

## **Item 15 – Draft Response to RCC Transport & RoW Consultation**

*Produced in November by a UTC working group consisting of Cllrs Miranda Jones , Dave Casewell, Steve Rozak, Cornelius Vincent-Enright, Pete Rees, & Alec Crombie*

*December full council referred initial document to UTC NPAG. At the UTC NPAG meeting In December they deferred discussion asking UTC to request RCC to delay by 1 month the closing date for responses. RCC responded indicating they were unable to accede to this request. UTC NPAG chair & vice chair suggested that due to time issues this paper be considered the UTC response as there was unlikely to be much difference in the 2 perspectives*

*The UTC working group met again in January to make further revisions to the response indicated in italics*

### **(DRAFT) RESPONSE OF UPPINGHAM TOWN COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ADVISORY GROUP TO RUTLAND COUNTY COUNCIL'S FOURTH LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN Jan 2019**

#### **1. GENERAL COMMENTS**

1.1 The response template offered within the plan is not helpful, and overly 'steers' the respondent to simply approve policies (see below) rather than make specific points.

1.2 Rutland is a small county with many different transport requirements. The plan offered is very general, and seems to more suited to a larger county.

1.3 Due to the generality of most of the policies it is difficult to disagree with the worthy intentions expressed

1.4 The points that follow reflect the concerns *and interests* of the Uppingham community *as to how the plan will/should impact upon the town*

#### **2. THE TRANSPORT PLAN**

2.1 The plan makes no mention of Neighbourhood Plans, and in particular Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan. The plan should acknowledge the importance of such plans and require these plans to maximise the effectiveness of transport planning, passenger transport and rights of way planning.

2.3 *Whilst there is a description of the 'Rutland Landscape' and mentions of 'out county' growth, there is little or no strategy to deal with the implications of this residential and industrial growth. There should be requirements for joint workings/funding strategies to mitigate the inevitable growth in both passenger and freight traffic through the County in general and Uppingham in particular.*

2.4 *Whilst given a brief mention, there should be greater emphasis on North /South bypasses to mitigate residential and industrial growth which is likely to come from both north and south of Uppingham, placing great stress on the capacity of the A6003.*

2.5 *The A6003 traffic growth represents a growing pollution menace to the town. The A6003 provides a pedestrian 'Route to School' for many hundreds of pupils, and with current traffic calming measures and steep gradients it creates an environment that leads to high emissions. Pollution readings should be publicly displayed, with a*

*'beginning of plan' baseline measure, and a 'maximum tolerated' measure created. Strategies would need to be required as to how to react if measures were higher than the 'maximum tolerated'.*

2.6 *The plan should recognise the problem of speeding throughout the county.*

*Uppingham in particular requires strategies to deal with speeding at the entrances and exits to the town.*

2.7 There is little real referencing as to how this plan will be operationalised, with respect to on-going consultations and communications with local communities. There is a need for communities *in general, and Uppingham in particular*, to feel involved in small and large scale improvements/repairs rather than suddenly 'things happen'.

### **3. PASSENGER TRANSPORT POLICY**

3.1 The current electronic bus departure display is misleading as it is only an electronic representation of the printed timetable. There is a need to urgently move to a real time display so that passengers can be made aware of delays and cancellations

3.2 The buses used within Rutland are not environmentally friendly. RCC should give urgent consideration to transport that reduces/eliminates emissions. *There is little recognition given to changes in technology, within the time frame of the plan, which may be innovatively used in the future to assist the effectiveness, efficiency, safety and environmental outcomes of public transport.*

3.3 There should be further consideration given to the layout of the bus interchange on North Street East. The coincidence of bus parking and the entrance/exit to car parks on the south side of the street is potentially dangerous

3.4 The plan needs to acknowledge the unique geographic position of Uppingham at the intersection of a major North/ South route (A6003) linking Oakham to Corby, and a major East /West route linking Peterborough to Leicester. This upgrades the significance of public transport linking to rail stations, hospitals and other significant services *such as the 'job centre plus' provision in Stamford. There needs to be minimum public transport requirement and guarantee that residents of Uppingham should have public transport access at appropriate times to the principal retail, transport and service providers of Leicester, Peterborough, Corby, Oakham and Stamford.*

3.5 There is no mention of the demands and complexities brought about by many of the bus services crossing into neighbouring counties, and the risks that *this* brings to continuity of service, *particularly with the provision of subsidies.*

3.6 The 'Scoring Process' for assessing the case for supporting a local bus service relates to the hierarchy of settlements previously contested in Uppingham Town Council's response to the 'Local Plan'

3.7 *Uppingham Town Council* We have concern over the possible direction that might be taken over concessionary fares. More data is required on this.

3.8 Bus usage data is somewhat historic and needs to be current *in its presentation.*

3.9 In consideration of the variety of public transport organisation, there is no mention of the community based 'Uppingham Hopper. *This service which* needs to be brought into the main stream debate, rather than just seen as a local initiative *reliant upon local community funding, in direct contrast to such services within Oakham.*

### **4. RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

- 4.1 The rights of way network should be seen as a major part of the tourist economy, and are currently vastly under exploited
- 4.2 There needs to be definitive maps produced , both digitally and physically, which indicate the extensive network, which should then be widely publicised.
- 4.3 There should be extensive capital expenditure to support improved surfacing and lighting where appropriate
- 4.4 Signage should be upgraded to indicate possible destinations, for both ‘leisure walking’ and ‘utility walking’, generally within communities. Thought needs to be given to improve rights of way to enable/encourage ‘routes to school/doctors/local shops and facilities’
- 4.5 In order to maximise ‘utility walking and cycling’ there should be a focus on improving existing ‘in town’ routes and also ensuring that rights of way are developed/improved by new developments within towns and villages.
- 4.6 Dedicated cycle tracks should continue to be provided wherever practical *throughout the county*. Consideration must be given to linking these tracks into a coherent network. *Strategies should be evaluated as to how cycling friendly routes may be integrated into Uppingham , linking the newer estates to the town centre, and also to services such as schools, health, libraries and shops. This should be a required consideration for new developments, and as such is likely to be considered as a Neighbourhood Plan requirement.*
- 4.7 Consideration should be given to the development of rights of way that offer access to those with limited mobility. *Footpaths, such as that linking Uppingham to Bisbrooke, are quite capable of surface upgrading to facilitate wheelchairs and prams/buggies.*
- 4.8 Pavements and footpaths are the main rights of way in towns and villages. Priority should be given to ensure that they are maintained to preserve ~~and improve their~~ ~~their~~ aesthetics and a safe, safety to provide a trip and obstruction free, footway. There should be a complete stop to ‘tarmac patching’ when repairing pavements, *in order to maintain the aesthetics of the town. Contractors accessing facilities under pavements should be required to restore surfaces to their original appearance. Greater emphasis should be given to the usage of traditional rights of way for both ‘utility and leisure, movement within villages and towns, as they generally provide direct useful links within communities.*
- 4.9 Further consideration should be given to the problem of dropped kerbs, both to existing pavements and new developments. *Policies to ensure that they continue to be introduced, and their usage enforced, should be a priority within the plan.*
- 4.10. As the population of the county in general, and Uppingham in particular, ages there will be an increasing reliance upon mobility scooters and more substantial mobility aids. *This growth should be acknowledged and taken account of in the design and regulation of town and village centres.*