report, following what was described as the "largest city tree survey of its kind", it was calculated that London's trees provided at least £133 million of benefits every year in terms of air pollution removal, carbon sequestration and reducing the amount of water going into drains

[https://thought-leadership-production.s3.amazonaws.com/2017/09/19/15/24/13/b408e102-561f-4116-822c-2265b4fdc079/Trees4Health\\_FINAL.pdf](https://thought-leadership-production.s3.amazonaws.com/2017/09/19/15/24/13/b408e102-561f-4116-822c-2265b4fdc079/Trees4Health_FINAL.pdf)  
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-37813709?SThisFB>

Finally I must point out that the **TNC report highlighted that most of the cities featured in the study were losing more trees than they were gaining.**

I ask you to please ensure that within the JSP trees become a major not a minor part of our future in The South West of England



## Statement to West of England Combined Authority Committee and the West of England Joint Committee Wednesday 18 April 2018

FOSBR continues to urge that WECA develop its own specific Rail Plan to balance the Bus Strategy, as part of the upcoming Joint Local Transport Plan, based on our suggestions in the FOSBR Rail Plan 2018.

FOSBR is delighted that WECA is carrying out a £2m study into Temple Meads, and asks that WECA engages with FOSBR and TfGB to ensure that Station Street is delivered as an initial phase and that a bus exchange on the Friary remains as a key part of the plans. This will ensure that Temple Meads has the infrastructure to host the Arena at this preferred location.

As another example of this, we would like to draw WECA's attention to the evidence we have submitted to the Great Western Franchise consultation in February 2018 in support of our proposal to restore commuter rail services to Pilning.

Document 1: A cost-benefit analysis by a UWE academic, David Williams, which sets out different scenarios of modal shift and the associated savings in carbon emissions and pollution and the consequent payback time for the £2m footbridge required.

Document 2: A map of the Pilning station environs with the proposed M49 junction

Document 3: An estimate of the possible ridership for Pilning from the Severnside commercial employment area

Document 4: An undertaking from the Cribbs Mall Transport officer to support a bus shuttle from Pilning to Cribbs should the passenger service be restored.

FOSBR continues to offer its resources and local knowledge to the JLTP.

Christina Biggs (FOSBR Secretary)



# Pilning Station Footbridge Cost Benefit Analysis

February 2018

---

Dr David Williams.

## About the Author:

Dr David Williams is a Research Associate at the University of the West of England. Dr Williams has a background in transport planning and assessment for local authorities in the West of England. This work was conducted in Dr Williams' own time for FOSBR and the findings are his own work and do not reflect the views of the University of the West of England.



---

## CONTENTS

---

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
Feasibility	3
<b>Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)</b>	<b>4</b>
Assumptions	4
<b>Calculation</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Next Steps</b>	<b>7</b>

---

# Introduction

The Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways (FOSBR) have requested that a cost benefit analysis be completed to support their case for the installation of a new footbridge at Pilning station in South Gloucestershire, to the north west of the city of Bristol. The case is being made to the GWR Franchise consultation that closes on 21 February 2018. The original footbridge was removed in 2016 as part of Network Rail's electrification programme<sup>1</sup> and it was deemed not cost effective to replace it due to the low number of passengers using the station, with just 230 people using the station in 2016/17<sup>2</sup>. The low number of passengers, up from 46 in 2015/16, is due to the fact that the station is served by just two trains a week, at 0834 and 1534 on a Saturday. Network Rail has estimated that the installation of an equalities compliant bridge at the station will cost £2 million and FOSBR have requested that the installation of this bridge be included within the next stage of the GWR franchise after 2020.

## Feasibility

Since Network Rail's decision not to replace the footbridge in 2016 there have been several changes to transportation within the Greater Bristol area surrounding Pilning Station. Highways England has announced plans to construct a new junction on the M49 motorway that would provide greater access to the station. This new junction provides Bristol City Council with the opportunity to develop a Park and Rail site at the station, reducing trips into Bristol city centre. This is important as Bristol City Council is currently developing options for installing a Clean Air Zone (CAZ) within the city centre to comply air quality standards<sup>3</sup>. Developing Park and Rail facilities at Pilning station, through the construction of a pedestrian bridge and surface level car parking would provide a relatively low cost option compared to the construction of a new Park and Ride site served by buses. The new junction is expected to cost between £25m and £50m, but as yet no date has been set for its construction.

The second change to transportation in the Greater Bristol area is the proposed expansion of *The Mall* at Cribbs Causeway and the associated additional traffic this will have. Pilning railway station is situated 4.8km away from The Mall site. The Transport Review Group for the development's travel plan have stated to FOSBR that if more frequent services were reintroduced to Pilning Station they would consider running a shuttle bus to/from the station to serve their customers who wished to travel by train, rather than car.

The final change comes from the businesses to the south of Pilning Station based at Severnside. SevernNet, a consortia of businesses on at Severnside, are interested in running shuttle buses for their staff to/from the station providing the services meet fit with current shift patterns. All three of these changes suggest that the re-installation of a footbridge at Pilning station should be considered as part of the next GWR franchise as they would provide benefits for

### PROPOSED M49 AVONMOUTH JUNCTION<sup>4</sup>



<sup>1</sup> Sims, A. (2016) [http://www.gazetteseries.co.uk/news/14587196.Rail\\_platform\\_and\\_footbridge\\_set\\_for\\_closure\\_in\\_Pilning/](http://www.gazetteseries.co.uk/news/14587196.Rail_platform_and_footbridge_set_for_closure_in_Pilning/)

<sup>2</sup> ORR (2018) <http://orr.gov.uk/statistics/published-stats/station-usage-estimates>

<sup>3</sup> BBC (2017) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-bristol-40865101>

<sup>4</sup> Highways England (2017) <http://roads/highways.gov.uk>



travel within the Greater Bristol area.

## Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)

The Department for Transport's Web-based Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTAG) provides advice on transport modelling and appraisal for highways and public transport interventions. This is based on HM Treasury's Green Book to explore a wide range of impacts from a transport intervention. Rail interventions are based on the same approach. For the purposes of this analysis three scenarios will be tested to demonstrate the benefits of installing the bridge. This will be based on the Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and Nitrogen Oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) reductions from people travelling by train compared to driving within the Greater Bristol area. It is not possible to capture the wider economic benefits or social benefits of this scheme due to the lack of available data. The analysis is therefore designed to demonstrate the benefits in one area, emissions, with the request that WECA conduct a full CBA as part of the Joint Local Transport Plan for the implementation of the bridge in line with its inclusion in the next GWR franchise period.

### Assumptions

As with any model a set of assumptions will be included. These will be outlined below.

The CBA will be based on the assumption that additional train services will be provided to/from Pilning Station by Great Western Railways as part of their next franchise to meet the demands of Severnside businesses and The Mall's customers. The table below includes the proposed services which would include 10 services a day in each direction. This number of services has been used for the CBA as it would provide services to serve shift patterns at Severnside and the majority of the weekend trips to The Mall.

The second assumption is based on the type of car that will be taken off the road. For this scenario the findings are based on a 1.6ltr Diesel Ford Focus, the most popular car in Britain. The Ford Focus emits 114 grams of CO<sub>2</sub> per kilometre<sup>5</sup> and between 0.5 and 0.75 grams of NO<sub>x</sub> per kilometre<sup>6</sup>. The cost of these emissions to the environment is approximately £0.05/kilometre<sup>7</sup>.

The CBA will test the three scenarios.

<sup>5</sup> EU (2015) <https://www.energy.eu/car-co2-emissions/ford.php>

<sup>6</sup> Emissions Analytics (2018) <http://equaindex.com/equa-air-quality-index/>

<sup>7</sup> MyClimate.org (2016) [https://co2.myclimate.org/en/portfolios?calculation\\_id=1045204&localized\\_currency=GBP](https://co2.myclimate.org/en/portfolios?calculation_id=1045204&localized_currency=GBP)



**Scenario 1** – 10 passengers will use Pilning Station/train

**Scenario 2** – 20 passengers will use Pilning station/train

**Scenario 3** – 40 passengers will use Pilning Station/train

An assumption has been made that each of these passengers would travel 40km by car if they were not travelling by train.

The trains currently running this line run on diesel and therefore emit CO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>. These trains will be running on this line whether they stop at Pilning or not. The level of emissions per service is therefore negligible and has been discounted for the purposes of this analysis. Further research would need to incorporate these figures.

DAY	DIRECTION	APPROX TIME	PURPOSE
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0530	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0630	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0730	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0750	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	0830	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	1330	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	1430	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	1600	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	1930	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Bristol to Pilning	2030	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0530	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0630	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0730	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0750	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	0830	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	1330	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	1430	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	1600	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	1930	Serving Businesses at Severnside
MON-FRI	Newport to Pilning	2030	Serving Businesses at Severnside
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	0930	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1030	Serving the Mall



DAY	DIRECTION	APPROX TIME	PURPOSE
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1130	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1230	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1330	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1430	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1530	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1630	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1730	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Bristol to Pilning	1830	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	0930	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1030	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1130	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1230	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1330	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1430	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1530	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1630	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1730	Serving the Mall
SAT-SUN	Newport to Pilning	1830	Serving the Mall

### Calculation

The calculations are based on the use of the station for 363 days of the year, with each person saving 40km of travel by car. The first table shows the financial benefits per day of the three scenarios. With scenario 1 an average of 10 passengers per train there is a £4,000 financial benefit for the local environment due to the emissions saved, with this increasing to £16,000 if there were 40 passengers alighting per train.

NO. TRAIN SERVICES/ DAY	NO. PASSENGERS/ TRAIN	TOTAL PASSENGER S/ DAY	DISTANCE BY CAR SAVED (40KM/ PASSENGER)	CO <sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS SAVED/DAY (114G/KM)	NO <sub>x</sub> EMISSIONS SAVED/DAY (0.625G/KM)	ENVIRONMENTAL SAVING/DAY (£)
20	10	200	8,000km	912kg CO <sub>2</sub>	5kg	£4,000
20	20	400	16,000km	1,824kg CO <sub>2</sub>	10kg	£8,000
20	40	800	32,000km	3,648kg CO <sub>2</sub>	20kg	£16,000

For the year the figures demonstrate that for Scenario 1, 10 passengers per train the environmental benefits would be £1.4m per year, with this increasing to £5.8m for Scenario 3, with 40 passengers per train.



NO. TRAIN SERVICES/ YEAR	NO. PASSENGERS/ TRAIN	TOTAL PASSENGER S/ YEAR	DISTANCE BY CAR SAVED (40KM/ PASSENGER)	CO <sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS SAVED/ YEAR (114G/KM)	NO <sub>x</sub> EMISSIONS SAVED/ YEAR (0.625G/KM)	ENVIRONMENTAL SAVING/YEAR (£)
7260	10	72,600	2,904,000km	331,056 kg CO <sub>2</sub>	1,815 kg	£1,452,000
7260	20	145,200	5,808,000km	662,112 kg CO <sub>2</sub>	3,630 kg	£2,904,000
7260	40	290,400	11,616,000km	1,324,224 kg CO <sub>2</sub>	7,260 kg	£5,808,000

## Summary

The results show that if GWR were to provide 10 services a day to Pilning station and that if each train had 10 passengers either alight or board the service the environmental savings for the West of England area of installing the footbridge at Pilning at the cost of £2m would be paid back in under 18 months. In the most optimistic scenario (Scenario 3) this would be paid back in just under four months, in terms of environmental benefits for the Greater Bristol area.

The findings do not include any calculations of economic or social benefits of implementing this scheme, that would be added to this equation to demonstrate the full benefits.

This report concludes that providing GWR were prepared to run these services and work together with SevernNet and The Mall's transport plan team, it would be possible to provide these services and help reduce emissions CO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> in the Greater Bristol area.

## Next Steps

The results of this analysis show that the provision of services and a new footbridge at Pilning station have the potential to provide an environmental benefit to the Greater Bristol area in terms of emissions reduction. Therefore this report recommends that the installation of a bridge and the introduction of services be considered for the next GWR franchise period by the Department for Transport.

The installation of the footbridge, additional trains, new junction for the M49 linking to Pilning station and a Park and Rail site to be delivered at the station should also be included for consideration at Pilning as part of the West of England Combined Authority's Joint Local Transport Plan. Once the scheme is included in both these plans it will be possible to conduct a full cost benefit analysis of the schemes to demonstrate the wider benefits the enhancement of this station can provide to the Greater Bristol area moving forward.

## Employment density for Severnside Local Area

**Author:** Andrew. G. Short 27/2/17, for Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways.

**Business area: Central park, Western Approach and West Gate.**

HMG document 'Employment Density Guide (3<sup>rd</sup> edition Nov 2015)' issued by the Homes & Communities Agency suggest that a typical density of employees in 'regional Distribution Centres is 77 square metres (M<sup>2</sup>) per person average.

This is per Full Time Equivalent (FTE). This equates to a single shift through the average working week. The occupancy would thus be 2 persons per 77 per M<sup>2</sup> if everyone in every company worked a two-shift system, 3 persons per 77 M<sup>2</sup> for 3 shifts.

Brochures for the business areas quote:

Westgate development overall	4,000,000 sq ft.
Tesco (not in above) estimated	500,000 sq ft.
Central park development overall	3,775,000 sq ft.
Western Approach (estimated)*	3,000,000 sq ft

( \* Brochure not available 16-1-17).

Red figures below from <http://sites.southglos.gov.uk/insouthglos/enterprise/avonmouth/key-facts/>

Total business building floor area	11,275,000 sq ft.
At 10.7 ft sq per M <sup>2</sup> , this equates to	1,105,400 (1,323,630) M <sup>2</sup>

At 77 M<sup>2</sup> per person, this equates to some 13,700 (17,190) FTE persons.

It is assumed that 50% of employees are on the businesses are on 2 shift and 15% on three shift. This equates to:

$$(13,700 * 0.35) + (13700 * 0.5 * 2) + (13,700 * 0.15 * 3) = 24,660 (30,941) \text{ FTE persons.}$$

Assuming an occupancy of 3/4 (allowing for vacancies, automation, sickness, business premises vacated, etc.) this gives a level of 18,500 FTE persons.

**Thus on an average day, there could be 18,500 (23,200) persons commuting to and from the three distribution parks** and to be targeted as possibilities for public transport (e.g. a 1% take-up of public transport equates to 185 (232) return journeys per day.

## Cribbs Mall Transport Response to Representation by Christina Biggs

### Summary of Representation

1. Dr Christina Biggs on behalf of Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways identified that the group is lobbying for the reintroduction of daily rail services to Pilning rail station approximately 4.8km from the Mall site. Dr Biggs identified that the station would require the provision of a new footbridge (apparently costed at £2 million) and suggested that the station could be used by those travelling to the Mall from Wales, with the Mall providing a shuttle bus service to collect/drop off visitors.

### Response to Representation

2. Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure (CIL) Levy Regulations, 2010 states that:

*“A planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:*

- a. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*
- b. directly related to the development; and*
- c. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.”*

3. The pedestrian footbridge at Pilning rail station is not considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, nor is it directly related to the development. Furthermore, the cost of provision is not considered to be reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. This measure would therefore not meet the guidance set out in the CIL Regulations 2010, and cannot be required to be provided by the proposed development.
4. With regard to the shuttle bus to Pilning rail station, if the proposed development is granted planning consent the s.106 agreement requires that the Applicants make contributions towards sustainable travel. The use and spending of these contributions will be monitored through the Travel Plan, as overseen by the Transport Review Group (TRG). *If* more frequent rail services are reintroduced to Pilning station, the TRG will be able to consider the suggested shuttle bus measure and whether funding should be made available to support such a service.

**Sent by email to Christina Biggs**

**November 2017**