

**Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy Examination
November 2010**

Matter 6 Norwich City Centre

Note submitted by NNTAG to the Inspectors on 25 November 2010

concerning references to Keith Buchan MTRU Analysis of Public Transport Options in NDR Major Scheme Business Case for NNTAG/CPRE

Under issue 2 of Matter 6, NNTAG described the poor performance of public transport options tested in the NDR Major Scheme Business Case submitted by Norfolk CC to the Department for Transport in July 2008 and re-submitted in December 2009.

NNTAG stated the need for a high quality public transport system for serving NPA, supported by strong parking controls and a strong package of smart measures.

Although welcome more detailed public transport measures have been worked up in the last fifteen months through NATS IP, the transport strategy is lacking any parking management element, whilst the travel behaviour proposals are weak.

Although Public Transport Strategy options were tested in the course of NDR Major Scheme Business Case preparations, they performed badly, leading the DfT to conclude that public transport alternative was poor value for money.

Ms Carlo referred to supporting advice prepared by Keith Buchan, transport consultant, MTRU, for NNTAG and CPRE Norfolk. These were attached as appendices to NNTAG Statement 1 B 2i) and relate to:

NDR MSBC July 2008

NNTAG/CPRE and MTRU gave two powerpoint presentations to Department for Transport officials in December 2008 on the NDR MSBC submitted in July 2008. Keith Buchan MTRU outlined some initial concerns in:

i) Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NDR): Preliminary data requests and subsequent analysis, MTRU

2 Option development (p 6)

“Public transport options are inadequately prepared and perform strangely – in the Forecasting Report worse than Do Minimum and with one extra passenger in the pm peak compared to the Preferred scheme.”

“There is no evidence of a “best performing alternative” having been conceived, prepared or presented”.

3 Planning data (p7)

“The assumption appears to be that over 90% of all travel to work will be by car driver mode”.

“No analysis of current or future parking levels is provided in relation to a sustainable transport plan, public transport or smarter choices.”

ii) Interim Note, MTRU for NNTAG/CPRE, Feb 2009.

Following the December 08 discussion with DfT and further information from Norfolk CC, Keith Buchan drafted an Interim Note on NDR package. He concluded: (p 5)

“It supports car dependency, with over 90% of commuting by car in the associated new developments”.

“The public transport option is costly but hardly makes any difference to public transport use or attracting people from cars – it is either very badly designed or the model is incapable of reflecting its impact”.

“There is no valid demand management plus public transport alternative put forward – this is against Treasury and DfT guidance”.

“There is a very poor relationship between transport infrastructure, the location of employment and housing and management measures such as travel planning”.

iii) Letter from MTRU to Denise Carlo, NNTAG dated 23 September 2009, (copied to DfT and Norfolk CC).

In August 2009, the DfT asked Norfolk CC to do further work including the conduct of several sensitivity tests.

NNTAG/CPRE met the DfT and Norfolk CC officials on several occasions. Following a meeting with Norfolk CC in mid September 2009, Keith Buchan MTRU wrote to Ms Carlo NNTAG, setting out his views on problems with the NDR model in relation to switch to sustainable transport modes.

At the meeting, the County had given the impression that new modelling work on performance of the non-road elements in NATS had been undertaken, but as the letter indicates, this turned out not to be the case. (p 1)

iv) Initial response by MTRU to sensitivity testing reports for Norwich Northern Distributor Road, 4 December 2009

In late 2009, Norfolk CC submitted its further work on sensitivity testing and modelling work to DfT. NNTAG was given the opportunity to comment in mid December.

MTRU commented briefly on the results (EiP T14), noting (p2):

“For example, there was no serious consideration of alternative options to the road scheme in the original MSBC; none of the sensitivity tests address this. In fact, all the tests are based on virtually zero demand management”.

v) Letter from Department for Transport to NNTAG dated 17 November 2010

In September 2010, NNTAG asked the DfT to provide a note of exactly what non-road options had been tested by Norfolk CC.

The letter from Steve Berry DfT, advises (page 2) that the County Council tested a combined public transport scheme (new orbital bus route and improvements to existing radial buses and a BRT system (SW – NE corridor).

“The analysis of the Public Transport option in the Business Case gave a clear indication that this proposed combined scheme did not offer value for money, due primarily to the continuing cost of public transport subsidy.”

NNTAG Comments on the Poor Performance of Public Transport Option

- the Public Transport option was unaccompanied by proposals for encouraging modal switch from car to bus.
- the NDR model used for testing a Public Transport option assumed average trip generation rates for rural areas in developments associated with a NDR, resulting in an insignificant switch to public transport.
- the orbital bus option was based on the Norwich Orbital Bus Service which ran between November 2005 and March 2007 (£1.2m of Urban Bus Challenge funding) to link key residential and employment areas. The service was infrequent, unreliable and badly publicized in the early months. In January 2007, Norfolk CC agreed to terminate the service. Ref. Report on *Norwich Orbital Bus Service* by the Director of Planning and Transportation to Norfolk CC Cabinet 29 January 2007

http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/consumption/groups/public/documents/committee_report/cabinet290107item10pdf.pdf