

Government Office for the South West
London to South West and South Wales
Multi Modal Study
Consultation Report
March 2001



Halcrow Group Ltd

Burderop Park Swindon Wiltshire SN4 0QD
Tel +44 (0)1793 812479 Fax +44 (0)1793 845970
www.halcrow.com

Halcrow Fox has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions of their client, Government Office for the South West, for their sole and specific use. Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk.

© Halcrow Group Limited 2001

Government Office for the South West
London to South West and South Wales
Multi Modal Study
Consultation Report

Contents Amendment Record

This report has been issued and amended as follows:

Issue	Revision	Description	Date	Signed
09	0	Consultation Report (Draft)	Feb 2001	SM
09	1	Consultation Report	Mar 2001	SM

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Topic Group Meetings	2
3	Consultation with Local Authorities	4
	3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	4
	3.2 <i>Local Authority Briefings (1)</i>	4
	3.3 <i>Local Authority Briefings (2)</i>	4
	3.4 <i>One to One Meetings</i>	5
	3.5 <i>Correspondence</i>	5
4	Exhibitions and Questionnaires	6
	4.1 <i>Introduction</i>	6
	4.2 <i>Public Exhibition</i>	6
	4.3 <i>Newsletter Distribution</i>	7
	4.4 <i>Analysis of Questionnaires</i>	7
5	Responses from other organisations and the public	8
	5.1 <i>Other meetings</i>	8
	5.2 <i>Dobwalls</i>	8

Appendices

- A *Topic Group Meeting Notes*
- B *Local Authority Meetings (2)*
- C *Summary of correspondence from Local Authorities*
- D *Sample Questionnaire*
- E *Tables showing distribution and requests of SWARMMS newsletter No.1*
- F *Findings from questionnaire analysis*
- G *Summary analysis of the complete dataset*
- H *Summary analysis of: male respondents and female respondents*
- I *Summary analysis of those respondents that: do not have access to a car and those who do have access to a car*
- J *Summary analysis of the respondents: under 60 years of age and those respondents over 60 years of age*
- K *Summary of other Problems*
- L *Summary of the Top 20 problems*
- M *Other Comments*
- N *Summary of correspondence received from Organisations*
- O *Summary of correspondence received from the General Public*

1 Introduction

1.1.1 This report describes the consultation process used to identify the nature and scale of transport problems and issues within the SWARMMS Study Area. The problems and issues which emerged during this process, plus those identified via other sources, are presented in the 'Report on Problems and Issues' (March 2001).

1.1.2 The report sets out the various methods of consultation used in the study to date. These are:

- topic group meetings
- Local Authority briefings
- exhibition/questionnaire distribution
- other meetings/responses

1.1.3 The variety of methods ensures that the consultation process is a fundamental part of the SWARMMS methodology and that the study receives inputs from a whole range of different sources.

2 Topic Group Meetings

2.1.1 A series of one-off ‘Topic Group Meetings’ was held in order to allow major stakeholders and those with specialist interests to meet and impart their knowledge to the Study Team.

2.1.2 Meetings were held on the following topics:

- Planning (held 20/7/2000, with representatives from South West Regional Development Agency, Joint Strategic Planning and Transportation Unit, Devon County Council, CBI/Regional Assembly, Bristol City Council, Swindon Borough Council and Cornwall County Council)
- Bus (held 31/7/2000, with representatives from First Western National and Stagecoach)
- Freight (held 2/8/2000, with representatives from Bristol Port Company, Poole Harbour Commissioners, Freight Transport Association, Argent Group-London International Freight Exchange and Mendip Rail)
- Environment (held 15/8/2000, with representatives from CPRE, Highways Agency, FRCA, Civic Trust, English Heritage, Devon Environment Protection Group, Friends of the Earth and Environment Agency)
- Rail (a series of Topic Group meetings were held with Railtrack, Virgin, South West Trains, First Great Western and Wales and West)
- Tourism (held 19/7/2000, with representatives from The National Trust, South West Regional Development Agency, Somerset Tourism, Exmoor National Park Authority, Dartmoor National Park Authority, Devon County Council, Cornwall County Council, South West Tourism, Devon County Council and Cornwall Enterprise)
- Social Exclusion (held 26/1/2001, with representatives from the Countryside Agency, Employment Agency, Benefits Agency, Devon and Cornwall Careers and the Black Network South West)
- Planning Reference case (held 19/2/2000, with representatives from ORBIT, GOSW, SWARMMS and DETR)

2.1.3 The topic groups were briefed on the objectives of the SWARMMS study and invited to provide inputs towards the strategy development, identification of problems and issues and opportunities for data collection.

2.1.4

The key points and views made from each Topic Group Meeting can be found in the various meeting notes in Appendix A.

3 Consultation with Local Authorities

3.1 *Introduction*

3.1.1 The SWARMMS Study Team has held a number of meetings with Local Authorities during the study. These took the form of briefings with presentations, one to one in formal meetings and other regional meetings.

3.2 *Local Authority Briefings (1)*

3.2.1 Two Local Authority briefings were held towards the start of the study, one for authorities in the South West and one for authorities in the South East. They were:

- South West (13th April 2000, The Pithay, Bristol) attended by,
 - Bristol CC
 - Devon CC
 - Gloucestershire CC
 - North Somerset C
 - Plymouth CC
 - Somerset CC
 - South Gloucestershire C
 - Torbay C
 - Wiltshire CC
- South East (2nd June 2000, Hampshire CC, Winchester) attended by,
 - Oxfordshire CC
 - The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
 - Hampshire CC
 - Slough BC
 - Reading BC

3.2.2 The purpose of these meetings was to provide an introduction to the study, to negotiate assistance with the study, and to ask for help with data release and general cooperation with the study. Each Local Authority was requested to send along one officer to represent their Authority at the briefing.

3.3 *Local Authority Briefings (2)*

3.3.1 The second set of Local Authority briefings were held later in the study as follows:

- Newbury (15th Sept 2000, West Berkshire Council)

- Bath (18th Sept 2000, Bath and North East Somerset Council)
- Exeter (20th Sept, Thistle Hotel).

These were provided to update Member and Officers from District, Unitary and County Authorities on progress and to allow discussion regarding the study and the study process.

3.3.2 The attendees of these meetings are contained in Appendix B.

3.4 ***One to One Meetings***

3.4.1 It emerged from the Local Authority briefings that some authorities wished to have one-to-one meetings to discuss their particular issues and how SWARMMS will address them.

3.4.2 An invitation was sent to all highway authorities in the South West and South East to have these informal meetings. Seven Authorities accepted the Study Team's invitation. They were:

- Reading BC 19/9/2000
- Somerset CC 30/10/2000
- Wiltshire CC 30/10/2000
- North Somerset C 1/11/2000
- Swindon BC 3/11/2000
- Devon CC 7/11/2000
- Cornwall CC 13/11/2000

3.5 ***Correspondence***

3.5.1 As well as the briefings and one-to-one meetings, Local Authorities were also invited to send correspondence to the Study Team. The views expressed are presented in Appendix C.

4 Exhibitions and Questionnaires

4.1 *Introduction*

4.1.1 In order to reach members of the General Public and obtain their views for the study, a series of Public Exhibitions was held, accompanied by distribution of a newsletter. The newsletter also contained a questionnaire, the responses of which have been analysed.

4.2 *Public Exhibition*

4.2.1 During September 2000 a mobile exhibition toured the study area in order to raise public awareness of the study and to receive feedback concerning problems and issues.

4.2.2 The exhibition consisted of six display boards, which provided a background to SWARMMS, explained how the consultation process worked, an outline of the main problems, suggestions of possible solutions and opportunities for further inputs/feedback. Similar information was also included within a SWARMMS newsletter (No.1) that was made available to the public by various means at the same time. The questionnaire was aimed at identifying the problems and developing possible solutions for the future; a sample questionnaire is included in D.

4.2.3 The exhibition toured the Study Area between the 1st and 25th of September 2000 visiting the following locations:

Date	Location	Time
Friday 1 st September	Newquay, Bank St.	0900-1800
Saturday 2 nd September	Penzance Rail Station	1000-1900
Monday 4 th September	Plymouth, Place de Brest	0900-1800
Tuesday 5 th September	Exeter St David's Rail Station	0800-1800
Wednesday 6 th September	Exeter J30 services	0900-1800
Thursday 7 th September	Bristol Bus Station	0800-1800
Friday 8 th September	Bristol Michaelwood Services	0900-1800
Saturday 9 th September	Reading Westbound Services	0900-1800
Tuesday 12 th September	A303/A37, Podimore Services	0900-1800
Wednesday 13 th September	Mere, The Lecture Hall	1000-2000
Thursday 14 th September	Westbury, Rail Station	0700-1800
Monday 18 th September	Andover, Rail Station	0800-1800
Tuesday 19 th September	Basingstoke, The Walks Shopping Mall	0900-1800

Date	Location	Time
Wednesday 20 th September	Windsor, Peascod St.	0900-1800
Thursday 21 st September	Bristol, The Mall at Cribbs Causeway	0900-2000
Friday 22 nd September	Paddington Rail Station	0700-1900
Monday 25 th September	Swindon ,The Parade	0900-1800

4.2.4 A day was also planned for Paddington station but this was cancelled by Railtrack Major Stations at a late stage. A rearranged date was also cancelled due to the Hatfield incident and its subsequent knock on effects.

4.2.5 The locations were chosen in order to involve a wide range of interested parties in the study. Out of the 17 locations, six were at busy shopping areas, five were at train stations, four were at service stations, one was at a bus station and one was within a rural locality. A total of 2600 newsletters were distributed.

4.3 *Newsletter Distribution*

4.3.1 In addition to distribution at the mobile exhibition, newsletters with accompanying questionnaires were also sent to Local Authorities for them to distribute in public buildings such as Council Offices, libraries and tourist information offices throughout their local areas.

4.3.2 Over 8000 newsletters were distributed in this way, each Local Authority being allocated a number based on their size and proximity to the main study corridors. See Appendix E for details of the allocation.

4.3.3 Some Local Authorities requested more copies of the questionnaires. These extra requests are included in Appendix E.

4.3.4 There were also requests form other interest groups and members of the public who requested additional copies of the newsletter and questionnaire. Those requests can also be seen in Appendix E.

4.4 *Analysis of Questionnaires*

4.4.1 A total of some 1014 completed questionnaires were returned to the Study Team out of a total of 13,250 distributed. A return rate of 7.7%. These have been analysed on the basis of this whole dataset, split by gender, age, car availability and geographic area. A more detailed analysis, interpretation and discussion of results, relevant to the various problems, and potential solutions is provided in Appendices F-M.

5 Responses from other organisations and the public

5.1 *Other meetings*

5.1.1 During the consultation process there have been many other meetings and briefings. The SWARMMS team topic leaders have been liaising with stakeholders relevant to their expertise. There have also been calls from other organisations asking for meetings, e.g. BAA and South West Area Transport Roundtable (SWATAR).

5.1.2 There was also a series of ad hoc presentations given to regional forums, which included MPs and MEPs, the South West Regional Planning Conference-Technical Officers Group, the Highways Agency-Transport Users Groups, the South East Technical Advisors Group and the South East Regional Assembly.

5.1.3 The Study Team has also received other correspondence during the duration of the study by letter, email and comments on the website. In addition to the above a website is also available to the public (The website contains information on the study with regular updates, which include newsletters and reports. There is a link to allow inputs from the public to be considered within the study. The URL of the site is <www.swarmms.org.uk>. The site, set up in mid May 2000 averages 500 hits per month by separate individuals). They were from other organisations wanting to contribute to the study and also from the General Public. A summary of these comments can be found in Appendices N and O.

5.2 *Dobwalls*

5.2.1 Since the inception of SWARMMS, the Study Team has received a substantial amount of correspondence supporting the early provision of a Dobwalls bypass. This comprised of:

- 808 pre printed postcards, and
- 152 pre printed letters.

Appendix A

Topic Group Meeting notes

Planning Topic Group 20/7/2000

Attendance:

Chris Cobbold	DTZ Piedad Consulting
Michelle Dix	Halcrow
Andy Spracklen	Halcrow
Peter Botham	GO-SW
Neil Whithead	GO-SW
David Mills	GO-SW
Stephen Dapaah	GO-SE
Robin Miller	SWRDA
Tim Lansley	Joint Strategic Planning and Transportation Unit
Joe Keech	Devon County Council
John Wilkinson	CBI/Regional Assembly
Chris Marks	Bristol City Council
Linda Jewell	Swindon Borough Council
Malcolm Brown	Cornwall County Council

Apologies

Don Gobbett	Dorset County Council
Dick Owen-Smith	Wiltshire County Council
Mike Birkin	Friends of the Earth

1. Chris Cobbold welcomed participants.
2. Michelle Dix gave a brief overview of the overall purpose of the SWARMMS study and the timetable.
3. Chris Cobbold outlined the approach that DTZ would be using to assemble the reference case. The overheads used are attached as a separate document. Documents circulated for discussion at the meeting are also attached.
4. Topics were discussed as they arose in the presentation. Key points arising from the discussions are summarised below:
5. **TEMPRO assumptions/data**
 - (i) The group questioned how the Expected Growth Rates, which are used to distribute population/households/employment below county level, have been determined and how in practice they work. CC indicated that at that point information was not available on how in practice these work, and that DTZ would be seeking clarification on this from DETR. Are they an annual growth rate or for a five year period?
 - (ii) The group asked why 1996 population projections are being used for Temprow rather than 1998 data recently published? The reason is probably that at the time Temprow was being assembled the 1996 data were the most up to date available. The group indicated that the 1998 projections are based on a new methodology for migration so that there could be significant divergence between the 1996 and 1998 based projections, especially at district level, which could cause controversy.

- (iii) Members of the group expressed some concern that hitherto local authorities did not seem to have been involved in the process of data gathering or design. CC explained that DETR were currently in the process of consulting Government Offices and Regional Planning bodies.

6. **Population**

- (i) The group was generally happy with the 1998 base year population projections
- (ii) There was some discussion around the divergence of Tempro 2011 data particularly for Dorset & Devon. In Dorset in draft RPG in-migration has been constrained due to lack of jobs and capacity (DTZ advised to speak to Don Gobbett at DCC about this). The divergence of forecasts for Devon is also likely to relate to in-migration assumptions.

7. **Households**

- (i) The group emphasised the need in subsequent work to point out the need to compare Tempro data with RPG data and those that emerge from the Panel report.

8. **Employment**

- (i) The comment was made that county data is available from the Labour Force Survey so this should be used in preference of regional self employment data to arrive at total workforce estimates to take account of intra-regional differences in the growth of self employment. However it was acknowledged that county based data on self employment can vary considerably due to the small sample size. This may be the reason why DETR have used regional estimates in preference.
- (ii) It was pointed out that the comparison tables produced compared Tempro data for 2011 with draft RPG data for 2016 and hence was not a valid comparison. CC agreed in subsequent work to ensure direct comparability.

9. **Workforce**

- (i) It was pointed out that the comparison tables produced compared Tempro data for 2011 with draft RPG data for 2016 and hence was not a valid comparison. CC agreed in subsequent work to ensure direct comparability.
- (ii) Concern was expressed over how seasonal variation will be taken into account. CC indicated that in a strategic model of this nature it was perhaps not a critical issue. Similarly exactly how policy is accounted for.

10. **General Points Arising**

- (i) It was agreed that, because of the need for consistency with other Multi-Modal Studies, that Tempro should be used for the reference case, but the documentation should highlight and explain where Tempro data differs significantly from RPG. These differences should be fed back to DETR.
- (ii) It was agreed at the RPG EIP that there is a wide range of employment forecasts and methodologies. SWARMMS requires robust, justifiable figures without 'getting political'. It was agreed that Tempro is the best option for this – not least in that it produces forecasts for sectors which tie into trip generation factors, which are central to the modelling process. No other forecasts do this.
- (iii) In thinking about the distribution of growth within counties DTZ should take into account additional work by Halcrow Fox on the SW spatial strategy. CC indicated that DTZ would gather Structure Plan monitoring data on housing and employment land allocations,

completions etc, since future patterns of development will to a large degree reflect decisions already made – though PB pointed out that PPG3 says that housing allocations should be reviewed in the light of new Government policy – hence through monitoring and review, figures may be updated. DTZ advised to contact Sue Watts @ Somerset county council, in first instance.

- (iv) Concern was expressed over how Temprow considers future growth in a PUA which will occur in adjacent district, e.g. growth of Swindon post-2011. It was agreed that in the first instance, SWARMMS will test one strategic scenario based on county level employment & population data which assumes a distribution based on current trends/known development plan strategy. Variations in this scenario at a local level can be tested at a later stage. This raised the concern that the modelling will be based on a trends-led rather than plan/policy-led model. However, after discussion it was agreed that the Temprow trends-based data was a good starting point for the strategic transport model, since it is important to understand where existing trends will lead, in order to determine policy and plans. If the spatial distribution differs from that in RPG etc. sensitivity tests can be undertaken later to ensure reliability/accuracy.
- (v) JW suggested that there would be merit in discussing the reference case with the Regional Chamber's Planning Policy Advisory Group, which meets next on 26 September (Philip Bostock, CEO of Exeter City Council is the Secretary to the Chamber, and is the appropriate point of contact)

11. Conclusions and Action Points

- (i) It was agreed that the basis for assembling the reference case should be Temprow (**Post meeting note:** This is in fact a DETR requirement to ensure consistency for all the Multi Modal Studies). However DTZ should highlight where Temprow data diverges from RPG data, and the reasons for this divergence. Sensitivity tests can be run at a later stage in the modelling to take account of policy decisions such as RPG.
- (ii) DTZ to seek further explanation from DETR about the workings of the Temprow model, in particular the Expected Growth Rates, and advise group members.
- (iii) DTZ to liaise with Don Gobbett and Sue Ward about Structure Plan monitoring data for the SW.
- (iv) DTZ to liaise with Neil Whitehead (GO-SW) Tim Lansley (JPTU) Steve Dapaah (GO-SE) and Joe Keech (DCC) about issues relating to distribution of growth within counties.
- (v) CC agreed to consider with Halcrow the suggestion made by John Wilkinson to make a presentation to the Regional Chamber's Planning Policy Sun-Group on 26 September.

12. Post Meeting Note

- (i) DETR have advised us that the full planning data disaggregated to district and zone within county is unlikely to be available until after the end of August. DTZ have therefore had to develop an alternative approach to producing the reference case, which has to be complete by mid-September for transport modelling
- (ii) It is proposed now to use the Temprow 2016 projections at county level, which we hope will be available before the end of August, and then to determine through an expert panel the

Appendices

appropriate distribution between districts. We hope to involve the people from the topic group listed in 11 (iv) in this expert panel – and we will into account RPG projections and policy, and existing structure plan monitoring data.

Freight Topic Group

Project	SWARMMS	Date	2 August 2000
		Ref	FS5217.020
Subject	Freight Topic Group	Page	5 of 140

Venue	GOSW office, The Pithay, Bristol
Date held	20 July 2000
Present	Alan Peakall, Gareth Walters, Mike Poole (Halcrow/SWARMMS) Andrew Page-Dove (GOSW) Bryan Smith (Bristol Port Co) Ian Roberts (Poole Harbour Commissioners) Joan Clark (Freight Transport Association) Stephen Tillman (Argent Group – LIFE) Alan Freemantle (Mendip Rail)
Apologies	Matthew Lodge (sSRA), John Parkin (Bristol International Airport)

record of meeting

Action

The meeting opened with a brief review of congestion. Other than known roads that also impact on passenger transport, no particular sites were identified that impacted on freight movement. Holiday routes were a known seasonal problem, moves to spread holiday traffic out over the week, rather than concentrating “change-over” days at the weekend were supported.

It was noted that there are a number of other multi-modal and corridor studies abutting or crossing the SWARMMS area whose findings and observations would need to be taken into account, including the A36/46 and A417/419.

The objective of shifting freight from road to rail or water was not specifically mentioned, but appeared to be accepted by all, underlying most of the early part of the discussion. There was general agreement that, even with policies to encourage a switch to rail, road freight would not decrease, merely grow more slowly than in recent years.

A growing number of capacity constraints affecting rail freight were identified, with priority given to passenger trains in the commuter peaks (particularly on the approaches to London), i.e. a conflict of interest between passengers and use of rail as part of a “just-in-time” logistics chain. It was considered that there was still plenty of capacity for increased freight movement, particularly at night, although making full use of this could lead to environmental problems.

Discussion then turned to facilitating modal shift to rail and the need for road-rail interchange facilities. SSRA are developing a terminal location strategy, involving both large and small terminals. It was questioned whether large size and sophisticated facilities were required to attract hauliers – could an area of rai-side hardstanding with cranes suffice? The potential for third-party use of spare capacity at private sidings was also considered – limited scope was seen, although the possibility existed to add additional wagons to trainload trains going

Freight Topic Group

between the same two points.

The potential viability of some of the terminals currently planned was also questioned, with many being proposed for towns that lacked critical mass. The potential volume of (long-haul) freight that could conceivably transfer to rail was too low to fill the several trains per day (allowing a number of different routes to be served) needed to attract shippers and hauliers to use the facility. It was noted that, when re-constructing Berlin's rail network following re-unification, three rail-served distribution depots had been built, but that these were little used (the cost of rail haulage in Germany appeared to be the main issue). It was also noted that the handling costs incurred when transferring goods between road and rail were critical to the viability of railfreight.

New rail (and other) facilities have been to be subject to environmental constraints. Bristol Port experienced difficulty in getting planning permission to re-open the Portishead rail line and extend it into the port area, largely associated with the "new" section between the disused line and the port boundary. Concern was expressed about a perceived tendency to rigid interpretation of European environmental legislation in the UK. While permission has now been granted, it is for 10 trains per day – Bristol would prefer greater flexibility, e.g. 300 trains per month, to allow it to attract and handle large ships loaded with rail-friendly cargoes. However, the main aim of rail connection to Portishead was to enable the port to attract new traffic, rather than transfer existing traffic to rail (Polish coal is currently landed at Portishead, then transferred across the river by conveyor to rail at Avonmouth). Saw airports having similar problems expanding or altering the nature of the traffic they handled.

Poole also reported environmental / planning conflicts, both landside (improving port access by road) and seaside (increasing throughput). The port is on an island connected to the mainland by a single lifting bridge, which restricts access. While a proposal for a high-level bridge was turned down, a second low level access route involving a lift or swing bridge (also opening up a brownfield site for development) looks likely to be approved. Once access problems solved, Poole will face environmentalist opposition to increase in traffic as, port island apart, Poole Harbour is a leisure facility and nature reserve – restrictions on ship size, speed, frequency etc. Sees all ports encountering these problems due to sharing coastal location with leisure and nature conservation areas (e.g. Southampton's plans for Dibden Bay).

Poole is rail connected, but 98% of traffic (mainly on Ro-Ro ferries, but some bulk steel) is on road. EWS said to be keen to take more steel traffic, but lack suitable wagons or rail connected warehousing in the Midlands. This led to speculation about what rail really wants to carry. A number of obstacles to transferring freight to rail were identified, including the lack of a "one-stop-shop" for setting up a new freight flow and unexpectedly high costs quoted for certain elements – EWS were seen as having a near monopoly on existing sidings, and thus on access fees; Railtrack quotes for connecting new (private) sidings were considered excessive, while track access charges were non-transparent.

While there had been some improvement in recent years, the rail industry was seen as struggling with the just-in-time concept, or at least in delivering on it. Further, the cost of railfreight could rise in future as Railtrack were seeking to eliminate a perceived cross-subsidy

Freight Topic Group

to freight within the performance payments regime.

A side issue at Poole was different standards of vehicle inspection being applied at various ports - a perception that Poole rigorously inspected, others (e.g. Tunnel) not.

Limited scope was seen for increased use of coastal shipping or inland waterways in the south-west. While 23% of all domestic freight movement is by water, most suitable flows (e.g. bulk minerals and petrochemicals) are already using ship and barge. Increased use of inland waterways (primarily the Severn to Gloucester and Worcester in the SWARMMS area) for freight would involve double handling of goods (ship to barge, barge to truck), would be slow if passage through locks was required, disrupt the use of canals for leisure traffic, and possibly cause more environmental damage on the waterways than it avoided on road.

Conversely, potential was seen for more short-sea international traffic, e.g. a proposal for fast-ship (40 knot) trans-Atlantic container service to a W. European hub port (Cherbourg?) and feeder services to a number of UK ports (arriving in trainload size?).

Potential for radical change in the structure of the distribution industry was seen, but there were problems as well as opportunities. Shifting the trunk-haul element of supermarket distribution on to rail would require industry-wide co-operation and consolidation of distribution depots – considered unlikely. In its absence, such traffic, involving (less-than-) truckload transfers between warehouses and shops or end customers, was entirely captive to road.

Making shop (particularly super-store) deliveries at night, avoiding the busier daytime hours, was being encouraged from the centre, but local authorities were anti. A further threat to night time running is implicit in the Working Time Directive's 8-hour limit. If fully implemented this could mean require national logistics groups to revise their strategies, as distribution depots could be in the wrong place (i.e. more than 4 or 8 hours drive apart).

Back-loads provide another opportunity to reduce the volume of truck traffic, but it was doubted that efficiency could go much further.

Mixed potential was foreseen for e-commerce. An increase in home working would remove commuter trips from the roads, and an increase in on-line shopping would reduce the number of shopping trips. However, there would be a corresponding increase in the number of delivery trips, probably involving smaller "white van" type vehicles, and in the number of b2b related just-in-time deliveries.

A recent change in the freight market was commented on, particularly in the speed of reaction required from hauliers – from 4-5 days to arrange a delivery to as little as 13 hours. Cost of warehousing (rents) and the need to minimise stocks was seen as driving the trend to just-in-time deliveries.

Rail was not considered suited to cope with such demands, leading to further doubt being expressed on rail's ability to effect any significant mode shift. A 20:80 split between rail and road was considered the best that could be achieved, with doubts expressed about the ability of

Freight Topic Group

the rail network to absorb this much extra traffic.

It was suggested that the UK was too small for rail freight to be viable, and a “devils advocate” argument presented that the best role for rail was to take passenger (i.e. car) traffic off the roads, freeing them up for the movement of goods. While new roads were clearly needed in certain locations (e.g. small towns without by-passes), in general if more road space is provided it fills up with cars and road freight is little better off – better to take cars off the roads..

There was general agreement that no one mode could offer a solution, and that integration and multi-modal answers were needed – “We need logistically sound solutions, not politically correct solutions”.

A number of concerns regarding the planning process were raised, with respect to obtaining permission for new freight transfer depots, improved site access (c.f. Bristol and Poole ports). There was a conflict between the desire to develop sites and create jobs and environmental concerns / “nimbyism”. Local Authorities were seen to lack power, leading to an inability to make decisions and “fence sitting” by local councillors on planning issues.

Both the lead time and the cost involved in planning applications were criticised – Argent, promoters of the London International Freight Exchange near Slough will have spent £8m on planning, proofs of evidence and Environmental Impact Assessments for a Transport and Works Act application, etc. The need was seen for a faster planning process at a strategic level. Different attitudes to the planning process in UK and Europe were cited, with businesses in Europe often allowed to trade in advance of their applications being approved.

Development land was seldom available in suitable locations – it was commented that Government had been slow to reverse the policy of zero-rating development on greenfield sites, which seems contrary to current policy of encouraging use of brownfield sites. Rating policy was seen as a means of encouraging appropriate development – logistics firm Exel had negotiated rate rebates with several local authorities if at least 20% of goods at a depot were rail-borne.

Data availability for the SWARMMS modelling and forecasting process was discussed. It was accepted that, given the high degree of inter- and intra-modal competition in the haulage industry, much data would be treated as commercially sensitive and unavailable to the study. Argent will forward a copy of the demand forecasting report used in proofs of evidence at their planning enquiry.

In apologies for absence:

- sSRA communicated a list of concerns from the main rail freight operators, noting
 - parts of the London-south west rail corridor important, e.g. Reading, where SW-London and SE flows crossed Southampton-Midlands flows and any further increase in the number of passenger trains would limit their ability to operate freight trains;
 - similar concerns between Oxford and Didcot, and west of Swindon;

Freight Topic Group

- on all lines an increase in the number and speed of passenger trains limits the number of paths for freight;
- while distances in/to the South West made railfreight a potentially good option, there were problems with loading gauge and gradients in Devon and Cornwall;
- (as noted in the meeting) there was little road congestion affecting competitors to encourage modeswitching;
- Avonmouth was potentially important, e.g as a regional distribution centre;
- There was potential for rail to transport waste to landfill sites / incinerators; and
- The proposed upgrade of the Great Western Main Line would reduce the need for expansion on the London-Exeter route.
 - Bristol International Airport advised that very little freight passes through the airport – the small aircraft used on regional routes have low capacity for belly hold cargo. Their freight activity is currently centred on a bonded warehouse at Avonmouth and road haulage, primarily to Heathrow. If larger aircraft come into use, this activity will return to the airport – only 4,200 tonnes per annum are handled at present.

Environment Topic Group

Venue	RNIB Bristol	
Date held	24th July 2000	
Present	Fiona Brown	Halcrow
	Arefa Siddiqi	Halcrow
	Gareth Walters	Halcrow
	Geoff Smith	Chris Blandford Associates
	Andrew Page-Dove	GOSW
	David Mills	GOSW
	Antonia Glyde	Highways Agency
	Catherine Mack	Council for the Protection of Rural England
	Katie Sellek	Countryside Agency
	David Rayner	FRCA
	John Henry	Civic Trust
	Gerry Friell	English Heritage
	John Leech	Devon Environment Protection Group
	Dagmar Junghan	English Nature
	Mike Birkin	Friends of the Earth
	Kath Haskey	Environment Agency

Action

Presentation by Halcrow and Chris Blandford Associates - ½ Hour

- Introduction
- Outline of the Study: its purpose and main objectives, the study area, programme, consultation
- Purpose of Meeting
- Methodology and Appraisal Framework for the study:
 - Overview of Approach
 - Local and Regional Objectives
 - Scale of Data Collection and Analysis
 - Problem Identification
 - How Strategies and Plans will be developed
 - Assessment of Strategies and Plans (approach), Appraisal Summary Table and supporting analysis

Issues and Trends Session – ¾ Hour

Introductions were made from everyone around the table with individuals outlining their main areas of interest. Everyone was asked to put forward issues and trends that they felt were relevant to the study. In particular they were asked to pinpoint specific areas of environmental concern.

Environment Topic Group

John Leech (JL) – Identified that there is a perception that air quality is getting worse (in Devon at least). Ozone problem and poor/limited data in Cornwall. Mike Birkin (MB) also identified that more information on ozone is needed as the data is not very good at the moment.

Cath Mack (CM) – Light pollution, affecting tourism and enjoyment of areas as well as a landscape issue. CPRE has lots of information on work done on light pollution – definition of SW Character Areas included light pollution. Katie Selleck (KS) – highlighted the fragility and character of SW. Antonia Glyde (AG) can provide information on assessment of light pollution if required.

KS – The SW has a large no. of designated landscapes – interlink with tourism. AONB's equal to National Park status. (PPG7 incorrect). Local Authorities have also been advised that 'other' landscape areas are also important – particularly the interrelationship between rural and urban fringe.

Gerry Friel (GF) – Noted that there is a heritage contribution to each landscape characterisation. Methodologies for assessing heritage areas can be obtained from English Heritage (EH) headquarters. Bypasses are a big heritage issue in urban/rural fringe areas (e.g. severance, development demand)

KS – Mentioned the issue of 'Balancing' environmental concerns against socio-economic issues not being correct and that we should be aiming to achieve all four of the Governments sustainability objectives.

Mike Birkin (MB) – The Environmental Quality of the SW contributes to the economic development of the area – the 'Environmental Driver'. There is a problem of pressure on green belts and urban fringe – also leading to noise and air quality character changes. CM however stated that economic development in the SW is not just transport led. There is a 'Constructive tourist Economy'.

Kath Haskey (KH) - provided details of where information can be obtained on Groundwater protection zones, flood plains, Climate change etc.

Dagmar Junghans (DJ) – Identified that there is a water supply management issue – transfer of water to other parts of the region – therefore this cannot be looked at just locally. Another concern to English Nature (EN) is the pressure on ecology outside designated areas, e.g. pressure on biodiversity due to farming practices.

David Rayner (DR) – effects on rural communities adjacent to major trunk routes. It is important to consider local transport needs and local businesses. (issues of severance etc).

Antonia Glyde (AG) – identified the issue of increased accessibility and the effect on landscape and noise. CM pointed out however that increased accessibility does not necessarily mean increase in roads or transport – it could mean better access to public transport for example. However, increased car access can increase social exclusion. Also DJ stated that these areas are nice in many ways because of a lack of accessibility. DJ made reference to the Countryside Access Bill. Countryside Agency do not believe the Countryside Access Bill will be a major issue.

KS – Transport is linked to what type of tourism industry is wanted. AG – The Cotswolds had been badly affected by tourism.

GF – Railway infrastructure is important in SW – historically. Great Western Railway

Environment Topic Group

was recently nominated for consideration for designation as a World Heritage Site.

CM – Highlighted the issue of conflicting use of roads for different purposes – e.g local / distance use. There is also greater aggressive use of minor roads – and thereby safety issues through communities. Important to think of ways of managing roads (e.g. closing roads to certain vehicles) rather than building bypasses and include ranges of solutions. DR – agricultural business needs should be accommodated.

KS – Speed of and attitudes to travel is an issue e.g. in Devon. John Leech (JL) – night time noise from lorries (especially refrigerated lorries) is an issue.

Feedback Session

The aim of this session was to obtain information on specific locations of environmental concern/hotspots within the study area. DM reiterated that the study also includes the South East.

- Countryside Agency: Research into methods for achieving the four sustainability objectives from Rick Minter, Cheltenham office
- Countryside Agency: Countryside Character areas and their descriptions. Katie Sellek is sending. KS
- English Nature Natural Area Profiles - Gerry Hannersly/Dagmar Junghanns or EN's geographical unit in Peterborough
- Environment Agency : State of the Environment Report , Indicative flood plain maps (GIS) and Groundwater Protection Zones (GIS)
- LEAPS: Local Environment Action Plan - Pat Steward, EA's Development Planner (Exeter)
- University of Western England: Air Quality Review and Assessment Reports JL
- NETCEN Webpage links to NETCEN site and lists LA's with info on Air quality (John Leech to e-mail web page address to us)
- Chartered Institute of Environmental Health: Annual returns to noise complaints by LA area.
- Devon Environment Protection Group: Exeter noise survey, John Leech
- CPRE: Tranquil Areas , Transport Policy Officer, Warwick House – CPRE head office.
- Friends of the Earth: Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Mike Birkin to enquire re. SW and a contact name MB
- NETCEN Regional Air pollution maps
- Local Records Centre (each county has one – except Devon): Biological Records (by County), Dagmar Junghanns.
- English Heritage (EH): Stonehenge World Heritage Site – GIS (Link to Stonehenge and Avebury Management Plans), Sue Cole, Saville Row office (Gerry Friell to check name) GF
- EH: Scheduled Ancient Monuments – digitally available
- EH: Sites and Monuments Records - County Council
- EH: Listed Buildings - Local Authorities
- EH: National Monuments Records, Swindon Office
- EH: Historic Landscape Programme - Graham Fairclough – London HQ GF
- EH: Historic Core Zones Chris Winter – Historic Towns Forum (Gerry Friell to

Environment Topic Group

provide telephone no.)

- Somerset County Council/CPRE: Blackdown Hills enquiry
- CA Inspectors Reports (and CA's report on this) Ken Roberston – Salisbury office
- CPRE: Stonehenge, CPRE Transport officer at Warick House

Next Steps

FB gave contact details for Halcrow. It was requested that another meeting take place to follow up this Environmental Topic Group meeting. Currently MB is responsible for informing interested parties of the study's progress. FB mentioned the website as a source of information for interested parties. FB

Bus Topic Group 31/7/2000, The Pithay, Bristol

Operators present at the meeting were:

- Brian James (First Western National);
- Derek Pemberton (Stagecoach);
- Roy Jeffires (First Western National).
- Steve Harrison (Halcrow)
- Roger Childs (Halcrow)
- Andrew Carlyle (Halcrow)

Problems

Traffic Congestion

Problems are largely concentrated in the urban areas and relate to the impact of traffic congestion on bus journey times and, as importantly, reliability. Particular problem locations include:

- Exeter;
- Taunton;
- Plymouth;
- Newton Abbot – Torquay - Paignton (outside SWARMMS area?);
- Bristol (along those corridors where bus priority measures are limited/non-existent).

Traffic congestion on inter-urban roads is limited, although there are summer Saturday problems in the south west.

Levels of Service

- Levels of service are relatively low (hourly or worse). Express bus market limited by the strength of competing modes, in particular car, rail and to a lesser extent coach. Bus operators are unlikely to invest in significant increases in service frequency if the demand potential is low. Low levels of demand for both end-to-end and shorter journeys along inter-urban bus routes are common in Devon and Cornwall. A good example is the St Austell – Plymouth route where the bus operator (First Western National) would like to offer a better level of service but cannot justify the level of investment required given the strength of competition, in particular from car and to a lesser extent rail.
- Low fares (in comparison with rail) are believed to be insufficient to attract enough demand to justify the introduction of increased levels of service.
- Transport 2000 have identified gaps in the Express Bus network between Exeter and Salisbury. There is also potential to improve integration between the existing and proposed express buses and rail services on the Exeter – Salisbury line.

Successful Initiatives

- Penzance – Camborne – Truro Corridor (First Western National): Quality Bus Partnership with local authority has led to the introduction of a “premier service”.
- Newquay – A30 – Exeter express bus service (First Western National) is considered to be a success and has reasonable load factors, in particular during the summer months.
- Swindon – Cheltenham – Gloucester express bus service (Stagecoach). Reasonably successful, but has to compete with both rail and coach for longer distance demand along this corridor.

- Through ticketing initiatives with rail are seen as a “good thing” but take up has been limited in some locations. Good example are the through tickets enabling rail passengers to access Sidmouth via an interchange at Honiton.

Other Problems

- Quality of waiting facilities for passenger away from the urban centres. Given the low service frequencies this is a particular problem, especially when combined with:
- Poor quality information on bus services (both scheduled and real time). Again a particular problem for passengers waiting to catch buses in rural areas. Very limited reassurance that bus will turn up. This discourages all but regular bus users.
- Integration with rail services is seen as a localised problem dependent upon management attitudes of specific bus and train operating companies. However, the development of large holding companies responsible for both rail and bus operations may help to encourage further integration.
- Vehicle quality is seen as having improved over the past 5 years with low-floor vehicles being introduced. However, these tend to be concentrated on high demand urban operations rather than inter-urban services where high floor, coach-type vehicles are often used.

Tourism Topic Group 19/7/2000

Venue South West Regional Development Agency, Exeter
Present Andrew Ball - Halcrow
Robyn Brown - The National Trust
Jonathon Coe - South West RDA
Judith Crisp - Somerset Tourism
Martin Evans - Exmoor National Park Authority
Gareth James – Halcrow
Phillip Markham – Dartmoor National Park Authority
Rebecca Mosley – Devon County Council
Andrew Page-Dove – Government Office for the South West
David Pattison – Cornwall County Council
Michael Preece - South West Tourism
Janet Reynolds – Devon County Council
Claire Simmons – Halcrow
Teresa Timms – Cornwall Enterprise

Apologies

Action

Introduction

The SWARMMS study aims to develop “a long term strategy to address passenger and freight movement needs on the key transport corridors providing routes between London and the South West of England and South Wales”. The aim of the tourism topic group meeting is to:

- Understand **current/future trends** in the tourist industry;
- Understand the **aspirations** of the tourist industry;
- Gather information regarding **mode of tourist travel**, both to, and around the South West;
- Identify **transport problems** of particular relevance to the tourist industry;
- Understand how transport impacts on the potential for **tourism growth**; and
- Identify **opportunities** to improve the transport network to the benefit of the tourist industry.

Data collection

- The National Park Visitors Survey (1994) may provide useful information, based on site and roadside interviews. This is available from the Centre for Leisure Research. It was

Tourism Topic Group 19/7/2000

recommended that Halcrow review this data.

Halcrow

- The Devon Annual Tourism Trends Report produced by Devon County Council may be a valuable additional source. Again, Halcrow should review this information.
- South West Tourism, in conjunction with the local authorities, compile information on holiday patterns. Dominic Houston at South West Tourism may be a useful contact for additional data on tourism trends. Halcrow was invited to meet with Mr. Houston to discuss available data.

Halcrow

Halcrow

Past/present tourism trends

- The topic group agreed that the tourist industry in the south west is not necessarily looking to attract additional visitors during the peak season, rather they are seeking to promote higher spending throughout the year.
- GDP in Cornwall is poor. Seasonal employment and a bulk of traditionally low paid jobs in the tourist industry are partially to blame. Thus from an economic perspective, considerable benefits may arise if the tourist season was extended and was capable of producing year round jobs. However, in the off peak season, competition from overseas destinations is particularly stiff. Indeed, the availability of cheap air fares/ferry crossings, combined with a greater range of information sources about holidays (e.g. teletext and the internet), means that the region is increasingly competing with tourist destinations world-wide. In order to do so the tourist industry in the south west needs to create a 'product'. It is recognised that there is 'redundant stock' in the industry and that this needs to be replaced in order to attract increasing numbers of visitors.
- Recent changes in employment law mean that all employees are now entitled to a statutory four weeks of annual leave. This change in legislation is likely to have a significant impact on the pattern of tourism in Britain. Increasingly the tourist industry is forced to accept that many people travel to foreign destinations for their main holiday. However, under new legislation the way in which people choose to spend the third and fourth weeks of their annual leave may have an important implications for the tourist industry. The topic group agreed that this change in legislation presents an opportunity to promote the south west as a location for additional holidays. The tourist industry is therefore keen to encourage people to spend their second holiday en-bloc in the south west. Their challenge is thus to highlight the desirability of the region in this respect.

Future tourism trends

- Rising fuel costs are likely to have an adverse effect on the tourist industry in the south west, making travel increasingly expensive. This is compounded at present by the strength of the pound, making overseas holidays comparatively cheaper. If the value of the pound drops the potential for the tourist industry in Britain is likely to increase.
- The industry anticipate that the short break market will grow over coming years.

Tourism Topic Group 19/7/2000

However, an ageing population suggests that this growth may not necessarily be in weekend breaks. With retired people accounting for increasing numbers of visitors the mid-week and out of season market is likely to expand.

- It is hoped that new attractions in the region will generate additional demand for short breaks. Whilst it is anticipated that visitors to the Eden Project will travel mainly by car, visitors to other attractions, such as the '@ Bristol' project will have a choice of modes.

Tourist travel – general points

- In general terms tourist travel by road has increased at the expense of rail.
- Figures relating to tourist movement in the south west show that around 90% of visitors to the region travel by car. This figure is higher in certain areas, for example, 97% of travel to the National Parks in the region is by car. Data indicates that this proportion is increasing over time.
- Many visitors are attracted to the south west because of the natural environment. It was agreed that whilst the tourist industry can support increased numbers of visitors, the region can not support a significant increase in the number of cars.
- The topic group agreed that it would be unrealistic to expect the majority of visitors to leave their cars behind entirely. However, it was widely recognised that visitors should be encouraged to use an alternative to the private car wherever possible. It was agreed that the industry agrees that most visitors would prefer not to travel by car if there was a viable alternative.
- In Cornwall the average length of stay is 7 nights. 60% of visitors stay in self-catering accommodation, where breaks run typically from Saturday to Saturday. This pattern of weekend changeover has an important impact on traffic. Surveys show that, in Cornwall, congestion is perceived to be a problem by around 50% of visitors. Furthermore, given that 70% of visitors are repeat visitors, congestion and perceived congestion have an important impact. The topic group agreed that the visitor's first impression colours their holiday and that their last impression is particularly influential in determining whether they return. In both cases, transport plays an important role. The industry in the south west has, to a certain extent, already begun to try and break the pattern of weekend change over days and thus tackle the problem of resulting congestion. Increasingly attempts are being made to add additional days to the average length of stay. 9 days for the price of 7 is a common offer. Such initiatives may have important implications for traffic.
- The number of visitors to the south west who enjoy cycling as part of the holiday experience is increasing. Cycling is considered to be a potential growth market that could be promoted as an attraction in its own right. If cycling is to be encouraged then it is important that off-road facilities are improved around the region. The topic group considered that the difficulty of carrying bicycles on public transport, especially on trains,

Tourism Topic Group 19/7/2000

is a particular problem.

- Park and Ride is generally considered to be an appropriate solution to tourist related traffic problems in many cases. The topic group felt that, if properly designed, Park and Ride could be made part of the holiday experience. Indeed, it is often the only time that some car drivers use public transport.

Tourist travel into the region

- The existing railway service is seen as particularly problematic in catering for the needs of tourist travel. Overall, there is a strong recognition that the railways need to be more customer focused and customer friendly. The quality of experience on the rail travel is particularly important for the tourist (much more so than for a business person or utility traveller), because often the journey is an important part of the holiday experience. The topic group considered that the main issue for the tourist is one of comfort rather than time. If tourists are to be encouraged to travel by rail it is likely to be necessary to re-introduce a perception of quality. Brand names such as 'The Cornishman' can potentially play a large role in this sense, promoting a quality of service and a willingness to oblige. Other particular problems with rail travel include the ease with which seats can be booked, catering arrangements, and the storage and movement of luggage. 'Motor-rail' is considered to be a potential way forward for the future but will require imaginative thinking.
- The topic group agreed that there is a need to ensure that adequate transport infrastructure and services are in place all year round. At present additional services, particularly on the railways, are provided at peak times during the tourist season. This raises the problem that where a visitor has made use of public transport during the peak season and then returns in the off-peak to find that services have been scaled down, their perception of the credibility of public transport system in the region is damaged.
- The cost of public transport is a further important barrier to increased use of public transport. Indeed, realistic pricing is essential if visitors to the region are to be encouraged to travel by more sustainable means. Why can rail travel not be cheaper at night as is often the case with air travel?
- Problems of frequency, quality and provision of service together with cost mean that at present package holidays by public transport are unattractive to the tourist and difficult to organise.
- The main barrier to encouraging more sustainable patterns of tourist travel into the region is largely that of tackling the final section of the journey, between the major mode/network and the ultimate destination. For most tourist destinations this part of the journey is largely off the main network. Therefore, whilst a train service from the south east or the midlands may serve stations in Cornwall, onward bus services to holiday destinations are poor. Thus, the mode required for this final section often dictates the

Tourism Topic Group 19/7/2000

mode used for the entire journey.

Tourist travel around the region

- The Dartmoor Bus, a service providing for cycles and passengers, has had limited success. The operators have received a bulk of enquiries from outside the county but the service seems to have had relatively little backing from within the county and patronage has not been encouraging.
- The tourist industry is seeking to encourage visitors to spend more. The topic group agreed that there is a conflict between encouraging tourists to shop and take goods home with them and travel by public transport that does not allow large amounts of luggage to be carried.
- The communication and provision of information on public transport is regarded as a particular problem. There is a need for information to be readily accessible both to visitors once they are within the region, but also prior to leaving home, to allow the journey into the region to be planned. In trying to encourage visitors to use more sustainable modes for their long distance trip the tourist industry in the south west is faced with a cultural problem as much as a logistical problem. The topic group agreed that the opportunity exists to promote alternatives to the car for shorter journeys by virtue of their novelty value.

Travel problems/opportunities for improvement

- The topic group identified a number of pressure points on the network. Indian Queens (A30) is perceived as a particularly problematic stretch. The topic group felt that this stretch would benefit from dualling to Land's End. Other problems include the route between 'Summer West World' and Bridgwater and the A30/303 from Honiton to Ilminster. The Kingskerwell area is also considered problematic.
- It was noted that there is a need to improve north south links in the region both in terms of road and rail. There is also a perceived need to upgrade many existing B roads to A roads.
- The eclipse generated significant traffic in the region. However, the topic group agreed that the traffic management measures put in place were successful in avoiding major problems. With continued funding the topic group feel that such measures could help to overcome many of the problems generated by tourist traffic.
- Many of the barriers to encouraging more sustainable tourist travel are considered to be structural. For example, encouraging tourist to travel by rail is problematic because rail can only provide transport to an intermediate point. Thereafter, in many parts of the region, the local transport infrastructure is not sufficient in terms of both quantity and quality. The location of Bodmin Parkway station is an example of this problem.

Tourism Topic Group 19/7/2000

- It was agreed that interchange often deters visitors from using public transport. The frequency of public transport services into the south west and then subsequently on to other destinations was also identified as a deterrent to its use.

Anticipated future travel trends

- At present, air services into the region account for a very small proportion of inward travel. In terms of attracting visitors from overseas via the regional airports the topic group felt opportunities had been missed. Previously scheduled services have been withdrawn through lack of usage. However the topic group consider that inbound air travel (in particular to Cornwall) has huge potential, not least in terms of attracting extra value 'high spend' visitors. However, if the regional airports are to benefit tourism there is a need for a long term strategy.
- Regional airports also offer significant potential in terms of outbound travel. For example, the future expansion of local airports may impact on local travel patterns by providing an alternative to major airports situated outside of the region. Exeter Airport is considered to have particular potential for future development, and the general opinion of the topic group is that land surrounding the existing airport should be protected for future growth.
- Allied to the future development of the regional airports is the opportunity to develop the related hotel industry. At present those using Exeter airport, in the most part, do not create significant additional trade. Expansion of the airport would create an additional market in terms of pre/post flight overnight stays. With the growth of attractions such as the Eden Project the industry hopes that increasing numbers of visitors will fly into the region and use places such as Exeter as a base for their stay.
- Boats and cruise liners are considered to be a growing niche market. As such, the topic group agreed that access to ports is likely to become an increasingly significant issue. At present access to local ports by high quality coach, as specified by cruise operators, raises a particular problem, for example at Fowey.
- The industry considers there to be a potential market for trips that combine rail travel with car hire at the destination. However, the high cost of this option is likely to be a significant barrier to significant use in the near future.
- In terms of attracting visitors from overseas, the south west considers itself to be disadvantaged in terms of peripherality. Many overseas visitors travel by ferry via Dover or use the Channel Tunnel. The substantial distance from point of entry to destinations in the south west is a significant problem. The provision of adequate/improved links (both road and rail) between the south west and Kent is considered to be particularly important for the future of the industry.

Social Exclusion Topic Group, 26/1/2001, The Pithay, Bristol

Present	Leslie Pearman	Countryside Agency
	Michael Socha	Employment Agency (Head of Welfare to Work)
	Graham Carter	Benefits Agency
	Richard Hartley	Devon and Cornwall Careers
	Arif Hussain	Black Network South West
	Ian Chancellor	GOSW-Social Exclusion
	Andrew Page-Dove	GOSW
	Martyn Brooks	Halcrow
	Steven McCloy	Halcrow

Introduction by Halcrow

- Introduction
- Outline of the Study: its purpose, main objectives and context.
- Outline of key problems and issues, under the headings of,
 - Environment
 - Safety
 - Economy
 - Accessibility
 - Integration
- The four strategies under which future solutions were also outlined, they are,
 - Minimum Infrastructure Strategy
 - Local Level Strategy (Principal Urban Areas)
 - Long Distance/Strategic Strategy
 - Maximum Intervention (Max Money Spend)

Issues and Trends

Introductions were made from everyone around the table with individuals outlining their main areas of interest. Everyone was asked to put forward issues and trends they felt were relevant to the study. In particular they were asked to pinpoint specific areas of concern about social exclusion.

Leslie Pearman (LP) identified that the cost of public transport relative to car costs was very expensive. She also identified that there was a lack of public transport in rural areas.

Michael Socha (MS) mentioned that people after having found work in the SW; availability of using public transport to get to and from work was very difficult, especially in Devon and Cornwall.

Graham Carter (GC) informed the group that roughly 37% of people surveyed in Somerset identified that the lack of transport was the main reason why they couldn't get a job. MS was to receive the paper.

Arif Hussain (AF) – if the need to travel was reduced then local services would be undermined, there should be increased levels of local services.

GC – Home working, e-education, e-commerce, e-employment and video conferencing should be considered in looking at changes in travel patterns especially in the West Country.

Social Exclusion Topic Group, 26/1/2001, The Pithay, Bristol

RH – agreed with the above comments by GC but identified that there has to be a certain skills set and qualifications to be able to work from home which still requires a person to person contact.

MS – suggested that car share should be encouraged by financial incentives.

LP – agreed and recommended that motorway service stations would be a possible place to implement such schemes and help to alleviate social exclusion.

RH – Made the point that in the SW there is a clear difference between peak time congestion vs. no traffic at all in off peak times and that the rising cost of public transport was excluding the elderly and young people from travelling.

GC – identified that at peak times (Summer Months) within the SW there are avoidance practises in industry.

LP – made the point that the complexity of the rail fare structure and the condition of bus stations put people off travelling by rail and by bus. Travelling by bus can give the impression of travelling by 2nd class public transport.

GC – highlighted that public transport travel would be improved by increased integrated ticketing between buses and trains.

LP – felt that rural stations were important especially for example, at Tisbury and along the Bristol-Weymouth line. Also made the point that the thrust of the Wigglybus/flexi-taxi services was encouraging.

GC – made the point that Dorset was an important area as it provided another corridor to the A303. E.g. travelling along to Bournemouth and up to London via the M3.

RH – highlighted that Cornwall requires better rail infrastructure to reduce journey times.

There is a need for the fast services and the local stopping services. There is a perception that the single sections of the A30 discourage inward investment.

Ian Chancellor (IC) – highlighted that there should be better feeder services onto the main routes.

MS – informed the group that disabled people travelling to work do not use public transport. They use either a car or a taxi, improving public transport provision doesn't really help them. The New Deal for disabled people means that there are government funds to pay for taxis and cars. With these extra funds MS expects more disabled people to return to employment.

LP – would like to see more money being invested in public transport instead of road building. If efforts were concentrated on public transport the commuter problems in and around Bristol would be removed. It was also suggested that local initiatives in rural communities should be introduced to feed into the main corridors.

GC – made the point that 'Local Strategic Partnerships' would help focus problems.

IC – explained 'Local Strategic Partnerships', in that the government has suggested services could be brought together to develop a range of initiatives to address local issues. These collaborations could be at District or Local Authority size. IC is to send details from a seminar on these proposed initiatives.

GC – stated that the ideal scenario would be to encourage the socially excluded to travel more and the social included to travel less.

LP – would like to see the 'Rural Transport Partnership' at county level to promote social exclusion. The point was also made that the weak links are the Hospitals as they have different priorities to other services. There should be directives/incentives to involve the major transport generators.

Social Exclusion Topic Group, 26/1/2001, The Pithay, Bristol

GC – stated he finds that public transport providers are only out there to make profit not provide a service.

LP – made the point that the Cornwall Truronian was doing well, but emphasised that it was financially supported.

Andrew Page-Dove (APD) – would like employers to allow ‘non-employees’ onto their services so they can get to facilities near by the destination.

LP – felt that the key to solving problems was by having a quality public transport service.

GC – identified that in 2-3 years time there would be a market for second hand mopeds and that perhaps these could help mobilise young people to education centres. Perhaps even by taking them on trains.

LP – suggested also putting cars onto trains, thus avoiding dualling the remaining sections of the A303.

RH – would like to see free parking at rural railway stations.

IC – peak fares discourage young people to travel.

MS – informed the group that under the ‘New Deal’ there are going to be new initiatives underway to help people get to and from work.

RH – backed this point up emphasising that secondary schools are usually quite close by and served by school buses, alternatively FE Colleges may be 20-30 miles away.

LP – felt that taxi services at a local level should be given more co-ordination and impetus to help those socially excluded.

IC – made the point, if access was increased to rural areas there could be an increase in property values, therefore making those socially excluded even more less well off.

GC – there is high demand for increased air services/links to Cornwall.

GC – Elderly people suffer lack of mobility and it is vital to identify the benefits of the point of need instead of at the point of crisis. This is very similar for those young people who are socially excluded.

LP/AH – Local problems need local solutions each problem varies from place to place.

IC – made the point that the elderly see personal security on public transport as a big issue.

LP – informed the group that it is the elderly people in rural communities that do most of the voluntary driving to aid the community. Also that acknowledged forms of community transport should have recognised interchange points with easy drop offs and access to information.

Planning Reference Case, 19/2/2001, DTZ London

Venue DTZ London
Date held 19/2/2000
Present David Mills - GOSW
Eddie Strankalis - ORBIT team (Haliburton)
Martin Tate - ORBIT team (ME&P)
John Barton - SERAS team (Halcrow)
Chris Cobbold - SWARMMS team (DTZ Pieda)
Dean Dyer + ANO - DETR Airports Division

It was agreed that the three teams should share information and as far as possible ensure consistency of planning reference data. The position as at the meeting was:

- SERAS have produced their planning case (population, households, workforce and employment to 2016 and 2031) based on Tempro data adjusted by Russell Harris of HETA to reflect March 2000 RPG dwelling figures.
- ORBIT are still developing their reference case and certain key variables for the SWARMMS and SERAS reference cases are in fact outputs from the LASER model not input. The ORBIT Reference Case would not be completed until end of February (at earliest). Agreed that ORBIT team would share dwelling stock data and projections
- SWARMMS Reference Case needing to be updated by mid February at latest.

Figures for South West unlikely to change but need to revise figures for the South East both to reflect RPG and comments on first draft of the planning reference case.

Agreement was reached in principle that:

- On employment SERAS and SWARMMS would use Tempro County based employment projections. SWARMMS would distribute these to districts based on consultation and analysis. SERAS would consider if it wished to utilise the SWARMMS figures at district level - but potentially complicated that the SWARMMS method would then need to be applied across the SERAS area
- With respect to households, SWARMMS and SERAS would review the dwellings provision figures produced by ORBIT and for SWARMMS would consider using these to distribute to district.
- SERAS and SWARMMS would need to run independently of ORBIT on population and labour force since these are not required for the ORBIT model.
- Agreed about the desirability of avoiding large differences in the figures being used and to keep in touch. As a general principle SWARMMS should conform where possible to SERAS or ORBIT - in practice more relevant to tie into SERAS.

Appendix B

Local Authority Meetings (2)

LA Briefings (2) Newbury 15/9/2000

Venue	West Berkshire Council Office, Newbury	
Date held	15 th September 2000	
Present:	Dominic McGrath	Basingstoke & Deane BC
	Colin Chapman	South Bucks DC
	Cllr Paul Bryant	West Berkshire Council
	Peter Murnaghan	Hampshire CC (Apologies from Cllr Keep)
	Richard Stainthorp	Reading BC
	Pat Baxter	Reading BC
	Bob Coe	Wokingham DC
	Chris Boylan	Slough BC
	Cllr R Sibley	Slough BC
	Gordon Oliver	West Berks Council
	Philip Frost	West Berks Council
	Steve Pascall	West Berks Council
	David Mills	Government Office for the South West
	John Rider	Government Office for the South East
	Martin Tugwell	South East England Regional Assembly
	Martyn Brooks	Halcrow
	David Turner	Halcrow
	Gareth Walters	Halcrow

LA Briefings (2) Bath 19/9/2000

Venue	Bath & North East Somerset Council, Guildhall, Bath	
Date held	19 th September 2000	
Present:	Roger Clews	Gloucester CC
	Mike Kerton	Cotswold DC
	Geoff Howe	Swindon BC
	Peter Reynolds	Kennet DC
	Colin Medus	North Somerset Council
	Noel Edwards	North Somerset Council
	William Wallace	East Dorset DC
	Cllr Richard Pyle	Bristol City Council
	Bob Hewett	Bristol City Council
	Geoff Pell	West Wilts DC
	Richard Metford	Bridgend CBC
	Alex Side	Neath Port Talbot CBC
	Mike O'Dowd-Jones	Somerset CC
	Tim Creroll	Somerset CC
	Catherine Mack	Somerset CC
	Martin Williams	B&NES
	Andrew Fayre	South Somerset DC
	Cllr John Farley	South Somerset DC
	Nick Helps	Wiltshire CC
	Spencer Drinkwater	Wiltshire CC
	David Mills	Government Office for the South West
	Peter Dawson	Government Office for the South West
	Andrew Page-Dove	Government Office for the South West
	Martyn Brooks	Halcrow
	Gareth Walters	Halcrow

LA Briefings (2) Exeter 20/9/2000

Venue	Thistle Hotel, Exeter	
Date held	20 th September 2000	
Present:	Ray Bentley	Plymouth City Council
	John Mandred	East Devon DC
	Ian Harrison	Devon CC
	David Budd	Dorset CC
	Jenny Pritchard	Dorset CC
	Malcolm Woodward	West Dorset DC
	Rebecca Mosley	Teignbridge DC
	Tony Hodgkiss	Torbay Council
	Mike Fox	Torbay Council
	Paul Adams	Caradon DC
	Martyn Gallivan	Weymouth and Portland BC
	Jill Cluivehouse (?)	Weymouth and Portland BC
	Mick Nesbet	Penwith DC
	Martyn Haley	Penwith DC
	Brian Grey	Teignbridge DC
	John Cocker	Teignbridge DC
	Robert Hichens	Cornwall CC
	Richard Fish	Cornwall CC
	David Mills	Government Office for the South West
	Peter Dawson	Government Office for the South West
	Andrew Page-Dove	Government Office for the South West
	Martyn Brooks	Halcrow
	Gareth Walters	Halcrow

Appendix C

Summary of correspondence from Local Authorities

Local Authorities

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE FILE

Highways

- Urgency for improvements to the A30 (T) between Bodmin and Indian Queens.
- Need to safeguard the A38 alignment for the Broadmoor Farm Strategic Employment Site.
- Clarification of the future of the Tamar crossing.
- The long single sections along the A38 with unsatisfactory horizontal and vertical alignments, junction configurations, and bisecting the villages of Dobwalls, Tideford and Landrake.
- If road schemes continue to be delayed, then public transport improvements, particularly rail, will become a matter of extreme urgency.
- A354 and A37 need improvement.
- The Nettleton-Crickley single carriageway section between the M4 and M5 is in need of improvement to reduce accidents and congestion.
- Serious safety hazards, congestion and inevitable rat-running along local lanes emanating from the bottleneck on unimproved section of the A417 Trunk Road at Crickley Hill and at the Air Balloon junction with the A436.
- Localised bottlenecks in and around the Cotswolds.
- Need to address north-south access to the recognised ports.
- Increase of traffic on some junctions on the A38, due to the development of 6000 additional homes to the east of Plymouth.
- Areas of the M4 need to be designated Air Quality Management Areas as air pollution from road traffic is resulting in exceedances of nitrogen dioxide.
- Traffic noise and pollution from the M4.
- The construction of parallel relief roads would be harmful for reasons of visual impact, noise, emissions and potential additional traffic generation.
- Motorway widening shouldn't be considered unless it is solely connected with traffic management (e.g. exclusive lanes) and to be contained within existing highway limits.
- Restricting motorway access will only add to the impact of traffic onto other local roads that are already under considerable pressure from traffic.
- Park and Ride sites could mean inappropriate development in Green Belt areas, it also can generate more car trips rather than encouraging journeys to be based fully on public transport.
- Motorway tolls will push traffic onto local roads, putting pressure on local communities.
- Noise pollution generated by traffic, especially on the M3.
- Possible introduction of motorway tolls and the impacts associated with problems they may have on the local road network need to be considered.
- If Terminal 5 at Heathrow gets the go ahead then a number of surface access provisos have to be met as T5 will have major long term transport implications for the area.
- If there is widening of the M25 between the M3 and M4 junctions during the construction phase the reduced capacity on the M25 will force more traffic onto local roads.
- Future decisions on Terminal 5 and LIFE will effect the close relationship between the M4 and A4, especially at Junction 5 where the routes cross these are the main feeder route into Slough and need to be considered very carefully.

Appendices

- Dobwalls village requires a bypass.

Rail

- Poor rail service in Cornwall, in terms of journey times and reliability, resulting in increased congestion on the roads.
- Waterloo-Salisbury-Exeter railway line needs upgrading.
- The Weymouth-Yeovil-Bristol railway line needs an improvement in services, rolling stock and capacity.
- There is a need for the 'south cord' link (between Yeovil Junction and Pen Mill) to integrate services between Weymouth-Bristol and Waterloo-Exeter.
- Poor transport connections to transport interchanges discouraging the use of existing rail services and reinforcing car dependency.
- High cost of rail fares to London Paddington reduces the attractiveness of rail as an alternative.
- SWARMMS should note the talks of clockface services in the SOWRACC document on passenger rail for the Southwest, as part of the attractiveness of the rail alternative is its regularity.
- There is a problem that the rail network will not be able to expand fast enough to meet present demand.
- The Airtrack development could have disbenefits to local rail journeys.
- Any proposed motor-rail terminal to the west of London although having benefits for a small number of car users, the impacts of such a facility in terms of local traffic impact could encourage car use rather than promote a modal shift.
- There is a lack of progress in improving local rail services, such as those operating for Overton and Whitchurch currently running a two-hour frequency.
- Rail links to Heathrow Airport from Basingstoke need to be considered.
- The level of Local Authority input into the re-franchising of the rail network, especially the Wessex area needs greater considering.
- Rail services through Slough are focused too much on London commuter movement.

Freight

- Environmental disruption in the North Cotswolds particularly from international road freight distribution in and out of the Vale of Evesham.
- No mention of moving freight by sea at the presentation (Thistle Hotel, Exeter 20th Oct 2000).
- The development of large freight depots, such as LIFE and Central Railway are more likely to add to the problems of traffic congestion around London, in addition to their considerable harm to the local environment.

Bus/Coach

- There is currently no connecting bus service from Cirencester to the nearest railway station (4 miles).
- There is a lack of bus links from nearby towns to allow local residents onto the rail network in and around Slough.

Sea

- No mention of short sea shipping at the presentation (Thistle Hotel, Exeter 20th Oct 2000).

Air

- Newquay Airport is somewhat remote. It requires improved links to the centres of population and a greater range of services.

Tourism

- Need to consider tourist movements on the A37/A350/A358/A303/A3088.

Miscellaneous

- The effectiveness of the north-south routes linking in with the identified east-west corridors and the integration with these routes.
- The study need to consider the relationship and links between the conurbations of Poole/Bournemouth and Southampton/Portsmouth and the main transport corridors in the study.
- The A417/A419 needs to be considered in the SWARMMS study area.
- The extension of the SWARMMS study area to cover Gloucestershire needs to be done to ensure that the Northern Sub-Region's transport needs are fully addressed in time.
- There is a lack of any alternative services in the north Cotswolds such as Chipping Camden.
- There are poor local public transport connections in many of the smaller settlements which reinforces people's dependence on private transport modes to the South West.
- Study area too narrow and should encompass the M3/M27/A31/A35 corridor.
- Need to consider the A39 as a link into North Devon as an alternative corridor to be part of the study.
- Difficulties often arise with the interface between transport organisations, e.g. Railtrack, TOC's, HA LA's etc...

Contributions from:

Penwith District Council
Caradon District Council
West Dorset District Council
Gloucestershire County Council
Cotswold District Council
Weymouth and Portland District Council
Plymouth City Council
Wokingham District Council
South Bucks District Council
The Borough of Basingstoke and Deane
Slough Borough Council
Dobwalls and Trewidland Parish Council
Torridge District Council

Appendix D

Sample Questionnaire

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

PROBLEMS - Please indicate whether you think the following are transport problems, and if so how serious. (please tick only one box on each line).

Q1.1a Car Travel?

	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
traffic congestion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Journey time reliability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
road safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
availability/quality of information and signs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q1.2a Bus Travel?

bus service frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
reliability of bus travel times	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
speed of bus journeys	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
comfort on bus journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
bus services don't go where I want to go	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
cost of bus journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
availability/quality of information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q1.3a Coach Travel (longer distance)

reliability of coach travel times	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
speed of coach journeys	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
coaches don't go where I want to go	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
availability/quality of information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q1.4a Lorries

lorries get held up in congestion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
speed of lorries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
lorries can be intimidating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
number of lorries on the road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q1.5a Rail Services

train service frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
reliability of train travel times	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
speed of train journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
comfort of train journeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
there is no rail station near where I live	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
trains don't go near where I want to go	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
cost of train journeys	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
availability/quality of information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
interchanges with buses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
Q1.6a	Air and Sea						
	access to main airports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	journey opportunities from local airports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	cost of air travel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	access to sea ports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Q1.7a	Rural Transport						
	availability of public transport	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	cost of car travel in rural areas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	traffic speeds in rural areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q1.8a	Holiday Season						
	congestion during holiday season	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	journey time reliability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q1.9a	The Environment						
	overall quality of the environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	transport noise and pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	traffic impact on local communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	impact on national heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	use of greenfield sites for development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q1.10a	The Economy						
	congestion effects on local businesses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	congestion effects on the tourism industry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	access to jobs (employment prospects)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q1.11a	Disadvantaged Groups						
	transport for those without access to a car	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	transport for people with disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Q2	ANY OTHER PROBLEMS - If there are any problems with transport in the SWARMMS area not mentioned above please tell us.						
	SOLUTIONS, WHAT SHOULD WE DO? - Listed below are examples of some potential solutions to the transport problems within the SWARMMS area. Please tick one box for each potential solution to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the approach						
Q3.1a	Use of the road network						
		strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
	limiting access onto motorways at busy times	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

		strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
	charges to use roads (tolls)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	give priority to lorries and buses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3.2a	Rail Improvement						
	new tracks/improved rail routes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	faster, more frequent and reliable train services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	more freight on trains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3.3a	Bus and Coach improvements						
	more local bus routes and services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	better information about public transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3.4a	Interchange between types of transport						
	better Interchange between rail and bus/coach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	more Park & Ride	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	more car parking at railway stations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3.5a	Build new roads						
	widening major routes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	local bypasses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	schemes to improve safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3.6a	Reduce/Manage the need to travel						
	providing more local facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	more walking and cycling within local areas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	change work patterns (eg working from home)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	change travel habits (eg car sharing)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q3.7a	Do Nothing						
	Do nothing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q4	ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS? - If there are any other solutions not mentioned above, please tell us:						
Q5.0	Are you...?						
	<input type="checkbox"/> Male						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Female
Q6.0	Which age group do you belong to...?						
	<input type="checkbox"/> under 18						<input type="checkbox"/> 45 - 54

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

- 18 -24
- 25 -34
- 35 - 44

- 55 - 59
- 60 - 64
- 65 or older

Q7.0 Do you have access to a car for your own use...?

Yes

No

Q8 Please tell us your Post Code Area:

BS

Q9 Please tell us your Post Code District:

6

Q10 How often do you use the following forms of transport...?

	5+ times a week	2-4 times a week	once a week	less often	never
Car	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coach	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Train	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q11.0 Form of Questionnaire Reply...?

Original Form

Photocopy

E-mail Response

Q12.0 Address given for further contact...?

E-mail

Fax

Post

None

Appendix E

Tables showing distribution and requests of SWARMMS newsletter No.1

Newsletter No.1 Distribution List

Organisation	No. Newsletters
Carrick DC	80
Kerrier DC	80
Penwith DC	80
Dartmoor NPA	80
Exeter CC	80
North Devon DC	40
Teignbridge DC	80
Isles of Scilly	40
North Cornwall DC	80
Restormel BC	80
Mid Devon DC	80
South Hams DC	80
Torridge DC	40
West Devon BC	80
East Dorset DC	40
Purbeck DC	40
Weymouth & Portland BC	40
Caradon DC	80
Cotswold DC	40
Gloucester CC	40
Christchurch BC	40
North Dorset DC	40
West Dorset DC	40
Exmoor NPA	80
Cheltenham BC	40
Forest of Dean DC	40
Stroud DC	40
Tewkesbury BC	40
Sedgemoor DC	80
Taunton Deane BC	80
Kennet DC	80
Salisbury DC	80
Mendip DC	80
South Somerset DC	80
West Somerset DC	40
North Wiltshire DC	80
West Wilts DC	80
Bath and North East Somerset Council	200
North Somerset Council	200
Cornwall CC	300
Plymouth CC	200
Dorset CC	200
Poole BC	80
Somerset CC	300
Bristol City Council	300
South Gloucestershire Council	200
Devon CC	300
Torbay BC	150

Organisation	No. Newsletters
Bournemouth BC	80
Gloucestershire CC	200
Wiltshire CC	300
Swindon BC	200
Monmouthshire County Council	80
Newport County Borough Council	80
Cardiff County Council	80
The Vale of Glamorgan Council	40
Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council	40
Bridgend County Borough Council	40
Neath Port Talbot County Council	40
City and County of Swansea	40
Carmarthenshire County Council	40
Basingstoke and Deane BC	80
Bracknell Forest BC	80
Buckinghamshire CC	150
Eastleigh BC	40
Hants CC	150
Hart DC	40
Reading BC	300
Runnymede BC	40
Rushmoor BC	40
Slough BC	150
South Buckinghamshire DC	80
Spelthorne BC	80
Surrey CC	150
Surrey Heath BC	40
Test Valley BC	80
West Berkshire Council	80
Winchester City Council	80
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	80
Wokingham DC	80
Oxfordshire CC	150
TOTAL	7980

Additional Newsletter Requests from LA's

Organisation	No.
Caradon District Council	250
South Somerset District Council	100
North Cornwall DC	80
West Dorset District Council	60
Tavistock Town Council	15
Somerset County Council	75
Cheltenham Borough Council	20
West Berkshire Council	200
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council	20
Gweek Parish Council	10
Torbay BC	200
Linkinhorne and St Dominic Parish Councils	24

Organisation	No.
Wokingham District Council	50
S Gloucestershire Council	40
Yeovil Town Council	30
Clevedon Town Council	25
Pelynt Parish Council	10

Other Additional Newsletter Requests

Organisation	City	No.
(private individual)	Falmouth	1
Southgate Shopping Centre	Bath	1
Trowbridge Resource Centre	Trowbridge	1
Envolve	Bath	5
(private individual)	Kingskerswell	1
Charles Robertson Developments	Liskeard	1
Transport 2000 Trust	London	10
Sustainability SW	Bristol	200
(private individual)	Wellington	1
(private individual)	Reading	1
(private individual)	Taunton	1
(private individual)	St.Austell	1
(private individual)	Chard	2
(private individual)	Taunton	1
(private individual)	Taunton	20
(private individual)	Exeter	1
(private individual)	Taunton	1
(private individual)	Taunton	1
(private individual)	Bude	1
CBI South West	Bristol	100
(private individual)	Taunton	1
(private individual)	Taunton	1
(private individual)	Taunton	1
(private individual)	Totnes	20
(private individual)	Wellington	1
(private individual)	Plymouth	2
(private individual)	Gloucester	1
Mott Macdonald	Winchester	3
(private individual)	Liskeard	1
(private individual)	Swindon	1
(private individual)	Chard	1
(private individual)	Salisbury	8
(private individual)	St Austell	10
(private individual)	Bristol	8
The New Mechanics	Swindon	10
(private individual)	Portishead	1
MP for Totnes	London	15
(private individual)	Penzance	12
Helston the Lizard Community Development Officer	Helston	1

Appendix F

Findings from the questionnaire analysis

Introduction

Background

The overall aim of the SWARMMS study is to make recommendations for a long term strategy to address both passenger and freight transport needs within the key transport corridors. A very important part of the study is to find out what people currently think about transport in the study area.

As part of this information gathering process, an initial Newsletter together with an accompanying questionnaire was produced in September of last year, outlining the work of the study and containing an opportunity for the public to respond.

The key purpose of this initial questionnaire was to provide the study team with a fact gathering exercise. During this public consultation, a wide range of individuals within the study area were consulted on their perceptions of where the present transport arrangements exhibit shortcomings. This report presents the results of this initial questionnaire and provides commentary on the various issues raised.

Structure of Report

Following this introduction, chapter 2 sets out the survey methodology, including notes on the interpretation of data. This is then followed in chapter 3 with a general summary of the main findings from the survey relative to gender, age, car availability and geographic issues. Chapters 4 and 5 then provide a more detailed overview of the results of the questionnaire analysis, in terms of both the problems and issues raised and the possible options for solutions.

Methodology

Exhibition

As part of the public consultation process, the SWARMMS team visited a total of seventeen locations throughout the study area with a mobile exhibition during September 2000. The exhibition was open to all, and offered the general public the opportunity to talk to members of the study team at each venue. Copies of the initial newsletter and accompanying questionnaire were made available for collection at each of these venues.

Questionnaires

To gain a quantitative understanding of people's views and perceptions of the various transport issues, detailed questionnaire forms asking the public their views were distributed across the study area during September/October 2000.

Whilst approximately 9650 of these questionnaire forms were distributed to local authorities and other public bodies, 1000 were sent to and distributed to workshop

attendees, a further 2600 were given directly to members of the general public at the series of exhibitions and at various railway/bus stations and motorway service areas. In total, this gave an estimated total allocation of 13250 questionnaires.

By the end of November 2000, 1014 completed questionnaires had been returned to the study team.

The subsequent 'SNAP' (survey questionnaire design and analysis computer package) analysis has been based on these 1014 questionnaire returns – the total numbers input by the end of November, immediately prior to the publication of the 'Problems and Issues Report'. Based on this interim total, this equates to an approximate 8 / 9% overall sample rate.

It should be noted that during the distribution of the questionnaires, no intended bias was made towards any particular group of transport users. Also, while it has been assumed that the respondents are a representative sample of the general public in the SWARMMS study area aged 16+, no pre-determined range limits were defined with respect to proportional splits by age, gender, employment status, socio-economic group and geographic sub-region.

An example of the wording and overall scope of questions asked has been included in Appendix D in the form of a completed sample questionnaire.

Interpretation of Data

In the following survey analysis, where percentages do not add up to exactly 100% this is due to either computer rounding error, or more likely, the exclusion of 'no replies' or to multiple answers.

It should be reiterated that the views and opinions of respondents in this report represent only a sample of the general public in the SWARMMS area, rather than those of the total statistical 'universe'. In consequence, the various results are subject to potential sampling error (tolerance levels), which means that not all differences (particularly those of a minor degree) between figures or sets of figures are necessarily statistically significant.

Finally, it should be noted that the extensive program of track maintenance works introduced by Railtrack in the light of the Hatfield rail crash (which occurred on 17th October 2000), combined with the subsequent widespread delays and cancellations to many passenger rail services, may have influenced the answers given by certain respondents to specific questions within the survey.

Summary of Key Findings

Introduction

This chapter of the report sets out the main survey findings of a general nature, based on the 1014 completed and returned questionnaires. The subsequent analyses have been

undertaken on the basis of this whole dataset, split by gender, age, car availability and geographic area. A more detailed analysis, interpretation and discussion of results, relevant to the various problem issues and potential solutions is provided in later chapters.

A summary analysis of the entire questionnaire, given as percentages, is included as Appendix G. Similar analyses by gender split are given in Appendix H for males and females, while Appendix I shows the results of those with/without access to a car for their own use. Lastly, an analysis of responses is presented in Appendix J. for respondents under 60 and for the older population.

General Results

Of the total 1014 completed and returned questionnaires, 70% were from male and 30% from female respondents.

Some 70% of all respondents were below the age of 60, with 30% aged 60 or older. Indeed, 73% were 45 years of age or older. A comparison of the male/female split of these statistics shows a very similar trend, with 76% of males equal or greater than 45 years old and 30% 60 or older. Equivalent female figures are 70% and 29% respectively.

In the study area as a whole, 84% of all respondents had access to a car for their own personal use and 16% did not. Of those with a car available, 90% used it two or more times and 65% five or more times per week. Of those without access to a car (nearly one in every six people who replied), 75% travelled by this mode less than once per week.

Combining the gender/car availability statistical breakdown for the complete study area, of the 87% of males who have a car available for personal use, 94% of these use it twice or more and 68% five or more times per week. Similarly, of the 77% of females with access to a car, 89% use it twice or more often and 61% five or more times per week. Of those males without a car (13%), 75% use this mode of travel less often than once per week, while for females (23%) the equivalent rate is 73%.

In terms of frequency of use of transport modes other than the private car, of those replies from respondents with a car available, 80% stated that they travel by bus less than once a week or never, while for coach and rail travel, these figures are 99% and 77% respectively. For those without access to a car, 57% use a bus twice or more times per week, 17% once and 26% less often or never; with equivalent percentage splits of 1.5%, 6.5% and 92% for coach travel and 27%, 18% and 55% for rail travel.

For subsequent analysis purposes, the study area was split into the following geographic sub-areas:-

- Devon and Cornwall
- The adjacent south west area, including South Wales
- The Greater London area and its immediate environs, and
- Those remaining areas outside the SWARMMS study area

Some 44% of all respondents gave their home address in Devon or Cornwall, while 45% lived in the adjacent South West area (including S. Wales) and 10% in the London area. Less than 1% of those who replied gave an address outside the overall study area. Indeed, with only 3 respondents giving an address outside the SWARMMS study area i.e. sub-area 4, this data has subsequently been excluded from all statistical comparisons carried out on a geographic basis.

Looking in more detail at the responses from these four geographic sub-areas, the gender split varied from between 66 to 74% male, and from 26 to 33% female.

Finally, in both gender and car availability terms, the various percentage breakdown statistics for alternative travel modes are reasonably consistent across all areas.

Survey Findings – Problems and Issues

Introduction

This chapter provides a detailed review of the results from the questionnaire analysis with regard to answers and comments given in response to specific questions relating to transport problems and issues (Questions 1 and 2). As noted earlier, Appendix D contains a sample questionnaire showing the format and content of the individual questions asked.

Analysis Method

In Question 1 of the survey, respondents were asked to rate current conditions in terms of a set of 11 transport-related topic groups, each with its own subset of key indicators. Each aspect was rated using a six-point classification, ranging from 'serious problem' through to 'positive feature' and including a 'don't know' option. Cumulative ratings were then analysed and compared across each topic group. The topic groups comprised Car, Bus, Coach Travel, Lorries, Rail Services, Air and Sea, Rural Transport, Holiday Season, the Environment, Economy and finally, Disadvantaged Groups.

For ease of analysis and interpretation of the overall survey results, these 11 topic groups have been combined into the following 8 subject headings:-

- Highway Conditions – Car Travel and Lorries
- Bus and Coach Travel
- Railways
- Air and Sea Transport
- Social Inclusion – Rural Transport and Disadvantaged Groups
- Tourism
- The Environment
- The Economy

In the following sections, the main survey findings for each of these eight subject groups are discussed in turn, after which the various subjective comments given in response to Question 2 are discussed.

Highway Conditions

The questionnaire asked respondents a series of different questions relating to highway conditions with specific reference to car and lorry travel. The results are given in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: Responses on Car Travel

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Traffic congestion	51.6%	31.7%	10.0%	3.0%	1.0%	0.5%
Journey time reliability	24.1%	36.4%	23.8%	10.0%	1.5%	0.9%
Road safety	35.1%	30.0%	20.0%	11.3%	0.3%	0.5%
Availability/quality of information and signs	10.1%	19.5%	23.0%	35.2%	6.9%	1.7%

Table 2: Responses on Lorries

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Lorries get held up in congestion	30.7%	27.2%	18.7%	9.4%	2.8%	6.7%
Speed of lorries	39.1%	26.2%	16.5%	11.9%	0.5%	2.7%
Lorries can be intimidating	47.2%	22.2%	13.5%	12.8%	0.3%	1.1%
Number of lorries on the road	60.4%	16.2%	10.8%	8.9%	0.1%	1.4%

It can be seen from Table 1 that over 80% of respondents regard *traffic congestion* as either a moderate or serious problem. Indeed, over 50% of all respondents regarded it as a serious problem. *Journey time reliability* and *road safety* were also seen as significant problems, with corresponding figures of over 60% and 65% respectively. In contrast, only 30% felt that the *availability and quality of information and signs* was a moderate or serious problem. Over 40% thought that this was not a problem of any degree.

Table 2 shows a concentration of responses indicating that both the *number of lorries on the road* and their *intimidating effect* are serious problems (60% and 47% respectively). The *speed of lorries* was also seen as being a moderate or serious problem by over 65% of respondents, with almost 60% being similarly concerned about *lorries being held up in congestion*.

When comparing the responses by gender, it is noticeable that the female respondents saw *road safety* as a greater problem than their male counterparts (72% vs 63% regard it as a serious or moderate problem). Female respondents also showed greater concern for the *number of lorries on the road* (82% vs 74%), their *intimidating effect* (77% vs 66%), and their *speed* (74% vs 62%). The other responses were little different between the two genders.

There were only small differences between the responses of those aged 60 or over compared to the younger population. The greatest difference occurred with respect to lorry issues, in that the older respondents considered *lorries getting held up in congestion* as a greater problem (64% vs 56% thought it to be a serious or moderate problem).

Relative to car availability, a comparison of responses shows that those people without access to a car for their own use consider *traffic congestion* and *road safety* issues as more serious problems than those who have a car available (60% vs 50%, and 50% vs 32% respectively). Focussing on lorry issues, the main differences of opinion occur with respect to *lorry speeds* and to their *intimidating effect*, with those without a car rating these issues as more serious or moderate problems than those with access to a car (72% vs 64%, and 77% vs 68% respectively).

Looking at a geographic split of the survey results, those respondents giving an address in London or the immediate surrounding counties view *road traffic congestion* and *journey time reliability* issues as more serious problems compared to elsewhere in the study area (64% vs 50% average, and 35% vs 24% average). However, with respect to lorry issues, there appears little difference in opinions between the 4 sub-areas.

Bus and Coach Travel

The responses received from the questionnaires concerning issues relating to bus and coach travel are given in Tables 3 and 4 below. Table 3 shows that the greatest concerns over bus travel are bus service frequency (69% regard this as a serious or moderate problem), the routes not reflecting where the respondents wish to travel (64%), the cost of bus journeys (59%), and the reliability of bus travel times (58%). The comfort of bus journeys was the least concern.

Table 3: Responses on Bus Travel

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Bus service frequency	38.6%	30.1%	12.2%	7.5%	1.4%	7.1%
Reliability of bus travel times	29.5%	28.3%	17.8%	11.1%	0.9%	9.0%
Speed of bus journeys	22.6%	29.1%	19.1%	16.1%	0.6%	8.0%
Comfort on bus journeys	17.6%	23.2%	21.9%	23.7%	1.9%	7.1%
Bus services don't go where I want to go	41.0%	22.7%	13.2%	12.3%	0.7%	5.9%
Cost of bus journeys	34.8%	24.2%	16.7%	13.2%	1.1%	5.9%
Availability/quality of information	24.4%	24.5%	21.9%	17.0%	1.9%	6.7%

Table 4: Responses on Coach Travel (longer Distance)

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Reliability of coach travel times	6.0%	17.2%	18.1%	27.1%	2.5%	23.6%

Speed of coach journeys	8.5%	15.5%	17.3%	29.1%	2.4%	21.4%
Coaches don't go where I want to go	14.4%	15.4%	16.3%	26.1%	0.5%	21.1%
Availability/quality of information	10.1%	16.1%	18.9%	26.9%	2.3%	20.0%

In contrast, Table 4 shows that coach travel is not seen as an overall problem although on average some 20% of respondents chose not to answer. Only save 23%-30% of respondents regarded any of the coach issues to be a serious or moderate problem.

The responses by gender vary quite markedly in several instances. Female respondents regarded bus travel as a more serious problem than their male counterparts. In terms of bus service frequency, 75% of females regarded it as a serious or moderate problem compared to 66% for males. Similar variations are seen in the routes offered (70% vs 61%), the cost of bus journeys (65% vs 57%), and the reliability of journey times (62% vs 56%). There were smaller differences in terms of the coach travel responses but, in general, female respondents were more content with the service provided.

The age of respondent had little difference in the majority of responses. The main differences were that the older respondents aged 60+, were more content with the speed of both bus and coach journeys, the comfort of bus journeys, and the availability and quality of information provided for both bus and coach travel.

In terms of the effects of car availability, those respondents without access to a car for their own use (nearly 1 in 6 of the total data sample) perceived the various bus and coach issues as more serious problems than those with daily use of a car. With regard to bus travel, 77% of those without a car view bus service frequency as either a serious or moderate problem compared to 67% of those with a car. The same pattern is repeated, for example, with the reliability of bus travel times (69% vs 56%), cost of bus journeys (66% vs 58%), availability/quality of information (59% vs 47%) and to a lesser extent, speed of bus journeys (54% vs 51%). As with the analysis based on gender split, the differences in coach travel responses were smaller, ranging between 3 and 6% for each of the stated problems.

Looking at the above issues on a geographic basis, there appear only minor differences in opinion trends for respondents in each of the 4 sub-areas (as defined elsewhere in the report). In all areas, the issue perceived as the most serious or moderate problem, is service frequency for bus travel and, for coach travel, the routes not reflecting where the respondents most wish to travel.

Finally, of those respondents who have access to a car for their own use (86% of the total dataset), only 19% of these make use of a bus 1 or more times a week, with 25% stating that they never use this method of transport. For those without access to a car, 57% use a bus 2 or more times per week, 17% once and 26% less often or never. Less than 1% of car users make use of a coach once or more than once per week, with 41% never using coach services; whilst for those without a car, no more than 7% tend to use a coach 1 or more times per week, and 22% never.

Railways

Respondents were asked their opinion on a series of issues relating to rail services in the study area. The overall responses are given in Table 5 Below. The survey findings show that by far the greatest concern is the cost of train journeys, with nearly 57% of all respondents identifying this as the most serious problem. This is followed by interchanges with buses (37%) and reliability of train travel times (30%), with all other issues recording scores of 22% or less in most cases in this category.

Several of the other issues were adjudged not to be a problem by significant numbers of respondents, for example, lack of a railway station close to where the respondents live (52%), trains not going to where the respondents want to go (39%), and speed and comfort of train journeys (32% and 28% respectively).

Comparing the results by gender, female respondents have tended, in general, to place marginally more concern on all the issues canvassed, when viewed either as a serious problem or a serious or moderate problem.

There also appears a consistent trend in the differences between the responses of those aged under 60 compared to the older population. Respondents in this younger age group viewed all the issues as more serious or moderate problems than the older population. This was particularly the case with regard to the cost of train journeys (81% vs 69%) and train service frequency (57% vs 47%), whilst for all other issues, these differences averaged around 5%.

Table 5: Responses on Rail Services

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Train service frequency	22.2%	31.6%	20.5%	18.2%	1.8%	2.7%
Reliability of train travel times	30.0%	27.9%	23.2%	12.0%	1.7%	2.9%
Speed of train journeys	12.6%	18.1%	20.9%	32.2%	10.8%	2.7%
Comfort of train journeys	11.0%	18.0%	25.3%	28.2%	11.4%	2.7%
There is no rail station near where I live	18.3%	10.4%	9.7%	51.8%	3.2%	2.1%
Trains don't go near where I want to go	16.0%	16.3%	19.1%	39.2%	1.0%	2.7%
Cost of train journeys	56.5%	20.7%	11.5%	6.4%	0.8%	1.7%
Availability/quality of information	18.1%	24.0%	23.2%	26.0%	3.0%	2.2%
Interchanges with buses	36.7%	24.9%	13.8%	9.4%	1.0%	11.3%

In general, those respondents without access to a car for their own use considered the various rail issues as more serious or moderate problems than those having a car available. Such differences of opinion were particularly noticeable with respect to specific issues viewed as serious problems, for example, 46% of respondents without a car regarded interchanges with buses as a serious problem compared to 35% of those with a car, with a similar trend for availability/quality of information (26% vs 17%), reliability of train travel times (37% vs 29%) and train service frequency (29% vs 21%).

On a geographic basis, the proportions of respondents regarding the various issues as either a serious or moderate problem were, with minor exceptions, relatively consistent across the 4 sub-areas. There was just the one issue, lack of a rail station near to where the respondents live, which showed significant differences in responses, with only 15% of those living in the London area viewing this as a serious or moderate problem compared to 31% of those living elsewhere.

Analysis of the overall survey statistics with relevance to the frequency of train travel for those with/without access to a car for their own use, shows that of those respondents with a car available for their own use (84% of the total data sample), only 10% made journeys by train on 2 or more occasions per week, 13% once a week and the remaining 77% less often or never. Of those without access to a car for their own use, (16% of the total), 27% of these use the train twice or more often per week, 18% once per week and 55% less often or never.

Air and Sea Transport

In this section of the questionnaire respondents were asked their opinions on a set of 3 issues relating to air travel and also as to whether they thought access to seaports was a specific transport problem. The responses to these questions are set out in Table 6.

The results show a concentration of around 47 to 50% of respondents who perceive each of the air travel issues as either a moderate or serious problem, with the cost of air travel of marginally greatest concern (50%). Only 34% of those who responded regard access to seaports in a similar vein. By contrast, nearly 34% thought access to sea ports not to be a problem of any degree or in fact a positive feature, with equivalent rates of between 20 and 26% for the air travel issues.

Comparing the differences in results between male/female respondents, there appears little variation in responses given by either gender group.

Likewise, analysis of the survey results shows there to be only minor differences between the responses of those people aged 60 or over compared to the younger population.

Table 6: Responses on Air and Sea Travel

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Access to main airports	20.9%	26.5%	15.2%	23.8%	2.5%	8.4%
Journey opportunities from local airports	23.1%	23.4%	15.6%	20.2%	2.9%	11.6%
Cost of air travel	26.3%	23.5%	16.7%	18.9%	1.7%	10.2%
Access to sea ports	11.5%	22.1%	17.9%	31.6%	2.0%	12.1%

Relative to car availability, a comparison of responses indicates that those with a car available for their own use consider the issue of access to main airports with greater concern than do those without a car (49% vs 42% as a serious or moderate problem). On the other hand, with regard to access to seaports, while 34% of those with a car see this issue as not a problem, this drops to 21% for those without.

Analysis on a geographic basis shows that the proportions of respondents regarding the air travel issues as moderate or serious problems were significantly higher for Devon and Cornwall than for other locations in the study area (57% vs 43% next highest for access to main airports, 59% vs 41% next highest for journey opportunities, and 58% vs 44% next highest for cost of air travel). Indeed, these issues were perceived as not a problem by between 26 and 35% of respondents in the London and surrounding area compared to only 13 to 20% of those in Devon or Cornwall.

With regard to access to sea ports, views were relatively consistent across all geographic areas of the study; the only difference of opinion occurring between the proportion of those in the London area regarding this issue as not a problem compared to Devon and Cornwall (37% vs 30% respectively).

In summary, whilst the survey results for each of the air travel issues are relatively similar, views with regard to access to sea ports show a concentration of opinions at either end of the scale. There are minimal variations in responses between gender, age group and those with/without access to a car for their own personal use. Geographically, there were specific variations in the views of those respondents living in Devon or Cornwall compared to the study area as a whole, and in particular to those for the London area.

Social Inclusion

The questionnaire asked respondents their opinions on a range of questions relating specifically to the concept of social inclusion, covering both rural transport and the issue of disadvantaged groups. The overall responses are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

Looking firstly at the rural transport issues, Table 7 shows that over 80% of all respondents regard the availability of public transport (or rather the lack of availability) as either a moderate or serious problem. Indeed, 63% regarded it a serious problem. The cost of car travel and traffic speeds in rural areas were also seen as significant (serious/moderate) problems, with corresponding rates of 65 and 62% respectively.

With regard to disadvantaged groups, Table 8 shows a concentration of responses indicating that transport both for those without access to a car (64%) and for people with disabilities (56%) are serious problems. These figures rise to 82 and 76% respectively when categorised as either a moderate or serious problem.

Table 7: Responses on Rural Transport

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Availability of public transport	63.3%	18.2%	6.7%	3.7%	0.2%	6.3%
Cost of car travel in rural areas	44.0%	20.9%	11.3%	12.4%	1.7%	7.7%
Traffic speeds in rural areas	39.6%	21.9%	15.8%	15.4%	0.2%	5.1%

Table 8: Responses on Disadvantaged Groups

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Transport for those without access to a car	63.8%	18.4%	5.6%	1.7%	0.4%	7.6%
Transport for people with disabilities	55.5%	20.4%	7.1%	1.9%	0.1%	12.4%

Comparing the results by gender, it is apparent that female respondents perceive each of the rural transport issues with greater concern than their male counterparts; 71% regarding the availability of public transport as a serious problem, 59% the cost of car travel, and 46% the issue of traffic speeds, compared to 60, 41 and 37% respectively. Similarly, females also regarded as more of a serious problem transport for those without access to car (73% vs 60%) and transport for those with disabilities (66% vs 51%).

It would appear generally, that there were only minor differences between the responses of those people aged 60 or over compared to the younger population. The biggest differences occur with respect to rural transport, in that the older respondents considered the cost of car travel as a more serious problem (49% vs 42%).

In terms of rural transport, those respondents without access to a car for their own use identified the availability of public transport and traffic speed issues as more serious problems than those who have a car available (68% vs 63% and 47% vs 40% respectively). On the cost of car travel in rural areas issue however, the reverse is true, with 44% of those respondents with a car available regarding this as a serious problem compared with only 29% of those without. Focussing on the issues with respect to disadvantaged groups, only minor differences exist between the responses of those people with and without access to a car.

A geographic split of the survey results shows that respondents with an address in the London and surrounding area regarded both the cost of car travel in rural areas and transport for those without access to a car as a less serious problem, compared to elsewhere in the study area (30% vs 46% average and 56% vs 65% average, respectively).

In summary, a concentration of responses indicate significant proportions of respondents showing a strong concern for each of the issues considered, with female respondents showing the greatest concern. Whilst there is little variation in responses with regard to the age of respondents, there appears a significant difference in views on rural transport issues between those with/without access to a car. Geographically, there occurred specific variations in the opinions of respondents from London and its immediate environs compared to the overall study area.

Tourism

Relative to the holiday season, respondents were asked whether they thought traffic congestion and journey time reliability issues were specific transport problems. The responses are given in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Responses on Tourism Issues

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Congestion during the holiday season	52.6%	26.3%	13.1%	4.9%	0.4%	1.6%
Journey time reliability	42.1%	26.9%	17.5%	8.6%	0.4%	2.5%

From these results it can be seen that 79% of respondents regard congestion and 69% journey time reliability as either moderate or serious problems during holiday periods. Indeed, less than 10% thought either issue not to be a problem of any degree or in fact a positive feature.

Comparing the results by gender, there appears little variation in responses given by either male or female respondents.

There are also only minor differences between the responses of those people aged 60 or over compared to the younger population. The biggest difference occurred with respect to journey time reliability, in that the younger respondents considered this a slightly greater problem (71% vs 65% thought it to be a serious or moderate problem).

For both issues, those respondents without access to a car for their own use gave very similar responses to those who had a car available. In either case, differences in results between the two groups were in the order of only a couple of percentage points.

On a geographic basis, the proportions of respondents regarding both issues as a serious problem were significantly higher for Devon and Cornwall than for other locations in the study area (59% vs 49% next highest for congestion, and 48% vs 39% next highest for journey time reliability).

In summary, significant proportions of respondents showed strong concern for both issues considered, with minimal variation in responses between gender and age groups or between those with/without access to a car for their own personal use. Geographically and perhaps not surprisingly, those respondents living in Devon or Cornwall perceived both issues as a more serious problem than was generally the case elsewhere in the study area.

The Environment

Under this subject heading the questionnaire asked respondents a set of five questions relating to environmental issues. The overall responses are given in Table 10.

From Table 10, traffic impact on local communities (58%) and the use of greenfield sites for development (59%) were considered as the most serious problems. Indeed, there is strong concern shown for all 5 issues considered, as either a moderate or serious problem, with the results ranging from 83% for traffic impact on local communities, to 62% for impact on the national heritage.

When comparing the results by gender, it is clear that female respondents placed significantly greater concern on all 5 issues canvassed, particularly with regard to serious problems, with response rates on average between 5 and 15% higher than equivalent male responses; for example, traffic impact on local communities (64% of females regard it as a serious problem compared to 56% of males) and transport noise and pollution (60% females and 45% male).

Table 10: Responses on Environmental Issues

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Overall quality of the Environment	36.5%	29.2%	16.6%	9.8%	4.4%	0.8%
Transport noise and pollution	49.6%	26.2%	15.9%	6.4%	0.3%	0.2%
Traffic impact on local communities	58.2%	24.6%	12.8%	2.3%	0.2%	0.5%
Impact on national heritage	35.2%	27.0%	22.2%	9.3%	0.5%	3.6%
Use of greenfield sites for development	59.0%	18.6%	11.2%	6.8%	0.4%	2.3%

The main differences in responses by age were with regard to transport noise and pollution and overall quality of the environment, where respondents under 60 years of age viewed these as more serious or moderate problems than the older population (79% vs 67%, and 69% vs 59% respectively). Responses to the other 3 issues were similar for both age groups.

In general, those respondents without the availability of a car gave consistently higher percentage scores (10 to 22% higher) for all issues as serious problems, compared to those having access to a car. In terms of the overall quality of the environment, 79% of respondents without a car regarded it as either a serious or moderate problem compared to 63% of those with a car, with a similar trend for transport noise and pollution (86% vs 73%) and impact on national heritage (72% vs 60%). Smaller, less significant, differences of 5% were recorded in terms of traffic impact and the use of greenfield sites.

On a geographic split, although the proportions of respondents regarding the various issues as either a serious or moderate problem were consistent for each of the 4 sub-areas, problems concerning the quality of environment, transport noise and pollution and impact on national heritage were seen as more serious in Greater London compared to other areas (49% vs 37% next highest, 60% vs 51% next highest and 42% vs 34% next highest respectively).

In summary, the overall results of the survey show a strong emphasis placed on problems associated with environmental issues as a result of transport activity. More specifically, It would appear that both female respondents and those without access to a car for their own individual use tend to view these problems more seriously than others.

The Economy

Respondents were asked their opinion on a set of 3 questions relating to the economic impact of current transport issues. The overall responses are given in Table 11. From these tabulations it can be seen that between 56 and 62% of respondents regard each of these economic issues as either a moderate or serious problem. Indeed in each case, less than 10% thought that they were not a problem of any degree.

Comparing the results by gender, female respondents perceive the issue of access to jobs (employment prospects) as more of a serious problem than their male counterparts (42% vs 28%). As for the other issues, there would appear little if any differences between gender groups when viewed either as a serious problem or a serious/moderate problem.

It would appear also that there were only minor differences between the responses of those people aged 60 or over compared to the younger population.

Table 11: Responses on Economic Issues

	Serious problem	Moderate problem	Slight problem	Not a problem	Positive feature	Don't know
Congestion effects on local businesses	28.8%	33.2%	21.0%	6.5%	0.2%	8.8%
Congestion effects on the tourism industry	28.1%	27.4%	24.2%	8.6%	0.9%	8.9%
Access to jobs (employment prospects)	31.9%	28.8%	19.1%	9.5%	0.3%	8.1%

Those respondents without access to a car for their own use gave very similar responses as those who had a car available. The only significant differences between the two groups occur when those people regarding the issues as a slight problem are considered. Of those respondents with access to a car, between 20 to 25% regarded each of the 3 issues as a slight problem, whilst for those without a car available, this figure averaged between 11 and 18%, 7 to 12% lower on average in each case.

On a geographic basis, the proportions of respondents regarding congestion effects on the tourism industry and access to jobs (employment prospects) issues as a serious problem were higher for Devon and Cornwall than for other locations in the study area (35% vs 25% next highest, and 39% vs 28% next highest respectively).

In summary, significant proportions of respondents showed a strong concern for each of the topics considered, with female respondents in particular regarding access to jobs as a serious problem issue.

Other Comments

With regard to Question 2 of the survey form, nearly 46% of respondents provided comment on other transport problems in the SWARMMS area not already mentioned in Question 1.

In many cases those who did reply listed more than one topic of concern, some of which overlapped on problems already highlighted in the previous Question 1. As a result, a whole myriad of issues were raised and in order to provide a meaningful commentary, these have been grouped into main topic areas, a full listing of which is provided in Appendix K. This list includes a reference to the frequency of response for each issue raised.

From this general file of problems and issues, the 'top twenty' most frequently occurring comments have then been derived and a separate list of these is included in Appendix L.

An analysis of this information in Appendix L shows that the top six comments were all related to problems with public transport. These included issues concerning the level of fares, lack of integration, lack of service routes and frequencies especially in rural areas (particularly buses), the availability of timetable information and unreliability of services. Indeed, ten out of the top twenty issues raised were public transport related.

Of the other topics raised, cycling issues are seen as a concern, particularly with regard to road safety, cycle routes and integration with public transport (lack of facilities for transporting bicycles onboard buses and trains). Congestion on roads in urban areas during peak periods and on motorways and major strategic routes are also seen as major concerns, as are general road safety issues, petrol prices and poor driving behaviour coupled with a lack of enforcement of road traffic laws and regulations.

Of final note, in some cases respondents have taken the opportunity by way of this open ended question to pass criticism on either the overall structure, content and / or scope of the questionnaire. These criticisms comprise a range of comments which include the following:

- The questions asked were too simplistic and were badly worded and confusing and open to misinterpretation.
- There was a lack of emphasis on the environmental effects of transport on both people and property.
- Motorcyclists, pedal cyclists and pedestrians appear to have been ignored in the study or paid only lip service.
- Air and Sea transport issues should have been reviewed separately.
- The overall emphasis of the study seems to be focussed on a narrow east-west corridor of strategic road and rail links between London and the south west, thereby excluding problems on a north-south axis.

Survey Findings – Possible Solutions

Introduction

This chapter of the report deals with an analysis of the responses given to Questions 3 and 4, regarding the potential solutions to transport problems within the SWARMMS area.

Analysis Method

In Question 3 of the survey, respondents were asked to score a list of possible solutions based on an overall package of six sets of transport topic strategies. These topic groups were split into a series of sub-options or proposals, with each of these rated against a six-point classification, ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree', with a 'don't know' option allowable. The cumulative totals for each option were then assessed on a percentage basis, and the results compared across each topic group. Public opinion was also sought on the basis of a 'do nothing' scenario.

The six transport topic groups investigated were as follows:-

- Use of the road network
- Rail improvements
- Bus and Coach Improvements
- Interchange between types of transport
- Build new roads
- Reduce/Manage the need to travel

In the following sections, the key survey findings are discussed for each of these six transport topic groups and for the 'do nothing' alternative option. This is then followed by a general discussion of the potential other solutions noted in response to Question 4.

Use of the Road Network

In this question respondents were asked their opinion on a set of three possible measures to restrict access onto the road network. The results are presented in Table 12 below.

Table 12: Responses on Use of Road Network

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Limiting access onto motorways at busy times	9.6%	15.3%	17.8%	29.8%	18.8%	4.0%
Charges to use roads (tolls)	12.9%	20.2%	10.6%	23.1%	27.3%	2.2%
Give priority to lorries and buses	14.2%	20.2%	12.3%	23.1%	23.4%	1.8%

From this table of results it is apparent that views appear polarised, with an overall net disagreement for all 3 of the proposed solutions. In the case of limiting access onto motorways at busy times, whilst 25% of respondents either agree or strongly agree with this measure, as many as 49% disagree or strongly disagree, with an interestingly large proportion holding no opinion either way or having no particular view (18% and 4%). With regard to charging to use roads (tolls) and giving priority to lorries and buses, there is a very similar trend in views, with 33 and 34% in favour (agree/strongly agree) and 50 and 46% against (disagree/strongly disagree) respectively. Indeed, as many as 27 and 23% 'strongly disagreed' with each of these two issues respectively.

A major concern which did arise, and which was reflected in the many comments given later in Question 4, was that respondents were of the opinion that in the giving priority to lorries and buses option, these vehicle categories should have been assessed separately rather than looked at together. Many people stated that while in favour of bus priority, they were strongly against such measures for lorries. As a consequence, this particular question was left unanswered by a significant number of respondents.

Analysing the results by gender, female respondents have tended to place marginally less support for each of the 3 issues canvassed compared to their male counterparts.

Looking at the differences in responses between those people aged 60 or over compared to the younger population, whilst views on the issue of limiting access onto motorways are virtually identical, the older respondents are less in favour and more against either charging to use roads or giving priority to lorries and buses, with respective figures of 29 and 31% 'in favour' compared to 35 and 36% of those under 60, and 55 and 48% 'against' as compared to 48 and 45%.

Perhaps not surprisingly, a comparison of responses indicate that those people with a car available are significantly less in favour and show much stronger disagreement for each of the 3 proposals than do those without a car. Looking at each of the issues in turn, while 22% of respondents with a car were in favour of limiting access onto motorways and 53% against, the figures for those without a car were 36% and 30%. Similarly, while 31% of car users are in support of and 54% against charges to use roads, 45% of those without a car are in favour of and only 33% against such a measure. In giving priority to lorries and buses, equivalent figures were 32% of car users in favour of and 51% against, compared to 50% for and 23% against for those with no car available.

On a geographic basis, the proportions of respondents in favour of each of the proposals varied across the sub-areas, as defined earlier in Section 3.2.6. Whilst in Devon and Cornwall, 19%, 29% and 29% supported limiting access onto motorways, road tolls and priority measures, equivalent rates for the adjacent South West and Greater London areas were 27, 37 and 39%, and 34, 35 and 41% respectively. With regards to the proportions of those voting against each of the measures proposed, views appear consistent across the SWARMMS area, with the exception of Devon and Cornwall, where equivalent scores were 10% higher than elsewhere on the issue of giving priority to lorries and buses.

Rail Improvement

On the topic of measures specifically designed to improve rail transport, respondents were asked to evaluate three potential solutions. The results are shown in Table 13 overleaf. Clearly, there appears overwhelming agreement for all three measures considered, with the highest score given in support of more freight on trains (nearly 79%), then new tracks/improved rail routes (68%), closely followed by the proposal for faster, more frequent and reliable train services (65%). Indeed, overall rates of agreement (agree/strongly agree) for each of these proposals are virtually identical, at 92, 91 and 92% respectively, with less than 2% of respondents in opposition in each case.

A comparison of the survey results by gender shows little significant difference between male/female respondents, although females tend to indicate slightly 'stronger agreement' for each of the 3 solutions.

There are also minor differences regarding the responses of those people aged 60 or over compared to the younger population, with the younger age group voicing stronger agreement for each of the 3 proposals e.g. 70% strongly in favour of new tracks/improved rail routes, 69% in favour of faster, more frequent and reliable train services and 79% in favour of more freight on trains, compared to 63, 57 and 76% respectively for the older age group.

Table 13: Responses on Rail Improvements

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
New tracks/improved rail routes	68.0%	23.4%	4.0%	1.4%	0.4%	1.1%
Faster, more frequent and reliable train services	65.1%	26.8%	5.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
More freight on trains	78.5%	13.8%	3.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%

In car availability terms, those respondents without access to a car for their own use gave much stronger agreement for new tracks/improved rail routes, compared to those with a car, i.e. 78% against 66%. All other responses between the two groups were relatively similar.

Geographically speaking, there were few significant differences in opinion between the separate sub-areas, with only the results from the Devon and Cornwall area showing stronger agreement for new tracks/improved rail routes i.e. 75% compared to an area wide average of 68%.

Bus and Coach Improvements

The results of the overall analysis of the questionnaire responses in relation to the proposed solutions regarding bus and coach transport are given in Table 14.

In all three cases, there is significant support for the proposed improvements, with up to 88% of respondents in favour of more local bus routes and services, 83% in favour of better information about public transport and 67% wanting faster, more frequent and reliable coach services. It should be noted that up to 22% of respondents neither agree nor disagree with the proposed improvements to coach services. However, as with rail improvements, there appears very little opposition to the proposals listed, ranging from between 1 and 4% depending on the option considered.

The responses by gender show that there is much 'stronger agreement' from females for all 3 proposals compared to their male counterparts - with 72% strongly in favour of more local bus routes and services, 56% in favour of better information about public transport and 47% in favour of faster, more frequent and reliable coach services,

compared to 53, 47 and 33% respectively. However, overall support is only marginally higher than for male respondents. Also, only 16% of females have no firm views with regard to improvements to coach services compared to 24% for males.

Table 14: Responses on Bus and Coach Improvements

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
More local bus routes and services	58.7%	29.5%	7.5%	1.4%	0.1%	1.8%
Faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	36.9%	30.1%	21.6%	3.0%	1.1%	4.9%
Better information about public transport	49.4%	33.4%	12.4%	1.4%	0.2%	1.5%

There also appears a consistent trend in the differences between the responses of those aged under 60 compared to the older population, with a higher percentage of respondents in the younger age group indicating strong agreement for each proposal (ranging between 6 and 10% higher on average). Conversely, in each of the three options there is a higher proportion (4 to 6% higher) of the older age group neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the proposals.

In general, those respondents without access to a car for their own use show much stronger agreement for all three solutions proposed i.e. 72% strongly support more bus routes and services, 63% better information about public transport and 47% faster, more frequent and reliable coach services, compared to 56, 47 and 35% respectively of those with a car available. Differences in overall support between the two groups is not as pronounced, ranging between 2 and 9% higher for those without a car.

Looking at the survey results in terms of a breakdown into separate geographical areas, there appears very little difference in opinions between the various sub-areas.

Interchange between Types of Transport

5.2.2

Respondents were asked to score three proposals aimed at promoting/encouraging the interchange of passengers between different transport modes. The cumulative results for each option are given below in Table 15.

Table 15: Responses on Interchanges between Types of Transport

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Better interchange between rail and bus/coach	60.1%	28.6%	6.9%	0.6%	0.1%	1.7%
More Park and Ride	42.7%	29.6%	14.0%	6.2%	3.5%	1.5%
More car parking at railway stations	42.4%	32.5%	14.2%	4.3%	1.6%	2.2%

The survey findings indicate good general support for each proposal, with 89% of respondents in favour of better interchange between rail and bus/coach, 75% in favour of more car parking at railway stations, and 72% supporting more park and ride. Indeed, it should be emphasised that 60% of respondents 'strongly agree' with proposals for better interchange between rail and bus/coach. Opposition levels are low, ranging between <1% (better interchanges) and 10% (more park and ride).

An analysis of the results by gender group confirms that male and female respondents hold very similar views regarding these various interchange issues.

The age of respondent made little difference in the majority of responses given. The main difference was that there was slightly more overall support from the '60 or over' group for each of the three proposed solutions (+2% in favour of better interchanges, +5% in favour of more park and ride and +7% in favour of more car parking at rail stations).

The responses from those without access to a car for their own use show a greater proportion of respondents in 'strong agreement' with the proposal for better interchange between rail and bus/coach (68%), compared to those with a car available (58%), although overall support for this option is only 4% higher. Conversely, there is not as much overall support shown for either of the other two proposals from this non-car group. With 63% in favour of more park and ride and 59% in favour of more car parking at railway stations, these proportions are lower than the respective figures of 74 and 78% of those with a car available.

As regards the geographic split of these survey results, with the exception of the Greater London area, where a greater proportion of respondents strongly agree with more car parking at railway stations (51% compared to an average of 42% for all other areas), there appear only minor differences in opinions between sub-areas.

Build new Roads

Respondents were asked their opinion on proposals involving the building of new roads. The options under review comprise the possible widening of major routes, the building of local bypasses and schemes to improve safety. The subsequent results are presented in Table 16.

The results show that whilst opinions seem to be split over the issue of widening major routes, a healthy majority of respondents are in favour of building local bypasses, with very strong support for schemes to improve safety. The results for each of these options are now looked at in greater detail.

With reference to the widening of major routes, 43% of respondents are in support of this proposed solution while 38% oppose it. Indeed, strong opinions are expressed on either side, with 25% strongly agreeing and 20% showing strong disagreement, with a rump of 14% of responses not concerned either way.

While 65% of respondents are in favour of local bypasses, only 20% are against. In fact, 35% of all responses give strong agreement while only 11% hold strong opposite opinions.

The proposal of schemes to improve safety is given overwhelming support, with 50% strongly agreeing and 85% in overall favour. Less than 5% of respondents were against such a proposal.

Table 16: Responses to Building New Roads

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Widening major routes	24.7%	18.7%	14.0%	18.7%	19.6%	1.0%
Local bypasses	35.1%	29.5%	12.8%	9.1%	10.6%	0.6%
Schemes to improve safety	50.1%	34.7%	8.4%	2.7%	1.6%	0.3%

Comparing the results of the survey by gender group, there is less support and consequently greater opposition amongst females for either the widening of major routes or building of local bypasses compared to their male counterparts (37 and 54% in support, compared to 46 and 69% of males; and 36 and 16% against, compared to 44% and 28% respectively). Conversely, a greater proportion of females strongly agree with schemes to improve safety, (55% compared to 48% of males), although overall support at 88%, is only 4% higher.

A greater proportion of people aged 60 or over are in favour of widening major routes and building local bypasses compared to the younger population (51 and 73% compared to 41 and 61% respectively), whilst there appears little difference in opinions with regard to schemes to improve safety.

When the survey results for those respondents without access to a car for their own personal use are analysed separately, there is much less support for and significantly more opposition to both the widening of major routes and building of local bypasses. A breakdown of the appropriate statistics show only 22 and 44% in favour of each of these options, compared to 48 and 69% of those with a car available, with 58 and 36% in opposition compared to 34 and 17% respectively. Opinions between the two groups regarding schemes to improve safety are, however, very similar.

Looking at the issues on a geographic basis, a greater proportion of respondents in the Devon and Cornwall area strongly agree with both the widening of major routes and building local bypasses (29 and 41% compared to averages of 23 and 30% for all other areas). Regarding schemes to improve safety, there is a consistency of results across all areas in support of such measures.

Reduce/Manage the Need to Travel

The responses received from the questionnaire survey concerning the popularity of specific measures designed to reduce/manage the need to travel have been analysed and the results given in Table 17. These indicate that of the four possible measures

considered, there is significant overall support for providing more local facilities and for more walking/cycling within areas (85% and 83% respectively of the total responses), followed by proposals to change travel habits (74%) and to change work patterns (67%). With regard to the issue of changing work patterns i.e. working from home, 20% of respondents neither agree nor disagree.

The responses by gender group show that female respondents are more strongly in favour of all four measures, as listed in the above paragraph, with respective scores of 64, 60, 49 and 40%, compared to 48, 54, 39 and 38% for their male counterparts.

Table 17: Responses to Reducing/Managing the Need to Travel

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Providing more local facilities	52.8%	32.4%	8.3%	1.5%	0.6%	1.0%
More walking and cycling within local areas	56.1%	27.0%	10.0%	3.1%	1.6%	0.3%
Change work patterns (eg working from home)	38.0%	28.8%	19.9%	7.4%	1.7%	1.5%
Change travel habits (eg car sharing)	42.3%	31.9%	13.7%	6.2%	2.3%	0.9%

In comparison to the older population, a larger proportion of people under the age of 60 agree more strongly with each of the four proposed solutions. The relative percentage scores were:- 53% for more local facilities, 60% for more walking/cycling within areas, 42% for changes to work patterns and 45% for changes to travel habits, compared to 51, 45, 28 and 36% respectively for those aged 60 or over. The scores reflecting 'overall support' i.e. those who either agree or strongly agree, tell a similar story, with percentage totals on average 5 to 12% higher than equivalent response rates for the older population.

Those respondents without access to a car for their own use gave stronger support for all four measures considered, compared to those with a car available. Looking at the relative statistics, 58% strongly agree with providing more local facilities (compared to 51%), 72% with more walking/cycling within areas (compared to 53%), 40% with changes to work patterns (compared to 38%) and 54% with changes to travel habits (compared to 40%). Differences in 'overall support' between the two groups are less extreme, ranging from between 3 and 9%.

With the one exception, the analysis shows only minor differences in opinion between respondents in each of the separate geographic sub-areas. The exception occurs with respect to respondents from the Greater London area, who indicate greater support for the proposal for changes in work habits, with 50% 'strongly agreeing' and 77% giving 'overall support', compared to average scores of 37% and 66% for all other areas.

Do Nothing

Public opinion was also sought on the basis of a 'do nothing' scenario. The key findings of this part of the survey are presented in Table 18 below.

Table 18: Responses to Do Nothing

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Do Nothing	1.9%	0.5%	2.9%	15.2%	59.3%	0.9%

An inspection of the above figures clearly indicates that an overwhelming majority of 75% of respondents oppose such a 'do nothing' approach, with nearly 59% strongly disagreeing with this concept. It should be noted however, that as many as 20% of respondents failed to answer this specific question. Removing this group from the overall analysis, the revised statistics subsequently show that up to 93% of responses disagree with such a 'do nothing' approach.

As expected, these survey results are consistent across the separate age, gender, car ownership and geographic sub-category analyses.

Other Solutions

With regard to Question 4 of the survey, over 59% of respondents have taken the opportunity to comment on other possible solutions to current transport problems within the SWARMMS area.

As was the case with the replies to the earlier Question 2, many of the respondents have provided more than the one comment or suggestion in answering this question, a proportion of which have overlapped on issues previously assessed under the various topic group options discussed in Question 3. A full listing of these comments and suggestions is provided in Appendix M, classified into main topic areas, with the frequency of response per issue shown in brackets.

Analysis of the responses in Appendix M shows that the top ten list of suggested 'other solutions' are as follows, again with the number of responses given in brackets:

- Greater Investment & Improvements in Public Transport (117)
- Give priority to buses, not lorries (97)
- Reduce (subsidise) Public Transport Fares (85)
- Need for more, direct, and safer cycle routes (preferably segregated from other road users), in both urban and rural areas (50)
- Transfer large (long distance) road freight to rail (42)
- Integration of Public Transport Services and Timetable Information (39)
- Increased provision of cheap (free), safe and secure car parking at railway stations for train ticket holders (32)
- Greater integration of cycling with public transport systems (buses, coaches and rail) e.g. secure/safe cycle parking and locker facilities at stations, and adequate provision for the carriage of cycles onboard buses and trains (28)
- Greater provision of edge-of-town Park & Ride sites for all towns/cities (25)
- Enforcement of Road Traffic Regulations (24)

Looking in more detail at this top ten list of solutions, seven of these are directly concerned with public transport issues. These comprise the following - greater investment and improvements, reducing fares, support for more bus priority measures, better integration of services and timetables, the transfer of road freight to rail, cheaper car parking at train stations and the integration of cycling with all public transport systems.

Clearly, the top three suggested solutions - 'Greater investment & improvements in public transport', 'Give priority to buses, not lorries' and 'Reduce (subsidise) public transport fares' are by far the most popular packages of measures, with 117, 97 and 85 comments respectively. Indeed, with an overall total of 299 votes in favour, these three sets of measures are more popular proposals than the other seven combined (240 comments).

Finally, of these other seven suggested solutions, the three measures dealing with non public transport related issues are, in order of popularity, in 4th place 'the need for more cycle routes' (50 comments in support), in 9th place 'greater provision of edge-of-town park & ride sites' (25 comments), and in 10th place 'enforcement of road traffic regulations' (24 comments).

Appendix G

Summary analysis of the complete dataset.

A Study of Transport between London and the South West of England and South Wales

PROBLEMS - Please indicate whether you think the following are transport problems, and if so how serious. (please tick only one box on each line).

	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
Q1.1 Car Travel?						
traffic congestion	51.6%	31.7%	10.0%	3.0%	1.0%	0.5%
Journey time reliability	24.1%	36.4%	23.8%	10.0%	1.5%	0.9%
road safety	35.1%	30.0%	20.0%	11.3%	0.3%	0.5%
availability/quality of information and signs	10.1%	19.5%	23.0%	35.2%	6.9%	1.7%
Q1.2 Bus Travel?						
bus service frequency	38.6%	30.1%	12.2%	7.5%	1.4%	7.1%
reliability of bus travel times	29.5%	28.3%	17.8%	11.1%	0.9%	9.0%
speed of bus journeys	22.6%	29.1%	19.1%	16.1%	0.6%	8.0%
comfort on bus journeys	17.6%	23.2%	21.9%	23.7%	1.9%	7.1%
bus services don't go where I want to go	41.0%	22.7%	13.2%	12.3%	0.7%	5.9%
cost of bus journeys	34.8%	24.2%	16.7%	13.2%	1.1%	5.9%
availability/quality of information	24.4%	24.5%	21.9%	17.0%	1.9%	6.7%
Q1.3 Coach Travel (longer distance)						
reliability of coach travel times	6.0%	17.2%	18.1%	27.1%	2.5%	23.6%
speed of coach journeys	8.5%	15.5%	17.3%	29.1%	2.4%	21.4%
coaches don't go where I want to go	14.4%	15.4%	16.3%	26.1%	0.5%	21.1%
availability/quality of information	10.1%	16.1%	18.9%	26.9%	2.3%	20.0%
Q1.4 Lorries						
lorries get held up in congestion	30.7%	27.2%	18.7%	9.4%	2.8%	6.7%
speed of lorries	39.1%	26.2%	16.5%	11.9%	0.5%	2.7%
lorries can be intimidating	47.2%	22.2%	13.5%	12.8%	0.3%	1.1%
number of lorries on the road	60.4%	16.2%	10.8%	8.9%	0.1%	1.4%

	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
Q1.5 Rail Services						
train service frequency	22.2%	31.6%	20.5%	18.2%	1.8%	2.7%
reliability of train travel times	30.0%	27.9%	23.2%	12.0%	1.7%	2.9%
speed of train journeys	12.6%	18.1%	20.9%	32.2%	10.8%	2.7%
comfort of train journeys	11.0%	18.0%	25.3%	28.2%	11.4%	2.7%
there is no rail station near where I live	18.3%	10.4%	9.7%	51.8%	3.2%	2.1%
trains don't go near where I want to go	16.0%	16.3%	19.1%	39.2%	1.0%	2.7%
cost of train journeys	56.5%	20.7%	11.5%	6.4%	0.8%	1.7%
availability/quality of information	18.1%	24.0%	23.2%	26.0%	3.0%	2.2%
interchanges with buses	36.7%	24.9%	13.8%	9.4%	1.0%	11.3%
Q1.6 Air and Sea						
access to main airports	20.9%	26.5%	15.2%	23.8%	2.5%	8.4%
journey opportunities from local airports	23.1%	23.4%	15.6%	20.2%	2.9%	11.6%
cost of air travel	26.3%	23.5%	16.7%	18.9%	1.7%	10.2%
access to sea ports	11.5%	22.1%	17.9%	31.6%	2.0%	12.1%
Q1.7 Rural Transport						
availability of public transport	63.3%	18.2%	6.7%	3.7%	0.2%	6.3%
cost of car travel in rural areas	44.0%	20.9%	11.3%	12.4%	1.7%	7.7%
traffic speeds in rural areas	39.6%	21.9%	15.8%	15.4%	0.2%	5.1%
Q1.8 Holiday Season						
congestion during holiday season	52.6%	26.3%	13.1%	4.9%	0.4%	1.6%
journey time reliability	42.1%	26.9%	17.5%	8.6%	0.4%	2.5%
Q1.9 The Environment						
overall quality of the environment	36.5%	29.2%	16.6%	9.8%	4.4%	0.8%
transport noise and pollution	49.6%	26.2%	15.9%	6.4%	0.3%	0.2%
traffic impact on local communities	58.2%	24.6%	12.8%	2.3%	0.2%	0.5%
impact on national heritage	35.2%	27.0%	22.2%	9.3%	0.5%	3.6%

	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	Don't know
use of greenfield sites for development	59.0%	18.6%	11.2%	6.8%	0.4%	2.3%
Q1.10 The Economy						
congestion effects on local businesses	28.8%	33.2%	21.0%	6.5%	0.2%	8.8%
congestion effects on the tourism industry	28.1%	27.4%	24.2%	8.6%	0.9%	8.9%
access to jobs (employment prospects)	31.9%	28.8%	19.1%	9.5%	0.3%	8.1%
Q1.11 Disadvantaged Groups						
transport for those without access to a car	63.8%	18.4%	5.6%	1.7%	0.4%	7.6%
transport for people with disabilities	55.5%	20.4%	7.1%	1.9%	0.1%	12.4%

Q2 ANY OTHER PROBLEMS - If there are any problems with transport in the SWARMMS area not mentioned above please tell us.

45.5%

SOLUTIONS, WHAT SHOULD WE DO? - Listed below are examples of some potential solutions to the transport problems within the SWARMMS area. Please tick one box for each potential solution to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the approach

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
Q3.1 Use of the road network						
limiting access onto motorways at busy times	9.6%	15.3%	17.8%	29.8%	18.8%	4.0%
charges to use roads (tolls)	12.9%	20.2%	10.6%	23.1%	27.3%	2.2%
give priority to lorries and buses	14.2%	20.2%	12.3%	23.1%	23.4%	1.8%
Q3.2 Rail Improvement						
new tracks/improved rail routes	68.0%	23.4%	4.0%	1.4%	0.4%	1.1%
faster, more frequent and reliable train services	65.1%	26.8%	5.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
more freight on trains	78.5%	13.8%	3.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
Q3.3 Bus and Coach improvements						
more local bus routes and services	58.7%	29.5%	7.5%	1.4%	0.1%	1.8%

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	36.9%	30.1%	21.6%	3.0%	1.1%	4.9%
better information about public transport	49.4%	33.4%	12.4%	1.4%	0.2%	1.5%
Q3.4 Interchange between types of transport						
better Interchange between rail and bus/coach	60.1%	28.6%	6.9%	0.6%	0.1%	1.7%
more Park & Ride	42.7%	29.6%	14.0%	6.2%	3.5%	1.5%
more car parking at railway stations	42.4%	32.5%	14.2%	4.3%	1.6%	2.2%
Q3.5 Build new roads						
widening major routes	24.7%	18.7%	14.0%	18.7%	19.6%	1.0%
local bypasses	35.1%	29.5%	12.8%	9.1%	10.6%	0.6%
schemes to improve safety	50.1%	34.7%	8.4%	2.7%	1.6%	0.3%
Q3.6 Reduce/Manage the need to travel						
providing more local facilities	52.8%	32.4%	8.3%	1.5%	0.6%	1.0%
more walking and cycling within local areas	56.1%	27.0%	10.0%	3.1%	1.6%	0.3%
change work patterns (eg working from home)	38.0%	28.8%	19.9%	7.4%	1.7%	1.5%
change travel habits (eg car sharing)	42.3%	31.9%	13.7%	6.2%	2.3%	0.9%
Q3.7 Do Nothing						
Do nothing	1.9%	0.5%	2.9%	15.2%	59.3%	0.9%
Q4 ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS? - If there are any other solutions not mentioned above, please tell us:						
	59.3%					
Q5 Are you...?						
	69.4%	Male		29.3%	Female	
Q6 Which age group do you belong to...?						
	0.5%	under 18		28.8%	45 - 54	
	1.7%	18 -24		15.2%	55 - 59	
	8.6%	25 -34		11.3%	60 - 64	
	14.8%	35 - 44		18.2%	65 or older	
Q7 Do you have access to a car for your own use...?						
	83.5%	Yes		15.7%	No	
Q8 Please tell us your Post Code Area:						
	99.6%					

Q9 Please tell us your Post Code District:

99.5%

Q10 How often do you use the following forms of transport...?

	5+ times a week	2-4 times a week	once a week	less often	never
Car	55.0%	22.7%	6.0%	9.1%	3.5%
Bus	7.1%	10.4%	9.6%	46.3%	21.3%
Coach	0.2%	0.1%	1.2%	53.5%	37.1%
Train	3.7%	8.0%	13.5%	61.3%	9.3%

Q11 Form of Questionnaire Reply...?

92.4%	Original Form	4.1%	Photocopy	3.5%	E-mail Response
-------	---------------	------	-----------	------	-----------------

Q12 Address given for further contact...?

21.6%	E-mail	5.8%	Fax	52.4%	Post	29.8%	None
-------	--------	------	-----	-------	------	-------	------

A Study of Transport between London and the South West of England and South Wales

PROBLEMS - Please indicate whether you think the following are transport problems, and if so how serious. (please tick only one box on each line).

Q1.1	Car Travel?	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	traffic congestion	53.5%	32.3%	6.0%	2.8%	1.8%	0.7%
	Journey time reliability	22.3%	36.5%	20.9%	12.1%	1.4%	1.8%
	road safety	38.7%	33.0%	14.9%	7.4%	0.4%	1.4%
	availability/quality of information and signs	10.3%	22.3%	22.0%	30.1%	6.7%	3.5%
Q1.2	Bus Travel?						
	bus service frequency	51.8%	23.0%	10.6%	6.0%	0.7%	3.5%
	reliability of bus travel times	34.8%	27.0%	16.7%	10.6%	0.0%	7.4%
	speed of bus journeys	23.8%	28.0%	19.5%	16.0%	0.4%	6.4%
	comfort on bus journeys	16.0%	23.8%	23.4%	24.1%	1.4%	5.3%
	bus services don't go where I want to go	46.1%	23.8%	11.0%	9.2%	0.4%	5.0%
	cost of bus journeys	40.8%	23.8%	14.2%	11.0%	0.7%	4.3%
	availability/quality of information	26.6%	25.5%	19.9%	18.1%	1.8%	4.6%
Q1.3	Coach Travel (longer distance)						
	reliability of coach travel times	3.9%	14.9%	17.0%	33.7%	1.8%	22.7%
	speed of coach journeys	8.2%	15.6%	16.3%	31.9%	1.8%	19.5%
	coaches don't go where I want to go	16.0%	17.0%	16.0%	24.8%	0.7%	19.1%
	availability/quality of information	9.6%	17.0%	17.7%	28.7%	2.5%	18.1%
Q1.4	Lorries						
	lorries get held up in congestion	33.7%	27.3%	16.3%	6.4%	2.1%	8.9%
	speed of lorries	45.0%	28.7%	8.9%	9.2%	0.4%	3.9%
	lorries can be intimidating	53.9%	23.4%	8.5%	8.9%	0.7%	1.4%
	number of lorries on the road	65.6%	16.0%	6.7%	7.4%	0.0%	2.1%
Q1.5	Rail Services						
	train service frequency	27.3%	29.4%	18.1%	17.4%	1.4%	2.5%

Appendices

		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	reliability of train travel times	36.5%	24.8%	21.6%	9.9%	1.1%	3.2%
	speed of train journeys	12.4%	18.1%	19.9%	34.4%	9.6%	2.5%
	comfort of train journeys	13.1%	19.1%	23.0%	29.1%	9.2%	2.5%
	there is no rail station near where I live	22.3%	12.1%	8.5%	49.6%	1.1%	1.8%
	trains don't go near where I want to go	18.4%	15.6%	19.1%	39.4%	0.0%	2.8%
	cost of train journeys	62.1%	16.7%	9.6%	7.1%	0.4%	1.8%
	availability/quality of information	21.3%	25.5%	19.1%	27.7%	1.4%	1.8%
	interchanges with buses	38.3%	23.8%	12.8%	8.9%	1.1%	12.4%
Q1.6	Air and Sea						
	access to main airports	22.0%	26.2%	16.3%	20.9%	1.8%	10.3%
	journey opportunities from local airports	22.0%	23.0%	16.7%	18.4%	1.4%	14.2%
	cost of air travel	26.6%	24.8%	16.7%	14.9%	1.4%	11.3%
	access to sea ports	9.9%	24.8%	19.1%	28.7%	0.7%	13.5%
Q1.7	Rural Transport						
	availability of public transport	70.9%	12.8%	6.0%	2.1%	0.7%	5.3%
	cost of car travel in rural areas	49.3%	18.4%	8.5%	9.6%	1.8%	9.6%
	traffic speeds in rural areas	46.1%	22.3%	12.1%	11.3%	0.0%	5.0%
Q1.8	Holiday Season						
	congestion during holiday season	55.7%	26.6%	11.3%	3.5%	0.0%	1.1%
	journey time reliability	45.0%	25.2%	17.7%	7.1%	0.4%	2.1%
Q1.9	The Environment						
	overall quality of the environment	45.7%	27.7%	11.7%	6.4%	4.6%	0.7%
	transport noise and pollution	59.6%	20.6%	11.3%	5.3%	0.4%	0.4%
	traffic impact on local communities	63.8%	20.9%	11.0%	0.7%	0.4%	1.1%
	impact on national heritage	44.0%	24.5%	17.4%	5.0%	0.7%	6.0%
	use of greenfield sites for development	65.2%	14.5%	11.0%	2.5%	0.7%	4.3%
Q1.10	The Economy						
	congestion effects on local businesses	27.7%	34.4%	18.1%	5.0%	0.7%	11.7%

	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
congestion effects on the tourism industry	26.2%	30.5%	22.7%	6.0%	1.4%	11.0%
access to jobs (employment prospects)	42.2%	25.5%	13.1%	6.4%	0.4%	8.5%

Q1.11 Disadvantaged Groups

transport for those without access to a car	73.0%	13.5%	3.9%	1.4%	0.0%	5.3%
transport for people with disabilities	65.6%	14.9%	3.5%	1.1%	0.0%	11.3%

Q2 ANY OTHER PROBLEMS - If there are any problems with transport in the SWARMMS area not mentioned above please tell us.

49.3%

SOLUTIONS, WHAT SHOULD WE DO? - Listed below are examples of some potential solutions to the transport problems within the SWARMMS area. Please tick one box for each potential solution to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the approach

Q3.1 Use of the road network

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
limiting access onto motorways at busy times	8.9%	14.2%	15.2%	34.8%	13.5%	6.0%
charges to use roads (tolls)	11.7%	18.8%	8.9%	29.1%	22.3%	3.2%
give priority to lorries and buses	12.1%	17.4%	10.3%	27.0%	24.1%	1.8%

Q3.2 Rail Improvement

new tracks/improved rail routes	69.9%	19.9%	3.9%	1.4%	0.0%	2.1%
faster, more frequent and reliable train services	66.0%	23.8%	5.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
more freight on trains	79.8%	9.6%	6.0%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%

Q3.3 Bus and Coach improvements

more local bus routes and services	72.0%	18.8%	4.6%	0.7%	0.4%	1.4%
faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	46.5%	25.5%	16.0%	1.8%	1.4%	6.0%
better information about public transport	56.0%	27.3%	9.9%	2.1%	0.0%	1.8%

Q3.4 Interchange between types of transport

better Interchange between rail and bus/coach	60.3%	29.4%	6.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
more Park & Ride	43.3%	28.0%	12.8%	6.0%	3.5%	2.1%
more car parking at railway stations	46.1%	27.3%	12.8%	5.0%	1.8%	3.2%

Q3.5	Build new roads		strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
	widening major routes	20.2%	16.7%	12.1%	22.0%	22.3%	1.8%	
	local bypasses	29.4%	24.8%	14.2%	14.5%	13.1%	1.1%	
	schemes to improve safety	55.3%	32.6%	5.7%	2.5%	1.1%	0.0%	
Q3.6	Reduce/Manage the need to travel							
	providing more local facilities	63.8%	23.4%	6.0%	0.7%	0.0%	1.1%	
	more walking and cycling within local areas	60.3%	27.3%	7.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.4%	
	change work patterns (eg working from home)	39.4%	26.6%	18.1%	9.9%	0.7%	1.8%	
	change travel habits (eg car sharing)	48.9%	28.0%	10.3%	5.7%	1.4%	1.8%	
Q3.7	Do Nothing							
	Do nothing	3.5%	0.4%	2.8%	16.7%	54.3%	0.7%	
Q4	ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS? - If there are any other solutions not mentioned above, please tell us:							58.9%
Q5	Are you...?	0.0%	Male	100.0%	Female			
Q6	Which age group do you belong to...?	1.4%	under 18	25.9%	45 - 54			
		3.5%	18 -24	15.2%	55 - 59			
		11.7%	25 -34	14.2%	60 - 64			
		12.8%	35 - 44	14.9%	65 or older			
Q7	Do you have access to a car for your own use...?	77.0%	Yes	22.7%	No			
Q8	Please tell us your Post Code Area:							99.6%
Q9	Please tell us your Post Code District:							99.6%
Q10	How often do you use the following forms of transport...?		5+ times a week	2-4 times a week	once a week	less often	never	
	Car	46.5%	23.4%	8.9%	12.1%	4.6%		
	Bus	7.1%	15.2%	10.3%	42.2%	20.6%		
	Coach	0.4%	0.0%	2.1%	56.0%	33.7%		
	Train	1.1%	7.1%	7.8%	68.8%	10.6%		
Q11	Form of Questionnaire Reply...?	92.6%	Original Form	3.5%	Photocopy	3.9%	E-mail Response	
Q12	Address given for further contact...?	17.7%	E-mail	3.9%	Fax	45.4%	Post	39.0%
								None

Appendix H

Summary analysis of:

- Male respondents, and
- Female respondents.

A Study of Transport between London and the South West of England and South Wales

PROBLEMS - Please indicate whether you think the following are transport problems, and if so how serious. (please tick only one box on each line).

Q1.1a Car Travel?		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	traffic congestion	51.0%	31.6%	11.4%	2.8%	0.7%	0.4%
	Journey time reliability	24.9%	36.4%	25.3%	8.7%	1.5%	0.6%
	road safety	34.0%	28.6%	22.3%	12.6%	0.3%	0.1%
	availability/quality of information and signs	10.0%	18.4%	23.5%	37.0%	7.0%	0.9%
Q1.2a Bus Travel?							
	bus service frequency	33.2%	33.2%	12.6%	8.2%	1.6%	8.4%
	reliability of bus travel times	27.5%	28.7%	18.4%	11.2%	1.3%	9.6%
	speed of bus journeys	22.2%	29.8%	19.0%	16.0%	0.7%	8.5%
	comfort on bus journeys	18.4%	23.4%	21.1%	23.4%	2.1%	7.6%
	bus services don't go where I want to go	39.1%	22.3%	14.2%	13.5%	0.9%	6.0%
	cost of bus journeys	32.0%	24.7%	18.0%	14.2%	1.3%	6.4%
	availability/quality of information	23.7%	24.3%	22.9%	16.5%	1.9%	7.3%
Q1.3a Coach Travel (longer distance)							
	reliability of coach travel times	7.0%	18.1%	18.7%	24.0%	2.8%	24.0%
	speed of coach journeys	8.8%	15.6%	17.7%	27.5%	2.7%	22.2%
	coaches don't go where I want to go	14.1%	15.0%	16.3%	26.3%	0.3%	21.9%
	availability/quality of information	10.3%	16.0%	19.3%	25.9%	2.2%	20.7%
Q1.4a Lorries							
	lorries get held up in congestion	29.8%	27.4%	19.8%	10.3%	3.1%	5.4%
	speed of lorries	36.8%	24.9%	19.9%	13.0%	0.6%	1.9%
	lorries can be intimidating	44.0%	22.2%	15.6%	14.5%	0.1%	0.9%
	number of lorries on the road	58.2%	16.2%	12.7%	9.4%	0.1%	1.0%
Q1.5a Rail Services							
	train service frequency	19.9%	32.8%	21.6%	18.6%	1.8%	2.8%
	reliability of train travel times	27.4%	28.7%	24.1%	12.7%	1.9%	2.8%
	speed of train journeys	12.6%	18.3%	21.4%	31.1%	11.4%	2.7%
	comfort of train journeys	10.0%	17.5%	26.2%	27.7%	12.6%	2.7%

		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	there is no rail station near where I live	16.2%	9.7%	10.3%	53.1%	4.2%	2.1%
	trains don't go near where I want to go	14.8%	16.5%	19.3%	39.5%	1.5%	2.5%
	cost of train journeys	53.7%	22.6%	12.6%	6.1%	1.0%	1.6%
	availability/quality of information	16.5%	23.4%	25.1%	25.3%	3.6%	2.4%
	interchanges with buses	35.8%	25.4%	14.5%	9.6%	1.0%	10.8%
Q1.6a	Air and Sea						
	access to main airports	20.4%	26.9%	15.0%	24.6%	2.7%	7.6%
	journey opportunities from local airports	23.4%	24.0%	15.1%	20.8%	3.3%	10.6%
	cost of air travel	26.0%	23.4%	16.8%	20.4%	1.8%	9.6%
	access to sea ports	12.0%	21.3%	17.5%	32.6%	2.4%	11.5%
Q1.7a	Rural Transport						
	availability of public transport	59.9%	20.8%	6.9%	4.5%	0.0%	6.6%
	cost of car travel in rural areas	41.2%	22.3%	12.7%	13.6%	1.6%	6.7%
	traffic speeds in rural areas	36.8%	22.0%	17.5%	16.9%	0.3%	4.9%
Q1.8a	Holiday Season						
	congestion during holiday season	51.2%	26.3%	13.9%	5.4%	0.6%	1.6%
	journey time reliability	40.7%	28.0%	17.5%	9.1%	0.4%	2.4%
Q1.9a	The Environment						
	overall quality of the environment	32.5%	29.9%	18.9%	11.1%	4.2%	0.9%
	transport noise and pollution	45.2%	28.4%	18.1%	6.9%	0.3%	0.1%
	traffic impact on local communities	55.8%	26.2%	13.6%	2.8%	0.1%	0.3%
	impact on national heritage	31.7%	27.8%	24.4%	11.1%	0.4%	2.5%
	use of greenfield sites for development	56.7%	20.4%	11.5%	8.1%	0.3%	1.3%
Q1.10a	The Economy						
	congestion effects on local businesses	29.5%	32.6%	22.6%	6.7%	0.0%	7.5%
	congestion effects on the tourism industry	28.7%	26.6%	25.1%	9.1%	0.7%	7.9%
	access to jobs (employment prospects)	27.7%	30.2%	21.9%	10.5%	0.3%	7.8%
Q1.11a	Disadvantaged Groups						
	transport for those without access to a car	59.7%	20.5%	6.4%	1.8%	0.6%	8.5%
	transport for people with disabilities	50.9%	22.8%	8.7%	2.2%	0.1%	12.9%

Q2 ANY OTHER PROBLEMS - If there are any problems with transport in the SWARMMS area not mentioned above please tell us.

44.0%

SOLUTIONS, WHAT SHOULD WE DO? - Listed below are examples of some potential solutions to the transport problems within the SWARMMS area. Please tick one box for each potential solution to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the approach

Q3.1a Use of the road network	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
limiting access onto motorways at busy times	9.7%	15.4%	19.0%	27.7%	21.3%	3.1%
charges to use roads (tolls)	13.3%	21.1%	11.2%	20.4%	29.3%	1.8%
give priority to lorries and buses	15.3%	21.7%	13.2%	20.8%	23.2%	1.8%
Q3.2a Rail Improvement						
new tracks/improved rail routes	66.9%	25.0%	4.0%	1.3%	0.6%	0.7%
faster, more frequent and reliable train services	64.8%	28.0%	5.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
more freight on trains	77.7%	15.9%	2.8%	1.0%	0.6%	0.6%
Q3.3a Bus and Coach improvements						
more local bus routes and services	52.8%	34.4%	8.8%	1.3%	0.0%	1.9%
faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	32.8%	32.2%	24.1%	3.4%	1.0%	4.3%
better information about public transport	46.9%	35.8%	13.2%	1.0%	0.3%	1.3%
Q3.4a Interchange between types of transport						
better Interchange between rail and bus/coach	59.6%	28.6%	7.3%	0.6%	0.1%	2.1%
more Park & Ride	42.4%	30.2%	14.8%	6.4%	3.3%	1.2%
more car parking at railway stations	40.7%	34.9%	14.8%	3.9%	1.5%	1.8%
Q3.5a Build new roads						
widening major routes	26.5%	19.8%	15.1%	17.2%	18.3%	0.7%
local bypasses	37.0%	31.7%	12.4%	7.0%	9.4%	0.4%
schemes to improve safety	47.8%	35.8%	9.7%	2.7%	1.6%	0.4%
Q3.6a Reduce/Manage the need to travel						
providing more local facilities	47.9%	36.8%	9.0%	1.8%	0.9%	0.9%
more walking and cycling within local areas	54.2%	27.2%	11.1%	3.4%	2.2%	0.1%

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
change work patterns (eg working from home)	37.6%	29.8%	20.5%	6.3%	2.1%	1.2%
change travel habits (eg car sharing)	39.4%	33.8%	15.3%	6.4%	2.5%	0.4%
Q3.7a Do Nothing						
Do nothing	1.2%	0.6%	2.8%	14.7%	61.4%	0.9%
Q4 ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS? - If there are any other solutions not mentioned above, please tell us:						
	59.3%					
Q5.0 Are you...?						
100.0% Male				0.0%	Female	
Q6.0 Which age group do you belong to...?						
0.1% under 18				30.4%	45 - 54	
0.9% 18 -24				15.3%	55 - 59	
7.5% 25 -34				10.2%	60 - 64	
15.9% 35 - 44				19.8%	65 or older	
Q7.0 Do you have access to a car for your own use...?						
87.0% Yes				13.0%	No	
Q8 Please tell us your Post Code Area:						
99.9%						
Q9 Please tell us your Post Code District:						
99.7%						
Q10 How often do you use the following forms of transport...?						
	5+ times a week	2-4 times a week	once a week	less often	never	
Car	58.7%	22.8%	4.8%	8.1%	3.1%	
Bus	7.2%	8.4%	9.4%	48.1%	21.9%	
Coach	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%	52.8%	38.8%	
Train	4.9%	8.5%	16.0%	58.7%	8.5%	
Q11.0 Form of Questionnaire Reply...?						
92.2% Original Form		4.3%	Photocopy		3.4%	E-mail Response
Q12.0 Address given for further contact...?						
23.5% E-mail	6.6%	Fax	55.4%	Post	25.7%	None

A Study of Transport between London and the South West of England and South Wales

PROBLEMS - Please indicate whether you think the following are transport problems, and if so how serious. (please tick only one box on each line).

Q1.1	Car Travel?	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	traffic congestion	53.5%	32.3%	6.0%	2.8%	1.8%	0.7%
	Journey time reliability	22.3%	36.5%	20.9%	12.1%	1.4%	1.8%
	road safety	38.7%	33.0%	14.9%	7.4%	0.4%	1.4%
	availability/quality of information and signs	10.3%	22.3%	22.0%	30.1%	6.7%	3.5%
Q1.2	Bus Travel?						
	bus service frequency	51.8%	23.0%	10.6%	6.0%	0.7%	3.5%
	reliability of bus travel times	34.8%	27.0%	16.7%	10.6%	0.0%	7.4%
	speed of bus journeys	23.8%	28.0%	19.5%	16.0%	0.4%	6.4%
	comfort on bus	16.0%	23.8%	23.4%	24.1%	1.4%	5.3%
	journeys						
	bus services don't go where I want to go	46.1%	23.8%	11.0%	9.2%	0.4%	5.0%
	cost of bus journeys	40.8%	23.8%	14.2%	11.0%	0.7%	4.3%
	availability/quality of information	26.6%	25.5%	19.9%	18.1%	1.8%	4.6%
Q1.3	Coach Travel (longer distance)						
	reliability of coach travel times	3.9%	14.9%	17.0%	33.7%	1.8%	22.7%
	speed of coach journeys	8.2%	15.6%	16.3%	31.9%	1.8%	19.5%
	coaches don't go where I want to go	16.0%	17.0%	16.0%	24.8%	0.7%	19.1%
	availability/quality of information	9.6%	17.0%	17.7%	28.7%	2.5%	18.1%
Q1.4	Lorries						
	lorries get held up in congestion	33.7%	27.3%	16.3%	6.4%	2.1%	8.9%
	speed of lorries	45.0%	28.7%	8.9%	9.2%	0.4%	3.9%
	lorries can be intimidating	53.9%	23.4%	8.5%	8.9%	0.7%	1.4%
	number of lorries on the road	65.6%	16.0%	6.7%	7.4%	0.0%	2.1%
Q1.5	Rail Services						
	train service frequency	27.3%	29.4%	18.1%	17.4%	1.4%	2.5%

Appendices

		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	reliability of train travel times	36.5%	24.8%	21.6%	9.9%	1.1%	3.2%
	speed of train journeys	12.4%	18.1%	19.9%	34.4%	9.6%	2.5%
	comfort of train journeys	13.1%	19.1%	23.0%	29.1%	9.2%	2.5%
	there is no rail station near where I live	22.3%	12.1%	8.5%	49.6%	1.1%	1.8%
	trains don't go near where I want to go	18.4%	15.6%	19.1%	39.4%	0.0%	2.8%
	cost of train journeys	62.1%	16.7%	9.6%	7.1%	0.4%	1.8%
	availability/quality of information	21.3%	25.5%	19.1%	27.7%	1.4%	1.8%
	interchanges with buses	38.3%	23.8%	12.8%	8.9%	1.1%	12.4%
Q1.6	Air and Sea						
	access to main airports	22.0%	26.2%	16.3%	20.9%	1.8%	10.3%
	journey opportunities from local airports	22.0%	23.0%	16.7%	18.4%	1.4%	14.2%
	cost of air travel	26.6%	24.8%	16.7%	14.9%	1.4%	11.3%
	access to sea ports	9.9%	24.8%	19.1%	28.7%	0.7%	13.5%
Q1.7	Rural Transport						
	availability of public transport	70.9%	12.8%	6.0%	2.1%	0.7%	5.3%
	cost of car travel in rural areas	49.3%	18.4%	8.5%	9.6%	1.8%	9.6%
	traffic speeds in rural areas	46.1%	22.3%	12.1%	11.3%	0.0%	5.0%
Q1.8	Holiday Season						
	congestion during holiday season	55.7%	26.6%	11.3%	3.5%	0.0%	1.1%
	journey time reliability	45.0%	25.2%	17.7%	7.1%	0.4%	2.1%
Q1.9	The Environment						
	overall quality of the environment	45.7%	27.7%	11.7%	6.4%	4.6%	0.7%
	transport noise and pollution	59.6%	20.6%	11.3%	5.3%	0.4%	0.4%
	traffic impact on local communities	63.8%	20.9%	11.0%	0.7%	0.4%	1.1%
	impact on national heritage	44.0%	24.5%	17.4%	5.0%	0.7%	6.0%
	use of greenfield sites for development	65.2%	14.5%	11.0%	2.5%	0.7%	4.3%
Q1.10	The Economy						
	congestion effects on local businesses	27.7%	34.4%	18.1%	5.0%	0.7%	11.7%

	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
congestion effects on the tourism industry	26.2%	30.5%	22.7%	6.0%	1.4%	11.0%
access to jobs (employment prospects)	42.2%	25.5%	13.1%	6.4%	0.4%	8.5%

Q1.11 Disadvantaged Groups

transport for those without access to a car	73.0%	13.5%	3.9%	1.4%	0.0%	5.3%
transport for people with disabilities	65.6%	14.9%	3.5%	1.1%	0.0%	11.3%

Q2 ANY OTHER PROBLEMS - If there are any problems with transport in the SWARMMS area not mentioned above please tell us.

49.3%

SOLUTIONS, WHAT SHOULD WE DO? - Listed below are examples of some potential solutions to the transport problems within the SWARMMS area. Please tick one box for each potential solution to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the approach

Q3.1 Use of the road network

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
limiting access onto motorways at busy times	8.9%	14.2%	15.2%	34.8%	13.5%	6.0%
charges to use roads (tolls)	11.7%	18.8%	8.9%	29.1%	22.3%	3.2%
give priority to lorries and buses	12.1%	17.4%	10.3%	27.0%	24.1%	1.8%

Q3.2 Rail Improvement

new tracks/improved rail routes	69.9%	19.9%	3.9%	1.4%	0.0%	2.1%
faster, more frequent and reliable train services	66.0%	23.8%	5.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
more freight on trains	79.8%	9.6%	6.0%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%

Q3.3 Bus and Coach improvements

more local bus routes and services	72.0%	18.8%	4.6%	0.7%	0.4%	1.4%
faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	46.5%	25.5%	16.0%	1.8%	1.4%	6.0%
better information about public transport	56.0%	27.3%	9.9%	2.1%	0.0%	1.8%

Q3.4 Interchange between types of transport

better Interchange between rail and bus/coach	60.3%	29.4%	6.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
---	-------	-------	------	------	------	------

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
more Park & Ride	43.3%	28.0%	12.8%	6.0%	3.5%	2.1%
more car parking at railway stations	46.1%	27.3%	12.8%	5.0%	1.8%	3.2%
Q3.5 Build new roads						
widening major routes	20.2%	16.7%	12.1%	22.0%	22.3%	1.8%
local bypasses	29.4%	24.8%	14.2%	14.5%	13.1%	1.1%
schemes to improve safety	55.3%	32.6%	5.7%	2.5%	1.1%	0.0%
Q3.6 Reduce/Manage the need to travel						
providing more local facilities	63.8%	23.4%	6.0%	0.7%	0.0%	1.1%
more walking and cycling within local areas	60.3%	27.3%	7.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.4%
change work patterns (eg working from home)	39.4%	26.6%	18.1%	9.9%	0.7%	1.8%
change travel habits (eg car sharing)	48.9%	28.0%	10.3%	5.7%	1.4%	1.8%
Q3.7 Do Nothing						
Do nothing	3.5%	0.4%	2.8%	16.7%	54.3%	0.7%
Q4 ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS? - If there are any other solutions not mentioned above, please tell us:						58.9%
Q5 Are you...?	0.0% Male			100.0% Female		
Q6 Which age group do you belong to...?	1.4% under 18		25.9%	45 - 54		
	3.5% 18 -24		15.2%	55 - 59		
	11.7% 25 -34		14.2%	60 - 64		
	12.8% 35 - 44		14.9%	65 or older		
Q7 Do you have access to a car for your own use...?	77.0% Yes		22.7%	No		
Q8 Please tell us your Post Code Area:						99.6%
Q9 Please tell us your Post Code District:						99.6%
Q10 How often do you use the following forms of transport...?						
	5+ times a week	2-4 times a week	once a week	less often	never	
Car	46.5%	23.4%	8.9%	12.1%	4.6%	
Bus	7.1%	15.2%	10.3%	42.2%	20.6%	
Coach	0.4%	0.0%	2.1%	56.0%	33.7%	
Train	1.1%	7.1%	7.8%	68.8%	10.6%	
Q11 Form of Questionnaire Reply...?	92.6% Original Form	3.5% Photocopy		3.9% E-mail Response		
Q12 Address given for further contact...?	17.7% E-mail	3.9% Fax	45.4% Post	39.0%	None	

Appendix I

Summary analysis of those respondents who,

- do have access to a car., and
- do not have access to a car.

A Study of Transport between London and the South West of England and South Wales

PROBLEMS - Please indicate whether you think the following are transport problems, and if so how serious. (please tick only one box on each line).

		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
Q1.1	Car Travel?						
	traffic congestion	49.9%	33.4%	11.2%	2.9%	1.1%	0.0%
	Journey time reliability	24.2%	36.9%	24.7%	10.0%	1.7%	0.1%
	road safety	32.4%	30.8%	21.3%	12.8%	0.4%	0.1%
	availability/quality of information and signs	9.6%	19.9%	23.8%	36.0%	7.3%	0.6%
Q1.2	Bus Travel?						
	bus service frequency	36.7%	30.5%	12.6%	7.6%	1.2%	7.8%
	reliability of bus travel times	28.6%	27.0%	17.8%	11.6%	1.1%	10.2%
	speed of bus journeys	22.0%	29.4%	19.6%	14.8%	0.7%	9.1%
	comfort on bus journeys	17.3%	23.9%	21.0%	22.9%	1.7%	8.0%
	bus services don't go where I want to go	41.5%	22.5%	12.2%	12.0%	0.7%	6.6%
	cost of bus journeys	33.0%	24.8%	16.9%	13.4%	1.2%	6.6%
	availability/quality of information	23.2%	24.0%	22.5%	17.8%	1.2%	7.6%
Q1.3	Coach Travel (longer distance)						
	reliability of coach travel times	5.7%	16.4%	18.7%	26.5%	2.6%	24.2%
	speed of coach journeys	8.1%	15.2%	16.9%	29.4%	2.5%	22.0%
	coaches don't go where I want to go	13.9%	15.3%	16.3%	26.2%	0.5%	21.8%
	availability/quality of information	9.3%	16.7%	18.9%	26.0%	2.5%	20.9%
Q1.4	Lorries						
	lorries get held up in congestion	30.9%	27.9%	19.1%	8.8%	3.1%	6.1%
	speed of lorries	38.6%	25.2%	18.2%	12.2%	0.6%	2.2%
	lorries can be intimidating	45.7%	22.3%	14.8%	13.9%	0.1%	0.7%
	number of lorries on the road	59.2%	17.1%	11.8%	9.3%	0.0%	0.9%
Q1.5	Rail Services						
	train service frequency	20.9%	31.6%	20.4%	19.2%	2.0%	2.7%
	reliability of train travel times	28.9%	27.5%	24.4%	12.2%	1.7%	3.0%
	speed of train journeys	11.8%	17.3%	21.0%	33.7%	10.6%	2.7%

		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	comfort of train journeys	11.0%	17.7%	24.0%	29.6%	11.5%	2.6%
	there is no rail station near where I live	19.1%	11.2%	10.0%	50.7%	3.4%	1.9%
	trains don't go near where I want to go	16.1%	15.9%	18.6%	40.6%	1.1%	2.5%
	cost of train journeys	56.0%	21.2%	11.3%	6.8%	0.9%	1.6%
	availability/quality of information	16.6%	24.9%	23.3%	26.5%	3.1%	2.2%
	interchanges with buses	34.9%	25.7%	14.6%	9.7%	0.6%	11.6%
Q1.6	Air and Sea						
	access to main airports	21.2%	27.3%	15.9%	23.9%	2.5%	7.0%
	journey opportunities from local airports	23.9%	23.7%	16.7%	20.3%	2.6%	10.2%
	cost of air travel	25.2%	24.8%	17.8%	19.6%	1.6%	8.8%
	access to sea ports	11.5%	22.0%	18.4%	33.6%	2.1%	9.8%
Q1.7	Rural Transport						
	availability of public transport	62.3%	19.3%	6.6%	3.7%	0.1%	6.2%
	cost of car travel in rural areas	46.6%	21.5%	11.6%	11.7%	1.4%	5.4%
	traffic speeds in rural areas	38.1%	22.8%	16.4%	16.3%	0.2%	4.1%
Q1.8	Holiday Season						
	congestion during holiday season	53.1%	25.7%	13.9%	4.7%	0.5%	1.1%
	journey time reliability	42.7%	26.8%	17.9%	8.6%	0.5%	1.6%
Q1.9	The Environment						
	overall quality of the environment	33.3%	29.9%	18.4%	10.8%	4.7%	0.5%
	transport noise and pollution	46.3%	26.9%	17.9%	7.2%	0.4%	0.0%
	traffic impact on local communities	56.5%	25.5%	13.7%	2.5%	0.2%	0.4%
	impact on national heritage	31.8%	28.6%	24.2%	10.5%	0.6%	2.4%
	use of greenfield sites for development	57.5%	19.3%	12.3%	7.3%	0.5%	1.4%
Q1.10	The Economy						
	congestion effects on local businesses	28.5%	33.4%	23.0%	6.0%	0.1%	7.6%
	congestion effects on the tourism industry	28.3%	27.6%	25.3%	9.1%	0.7%	7.5%
	access to jobs (employment prospects)	31.1%	29.3%	20.3%	10.1%	0.2%	7.0%

Q1.11 Disadvantaged Groups

	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
transport for those without access to a car	64.0%	19.1%	5.4%	1.2%	0.2%	7.7%
transport for people with disabilities	55.2%	21.5%	7.2%	1.9%	0.0%	11.7%

Q2 ANY OTHER PROBLEMS - If there are any problems with transport in the SWARMMS area not mentioned above please tell us.

44.1%

SOLUTIONS, WHAT SHOULD WE DO? - Listed below are examples of some potential solutions to the transport problems within the SWARMMS area. Please tick one box for each potential solution to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the approach

Q3.1 Use of the road network

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
limiting access onto motorways at busy times	8.3%	13.9%	18.3%	31.3%	21.2%	2.7%
charges to use roads (tolls)	11.5%	19.4%	10.5%	23.7%	29.9%	1.6%
give priority to lorries and buses	11.5%	20.0%	11.6%	24.4%	26.4%	1.4%

Q3.2 Rail Improvement

new tracks/improved rail routes	66.1%	24.9%	4.2%	1.6%	0.4%	1.0%
faster, more frequent and reliable train services	64.5%	27.1%	5.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%
more freight on trains	78.6%	13.8%	3.6%	1.0%	0.6%	0.6%

Q3.3 Bus and Coach improvements

more local bus routes and services	55.9%	31.9%	7.7%	1.2%	0.1%	1.9%
faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	35.0%	31.5%	21.9%	2.9%	1.2%	5.1%
better information about public transport	46.8%	34.5%	13.6%	1.2%	0.2%	1.5%

Q3.4 Interchange between types of transport

better Interchange between rail and bus/coach	58.3%	29.6%	7.6%	0.6%	0.0%	1.6%
more Park & Ride	42.5%	31.5%	13.6%	5.6%	3.5%	1.1%
more car parking at railway stations	44.0%	34.1%	12.8%	3.5%	1.5%	1.2%

Q3.5 Build new roads

widening major routes	27.1%	20.5%	14.4%	18.2%	16.1%	0.9%
local bypasses	38.1%	30.5%	12.1%	8.2%	8.3%	0.6%
schemes to improve safety	50.4%	34.6%	8.2%	2.7%	1.4%	0.4%

Q3.6	Reduce/Manage the need to travel	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
	providing more local facilities	51.4%	33.7%	8.7%	1.4%	0.5%	0.9%
	more walking and cycling within local areas	52.9%	28.6%	10.5%	3.6%	1.9%	0.4%
	change work patterns (eg working from home)	37.5%	29.9%	19.3%	7.7%	1.7%	1.2%
	change travel habits (eg car sharing)	39.9%	33.1%	14.6%	6.7%	2.5%	0.7%
Q3.7	Do Nothing						
	Do nothing	2.0%	0.5%	3.0%	16.2%	58.7%	1.0%
Q4	ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS? - If there are any other solutions not mentioned above, please tell us:						
		59.3%					
Q5	Are you...?						
	72.4%	Male		27.0%	Female		
Q6	Which age group do you belong to...?						
	0.2%	under 18		30.1%	45 – 54		
	1.1%	18 -24		15.9%	55 – 59		
	9.0%	25 -34		11.2%	60 – 64		
	14.4%	35 - 44		17.7%	65 or older		
Q7	Do you have access to a car for your own use...?						
	100.0%	Yes		0.0%	No		
Q8	Please tell us your Post Code Area:						
	99.8%						
Q9	Please tell us your Post Code District:						
	99.8%						
Q10	How often do you use the following forms of transport...?						
		5+ times a week	2-4 times a week	once a week	less often	Never	
	Car	65.0%	25.3%	5.2%	1.9%	0.2%	
	Bus	3.9%	6.2%	8.3%	51.2%	24.9%	
	Coach	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	51.7%	40.6%	
	Train	2.6%	6.6%	12.8%	64.6%	9.6%	
Q11	Form of Questionnaire Reply...?						
	91.9%	Original Form	4.1%	Photocopy	4.0%	E-mail Response	
Q12	Address given for further contact...?						
	24.0%	E-mail	6.6%	Fax	51.1%	Post	29.0% None

A Study of Transport between London and the South West of England and South Wales

PROBLEMS - Please indicate whether you think the following are transport problems, and if so how serious. (please tick only one box on each line).

Q1.1 Car Travel?		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	traffic congestion	60.3%	23.2%	3.3%	3.3%	0.7%	3.3%
	Journey time reliability	23.8%	33.1%	20.5%	9.3%	0.0%	5.3%
	road safety	50.3%	25.2%	13.9%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%
	availability/quality of information and signs	13.2%	17.2%	18.5%	30.5%	4.6%	7.3%
Q1.2 Bus Travel?							
	bus service frequency	49.7%	27.2%	9.3%	7.3%	2.0%	2.6%
	reliability of bus travel times	35.1%	33.8%	17.9%	8.6%	0.0%	2.6%
	speed of bus journeys	25.8%	27.8%	16.6%	22.5%	0.0%	2.0%
	comfort on bus journeys	19.2%	20.5%	25.8%	27.2%	2.6%	2.0%
	bus services don't go where I want to go	39.1%	23.2%	17.9%	14.6%	0.7%	1.3%
	cost of bus journeys	43.7%	22.5%	15.9%	11.3%	0.7%	2.0%
	availability/quality of information	31.8%	27.2%	17.9%	13.2%	5.3%	1.3%
Q1.3 Coach Travel (longer distance)							
	reliability of coach travel times	7.9%	20.5%	15.9%	28.5%	2.0%	21.2%
	speed of coach journeys	11.3%	17.2%	18.5%	26.5%	2.0%	18.5%
	coaches don't go where I want to go	17.9%	16.6%	15.2%	25.2%	0.0%	17.9%
	availability/quality of information	14.6%	13.9%	17.2%	31.1%	1.3%	15.2%
Q1.4 Lorries							
	lorries get held up in congestion	30.5%	24.5%	15.9%	11.3%	1.3%	9.3%
	speed of lorries	41.7%	30.5%	8.6%	10.6%	0.0%	4.6%
	lorries can be intimidating	53.6%	23.2%	6.6%	7.3%	1.3%	2.6%
	number of lorries on the road	65.6%	11.9%	6.0%	7.3%	0.7%	4.0%
Q1.5 Rail Services							
	train service frequency	29.1%	31.1%	20.5%	13.9%	0.7%	2.6%
	reliability of train travel times	37.1%	27.8%	16.6%	11.3%	1.3%	2.6%
	speed of train journeys	16.6%	22.5%	19.9%	23.8%	11.9%	2.6%
	comfort of train journeys	11.3%	19.9%	31.8%	19.9%	11.3%	3.3%

		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	there is no rail station near where I live	12.6%	6.0%	8.6%	58.9%	2.6%	3.3%
	trains don't go near where I want to go	15.2%	17.2%	22.5%	33.8%	0.7%	4.0%
	cost of train journeys	58.3%	18.5%	12.6%	4.6%	0.7%	2.0%
	availability/quality of information	25.8%	18.5%	23.2%	23.2%	2.6%	2.0%
	interchanges with buses	46.4%	21.2%	10.6%	7.3%	3.3%	9.3%
Q1.6	Air and Sea						
	access to main airports	18.5%	23.8%	11.3%	23.2%	2.0%	15.9%
	journey opportunities from local airports	17.9%	23.2%	9.3%	19.9%	4.0%	19.2%
	cost of air travel	31.8%	17.9%	10.6%	15.2%	2.0%	17.2%
	access to sea ports	10.6%	23.8%	15.9%	20.5%	0.7%	23.8%
Q1.7	Rural Transport						
	availability of public transport	68.2%	13.2%	6.6%	4.0%	0.7%	6.6%
	cost of car travel in rural areas	29.1%	18.5%	9.9%	15.9%	3.3%	19.9%
	traffic speeds in rural areas	47.0%	17.9%	12.6%	10.6%	0.0%	9.9%
Q1.8	Holiday Season						
	congestion during holiday season	49.7%	29.8%	8.6%	6.0%	0.0%	4.0%
	journey time reliability	38.4%	28.5%	15.2%	8.6%	0.0%	6.6%
Q1.9	The Environment						
	overall quality of the environment	52.3%	26.5%	7.3%	4.6%	2.0%	2.6%
	transport noise and pollution	65.6%	22.5%	6.0%	2.6%	0.0%	1.3%
	traffic impact on local communities	66.9%	19.9%	7.9%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%
	impact on national heritage	53.6%	18.5%	11.9%	3.3%	0.0%	9.9%
	use of greenfield sites for development	66.9%	14.6%	6.0%	3.3%	0.0%	7.3%
Q1.10	The Economy						
	congestion effects on local businesses	29.8%	31.8%	11.3%	9.3%	0.7%	15.2%
	congestion effects on the tourism industry	26.5%	27.8%	18.5%	5.3%	2.0%	16.6%
	access to jobs (employment prospects)	35.8%	25.8%	13.2%	6.6%	0.7%	13.9%
Q1.11	Disadvantaged Groups						
	transport for those without access to a car	62.3%	15.2%	7.3%	4.0%	1.3%	6.6%
	transport for people with disabilities	57.0%	13.9%	6.6%	2.0%	0.7%	15.9%

Q2 ANY OTHER PROBLEMS - If there are any problems with transport in the SWARMMS area not mentioned above please tell us.

53.0%

SOLUTIONS, WHAT SHOULD WE DO? - Listed below are examples of some potential solutions to the transport problems within the SWARMMS area. Please tick one box for each potential solution to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the approach

Q3.1	Use of the road network	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
	limiting access onto motorways at busy times	15.2%	21.2%	15.2%	22.5%	7.3%	10.6%
	charges to use roads (tolls)	19.9%	25.2%	11.3%	19.2%	13.9%	5.3%
	give priority to lorries and buses	29.1%	21.2%	15.9%	14.6%	7.9%	4.0%
Q3.2	Rail Improvement						
	new tracks/improved rail routes	77.5%	15.2%	2.6%	0.0%	0.7%	2.0%
	faster, more frequent and reliable train services	67.5%	25.8%	4.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%
	more freight on trains	76.8%	14.6%	4.6%	0.7%	0.7%	1.3%
Q3.3	Bus and Coach improvements						
	more local bus routes and services	72.2%	17.9%	6.6%	2.0%	0.0%	1.3%
	faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	47.0%	23.2%	19.2%	4.0%	0.7%	4.0%
	better information about public transport	62.9%	27.8%	5.3%	2.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Q3.4	Interchange between types of transport						
	better Interchange between rail and bus/coach	68.2%	23.8%	3.3%	0.7%	0.7%	2.0%
	more Park & Ride	43.7%	19.2%	17.2%	9.9%	3.3%	3.3%
	more car parking at railway stations	34.4%	24.5%	21.2%	7.9%	2.0%	7.3%
Q3.5	Build new roads						
	widening major routes	11.9%	9.9%	12.6%	21.9%	36.4%	2.0%
	local bypasses	18.5%	25.2%	17.2%	14.6%	21.2%	0.7%
	schemes to improve safety	47.7%	35.8%	9.9%	2.0%	2.6%	0.0%
Q3.6	Reduce/Manage the need to travel						
	providing more local facilities	58.3%	27.2%	6.0%	2.0%	1.3%	2.0%
	more walking and cycling within local areas	71.5%	19.9%	7.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
change work patterns (eg working from home)	40.4%	23.8%	21.9%	6.0%	1.3%	2.6%
change travel habits (eg car sharing)	53.6%	26.5%	9.3%	4.0%	1.3%	2.0%
Q3.7 Do Nothing						
Do nothing	1.3%	0.7%	2.6%	10.6%	62.3%	0.7%
Q4 ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS? - If there are any other solutions not mentioned above, please tell us:						
	57.6%					
Q5 Are you...?						
	57.6%	Male		42.4%	Female	
Q6 Which age group do you belong to...?						
	2.0%	under 18		23.2%	45 - 54	
	4.6%	18 -24		11.9%	55 - 59	
	7.3%	25 -34		11.9%	60 - 64	
	17.2%	35 - 44		21.9%	65 or older	
Q7 Do you have access to a car for your own use...?						
	0.0%	Yes		100.0%	No	
Q8 Please tell us your Post Code Area:						
	100.0%					
Q9 Please tell us your Post Code District:						
	99.3%					
Q10 How often do you use the following forms of transport...?						
		5+ times a week	2-4 times a week	once a week	less often	never
Car		4.0%	9.9%	9.9%	47.7%	21.2%
Bus		24.5%	31.8%	16.6%	21.9%	3.3%
Coach		0.7%	0.7%	6.0%	64.2%	20.5%
Train		9.9%	15.9%	17.2%	46.4%	7.3%
Q11 Form of Questionnaire Reply...?						
	94.7%	Original Form	4.0%	Photocopy	1.3%	E-mail Response
Q12 Address given for further contact...?						
	9.9%	E-mail	1.3%	Fax	59.6%	Post
					33.1%	None

Appendix J

Summary analysis of the respondents:

- under 60 years of age, and
- those respondents over 60.

A Study of Transport between London and the South West of England and South Wales

PROBLEMS - Please indicate whether you think the following are transport problems, and if so how serious. (please tick only one box on each line).

	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
Q1.1 Car Travel?						
Traffic congestion	51.1%	33.2%	10.5%	2.8%	0.9%	0.6%
Journey time reliability	24.7%	36.5%	25.1%	9.6%	1.6%	1.2%
Road safety	35.7%	30.6%	21.4%	10.2%	0.1%	0.6%
Availability/quality of information and signs	10.5%	20.0%	23.3%	35.4%	6.6%	1.9%
Q1.2 Bus Travel?						
bus service frequency	40.4%	29.7%	12.1%	6.6%	1.3%	7.8%
Reliability of bus travel times	30.8%	28.3%	17.9%	10.3%	0.6%	9.6%
Speed of bus journeys	27.1%	29.6%	19.6%	11.4%	0.3%	8.7%
Comfort on bus journeys	19.6%	23.6%	21.1%	22.1%	2.1%	7.5%
bus services don't go where I want to go	42.0%	23.5%	12.6%	12.1%	0.4%	6.0%
cost of bus journeys	35.3%	23.0%	18.5%	12.6%	1.2%	6.7%
Availability/quality of information	25.7%	25.1%	22.3%	14.9%	2.1%	7.2%
Q1.3 Coach Travel (longer distance)						
Reliability of coach travel times	6.7%	16.6%	18.7%	26.3%	2.4%	24.8%
Speed of coach journeys	10.2%	16.0%	19.3%	26.5%	1.6%	22.1%
Coaches don't go where I want to go	15.1%	14.3%	16.6%	26.3%	0.1%	22.3%
Availability/quality of information	9.9%	16.6%	19.7%	25.4%	2.5%	21.1%
Q1.4 Lorries						
Lorries get held up in congestion	28.0%	28.0%	20.5%	10.2%	3.4%	6.6%
Speed of lorries	38.7%	26.3%	17.3%	12.6%	0.1%	3.0%
Lorries can be intimidating	46.8%	22.1%	14.5%	13.5%	0.3%	1.5%
Number of lorries on the road	59.3%	16.4%	11.1%	10.0%	0.1%	1.8%
Q1.5 Rail Services						
Train service frequency	23.3%	33.3%	21.7%	17.6%	1.0%	1.5%
Reliability of train travel times	32.0%	26.5%	25.0%	12.3%	1.3%	1.8%
Speed of train journeys	13.9%	19.1%	22.9%	31.2%	10.0%	1.8%
Comfort of train journeys	11.4%	18.5%	26.2%	28.7%	10.9%	1.8%

		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	There is no rail station near where I live	17.5%	10.9%	10.2%	54.9%	2.2%	2.1%
	Trains don't go near where I want to go	17.0%	17.5%	19.6%	39.3%	0.7%	2.1%
	cost of train journeys	59.9%	20.6%	10.6%	5.5%	0.7%	1.3%
	Availability/quality of information	18.1%	26.2%	25.0%	25.4%	2.5%	1.0%
	Interchanges with buses	37.4%	25.4%	14.1%	10.2%	0.9%	10.6%
Q1.6	Air and Sea						
	Access to main airports	19.6%	27.7%	16.6%	24.2%	2.4%	7.6%
	Journey opportunities from local airports	22.3%	25.1%	16.0%	20.3%	3.0%	11.1%
	cost of air travel	25.9%	25.7%	17.6%	18.5%	1.8%	8.5%
	Access to sea ports	11.1%	22.6%	18.7%	31.8%	2.2%	11.8%
Q1.7	Rural Transport						
	Availability of public transport	63.4%	18.7%	6.6%	2.7%	0.0%	7.5%
	cost of car travel in rural areas	41.7%	20.6%	12.3%	13.9%	2.2%	7.9%
	Traffic speeds in rural areas	38.4%	22.3%	16.6%	15.7%	0.3%	5.7%
Q1.8	Holiday Season						
	Congestion during holiday season	53.1%	26.0%	13.0%	5.1%	0.6%	1.5%
	Journey time reliability	43.2%	27.7%	17.2%	8.5%	0.6%	1.8%
Q1.9	The Environment						
	Overall quality of the environment	39.0%	29.7%	16.6%	8.1%	4.3%	0.7%
	Transport noise and pollution	51.6%	27.7%	15.1%	4.9%	0.3%	0.1%
	Traffic impact on local communities	58.6%	25.3%	12.9%	2.1%	0.1%	0.6%
	Impact on national heritage	35.4%	28.0%	23.0%	8.2%	0.7%	3.6%
	use of greenfield sites for development	57.8%	19.1%	12.7%	6.0%	0.6%	2.4%
Q1.10	The Economy						
	Congestion effects on local businesses	26.8%	35.9%	22.1%	6.9%	0.3%	7.6%
	Congestion effects on the tourism industry	27.8%	28.4%	25.7%	8.8%	1.2%	7.6%
	Access to jobs (employment prospects)	32.1%	29.1%	21.4%	10.0%	0.3%	6.1%
Q1.11	Disadvantaged Groups						
	Transport for those without access to a car	64.7%	18.7%	5.7%	1.8%	0.3%	7.6%
	Transport for people with disabilities	56.2%	21.5%	7.0%	1.8%	0.0%	12.3%

Q2 ANY OTHER PROBLEMS - If there are any problems with transport in the SWARMMS area not mentioned above please tell us.

44.7%

SOLUTIONS, WHAT SHOULD WE DO? - Listed below are examples of some potential solutions to the transport problems within the SWARMMS area. Please tick one box for each potential solution to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the approach

Q3.1	Use of the road network	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
	limiting access onto motorways at busy times	8.5%	16.1%	18.4%	29.6%	19.6%	3.6%
	charges to use roads (tolls)	12.7%	22.3%	11.2%	21.4%	27.1%	2.2%
	give priority to lorries and buses	14.9%	21.2%	11.8%	21.7%	23.8%	1.8%
Q3.2	Rail Improvement						
	new tracks/improved rail routes	70.0%	21.7%	4.5%	1.5%	0.3%	0.7%
	faster, more frequent and reliable train services	68.5%	24.5%	5.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%
	more freight on trains	79.2%	13.3%	4.5%	0.6%	0.3%	0.7%
Q3.3	Bus and Coach improvements						
	more local bus routes and services	60.4%	29.0%	6.4%	1.0%	0.1%	2.1%
	faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	39.6%	29.4%	19.9%	2.7%	0.9%	5.2%
	better information about public transport	52.0%	32.1%	11.1%	1.5%	0.1%	1.6%
Q3.4	Interchange between types of transport						
	better Interchange between rail and bus/coach	61.0%	27.1%	7.9%	0.7%	0.0%	1.5%
	more Park & Ride	42.6%	28.3%	14.6%	7.2%	3.4%	1.5%
	more car parking at railway stations	41.0%	32.1%	16.1%	4.6%	1.5%	1.9%
Q3.5	Build new roads						
	widening major routes	22.3%	18.2%	15.5%	18.2%	22.3%	0.9%
	local bypasses	31.1%	29.9%	14.6%	9.3%	12.4%	0.7%
	schemes to improve safety	50.1%	35.4%	8.2%	3.0%	1.0%	0.1%
Q3.6	Reduce/Manage the need to travel						
	providing more local facilities	53.1%	32.9%	8.4%	1.3%	0.6%	0.9%
	more walking and cycling within local areas	60.4%	26.0%	8.2%	2.5%	1.0%	0.3%
	change work patterns (eg working from home)	42.3%	27.1%	18.5%	6.9%	2.1%	1.2%

		strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
	change travel habits (eg car sharing)	44.7%	31.1%	13.0%	5.5%	2.5%	0.7%
Q3.7	Do Nothing						
	Do nothing	1.8%	0.7%	2.8%	14.2%	62.2%	0.9%
Q4	ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS? - If there are any other solutions not mentioned above, please tell us:						
		60.2%					
Q5	Are you...?						
	70.0% Male			29.7% Female			
Q6	Which age group do you belong to...?						
	0.7% under 18			41.4% 45 - 54			
	2.4% 18 -24			21.8% 55 - 59			
	12.4% 25 -34			0.0% 60 - 64			
	21.2% 35 - 44			0.0% 65 or older			
Q7	Do you have access to a car for your own use...?						
	85.1% Yes			14.9% No			
Q8	Please tell us your Post Code Area:						
		100.0%					
Q9	Please tell us your Post Code District:						
		99.9%					
Q10	How often do you use the following forms of transport...?						
		5+ times a week	2-4 times a week	once a week	less often	never	
	Car	58.4%	20.5%	7.0%	8.4%	3.6%	
	Bus	7.5%	11.2%	9.9%	46.8%	20.2%	
	Coach	0.3%	0.1%	0.7%	52.8%	39.6%	
	Train	5.2%	9.6%	12.6%	61.7%	7.8%	
Q11	Form of Questionnaire Reply...?						
	90.4% Original Form		4.9% Photocopy		4.6% E-mail Response		
Q12	Address given for further contact...?						
	26.5% E-mail	5.2% Fax	48.3% Post	30.0%	None		

A Study of Transport between London and the South West of England and South Wales

PROBLEMS - Please indicate whether you think the following are transport problems, and if so how serious. (please tick only one box on each line).

Q1.1 Car Travel?		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	traffic congestion	52.8%	28.5%	8.8%	3.2%	1.4%	0.4%
	Journey time reliability	22.5%	36.3%	21.5%	10.6%	1.1%	0.4%
	road safety	34.2%	28.2%	17.3%	13.7%	0.7%	0.4%
	availability/quality of information and signs	9.5%	18.3%	22.5%	34.2%	7.7%	1.1%
Q1.2 Bus Travel?							
	bus service frequency	35.2%	31.0%	12.0%	9.9%	1.4%	5.3%
	reliability of bus travel times	27.1%	27.8%	18.0%	13.0%	1.8%	7.7%
	speed of bus journeys	12.3%	28.2%	18.0%	27.5%	1.4%	6.3%
	comfort on bus journeys	13.0%	22.9%	23.6%	27.5%	1.4%	6.0%
	bus services don't go where I want to go	39.1%	20.8%	14.8%	13.0%	1.4%	5.3%
	cost of bus journeys	33.5%	27.8%	12.7%	14.8%	1.1%	3.9%
	availability/quality of information	21.8%	23.2%	21.1%	22.2%	1.4%	5.3%
Q1.3 Coach Travel (longer distance)							
	reliability of coach travel times	4.6%	18.3%	16.9%	28.5%	2.8%	21.1%
	speed of coach journeys	4.9%	14.4%	12.3%	34.9%	4.2%	20.1%
	coaches don't go where I want to go	13.4%	18.3%	15.1%	25.4%	1.1%	18.7%
	availability/quality of information	10.9%	15.5%	16.5%	29.9%	1.8%	17.6%
Q1.4 Lorries							
	lorries get held up in congestion	37.7%	26.1%	14.4%	7.0%	1.4%	6.7%
	speed of lorries	40.5%	25.0%	15.1%	10.6%	1.4%	1.8%
	lorries can be intimidating	47.5%	23.2%	11.3%	11.6%	0.4%	0.0%
	number of lorries on the road	62.7%	15.5%	10.6%	6.7%	0.0%	0.4%
Q1.5 Rail Services							
	train service frequency	19.4%	27.8%	17.6%	20.1%	3.5%	5.6%

Appendices

		serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
	reliability of train travel times	25.7%	30.3%	19.4%	11.6%	2.5%	5.6%
	speed of train journeys	9.2%	15.8%	16.2%	34.5%	13.0%	4.9%
	comfort of train journeys	10.2%	16.5%	23.2%	26.8%	13.0%	4.9%
	there is no rail station near where I live	19.0%	9.2%	8.8%	45.8%	5.6%	2.1%
	trains don't go near where I want to go	13.0%	13.0%	18.7%	40.1%	1.8%	4.2%
	cost of train journeys	47.9%	21.1%	14.1%	8.8%	1.1%	2.5%
	availability/quality of information	18.0%	18.7%	19.4%	27.5%	4.2%	4.9%
	interchanges with buses	34.9%	24.3%	13.7%	7.4%	1.4%	12.7%
Q1.6	Air and Sea						
	access to main airports	23.6%	24.3%	12.3%	22.9%	2.5%	10.2%
	journey opportunities from local airports	24.3%	20.1%	14.8%	20.1%	2.5%	13.0%
	cost of air travel	26.8%	19.0%	14.4%	20.1%	1.4%	14.1%
	access to sea ports	12.0%	21.8%	16.2%	31.3%	1.1%	12.7%
Q1.7	Rural Transport						
	availability of public transport	63.0%	17.6%	6.7%	6.3%	0.7%	3.5%
	cost of car travel in rural areas	48.6%	22.2%	9.5%	8.8%	0.4%	7.0%
	traffic speeds in rural areas	42.3%	21.5%	14.1%	14.8%	0.0%	3.5%
Q1.8	Holiday Season						
	congestion during holiday season	51.1%	27.1%	13.7%	4.6%	0.0%	1.8%
	journey time reliability	39.1%	25.7%	18.7%	8.8%	0.0%	3.9%
Q1.9	The Environment						
	overall quality of the environment	30.3%	28.2%	16.9%	14.1%	4.2%	1.1%
	transport noise and pollution	44.7%	22.5%	18.3%	10.2%	0.4%	0.4%
	traffic impact on local communities	57.4%	23.2%	12.7%	2.8%	0.4%	0.4%
	impact on national heritage	35.2%	24.6%	20.4%	12.0%	0.0%	3.5%
	use of greenfield sites for development	62.3%	17.3%	8.1%	8.5%	0.0%	1.8%
Q1.10	The Economy						
	congestion effects on local businesses	33.8%	26.4%	19.0%	5.6%	0.0%	11.6%

	serious problem	moderate problem	slight problem	not a problem	positive feature	don't know
congestion effects on the tourism industry	28.2%	26.1%	21.1%	7.7%	0.4%	12.0%
access to jobs (employment prospects)	31.3%	27.8%	14.1%	8.5%	0.4%	12.7%
Q1.11 Disadvantaged Groups						
transport for those without access to a car	61.6%	18.0%	5.6%	1.4%	0.7%	7.4%
transport for people with disabilities	53.9%	17.6%	7.4%	2.1%	0.4%	12.7%
Q2 ANY OTHER PROBLEMS - If there are any problems with transport in the SWARMMS area not mentioned above please tell us.						47.9%
SOLUTIONS, WHAT SHOULD WE DO? - Listed below are examples of some potential solutions to the transport problems within the SWARMMS area. Please tick one box for each potential solution to indicate whether you agree or disagree with the approach						
Q3.1 Use of the road network	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
limiting access onto motorways at busy times	11.6%	13.0%	16.5%	30.3%	17.6%	4.9%
charges to use roads (tolls)	13.0%	15.8%	9.2%	26.8%	28.2%	2.1%
give priority to lorries and buses	12.7%	18.3%	13.4%	25.4%	22.9%	1.8%
Q3.2 Rail Improvement						
new tracks/improved rail routes	63.0%	27.8%	2.8%	1.1%	0.7%	2.1%
faster, more frequent and reliable train services	57.0%	32.7%	5.6%	0.4%	0.7%	0.7%
more freight on trains	76.4%	15.5%	2.1%	1.8%	1.4%	0.7%
Q3.3 Bus and Coach improvements						
more local bus routes and services	54.2%	31.3%	10.2%	2.1%	0.0%	1.1%
faster, more frequent and reliable coach services	30.3%	32.0%	25.7%	3.9%	1.8%	4.2%
better information about public transport	43.7%	36.6%	14.8%	1.1%	0.4%	1.1%
Q3.4 Interchange between types of transport						
better Interchange between rail and bus/coach	57.4%	32.7%	4.6%	0.4%	0.4%	2.1%
more Park & Ride	42.6%	33.1%	13.0%	4.2%	3.5%	1.4%
more car parking at railway stations	45.8%	34.2%	9.5%	3.2%	1.8%	2.8%

Q3.5	Build new roads						
		strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
	widening major routes	30.6%	20.4%	10.9%	19.7%	12.7%	1.4%
	local bypasses	44.0%	29.2%	8.8%	9.2%	6.0%	0.4%
	schemes to improve safety	50.0%	33.5%	9.2%	1.8%	2.8%	0.7%
Q3.6	Reduce/Manage the need to travel						
	providing more local facilities	51.4%	32.4%	8.1%	1.8%	0.7%	1.4%
	more walking and cycling within local areas	45.4%	30.3%	14.1%	4.6%	2.8%	0.4%
	change work patterns (eg working from home)	27.8%	33.5%	22.5%	8.8%	0.7%	2.1%
	change travel habits (eg car sharing)	35.9%	34.5%	15.5%	8.1%	1.8%	1.4%
Q3.7	Do Nothing						
	Do nothing	2.1%	0.0%	3.2%	17.6%	52.5%	1.1%
Q4	ANY OTHER SOLUTIONS? - If there are any other solutions not mentioned above, please tell us:						56.3%
Q5	Are you...?						
	70.4% Male			28.9%	Female		
Q6	Which age group do you belong to...?						
	0.0% under 18			0.0%	45 - 54		
	0.0% 18 -24			0.0%	55 - 59		
	0.0% 25 -34			38.4%	60 - 64		
	0.0% 35 - 44			61.6%	65 or older		
Q7	Do you have access to a car for your own use...?						
	81.7% Yes			18.0%	No		
Q8	Please tell us your Post Code Area:						99.6%
Q9	Please tell us your Post Code District:						99.6%
Q10	How often do you use the following forms of transport...?						
		5+ times a week	2-4 times a week	once a week	less often	never	
	Car	47.9%	28.2%	3.5%	11.3%	3.5%	
	Bus	6.3%	8.5%	9.2%	45.8%	24.6%	
	Coach	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	56.3%	32.0%	
	Train	0.4%	4.6%	15.8%	62.0%	12.7%	
Q11	Form of Questionnaire Reply...?						
	96.8% Original Form		2.1%	Photocopy	1.1%	E-mail Response	
Q12	Address given for further contact...?						
	10.9% E-mail	7.0%	Fax	62.3%	Post	28.5%	None

Appendix K

Summary of other Problems

Q2. Other Transport Related Problems

(Where the overall number of comments per issue are shown in brackets)

Road Transport Issues – General

- Congestion in towns/cities at peak periods, particularly during school term times (16)
- Major road congestion in hotspot areas e.g. Aztec West on M5 Bristol, M5 on Avon Bridge , A303 (12)
- Long distance commuting, including children travelling to school (2)
- Lack of commuter parking in towns/cities (3)
- Car Parking Policy - lack of adequate and affordable parking in urban areas (9)
- On-street parking in narrow streets in towns and villages in tourist areas (6)
- Traffic congestion in rural villages due to through traffic (6)
- Poor driving skills and lack of enforcement of traffic laws and regulations (12)
- Lack of focus on greater motorcycle / moped use as an alternative to the car (2)
- Ineffective Traffic Calming measures - If not thought through properly, these can cause traffic queues, delays and pollution (4)
- Anti-car Government policies which have resulted in the intentional obstruction of the free flow of traffic (5)
- Lack of Car Sharing – low car occupancy levels during peak periods (3)
- Lack of Travel Awareness – Sustainability issues (2)
- Lack of use of alternative means of powering road transport e.g. gas, electricity (1)
- Overuse of company cars (1)
- Not enough ‘Park and Ride’ schemes in urban areas (1)
- ‘Park & Ride’ schemes are not always the solution e.g. inappropriate when buying heavy or bulky shopping items (2)
- Lack of Light Rapid Transit (LRT) systems in larger towns / cities (1)
- Lack of footpaths on rural roads, especially Cornish lanes e.g. which discourages walking to school (3)
- Tourist traffic in the Southwest during the holiday season (6)
- Lorries are a significant cause of traffic congestion and pollution (6)
- Damage caused by heavy lorries to road surfaces, particularly motorways (2)
- Heavy, articulated (often agricultural) vehicle movements in rural lanes in Devon / Cornwall, which often cause traffic congestion and are a safety risk (3)
- Too many unnecessary journeys by car e.g. ‘home to school’ trips (9)
- Road safety issues of pedestrians and cyclists, due to volume and / or speed of road traffic (13)
- Road accidents delays on Motorways and other main routes in Devon and Cornwall - Increasing impact of traffic diversions on surrounding routes and the resultant delays/congestion (6)
- Road users pay too much in fuel charges, particularly in rural areas (14)
- Too many lorries in towns / villages – (5)
- Too many lorries on the roads – need to transfer freight on to rail network (8)
- Excessive traffic speeds, particularly on minor roads and through rural settlements (7)
- Poor north/south road links (2)
- Too many road signs – often unnecessary and confusing (2)
- There is no alternative to the car in isolated rural areas (7)

Specific Road Building and Improvements

- Need for further road building in Devon / Cornwall to avoid traffic congestion (3)
- Road improvement schemes have only created further congestion (4)
- Due to traffic congestion problems, main trunk roads in the south west area should be dualled throughout e.g A30, A303 (11)
- Lack of south coast road link, (A303), which would reduce congestion in the Study Area and on the M25 – most travellers from the south west using Dover (Tunnel or Ferries) have to go via London (2)
- A358 in need of dualling, problem with peak time access from side roads (1)
- Local seasonal road capacity problems e.g. single carriageway - Ilminster bypass (1)
- Urgent need for a bypass at A38 (Dobwalls) Cornwall, due to the traffic attracted to the ‘Eden’ project, near Liskeard (2)
- The new improvements on the A30 ‘Exeter to Honiton’ have made congestion worse on the unimproved section as far as Yeovil – need to extend these improvements (1)
- A30 ‘Indian Queens’ needs dual carriageway urgently (3)
- Severe traffic congestion on A380 Penn Inn / Kingskerswell (Torbay area) – need for a bypass (6)
- A number of villages (along the A30 trunk route) through Dorset are in urgent need of bypasses (1)
- Need for a new M5 / A303 link in Somerset to connect with the M4 (1)
- Delays at M5 / M4 interchange and on M4 between junctions 10 & 12 (1)
- Severe congestion on North-South access between Bristol and Southampton, from M4 via A36 and A350 (1)
- New bypass needed for A371 (Banwell) – North Somerset (1)
- Need to improve the A386 between Derriford and Woolwell roundabouts (1)

Road Maintenance Issues

- Road works which always seem to take place on busy routes at inappropriate times e.g. during Bank Holiday / Summer Holiday periods, causing traffic congestion (4)
- Motorway repairs and other road works and their associated traffic delays (3)
- The ‘March road maintenance madness syndrome’ – are the associated delay costs properly accounted for in planning this maintenance? (1)
- Traffic delays due to Tamar Bridge repairs (2)
- Road works caused by Digital cable laying companies (2)
- Too many uncoordinated road works (1)
- Road works which last for long periods of time e.g. M5 Avon Bridge (2)
- Poor signing of speed restrictions through sections of road works (1)
- Poor condition of roads due to lack of surface maintenance (4)
- Lack of maintenance of road verges and drainage channels etc, particularly in rural areas (3)

Public Transport Issues – General

- The gradual deterioration of public transport services (2)
- Lack of integration between bus and rail services and between separate rail companies (26)
- Lack of capacity (overcrowded) public transport services, especially at peak periods (10)
- Unreliability of public transport services (17)

- Public transport fares are too expensive, particularly for group travel, which in turn encourages use of the car (29)
- Lack of public transport provision to cater for tourists (1)
- Lack of availability of passenger information on public transport services and current timetables (19)
- Lack of 'real time' information on late/cancelled public transport services (2)
- Need for improved public transport service penetration, especially bus services, in rural areas (21)
- Lack of early morning /late evening /weekend public transport services, connecting rural with urban areas (18)
- Better public transport links/service frequencies are needed to / within towns (13)
- Confusing (often complex) public transport service timetables and fares structuring and lack of co-ordination between operators (11)
- Lack of cleanliness of public transport vehicles /rolling stock (2)
- Lack of traffic interchange points between car/bus/rail services (3)
- North-South public transport road and rail links are poor (2)
- Lack of through ticketing or cross ticketing between public transport services, particularly between rail companies (3)
- Lack of secure storage for luggage, pushchairs or pedal cycles on public transport (2)
- Unsafe rural bus and rail stations and poor security onboard public transport services (2)
- Problem of reduced winter /off-season public transport services (5)
- Lack of comfort on public transport e.g. Sprinter trains and Coaches (2)
- Lack of competition between public transport operators (2)
- The average age of public transport vehicles needs to be reduced (1)
- Poor environment, quality of services and design of public transport stations (5)

Public Transport – Rail

- Virgin train services to the south west during summer weekends are very crowded (1)
- Rail network congestion (Exeter St Davids / Westbury / Swindon) (3)
- Long stretches of single track working west of Exeter place a restraint on service frequency (5)
- Train journey times are too long – it is often quicker to travel by car (5)
- Need to improve the 'Wessex- South west' rail connections via Dorchester / Yeovil / Castle Cary – to avoid London and provide more direct access to the Channel Tunnel from the south west (5)
- Delays caused by repairs to rail infrastructure (1)
- Lack of freight carriage by rail (2)
- Train Operating Companies concentrate their efforts on longer distance travel (2)
- Unavailability to pay fares on board trains (1)
- Poor frequency of services between Southwest and London, and to the North/Scotland (4)
- More rail services needed in / out of towns / cities e.g. Plymouth, Bristol, Swindon (3)
- Lack of rail network/services in Cornwall (7)
- Freight railway lines should be upgraded to take passenger services (2)
- Lack of 'local' railway stations, both rural and in town areas (5)
- Too many restrictions on the use of cheaper travel Railcards, for pensioners and students (3)
- Costs of long stay parking and security of car parks at railway stations (12)
- Lack of taxis at stations (1)
- The railway closure programme of the 1960s severed railway networks in the south west area. This has been made worse by the selling off of some of these former railway lines (2)
- Smoking on trains (1)

Public Transport – Buses

- Neighbouring bus operators with no shared tickets / timetables (5)
- Inability to purchase National Coach tickets over the telephone (1)
- Poor promotion, advertising and marketing of bus services (2)
- Bus lanes are often empty for most of the time, and cause traffic delays which ultimately effect buses (1)
- Speed of buses (1)
- Poor public perception of bus services e.g. Inconsiderate / discourteous / unhelpful staff (4)
- Lack of bus stops and very poor provision of bus shelters in the south west area (3)
- Difficulty in finding long term car parking areas near coach stopping points (2)
- Excessive speed of Coaches on Motorways (1)
- Cross-country coach service routes still centred on London (1)
- Lack of inter-urban express coach services in the south west area (other than the Exeter – Plymouth service) (5)

Air Transport

- Lack of proximity of rail stations to airports (except Gatwick) (2)
- Lack of sufficient comfort on aircraft – lack of leg room (1)
- Air link from the south west to the east of the country (Stansted) required (1)
- Cost of air travel is too cheap – leading to environmental pollution (1)
- Security and cost of car parking at airports (2)
- Poor ground access to Bristol airport (2)
- Cost of air travel from Bristol airport in comparison to London airports (2)
- Bristol airport should have a wider range of international flights, and a service to Heathrow (1)
- Lack of a decent International airport in the Bristol / Plymouth / Exeter area, offering service routes to Europe and transatlantic flights and budget airlines (3)
- Poor air transport links connecting the south west area, a prime tourist area, with the rest of the country. (1)
- Limited air services from Newquay airport and existing fares are too expensive (1)
- Limited and expensive air travel to European destinations from Plymouth – much cheaper to drive to and then fly from Heathrow (1)

Sea Transport

- Greater use of water taxis / ferries e.g. Bristol – Temple Meads through floating harbour at peak times (1)
- Lack of Cornish ports with ROLL on ROLL off facilities (2)
- Lack of use of canals, particularly for movement of freight (1)
- Lack of access to sea ports by public transport (1)
- The Torpoint ferries (Plymouth) are in great need of replacement (1)

Cycling Issues

- Lack of planned cycle routes and dedicated pedestrian walkways, away from busy roads (17)
- Cyclists and pedestrians should not use the same path – need for segregation (3)
- Motorists (intimidating) attitudes towards cyclists (4)

- Cycle paths end at busy road junctions – just where they are needed (3)
- Poorly designed / unsafe existing cycle lanes on road carriageways (7)
- Lack of safe, secure parking for pedal cycles (3)
- Lack of integration between cycling and other forms of transport (3)
- Difficulties of transporting pedal cycles onboard trains, buses and coaches, or where there is only limited provision (10)
- Cycling is not an attractive alternative transport option for older people (1)
- Poor cyclist road behaviour e.g. lack of use of cycle paths (3)

Environmental Issues

- Noise and air pollution from railway engines (2)
- Pollution from aircraft, including flight path noise and Co2 emissions (5)
- Pollution caused by car traffic, particularly due to road congestion (7)
- Road noise (concrete roads) e.g. sections of the A30 and M4/M5 (3)
- Inappropriate / non-existent landscaping for road schemes (1)
- Environmental Impact of new roads / bypasses (1)

Disadvantaged Groups & Disability Issues

- Need for 'Low Floor' public transport vehicles for ease of access (3)
- Inconvenience to disabled drivers as more town centres become pedestrianised - better penetration of public transport services into town centres (2)
- Poor wheelchair access on buses and trains (2)
- Lack of access facilities for disabled and people with pushchairs at public transport stations (2)
- Problem of physically disabled people getting to / from public transport stations – often incurring expensive taxi fares (2)
- Lack of public transport alternatives (community buses) in rural areas for people with disabilities who are unable to drive (3)
- Single female travellers are 'disadvantaged' in that the private car is the safest form of travel, rather than having to walk any distances alone and/or wait at deserted bus/train stations (1)
- In rural areas, employers are more likely to employ people with access to a car, than those without – more dependable/reliable in terms of getting to/from work (1)

General Issues

- Lack of understanding of 'Land Use / Transport Planning' at Government level – New housing settlements / commercial developments should ensure provision of transport infrastructure, and be centred on public transport networks/facilities (7)
- Problem of 'Out of Town' Retail centres – which often have large catchment areas for road based traffic, and which discourage local shopping (2)
- High house prices in the Berks, Surrey, Oxon, Wiltshire areas has led to more long distance commuting into these areas, which in turn has helped caused traffic congestion (1)
- The closure of local services and facilities e.g. Magistrates Courts, does not help to discourage longer distance travel (1)

- Poor planning of pedestrianisation schemes and other transport policies – resulting in additional traffic delays, tailbacks and exhaust pollution (2)
- Taxi fares are too expensive (1)
- Traffic congestion problems ultimately cause knock-on economic effects – a). higher prices in shops, and b). increased stress levels and loss of business productivity ((2)
- Greater use of shopping from home, causing increased number of lorries on local roads (1)
- In the past number of years, transport has been too cheap, which has encouraged excessive commuting distances to work, and the proliferation of large lorries making small deliveries (1)
- Situations where a person's job requires the use of a car e.g. area sales manager (1)
- National Transport Policy should not so easily be put on hold or changed by successive Governments (1)
- Too great a concentration of tourism in Devon and Cornwall (4)
- The gradual closure of traditional industries has meant that collective transport becomes unviable – dispersed service industries require people to travel by car (3)
- Lack of area wide Transport Planning bodies e.g. Avon (1)

Criticisms of the Questionnaire

- The questions asked were too simplistic/broad based (2)
- The questionnaire was badly worded and confusing (1)
- Many of the questions asked in the survey do not give the opportunity to express precise answers to a particular problem and could be misinterpreted (1)
- No mention is made in the questionnaire about the effects on property and on peoples health e.g. vibration damage, noise and air pollution (1)
- Motorcyclist, pedal cyclists and pedestrians seem to have been ignored in this study (5)
- Air and sea transport issues should not have been classed together under same section in the questionnaire (1)
- The focus of the study appears to be east-west, whereas some of the problems are much greater on a north-south axis e.g. Bristol-Poole (3)
- Why does the Study Area not include North Devon – need to improve rail services to Barnstaple and Bideford (1)
- Why has SWARMMS been confined to a study of transport to / from the London area? South Dorset should have been included in the study (1)

Appendix L

Summary of the Top 20 problems

The top twenty list of problem issues given by respondents in reply to Q2 of the SWARMMS Questionnaire

(Where the overall number of comments per issue are shown in brackets)

1. Public transport fares are too expensive, particularly for group travel, which in turn encourages use of the car (29)
2. Lack of integration between bus and rail services and between separate rail companies (26)
3. Need for improved public transport service penetration, especially bus services, in rural areas (21)
4. Lack of availability of passenger information on public transport services and current timetables (19)
5. Lack of early morning /late evening /weekend public transport services, connecting rural with urban areas (18)
6. Unreliability of public transport services (17)
7. Lack of planned cycle routes and dedicated pedestrian walkways, away from busy roads (17)
8. Congestion in towns/cities at peak periods, particularly during school term times (16)
9. Road users pay too much in fuel charges, particularly in rural areas (14)
10. Road safety issues of pedestrians and cyclists, due to volume and / or speed of road traffic (13)
11. Better public transport links/service frequencies are needed to / within towns (13)
12. Major road congestion in hotspot areas e.g. Aztec West on M5 Bristol, M5 on Avon Bridge , A303 (12)
13. Poor driving skills and lack of enforcement of traffic laws and regulations (12)
14. Costs of long stay parking / security of car parks at railway stations (12)
15. Due to traffic congestion problems, main trunk roads in the south west area should be dualled throughout .e.g. A30, A303 (11)
16. Confusing (often complex) public transport service timetables and fares structuring and lack of co-ordination between operators (11)
17. Lack of capacity (overcrowded) public transport services, especially at peak periods (10)
18. Difficulties of transporting pedal cycles onboard trains, buses and coaches, or where there is only limited provision (10)
19. Car Parking Policy - lack of adequate and affordable parking in urban areas (9)
20. Too many unnecessary journeys by car e.g. 'home to school' trips (8)

Appendix M

Other Comments

Q4. Other Transport Solutions

(Where the overall number of comments per issue are shown in brackets)

Use of the Road Network

General

- Give priority to buses, not lorries (97)

[There was strong agreement for priority for public (bus) transport. Question 3.1c was seriously flawed in that the wording could have created a serious bias. Buses and lorries should be treated separately rather than combined as an inappropriate single issue.]

- Greater provision of edge-of-town Park & Ride sites for all towns/ cities (25)

[Both 'bus' and 'rail' based schemes - with cheap (free) parking (to also encourage car sharing) and minimum bus / rail fares]

- Enforcement of Road Traffic Regulations (24)

[Nearly all these responses were in support of stricter enforcement of the existing traffic laws and regulations, with particular regard to speeding, illegal parking on kerbs and double yellow lining. In addition, strong views were expressed in favour of 'Increasing the minimum driving age to 18/25' (2), and 'Mandatory driving tests every 5/10 years up to a certain age, and then more often thereafter' (2). Other comments included: 'Create a new traffic police force (or increase size of existing force) to enforce the laws' (2) and 'Better education of motorists regarding road safety issues' (2).]

- Speed Restrictions (21)

[Most of these comments were in favour of reductions in speed limits for both urban and rural roads, on road safety grounds, with suggested speed limits of 20 and/or 15 mph and the concept of 'quiet roads' for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, horse riders, and cyclists. Other views were in support of 'Variable speed limits on motorways to help reduce congestion, as in the case of the M25' (2), and 'Minimum speed restrictions on major routes/motorways' (2).]

- Car Sharing Measures (18)

[The range of comments included the following:- 'Car Sharing Schemes, which could include the use of central booking agency for lifts' (8), 'High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes for cars with more than one person' (4), 'Encouraging car sharing/car pooling by rewards e.g. reduced parking charges related to the number of people in cars, company tax incentives/financial incentives to employees' (3), 'Allowing shared taxis' (2).]

- Charging to use roads (Tolls) (15)

[The majority of these comments agreed with the concept of road tolls to enter cordoned areas within towns/cities, although there was opposition to motorway tolls, with the view that fuel costs are high enough at present. Other views stated that road pricing should not be looked at in isolation, but instead combined with other measures such as improved public transport services and associated edge of town 'cheap' car parks. Several of those in favour of road charges, stated that they would like to see such tolls restricted to 'heavy goods' and 'foreign' vehicles only.]

- Better/Greater use of urban traffic management techniques (15)
[Including traffic signals at key roundabout junctions at peak times (4), reassessment of traffic priorities at junctions on busy routes i.e. removal of some signalised crossings which slow traffic down and replacement by more pedestrian/cycle footbridges/underpasses (4), more traffic calming (3), and more widespread priority for buses at traffic signalised junctions (3), more realistic speed limits on safer roads (1)]
- Promote the use of more environmentally friendly vehicles e.g electric/LPG vehicles and trams (11)
- Banning, Taxing or Charging for Workplace Parking (11)
[Views were evenly spread between these various methods of controlling/limiting the number of available car parking spaces at the work place]
- Banning, Taxing or Charging for Workplace Parking (10)
[Views were evenly spread between these various methods of controlling/limiting the number of available car parking spaces at the work place]
- Restricting Caravan/Tractor/Trailer movements on roads (8)
[Comments included:- 'Banning Caravans on main roads during peak times in summer holiday periods' and 'Restricting Tractor/Trailer movements from narrow lanes/routes']
- Greater tax differential for polluting/non-polluting vehicles to encourage the development and use of cleaner/smaller more fuel efficient vehicles (7)
- Limiting/banning cars and lorries in central areas of larger urban areas, with provision of efficient alternative public transport services (6)
- Tax advantages for use of dual-powered vehicles use i.e. battery power for limited urban speeds and petrol power for longer trips (3)
- Closing/limiting the size of town centre car parks (2)

Fuel/Taxation Issues

- Increase fuel prices (22)
[To discourage unnecessary car travel, with possible 'ring fencing' of money to fund road improvements (4) / alternative public transport travel to help reduce congestion/pollution and provide a greener environment (6)]
- Differential 'road tax' rates (4)
[Higher road tax on high fuel consumption cars, and specific vehicle groups e.g. 4WD Off Road vehicles]
- Reduce fuel costs for rural transport users (3)
- Decrease the price of fuel for public transport, taxis and essential services (3)
- Reduce diesel/road tax costs for freight/lorries and taxis (3)
- Petrol sales to be restricted/rationed to encourage more efficient use of cars and to help reduce congestion/pollution/road accidents (2)

- Remove road tax and charge according to vehicle usage (petrol consumption) (1)

Road Maintenance

- Ensure that only necessary roadworks are carried out, to minimise inconvenience to road users e.g. all road works should be carried out at night (2)
- Better co-ordination of all roadworks/maintenance (2)
- Better standards of road maintenance work – not just filling in holes (2)
- Regular roadside hedge cutting – would improve road safety (1)

Road Building/Improvements – Specific Schemes

- Need to at least dual the A30/A303 from Amesbury to Exeter with grade separated junctions, and then dual to Cornwall (including Penzance to Plymouth), thus diverting London – South West traffic away from the Bristol bottleneck (18)
- Need for improvements/bypass to the A380 at Kingskerswell, between Newton Abbot and Torquay (7)
- Local A303 improvements only e.g. between Ilminster and Honiton, Honiton to Hampshire etc. (6)
- Need to upgrade the A361/A39 ‘Atlantic Highway’ route, from M5 J27 through north Devon/north Cornwall (particularly between Bideford and Fraddon – A30 Indian Queens), as part of an integrated traffic plan to improve access for the whole of the south west and to help regenerate this area (6)
- Selection road widening/improvements on the A30 single carriageway sections, especially at Goss Moor (3) section (5)
- Need to convert the A358 between Ilminster and Taunton (linking the A303 with the M5 J25), to dual carriageway standard, with bypass for Ilminster and Northern Relief Road for Taunton (4)
- Requirement for another road bridge parallel to the existing M5 Avonmouth Bridge, and local M5 widening as far north as J16/17 (3)
- Need for A38 Dobwells bypass (2)
- Need to improve route between Bristol and Bournemouth (A36/A350) (2)
- M4/M5 interchange – junction improvements (2)
- Improve the A420 between Swindon and Oxford (1)
- Building A46 – A36 link road to bypass Bath (1)

- M27 should be extended to run from Dover to Exeter (1)

Journeys to School

- Encourage more walking/cycling to school (safer routes to school) (10)
- Stagger school holidays/opening hours (9)
- Provide more (free) school buses e.g. U.S. style bus system (5)
- Reduce the number of parents taking children to school by car e.g. car sharing (5)
- Encourage the choice of local (nearest) school (5)
- Improve transport to schools (2)
- Education via the Internet (1)

Changing Work/Journey to Work Patterns

- Flexible/staggered working hours (12)
- More working from home, and greater use of Video/Tele Conferencing, therefore reducing the need to travel (8)
- Larger employers could sponsor/offer subsidised public transport or organise mini-buses to pick up/drop of employees at predetermined points e.g. at bus/rail stations (7)
- Many more employer Green Travel Plans, particularly large organisations (6)
- Provide incentives for people to live near their work place, or incentives to employers to employ a higher proportion of locally based labour – thus reducing “commuting distances” (6)
- Increase tax on company cars for private use – to help reduce long distance commuting to/from work, or set a preference for smaller engine size vehicles (5)
- Funding to facilitate ‘cycling to work’ e.g. companies to provide showers, safe/secure cycle parking and lockers etc. (4)

Changes to Travel Habits

- Better integration of Land Use/Transport Planning i.e. locating all major shopping/commercial/industrial/business development in urban areas with adequate public transport

provision, while preventing out of town (remote) development which has only encouraged car dependence (17)

- Greater use of powered two-wheeled vehicles e.g. motorcycles and scooters, which would help reduce congestion, journey times and parking needs and cause less pollution (9)
- Focus new house building in urban areas (Brown Field Sites) where there are sufficient existing facilities nearby e.g. shops, schools, jobs, access to public transport, while minimising Green Field developments (8)
- Maintain local services e.g. hospitals, schools, banks and shops, with less centralisation of Government services, therefore reducing the need for long distance travel (5)
- Greater use of Internet Shopping and more shopping home delivery (4)
- Reduce commuting distances, especially long distance commuting (4)
- Penalise multiple car owners (3)
- Travel Awareness (3)
- Generally, people need to adjust their lifestyles to reduce their need to travel (2)

Cycling/Walking Issues

- Need for more, direct, and safer cycle routes (preferably segregated from other road users), in both urban and rural areas (50)
- Greater integration of cycling with public transport systems (buses, coaches and rail) e.g. secure/safe cycle parking and locker facilities at stations, and adequate provision for the carriage of cycles onboard buses and trains (28)
- Encouragement /priority for greater use of walking and cycling modes of travel, with emphasis on health and fitness e.g. journeys to work, school and shopping (14)
- Providing more/better walking and cycling facilities within urban and tourist areas, including bikes to hire, designated links and lockers/secure cycle stands at interchanges and at key educational establishments and public buildings (6)
- Safer crossing points of all major routes, in both urban and rural areas, for pedestrians and cyclists (6)
- Pedestrians and cyclists need to be included in multi-modal studies (3)

Public Transport – General

- Greater Investment & Improvements in Public Transport (117)
[These comments were wide-ranging and included ‘Improving local routes, frequencies and service (capacity) and reliability’ (22), ‘Building fast, clean, efficient electrified Tramways/Light Rail schemes in all major urban areas, on dedicated tracks to avoid road traffic congestion, as in Newcastle, Manchester and Croydon’ (26), ‘Better rural bus services’ (7), ‘Improve public transport service/timetable information’ (11), ‘Improve facilities and passenger safety at bus/rail stations’ (7), ‘Make public transport more attractive to use – image, comfort’ (5), ‘More low floor buses required, suitable for disabled groups and parents with children’ (3), ‘Electrify the rail system’ (4), ‘Construct new rail routes’ (3), Better cross country rail/bus links’ (4)]
- Reduce (subsidise) Public Transport Fares (85)
[Of this total figure, 16 comments referred specifically to buses and 22 to rail fares. The general theme throughout was that cheaper more affordable public transport fares would give people the incentive to leave their private cars at home. Other comments included the following:- ‘public transport fares should be structured more to suit group/family travel, matching the costs of travel by car’, ‘free travel for pensioners’, ‘Cheaper travel during peak hour periods’, ‘More bargain fares and greater use of Travelcards, Rovercards, and Season Tickets for regular/frequent users, ‘cheaper single (one-way) fares’, ‘Simplify rail fares structure, and reduce long distance fares to places other than London’ and ‘Flat fares policy, and use of zonal tickets’.]
- Integration of Public Transport Services and Timetable Information (39)
[The general theme was the need for more effective promotion of integrated public transport. Comments included the following:- ‘Better Interchange facilities’ (6), ‘Integration of fares/cross ticketing between trains and buses and between different train operating companies’ (7), ‘Re-nationalise rail companies and railtrack in order to provide an integrated system of rail routes and services’ (8), ‘Integration of rail/bus/coach services both in and between towns and cities’ (6).]
- Increased provision of cheap (free), safe and secure car parking at railway stations for train ticket holders (32)
[This would encourage motorists to interchange with rail transport and prevent on-street car parking at / near stations. Railway station car parking should not be viewed as another business opportunity for profit generation, otherwise this could act as a deterrent to motorists thinking of using rail for major journeys.]

Specific Rail Improvements

- The rail track between Exeter and Salisbury should be double-tracked, to permit through services between Waterloo and Exeter and Penzance, making it a competitive inter-city route between London and Plymouth and an alternative route for Eurostar Connection (10)
- Reinstate some disused (pre-Beeching) railway lines for regular passenger and freight services, where feasible and where there is proven demand e.g. the Swanage branch line, Axminster to Lyme Regis, St Agnes to Perrenporth, Plymouth to Tavistock, Helston branch line, and Oxford to London via High Wycombe/Thame (to release capacity at peak hours through Reading). (8)
- Reopen/open rail stations, where operationally practical, to serve large population and business communities e.g. Corsham, Wellington, Somerton, Wilton, Wantage, Kidlington, Plympton and Langage, and around major urban areas such as Swindon (Wootton Bassatt and Purton) (8)

- Convenient double track rail access from the west to link railways to major airports e.g. Heathrow and Bristol airports (5)
- Build a new high speed rail link from Exeter into Devon and Cornwall, including a faster more direct line between Plymouth and Exeter (4)
- Improve the frequency of Waterloo line train services and extend them past Okehampton and on to Tavistock (2)

Lorry Transport – General

- Transfer large (long distance) road freight to rail (42)
[‘Piggy back’ rail wagons for lorry trailer transfer, as in Canada. Greater use of containerisation to help integrate rail and road distribution. Trans-shipment to local distribution centres for final delivery by smaller lorries]
- Restrict Heavy Goods Vehicle movements (HGVs) on main roads / motorways during peak periods (20)
[Ban HGVs overtaking, and/or travel at off-peak times only i.e. overnight delivery – enforced by road signs and backed up with heavy fines.]
- Transfer road freight to canals and waterways (12)
- Limit on the size and / or speed of Heavy Lorries (10)
[In urban areas and on minor roads]
- Introduce Nationwide Freight Routes, with local transfer to electric-powered vehicles (2)
- Reduce ‘just in time’ lorry deliveries (1)

Air Transport

- Develop frequent, reliable and less costly air travel between London / Europe and Newquay, Plymouth and Exeter regional airports. This would reduce ground travel to / from Heathrow and Gatwick (7)
- Air Transport is a major source of pollution – need to introduce an aviation fuel tax (5)
- More direct rail / road links to Bristol / London airports (2)
- More domestic / international flights out of Bristol airport (1)
- Provide a network of cheap domestic flights from Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool etc. to enable tourists to fly directly into Newquay airport (1)
- Local commercial airport in the Weymouth area to connect to London airports (1)

- Introduce low altitude Air Ships for freight / passenger travel (1)

Sea Transport

- Where appropriate, encourage road freight on to canals and inland waterways e.g. Thames and Kennet and Avon canal corridors to be developed (12)
- Greater use of coastal shipping to move bulk goods and / or passengers (7)
- Introduce car ferries to transport holiday traffic (including pedestrians and cyclists) between South Wales and Devon and Cornwall, relieving road traffic using the Severn Bridges (3)
- Implement a Marine Transport Policy for Cornwall (1)
- Improvements to the Torpoint ferry service (Plymouth) – to provide a shuttle service during peak periods (1)

General Comments

- There is a need for separate consideration of travel needs in rural areas, which will always depend on the private car. Providing sufficient public transport is not a feasible financial option. The car is the most flexible form of transport and is essential to many people in carrying out their day to day activities (10)
- There is a need for the greater use of 'self help' transport solutions in such rural areas e.g. community bases mini-buses/taxi services, subsidised and price controlled taxi operation for standard journeys, and taxi buses, (5)
- Better electronic motorway information signs/systems to users regarding traffic queues and delays, accidents etc. and as a method of speed/flow management and lane discipline (4)
- Road building/widening is not the solution to traffic crisis problems; it only helps to increase traffic and therefore safety risks to road users (3)
- Improve strategic routes in order to move efficiently e.g. use of the 'ski lift' principle for motorways, or double deck motorways (with separate vehicle categories) (2)
- Resiting motorway service areas at road junctions, with associated bus/coach/car/rail interchanges and car park to also encourage car sharing (2)
- Widening of major routes to achieve consistent continuous highway standards across county boundaries (2)
- Radical rethink required of major traffic routes in the study area, to encourage cross-country routes and discourage out-dated radial system using London as the 'hub', particularly for longer distance north – south and east – west journeys (2)

Appendix N

Summary of correspondence received from Organisations

Organisations

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE FILE

Highways

- SWARMMS must couple together the A30/A303 Marsh Honiton Improvement and the A35 Honiton Eastern Bypass (note included in the file).
- Concern that without more clarity of objectives and underlying assumptions of the study, the outcome will be an expensive exercise in justifying more road buildings.
- Roads are 'two way', they can often end up sucking resources out of an area or opening it up to new competition that will have a negative impact on the local economy. This effect is likely in peripheral regions.
- If 70% of the traffic on the A303 is local can we justify dualling it?
- Need to see evidence of accidents in a particular area when a road scheme is put forward.

Sea

- China Clay cargoes out of Par, Fowey and Bideford are falling as a result of Imerys' strategic policies world wide.
- All of Cornwall's oil products are now brought in by road from Plymouth and beyond, by road, where previously there were facilities at several Cornish ports.
- There need to be a diversification of cargoes.
- The plans for the Objective One bid for Falmouth Docks is missing from SWARMMS.

Air

- CPRE's position is that air travel should be considered as a last resort, supporting the Royal Commission for Environmental Pollution's view that air travel is the most unsustainable form of transport.
- The Colnbrook area west of Heathrow urgently needs sorting out (T5).

Tourism

- There needs to be more sustainable travel to and within the SWARMMS region.
- Public transport is poor beyond Bodmin, which doesn't allow tourists to leave their cars at home.

Miscellaneous

- New development shouldn't continue to fragment the countryside. Safe and convenient crossings should be provided for those who ride/drive horses.
- There is a combination of non-evidentially based assertions and incompatible objectives that seemed to run through the sessions and will make any 'consensus' clearly impossible to achieve.

Contributions from:

CPRE Dorset

Andeen Limited

CPREsouthwest

Transport 2000

Wiltshire Bridleways Association

Cornish Social and Economic Research Group

Appendix O

Summary of correspondence received from the General Public.

General Public

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES FORM THE CORRESPONDENCE FILE

Highways

- Lorries of more than 20 tonnes on all routes except for motorways and dual carriageways should be banned.
- Dual the remaining single sections of the A303 (5).
- Drop all plans for local bypasses as it only encourages more traffic, followed by rat running through the original route.
- Build Dobwalls bypass (2).
- Do not support the building of a bypass at Kingskerswell.
- Support the building of a bypass at Kingskerswell (2).
- Life is intolerable in the village of Henlade, as levels of traffic have increased from the A303 onto the M5.
- There needs to be an A303 bypass at Chicklade (3)
- Residents at Barrow Gurney would like consideration of the problems on the road links around Bristol, in order to make viable alternatives to address continued rat running through the small village towards Bristol Airport.
- Weight limits should be imposed on the A30 to stop large vehicles 'ploughing through' the small villages.
- 30mph speed limits should be imposed on the A30 to allow residents of the villages on the route cross the road to vital services.
- The people of Crowlas would like a bypass or a quieter road surface to reduce HGV noise pollution.
- The Honiton Eastern bypass needs to be built to reduce air pollution.
- Cyclists should have more priority in urban areas.
- A motorway should be built into Cornwall to reduce journey times, it could breathe new life into the area.
- The A30 needs dualling all the way from Bodmin to Penzance.

Rail

- Restore the double track on the Exeter-Salisbury route.
- Restore Exeter-Okehampton and Taunton-Minehead to reduce the pressure on local roads.
- Re-install small intermodal freight unloading yards at railheads.
- Install more local car hire facilities at railheads for tourists and businessmen.
- There is a need to improve rail services in and around Bristol, this would encourage new mixed development next to stations.
- Truro rail station is very dark and uninviting in the evenings, there is also a lack of information available.
- Parkway stations should have free parking as the name should suggest.

Bus

- The idea of using proximity to a bus stop as a measure of accessibility is flawed unless the frequency of a service is taken into account. It isn't very useful if the bus only goes once a day, e.g. in the West Devon area.

Sea

- There is a need for Ro-Ro facilities at Falmouth Docks in order to be fully connected to the 'Celtic Arc'.

Air

- Air travel is inherently inefficient in fuel use, profligate in land use and environmentally disastrous.

Tourism

- High cost of rail and bus travel encourages car use to travel into Cornwall.

Miscellaneous

- The government should have enough courage to ignore immediate popularity in favour of preserving a reasonable quality of life throughout the country.
- Travel from the South West into the Midlands should be considered as part of the study.
- The Torbay area should be included as part of the SWARMMS study (4).
- There is no reference to cycling as part of an integrated transport policy.
- SWARMMS shouldn't duplicate any work carried out during the LTP process.