

Appendix E

LTP2 Consultation and Involvement Report

CONTENTS

Overview	3
Preliminary Consultation and Preparation Development of a Consultation Database	3
The First Round of Consultation – Strategic Objectives Reporting on the First Round of Formal Consultation	4
The Second Round of Consultation – Objective Refinement and Introduction to the Programme	5
The Third Round of Consultation – Indicators and Target Proposals	8
Appendix 1	10

Overview

- E.1** With primary reference to the Department for Transport's (DfT) guidance on completing Local Transport Plans and in accordance with our commitment to support the longer term vision for transport provision in the county, the second LTP has also been importantly developed by taking account of the views of our stakeholders.
- E.2** In addition to our programme of continuous engagement with our key strategic partnerships which is evidenced in Chapter 2 of this document, the preparation and improvement of LTP2 was assisted by comments received from our stakeholders through 3 large-scale countywide engagement exercises which saw the LTP's strategies, objectives and targets open to challenge by a wider audience.
- E.3** As with any consultative exercise, comments received will always cover the full spectrum from agreement to disagreement, and many views expressed unfortunately often request alterations to our developing document which fall outside the scope of our longer term visions for transport, as outlined in other strategic document such as the South Yorkshire Transport Manifesto, or do not accord with the LTP preconditions as prescribed to us by the DfT guidance and can therefore not be assimilated.
- E.4** However, to ensure impartiality all responses have been given due respect and afforded equal notification in reports and circulation.

Preliminary Consultation And Preparation

- E.5** In May, 2004, an announcement was made informing our stakeholders of the impending development of a new local transport plan for the county to cover the period 2006-2011. To generate interest and awareness, and in conjunction with a media awareness campaign, the summary newsletter of the 4th LTP1 Annual Progress Report was used to start this process by reminding the public of the 7 strategic objectives set out in the first plan and asking readers to question whether they were still relevant.
- E.6** 4,000 copies of the newsletter were distributed via established partner consultee channels and were also made available at all public offices, transport interchanges and Travel Information Centres.
- E.7** In addition, the publication invited the public to outline their aspirations for transport over the second LTP period. It was clearly explained that all feedback would be considered and, where practicable, contribute to the development of the draft provisional LTP2 document and further refine the formal stages of the consultation process.
- E.8** A realistic approach to consultation was maintained and stakeholders well informed that not all views could be incorporated, but where this was the case an explanation would be given.
- E.9** Responses were amalgamated into a report and circulated to officers. Comments relating to specific projects or concerns were forwarded to officers for further consideration and resolution.
- E.10** The details of the 118 respondents to the initial exercise who had expressed an interest in being kept informed of the development of the plan were added to the consultation database.

Development of a Consultation Database

- E.11** For the purposes of LTP2 consultation and in the interests of ensuring that stakeholders were not inadvertently omitted from the engagement process, a data collation and cleansing exercise was undertaken with the aim of developing a countywide consultation list which was cross-referenced with the lists of consultees held by all Partners. Where obvious gaps were identified in respect of communities of interest not represented, they were also added to the list.
- E.12** A total of 530 stakeholders were subsequently identified and in the interests of ensuring that stakeholders received information in a manner which would prove to be most mutually beneficial, they were sub-divided into 3 categories
- **Key Stakeholders** *including Local Strategic Partnerships, Chambers of Commerce, Highways Agency*
 - **Informed Stakeholders** *including commercial operators*
 - **General Stakeholders** *other consultees and members of the public*

The First Round of Consultation – Strategic Objectives

- E.13** The first round of formal consultation took place during May-June 2005. Stakeholders were asked to give attention to the strategic objectives of the LTP and consider whether the objectives of the draft Local Transport Plan were supportive of broader social and economic agendas.
- E.14** Our first draft provisional LTP2 was written on the basis of:
- The requirements stipulated by the LTP guidance
 - The aims and objectives of South Yorkshire's other visionary agendas, including those of our stakeholders
 - The opinions and strategic steer afforded by the county's Political Leaders and Chief Executives
 - Comments received on the worthiness of the existing objectives of LTP1
 - Other comments received via the preliminary consultation exercise
- E.15** A consultation pack comprising a draft version of the Local Transport Plan, together with supporting notes, was sent out to over 530 consultees across the county

Reporting on the First Round of Formal Consultation

- E.16** All comments received were compiled into a report which was presented to the June 05 meeting of the Planning and Transportation Steering Group
- E.17** An Appendix summarised the responses received and, for ease of reference, was categorised into comments relating to:
- Supporting wider objectives
 - The 4 shared priorities
 - Public transport strategies
 - Environmental issues
 - Major schemes
 - Walking and cycling
 - General comments

- E.18** The schedule also indicated where comments have been incorporated, taken account of or alternatively, highlighted as not feasible.
- E.19** Those responding had their submissions acknowledged and were thanked for their contributions. All contributors will be added to the database of contacts and kept informed on progress against our LTP objectives.
- E.20** Consequently, the provisional LTP2 document was submitted to the Department for Transport and Government Office for Yorkshire and Humber (GOYH) as per the July 2005 deadline.

CASE STUDY 1 – How comments influenced the document

Comment Received

*“There is no vision and strategy consistent with the barriers to economic growth”
Rotherham Chamber of Commerce Transport Working Group*

Response and Action Taken

Such comments added weight to the debate regarding the LTP’s place within the whole raft of other strategies on local, regional and national levels.

The document’s text has been further developed along these lines to reflect such an understanding, and affirm our assertion that the document’s objectives have an important role in supporting other agendas and particularly those relating to the economic regeneration of the county.

The Second Round of Consultation – Objective Refinement and Introduction to the Programme

- E.21** The second round of formal consultation was used to familiarise with the provisional LTP document and confirm the new objectives which had arisen as a result of the engagement and deliberation process to date.
- E.22** The second phase of the consultation Strategy concentrated on:
- Revisiting Local Strategic Partnerships and other key stakeholders to demonstrate how the document has evolved in light of responses received.
 - Consulting in depth on the emerging 5 year capital programme and revised LTP2 targets.
 - Promoting the Plan to a wider audience by engaging with the public to firm up policies and identify a broadly acceptable range of schemes.
- E.23** Stakeholders were informed:
- That the provisional document had taken account of comments and observations received on the initial round of consultation and reflected the priorities of national

and local government in addressing congestion, improving accessibility, reducing road casualties and improving air quality, but within the wider context of the county's regenerative objectives.

- As a provisional plan, the five year capital programme and the targets remain work in progress and are in the process of being refined for inclusion in the Full LTP to be submitted in March 2006.
- Opportunity exists for stakeholders to now look at some of the more detailed aspects of our proposals as well as to offer suggestions on the sorts of physical measures that will help us meet the Plans objectives.
- The partners are keen to develop cross-partnerships and new ways of working with all stakeholder organisations, agencies and networks which can assist us in addressing the challenges we have identified in the Plan.

E.24 Key stakeholders received a copy of the full document. These included:

- Local Strategic Partnerships
- Chambers of Commerce
- Passenger Transport Authority/Planning and Transportation Steering Group Members
- District Leaders and Chief Executives
- SY Heads of Health, Social Services and Education Directorates
- Pre-identified key strategic stakeholders
- Neighbouring Authorities

E.25 Informed Stakeholders received the 'Executive Summary' of the full document and were invited to contact the LTP consultation office to request a copy of the full document if required.

E.26 General Stakeholders were advised that the documents were all available to be viewed on the LTP website and that hard copies of the full document or the executive summary were available on request.

E.27 An additional 200 consultative packs were distributed via Partners' historic consultation channels.

E.28 Additional key comments were received from DfT and GOYH colleagues at a specially convened assessment meeting held on 14 October.

E.29 Comments were mostly supportive of the document and largely appreciative of the somewhat diametric challenges faced in trying to reconcile the intentions of the Shared Priorities (addressing air quality, improving accessibility, tackling congestion and increasing road safety) against the likely effects the county will experience through its continuing economic regeneration.



Figure 1: Consultation letter sent to all Stakeholders

CASE STUDY 2 – How comments influenced the document**Comment Received**

Numerous comments received from the South Yorkshire LTP Disability Forum

Response and Action Taken

The LTP Partners' have always viewed the document as a 'Local Transport Plan for All' and, whilst alluding to the obvious actuality that all strategies and programmes would comply with appropriate laws and statutes, had, for the purpose of clarity, decided to summarise the salient points of supporting strategies. Correspondence and engagement with the forum addressed this balance and in certain areas it was decided that more information should feature in the main document, particularly in relation to the Accessibility Planning strategy.

The Third Round of Consultation – Indicators and Target Proposals

- E.30** The third round of formal consultation took place during February-March 2006 and was used to give our stakeholders an advanced indication of the performance targets and indicators which were to be included in the final document and provide an additional opportunity to comment on and potentially influence the intended figures.
- E.31** Stakeholders were asked to consider and where necessary challenge the LTP Partners' assertion that the targets are both ambitious AND realistic.
- E.32** For information, stakeholders received the latest set of targets and indicators and the latest version of the Executive Summary of the final document.
- E.33** The responses were collated and given consideration at meetings held to finalise the LTP targets. Responses were also used to help refine the text where it was evident that the explanation of the rationale behind the indicators was not apparent. Significant comments were received in relation to public transport patronage targets which we have subsequently refused in the light of further data. Appendix 1 provides a fuller explanation of the comments received and how we responded.

CASE STUDY 3 – How comments influenced the document

Comment Received

"Regarding Cycling trips, the target is very un-ambitious and disappointing. A suggested 'ambitious but realistic' target would be a 50-100% increase"

- North Sheffield PCT

Response and Action Taken

Our first LTP established 'aspirant' targets, which we failed to meet (thereby contributing to poor performance assessments). Our 10% target is considered more realistic (based on recent progress). However, we acknowledge that:

Methods of monitoring will be addressed.

The document will be revised to give more acknowledgement of the health benefits of walking and cycling, and countywide strategies will be reviewed and improvements proposed by the Countywide Travel Planning Co-ordinator

APPENDIX 1 SOUTH YORKSHIRE LTP2 - CONSULTATION ON INDICATOR TARGETS (SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED – MARCH 2006)

GENERAL		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
North Sheffield PCT	Disappointed that there is no Indicator relating to walking levels.	Walking is an important component in the Mandatory Indicator on “mode share of journeys to school” and in our Local Indicator on “mode share of journeys to the main urban centres”. Opportunities to incorporate walking and cycling into the Accessibility Indicators will be investigated (currently restricted due to technical issues relating to the “Accession” analysis software tool). Adoption of a specific usable Indicator on walking levels throughout the County is difficult, bearing in mind the problems in monitoring such activity. We will, however, continue to investigate development of a Complementary indicator on walking levels.
Rotherham Chamber of Commerce	Consider our targets to be “unambitious”, and that only a real change in culture and focus will bring the transport improvements necessary to match our economic growth.	Our LTP details our approach and reasoning behind the setting of “realistic but challenging” targets.
Rotherham Community Transport Ltd	The targets do not identify indicators or measures that will be taken to address inequalities in access to transport associated with gender, minority communities, disability or older people.	Our LTP makes clear our commitment to ensuring the transport network is fully accessible. We will continue to investigate the extent to which complementary indicators can be developed to provide meaningful information as to progress on such matters.
Sheffield Chamber of Commerce & Industry	<p>Research on why car ownership/usage preferred? Could the public transport offer be adapted to provide alternatives to some of those reasons?</p> <p>Reference to investment / spend to benefit the business community specifically.</p> <p>What do the phrases “pivotal international business location” and “transformational economic regeneration” actually mean?</p> <p>Issues relating to “maximising existing road space” (inc. 24-hour bus lanes, restrictive parking, road islands and unnecessary road closures).</p> <p>Achievable targets should accompany any proposed expenditure.</p> <p>There ought to be wider and more in depth detail on the major schemes.</p> <p>The report is clearly biased towards “public transport” and takes very little account of business requirements with a seemingly negative view of local shopping areas</p>	Not specifically related to Indicators / targets. Our LTP2 makes clear our approach on the issues raised.

Doncaster PCTs	Footways should always be included as part of any new road building.	Not specifically related to Indicators / targets.
BVPI-223: Principal Road Condition Our target is to reduce the proportion of the network where structural maintenance should be considered by 17.5%, i.e. from 36.77% (2004/05) to 30.35% (2010/11).		
BVPI-224b: Unclassified Road Condition Our target is to reduce the proportion of the network where structural maintenance should be considered by 23.6%, i.e. from 28.66% (2003/04) to 21.89% (2010/11).		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
Transport 17	General observation that road condition depends on those responsible adopting more efficient and long lasting methods of repair.	Our narratives (contained in the LTP's appendices), make clear that we will development of innovative new treatments and year on year efficiency savings.
BVPI -99a: All KSIs Our target is to reduce all KSI's by 20%, i.e. from 727 (2001-04) to 582 (2010)		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service	Suggest that consideration be given to including Indicators identifying all road traffic collisions (RTCs).	BVPI99 Indicators are Mandatory and defined by the DfT. Not all RTCs are reported / recorded. These issues could be pursued further with the Police, Fire & Rescue and Ambulance services, through the various partnership working groups.
Transport 17	Request the cessation of "speed cushion" installations.	Not relevant to consideration of this Indicator / target.
Doncaster PCTs	This is a challenging but appropriately ambitious target.	Noted.
BVPI -99b: Child KSIs Our target is to reduce child KSI's by 25%, i.e. from 124 (2001-04) to 93 (2010)		
Doncaster PCTs	This is a challenging but appropriately ambitious target.	Noted.
BVPI -99c: Slight casualties Our target is to reduce slight casualties by 5%, i.e. from 5875 (2001-04) to 5581 (2010)		
Doncaster PCTs	This appears to be unambitious in comparison to targets set for BVPI-99a and 99b, but acknowledge the scope of the "slight casualty" category.	Bearing in mind projected traffic growth increases and our objectives related to casualty reduction, we believe our target is challenging but realistic.
BVPI -102(+): Public Transport Patronage Our target is to increase Public Transport Patronage by 3.5%, i.e. from 138.36m (2003/04) to 143.27m (2010/11)		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
Rotherham MBC (Officer comments)	Questions whether the target is realistic / achievable.	This Indicator target has been refined since the consultation exercise. We have undertaken further analysis (including that of more recently available data) and revised our target to 142.8m

Rotherham Chamber of Commerce	Express concerns regarding bus patronage, pointing out that a continuation of the current trend would lead to a further 25m loss over the life of the next LTP. It is unclear whether or not the Chamber of Commerce are advocating that our Indicator target should be revised, and if so in which direction.	
Doncaster PCTs	Unless there is serious investment in infrastructure and vehicles, this target (and related satisfaction levels), will be very challenging.	
LTP-1: Accessibility Our target is to sustain "Access to Work" and "Access to Local Centres" at 2004/05 levels.		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service	Welcome commitment to improving accessibility to disadvantaged areas.	Noted.
Doncaster PCTs	Journey costs and times can be a trigger for people if they perceive that they "outweigh" the positive aspects of being in employment. Access to health and other services are vital to people in deprived areas that depend on public transport.	Our LTP details our strategy for improving accessibility, particularly in respect of the wider regeneration focus on deprived areas. Our emphasis on partnerships will also ensure that these vital aspects of accessibility are covered.
LTP-3: Cycling Trips Our target is to increase cycling trips by 10%, i.e. from 100a/l (2003/04) to 110a/l (2010/11).		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
North Sheffield PCT	The target is very un-ambitious and disappointing. They suggest an ambitious but realistic target would be a 50 – 100% increase.	Our first LTP established "aspirational" targets, which we failed to meet (thereby contributing to poor performance assessments). Our 10% target is considered more realistic (based on recent progress), although we recognise that methods of monitoring need to be addressed. LTP2 acknowledges the health benefits of walking and cycling (para. 8.12).
Doncaster PCTs	The target is ambitious, bearing in mind the projected increase in traffic levels.	
LTP-5: Bus Punctuality Our target is to improve Bus Punctuality (i.e. the "Headline" figure) by 6.1%, i.e. from 75.4% (2005/06) to 80% (2010/11).		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
Rotherham MBC (Officer comments)	Requests clarification about how this Indicator / Target relates to the Bus Punctuality Improvement Plans (PIPs).	This Indicator / target has been refined since the consultation exercise, to take into account latest data relating to the new method of assessing bus punctuality, i.e. in accordance with guidance on PIPs.

LTP-6: Changes in peak period traffic flows to Urban Centres.		
Our target is to limit the growth in the proportion of car driver journeys into Sheffield city centre to 6%, i.e. from 51.8% (2004/05) to no higher than 54.8% (2010/11); and into Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster town centres to 9%, i.e. 58.6% (2004/05) to no higher than 64.0% (2010/11).		
Doncaster PCTs	There will be health benefits from more people travelling by public rather than private transport, but the issues of modal shift will be difficult to address without additional investment.	Our LTP details our approach and reasoning behind the setting of “realistic but challenging” targets. Our targets for this indicator relate, particularly, to our “Key Routes” approach.
LTP-7: Congestion (Journey Time Indicator)		
Our target is still to be defined, subject to ITIS journey time data (July 2006).		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
David Wruttesley (Bradway)	Concerned that traffic congestion will not be reduced until “Congestion Charging” is implemented.	This Indicator / target is yet to be defined. Our LTP makes clear (chapter 9) our approach on congestion and “area-wide road charging”.
Transport 17	Extension of Supertram to Totley would provide considerable benefits along the Abbeydale Road corridor, which is particularly prone to congestion.	
LTP-8: Air Quality		
Our target is to reduce concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide concentrations in non-trunk road AQMA's by 11%, i.e. from 45 µg/m ³ (2005) to 40 µg/m ³ (2010).		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
North Sheffield PCT	Welcome our target on Nitrogen Dioxide, but believe it would be helpful to have some targets in addition to this.	Of the 15 AQMA's in South Yorkshire, declared as a result of road traffic emissions, all but one was as designated due to Nitrogen Dioxide levels (designation of the Fitzwilliam Road, Rotherham AQMA was due to both NO ₂ and PM ₁₀).
Transport 17	Urge central Government to stop penalising users of diesel cars.	Not relevant to the scope of the LTP.
Doncaster PCTs	Targets to limit growth of transport and reduce emissions are very welcome. More ambitious targets would be enhanced if public transport fleets were modernised.	Noted.
SYLI-2: Light Rail Patronage		
Our target is to increase Tram Patronage by 28%, i.e. from 12.1m (2003/04) to 15.4m (2010/11)		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
Rotherham MBC (Officer comments)	Questions whether the target is realistic / achievable.	This Indicator target has been refined since the consultation exercise. We have undertaken further analyse and revised our

David Wruttesley (Bradway)	Supports proposals to extend the Supertram network.	target to 15.0m. (primarily in relation to “stripping out” the impact of the First Group bus strike in August 2004).
SYLI-5: Rail Patronage		
Our target is to increase Rail Patronage by 32.5%, i.e. from 4.86m (2003/04) to 6.44m (2010/11)		
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM	SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS MADE	RESPONSE
Rotherham MBC (Officer comments)	Questions whether the target is realistic / achievable.	This Indicator / target is based on patronage data from the Train Operating Companies (TOCs). It takes into account proposals relating to Interchange improvements; Park & Ride initiatives; ticketing improvements; TOC improvements, e.g. First Trans Pennine Express’s new fleet.
D. Wruttesley (Bradway)	Concerned that “bottlenecks” at Swinton / Holme, Meadowhall / Sheffield and Sheffield / Dore may impact on Rail patronage.	
Transport 17	More stations are required and a rail link to RHADS.	

Comments received from:-

Doncaster PCTs (13/3/06)
 North Sheffield PCT (8/3/06)
 Rotherham Chamber of Commerce (10/3/06)
 Rotherham Community Transport (10/3/06)
 Rotherham MBC (Officers) (8/3/06)
 Sheffield Chamber of Commerce & Industry (10/3/06)
 South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service (8/3/06)
 Transport 17 (8/3/06)
 D. Wruttesley (Bradway) (2/3/06)