

Strategic Issues Update for the SPT area

Committee Strategy & Programmes

Date of meeting 21 May 2021

Date of report 11 May 2021

Report by Chief Executive

1. Object of report

The object of this report is:

- To provide an update on strategic-level issues affecting transport in the west of Scotland; and
- To recommend approval of SPT's draft response to Transport Scotland's request for comments on the Strategic Transport Projects Review Phase 1 Recommendations, Case for Change reports, and Option groupings. The response was submitted as draft within deadline subject to approval by this Committee and is attached at Appendix 1.

2. Background

Further to earlier reports¹, members will be aware that measures to address the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic and a range of other policy, planning and delivery initiatives are underway within transport and related sectors across Scotland at present, at national, regional and local levels. The impact of these on the people, communities and transport network of the west of Scotland could in some cases be significant, and it is therefore essential that SPT seeks to monitor progress and influence outcomes in order to maximise benefits for our area. This report summarises current progress on key workstreams and SPT activity in that regard.

3. Update

3.1 National

3.1.1 Covid-19 response

Responding to the impacts of the pandemic continues to be the primary focus for transport stakeholders across the west of Scotland. Those impacts and the responses required continue to evolve, particularly as a result of the west of Scotland moving from Level 4 to 3 and then Level 2, of the Scottish Government's protection level route-map and updated guidance in that regard.

Further to the presentation to the Operations Committee in April, SPT, both in terms of operations and planning, remains focused on playing its part in the

¹ http://www.spt.co.uk/documents/latest/sp190221_Agenda8.pdf

collective response to Covid-19. In addition to continued operation of services such as the Subway, supported bus services, bus stations and school transport, and continued liaison with NHS in relation to transport issues related to healthcare facilities and vaccination centres, SPT participates in the city-region level Transport Transition Plan (TTP) group co-chaired by Transport Scotland (TS) and Glasgow City Council, and in discussions with Ayrshire councils and Argyll and Bute. The TTP group continues to provide a useful forum for discussion on transport's response to the crisis, and remains focused on delivery of Bus Priority Rapid Deployment Fund and Spaces for People projects. It is hoped that this work will go some way in ensuring that any increase in the number of trips stimulated by further changes to route-map Levels, and preparations for a phased return to offices, will be undertaken as much as possible by public transport and active travel.

3.1.2 2020 United Nations (UN) Climate Change Conference – 26th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP26) – Glasgow

Global interest in COP26 continues to grow, stimulated as a result of such recent events as the “Leaders Summit on Climate”² which brought together 40 world leaders to discuss their approaches to addressing climate change. Planning continues for a full ‘in person’ COP26 in line with UK and Scottish Government advice, with SPT officers continuing to participate in working groups for Bus (which SPT chair), Communications and Rail/Subway. Notwithstanding this, SPT is guided that a final decision is imminent on whether COP26 will be ‘in person’, virtual, or a mix of the two, and this will naturally affect planning for delivery of the event. In April, SPT also participated in an online UITP³ event on transport in the build-up to COP26, jointly presenting with CPT⁴ Scotland on the important role of bus in reducing carbon emissions. Officers will continue to update the Committee on this and other related matters as the event moves nearer.

3.1.3 National Transport Strategy (NTS)

Transport Scotland has advised that work continues in relation to impact assessments for the NTS Delivery Plan 2020-22, published in December 2020⁵. In addition, SPT is guided that a proposed way forward for a National Transport Strategy “Working with Partners” report, which will highlight the role of external partners in the delivery of the NTS, is currently being developed and will be presented to a forthcoming NTS Delivery Board. Officers have engaged in early dialogue with TS in relation to the Working with Partners report and will continue to seek opportunities to influence this workstream as it develops.

In light of the publication of a new NTS, a review of Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) is underway, and the Regional Transport Partnerships of Scotland are represented by Nestrans on the STAG Review Advisory Board. While the review is at an early stage, TS has advised that they will be seeking significant input from RTPs, given the importance of STAG to strategy and project development across Scotland.

3.1.4 Transport (Scotland) Act 2019 regulations and guidance

² <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-56837927>

³ The International Association of Public Transport, of which SPT is a member - <https://www.uitp.org/>

⁴ Confederation of Passenger Transport

⁵ <https://www.transport.gov.scot/publication/national-transport-strategy-nts2-delivery-plan-2020-to-2022/>

Transport Scotland is currently engaging with transport stakeholders, including SPT, to support preparation of forthcoming regulations and guidance on the bus provisions of the Act. SPT, along with representatives of transport operators, local authorities, COSLA and transport user groups has taken part in an initial workshop to consider the scope of consultation on the future guidance and regulations. Further discussions are continuing between Transport Scotland, SPT, ATCO⁶ and other RTPs. It is anticipated that public consultation on the guidance will take place over coming months ahead of scrutiny by the Scottish Parliament. Officers will continue to update the Committee on progress.

3.1.5 Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR2)

Further to the report to the previous Committee⁷, a response was submitted to Transport Scotland in relation to their request for comments on the STPR2 Phase 1 recommendations, Case for Change reports and Option groupings. The response, attached at Appendix 1, was submitted as draft within the deadline of 31 March subject to approval by this Committee. It is worth highlighting that officers engaged in significant dialogue with councils and other partners across the SPT area in the preparation of the response.

In terms of next steps for STPR2, TS has advised that further work is underway in relation to option development and appraisal, and a workshop regarding scenario planning is to be held in May which SPT will attend. A further consultation later in the development process will provide the opportunity for further formal input to the STPR2, and TS has advised that it remains on track to complete in 2021, notwithstanding future impacts of the pandemic. For the meantime, SPT will continue to chair the STPR2 Regional Transport Working Group for the Glasgow city region and input to similar groups established for Ayrshire and Argyll and Bute. Officers will continue to update the Committee as work progresses.

3.1.6 ScotRail

On 17 March 2021, the Cabinet Secretary for Transport, Infrastructure and Connectivity announced that from April 2022, ScotRail services will be provided within Scottish Government ownership from the expiry of the current ScotRail franchise. Further information is awaited in relation to the detail of the implications of this change, although early dialogue with TS would suggest a continuing strong - and potentially growing - role for RTPs in rail in Scotland. Officers will continue to engage with partners in regard to this and update the Committee as matters progress.

3.2 Regional

Regional Transport Strategy (RTS)

Further to the report to the Partnership in March, the RTS Case for Change consultation commenced in late April for a minimum of 6 weeks. Engagement in the process has so far been positive and further responses from interested parties are expected as the consultation continues. In tandem with the consultation process, work continues in relation to option development, scenario planning, appraisal methodology, further research and development in relation to specific issues such as Mobility as a Service, and early preparatory work in regard to the provisions of the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019.

⁶ Association of Transport Co-ordinating Officers (Scotland)

⁷ http://www.spt.co.uk/documents/latest/sp190221_Agenda11.pdf

3.3 Local

Officers continue to liaise with councils, Community Planning Partnerships and other partners in relation to a range of plans, initiatives and projects, including the developing RTS, Local Transport Strategies, delivery of projects from SPT's capital programme and those mentioned elsewhere in this report, as well as undertaking liaison with relevant organisations in relation to the pandemic response.

4. Conclusions

The dominance of the Covid-19 pandemic on workloads and resources in transport and other sectors continues into 2021 however the parallel focus of the various organisations on taking forward the initiatives mentioned in section 3 is to be welcomed. SPT and partners will have a key role to play in positively shaping and influencing how the future unfolds and officers will keep Committee members updated on developments as matters progress.

5. Committee action

The Committee is recommended to:

- Note the contents of this report; and
- Approve the draft SPT response to the STPR2 request for comments attached at Appendix 1.

6. Consequences

Policy consequences	<i>The new RTS will need to take account and/or address matters raised in this report.</i>
Legal consequences	<i>None at present.</i>
Financial consequences	<i>None at present.</i>
Personnel consequences	<i>None at present.</i>
Equalities consequences	<i>None at present.</i>
Risk consequences	<i>None at present.</i>

Name Valerie Davidson
Title Assistant Chief Executive

Name Gordon MacLennan
Title Chief Executive

For further information, please contact *Bruce Kiloh, Head of Policy and Planning* on 07891 715217.

STPR2: Update and Phase 1 Recommendations report:

This Comments Form seeks to understand your views on the **eight Phase 1 themes and associated Phase 1 interventions** within the **STPR2: Update and Phase 1 Recommendations report**. We recommend that you review the material within the report prior to you providing comments. The form should take 10 minutes to complete and all responses are anonymous.

The closing date for comments is midnight on 31 March 2021.

Demographic Questions		
1		Are you responding as an individual or an organisation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organisation
2		If responding as an organisation, what is the name of your organisation? Strathclyde Partnership for Transport.
3		Please indicate which category best describes your organisation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Transport Partnership
4	Only for those responding as an individual	n/a

STPR2: Update and Phase 1 Recommendations report:

Comments Form STPR2: Update and Phase 1 Recommendations report		
5		<p>Do you feel the eight themes within the STPR2 Phase 1 capture what needs to be done in the short term, in relation to the transport investment priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strongly agree ▪ Agree ▪ Neither agree nor disagree ▪ Disagree ▪ Strongly disagree
6		<p>Do you feel the themes appropriately address challenges and opportunities described within the report?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes ▪ No
6b		<p>Please use the space below to provide any further comments on the challenges and opportunities described within the report:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p>
7		<p>Do you feel that the Phase 1 interventions associated with the eight themes support the priorities and outcomes of the National Transport Strategy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strongly agree ▪ Agree ▪ Neither agree nor disagree ▪ Disagree ▪ Strongly disagree

8		<p>Please use the space below to provide any further comments that you wish to make on the eight themes.</p> <p>The themes are clearly linked to the NTS2 priorities and outcomes.</p>
9		<p>How well do the Phase 1 interventions respond to the uncertainty in travel demand and behaviour that we face in the short term due to COVID-19?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very well ▪ Well ▪ Don't know / No opinion ▪ Poorly ▪ Very poorly
10		<p>How well do the Phase 1 interventions support Scotland's recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic in the short-term?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very well ▪ Well ▪ Don't know / No opinion ▪ Poorly ▪ Very poorly
11		<p>Please use the space below to highlight the Phase 1 themes and interventions, that you particularly support:</p> <p>SPT supports all of the interventions in Phase 1. We have made further specific comments on these in our response to Question 13.</p>
12		<p>Please use the space below to highlight where you disagree with any the Phase 1 themes or interventions.</p> <p>n/a</p>
13		<p><i>Please use the space below to provide any other comments you wish to make on the STPR2: Update and Phase 1 Recommendations report.</i></p>

	<p>SPT welcomes the focus and commitment to active travel and sustainable transport.</p> <p>Phase 1 sets out a good range of interventions that will support national transport priorities and climate change targets, priorities emerging through the developing Regional Transport Strategy, and local strategies, and will present a significant opportunity for transformational change to more sustainable travel behaviours.</p> <p>However, it is clear that many of the interventions will require local and regional infrastructure and significant local authority and RTP resources for delivery and maintenance. Therefore, to ensure the successful implementation of Phase 1, clear delivery pathways for each intervention are essential. It is crucial that clarity is provided to councils and RTPs on their expected roles and responsibilities in delivering the interventions, and on the capital funding and resources available to enable them to have the capacity to deliver. Further, the process needs to consider the revenue implications of the interventions for local and regional partners and the additional revenue support to relevant partners that may be required for the successful delivery of STPR2.</p> <p>SPT welcomes inclusion of the Glasgow ‘Metro’ strategy in Phase 1. An integrated multi-modal urban mass transit system serving strategic economic investment and development locations in the City-Region, as set out in the approved Clydeplan Strategic Development Plan, has the potential to be a catalyst for transformational sustainable economic regeneration and development, and a “green recovery” from the Covid-19 pandemic. However, we believe there needs to be wider consideration of what a ‘green’ recovery means in different contexts in our region outwith the inner conurbation, including alignment with the economic development priorities of the Ayrshire Growth Deal, Argyll and Bute Rural Growth Deal, and the need for improved orbital connectivity (e.g Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire-East Renfrewshire) and connectivity for areas in the City-Region that are more peripheral to the inner conurbation (e.g. Inverclyde) to support access to employment at major employment locations.</p> <p>SPT also believes there is a need to consider tourism travel in all relevant Phase 1 interventions to enable more sustainable travel behaviours and help maximise this economic opportunity in a sustainable way. Greenock’s new Ocean Terminal will be completed in 2022 and it is anticipated to receive over 100 ships a year, with tourists requiring high quality bus and rail connections to key destinations in the region and beyond. The impacts of COVID19 also mean there is a potential for both short- and long-term growth in domestic visitor and tourism trips, many of whom will be travelling to key destinations in the SPT region including Arran and Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park. However, domestic tourists are much more likely to travel by car and much less likely to travel by bus or rail compared to international tourists, according to Visit Scotland visitor surveys, so there is a potential for an exacerbation of existing sustainable transport challenges at these locations.</p> <p>SPT also feels that greater importance could be given to rural accessibility, which appears to be underrepresented in Phase 1. The SPT region, like elsewhere, is experiencing depopulation of rural, remote and coastal areas. Improving accessibility is essential to arresting</p>
--	--

this decline and helping communities to become more sustainable. A number of Phase 1 interventions have potential application in rural communities and small towns, but there is only one intervention specifically focused on rural accessibility (no 6) and, although welcome, this appears potentially limited in its scope and reach.

We strongly believe that different spatial contexts must be considered in the development and application of all appropriate interventions (e.g. 3, 4, 5, 13) and how these interventions can support integration and sustainability of rural transport, including existing fixed route rural public transport networks. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that the private car remains and will remain a key mode for rural accessibility (as is recognised in NTS2). There is limited scope for modal shift in rural areas so transitioning the rural ‘fleet’ to low and zero emission vehicles and increasing vehicle occupancies through shared mobility options will be key to reducing emissions from rural transport. However, this means there needs to be a corresponding commitment to local roads to facilitate low emission rural transport.

Given the reduction in use of public transport as a result of the pandemic, we very much welcome the emphasis given to it within the Phase 1 recommendations (e.g. 10, 12) and the significant need to positively influence travel choices to more sustainable modes (no. 3). The totality of the work required across these workstream is significant and councils and RTPs like SPT will have a key role to play in helping Transport Scotland and other partners (including operators) deliver the change required, particularly given such initiatives as the Bus Partnership Fund.

Below are some comments on specific Phase 1 recommendations:

- **Active Freeways –**
- It would be helpful to understand how Active Freeways relates to the NCN Strategic Active Travel Network that is in development.
- The clear acknowledgement that Active Freeways will require a reallocation of road space in many instances is welcome; however, it would be helpful to develop the thinking as to the specific ways that the Active Freeways intervention and STPR2 process more broadly can help tackle the well-known barriers to achieving this.
- There are existing capital funding streams for SPT and local authorities to design and deliver active travel projects so it is essential to understand how this intervention can be designed to facilitate an acceleration or step change in delivery. There is significant resource expended already in the application and matching of various national active travel funding sources and any new funding source should aim to reduce this burden to help accelerate this necessary step change.
- Going forward, the criteria for “high-demand travel corridors” should be considered within local contexts rather than a relative context, as there are many small and mid-sized towns in the SPT area, where overall travel demand levels are not as high as the urban core, that could benefit from “active freeways” investment. This is also the case with defining criteria for ‘short’ journeys

as average journeys distances are inevitably longer outside the urban core. SPT notes that there are inconsistencies between the definition of the active freeways phase 1 intervention and many of the phase 2 'sifted in' options within the 'active freeways' grouping (as many of these are not at all urban or high demand travel corridors).

- The rationale for this intervention highlights low physical activity as a problem that can be partly tackled through encouraging active travel. SPT welcomes this and believe it should inform the criteria for investment. Three of the four health boards that cover the SPT region have lower physical activity rates than the Scottish average. Ayrshire and Arran in particular has the lowest % of adults meeting physical activity guidelines (based upon 2016 – 2019 combined data).
- This intervention should cover the whole walking network including upgrading existing walking infrastructure to ensure existing networks are fit for purpose and provide safe and accessible infrastructure for all. This would be in line with the sustainable investment hierarchy. SPT supports modal shift to cycling, but recognises that walking has a higher modal share and requires more effective investment. Walking is also the only mode with significant positive behavioural change recorded for the region during the pandemic.
- **20mph zones and limits**
- SPT welcomes this intervention as the engagement for our new RTS has identified traffic speeds and behaviour of other road users as key barriers to encouraging more active travel, which matches other research and evidence
- 'Urban areas' should be changed to built up areas
- Enforcement needs to be included in the development of this intervention
- **Influencing travel choices –**
- This intervention should be prioritised as it is one of the Phase 1 interventions that can be rolled out at pace in the short term to harness and develop any beneficial impacts of the pandemic disruption on travel behaviours.
- Any concerted effort to maintain a reduced demand for travel to work needs to consider the imperative to revitalise town/city centres, and that a large proportion of current reduced demand for work trips is by people *who previously travelled by more sustainable means (e.g. public transport)*. Therefore while there is a need to encourage these people back to active or public transport when appropriate, travel behaviour campaigns will still need a strong focus on those people who have continued to travel by car.
- This intervention is likely to fall predominantly to local and regional partners to deliver.
- Travel behaviour change interventions as described in the AST predominantly require sustained revenue funding

- **Transport’s contribution towards placemaking principles in neighbourhoods –**
- We welcome this greater emphasis on sustainable transport’s role in place-making as this is an area that requires significant development and effort to get right and deliver more sustainable travel behaviours. Transport funding should only be used for these projects where there is a strategy for integration with the wider active travel and public transport networks coupled with demand management to reduce travel by car (in appropriate contexts). Without an integrated approach the reallocation of road space could result in unintended consequences, for example, decreasing access to bus services through adverse impacts on bus service operation.
- Projects that use transport funding need to be planned within the spatial context of the public transport network to reduce any adverse accessibility impacts and improve and facilitate integration of walking & cycling and public transport networks.
- Projects should be considered at locations where other key sectors (e.g. health) have also committed to service provision and investment to maximise opportunity for complementary interventions and a co-ordinated approach in improving accessibility

- **Guidance and framework for delivering mobility hubs –**
- The guidance and appraisal framework should consider how hubs will be ‘future proofed’ for the way transport services may be accessed and operated in future as well as the changing requirements of ultra-low emission vehicles.
- The guidance should have a strong practical focus on how existing sites/hubs can be redeveloped and any demonstrator projects should include at least one existing site for redevelopment/alteration, as it is unlikely that most mobility hubs will be altogether new.
- There should also be a specific focus on the way hubs could help improve integration of rural transport services with mainline networks and services.
- Personal safety and security must be ‘designed in’.
- Opportunities for provision of accessible facilities should be considered.

- **Investment in Demand Responsive Transport and CT**
- This intervention is labelled DRT and MaaS in the main report, but DRT and CT in the AST – this needs clarification.
- DRT and CT are accessible transport solutions in all contexts, not just ‘rural, island and peripheral areas.’ This is because DRT and CT meet accessibility needs not met by mainstream public transport, which is not only a function of low demand, but includes personal mobility accessibility needs and communities of interest e.g. hospital outpatients. Additionally, DRT and CT can provide transport solutions for low demand movements in urban settings, and this may be increasingly important in future.
- SPT supports integration of DRT and CT with MaaS solutions to deliver a more integrated network; however, MaaS has a much wider role in integration and modal shift.

- Whilst SPT supports this intervention, we would highlight existing evidence of approaches outlined in the AST including collaborative partnerships with, for example, the health sector, community operators and non-transport council departments, which are proving useful in making a significant change to existing provision. We would also highlight that these approaches require additional revenue funding in order to be mainstreamed into service provision beyond any pilot stage. Any potential revenue efficiencies to be achieved across public sector budgets means achieving agreement on integration of budgets and assets across multiple departments and bodies. The development of this intervention needs to consider these challenges in a meaningful way.
- The selection of pilot projects must be undertaken closely with local and regional partners. It is important that this intervention does not undermine the case for continued funding and investment in fixed route services where these are efficiently and effectively meeting community needs.

- **Reallocation of roadspace for active travel –**
- SPT supports this intervention and would highlight the importance of the monitoring and evaluation processes that are underway for Spaces for People projects in assessing which projects should be retained or removed.
- Integration with other interventions, particularly No 10 is essential to ensure the overall reallocation of road space provides for a high quality, integrated sustainable transport network serving a range of journey purposes and travel needs

- **Enhancing facilities at major rail stations (Rail Station Redevelopment)**
- Glasgow Central – report should make mention of the potential release of capacity that a scheme such as Glasgow Metro could provide.
- Glasgow Central Low Level – should be referenced in this intervention and should include consideration of better integration with High Level and improved accessibility
- Further, we would emphasise the opportunities presented by this intervention to maximise integration with other modes serving major stations (or their locality).

- **Development of Glasgow ‘Metro’ Mass Transit strategies**
- SPT remains very supportive of the work being undertaken in relation to the Metro project and are working closely with Glasgow City Council and other partners in seeking to progress matters.

- **Reallocation of roadspace for buses**
- SPT is very supportive of this intervention. A crucial point set out in the rationale is the need to ‘rebalance the attractiveness of bus *relative to car.*’ This objective needs to be maintained as specific proposals develop because a bus journey time

		<p>improvement from the baseline may not be sufficient to deliver required levels of modal shift. Further, it is essential that the quality gap between bus and car is also reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration with other interventions, particularly No 7 is essential to ensure the overall reallocation of road space provides for a high quality, integrated sustainable transport network serving a range of journey purposes and travel needs • The figures on page 7 of the AST do not add up to DfT figures for bus passenger journeys. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting integrated journeys at ferry terminals • The selection of ‘key’ terminals for the review should take into consideration the <i>potential</i> for a modal shift. • SPT agrees that this intervention needs to be linked with other interventions as the integration benefits will not be realised if connecting services are inadequate or non-existent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure to provide access for all at rail stations – • It is appreciated that this intervention cannot consider all access routes to stations, but there should be consideration of any accessibility problems or opportunities within the immediate vicinity of stations. Collaboration with local and regional partners will be important to join up with plans and strategies for access improvements on routes to stations. <p>15. Strategy for improving rest and welfare facilities for hauliers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based upon SPT’s experience in studying this issue in our region, the review described in the AST needs to include engagement with the market to understand the development barriers and opportunities. • The intervention should include consideration of improved or additional roadside laybys <p>17. Investment in the trunk road network asset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPT is supportive of making best use of existing transport assets in line with the sustainable transport and investment hierarchies, relevant strategies / targets, and ensuring those assets are maintained to the appropriate level. <p>18. A83</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The delivery of a permanent solution is a regional priority and essential to inter-regional connectivity including goods movements, access to hospital and tourism
--	--	---

Comments Form STPR2 Case for Change and Transport Options		
		<p>Which of the Case for Change reports have you read prior to providing comments? Tick as many that apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Argyll & Bute Case for Change ▪ Ayrshire & Arran Case for Change ▪ Glasgow City Region Case for Change
5		<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The recommended transport options for STPR2 are strategic covering a range of modes and geographies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strongly agree ▪ Agree ▪ Neither agree nor disagree ▪ Disagree ▪ Strongly disagree
6		<p>How well do you feel the transport options recommended for further consideration address the problems, opportunities and objectives for strategic transport connections in Scotland?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very well ▪ Well ▪ Don't know / No opinion ▪ Poorly ▪ Very Poorly
7		<p>Do you have any other comments on the transport options identified?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPT believes that regionally strategic local roads should be within scope of STPR2, particularly A70 and A71. This is set out in further detail in our response to Q16. • SPT believes that Paisley Gilmour Street should be included in the options for Public Transport: Regional Passenger Facilities/Station enhancements. Paisley Gilmour Street is the 4th busiest rail station in Scotland, with around 4 million passenger entries and exits per year according to ORR data. There are opportunities to improve accessibility and integration of the station with other modes particularly linking to the developing local/regional cycling network e.g. Paisley – Renfrew, Paisley – Glasgow. This would also build upon existing significant investment by the council and SPT in bus infrastructure in the town centre and on key bus routes.

8		<p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It is clear what the next steps are when considering the transport options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strongly agree ▪ Agree ▪ Neither agree nor disagree ▪ Disagree ▪ Strongly disagree
9		<p>Do you believe that the COVID-19 pandemic will bring about challenges and/or opportunities relevant to planning future transport investment through STPR2? Please select all that apply below (NOTE: this will only be possible for the top two in the list)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, challenges ▪ Yes, opportunities ▪ No, neither challenges nor opportunities ▪ Don't know
10		<p>What do you believe could be the key medium to longer-term challenges relevant to STPR2 arising from the COVID-19 pandemic on travel demand and patterns in your region / nationally?</p> <p>In the SPT region, preCOVID19, a large proportion of intra-regional commuting was facilitated by rail. There is now the potential for a large-scale, permanent shift towards more home/remote working in future in the region. For example, the ONS Business and Industry Survey are finding that the Information and Communications and Professional, Scientific, and Technical activities sectors are most likely to be considering increased home working as permanent business modal going forward - in the SPT region, these sectors comprise c. 10% of regional jobs. Additionally, findings from the ITS Leeds COVID19 Transport and Social Adaptation Study is finding that people who are working from home were more likely to have travelled by public transport for commuting purposes prior to the pandemic. This presents a sizeable challenge for the future demand for rail and what this will mean for service provision and the ability of rail to support climate change and modal shift targets and objectives in the region. Additionally, given the density of the rail network in the SPT region, there could be impacts on local accessibility on routes where rail also provides a local public transport function.</p> <p>Also, without intervention, there will be further exacerbation of existing challenges around the diminishing demand for bus travel. Any prolonged or permanent reductions in core demand will have impacts on accessibility particularly disadvantaged communities and groups more dependent upon bus services. At the same time, the economic impacts on private car ownership</p>

		<p>means that existing income-related inequalities of access may be exacerbated alongside potentially diminishing public transport provision.</p> <p>The potential longer-term impacts on the location of jobs and development, and the effects of this on travel demand, present large uncertainty for transport investment. Additionally, any significant shift in activity and investment away from town and city centres will create further challenges for the efficient planning and provision of regional transport networks and services.</p>
11		<p>What do you believe could be the key medium to longer-term opportunities relevant to STPR2 arising from the COVID-19 pandemic on travel demand and patterns in your region / nationally?</p> <p>A reduced need to travel and improvements to digital access to work and services are key opportunities to help reduce or prevent congestion problems, particularly peak hour congestion and capacity constraints, improve road safety, reduce energy demands from transport and improve access to employment and services. This also presents a strategic opportunity to help tackle rural depopulation.</p> <p>SPT believes that more home working presents travel behavioural change opportunities around the ‘school run’ as more school trips are uncoupled from traditional (and often car-based) home-school-work trip chains. The renewed focus on ‘20 minute neighbourhoods’ also presents opportunities for cross-policy approaches to local accessibility and long term uplift in active travel and healthier travel behaviours.</p>
12		<p>How well do you feel the Case for Change element of STPR2 has engaged with stakeholders and the public?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very well ▪ Well ▪ Don’t know / No opinion ▪ Poorly ▪ Very Poorly
13		<p>Have you or your organisation participated in events or previous online surveys in relation to STPR2? Tick all that apply:</p> <p>Workshops Online Survey Feedback forms None</p>

14		<p>What worked well and what could have been improved in the Case for Change stakeholder and public engagement?</p> <p>The key factor in future work developing the STPR2 will be to ensure engagement continues with both public and stakeholders to an appropriate level, taking into account pandemic status. For local and regional stakeholders like SPT and councils, as noted earlier, we would like to work with TS regarding clarity on future delivery of the STPR2 (i.e. who leads, what responsibilities are) and also in regard to funding, both for STPR2 projects, and also any related capital / revenue funding for complementary measures / projects.</p>
15		<p>Overall, has the Case for Change element of STPR2 met your or your organisation’s expectations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, it has fully met my or my organisation’s expectations ▪ It has met some of my or my organisation’s expectations ▪ No, it has not met my or my organisation’s expectations
16	<p>Answer only for if you responded to Q15 – It has met some / No, it has not my or my organisations expectations</p>	<p>Please explain why the Case for Change element of STPR2 has not met all your organisation’s expectations?</p> <p>The national Case for Change sets out a limited scope for inclusion of local roads in SPTR2. SPT, as previously raised in our comments from November 2020, believes that the scope is too narrow. In the region, local roads make up 94% of the road network and carry approximately 58% of road traffic, but the scope criteria means that a number of regionally strategic local roads have been deemed out of scope for STPR2. SPT feels that the current scope could be reasonably expanded from international gateways (i.e. “access to major ports and airports”) to include access to international transport corridors (e.g. M74). In this way, SPT believes that options for the A70 and A71 should go forward to detailed appraisal in STPR2 particularly from the perspective of economic development <i>opportunity</i>. This would be in line with the Ayrshire and Arran STPR2 regional objective: <i>Increase the competitiveness of key domestic and international markets by reducing transport costs and improving journey time reliability for commercial transport routes including links to the Glasgow City Region, Glasgow Airport, Prestwick Airport, the M74 Corridor and the ports at Cairnryan</i>. Additionally, the present uncertainty around future trade routes also would seem to warrant further consideration of these options as potential opportunities for future national economic strategies and therefore we will feel it is premature to sift out these options.</p> <p>SPT is also concerned that the current scope for local roads is inequitable with regard to sustainable passenger travel. There is large opportunity for urban local roads to be “in scope” where these roads function as principle active travel and public transport corridors. However, in remote and rural areas, local roads appear to be largely out of scope with regard to sustainable passenger travel function despite local roads being essential to rural public transport networks.</p>

17		<p>Please provide any other comments on the Case for Change element of STPR2?</p> <p>As raised previously through the Glasgow City Region Regional Transport Working Group, the Glasgow City Region Strategic Initial Appraisal: Case for Change Report of February 2020 and the outputs from the Telmos model reported in Table 4, differ from forecasts of household growth being used for land use planning purposes.</p>
----	--	--