

## List of key comments and changes to LTP3 Joint Strategy in light of consultation responses

### Introduction

<u>General Comments</u>	<u>Changes</u>
Clarification of what Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH) is/ does requested	Explanatory paragraph added to preamble.
Comments received over the regular use of technical terminology.	Some use of technical terms is unavoidable, but a glossary of key terms will be provided as part of final document.
	Brief summary of Joint Strategy creation process to be added to this section.

### Policy Background

<u>General Comments</u>	<u>Changes</u>
Request to include reference to several economic policy documents.	Reference to Urban South Hampshire 2014-2019 Delivery Strategy, Hampshire County Council's economic assessment, Existing & emerging Local Authorities Economic Development Strategies has been added.
Request to include reference to Maritime & Coastal Access Act	Not directly included, but will be covered via Rights of Way Improvement plans (ROWIPS) which are now referred to in Policy I.
Complaints of limited mention of freight	Addition of reference to Transport for South Hampshire freight strategy
New policy announcements made by Government.	Reference to forthcoming government Localism and Decentralisation Bill and others included.
Request to include reference to Port of Southampton masterplan document.	New section of policies table ("Infrastructure related plans") added to account for Port & Airport masterplans and also Network Rail planning documents.

### Transport Vision

<u>General Comments</u>	<u>Changes</u>
General feedback supports need for and value of a vision statement	Comments on funding have been considered and potential new forms of funding incorporated into the Policy section.
Frequent comments regarding funding / budget concerns	
Some comments of being too car oriented, not enough reference to other modes	
Some comments that vision is not people-oriented	

Some suggestions that health and environment should be mentioned as a higher priority.	Existing vision has been amended slightly to incorporate health.
--	--

**Challenges**

<b><u>General Comments</u></b>	<b><u>Changes</u></b>
Generally wide agreement with challenges identified.	
Some comments requested changes to priority order of challenges- the challenges are listed in any intended priority order.	Sentence added clarifying that challenges are not in a priority order.
Some respondents made comments regarding ranking challenges by importance- the challenges are not ranked in any order.	Text added noting challenges are not ranked in any order of importance and removal of explicit numbering of challenges.
Suggestion by some respondents that challenges are too port/airport focused	Balance felt to be proportionate - no changes made.
Multiple comments identifying need for better PT as a challenge	Challenge 5 background helps to emphasise roles of public transport and active travel.
Multiple comments identifying greater support for active travel as a challenge	
Multiple comments regarding financial crisis and funding difficulties- and that funding improvements will be a challenge	Funding already identified as a challenge (Challenge 1)- no changes.
Most support respondents widening travel choice.	Noted.
Some comments that challenge 4 wording is too car oriented.	Challenge 4 reworded- "highway network" to "transport network"
Suggestions were made that a better explanation was needed as to why these had been identified as challenges.	Addition of more detailed background justifying all challenges in the final strategy compared to the consultation document.
<b><u>Specific Comments</u></b>	
Multiple comments suggesting need to recognise rural travel issues in challenges	Improved explanatory comments regarding Challenge 3 application to rural areas.
Some correspondents noting a lack of focus on environment protection/ climate change issues as a challenge	Creation of a new Challenge 7- incorporating reference to climate change/quality of life /environment issues – e.g. mitigating the adverse impacts of transport activity on people, communities and habitats.
Some correspondents suggesting improving quality of life a key challenge.	
Comments that Challenge 2 should link to supporting housing and employment growth	Wording of challenge and explanatory comments for Challenge 2 altered to reflect this and make reference to LDFs (housing & employment development)
Comments suggesting that Challenge 6 incorporate more focus on economic competitiveness.	Expanded wording of Challenge 6 title to reference economic competitiveness.
Queries regarding meaning of term "Journey Time Reliability" in Challenge 6	Journey Time Reliability added to glossary.
At presentations to businesses etc, the greatest concern encountered regarded	Expanded wording of Challenge 6 title to reference economic competitiveness and

congestion and journey time reliability and the significance of this as a challenge.	some other enhancements.
Some comments expressed a wish to add mention of regeneration to Challenge 6.	Added wording regarding regeneration opportunities to Challenges 2 and 6.
Need to better address cost of public transport and issues regarding low income areas and poverty highlighted by several responses.	Added extra text on quality and affordability of public transport to Challenge 2.  Added extra background text for Challenge 5 on these issues.

## **Outcomes**

<b><u>General Comments</u></b>	<b><u>Changes</u></b>
Regular request from all respondent types to prioritise active travel and public transport outcomes and strengthen their importance.  Multiple respondents noting concerns over concept of "reducing need to travel" - this was seen as a restrictive practice.	Outcome 1 and 2 wording changed to;  1) "Reduced dependence on the private car through increased number of people choosing public transport and active travel modes i.e.. walking and cycling" 2) "Improved awareness of the different travel options available to people for their journeys enabling informed choices about whether people travel and how."  It is felt that this re-wording should help address these comments.
Multiple comments regarding ability to deliver the outcomes with restricted funding and poor economic performance.	Already addressed in challenges and elsewhere.
Several comments referring to need to "push" car users out of cars as well as incentivise (ie "pull") in order to achieve modal shift.	No changes made. The strategy approach is one about improving choice, and encouraging behaviour change.
Some respondents were unclear what the drivers are for the outcomes.	Improved explanatory text linking outcomes to vision inserted in outcomes introduction.
Various comments on the fact the outcomes are linked/ dependent.	Wording in outcomes introduction expanded to note our recognition of this interdependency.
Various comments regarding insufficient emphasis placed upon environmental protection, climate change and reducing greenhouse gas emissions as an outcome.	Outcome 6 has been improved to include reference to greenhouse gas emissions.

## **Policies**

In light of the addition of a new policy on transport and the economy (Policy A), all subsequent policies have been re-titled with different letters. For example the former Policy A is now B, etc. The Policy titles below utilise this new lettering system.

<b><u>General Comments</u></b>	<b><u>Changes</u></b>
Some confusion regarding use of hyperlinks within text to link to details on delivery options and concepts.	Text explaining hyperlinks purpose already present in document introduction. No changes.
Respondents accorded a high level of importance to Policy H (active travel)	Noted.
Many respondents favoured delivery of measures which lower the impact and amount of car traffic.	Noted.
A number of respondents suggested that there needed to be a more explicit link demonstrating how transport links to economic prosperity.	A new policy (A) has been introduced to emphasise this link.
Some respondents favoured delivery of road infrastructure options primarily benefitting car drivers and road based PT.	Noted.
A need to emphasise the private operation of bus services within Policy I was identified.	Policy wording amended to address this.
Comments regarding wording of Policy K (rail improvements) and clarity of meaning	Policy K title has been reworded for better clarity regarding the role of the three LTAs in delivery of rail improvements and also regarding partnership working with the rail industry.
Comments regarding wording of Policy F (management of parking) and clarity of meaning	Policy F has not been re-worded as following discussion, it was agreed the original policy wording was adequate
<b><u>Specific Comments</u></b>	
Various responses favoured policies covering implementation of 20mph limits/zones in residential areas or as a general urban speed limit	In Policy G (road safety) we have included reference to consideration of implementing 20mph zones more widely.
Policy D does not explain how installation of more energy efficient street lighting and recycling of materials can help cut carbon emissions.	Wording of Policy D amended to address this.
Some comments requested that policies provided more detail on cycle infrastructure and other items	Details on local projects will be provided within Implementation Plans developed by Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council.

Several comments regarding schemes within Portsmouth.	These comments have been referred to PCC.
Several comments noting a preference for LRT and metro rail solutions rather than BRT.	Wording added to Policy K delivery options regarding feasibility study of light rail options In South Hampshire.
Comments received suggesting mention was needed of importance of cross-Solent ferry links to and from the Isle of Wight.	Policy J - minor rewording to emphasise the importance of cross-Solent ferry links to the Isle of Wight.
Several comments noting that there was no mention of Town Access Plans (TAPs) and measures within in the consultation documents.	TAPs have now been referenced in Policies H & I.
Several mentions of public rights of way issues and legislation which it was felt was omitted from consultation document.	Reference to rights of way improvement plans (ROWIPS) in Policy H- and that ROWIPS are the vehicle though which public rights of way issues are best handled.
Various comments regarding integration of land use / development planning and transport provision planning, especially in development areas.	No changes-Policy L already adequately covers this topic.
Several requests to highlight the links between and potential for active travel and health/health promotion	Health has been added to the vision, and elsewhere the emphasis placed on this within Policy H was considered to address this concern.
Suggestion that we should refer to Sport England design guidance for active travel	Not added- Policy M already includes reference to following principles in current design guidance.
Reference should be made to the PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy	Reference to this strategy made in glossary entry on Green Grids.
Some correspondents requested wording in Policy J to reflect movement of freight by sea over local distances.	Though Policy J is primarily intended to address interchange between passenger ferries and public transport, some text has been added regarding supporting port operators aspirations to increase freight moved by short sea shipping.
Various requested changes regarding references to ITS and network management throughout document.	Various detail changes made to improve clarity and correctness.
Comments requested we promote measures which will enable more freight to be moved by rail and make amendments to rail freight elements of policies.	Some amendments and changes have been made to wording of Policy K.
Some responses felt that reference to use of public transport for "everyday journeys" and that the types of journeys PT should be improved for should be specified.	Added text to Policy I outlining journey types (to work, shops, education, health and leisure facilities) that PT should be developed to represent an alternative to car travel for.

## Preferred Delivery Options

<u>Specific comments</u>	<u>Changes</u>
Multiple comments in support of better rail rolling stock, and provision for carriage of bikes on trains.	Noted. This point has already been addressed by Policy K
Multiple responses in favour of improved rail service quality and frequency and related enhancements.	Noted. This point has already been addressed by Policy K
Multiple comments in favour of improved parking at rail stations (for cars and bicycles)	Issue already addressed within Policy K but working improved; additional references added to Policy F.
Numerous comments in favour of options for better cycle, active travel infrastructure; also 'smarter choices' delivery options (travel plans/ car clubs etc)	None-already in Policy H
Numerous respondents in favour of general and some specific improvements to bus services	Noted. This point has already been addressed by Policy I.
A number of responses specifically in favour of integrated ticketing/ PT smart cards	Noted. This point has already been addressed by Policy I.
A number of responses specifically in favour of investment in road safety improvements. The need for more 20mph zones/ limits in urban areas was raised.	Noted, already covered by Policy G. Reference to consideration of more 20mph zones / limits in urban areas as a delivery option has been added.
A number of responses favouring improvements to rural public transport.	Noted.
Several responses requested greater coverage of needs of commercial vehicles and freight movement.	Changes include reference to TfSH freight strategy in policy list, and also extra delivery options in Policy F regarding commercial vehicle parking and loading.
Some comments on Policy F suggested consideration of parking was too car-centric and should include bicycles and motorcycles/ mopeds.	Bicycle parking infrastructure covered in Policy H already, but reference to motorcycle/ moped parking added to Policy F.
Some comments on Policy F highlighted need for references to the specific needs of disabled/ less mobile car users.	New delivery option regarding consideration of requirements of blue badge holders added to Policy F.
Some uncertainty regarding meaning of	wording in Policy E has been amended to

wording of "private car hire schemes" in Policy E.	clarify this.
Various comments regarding Policy N noted that safeguarding land is essential for delivery of improvements to all modes, not just road modes, and policy should reflect this.	Have incorporated reference to safeguarding land for rail development; also added text regarding developer led highway improvements.
Some respondents wanted to see more reference to measures to support taxi services.	Text in Policy I delivery options amended to include taxi ranks.

**Non-preferred Delivery Options**

<b><u>Specific comments</u></b>	<b><u>Changes</u></b>
Numerous respondents noted that Policy J and measures within should not be a priority.	Noted.
Several responses cited Policy M improvements as being too expensive and undesirable from a financial point of view.	No changes to Policy M are considered necessary.
Various responses objecting to demand management concepts within Policy F	No change to Policy F to be made.  Policy F is not aimed at demand management, but rather better use and management of parking- a resource that is costly in terms of land use and in some instances under significant pressure.