Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026

Consultation Workshops

Wiltshire Council
Where everybody matters

Contents   Page

Introduction

During November 2010, Wiltshire Council invited various stakeholders and other interested parties to attend one of four consultation workshops (see below) to discuss the development of the third Wiltshire Local Transport Plan (LTP3):

- 1st November 2010 –The Corn Exchange, Devizes
- 3rd November 2010 –County Hall, Trowbridge
- 9th November 2010 –Town Hall, Chippenham
- 16th November 2010 –City Hall, Salisbury.

Format of event

The events had five distinct sections:

- Introduction and presentation
- One minute views
- Workshop 1
- Workshop 2
- Discussion and end

Attendees were allocated to tables for each workshop. For workshop 1, the aim was to have a good mix of people with varying interests at each table. For workshop 2, attendees were asked in advance to state their preferred choice so that those with the same interest were grouped together. In general, there were between 5-10 people at each table including a Wiltshire Council officer who acted as a facilitator and note taker.

Following the introduction and Powerpoint presentation on the development of the LTP3, a number of those attending were invited to offer a 'one minute view' on a transport subject of their choice (see page 7).

The first workshop was then concerned with the overall strategy of the main LTP3 (see page 9). Three broad questions were posed which are included at relevant points in this document. As part of question 2, attendees were asked to place three green dots (signifying a high(er) priority) and one orange dot (signifying a low(er) priority) against the investment priorities proposed in the draft LTP3.

The second workshop focused on the freight, public transport and road safety strategies (see page 36). Again, specific questions were posed which are included at relevant points in this document.

Purpose and structure of document

The purpose of this document is to provide a record of each of the four LTP3 workshop events. It should be noted, however, that this is based on notes taken by the facilitator which reflect the thrust and most significant discussion points, and not a verbatim record.

The workshop sections have been formatted by question, then by event and then by table. The exception is the first part of question 1 of workshop one which has been formatted by theme. As a result, each of the comments in this section have been

referenced to the relevant event and table (i.e. T1-DV = Table 1 in Devizes) in the text.

Details of the attendees, table allocations and facilitators are provided in appendix 1 and 2.

Along with other consultation responses and evidence, this document will be considered by council officers in revising the draft LTP3. The final Wiltshire LTP3 will then be considered by the council's Cabinet and full Council in February 2011.

One Minute Views

Devizes

Speaker	One minute views
Kate Freeman	• Validity of consultation – so many items are missing from the LTP3 that it should be considered a "working document". • Should copy Buckinghamshire County Council and include 'Big Society' in LTP3 (i.e. a section on voluntary strategies).
Ian Sharpe	• Devizes – no bypass – gridlock on Northgate and two roundabouts. • Problem with new Brewery Corner – only room for one car. • Tailback coming out of Wharf every Friday.
Peter Crocker	• Minety Parish Council – problem with buses to Malmesbury and getting back (have to arrange a taxi the day before, no good in an emergency). Public transport facilities useless in spite of 1200 population.

Graham Ellis	• Taking up the theme of making better use of existing things:
	  • Let's not have buses running 2 minutes apart [then a long gap].
	  • Improve bus/rail connections. Better parking at stations. 30% population rural, 70% towns – public transport in towns should be better.

Rolf Brindle	• Request rail service improvements at Melksham [cited existing service].
Humph Jones	• Requested guidance on advertising signs. Some sympathy with people using signs in current economy, but signs cause a distraction problem. What should be left in place and what taken down.

Trowbridge

Speaker	One minute views
Gerald Milward-Oliver	• The most important goal identified in the earlier LTP3 Issues Paper consultation was 'quality of life' and yet this is effectively being ignored in the council's draft LTP3. • The council needs to assist local communities source additional funding and facilitate community involvement in transport-related issues. • The draft LTP3 does not adequately cover the issues of reducing carbon emissions.
Jeff Osborne	• Representatives on the Transforming Trowbridge initiative were not informed that the allocated £90k was being removed from the budget. There is a strong need for a transport strategy to be developed for Trowbridge - developments will come through regardless.
Martin Moyes	• While in favour of sustainable transport, the council and the LTP3 needs to put walking networks in communities and cycling networks between communities. Currently, the draft LTP3 has this the wrong way round.
Jenny Raggett	• Communities need evidence to make judgements on transport (e.g. maps) showing congestion and public transport provision - should be included in the LTP3.
Simon Hetzel	• Would echo Mr Milward Oliver's comments. • Intimidated by the amount of information on the council's transport web pages. • The goals of the draft LTP3 conflicts with the consultation response to the earlier Issues Paper.
Phil Davey	• The Army is important in Wiltshire and doesn't get the importance it warrants. Many Army personnel and their families feel isolated as public transport services are either not available or operate at the wrong times • There should be more priority attached to rural areas in the LTP3.

Chippenham

Speaker	One minute views
Anne Lock	• Contrary to the LTP3, Wiltshire is not a predominately rural county. • The 'radical' option, identified as the top priority during the LTP3 Issues Paper consultation, has not been reflected in the draft LTP3 - this is dispiriting to consultees. • It should be made clear to consultees that Wiltshire Council will include road schemes as part of sustainable transport packages.

Salisbury

Speaker	One minute views
Margaret Willmot	• LTP3 is an incomplete document. It's supposed to cover all policies and delivery plans. There is no Salisbury area transport strategy. We were told that there would be a [Salisbury] options and assessment report in February 2010. • The LTP3 was supposed to be a long term vision. Shortage of funding should not halt production of the long-term vision.
Clive Upton	• I'm an advocate of park and ride, however, [in Salisbury] it's not going to work unless "things happen". A recent TV item compared [P&R in] Oxford with Salisbury. It's costing us £1m because we have low car parking costs. Either we have to increase cost or reduce [the amount of] parking.
Chris Andrews	• Two problems – town and country are different things. We have not been told how much it costs to run a bus [see notes for table 3]. Have a Link scheme or similar and scrap a whole lot of buses.
David Carroll	• If the car parking charges are increased, then Salisbury will die – Salisbury's life is shopping.
Chris Cochrane	• Please could the LTP3 collate a description of the statutory duties.

Workshop One – Overall Strategy

Question 1 – specific comments

❏ Can the strategy package outlined be improved without increasing the cost?

❏ Which elements should be strengthened or omitted? Are there other measures that should be included?

Road safety
- There should be more emphasis on preventing speeding. In discussion, agreed speed is the immediate cause of many accidents, but need to consider underlying causes (why was the vehicle going too fast?). (**T1-DV**)
- Less consensus on what should be done – partly a policing issue (not seen by some as part of council's business); better roads could allow faster journeys without drivers taking risks – but might just encourage them to go even faster. (**T1-DV**)
- There was general consensus in support of council's approach. (**T2-DV**)
- Congestion and safety around schools seen as a significant issue and a difficult to achieve strategy through school travel plans. (**T6-DV**)
- It was generally agreed that the preferred options are appropriate; School Travel Plans and safety measures considered important. One view that STPs should have greater prominence as a way of reducing congestion and safety issues around schools; but a counter view that in a rural county many people have to use their cars and this will limit STP effectiveness (**T1-TB**)
- Why can't we have a pedestrian crossing if we can raise the money? (**T5-TB**)
- Seems to be a re-active policy rather than a pro-active policy. (**T1-CH**)
- We shouldn't be basing all road safety measures around accident black spots. (**T1-CH**)
- Need to target young drivers – may be an issue that needs to be addressed by central government. (**T1-CH**)
- Some road safety issues are being dealt with at a local level now by town and parish councils – this seems to be working well. (**T1-CH**)
- It was considered that there is a lot of needless argument about road safety because everybody considers themselves an expert. To avoid this, the council should give advice at a much earlier stage to parishes who consider they have a road safety problem. (**T2-SA**)
- Swindon Borough Council removed their safety cameras based on political and philosophical grounds. Wiltshire Council appears to have removed their safety cameras based on partly economic grounds. What is Wiltshire Council's political/philosophical position to safety cameras? What is the future for safety cameras in Wiltshire? (**T4-SA**)
- There needs to be a distinction between removing cameras from 'cash cow' sites and removing them from accident sites. (**T4-SA**)
- A way forward may be to use mobile speeding signs - the Amesbury Area Board operates one of these which it transfers around the parishes. (**T4-SA**)
- There is also the issue of the perception of speed - many cars look like they are speeding but on checking are actually not. (**T4-SA**)
- More clarity is needed about the council's position on speed cameras. General support for cameras and concerns that they would be removed. (**T5-SA**)

Freight

- There was general consensus that voluntary lorry routeing is ineffective (especially since growth of satnav use) **(T1-DV)**
- There was general consensus that Westbury freight interchange would be effective in taking freight off roads **(T1-DV)**
- There was general consensus that the current routing of lorries is ineffective. satnavs are at the heart of the issue because they are not suitable for routing lorries. Strong and compulsory controls are needed to ensure correct routing. **(T2-DV)**
- It was agreed that freight routeing is important but consensus that advisory routes are ineffective. **(T1-TB)**
- Freight should be routed by better signage at all levels/tiers. **(T4-TB)**
- The freight strategy would particularly support economic growth and it would also contribute to other objectives. It could involve investment at traffic 'bottlenecks'. satnavs cause a lot of the problems by routing lorries on unsuitable roads and addressing this needs to be part of the strategy. Improving the resilience of the network would also support economic growth. **(T2-TB)**
- Doubt that voluntary approach to freight routing will work – lorry drivers will take the shortest route. **(T3-CH)**
- Many rural and urban areas suffering from an increase in freight traffic because of satnav systems. There is a need to lobby government to deal with this issue. **(T5-CH)**
- Increasing pressures for more sand and gravel extraction are resulting in an increase in freight traffic and associated impacts in many areas i.e. Kingston St Michael and Latton. **(T5-CH)**
- Voluntary measures are not suitable for controlling freight movements. **(T5-CH)**
- Need to work with the Police more to enforce freight management measures. **(T5-CH)**
- Need to link enforcement with the planning system. **(T5-CH)**
- Increased emphasis should be given to rail freight especially given the LTP3's timescale to 2026. At the same time, the rationalisation of road freight should be pursued by the council where possible. The council should also lobby the Government over the increase in VAT in fuel for the freight industry. The carbon impact of freight routing should be included in any analysis together with the economic and social impacts. If the industry doesn't change its ways, then communities will put increasing pressure on the council and industry to change. In essence, the council needs to be more ambitious with regard to freight. **(T7-CH)**
- The freight strategy was considered one of the most important things for the economy of Wiltshire. However, attendees found it difficult to make more useful comments on the strategy as not enough detail in the summary notes. **(T2-SA)**
- A local working group wants to deprime the A338 as it is a poor route for the movement of lorries which cause damage to roadside properties and severance in communities. The alternative routes would be the A34 and M3 which would provide fuel efficient alternatives to businesses and hauliers. **(T4-SA)**
- Freight – voluntary lorry routes considered to be ineffective. Need to monitor and enforce as well. **(T1-SA)**
- The effectiveness of voluntary measures was questioned. **(T5-SA)**
- Strong support for improved signage/sign review for freight (particularly to give advanced warning of low bridges). **(T5-SA)**
- There was some support for GPS issues to be addressed. **(T5-SA)**

Cycling

- Agreed that strategy should include reference to safe cycling routes into towns from nearby villages (as well as within the towns). However, may need a culture change to encourage greater cycle use. **(T1-DV)**

- Not much interest as this was considered a leisure pursuit. Consensus that measures to enhance safety would be appropriate. **(T2-DV)**
- Cycling and walking issues have been promoted for years but without any real gains/benefits. What is the evidence of uptake vs. investment? **(T4-TB)**
- Cycling has proved unachievable and should not be chased. **(T4-TB)**
- The wording in both cycling and walking should read "Facilitate a sympathetically designed" and "Provide". **(T4-TB)**
- Cycling / Walking should have a strategy now regardless of future housing allocations **(T4-CH)**
- Cycling and walking should be the primary concern in the long term strategy plan **(T4-CH)**
- There should be more cycle routes between villages and nearby towns to substitute for car journeys. **(T5-TB)**
- This doesn't help groups like the elderly. **(T5-TB)**
- Cycle routes could provide collateral benefits for mobility-impaired groups – e.g. buggies or motability scooters – but the current erratic provision of drop-kerbs would need sorting. **(T5-TB)**
- Staverton has a cycle-route, but it is not joined-up to the wider network **(T5-TB)**
- Value-for-money: if money is tight, join up two parts of network instead of creating another isolated section. **(T5-TB)**
- Emphasis on market towns seems sensible and sustainable. **(T5-CH)**
- Some confusion over the definition of 'market towns' – this may exclude some larger settlements which may benefit from improvements in cycling infrastructure. **(T5-CH)**
- National Cycle Routes are good for tourism (not just meeting transport objectives) and should therefore be more actively promoted. **(T5-CH)**
- Cycle training for all school children should be in place (it is understood that the budget for cycle training school children has been cut). **(T5-CH)**
- We shouldn't just be building cycle routes for cyclists, but also for those with disabilities, particularly for those that use mobility scooters to get around. **(T5-CH)**
- While riding on pavements is a safety issue, people often do this because the roads are too dangerous. The road and user hierarchy should seek to encourage cycling and there should be every encouragement for people to cycle to bus/rail stations, schools, etc. Cycle networks need to be comprehensive and well signed - new roads should include cycle lanes as a matter of course. Adequate lighting needs to be provided for cycle parking. The council should look to Brighton and London and pilot cycle hire in one of Wiltshire's towns. Better use should be made of publicity for both cycling and walking (e.g. route maps provided in newspapers). **(T7-CH)**
- Some confusion around priorities given for cycling and walking, as they are both sustainable forms why they are at different priority levels. **(T3-DV)**
- A strongly held view that cycling is completely irrelevant and cannot be a practical mode of transport in a rural area like Wiltshire. An opposing view that cycling will become increasingly important in the future so should be catered for. All agreed that the behaviour of cyclists needs to be improved. **(T2-SA)**
- "No sane person would cycle or walk on the A36" "I do" I've cycled in London but Wiltshire is more terrifying. **(T3-SA)**
- The cycling section in the LTP seems to focus on cycling in towns. Cycling to Porton Down holds everyone [in motor vehicles] up due to the narrow roads. Porton Down should be a priority [for a cycle route] as it's a large employer. Stonehenge is another example [of a rural large attractor] I employ people [at Stonehenge] but there's no public transport. **(T3-SA)**
- There are practical difficulties putting cycle lanes on minor roads.   Have we thought of putting cycle routes on rights of way? ….not to allow motorcycles! Any bridleway can be used by a bicycle. I both ride a cycle and a horse, but imagine

an outcry if bridleways were covered in tarmac for a cycleway. How many people would use these rural routes? We have to balance benefits and costs. What are the relative costs of a cycleway compared with a rural bus service? What's the cost if you have [mostly?] fair-weather cyclists? **(T3-SA)**

- Urban areas have the large numbers of people [to justify cycle routes] and it will reduce parking requirements. **(T3-SA)**
- Cycling to transport hubs in rural areas? Why isn't this supported [cited instance where "council" refused to have cycle stands at bus stop]. Park-and-cycle should be tried in urban areas. **(T3-SA)**
- [the topic fizzled out without the rural proponents attempting to counter the two views that supported urban priority on account of presumed better cost-benefit performance. However, in the whole, the consensus could be that *if* demand for a rural cycle facility could be demonstrated, then it should be considered on its merits and not be a casualty of urban prejudice in the policy]. **(T3-SA)**
- Cycling – do not support cycle paths unless they are well segregated; current practice of painting white line to separate cycle lane from other traffic on busy roads is not safe. Not against cycling per se, but need to develop a 'cycling culture' (as in parts of Europe) or infrastructure remains unused. **(IW-SA)**
- Agreed with options, but important to look at routes to villages as well as in market towns. Some wanted to use the existing assessment criteria to priorities these links (i.e. by distance to amenities, etc), but most people did not know what these were.

Walking
- Agreed that walking routes need to be well maintained – this is not currently the case; there should be routine systematic inspection of footpaths in the same way as for roads. Especially important for the elderly. Is this something that Parish Councils could take on? **(T1-DV)**
- The general consensus that this is not important as a transport issue. Walking between towns and villages is considered only suitable as a leisure activity. Walking within towns and villages is something people can do for themselves without intervention by the council. **(T2-DV)**
- An access strategy for walkers is required. **(T5-CH)**
- The needs of the mobility impaired need to be considered more. **(T5-CH)**
- Walking and cycling strategies should not be separate and should be within the sustainable transport packages strategy. **(T6-DV)**
- Walking as a lower priority because 'people will walk if they want to', don't need nanny state. **(T5-SA)**

Maintenance
- There is general consensus that this is important **(T2-DV)**
- Removing road signs: has worked well removing traffic signals alters behaviour of drivers and pedestrians **(T3-CH)**
- There is an issue with utility companies not putting the road back as they found it, more checks need to be done and further enforcement needed. **(T5-CH)**
- Great deal of damage to road surfaces due to utility works. **(T5-CH)**
- Some villages have C class roads but suffer from A class levels of traffic - there is therefore a mismatch between maintenance needs and budgets. Maintenance should also include cycleways and footways as well as roads. Is it realistic to improve the maintenance of Wiltshire's road network given future funding levels? There are many instances of overgrown trees, hedges obstructing footpaths, signs, etc - while the Parish Stewards are good, they need to be more proactive. **(T7-CH)**

- There was a consensus that highways maintenance is much poorer in Wiltshire than other areas of the country. This was important for freight routes and to encourage cycling. **(T6-SA)**
- Freight routes should be a priority for maintenance to ensure that they are safe for other road users – issue of potholes being dangerous for cyclists and drivers. **(T6-SA)**
- Highway maintenance needs to be improved to promote cycling. **(T6-SA)**
- Roads leading to employment areas should be a priority for gritting and snow clearance. This is undertaken much better in neighbouring authorities. **(T6-SA)**
- Maintenance – agree that well maintained roads are important to support economy; if funding allowed, should look for upgrading of some routes as well. Is a link to freight routeing as some of the road damage is due to use by inappropriate vehicles. **(T1-SA)**
- Maintenance was considered the other most important thing for the economy in Wiltshire, particularly bridge maintenance. Agreed that too much resource was spent on upgrading and strengthening bridges on minor roads instead of on the main routes – we should take a much more flexible approach to meeting EU requirements. **(T2-SA)**
- Maintenance should be a high priority. Should encompass pavements and cycleways as well. **(T5-SA)**
- Agreement with the bridges option. **(T5-SA)**

Public transport
- Consensus that public transport was of very limited relevance in a rural area because of the limited levels of service. Jerry Kunkler was very emphatic that taxis were over regulated – "too much red tape". Consensus that this applied to Community Transport too, although both were useful for rural transport. **(T2-DV**)
- Public Transport should be split into road and rail categories. **(T4-DV)**
- More minibus use rather than large bus use should be encouraged. **(T4-DV)**
- Train fares are too high to promote rail and will be exasperated further once the subsidies are withdrawn. **(T4-DV)**
- If the council cannot influence rail provision should it be in there at all? **(T4-DV)**
- Promoting public transport for commuting also suggested as important, and that business travel plans could be used to achieve this. **(T1-TB)**
- Should be aiming for a step change in public transport attractiveness and use (similar to European towns) over the next 15 years, although accept that this needs a change in culture, funding and legislation **(T1-CH)**
- Land use planning should direct development to locations where can be effectively served by public transport; and also to develop attractive urban lifestyles so people choose to live near their work **(T1-CH)**
- Bus timetabling needs to adjust as the population ages more use of public transport will be required. **(T4-CH)**
- The current bus service isn't what is required. **(T5-TB)**
- Holt appallingly served. **(T5-TB)**
- Talked to residents – came up with a circular route "better than sparse hub and spoke". **(T5-TB)**
- Small buses aren't suitable for shopping. **(T5-TB)**
- Have a bus pass but can't use the bus. **(T5-TB)**
- More investment in Park and Ride needed. **(T5-CH)**
- Further investment in railway station parking required, many station car parks get full very quickly. **(T5-CH)**
- Integration with bus and rail network very important, particularly in terms of timetabling. **(T5-CH)**

- If our goal is to reduce carbon emissions surely we need to be providing more than just an <u>adequate</u> public transport service? **(T5-CH)**
- Bus viability and costs come into the equation with public transport. **(T5-CH)**
- Again the general perception emerged that too many buses are running around empty. Although there is a need to maintain access more consideration should be given to community transport, link and Connect2Wiltshire as a more economical approach. It is important to take measures to increase the usage of buses. The council should lead such measures with its own arrangements, e.g. all workers in Salisbury centre should be obliged to use the park and ride rather than drive into the city. **(T2-SA)**
- There is low patronage on the park and ride services in Salisbury - the council needs to encourage more people to use the Park and Ride services. However, Salisbury lacks the retail to sustain higher parking charges for shoppers. It is therefore a delicate balance between encouraging the worker and protecting the shopper. There was general support for an increase in long-stay parking charges and for the council to implement bus priority measures on the park and ride routes. **(T4-SA)**
- It was also suggested that the council could do more to encourage cyclists to use the Park and Ride services and that, given recently publicised patronage figures, smaller buses should be used - the current park and ride buses could then be diverted to run on rural services. This would also help to deal with the adverse impact buses have on Salisbury's air quality. **(T4-SA)**
- Bus fares were a disincentive to using public transport. I have a concessionary pass. Buses zero-cost [to me] but I still use the car because of convenience, and because the buses don't serve the destinations I need. There is a need for more integration **(T3-SA)**
- There was a debate on replacing some infrequent bus services with LINK. Are there enough volunteer drivers to extend LINK? Combine LINK with car share? Rural context – people are more trusting than in towns". I wouldn't say that in Wilts" [comparison made with Manchester, so I think the point was that towns in Wiltshire were almost rural as far as trust was concerned]. "How would you feel if LINK came to pick up your 15-year daughter and you didn't like the look of the driver? Use recommendations on the Web. [Comparison made with house-share system] **(T3-SA)**
- Very important for younger generation to get them into good habits. Very important for the older generation who give up their cars. More consideration for villages needed. **(T5-SA)**
- Agreement that rural services needed support because some people are reliant on them. General agreement that services were not good enough e.g. not frequent enough, booking 3 days in advance is not convenient, etc. Some believed that people in rural areas would not get out of their cars to use the bus and that buses could not be used for shopping. **(T5-SA)**
- Support for the better integration of park and ride with existing bus services. **(T5-SA)**

Smarter choices
- Lack of agreement that this approach is appropriate for rural areas **(T2-DV)**
- Smarter choices are unachievable **(T4-DV)**
- A 50/50 split was found on the issue of smarter choices with good arguments for the pros and cons. Although some confusion was mentioned onto the terminology used and if residential and business plans could realistically be mandatorily applied. **(T4-TB)**

- It was suggested to develop social networks in villages for lift sharing, to reduce single car occupancy trips. Also 'park and share' sites near major road junctions / edge of town where can park and then car share. **(T1-CH)**
- Current options are constrained by the lack of buses/safe cycle routes. **(T5-TB)**
- More emphasis needs to be placed on the marketing and dissemination of 'travel smart' information. **(T5-CH)**
- Technology, information and awareness are all essential. **(T5-CH)**
- Wiltshire Council should develop a smarter choices 'toolkit' and then work with communities, parish and town councils and housing associations to implement smarter choices. **(T7-CH)**
- Working from home is encouraged at Porton Down through the provision of an IT link. **(T7-SA)**
- The attendees queried why are school travel plans given a higher priority than business travel plans. **(T6-SA)**
- Put as lower priority - people did not understand what this meant. Conflicting opinions: some believed these were very effective, others believed they didn't work. General agreement that people needed to have choices available to them (e.g. better bus services) before they could be persuaded to use alternatives to the car. **(T5-SA)**

Network management

- There was general consensus that the idea of a traffic control centre is not necessary for a rural area such as Wiltshire. Radio stations do a perfectly good job of reporting traffic congestion so people can avoid it. The idea of a hierarchy of roads had support in the context of keeping traffic away from residential streets. **(T2-DV)**
- There is a need to link more road improvements with the planning system. **(T5-CH)**
- Use developer contributions wherever possible to improve the road network. **(T5-CH)**
- The idea of a traffic control centre was not welcomed. It was considered unnecessary, over elaborate and too expensive for Wiltshire. **(T2-SA)**
- So much traffic goes through Salisbury because all the roads go into it - a bypass needs to be included in any long-term strategy. **(T4-SA)**
- There are instances of rat-running (e.g. along the Portway) to avoid local delays. **(T4-SA)**
- Most people are happy with Salisbury the way it is and would not agree with further growth. **(T4-SA)**
- The road user hierarchy was not understood**. (T5-SA)**
- We already have traffic management – what's going to be different? **(T5-SA)**
- Scepticism about improvements: the RTPI system hasn't worked well. **(T5-SA)**

Rights of way

- Rights of way around some places have been compromised by development **(T5-TB)**
- Should have closer liaison with walking groups **(T3-CH)**
- Walkers don't currently have a right to trim hedges etc. **(T3-CH)**
- Can the RoW dept. give permission for footpath clearance? **(T3-CH)**
- Landowners not happy with that? **(T3-CH)**
- Even a problem in towns – footpaths between gardens **(T3-CH)**
- There is not just a need for ongoing maintenance; RUPPs are suffering damage from use by 4x4 vehicles and need restrictions on use **(T1-SA)**
- There was concern that less used routes would be neglected. Strong support for 'Big Society' input i.e. volunteers, Community Payback, people on JSA, etc to look after less well used rights of way. **(T5-SA)**

Structures

- Bridge strengthening – difficulties with Network Rail **(T3-CH)**

Question 1 - general comments

<u>**Devizes**</u>

Table 2
The council's thinking was considered too reliant on ideas developed for urban areas, which are not so appropriate in a rural county like Wiltshire. Examples of 'urban' thinking:
- Traffic control centre.
- Smarter choices (there are no practical alternatives to driving in rural parts).
- Public Transport (too sparse to be an alternative).
- Walking (destinations too far apart).
- Cycling enhancements.

Chris Humphries made a comment that promoting equal opportunity shouldn't be the least important priority and there was no argument about it.

Table 3
The following comments were made on behalf of table 3:
- National Goals are ok consensus around table.
- Adverse remark about the "loose statements" contained in the LTP [so ambiguous that they don't actually convey much meaning].
- Infrastructure based measures should be included such as charging points for electric cars.

A large section of the discussion concerned speed limits, particularly in villages. Enford cited (as represented at the table). National speed limit was incompatible with the coexistence of a Sustrans route. It was suggested that simply changing the limit wouldn't work, and that an engineered solution would be required.

A similar issue concerned the Ridgeway, where the C32 was involved – no footway, national speed limit, and presence of walkers and NCN45 giving an unsatisfactory mix. Group was prompted to put these concerns into a county-wide policy.

There was general consensus on:-
Slower speed limits should be achieved in certain locations, the benefits of which outweighed the small additions to journey times. Appropriate situations were:
- Where there is a safety issue
- Villages where houses front directly onto the road
- Roads forming part of the cycle network (talking here about lanes etc where there is no segregated cycleway)
- Walking routes (from the context, lanes etc with no segregated footway).

Omissions from strategy:
- Dealing with irresponsible cyclist behaviour
- Horse riders (cited safety issues – riding at dusk with no lights)
- Walking to school in the context of village problems.

It was suggested that "bite sized chunks" were the way to make progress.

The following comments were also made on behalf of table 3:

- General acceptance of goals although but not much interest shown as it was felt that they didn't necessarily represent Wiltshire's goals.
- Economic recovery should be the most important goal.
- It was felt that there needed to be an over-arching document to tie this strategy up with others to work toward an integrated approach to planning.
- All strategies should look to improve coordination with communities including parish and town councils (emphasised for school travel plans).
- It was felt very strongly that rural communities were under represented and strategies should include a consideration of how they are applied in rural areas. (public transport emphasised).
- Consideration of the voluntary sector, could a separate strategy be developed or added to strategies. Some discussion around how public transport might make use of volunteers to run rural public schemes.

Table 5
The following comments were made on behalf of table 5:
- There needs to be a rebalancing between the needs of industry and the damage caused to communities by HGV movements - it is risible that inappropriate roads in conservation areas are being used by lorries.
- The draft LTP3 lacks substance although this it is understood that this is somewhat because of current circumstances. The council should get back to basics (i.e. concentrating on the economy and quality of life) because it doesn't have the resources to do any more.
- There is a lack of joined up thinking in transport generally. Councils should be able to put some pressure on private operators and there should be more emphasis on simple solutions and better levels of integration as is practised in the Netherlands and Germany. The disappearance of the Quiet Lanes initiative does not inspire much confidence in the council.
- Greater need for joint funding e.g. between councils, Network Rail and parish councils.
- Dealing with a number of traffic blackspots would improve people's quality life - the council has rather a narrow-minded perspective.
- Following the decision on the A350 Westbury bypass, there has been a lack of progress on the West Ashton scheme - where is the funding?

Table 7
There was general consensus that the preferred strategy options were all very similar, and the consequence of ranking one above the other was some what irrelevant as they were all interlinked in some format. It was outlined that a more common sense approach to improving the existing transport network should be adopted, but appreciative that with a county the size of Wiltshire there would be anomalies in the service provided.

Trowbridge

Table 1
There was general agreement that (in contrast to view expressed by someone in the 'one minute view' slots) promoting economic growth should be a key transport objective; without growth there will be no money for other desirable activities. There was a view that it should be specifically promoting local (Wiltshire) economic growth to reduce long distance commuting and hence congestion/emissions.

Table 2

Most of the other options also support growth indirectly by making Wiltshire a preferred place to shop or locate a business.

Objectives about health and safety such as SO14 and SO8 are possibly not a practical way to achieve the preferred strategy options in the current economic climate.

There should be a strategy to improve management of highway work by the council. The programming of work is wasteful, e.g. road improvements are carried out and then the road layout is changed in the same place shortly afterwards. Another example at Bradford on Avon where a high quality paved road surface was installed while nearby building works was continuing so the new surface was damaged by heavy lorries.

Table 3

The draft LTP3 doesn't seem to contain much on community transport and disabled issues - these and other issues should be highlighted at the start of the document. The LTP3 strategy is built on discrete elements when it should be built in an integrated manner (e.g. between modes and areas). The LTP3 also requires a stronger 'visioning' element.

There is not enough recognition in the draft LTP3 of the importance of Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge. There is a need for holistic transport strategies to be developed for Trowbridge to support the 'Transforming Trowbridge Vision' - otherwise development will just take place without a strategic context having been set. It was suggested that the Historic Core Zone study and report for Bradford on Avon should be used as a template for rolling out similar community transport initiatives in the rest of Wiltshire.

Table 4

The strategy options are all small scale, approach needs to change (no real evidence of practical alternatives suggested)

The terms in the LTP3 need further clarification. Both the draft LTP3 and in particular the electronic version on the consultation portal should provide definitions of technical terminology and examples of schemes, measures, etc. In doing so, this would be helpful for members of the public who may be put off contributing otherwise.

Table 6

- The listed strategies key to achieving the national goals were judged by the group as follows:
    - S03 – Reduce the impact of traffic on people's quality of life.
    - S06 – To make the best use of existing infrastructure.
    - S09 – To reduce the impact of traffic speeds in towns and villages
    - S05 - To improve sustainable access to a full range of opportunities particularly for people without a car.

- Overall there was general agreement that the national goals were broadly correct but felt that for many the quality of life issue was very much linked to supporting economic growth. Quality of life was repeatedly raised as the no.1 key priority.

- With regard to the strategic options, the following comments were made:

- o No mention of historic towns.
- o No mention of historic core zones.
- o Area based strategies focused on the larger towns with no mention of small towns such as Bradford-on-Avon or Westbury.
- o SO2 Sustainable Transport is ranked as 'High' in terms of investment priorities but is only ranked as 'Medium' in the strategic transport objectives shown at Table 5.3 [in the draft LTP3].

<u>Chippenham</u>

Table 1
Things not included (or adequately covered);
- Recognition of special issues for communities (e.g. Purton) on the edge of the Swindon urban area. Local infrastructure already can't cope with impact of Swindon's growth – e.g. traffic volumes on narrow roads; rat-running by people commuting into Swindon. There is a need for joint working with Swindon BC to agree a common strategy which deals with impacts on Wiltshire 'fringe'.
- Need a more holistic view of planning and transport, and actions to guide planning decisions so that delivery of transport objectives can be achieved; not just a reactive approach.
- Should be a high level strategic priority to reduce the need for travel and particularly car use, with strategy options aligned to this. Should challenge the assumption that traffic will always increase.

Table 2
- SO1 –Consensus that it will be important to meet the goals but many of the other strategic objectives will play a part in achieving it. The same applies to SO12.
- SO2 – Cycling is not considered a practical means of transport in rural areas because of safety. SO8 and SO9 would need to be tackled first.
- SO3, SO8, SO9 and SO10 cover the big issue that dominated discussion at the table. Consensus that volume and speed of traffic frustrates efforts to meet the other objectives in the rural areas like cycling and safe routes to school. The roads are inappropriate for the traffic now using them. There is also a problem with routing of lorries. Often they use roads that are not suitable, even when there is an agreement about which route they should take.
- SO4 – Main cause of delay seen to be bad co-ordination of road works by Wiltshire Council. People want all the work in one place to be done at once so that the road is not repeatedly dug up.
- SO5 – Consensus about the importance of this but it is regarded as applying to other people, especially elderly people.
- SO6 – Supported the need for better co-ordination with adjacent authorities in areas near the county boundary.
- SO7 – Consensus this was not a bad thing but not seen as important
- SO13 and SO15 also seen as particularly important.

Table 3
"Its very hard to fault the list".

Table 4
- The council's priorities oppose those of the consultation responses; this proves that the consultation and process is indeed a farce. How will we be able to maintain highways or any of these other elements without the funding required?

- This is a pointless exercise as the funding streams are not known .
- Consensus that 'behavioural' carrot and stick are the correct approaches in some aspects but that the plan does not promote this.
- Wiltshire is not rural it is urban; 'this has been proved'.
- Maybe Wiltshire should consider separate urban and rural policies.
- Sustainable transport packages are for large cities not for market towns.
- The A350 should be a separate policy issue due to its strategic importance to the county**.**

Table 5
- More emphasis is needed on linking in with the planning system.
- Suggested a new strategic transport objective SO19 that states that development/strategic planning will be better linked to the provision of transport infrastructure.

Table 6
There was broad disagreement on which of the listed strategies were key to achieving the national goals, this was understandable given the diversity of the group members, however, there was some consensus on the following:
- S05 - To improve sustainable access to a full range of opportunities particularly for people without a car.
- S04 - To minimise traffic delays and disruption and improve journey times.
- S01 - To support and help the economic vitality, viability and resilience of Wiltshire's economy.
- S06 – To make the best use of the existing infrastructure through effective design, management and maintenance.
- S02 - To provide, support and /or promote a choice of sustainable transport options.

Salisbury

Table 4
The allocation of 'least important' to equality of opportunity is stark and seems to be out of step with the emerging community strategy. There is a need to cater for those (e.g. the old and young in rural areas) who don't have the opportunities offered to most car users.

Table 5
It is unclear what the strategy means for villages. There should be more focus on rural areas.
The strategy should be more ambitious and long-term. Some did not want to prioritise – should try to do everything.
Too much time and money has been spent on studies, and not enough on delivery.
LTP2 failed to deliver many of its promises.

Table 7
There was general agreement that national transport goals are ok but reducing carbon emissions should be less important than economy for this LTP period.

Question 2 – priorities

❑ Which options would you change to a different priority and why?

❑ Do we need to prioritise options?

❑ Is it to simplistic to prioritise options in this way? How else could we target available funding?

Devizes

Table 1
Some difficulty in understanding what was meant by some of the options (e.g. urban traffic control, sustainable transport packages, smarter choices, travel plans); also found it difficult to choose priorities given the degree of overlap / similarity between some of the options.

Comments on choices for green/orange dots; (these are mainly comments by individuals; not enough time to test how far were supported by everyone in the group)
- Car park management – orange was not considered important for rural villages (view not necessarily shared by others from towns)
- Sustainable transport packages – orange as although he is an environmentalist, considers that 'packages' are too large-scale for small town / rural areas; more appropriate in Wiltshire to give high priority to smaller scale walking and cycling schemes
- Smarter choices – orange as not considered to be the role of the council to tell people how they should travel (not a universally held view)
- Freight routeing – considers this should be a high priority in short term, but in longer term should not need to be such a priority as should by then have reduced need for long distance freight movement by local production of goods and increased rail freight (consensus that this would be a good thing, but not clear how it would be achieved – needs action by individuals and businesses to 'buy local').

Table 3
There was no disagreement on the "dots", possibly due to the composition of the group, i.e. representing several rural parishes.

The consensus was not extensively discussed due to time issues, but provisionally:
- **Higher** (all medium in plan):
    - Freight routing, local safety/speed, Road safety education.
- **Lower** (high in plan):
    - Car parking management (felt to be a local issue where county should not interfere), Sustainable transport packages.

It was suggested that voluntary freight routing would not work as operators would use the shortest route for cost reasons.

One person asked if they could get the council to recognise the A345 as a north-south through route? There was a response asking if that recognition was desirable.

Table 4

- **Priority 1**: Freight routes because we have small towns with small roads and we have pollution hot spots, and damage to infrastructure. Could we not employ a license to operate in certain area scheme? Could smaller vans be used as continental models use?
- General agreement that central Government or global events such as oil prices, are the only mechanism that will enable/promote the development of such schemes. (Consolidation centres)
- **Priority 2:** Carriageway maintenance and buses are both obvious candidates for priority investment and have to placed in the 'high' priority.
- **Priority 3:** Walking and cycling networks should be combined and not have priority over each other
- **Low priority 1**: Smarter choices as they are unachievable and have minimal influence
- **Low Priority 2:** Rail Freight as again this has proven to be unachievable in Wiltshire.

Table 6

High Priorities should include:

- Rail freight
- Sustainable transport packages but specifically for rail/bus interchanges and bus priority projects
- Economic recovery related strategies such as freight, car parking and congestion management

Following the assessment of priorities passenger transport and congestion Management had the highest priorities. Comments to confirm were as follows:

- Buses, range and focus of services needs to be smarter and make best use of different vehicles and also community transport (mini buses etc) - this strategy should focus on improving bus/rail linkage and access to rural communities.
- Congestion needs to be addressed to encourage movement of goods, services and access to shops/businesses - but should also consider moving buses more efficiently.

Table 7

There was some confusion regarding the naming of some of the priorities, and considered that some where actually the same. In principle it was accepted that a degree of prioritisation needs to be given to elements. The prioritisation given is simplistic, but again it was agreed that no other clear alternative is possible with out over complication.

The greatest support was for the increased se / improvements to public service, but not at the detriment to freight as this was essential for the economic growth/ recovery.

It was very difficult for group members to identify those priorities they would demote. No real consensus that with those priorities which should be lowered.

Long-term investment priorities (Devizes)

Investment priority	Strategic transport option
High	
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🔴	Buses
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🔴🔴	Car parking management
🟢🟢	Carriageway maintenance
🟢🟢🔴🔴🔴	School travel plans
🟢🟢🟢🔴🔴🔴🔴	Sustainable transport package
🟢🔴🔴🔴	Walking network
Medium	
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🔴	Congestion management
🟢🟢🔴	Cycle network
🟢🟢	Cycle parking
🟢🔴🔴	Freight information
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Freight routing
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Local safety/speed schemes
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Passenger rail
🔴🔴🔴🔴🟢🟢	Rights of way
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Road safety education, training and publicity
🔴🔴🔴🔴🔴🔴	Smarter choices
🔴🔴	Structures
🟢🟢🟢	Travel plans
Low	
🟢	Freight break bulk/consolidation
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Freight management
🔴	Freight parking
🔴🔴🔴🔴🟢🟢🟢	Rail freight
🔴🔴🔴	Road user/hierarchy
🟢🟢	Urban traffic control

Note: Green dot = high(er) priority; Red dot = Low(er) priority

Trowbridge

Table 1
- Walking should be medium not high priority because it does not help to promote economic growth (which is one of key objectives).
- Car park management – dissenting view that this should not be reduced to medium priority because it is important in the towns.
- Urban traffic control should be higher priority because congestion problems in main towns need a solution.
- Rail services should be better, and more carriages provided to reduce crowding on Trowbridge services.

Table 2
- Supporting the economy and market towns (SO1) should be a higher priority.
- Some of the 'soft' objectives (e.g. health benefits) will be solved as a side effect if we concentrate on 'hard' strategies like increasing cycling and walking
- People were unsure about what 'sustainability' means. Does it just mean staying the same or is it about reducing reliance on fossil fuels? There needs to be a clear definition of 'sustainable' in the document.

- There is not much support for cycling in Wiltshire.
- Public transport is correctly high priority because of its importance to carbon reduction agenda.
- Freight should have a higher priority because it will contribute to several objectives such as improving the economy, streetscene, carbon reduction, safety.
- There was consensus that the walking network should not be a priority when resources are scarce. Meeting many of the other objectives will itself encourage walking.

Table 3

The representative who allocated a low priority to carriageway maintenance argued that this simply supports further car use and growth.

In terms pf supporting passenger rail, it was argued that Wiltshire Council doesn't push rail hard enough in comparison with some other authorities in the south west. The council also needs to work more closely with the West of England Partnership on rail integration and use any opportunities (e.g. rail electrification).

Table 4

- **Priority 1**: Carriageway maintenance and buses are both obvious candidates for priority investment and have to be placed in the 'high' priority.
- **Priority 2**: Freight routes because we have small towns with small roads and we have pollution hot spots, and damage to infrastructure.
- **Low priority 1**: Car parking should be left as it is and should not be governed by County Hall. Let individual/parish council and businesses decide.
- **Low priority 2**: UTC systems are only applicable in the largest towns that have a critical mass of population and tourism such as Salisbury.
- **Low priority 3**: Walking networks are previously discussed have overall benefits vs. investments.

Long-term investment priorities (Trowbridge)

Investment priority	Strategic transport option
High	
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Buses
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🔴🔴🔴🔴	Car parking management
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Carriageway maintenance
🟢🟢🟢🟢🔴	School travel plans
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🔴	Sustainable transport package
🟢🔴🔴🔴🔴🔴🔴🔴🔴🔴🔴	Walking network
Medium	
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Congestion management
🟢🟢🟢🟢🔴	Cycle network
🔴	Cycle parking
🔴🔴	Freight information
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Freight routing
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Local safety/speed schemes
🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢🟢	Passenger rail
🔴	Rights of way
🟢🟢🟢🟢🔴	Road safety education, training and publicity
🟢🟢🟢🔴🔴🔴	Smarter choices
	Structures
🔴🔴	Travel plans
Low	
🔴	Freight break bulk/consolidation
🟢🟢🟢	Freight management
🔴	Freight parking
🟢🟢	Rail freight
🔴🔴	Road user/hierarchy
🟢🟢🟢🔴	Urban traffic control

Note: Green dot = high(er) priority; Red dot = Low(er) priority

Chippenham

Table 1

Comments on choices for green / orange dots;

- Orange dot for 'structures' means no more road building.
- Smarter choices should be higher priority as is part of the 'culture change' to reduce car use, and a low cost option to 'make better use of what already there'.
- Freight routeing is a problem in many villages. Green dot for 'freight routeing'; but orange dot for 'freight information' as not sure what it means, but if is providing (just) info on advisory routes, this will not be effective.
- Cycle network should be higher priority than walking network as is more likely to have an impact on car use (longer journeys possible).

Table 2

The consensus was that serious issues around road safety, speed impacts and lorry routing deserved more priority. This was supported by their actual experience in their villages.

Table 3

Orange dots: Sustainable transport packages (4)

Queried why sustainable transport packages received so many priority demotions:

- What is it? Another use of buzzwords.
- Reducing need to travel is a good thing, but thought this was excluded from the STPs.
- Need support for more mixed use developments.
- STPs a bit of a "red herring" – addressed by the other transport priorities.
- Where are [additional growth] people going to work in West Wilts?

Several people made points alluding to the need for the LTP and spatial planning to be better joined-up. Excluding Swindon BC who declined to comment, there was unanimous support for this proposition.

Green dots: Passenger rail (4)

If run more efficiently could solve problems on roads

- How would they get to the station? – there is no more parking in Chippeham.
- Only a trivial impact within Wiltshire Council.
- Does the car park strategy take account of rail parking?

Green dots: Freight routing (3)

Freight routing was a particular issue with small towns and villages

- Large lorries; old villages.
- We should take more not of parish councils in deciding routing.
- Better signs would make a difference [note this view contradicted a comment in the first section on strategy].

Table 4

- **Priority 1:** Even though a fair degree of cynicism was displayed during the debate for what a 'sustainable transport package' is and that it was undeliverable within a Wiltshire context.
- **Priority 2:** Carriageway maintenance should be an 'obvious' choice.
- **Low priority 1**: Freight break bulk is unachievable.

Table 5

- Freight management, routing and information should all be shown as one strategic transport option because they are all inter-linked.
- Congestion management should be a higher priority – it would help to meet many of the strategic transport objectives.
- Walking network is not a high priority, does not meet that many goals and objectives.
- Road user hierarchy not seen as important.
- School travel plans should remain a high priority as they provide the opportunity for local people to get involved with tacking transport problems.
- Travel plans (group unclear what they were at first) seem to also be useful for businesses to help their employees travel more sustainably. Probably cost effective, less resources need to be spent by the local authority of business are putting sustainable transport measures in place.
- Passenger rail – there is little we can do about this so why should it be a medium investment priority?

Long-term investment priorities (Chippenham)

Investment priority	Strategic transport option
High	
●●●●●	Buses
●● (red)	Car parking management
●●●●●● ●● (red)	Carriageway maintenance
●● (red)	School travel plans
●●●●●● ●●●●● (red)	Sustainable transport package
●● (red)	Walking network
Medium	
●●●●●● ●	Congestion management
●●●●●●	Cycle network
●●●● (red)	Cycle parking
●●●● (red)	Freight information
●●●●●●●●	Freight routing
●●●●●●● ●	Local safety/speed schemes
●●●●●●●●	Passenger rail
●●●● (red)	Rights of way
●●●● (red)	Road safety education, training and publicity
●●●●●●	Smarter choices
●●● (red)	Structures
●● (red)	Travel plans
Low	
● ●●● (red)	Freight break bulk/consolidation
●●●●●● (red)	Freight management
● (red)	Freight parking
●●● (red)	Rail freight
●●●● (red)	Road user/hierarchy
● (red)	Urban traffic control

Note: Green dot = high(er) priority; Red dot = Low(er) priority

Salisbury

Table 1
Comments on choices for green / orange dots;
- Speeding schemes and freight routeing – both higher priority because is a big problem in some villages.
- Comment – should lobby for change to legislation to allow automatic speed limit through villages, as in Europe.
- Rail – higher priority as should encourage rail use as an alternative to car. Also need more car parking at stations where they get full. Comment that park and ride opening times are not suitable for rail commuters.
- Walking networks generally seen as a lower priority compared to other schemes could spend the money on.

Table 3
The group was very reluctant to place orange dots on the priority table (only 2 orange dots were placed).

Table 6
- There was consensus that highway maintenance is a high priority.
- School travel plans should have the same priority as business travel plans but not necessarily higher as they are equally important.
- Schools are the heart of rural communities and some rural schools are being kept open by parents driving their children from neighbouring settlements. School travel plans should not be used to punish such schools that inevitably have lower sustainable travel to school patterns.
- Walking was considered to be a low priority as it is not a viable transport option for many people in rural village communities or as a viable commuting option for most employers and businesses.
- Pedestrian improvements should be targeted at urban areas where waking can be a viable travel to work option.

Table 7
- Economic goals are the key, therefore freight priority should be high.
- Sustainable transport packages should include demand management, smarter use of park &ride, higher charging for long stay car parking.
- Freight routing seen as a problem, specifically local issues. Better management of longer through routes, Use of A-roads to the east should be a priority.
- Passenger rail should be a high priority.
- School travel planning should be better coordinated with local communities and seen as a key priority to reducing congestion and improving safety.

Long-term investment priorities (Salisbury)

Investment priority	Strategic transport option
High	
●●●●●●	Buses
●●●○	Car parking management
●●●●●●●	Carriageway maintenance
●●●○●●●	School travel plans
●○	Sustainable transport package
○○●●●●●●●●●●●●●	Walking network
Medium	
●●●●●●●	Congestion management
●●●●●●●○	Cycle network
	Cycle parking
●○	Freight information
●●●●●●●●●○○	Freight routing
●●●●●●●●●○	Local safety/speed schemes
●●●●●	Passenger rail
○○○	Rights of way
●	Road safety education, training and publicity
●●●●●●○○	Smarter choices
	Structures
●●○	Travel plans
Low	
●	Freight break bulk/consolidation
●●○	Freight management
	Freight parking
●●○○	Rail freight
	Road user/hierarchy
●●○	Urban traffic control

Note: Green dot = high(er) priority; Red dot = Low(er) priority

Question 3 – 'Big Society' and 'localism'

❑ Do you think that 'localism' and 'Big Society' agendas can help the council, its partners and communities to do "more for less"? How would you suggest we do this for transport?

<u>Devizes</u>

Table 1
Following on from previous question, 'smarter choices' and 'buy local' (to reduce freight movement) could be areas where individuals rather than local/central government should take action.

But was a shared concern that is only a small proportion of the population that are prepared to get involved in local activity, so how much can 'Big Society' aspirations achieve? Changes in society in recent years have led to reduction in community spirit in many villages, with loss of young people and families and increase in town commuters and older retirees. But this appears to vary from place to place – examples given of some villages where is still a stronger sense of community. This also applies to our market towns – some have more community spirit than others.

How can community activity be encouraged in places where it doesn't exist at present? No answers offered – general feeling that it can't be 'organised' (eg through the Area Boards) but will depend on having people willing and able to get involved. So how far can it be relied on to deliver?

Table 2
More help for community transport. This doesn't just mean money, it could mean less 'red tape'. Examples of red tape include:
- The need for licences
- CRBs
- Requirements for escorts with children as well as the driver.

Another way of community transport could be helped would be paying a small contribution to drivers to reward them.

Table 3
There was a feeling that "common sense" should be used. The following ideas were suggested:
- The cost of changing speed limits/signage should be reduced by a change to the legal process.
- More use should be made of local knowledge.
- There were claims that the council's contractors were not as speedy getting things done as private contractors in general. Perhaps lacking the incentives?
- Money should go via area boards to local communities, who could secure better prices for work from local contractors.
- The parishes at the table were already involved in Community Speedwatch,
- The example from AC that planning decisions should be locally devolved seemed to be warmly welcomed.

Table 4
- It is difficult for local communities to engage when there has been a lack of progress demonstrated by the council in other transport measures.
- There should be a focus on 'quick wins' to build stimulus in local communities.
- There is a need for more community bus schemes.
- It is not realistic to expect parish and town councils to increase their precept to contribute to transport measures. It may also lead to greater inequalities as the more affluent communities will have the means to succeed.

Table 7
It was suggested that there is greater use of not for profit organisations, and encouragement of small business to adopt functions without the need for profit. Example given that a member of the group ran a minibus/coach for disadvantaged groups without the need for subsidy from the authority and was still profitable.

Trowbridge

Table 1
It was felt to be a good thing because it can help to get things done, but concern about relying on it too far, and are risks if not carefully managed:
- Being seen as "being asked to do other peoples jobs without being paid"
- A "big ask" if volunteers are expected to do too much.
- Already difficult for existing voluntary groups to recruit and retain volunteers due to changes in society and pace of life.
- Risk of loss of interest after first flush of enthusiasm – experienced by Community Speedwatch in some areas, where often ends up with all work falling on a few people Suggestions for areas where it could help achieve transport outcomes.
- Local surveys to establish service needs (but experience of transport survey in one area showed a scatter of needs that were difficult to serve, and could lead to disillusionment if expectations raised and then not met)
- Young peoples transport – Area Boards have been given money to address issues through local ideas, but results to date have been mixed
- Community Speedwatch was suggested.
- Promoting and distributing information about public transport services.
- Getting people involved through local pressure groups.

Table 2
Consensus support for localism meaning that more decisions should be taken at the Town Council or Area Board level. Town Councils are better placed to decide local issues as they have more knowledge of local circumstances. Area Boards are not being seen as effective in following local priorities because they do not have enough responsibilities for spending decisions in their areas. More local control could encourage public participation and increase the satisfaction of local people with decisions and services. In the same vein Wiltshire Council should engage more with Parish Plans, which represent local people saying what they want, and attempt to reflect them in its decisions.

The Big Society agenda will best be taken forward by building on what is already there, not trying to create something new. Wiltshire already has several forums for localism viz area boards, town councils and community partnerships. However, not only do these forums duplicate each other's functions but they don't discuss things together so their actions aren't co-ordinated.

If Wiltshire Council is to harness the power of voluntary action it needs a culture change in the council. There is currently too much emphasis on reasons not to do things. Volunteers are prevented from action by 'red tape' – perceived issues about safety, insurance or even exclusive contractual arrangements. The council will need to develop a 'can-do' approach throughout its activities.

Table 3
While community transport is given a reasonable priority at the moment by the council, worries were expressed that it would be given a lower priority in the future.

Some suspicion of the 'Big Society' - danger that Wiltshire Council just passes responsibility to parish and town councils. The council needs to work with parish councils to develop bids for funding from external sources, to encourage parish councils to push forward transport projects and to look at good practice elsewhere in terms of community facilitation.

Historically, communities have got fed up with Wiltshire Council and have therefore progressed transport measure themselves - this is not always as efficient as it might be if the council were leading or involved in the initiative. Reflecting earlier comments, in Bradfrod-on-Avon all the various studies have been developed separately without any integration.

Table 4
A brief discussion took place where the general consensus was that the concept could be applied to transport and that direct involvement with communities and transport officers is required and would be welcomed. Area boards were felt to be too exclusive.

Table 5
- Suggestion of locally-arranged bus services.
- Too much regulation – safety important.
- Never been asked 'what sort of bus service would you use?'
- There should be a local representative on the management of the bus company**.**

Table 6
There was some scepticism from the group with regard to the ideal of 'localism'. Many felt it was good in theory but the reality a little different. The majority of transport issues require experience and expertise and there was concern that unqualified and inexperienced individuals would promoting their own agenda and influencing decisions they were not qualified to make.

Chippenham

Table 1
Localism should be good if it gave more say over housing allocations and more influence over location of development

'Big Society' could help in the following:
- Promoting car sharing (but concern that this could undermine viability of bus services).
- Link schemes – expand their role and capacity so are seen as part of 'normal' transport not just 'something for elderly and disabled'.

- Community transport – Tisbus quoted as example of a scheme that is now successful after a less successful start.

Issues limiting possible impact:
- Parish Councils already very busy.
- Difficult to find volunteers due to pressures of work and social trends.
- Lack of info on what has worked elsewhere/what is feasible (role for council to provide info, advice and support, and to encourage local communities to get involved).

Table 2
The table agreed in not agreeing with David Cameron about this. They felt that this was an excuse for making cuts in services and hoping volunteers would take up the slack. There was also a lack of enthusiasm about more local decision making over planning applications, feeling that there was not the necessary planning expertise at parish level.

However, the idea of community transport was well received (at least one volunteer on the table) and felt that it could be expanded e.g. to cover work journeys into Chippenham or link to early London trains. Wiltshire Council could help by establishing a template that worked and could be introduced widely across the area.

Also voiced dissatisfaction with First and Faresaver bus services not being co-ordinated as regards timings.

Table 3
Lydiard Tregoyze just starting a community lorry watch (HGVs on weight restricted roads).

Table 5
- Parish Plans are very important.
- Area Boards very useful for discussing local matters.
- However, there is a need to have a balance between who makes the decisions on more important strategic transport schemes and on local, small scale schemes.
- Vision Boards play an important role.

Table 6
The group had a long discussion on the merits of localism. Most felt the principle was sound but foresee difficulties in its actual delivery. Moreover some members felt it might be seen by some as the highway authority simply discharging its functions and responsibilities to the local community.

Table 7
There are already examples of communities helping each other to develop transport solutions. Area Boards are too big an area for the development of community transport plans - resident groups are an ideal spatial scale. It is important for communities to have a vision for transport in their area - Wiltshire Council can then provide the necessary realism. All involved should seek to get funding from a variety of sources, including local businesses.

The LTP3 should strive to achieve a far greater level of integration and standard of information provision e.g. between and for bus and rail services. However, it is

realised that the way the UK's transport system is organised sometimes makes this difficult.

Salisbury

Table 1

Suggested areas where could benefit transport delivery;

- Community Speedwatch – big issue in villages and local people can help relatively easily.
- Could parishes help to fill potholes using volunteers? (have asked but are liability /safety / insurance issues).
- Tisbus and Link schemes held up as good examples of voluntary sector transport provision – but took a long time to develop, and rely on small number of volunteers (Link are stretched to capacity already).

General concern that although 'Big Society' is a good idea in principle (and villages often have a better community spirit), younger people do not have the time and in the end it is usually the same small group of people who do everything.

Table 2

There were concerns expressed by all about the practicality of many activities being taken on at a lower level. For example, parishes don't have the time or experience to take on many additional functions; there is likely to be a shortage of volunteers in many areas but the biggest problem is that parishes often don't agree with each other about what needs to be done. This would lead to local variations for customers so how could that be brought into line with policies at county and national level? There would be a particular problem with projects such as transport that cover several parishes with a single project. There would also have to be some mechanism to link these.

Table 3

- Car sharing appeals to me.
- People have to be willing to do it.
- How do we make it take off?
- Car share lanes.
- I would get rid of the Castle Road bus lane – not used enough (by buses)
- 4x4 on school run [against].
- Bullying on school buses.
- P&R for schools – Laverstock a good example where there is a cluster of schools on a narrow road with limited parking.
- Safety on rural routes for children? [security issue raised – this was more to do with foot/cycle routes than buses].

Localism

- Access to shops within walking distance [promote].
- Post office determined to close post offices.
- Shopping – internet shopping and monthly bulk shop.
- "All right if you've got a computer".
- Reappearance of milkman.
- We have a weekly fishmonger round.
- Mobile shop in Wylye Valley would be a good idea.
- Shopping has a social function.

Facilitator put forward suggestion of village shop as a delivery hub for internet shopping; supporting its traditional role and social function. There as general agreement on this.

Table 4
An example of community involvement is Community Speedwatch. However, issues regarding its practical operation. Lorrywatch, which the council is currently trialling, is another example.

The council needs to help communities deal with their issues. For example, there are small signs in Quidhampton advising HGV drivers leaving Churchfields - the community would like bigger signs and/or some other means of advising or restricting the movement of large lorries.

A possible danger of 'Big Society' and 'localism' is that you could get inconsistencies between communities e.g. the use of traffic calming measures could be different along neighbouring communities on the same road.

Table 6
- Buses stop running too early out of Salisbury to rural areas – there need to be more peak-time buses and less 'empty-running' buses at other times.
- Utilise military engineers to build highway infrastructure such as cycleways.
- Utilise members of the public (cf Sustrans rangers) to undertake sign cleaning/maintenance and other tasks under a formalised relationship.

Workshop 2 – Public Transport Strategy

Question 1

❑ Do you support the long term public transport strategy?

<u>Devizes</u>

Table 1
There was general support for the proposed strategy, but comments that the summary table did not give enough information on what was proposed and why (e.g. why promote viability of commercial services? Fares to be reviewed for what objective?)

- Real time information - view (not universally shared) that should not be included as it only benefits a few routes (maintain existing system but don't expand).
- Smartcards – view (not universally shared) that this should be progressed more quickly using Government funding that can currently be bid for.
- Bus Information Strategy – agreement that this should be reviewed, but conflicting views on what it should contain. One view expressed that if money is short, council priority should be to fund services not information – it is up to users to find out what services are available, and bus operators to provide information. Another view was that council should 'protect its investment' in supported services by actively promoting them to increase use and income, and similarly to encourage use of commercial services so that they remain commercial. Suggestion that the council should set the standards for what information should be provided and then require operators to provide it, or council provides and recharges the operators.
- Promote viability of commercial services – agreed this is important, and is strongly linked to information provision (above). But need to recognise the reality that most of Wiltshire is not attractive to commercial operators.
- It was agreed that there is an opportunity to expand the role of Community Transport (CT) (minibus and Link), but need to recognise limitations.
- Link schemes and infrequent minibuses will not cater for people getting to work.
- Minety had a community minibus which was wound up as too few travelling to make it viable, and because of lack of volunteers.
- Experience in Pewsey Vale shows CT minibuses are not always cheaper than having a contract with a taxi operator, and may be too expensive to meet subsidy criteria - suggestion for a 'travel club' approach where a local voluntary group commissions transport to meet local needs from wherever appropriate (another questioned whether this would increase workload on volunteers still further, and how the transport would be funded; possibly approach parish councils for funding?).
- Rail – should include support for rail link services.

Table 2
- Support for more active financial support from Wiltshire.
- Smartcards and real time information not appropriate for a rural area.
- Strong recognition of the need for more community transport to take up demand where services withdrawn. There is a problem with recruiting volunteer drivers but nothing the Council can do to help that.

- Lift giving and car pooling is something the Council could usefully help with by continuing/developing its car pool programme.
- Review of bus network should include consideration of where people want to go and there should be a review of the location of bus stops, many are not close enough to destinations, e.g. supermarkets in Devizes.

Table 3
- Where have the "One Council" savings gone? Why no reports? Should be spent on more service and less glossy buildings.
- The LTP doesn't explain its terminology!
- The long-term strategy lacks substance.

Trowbridge

Table 1
There was a desire for the strategy to contain firmer commitments on levels of service that would be provided and improvements that would be made. There was concern that the funding situation means that services are likely to be reduced rather than improved. There were criticisms that existing service levels are not adequate – not enough early morning journeys, buses after 6pm, connecting services and bus times which don't suit everyone's needs.

There was a view expressed that the council should encourage more supermarkets to run their own bus services – but another strong counter-view that this would undermine and lead to withdrawal of public bus services, even if supermarkets were willing. But developer funding from new supermarkets can provide money to run improved public services in some areas.

There was a suggestion that there should be park and ride in other towns (not just Salisbury) – but others doubted this would be cost-effective or affordable.
Concern about proposal to review fares if this meant an increase. Discussion of bus operator views of inadequate reimbursement for OAP free fares, and impact on services.

There is a need for better bus-rail connections as well as through ticketing.
Bus service punctuality – there was a suggestion that timetables need to be reviewed to allow adequate running time.

Agree with proposal to review network and to define strategic services and local area services. Hope that this will allow local area services to run more frequently (e.g. on a loop).

Table 2
There can be a conflict between the way bus services are provided and the real need of the community. Example is in Melksham where First and Faresaver both run hourly bus services to Bath but they run them at the same time instead of a half hour apart. As the services are commercial Wiltshire Council are not able to change this, so pressure for change will have to come from the community and their customers.

There is nothing in LTP3 about access for people with disabilities. There could be more emphasis and commitment to travel training for the disabled. Community Transport could be important for this but it is unlikely that existing funding will be increased. Travel training could be a way to save costs in medium term as it will

allow disabled people to make their own way on buses instead of council having to provide individual transport.

Should be more commitment to working with adjacent authorities e.g. West of England Partnership, Somerset. Could be cost savings through working together. Also could have more influence over DfT e.g. regarding rail services.

Table 3
There was agreement with the concessionary fares element but there is a need for taxi tokens to be made available for mobility impaired people.

The Link schemes provide more than just transport - can also provide community aspects. The RUH Hopper is a good service however it is relatively expensive for the council to run.

In terms of the balance between modal shift and accessibility, it depends on the needs of the area.

Encouraging more commercial services reduces the need for subsidised services. Commercial services often work best as direct links where as council services need to serve isolated communities. Between some communities (e.g. Trowbridge and Chippenham) it was considered that rail offers a better level of direct service. Few buses run in the evening - also need to run later.

The model of community rail partnerships seems to function well - doesn't appear to be an equivalent on the bus side.

Public transport information needs to be expanded and improved significantly, and that both ends of the journey need to be covered.

The provision for cycle on trains and on buses is missing.

<u>Chippenham</u>

Table 1
There was a discussion about free bus pass; has been useful to OAPs but also has stimulated a new attitude to bus travel among those who previously would not have used it.

It was agreed that punctuality/reliability are important.

It was suggested that there be supported use of parking income and developer funding to fund bus services

It was also suggested that there be supported continuation of Link payments and taxi vouchers (replacement for previous OAP vouchers / tokens) as is important (and fair) to provide alternative to bus pass for vulnerable people.

Otherwise there was general support for the proposed strategy.

Table 2

There should be use of smaller buses in rural areas where it would be seen as an environmental benefit. (Yes, they did know that the size of buses was set by the maximum load at school run time)

There is a need for cross boundary co-operation with Swindon to provide consistent timing and routing of services. Routing of buses should be responsive to local feeling

The council could encourage the government to reduce operating costs for bus operators (e.g. more BSOG) – recognised this is a national government issue.

It was pointed out that the 'introduction of low floor vehicles' was good as far as it goes but didn't deal with the full spectrum of disability. What about visually or hearing-impaired customers? The strategy should be more all embracing.

There was support for using planning gain to support bus services.

The replanned network needs to consider the real needs and journey preferences of users, not just traditional bus routes.

There was support for expanding rail freight, as well as support for better rail/bus co-ordination.

Table 3

Disconnection between bus and rail.
- people use public transport if it connects.
- [bus operator's retort about main market being shoppers added by me].
- Is that the wrong approach? – what is it WE want?, not what the bus operators want!

Reviews: Pointless to put these in the strategy – "surely you would do that?" [i.e. reviews are taken as a "given"]

Why use bus?
- How many people actually pay?
- Only [use] if significantly cheaper/better/more convenient.
- We'd have to penalise car drivers or underwrite bus services.

Objectives
Nothing talks about creating [mode] shift.
- 49 quite full.
- Yes, it connects the right places – it goes to the railway station.
- People from Melksham and Corsham have to come to Chippenham to catch the train – parking spreading outside the boundaries of the railway car park: need more parking at rail stations to avoid dispersal of parking

Strategy / approach
The strategy should give more priority to bus priority
- Do we have the space on the roads?
- We need a realistic approach. Buses aren't reliable for someone [with a fixed appointment or start time] [implied that cars were].

The strategy is all process / no vision / no strategy: vision=end-point [objective].

The strategy omits small buses (e.g 6 seater).

The ageing population will have more need for buses.

We should have [more] school buses to combat congestion (cited Chippenham where choice is leading to cross-town flows)

The lack of evening buses is a problem – can't go out for the evening.

The strategy in table B1 is too weak on rail. Should have support for Salisbury-Swindon rail axis.

Salisbury

Table 1
No dissent from the proposed strategy, but there were comments that the proposals are too vague and are just 'fine words'.
- Should be training bus drivers in customer care – many seem disinterested.
- Support for Link scheme mileage payments (in lieu of taxi vouchers) – help to increase the capacity of some schemes that struggle for funding.
- Is a waste of time trying to 'seek to influence' rail operators – they won't listen.
- Support for more bus/ rail integration.

Table 3
- Bus route variability.
- P&R insufficient incentives.
- Higher, long-stay parking charges needed.
- Keep short-stay cheap (shopping vitality).
- Buses should have greater priority getting into town. How?

LTP: "Hardly anything to argue against".

LINK and TISBUS should be part of the PT strategy.

Can't get a guarantee that a wheelchair space is available on buses (that the bus will have a wheelchair space, and that it's not already occupied) [from WITS].

Bus/rail need better integration

Tisbury parking problems [related to lack of integration?].

Question 2

❑ Which of the main Implementation Plan actions do you think are most important?

Devizes

Table 1
- General support for the priorities shown by the green dots.
- Comment that review of Bus Information Strategy should be aimed at improving what is available to the user.
- Information on bus fares is difficult to find.

Trowbridge

Table 1
General support for the priorities shown by the green dots.
Comments:
- Continuing discretionary enhancements to national bus pass (free travel pre-0930) is a low priority compared to keeping services running.
- Continuing support for existing community transport schemes is very important for people unable to use ordinary buses.
- Not sure that many existing community transport schemes will want to expand their role in the way suggested in the plan.
- Important to continue Independent Travel Training to help disabled people to learn how to use public transport – but grant to WITS project ends in April 2011.

Table 2
The prioritising exercise showed a wide spread of priorities across the implementation plan, but there were two or more people supporting most of the actions to support disadvantaged people. Christine Keepence thought that disability access training should be incorporated in the implementation plan.

Chippenham

Table 1
Green dots are self explanatory.

Table 3
Placement of green dots started with a hiatus, partly due to people not being sure how to deal with the number of "process" elements with uncertain outcome (e.g. review/develop).

Misc comments
Encouraged comments on why dots were assigned as they were:-
C) develop a new approach to securing developer funding – Developer contributions should be put into bus services, not roads.

Table B2 in general – "Some of these are so vague it's unbelievable".

What is the effect of disability policies on small buses? – does it mean we will have to use large buses?

Full-fares for 16+ is a real disincentive and encourages early car ownership. They should be encouraged to use public transport.

On the high support for bus-rail links (element n)
What were the markets this was to serve?
- Commuters.
- Just commuters? [me].
- Shoppers.
- What about students? – Sunday services? [me].
- Students not time-sensitive – not a priority.
- "…daily students are a different matter…".

Bus-rail integration is one of the few attractions [of the plan].

- linkages are important for non car owners.

Salisbury

Table 1
There was general support for the priorities shown by the green dots.
But plan is too vague and does not commit to enough definite actions. Not clear what is meant by "review….." – with what aim?

There was support for maintaining post16 education transport assistance at least at current level, to encourage young people to stay on in education

There was discussion about wider role for community transport – could it provide an adequate substitute for bus services, which are likely to be reduced? Mixed views – general agreement that it could, at least in some circumstances ("in rural areas we should be able to help ourselves"), but not sure whether would in practice be able to find enough volunteers. Example given of the Link schemes, which are already at 'saturation level' and find it hard to attract new volunteers. Not just drivers, but coordinators; suggested that using Link schemes to provide an advertised service replacing a low useage bus journey would put too great a strain on the coordinator.

Public transport: summary of short-term implementation plan		
Bus		A Define a hierarchy of services and use this to re-plan the bus network
		B Promote the viability of commercial services
		C Develop a new approach to securing developer funding
		D Fund bus services that met priority needs not catered for by the commercial network
		E Develop new criteria and procedures for funding and reviewing supported bus services
		F Review the procurement strategy for all transport services
		G Require low floor accessible buses in all new appropriate tenders for supported services
Community transport		H Continue grant funding for community transport operators and Link schemes
		I Produce a community transport development strategy to expand its role
Rail		J Respond to rail consultations to support local objectives
		K Support community rail initiatives
		L Work with any operator to develop the case for better services in Wiltshire
		M Encourage and assist with improvements in and around stations
		N Treat bus links to railway stations as part of the strategic network of bus services
Fares and concessions		O Review fares on council-funded bus services
		P Continue to provide the current discretionary enhancements to the national bus pass
		Q Continue to provide additional support to Link schemes
		R Review the post 16 education transport scheme
		S Encourage voluntary standardisation of the rate of discount/qualifying age on bus fares available to young people
Information and marketing		T Review the bus information strategy
		U Work with the regional partnership to upgrade the traveline website
		V Upgrade the real time passenger information system

Question 3

❑ Do you agree with these funding priorities for public transport services?

Devizes

Table 1
There was no time to discuss this question.

Table 2
Graham Ellis made the point that high priority hourly daytime services need to run at peak times as well as off peak so that they can be used for business and workers. Evening services can be important for communities but it was recognised that they are not necessarily well used.

Table 3
One person had a strong view that public transport t provision should be devolved to the area boards. There were several holding the differing view that Area Board's lacked the knowledge to make these decisions, but that they should be more involved in consultation on services in their locality.

Trowbridge

Table 1
No time to discuss this question.

Table 2
There was concern that evening and Sunday services shouldn't be low priority because of their importance to the cultural life of non car users. It was also felt that rural buses should have a higher than medium priority. There were no suggestions for items which should have reduced priority.

Table 3
There are opportunities to cut some hourly services in some areas.
It was suggested to cut bus services where there is duplication with rail - however, acknowledge that interim communities would not be served.
There was general support for the hypothecation of surplus parking charges to support public transport services.

Chippenham

Table 1
There was general agreement for priorities shown, but concern at possibility of service reductions.
There was a suggestion that evening services should be higher priority, as used by shift workers, rail commuters etc. (but no suggestion on something else to be low priority in its place).

Should health be a high priority? But accept may often not be appropriate for a bus.

Table 2
'Daytime service' should cover a longer period of time. Many 'daytime' services stop at 1500 because of the school run and that makes them unsuitable for work journeys or anything else that takes all day.

The low priority of evening services will be a problem for teenagers.

Shopper services should be funded by the shopping centres or supermarkets that benefit rather than by the council.

Table 3
There is a [too] low profile for evening bus services. Workers often have to work late. This policy needs tailoring to local circumstances.

The 0900-1500 window mentioned for 2-hourly daytime services (High priority item 5) is inadequate.

Is a daily service worth maintaining?
- People help each other with lifts when the service is that poor.
- Should replace this level of service with support for community initiatives.
- 2-hourly is the absolute minimum for a worthwhile service.
- Abandon once-daily services unless they are well used.
- Have "market day" multiple service instead of 1 bus per day for whole week.

Could the "shopper specials" be supported by traders (e.g. through travel plans)

Should hourly services be the top-limit for council funding?
- What about need?
- Rush hour?

The council has tended to prioritise funding bus services on the accessibility/inclusiveness agenda, not for other reasons such as economy or congestion relief. Which led to the following comments:
- LTP is "unimaginative".
- "Business as usual"
- "Creating a bus ghetto"
- Only for the poor / elderly
- "Shouldn't be like that".

Salisbury

Table 1
The principles behind the proposed guidelines were explained; agreement that the approach is reasonable. It was considered it is right to use cost and useage info to decide which services should be funded.

Suggests that parishes should play a greater role in making rural transport work – publicise services on a "use it or lose it" basis, and be prepared to provide local alternative if bus can not be made cost-effective (but see concerns about capacity above).

Table 3
The shopper specials to alternative destinations should not be in the list of priorities. Daily services? – need to be at least twice-daily.

Services have improved. (more frequent) but there are still reliability problems, and overcrowding at peak times.

0900 – 1500 is an insufficient period on which to base frequent services.

Evening services?:
- Use smaller buses.
- Need statistics to show demand.
- There should be more C2W bookable evening services.
- Problem of reliability – confidence in buses turning up – is more significant with evening services.
- Likewise, information and shelter is more important in the evening.

General comments

<u>Devizes</u>

Table 1
- Request for circulation of feedback from all the events to those who attended.
- Presentation could be improved by giving more detail about what strategies mean – summarised versions do not give sufficient explanation or detail.

Table 2
No consensus achieved. All views expressed were as individuals with little or no comment from others in the group.

Table 3
- There was strong support for providing bus services connecting with rail services. It was thought that this could be achieved without detriment to the shopper market.
- Why is 'Connect 2' missing from the list of priorities for funding?
- Devizes should have better public transport links to support the existing/future housing growth.
- For environmental and other reasons, subsidising buses to run [nearly] empty is a bad thing. Support for services should take the form of encouraging – even subsidising – people to use them.
- The taxi option for concessionary fares should be restored.
- P&R in Salisbury should include through journeys to Odstock Hospital.
- More attention needs to be given to making connections between bus services reliable.
- Express bus services (in lieu of rail services, e.g. to Devizes) would be unlikely to work because of reliability issues.

Workshop 2 – Freight Strategy

Question 1

❑ Should a third tier of freight routes, defined as 'Access Routes', be established to encourage the sustainable delivery of goods within towns and to industrial estates and other freight generators?

Devizes

Table 4
It was the general consensus that it is a good idea in principle however a number of roads were highlighted that should be included or withdrawn.

A number of comments were made as to the point of the exercise and that it will have a minimal effect on how freight travels through the county.

Partial consensus into a 'laisse faire' attitude of freight routing and to leave at this current time the network to natural dispersal of traffic.

Table 5
Wiltshire Council should use restrictions more to enforce HGV traffic to use specified routes - voluntary measures are not sufficient. As way of example, there is an issue in the Cricklade area where HGVs should be made to use the A419 and B4696 Spine Road rather than Cricklade High Street.

Satellite navigation devices are a growing issue - drivers will always follow the most direct route to a destination. The rise of internet shopping will lead to an increase in van/lorry deliveries.

The council needs to work with freight operators, for example, through the Wiltshire Freight Quality Partnership.

Trowbridge

Table 4
It was the general consensus that it is a good idea in principle, however a number of roads were highlighted that should be included or withdrawn.

There was particular mention of the A350, where advisory routing was seen to be pointless unless the road becomes 'fit for purpose' and this will lead to users not seeking short cuts on this overly congested route.

Satnav issue has to be addressed to have any real impact. It was agreed that this method would have a limited effect on 'drivers of habit' however the distribution of information with regard to freight was seen as a positive step.

Advanced an positive signing strategies are seen as essential in changing the decision of routing and elements of physical measures such as chicanes were a popular topic. Even though such restrictions are understood to have severe penalties in other areas.

Advisory status was not seen as enough and a signing and routing strategy should be reinforced.

Chippenham

Table 4

- It was the general consensus that it is all but a paper exercise and any associated cost would be used better elsewhere.
- Drivers will not pay any attention to this and will find their own routes.
- fT need to make satnav devices and their use a mandatory requirement.
- Advisory status was not seen as enough and a signing and routing strategy should be reinforced.
- Overall routing and enforcement strategy between local councils should be agreed and paid for by joint working.
- Funds would be better spent into lobbying central government for legislation into satnav devices.
- Wiltshire should concentrate on getting information on to i-phone type applications.
- outing should not follow the routes that are currently 'HGV' active just because they currently are.
- Strategy should have a solid routing and enforcement policy that can be applied over the next 15 years.
- Leicestershire model was considered good practice and something Wiltshire should follow regardless of cost and social cost to some and benefits to others.

Salisbury

Table 4

Many HGVs are causing damage (e.g. to banks and carriageway) to local roads - the council should seek to keep HGVs on appropriate routes. The size of lorries are now beyond the capability of many roads although it is acknowledged that using smaller vehicles would mean more vehicles and trips. Ideally, large 44 tonne vehicles should use the motorways and then their loads should be broken down at the junctions and distributed from there on smaller vehicles.

There is an issue with regard to distribution centres (e.g. at Solstice Park in Amesbury and at Andover in Hampshire). Lorries from these distribution centres will use inappropriate routes to the west. However, it is accepted that people are often hypocritical (i.e. we want well stocked shop shelves but not the lorries required to get the stock to the shop) and that planners do weigh up all the factors when considering planning applications for such sites.

The council needs to work with businesses not by putting up barriers, but by working with business (e.g. through the Freight Quality Partnership). A particular example of where this approach is needed is around the DSTL, Porton Down where currently a large number of HGVs use inappropriate routes (e.g. Pheasant Road) to access and egress the site. Could the council invite the MoD on to the Freight Quality Partnership?

Satnav is obviously a national issue which has local implications, for example, in and around Churchfields in Salisbury. Having said this, the businesses in Churchfields do provide HGV drivers with local information. There is also an issue with lorries carrying straw going through Quidhampton to access the A303.

Looking at the sub-region around south-Wiltshire, Southampton docks will grow and lead to an increase in freight traffic. If this can't be transferred to rail then the resulting HGVs should be made to use the strategic network of motorways and trunk roads.

Overall, there was general agreement with the council's proposed freight route network. However, there were two provisos:
- the council should engage with local communities to develop the local access routes; and
- that the advisory nature of the routes meant that they would never be very effective in changing the behaviour of businesses and hauliers.

Question 2

❑ Do you agree with the proposal to identify, improve and/or maintain a minimum 'basic' standard of lorry parking in Wiltshire?

Devizes

Table 4

Overall consensus into maintaining a 'minimum' standard of freight parking.

Table 5
- Lorry facilities need to be provided in industrial estates and new business developments.
- General agreement with the council's approach to improving lorry parking facilities and integrating this with the freight routing map. However, the freight organisations and companies should be made to contribute to the introduction and/or improvement of lorry parking facilities.

Trowbridge

Table 4
Overall consensus into maintaining a 'minimum' standard of freight parking was felt to be a positive step.

Chippenham

Table 4
Overall consensus into maintaining a 'minimum' standard of freight parking was felt to be a positive step albeit an obvious one that should not need a policy.

Question 3

❑ Do you agree with the council's pragmatic approach to rail freight?

Devizes

Table 4
Full agreement that rail freight should be re-balanced and that a more pragmatic approached should be adopted.

Chippenham

Table 4
- Overall consensus that the policies should be rebalanced.
- Again stated as an obvious policy that does not need consultation.

Salisbury

Table 4
The council needs to be more ambitious with regard to rail freight given the 2026 timeframe of the LTP. While the proposed pragmatic approach to rail freight in the draft LTP3 is understandable, there is the danger that the council is being too despondent - the council should be prepared to respond to opportunities. General opinion that most people would support more freight on rail and while it is acknowledged that central government needs to provide an encouraging context, if that is not in place then the council should be prepared to step in.

What about the rail head at Ludgershall? Has this or could it be used by commercial operators? Could it be developed as a commercial rail head if the MoD left?

There was no support for a freight consolidation centre in Salisbury.

General comments

Devizes

Table 5
There should be further development of the draft LTP3 - in doing so, this would lead to a better report being presented to Wiltshire Council's Cabinet.

The council should investigate moving the proposed development planned for Devizes elsewhere (e.g. Trowbridge or Chippenham) - Devizes has a lack of necessary transport infrastructure and investment to cope with the proposed development growth.

The draft LTP3 is difficult to read - there is too much technical language which is not explained.

Workshop 2 – Road Safety Strategy

Question 1

❑ Is the evidence-based approach the right way to determine road safety priorities? Could it be improved?

Devizes

Table 6
- General consensus of agreement with the 3 E's approach.
- Acceptance that evidence base is the only clear way to determine priorities and actions but there was strong criticism of this as it means you are working in a reactive manner.
- The 'somebody' has to get hurt before anything was done was seen as a weakness in the strategy but there was an acceptance that measurement of perception is difficult.

Trowbridge

Table 5
Broad agreement with the 3 'E's' approach but felt more emphasis should be placed on engineering rather than enforcement as it was deemed ineffective due to low prioritisation by the Police.

Table 6
The group was divided over this. They understood the reasons for this approach but wished for community concern sites to be included as part of the decision making process. Perhaps this is being addressed through the Community Area Transport Groups?

Chippenham

Table 5
All accidents cost money which can not be recovered; waiting until an accident has happened is the wrong approach Road safety should be developed from risk assessments as prevention is better than cure.

Open up evidence to include other qualitative evidence of where vulnerable road users are being intimidated away from using certain roads.

Yes the right approach but more data should be available to the public.

Possibly look at parish plans to see people's perceptions of road safety issues. Yes, but there are many situations where action is obviously beneficial to safety (such as 30mph speed in villages) which should be progressed if potential benefits large enough.

Table 7
There was general agreement with the evidence-based approach although other local issues (e.g. perceived local accident blackspots) should also play a part. A whole route approach may provide the necessary flexibility e.g. in dealing with community changes (e.g. a new school) and less severe deficiencies (e.g. poor surfaces and cambers). Community Speedwatch (CSW) seen to be a waste of

resources as it is an involved and lengthy process - better to spend the funds on actual physical measures.

Salisbury

Table 5
Table 5 would like the criteria used to be better explained to them and would like the Council to be more open about how they use it.

The Group felt that the approach should continue to be used until a better system has been identified.

Table 6
- Listen to Parish Councils and utilise local input as part of the evidence base for determining road safety priorities.
- Evidence is often gathered incorrectly – speed measurement devices (metro count etc) are often positioned in the wrong locations to measure speeding – need to liaise with Parish Councils on the location of speed readings
- Need more and lower speed limits – need to consult Parish Councils on where these should go and the appropriate speed limit.
- Give cycleways priority over motorised vehicles (as in Laverstock). This achieves the dual am of cutting speed and promoting cycling.
- However, the use of an evidence base was largely supported by the group as it is preferable to the 'whoever shouts loudest' system.

Question 2

❑ Should there be a greater emphasis on vulnerable users?

Devizes

Table 6
- Community Speedwatch seen as a really good idea but more should be made of it and it's use extended to other types of offence. Also identified that there needs to be a legal/prosecution threat and consequence of being caught for the process to work.
- The use of speed indicator and vehicle actuated signs was strongly supported.

Trowbridge

Table 6
The needs of an aging population should be considered. The group recognised the work carried out in schools such as road safety education and development of school travel plans etc.

Chippenham

Table 5
There should be equal emphasis for all users – walkers, cyclists, horse riders.
Road network is often not suitable for these groups due to speed and type of traffic.
Restriction of freight through villages would help vulnerable road users.

Table 6

The group agreed that there should be a greater emphasis on the more vulnerable within the road safety strategy, but felt that suitable protection should be afforded to all areas of the community not just the young and old.

Table 7

It is scary to ride on a bike in Wiltshire although many cyclists should be more visible and have better training. There should be dedicated crossings for disabled people and children. Vulnerable people should be involved in the design of physical features - communities could be asked to contribute to the cost of the feature if they required any enhancement. The concept of 'shared space' or similar measures (e.g. removing the white lines from the middle of roads) is appealing as it makes drivers feel insecure - however, their implementation should depend on local circumstances. Appropriate parking can also contribute to road safety by slowing traffic.

Salisbury

Table 5

Yes, generally felt by Table 5 that there should be, but could not really identify any particular measure that they could agree on.

Also felt that the Council should consider removing measures that have been implemented should they no longer meet the given criteria for that measure.

Table 6

- Some people felt that vulnerable road users should not necessarily be prioritised in a period of limited resources.
- However, there was an alternative view that giving more priority to walkers and cyclists may encourage modal shift.
- The consensus was that there should be equal emphasis and based on individual circumstances.
- There was a need for more off-road cycleways.

Question 3

❑ Is the 3 E's approach strategy right? Are there any omissions or alterations that you would propose?

Devizes

Table 6

- Road safety needs to cover all modes of transport for accident prevention (education) - mobility scooters were cited as users have little or no training and cause a risk to themselves and others also young riders of scooters.
- The strategy should include a commitment to develop a risk based (technical) assessment of sites/routes to provide an alternative means of prioritising sites with a collision history.

Trowbridge

Table 5

There was broad agreement with the 3 'E's' approach but felt more emphasis should be placed on engineering rather than enforcement as it was deemed ineffective due to low prioritisation by the Police.

The 3 'E's' should be ranked in order of importance as follows
1) Engineering
2) Education
3) Enforcement

Table 6
The group were content with this strategy but felt more resources were needed to deliver engineering solutions. Some felt that the community should play a greater lead in determining engineering solutions particularly when setting speed limits.

Chippenham

Table 5
- Yes.
- Particular emphasis should be placed on education, training and speed management/engorcement.
- Engineering could include provision of more separated rural footpaths to enable children to walk to school.

Table 6
Broad agreement with the 3 'E's' approach but felt many problems were not reflected in the evidence based approach. Local knowledge of problem areas within communities should be utilised to address local problems.

Table 7
- As long as all three of the 'E's' are implemented.
- Education - the priority should be cycle training for children (as this provides the principles of road sense for life) and driver and motorcycle rider training. General support for refresher driving course for all drivers every 10 years.
- Enforcement - CSW initiative is "useless". The real need in villages is for 20mph speed limits as often 30mph limit is too fast - therefore CSW has no real effect.
- Engineering - as engineering measures are expensive, it would be better to deal with current problems (e.g. ditches, road cambers) rather than build new infrastructure. Interactive signing does work but needs to be accurate and in the correct place. Gateway features need to be located and designed well. Junction layouts should provide adequate visibility and signing.

Salisbury

Table 5

This was decided as OK for the time being….but the Council should consider the "5 E's" (adding evaluation and encouragement).

Table 6
- Community Speedwatch is very good.
- Traffic calming with humps and bumps should be replaced with priority working as the impact of driving over humps can cause undue wear and tear on cars that can make them unsafe and lead to accidents.
- More cycleways on-carriageway (e.g. Laverstock) to achieve more cycling and reduce traffic speeds.

- Some people queried whether road safety education was as important or as good value as filling in potholes.

Question 4

❏ How might the strategy deal with traffic intimidation?

Chippenham

Table 5
- Convert minor roads which have alterative routes into bridleways/cycle routes/footpaths and divert motorists on to alternative route.
- Helmet cameras for cyclists/riders to record acts of aggression.
- Speed control and enforcement.
- Compulsory re-training for offending drivers.
- Local communities to solve own problems with community schemes.

Table 7
Motorcycle riders often overtake in very dangerous places and this, combined with their speed, can intimidate other road users.

Salisbury

Table 5
Take more opportunities to remove 'centre line markings' in 30mph speed limits and use narrowing visual paint effects in more places in both 30mph and 40mph areas.

Table 6
- Use engineering to shift priority from motorised vehicles and improve environment for local people e.g. Laverstock.
- Look for guidance from Parish Councils.
- In respect of 20mph speed limits, 6 out of 7 people on the table supported blanket 20mph speed limits.

General Comments

Trowbridge

Table 5
- There is too much emphasis on recorded collision data and not enough of non-injury collisions or near misses.
- The recent speed limit review was misleading. The way the Police collected the necessary speed data with average speeds taken from a moving vehicle cannot be correct.
- There should be a greater emphasis on vulnerable users. The council should be asking why people choose not to walk or cycle, simply than counting numbers that do. A degree of control data is essential.
- The council should work much more closely with freight operators to prevent weight limit offences.
- A measure of community severance is required.
- Pressure needs to be applied to encourage greater Police enforcement of speed limits in the absence of the Safety Camera Partnership.

- There was overall agreement that the Swindon and Wiltshire Safety Camera Partnership worked well and it disbandment would be detrimental to overall road safety in county.

Chippenham

Table 6
The group agreed that more emphasis should be placed on engineering solutions but accepted that during times of economic austerity prioritisation for higher ranking sites must take precedence.

The group felt that that there was little in the strategy of any substance with regard to education. The loss of the driver training programme would have a detrimental effect on long term road safety objectives.

The group felt that regular maintenance of the highway network had a huge impact on road safety and often negated the need for higher levels of intervention.

Salisbury

Table 7
- Loss of speed cameras is a bad thing.
- Improve assessment of traffic intimidation
- There are with HGV SATNAV.
- Improve targeted work around young drivers

Appendix 1 - Attendees and Table Allocation

Devizes

Name	Name	Organisation	Table W1	Table W2
Stanley	Bagwell	Enford Parish Council	6	5
Diann	Barnett	Ramsbury & Axford PC	2	2
Norman	Beardsley	Wilts Bridleway Association	7	
Ben	Braine	Wiltshire Police	4	6
Rolf	Brindle	Melksham without Parish Council	7	3
Phillip	Brown	Wiltshire Council	7	1
Sarah	Buttenshaw	Heytesbury PC	5	1
Gina	Chapman	Cricklade TC	4	5
Cllr	Cocker	Minety PC	1	1
Cllr	Cole	Minety PC	1	5
Fred	Collison	Netheravon PC	2	4
Alison	Comyn	Grafton PC	6	7
John	Coole	Cricklade TC	6	6
Richard	Covington	West Ashton PC	3	
Peter	Doyle	Wiltshire Council	2	1
Graham	Ellis	Melksham CAP	7	2
Kate	Freeman	DCAP Transport Group	6	1
Colin	Gale	Rushall PC	3	3
Richard	Gamble	Wiltshire Council	6	4
Chris	Garman	Grafton PC	1	6
Mark	Gaskarth	Wiltshire Fire & Rescue	1	4
Fiona	Hornby	CPRE Kennet	4	2
Chris	Humphries	Wiltshire Council	2	6
Stephen	Jackman	Woodborough PC	5	6
Humph	Jones	Tidworth Town Council	6	7
Jerry	Kunkler	Wiltshire Council	2	5
Paul	Langham	Devizes Chamber of Commerce	5	4
Ann	Lumb	Cheverall Magna PC	2	5
Ian	Mackinnon	Chirton PC	4	6
Laura	Mayes	Wiltshire Council	3	2
Rohan	McMillan	Chirton PC	3	1
Ken	Monk	Enford Parish Council	4	3
Jeff	Ody	Wiltshire Council	5	
Stephen	Petty	Wiltshire Council	7	5
John	Rogers	Rushall PC	3	5
Doug	Ross	Trowbridge TCAF	5	2
Ian	Sharp	White Horse Boats	6	3
Ian	Thomas	Wiltshire Police	3	7
Mary	Towle	Durrington TC	3	2
Geoff	Watkins	West Ashton PC	4	4
Eddy	Watts	Melksham CAP	6	6
Peter	Westlake	West Ashton PC	1	7
M	Woods	Etchilhampton PC	3	
Graham	Wright	Durrington TC	2	1

Trowbridge

Name	Name	Organisation	Table W1	Table W2
Peter	Akrigg	Devizes Phab	3	3
Gwen	Allison	Bradford on Avon TC	3	5
Rab	Beattie	Warminster Lib Dem	1	3
Ranald	Blue	Upper Deverills Parish Council	1	5
Charles	Boyle	Atworth PC	2	4
Rosemary	Buchan	West Wilts Rail Users Group	1	2
Michael	Braund	Devizes Phab	4	1
Trevor	Carbin	Wiltshire Council	6	4
Cliff	Carter	Hills Group	6	4
Richard	Craft	Climate Friendly Bradford	2	6
Bill	Dowling	Army	5	1
George	Fortune	Staverton PC	5	1
Peter	Fuller	Wiltshire Council	1	3
Effie	Gale-Sides	Atworth PC	4	2
Richard	Gamble		3	3
Peter	Glichriest	Malmesbury & Villages CAP	1	2
David	Gordon	Wiltshire Access Group	5	1
Neale	Hall	Gloucestershire CC	2	1
Lisa	Hawkins	Wiltshire Independent Travel Support	2	1
Simon	Hetzel	Climate Friendly Bradford	3	3
Sam	Howell	Swindon BC	3	4
Christine	Keepence	Wiltshire Independent Travel Support	1	2
John	Knight	Trowbridge TC	3	5
Godfrey	Marks	Bradford on Avon Preservation Trust	1	4
George	McDonic	CPRE	5	4
Gerald	Milward-Oliver	Priority for People	4	4
Francis	Morland	Wiltshire Council	4	2
Martin	Moyes	Holt PC	5	5
Adam	Nardell	Trowbridge Vision Board	3	3
Tony	Nicklin	Warminster TC	2	1
Jeff	Osborne	Wiltshire Council	3	3
Chris	Petty	Melksham TC	2	1
Jenny	Raggett	Travelwatch South West	4	2
Ray	Sanderson	Malmesbury & Villages CAP	4	6
Peter	Sexstone	Heywood PC	1	5
Becky	Stevens	Holt PC	6	6
Len	Turner	Trowbridge Vision Board	2	4
David	Walden	West Wilts Rail Users Group	6	3
Brian	Wilson	Bradford on Avon Preservation Trust	6	6
Ros	Windess	Wiltshire Access Group	2	3

Chippenham

Name	Name	Organisation	Table W1	Table W2
Desna	Allen	Wiltshire Council	2	2
Richard	Aylene	Calne Area Transport	5	1
Michael	Bell	Purton PC	1	2
Lesley	Bennett	Luckington & Alderton PC	1	4
Paul	Brown	Mouchel	7	4
Peter	Brown	Little Somerford PC	7	1
Chris	Caswill	Wiltshire Council	7	3
Anna	Durrant	Hullavington PC	3	1
Audrey	Erstrom		7	1
Sally	Fletcher	CCAN	7	3
Mollie	Groom	Wiltshire Council	7	4
Maureen	Hall	Kington St Michael Parish Council	6	7
Gerald	Harford	Humberts	4	1
Anne	Henshaw	Campaign for Better Transport	6	4
Peter	Hutton	Wiltshire Council	5	3
Nicholas	Keyworth		5	3
Alexander	Kirk Wilson	Marlborough TC	3	7
Anne	Lock	Campaign for Better Transport	6	1
Sue	Macklin	Sutton Benger PC	2	3
Callum	Macleod	Bath & District Advanced motorists	2	6
Collete	Mallion		3	4
John	Marsh	Ashton Keynes PC	1	5
Howard	Marshall	Calne TC	6	2
Tim	Martienssen	Wiltshire Council	6	3
Alistair	Millington	Sustrans	7	6
Alf	Moreton	North Bradley PC	3	1
Graham	Morris	Sherston Parish Council	6	5
Lesley	Palmer	Grittleton PC	2	6
John	Parmiter	Lea and Cleverton Parish Council	7	5
Eddie	Peckham	Cllr	1	5
Tom	Pepperall	Lydiard Millicent PC	4	6
Nina	Phillips	Wiltshire Council	4	2
Andy	Phillips	Chippenham Town Council	4	5
Tony	Pooley	Little Somerford PC	1	6
Linda	Roberts	Calne TC	3	7
Margaret	Rousell	Box PC	4	1
John	Scragg	Chippenham Town Council	1	3
Richard	Squires	Kington St Michael Parish Council	5	2
Ben	Staite	Swindon BC	3	1
Ashley	Stopforth	Luckington & Alderton PC	6	4
Dick	Tonge	Wiltshire Council	6	1
Adam	Walton	Transcoco	2	5
Peter	Willis	Lydiad Tregoze PC	3	5
Phil	Winfield	Latton PC	5	4
Lance	Workman	Sutton Benger PC	1	7

Salisbury

Name	Name	Organisation	Table W1	Table W2
Janet	Amos	Tisbury PC	2	6
Chris	Andrews	Steeple Langford	3	1
Patrick	Boyles	Chilmark PC	3	3
Ralph	Bryder	Salisbury Civic Society	4	1
David	Carroll	Tisbury PC	5	3
Sally	Cobb	Wiltshire Independent Travel Support	2	2
Chris	Cochrane	Wiltshire Council	4	1
PC Steve	Colwill	Wiltshire Constabulary	7	5
Mary	Douglas	Wiltshire Council	3	2
Peter	Durnan	C.O.G.S.	6	7
Mike	Fowler	Chilmark PC	6	6
Sue	Fraser	Waminster TC	2	2
Graham	Gould	Salisbury City Centre Management	3	1
Jose	Green	Wiltshire Council	1	6
Darren	Hall	Porton Down Green Travel Group	6	5
Chris	Hammer	Idmiston PC	7	4
Fiona	Larkin	Porton Down Bug	3	7
David	Law	Laverstock and Ford PC	4	7
Graham	Lawrence	MOD RSA Larkhill	6	2
Nigel	Lefroy	Burcombe PC	7	2
Trevor	Long		2	4
Pete	Maffrey	Laverstock and Ford PC	5	6
Noel	Maskell	Upavon PC	3	4
Peter	North	Wiltshire Independent Travel Support	3	3
Roger	Paye		1	1
Naomi	Piner	South Newton PC	5	6
Val	Powley	Area Board	5	5
Grant	Privett		1	5
Dave	Roberts	Quidhampton PC	4	4
John	Smale	Wiltshire Council	4	3
Karin	Taylor	National Trust	1	2
Major James	Thompson MBE	Bishopstone PC	2	4
John	Turley	Porton Down Bug	4	6
Jeremy	Turtle	Salisbury Civic Society	5	5
Clive	Upton	Dinton transport group (for Dinton PC)	1	4
Jimmy	Walker	C.O.G.S.	7	6
Christopher	Williams	Councillor Ludgershall & Perham Down Division	7	5
Margaret	Willmot	Campaign for Better Transport Salisbury	1	5
Tony	Williams	Upavon PC	1	3

Appendix 2 - Facilitators

Devizes

Table 1 – Ian White

Table 2 – Eric Egar

Table 3 – David Phillips

Table 4 – Kingsley Hampton

Table 5 – Robert Murphy

Table 6 – David Bullock

Table 7 – Gareth Rogers

Trowbridge

Table 1 – Ian White

Table 2 – Eric Egar

Table 3 – Robert Murphy

Table 4 – Kingsley Hampton

Table 5 – David Phillips/Martin Rose

Table 6 – Mark Stansby

Chippenham

Table 1 – Ian White

Table 2 – Eric Egar

Table 3 – David Phillips

Table 4 – Kingsley Hampton

Table 5 – Laura Gosling/Judith Billingham

Table 6 – Martin Rose

Table 7 - Robert Murphy

Salisbury

Table 1 – Ian White

Table 2 – Eric Egar

Table 3 – David Phillips

Table 4 – Robert Murphy

Table 5 – Heather Blake/Malcolm Burns

Table 6 – Spencer Drinkwater

Table 7 – David Bullock

Salisbury

This document was published by Wiltshire Council Neighbourhood and Planning Department. You can contact us in the following ways:

By telephone
01225 713458

By post
Sustainable Transport Group, Neighbourhood and Planning Department, County Hall, Trowbridge, Wiltshire BA14 8JD

By email
transportplanning@wiltshire.gov.uk

Information about Wiltshire Council services can be made available in other formats (such as large print or audio) and languages on request. Please contact the council on 0300 456 0100, by text phone on (01225) 712500, or by email on customercare@wiltshire.gov.uk