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1 Introduction

1.1.1 The Scottish Executive’s Guidance on Regional Transport Strategies (2006) states that ‘meaningful and effective engagement with regional stakeholders and the wider public should have a significant bearing on the overall direction of the RTS’. This report provides a description of the process undertaken, and related outcomes from, consultations undertaken to inform the development of the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) for the Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership (TACTRAN).

1.1.2 The diagram in Figure 1 displays the level and nature of consultation undertaken at each of the key stages in the development of the TACTRAN RTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stage</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Consultees</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trends &amp; Issues</td>
<td>Understanding of the issues and gap filling</td>
<td>Local Authority Officers</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wider Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>Telephone interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision &amp; Objectives</td>
<td>Informing, securing “buy in”, participation</td>
<td>Wider Stakeholders</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and feedback</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Telephone interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Generation</td>
<td>Informing, securing “buy in”, participation</td>
<td>Wider Stakeholders</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and feedback</td>
<td>Experts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>Expert input</td>
<td>Statutory Consultees</td>
<td>Workshop, focus groups &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feedback questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Strategy</td>
<td>Informing development of finalised RTS &amp;</td>
<td>Wider Stakeholders</td>
<td>Feedback questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback on the Draft RTS</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.1 Consultation Structure**

1.1.3 Consultation to inform the development of the RTS was an organic, evolving process, which began in June 2006, ended on 16th March 2007 and comprised:

- workshops;
- telephone interviews;
- a telephone validation survey;
1 Introduction

Consultation Report

1.2 Structure of the Report

1.2.1 The structure of this report follows the chronology of the consultation process, with each consultation element informing and developing the next. In the main body of the text, factual details of the consultations are given, consisting of the type of consultation undertaken, participants, date and place, summaries of the outcomes from each phase of the consultation process and how these influenced the development of the finalised RTS. The full, qualitative descriptions of the content of the consultations and lists of participants at each stage of the consultation process are included as Appendices and referenced in the relevant chapters and sections.

1.2.2 The remaining chapters of this report outline the consultations undertaken at the following key stages of the RTS development process:

- Trends & Issues;
- RTS Vision & Objectives;
- Option Generation, Sifting and Appraisal;
- Draft Regional Transport Strategy
- Appendices:
  - Appendix A: Info Note 02 – Notes from Local Authority Workshops;
  - Appendix B: Info Note 03b – Key Stakeholder Workshop;
  - Appendix C: Info Note 04b – Health-related Consultations;
  - Appendix D: Info Note 33b – Key Stakeholder Workshop 2;
  - Appendix E: Info Note 32b - Targeted Consultations;
  - Appendix F: Info Note 28 - Overview of Focus Groups Consultations;
  - Appendix G: Info Note 29 - Key Stakeholder Workshop 3;
  - Appendix H: Info Note 26 - Public Consultation Key Statistics;
  - Appendix I: Public Consultation Questionnaire;
  - Appendix J: Info Note 38 - Public Consultation list of Respondents;
  - Appendix K: Info Note 36 - List of Key Stakeholders;
  - Appendix L: Info Note 37 - List of Equality Consultees;
  - Appendix M: Info Note 35 - Focus Groups and Workshops Participants;
  - Appendix N: Copy of Councils’ Responses;
  - Appendix O: Summary of Consultation Responses.
2 Trends & Issues

2.1 Overview of Trends and Issues Consultation

2.1.1 In order to explore the transport trends and issues facing the TACTRAN region, Local Authority workshops, a wider Key Stakeholders workshop, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Group workshop, health-related consultations and Expert Panel discussions were held.

2.1.2 The Local Authority workshops comprised four half-day sessions with each of the TACTRAN Local authorities between 22 and 26 June 2006. The purpose of these consultations was to identify and incorporate all the local, regional and national issues relevant to the development and preparation of the RTS.

2.1.3 A wider Key Stakeholders consultation Workshop was held on 3 August 2006 at the Discovery Point in Dundee, in order to ensure that all issues relevant to the preparation of the TACTRAN RTS were included and understood, to fill any gaps in the list of previously-identified issues and to help draft RTS Objectives.

2.1.4 The SEA workshop was held in parallel with the wider Stakeholder Workshop on 3 August 2006.

2.1.5 Telephone consultations were undertaken with representatives of NHS Forth Valley and NHS Tayside and the Scottish Executive’s Health Department. NHS Forth Valley covers Stirling and NHS Tayside covers the areas of Angus, City of Dundee and Perth and Kinross.

2.1.6 Several issues-related one-to-one meetings were held with members of MVA Consultancy’s TACTRAN Expert Panel in July 2006.

2.1.7 Descriptions of the consultations and summaries of their outcomes are presented below.

2.2 Local Authority Workshops

2.2.1 The sessions were conducted with a comprehensive representation of Council officers and local area representatives whose remit covered Transportation and Roads, Strategic and Local Land use Planning, Public Transport, Economic Development and Corporate Services, Community Planning, Social Work, School Travel and Education, Environmental Protection and Health. Having such a broad range of attendees allowed the facilitators to elicit the most pertinent and useful information at the Local Authority level and to develop a better knowledge of the issues which are important to those living and working in the TACTRAN area. Early engagement with a broad range of constituent Council service interests also enabled identification of links with key strategic/policy documents, including Structure and Local Plans, Community Plans, Economic Strategies, Local Transport Strategies and other relevant policies/strategies.

2.2.2 Table 1 in Appendix M details the attendees of the Workshops.

2.2.3 A range of topics were discussed including:

- accidents and safety;
- access to education, employment health, retail and leisure;
- congestion;
road pricing;
- parking;
- public transport including fares and information;
- air travel;
- economic development;
- environment;
- health issues related to air quality;
- walking and cycling;
- freight;
- tourism;
- social inclusion; and
- cross-boundary issues.

2.3 Wider Key Stakeholder Workshop

2.3.1 The principal objective of the Workshop was to ensure all issues of concern to stakeholders had been considered. In addition, this Workshop considered whether each issue should be best addressed at the local, regional or national level and the most appropriate mechanism for addressing the issue.

2.3.2 The Workshop also considered relevant RTS Objectives and assigned priorities to the emerging draft Objectives.

2.3.3 The full exploration of issues and comments raised on Trends & Issues can be found in Appendix B – Info Note 03b: Key Stakeholder Workshop. Table 2 in Appendix M lists the attendees of the Workshop.

Key Outcomes

2.3.4 The various Workshop sessions flagged up a total of 57 Issues covering:

- Economy
- Accessibility
- Safety & Health
2.3.5 From these, stakeholders identified the following as being "Important for RTS consideration":

- Rail capacity constraints (identified by two groups)
- Lack of rail freight terminal facilities
- Access to ports/harbours
- Inadequate car parking in city and town centres

2.3.6 The discussions at this stage of the development of the RTS process helped inform the definition of Issues and subsequent prioritisation.

2.4 Health-related Consultations

2.4.1 Telephone consultations were undertaken with representatives of NHS Forth Valley and NHS Tayside and the Scottish Executive’s Health Department.

2.4.2 The consultations raised and considered a wide range of issues:

- short, medium and long term access to health facilities/hospitals,
- levels of transport service provision and options available for access to health, including the provision and scope for demand responsive, community and voluntary transport to health care;
- hospital car parking facilities,
- promotion of sustainable travel and public transport information for patients, visitors and staff; issues arising from hospital re-locations,
- non-emergency access for patients; and
- the scope for co-operation between health and transport teams.

2.4.3 Both Health Board consultees and their representatives were also invited to attend the Key Stakeholder Workshop at the Discovery Point in Dundee on 3 August 2006.

2.4.4 The full exploration of issues and comments raised in the telephone consultations with NHS Tayside, NHS Forth Valley and the policy division of Scottish Executive Health Department, can be found in Appendix C: Info Note 04b – Health-related Consultations.

Key Outcomes

2.4.5 Given the statutory requirement for formal working relationships between Transport Partnerships and Health Boards, the consultation provided insight into important issues and helped frame subsequent interventions aimed particularly at addressing the transport issues associated with access to health services.
2.5 **Expert Panel Discussion**

2.5.1 Various issues-related conversations and one-to-one meetings were held with members of MVA’s TACTRAN Expert Panel.

2.5.2 Initial conversations were held with (and/or material subsequently provided by):

- Professor David Gray, Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen;
- Mike Slinn, Director of Transport Consultancy, MVA Consultancy; and
- Duncan Cross, Director of Rail Operations, MVA Consultancy.

**Key Outcome**

2.5.3 These discussions centred on Rural Transport Issues and Freight-related Issues which helped to develop the Trends and Issues element of the project.
3 RTS Vision & Objectives

3.1 Overview of Vision and Objectives Consultation

3.1.1 The Vision and Objectives for the TACTRAN RTS were developed and informed by input from the Key Stakeholders Workshop and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Workshop, which were held on 3 August 2006 at the Discovery Point in Dundee.

3.1.2 The consultations with Key Stakeholders were supplemented with a sample telephone validation survey of 200 TACTRAN residents, who were contacted by telephone in September 2006.

3.2 Key Stakeholders Workshops

3.2.1 As previously described, the Workshop was run in two parallel sessions, one focusing on transport related Issues and Objectives, the other focusing on environmental Issues and Objectives. Stakeholders were invited to attend the session they felt most appropriate to their area of interest.

3.2.2 Having considered the Issues that the RTS should address, the participants were invited to comment on a set of draft Objectives for the Strategy and to assign priorities to them. The full exploration of issues and comments raised on the RTS Vision & Objectives can be found in Appendix B – Info Note 03b: Key Stakeholder Workshop.

Key Outcome

3.2.3 The Stakeholder Workshops provided essential feedback at a defining stage in the development of the draft Strategy. The Objectives determine the direction of the Strategy and are the mechanism by which successful delivery will be assessed. A number of Stakeholders will be key delivery partners and achieving support and buy-in at this stage was essential. The Key Stakeholders helped shape the initial draft Objectives, which were then further refined for subsequent Board approval in September 2006.

3.3 Telephone Validation Survey

3.3.1 In this exercise, 200 TACTRAN residents were contacted by telephone. They were asked to state how important they felt each of the emerging draft TACTRAN 18 Objectives to be. They were also asked to identify the Objective which they considered to be the most important, second most important and third most important.

3.3.2 The telephone survey results were analysed and the findings used to inform the development of the RTS Objectives.

Key Outcome

- The telephone survey provided a useful ‘straw poll’ during the development of the RTS Objectives. It helped provide insight into the potential acceptability of the Objectives and their relative importance ahead of the main public consultation phase.
3.3.3 From analysis of responses by location, respondents living in remote rural areas placed particular emphasis on access to health and education services whilst those in urban areas placed more emphasis on the natural and built environment.
4 Option Generation, Sifting and Appraisal

4.1 Overview of Options Consultation

4.1.1 In order to inform the option generation, sifting and appraisal process for the RTS, an Expert Panel Workshop, a 2nd Key Stakeholders Workshop and targeted consultations with DRT and Community Transport representatives were held.

4.2 Expert Panel

4.2.1 Meetings with members of the Expert Panel were convened on the 16th October and 6th November 2006. The participants in these meetings were Professors David Gray, Robert Gordon University (specialist in rural transport issues), Ron McQuaid Napier University (specialist in economic development and social inclusion) and Alan McKinnon, Heriot Watt University (specialist in freight issues), Dr Annie Say, Director, Natural Capital and members of the MVA team from across the Consultancy, including Duncan Cross (Director, Rail operations) and Steve Atkins (Projects Director, specialist in transport policy).

4.2.2 The discussions were wide ranging and covered:

- Role of Dundee airport – National Transport Strategy was anticipated to retain a focus on central belt airports. Agreed Dundee’s links to London City should be maintained and supported;
- Accessibility to health services – explored the issue of centralisation of specialist facilities versus local community health centres. Key issues are linking of transport services and co-ordination of information;
- A review of the proposed approach to objective weighting systems and the potential conflicts between the economy and the environment;
- Potential levels of funding availability to implement the Strategy and how to handle prioritisation;
- The strategic fit between TACTRAN and the emerging National Transport Strategy;
- Road pricing – not considered to be high on the regional agenda; town centre parking was considered to be a more pertinent issue;
- Freight issues – emerging issues in the forthcoming Freight Action Plan. Links to ports, with particular reference to how the timber and whisky industries operate & their needs. How retail distribution network operates in the region. Needs of big players in industry in the region. Issue of freight distribution in rural areas. Implications of switch away from landfill for waste disposal. Potential for rail heading in the region. Need for a freight quality partnership, use of freight facilities grants and how marginal improvements to roads can help lorry drivers make more efficient use of their allotted driving hours;
- Coastal shipping and the role of local ports – the trend towards large and smaller ports operating on a hub and spoke principle. Grangemouth was identified as a key external link in this context and this had implications for the key strategic road access links – Forth Bridge, Kincardine and M90. View was there was a need for a regional strategy...
for local ports and that regional ports need to concentrate on developing niche markets.

- A review of the emerging list of interventions and a discussion on national, regional and local issues. Rail access to Perth was viewed as an important element of the draft list of potential interventions compiled to date.

4.3 **2nd Key Stakeholders Consultation Workshop**

4.3.1 As part of the Options Generation and Sifting stage of the process a second Key Stakeholder consultation Workshop was held on 3 November 2006 at the Discovery Point in Dundee. The purpose of the workshop was to:

- update Key Stakeholders on progress with the TACTRAN RTS development;
- confirm potential schemes and interventions identified through technical and officer analysis of transport in the Region and identify new/additional options;
- discuss with Key Stakeholders the prioritisation of potential measures; and
- consider alternative strategies and strategy packages for further appraisal.

4.3.2 For this second wider Stakeholder Workshop, letters were sent out to some 200 stakeholders inviting them to participate. Over 30 representatives attended the event. Table 3 in Appendix M gives a list of participants.

4.3.3 The Workshop comprised two sessions, covering Option Generation and Strategy Options.

**Option Generation**

4.3.4 The options generation exercise was organised into 3 breakout sessions each consisting of 8-12 stakeholders with cross-section of interests. At the beginning of each session participants were presented with the list of schemes which have been previously collated from:

- A review of the constituent authority Structure and Local Plans, Local Transport Strategies, Community and Safety Plans;
- Analysis of the three strands of measures\(^1\) of work undertaken as part of the supporting study work; and
- Schemes identified by TACTRAN Partners members and officers.

4.3.5 Participants were asked to review the list to identify gaps and highlight any schemes which they had concerns with or which were likely to cause problems. Feedback from each group was presented to all stakeholders at the end of the exercise. The full exploration of issues and comments raised can be found in Appendix D: Info Note 33b – Key Stakeholder Workshop 2.

---

\(^1\) Having set the objectives the Strategy should achieve, three strands of work were undertaken to identify the types of measures which the RTS would be likely to contain. These were Network-based initiatives (covering physical infrastructure schemes and public transport supply on high demand corridors), Initiatives for specific areas and groups (aimed primarily at accessibility and providing minimum levels of service to specific localities); and Region-wide measures (measures affecting the whole TACTRAN area).
4.3.6 The second session of the Workshop focused on the consideration of potential alternative strategies. The session was run with all Stakeholders together. Participants were presented with the process of ‘shaping’ of the strategy and the effects of applying different weightings to the list of emerging schemes in order to consider Strategy options of either a balanced strategy or approaches where increased emphasis might be given to economy, accessibility and/or environment objectives. Examples of possible schemes favouring each theme were also demonstrated. Participants were encouraged to comment on the process and raise further issues related to the RTS development.

Key Outcomes

4.3.7 The Workshop sessions provided just over 100 suggestions on potential Interventions across the full range of Issues that the RTS could adopt, together with a further 20 comments on the content of the draft list of potential interventions placed before them. Following the Workshop, the participants’ responses and views were analysed and distilled and a further 60 Interventions were added to the list for subsequent appraisal.

4.4 Targeted DRT/Community Transport Consultation

4.4.1 During the Stakeholder Workshops, representatives of the various groups involved in Community Transport (CT) had sought to ensure that the emerging Strategy was founded on a full appreciation of the role of CT and the constraints and issues before it in further advancing that role.

4.4.2 Accordingly, a further consultation meeting was held with this interest group in November 2006 and included a comprehensive representation of DRT and Community Transport people in the TACTRAN region. The purpose was to:

- Discuss progress on developing Objectives and Options for the RTS;
- Identify what CT can contribute and what are the key CT issues and needs and
- Clarify how CT can contribute and identify “best practice” in TACTRAN region and elsewhere.

4.4.3 Details of the individuals and the various groups represented are given in Table 4 in Appendix M.

4.4.4 There was an informative discussion covering funding issues; legislative constraints; involvement of the CT groups in the development of the Strategy. The full exploration of issues and comments raised can be found in Appendix E: Info Note 32b - Targeted Consultations.

Key Outcome

4.4.5 Community Transport is an important element of the overall transport provision in the Region and has a key role in assisting in the achievement of Objectives to provide improved levels of accessibility to services for the Region’s residents. This aspect of the consultation provided additional information on the role and particular issues and constraints for Community Transport together and on the various DRT/CT services currently provided across the Region.
5 Consultation on Draft Regional Transport Strategy

5.1 Public Consultation Process

5.1.1 The consultation was publicised by placing statutory Public Notices in the Dundee Courier and Stirling Observer during week commencing 22 January and issuing Press Releases, via Councils, to regional and local press and media, the content of which was agreed in advance with Council Public Relations Officers.

5.1.2 Copies of the full RTS document were forwarded to statutory consultees (constituent Councils, Health Boards, SEA Gateway), Community Planning Partnerships, all other Regional Transport Partnerships, and the Scottish Executive and Transport Scotland. Copies of the document were issued by Councils to senior politicians and relevant Chief Officials.

5.1.3 Copies were also made available for public inspection in main Council offices and in all Public Libraries. Invitations to comment on the Draft RTS were sent direct to the 197 groups and individuals who form the RTS Key Stakeholders Grouping. All consultees were encouraged to access and respond to the consultation, by the 16th March deadline, via the TACTRAN website www.tactran.gov.uk. A questionnaire, designed to assist submission of views on the Preferred Strategy, proposed Interventions and other aspects of the Draft RTS was available on the website.

5.1.4 A Summary RTS was also produced and copies of this were sent to all 127 Community Councils across the TACTRAN area. Copies of the Summary and Full versions of the Draft RTS were also issued to individuals and groups on request.

5.1.5 A series of themed Focus Groups were held with Key Stakeholders on 8th and 13th February, covering walking and cycling; public transport; freight; health; national parks and tourism; environment; economy and enterprise; and disability and other special needs interests. All Key Stakeholders were also invited to a consultation Workshop on 28th February.

5.2 Statutory Consultee Responses

5.2.1 The comments of statutory consultees are summarised below. A number of requests for additional or amended Interventions were submitted. These were appraised in line with the approach adopted in developing the Preferred Strategy and the implications were subsequently considered at the Partnerships Board’s RTS Workshop on 20 March 2007.

Angus Council

5.2.2 Angus Council’s Infrastructure Services Committee considered the Draft RTS on 8th March 2007. The Committee generally welcomed the development of the RTS. Suggestions for a number of amendments to the clarity and presentation of the document were made. There was strong support for a number of proposed interventions, including the TERS rail proposals; improvements to the A92 north of Arbroath; improvements to Dundee station, including multi-modal interchange; Park & Ride; improvements to Port and Harbour access; and integrated ticketing. The importance of ensuring that the needs of rural areas are fully addressed was highlighted.
Clarification was sought on TACTRAN’s specific proposals in relation to developing Demand Management and a Regional Parking Policy Framework.

5.2.3 Angus Council indicated support for the need to improve the A90 through Dundee as a high priority, but did not support a new Outer Bypass of Dundee within Angus Council’s administrative boundaries. There was support for removal of tolls on the Tay Bridge to relieve congestion and air quality problems in Dundee.

**Dundee City Council**

5.2.4 Dundee City Council’s Planning and Transportation Committee considered the Draft RTS on 12th March 2007. The Committee agreed to strongly support the Preferred Strategy as being the correct strategy for the TACTRAN Region and indicated strong support for the RTS Objectives and analysis of Issues. The Council strongly supported the case for the TERS rail proposals; improvements to Dundee rail station; the A90 Outer Bypass of Dundee including investigation of all options for A90 corridor through Dundee, including a package of associated bus priority, cycle lanes and pedestrian measures on or across the Kingsway; and Park and Ride on the strategic network being included in the Strategic Transport Projects Review.

5.2.5 Dundee City Council requested that the RTS includes a statement supporting the abolition of tolls on the Tay Bridge and, if this is not the outcome of the Tolled Bridges Review, that the RTS supports relocation of the toll plaza to the south end of the bridge, with supporting Park & Ride/Park & Choose measures to reduce the volume of single occupancy cars accessing the City for commuter and other travel demands.

**Perth & Kinross Council**

5.2.6 Perth & Kinross Council’s Enterprise and Infrastructure Committee considered the Draft RTS on 7th March 2007. The Committee welcomed and supported the Preferred Strategy as representing a balanced approach to meeting the Objectives and addressing the key Issues. The Committee indicated full support for a number of the proposed Interventions, including the proposed new Tay Bridge and link between A94 and A9; new bus/rail interchange at Perth rail station; improvements to Perth Harbour; new Park & Ride sites; and development of sustainable options. The Committee requested clarification on TACTRAN’s proposals for establishing Regional Best Practice in transportation aspects of Development Management and on developing a Regional Parking Policy Framework.

5.2.7 Perth & Kinross Council also requested inclusion of additional Interventions for road safety improvements to the A9 north and south of Perth, including additional dualled sections and grade separated junctions; improvements to the A977 to address congestion and road safety issues on this route; improvements to the Inverness – Perth – Edinburgh rail service; and consideration of Errol as a potential alternative air site, if proposed improvements at Dundee Airport are unable to be achieved.

**Stirling Council**

5.2.8 Stirling Council considered the Draft RTS at its meeting on 15th March. The Council strongly supported the Preferred Strategy as being the correct strategy for the TACTRAN region and strongly agreed with the Objectives and analysis of key Issues. It considered that an appropriate balance of urban and rural issues had been achieved. There was support for the proposed Interventions on TERS rail proposals, extended to Dunblane, Stirling, and Glasgow; upgrading of
Stirling Bus Station and integration with the rail station; bus and rail based Park and Ride, including at Dunblane and Bannockburn; new link road between A84 and A9 and new M9/A811 interchange all being included in the Strategic Transport Projects Review.

5.2.9 The Council also requested an additional Intervention supporting proposed operation of 6-car trains between Dunblane/Alloa/Stirling and Glasgow/Edinburgh, with associated infrastructure upgrading works. The need to recognise existing joint working arrangements with Clackmannanshire and Falkirk was also highlighted.

Health Boards

5.2.10 **NHS Forth Valley** supported the analysis of Objectives and Issues and agreed with the Preferred Strategy. They welcomed the opportunity to work with partners in addressing transport issues of joint interest, in particular working jointly with TACTRAN on development of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.

5.2.11 **NHS Tayside** strongly agreed with the Preferred Strategy and Preferred Strategy interventions. They agreed with the Objectives and strongly agreed with the analysis of key Issues. They also noted support for additional emphasis on interventions which improve Health and Wellbeing.

Community Planning Partnerships

5.2.12 **Angus Community Planning Partnership** welcomed the opportunity to respond to the consultation and indicated that they supported and had nothing to add to the Angus Council response.

5.2.13 **The Dundee Partnership** indicated support for the Preferred Strategy. They considered that the Preferred Strategy represented a balanced approach which complemented their own vision and objectives.

5.2.14 **Stirling Community Planning Partnership** also welcomed the opportunity to comment and offered general support for the Preferred Strategy, indicating that they supported the views submitted by Stirling Council.

5.2.15 **Perth & Kinross Community Planning Partnership** indicated that they supported the Preferred Strategy and the views submitted by Perth & Kinross Council and other CPP partners.

Scottish Executive and Transport Scotland

5.2.16 Although the Scottish Executive is not a formal statutory consultee within the development of the RTS, as part of the RTS Assurance Process the Executive has a role to review the emerging RTS at two stages during its development. The first stage took place through consideration of the Issues and Objectives Report. The Executive endorsed that report and provided guidance on the development of the Strategy which was taken into account during its subsequent development.

5.2.17 The second stage in the Assurance Process was the consideration of the Consultation Draft of the RTS. The Executive and Transport Scotland submitted comments on the Draft RTS.

5.2.18 The Executive indicated in its response that it was content that TACTRAN had broadly followed the RTS Guidance, recognising that some elements of the process were required to be carried out in parallel, in order to meet the 31st March submission deadline. It was also indicated that the
Executive felt that the Draft RTS sat well with National Transport Strategy objectives, although more emphasis was likely to be sought in relation to buses, in accordance with the NTS Buses Action Plan.

5.2.19 Some amendments to the final RTS were recommended in relation to categorisation of proposed Interventions mindful of national and regional boundaries; tempering national project aspirations with likely availability of funds and other resources; the need to prioritise regional proposals on the basis of available funding and resources; and the need for appraisal of options using STAG, before commitments could be made to specific interventions.

**SEA Gateway**

5.2.20 The Consultation Draft was submitted to the SEA Gateway for consideration alongside the Environmental Report. The consultation authorities involved in the Gateway review are Historic Scotland, Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH). The review concluded that when considering the overall Strategy within the RTS that the effects on carbon emissions, air quality and health were dependent on the reduction in car dependency and promoting more sustainable modes (e.g. cycling and walking). It was recognised that many interventions in the RTS have the potential to reduce traffic growth, although possibly unlikely to reverse it. Further appraisal of interventions would be required to determine the precise effects – some negative effects could result if new road infrastructure leads to traffic growth but some benefits could result from modal shift.

5.2.21 The review considered that there may be some significant effects on the natural and cultural heritage from new infrastructure projects at some locations. Environmental Impact Appraisals would be required for all new major roads to determine specific effects and mitigation and to inform the decision making process. Appropriate assessment would be required of all schemes with potential to affect European sites to determine whether the proposals could affect the integrity of the sites. Implementation of best construction practices would reduce the risk of significant effects. Modal shift would have potential to enhance the setting of historic townscapes and features through reductions in traffic flows and congestion etc.

5.2.22 It was recommended that TACTRAN should promote information to ensure take-up of more sustainable modes to compensate for potential increases in motorised traffic using new road infrastructure. It was recognised that the majority of the RTS seeks to promote more sustainable transport and achieve modal shift and that success will depend on general raising of awareness on sustainable modes of transport within the region and delivery of committed actions.

**Regional Transport Partnerships**

**NESTRANS**

5.2.23 Nestrans indicated support for the Draft RTS interventions/proposals on fast hourly rail services between Aberdeen – Edinburgh with few stops; improving traffic flows on the A90 through/around Dundee; developing sustainable transport options for improved access to the Cairngorms National Park; and joint RTP working on developing Integrated Ticketing and on Freight initiatives, including Freight Quality partnerships.
Zetland Transport Partnership

5.2.24 ZETRANS indicated support for interventions/proposals for encouraging tourist travel by sustainable modes; fast hourly rail service Aberdeen – Edinburgh complemented by semi-fast Dundee – Edinburgh service; and joint RTP working on Integrated Ticketing. They noted the proposed improvements to the A90 around Dundee as being of benefit to freight hauliers accessing the Scottish mainland via Aberdeen harbour and also indicated a desire to share experience on Demand Responsive Transport.

Strathclyde Partnership for Transport

5.2.25 Strathclyde Partnership for Transport indicated willingness to develop joint approaches to common transport interests and objectives.

SEStran

5.2.26 SEStran indicated willingness to work jointly on addressing matters of cross-boundary interest, particularly in relation to issues such as travel information; cross-boundary bus and rail provision; and sought support on action to complete long distance cycle routes, such as the round the Forth and North Sea Cycle routes.

HITRANS

5.2.27 HITRANS indicated a willingness to work on cross-boundary issues, including Quality Bus Partnerships and strategic road and rail improvements. They requested specific reference be included on the need for improved rail services between Inverness – Perth – Edinburgh and on the West Highland Lines, and for improvements to the A9 and A82 Trunk Roads. They also supported improvements to Park & Ride and other public transport interchanges in the TACTRAN area which serve key cross-boundary corridors.

5.3 Key Stakeholders

Focus Groups

5.3.1 On 8th and 13th February 2007 four Focus Groups sessions were held in the Discovery Centre in Dundee. The purpose of these was to gain an in-depth understanding of specialist groups, equality groups and other stakeholders’ views, by focusing in on relevant areas of interest within the Draft RTS.

5.3.2 All members of the Key Stakeholder groups were invited to participate in these sessions. To ensure a wide range of interests were represented, members of the following areas of interest were particularly encouraged to attend:

- Walking and Cycling;
- Public Transport; (bus rail, taxi and community transport);
- Car Drivers and Motor Cyclists;
- Health Boards / Emergency Services;
- Disability groups;
5 Consultation on Draft Regional Transport Strategy

- Freight;
- National Parks and Tourism;
- Enterprise and Education; and
- Environmental and Special Interests.

5.3.3 Tables 5 in Appendix M detail the participants of the groups.

Key Outcomes

5.3.4 Each of the Groups was asked to consider the range of Interventions proposed for the draft Strategy and to comment as appropriate. In total 165 comments or points raised were recorded from these discussions for subsequent consideration.

5.3.5 The Groups were also asked to consider and provide comment on the Preferred Strategy and the alternatives that were considered. In general there was support for the Preferred Strategy with views expressed that it represented a balanced strategy. Representatives from individual interest groups did express views as to where they would like to see increased emphasis within the strategy which, as might be expected, reflected their particular interests.

5.3.6 The full descriptive write up of the four Focus Groups can be found in Appendix F: Info Note 28 - Overview of Focus Groups Consultations.

5.4 3rd Key Stakeholders Workshop

5.4.1 On 28th February five further Workshop sessions were held with groups of Key Stakeholders in the Discovery Centre in Dundee. The purpose of these consultations was similar to the earlier Focus Groups, to gain an in-depth understanding of the wider Stakeholders Groups views on the Draft RTS. Tables 6 in Appendix M detail the participants of the workshop. The full descriptive write up of the workshop consultation groups can be found in Appendix G: Info Note 29 – Key Stakeholder Workshop 3.

Key Outcomes

5.4.2 As with the earlier Focus Groups, each of these groups was asked to consider the range of interventions proposed for the Draft Strategy and to comment as appropriate. A further 92 comments or points raised were recorded from these discussions for subsequent consideration.

5.4.3 The groups considered and provided comment on the Preferred Strategy and the alternatives that were considered. There was a general consensus of support for the Preferred Strategy with views expressed that it represented a balanced strategy. Representatives from individual interest groups again expressed views as to where they would like to see increased emphasis within the strategy which, as might be expected, reflected their particular interests.

5.5 Public Consultation Responses

Summary of Responses

5.5.1 A total of 143 responses were received by the end of the consultation period (1700 on Friday 16 March), as follows:
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28 electronic copies of the questionnaire.
28 paper copies of the questionnaire; and
87 written responses.

5.5.2 Of these 143 responses, 8 were duplicates (ie more than 1 form of response was used by the same respondent):

- 2 respondents submitted a written response and a completed hard-copy questionnaire;
- 4 respondents submitted electronic questionnaire and a written response;
- 1 respondent submitted both the electronic and the hard-copy questionnaires; and
- 1 respondent submitted 2 written responses.

5.5.3 9 responses were received after 1700 on Friday 16 March. It was agreed that a belated response from HITRANS would be included in the statistical analysis.

5.5.4 A list of all respondents is provided in Appendix J.

5.5.5 Responses received by the end of the consultation period from the 136 respondents included:

- 6 were from Statutory Consultees;
- 10 were from Other Statutory Bodies;
- 5 were from neighbouring RTPs;
- 31 were from Key Stakeholders;
- 50 were from Representatives of Other Groups (including local councillors and MSPs/MPs); and
- 34 were from members of the general public.

5.5.6 The pie chart in Figure 5.1 below illustrates this breakdown of respondents by category.

![Category of Respondents](image)

**Figure 5.1 Breakdown of consultation responses by category**
Analysis of Consultation Questionnaire

5.5.7 The questionnaire consisted of open and closed questions on the following topics:

- Issues & Objectives;
- The Preferred Strategy;
- Proposed Interventions;
- Targets;
- Equality;
- Further Comments; and
- Demographic Information.

5.5.8 The results of responses to the questionnaire survey are summarised below:

- Overall there was strong agreement with the Objectives which the TACTRAN RTS should try to achieve, with 79% of respondents who either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the Objectives;
- 73% of respondents either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the analysis of the main issues facing TACTRAN;
- from the consultation, there was strong agreement that the Preferred Strategy had the correct balance between its three strategic themes, overall 76% of respondents either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the Preferred Strategy;
- there was strong support for the Preferred Strategy Interventions and Actions with 70% agreeing or strongly agreeing with the proposals;
- there was less support for the suggested set of targets which might be adopted to monitor and measure progress on achievement in meeting the RTS Objectives – 51% of respondents felt that the draft targets were not ambitious enough; and
- in respect of the possibility of the RTS having a negative impact on any of the Equality Groups, 88% considered there was either no impact or were unable to identify any negative impact.

5.5.9 The full description and statistical analysis of the public consultation survey can be found in Appendix H: Info Note 26 – Public Consultation Key Statistics. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix I: Public Consultation Questionnaire and a full list of respondents by category can be found in Appendix J: Public Consultation list of Respondents.

5.6 Equality Considerations

5.6.1 Throughout the consultation on the draft RTS, the needs of various equality interests across the Region were taken into account. Guidance was sought from the Scottish Executive’s Equality Unit on the groups with various equality interests and appropriate national and regional organisations were included within the Key Stakeholders from whom consultation responses were sought. Appendix L contains a list of the Equality Groups who formed part of the consultation process.
5.6.2 Representatives from the Key Stakeholder Equality Groups were invited to participate in the Focus Group or Workshop sessions or alternatively to respond either in writing or via the Questionnaire Survey. As set out in paragraph 5.5.7 above, consideration of the issue of equality impacts was widened out to all respondents to the questionnaire.

5.6.3 The preparation and consultation phases for the RTS have sought to ensure that the Finalised Strategy will not impact adversely on any particular group within society. This has been achieved by scrutiny of the Objectives and Interventions proposed within the Strategy and by seeking the views of a diverse range of Stakeholder groups and individuals through the consultation process.

5.6.4 In the future, all measures implemented via the RTS will be subject to an Equality Impact Assessment, where appropriate.

5.7 Public Consultation Outcomes

5.7.1 Following receipt of the various statutory and other stakeholder responses, the Focus Group and Workshop inputs, and the responses from the general public, a database was created into which all the responses were entered. Each response was considered and recommendations made as to whether action was required, or otherwise, or whether the response should be treated as an observation. A full summary of the detailed responses received during the 8-week public consultation period is given in Appendix O.

5.7.2 These responses to public consultation were considered by the Partnership Board at meetings on the 20th and 27th March and amendments to the draft RTS agreed. The Partnership’s response to comments submitted during the consultation are also summarised in Appendix O. Over 400 individual comments were considered and a range of amendments were incorporated into the Finalised RTS including:

- Strengthening interventions and actions covering freight, particularly in connection with rail freight and ports opportunities;
- Strengthening the consideration of environmental issues, particularly in connection with the implications of climate change and the peaking of oil supplies;
- Increased emphasis on walking and cycling in relevant interventions, particularly in connection with health and well-being, tourism in the National Parks and access to public transport for cycles;
- Increased emphasis on integration, both in terms of integrating walking, cycling and public transport and inter-modal integration of timetables and information;
- Clarifying and strengthening support for rail enhancements between Inverness – Perth – Edinburgh, on the West Highland lines, and investigating opportunities for station re-opening between Perth – Edinburgh;
- More explicit reference to and support for a number of cross-boundary interests raised by neighbouring Regional Transport Partnerships;
- Strengthening and including additional Interventions on a number of road safety issues on key routes/corridors, with particular reference to named sites with poor safety records;
- Including support for abolition of tolls on the Tay Road Bridge; and
Strengthening interventions and actions to reflect the need to improve opportunities for the mobility impaired.
Appendices
1 Introduction

1.1 Four half-day consultation workshops were conducted with each of the TACTRAN Local Authorities between 22 and 26 June 2006. The purpose of these consultations was to identify and feed in all the local issues relevant to the preparation of the Regional Transport Strategy.

1.2 The sessions were held with a broad range of Council officers and area representatives whose remit covers Transportation and Roads, Strategic and Local Land use Planning, Public Transport, Economic Development and Corporate Services, Community Planning, Social Work, School Travel and Education, Environmental Protection and Health. Having this range of attendees allowed us to draw out useful information at the Local Authority level and develop a better knowledge of the issues which are important to those living and working in the TACTRAN area. The list of Stakeholders that have been consulted is presented in Appendix M of the Consultation Report.

1.3 A range of topics were discussed including accidents and safety, access to education, employment, health, retail and leisure, congestion, private car, tolls, parking, public transport including fares and information, air travel, economic development, environment, health issues related to air quality, walking and cycling, freight, tourism, social inclusion and cross-boundary issues.

1.4 The consultations identified a wide range of problems and issues ranging from the very specific to the very strategic and broad. We have tabulated those issues in this Information Note to allow for easy comparison between authorities.

2 Tables

2.1 Table 2.1 outlines all work which has previously been taken out, or is ongoing, in the Local Authority areas.
### Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Plan</td>
<td>Preparing alteration to SP</td>
<td>Staff Travel Planning (surveys from Dundee University, Ninewells hospital &amp; Dundee CC)</td>
<td>LTS (October 2000) – won’t be updated until RTS is in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Management Plan</td>
<td>Local Transport Strategy (LTS) – won’t be updated until RTS in place</td>
<td>Car Parking Strategy (including best practice from other areas) and document regarding residential parking</td>
<td>Road Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance Plan</td>
<td>Committee reports</td>
<td>Tay Estuary Rail Study (Intercity and local services) – a priority scheme for TACTRAN</td>
<td>Local Plan Review – end of the year is completion, (LP adopted in 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Strategy (LTS 2006)</td>
<td>Perth Harbour Expansion reports</td>
<td>Usage of PT survey</td>
<td>Structure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Transport Strategy (CTS 2006)</td>
<td>Another crossing of Tay</td>
<td>Local Transport Strategy (LTS) 2000 – won’t be updated until RTS</td>
<td>Transport proposals - Tay Estuary Rail Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Alteration 2 - Local Plan Inquiry completed December 2005. (New village located to the South East of Stirling consisting of 2,500 house, business park, schools, community facilities and shops).</td>
<td>Perth Rail Station, Airport issues, Rail Studies (regional and strategic)</td>
<td>Community Plan – divided into 7 community plans, including environmental issues</td>
<td>Transport proposals - new generation of city region planning are at early stages, currently going through a planning bill with Scottish Parliament. Angus will be part of Dundee City Region – in very early stage now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Access Strategy (core path planning)</td>
<td>Work done on Health services (care review at present – strategic level)</td>
<td>Outdoor Access Strategy</td>
<td>PT Info Strategy (compatible with Dundee PT Information System)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stirling</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perth &amp; Kinross</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dundee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Angus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterspace Strategy (focuses on river Forth and new water corridor tying into the Millenium link and west coast corridor)</td>
<td>Community transport reviews (covers access to services)</td>
<td>Ambassador Route Strategy (main road routes into Dundee)</td>
<td>Eastern Cairngorms Access project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Routes to School</td>
<td>Air quality reports – Action plans</td>
<td>PTF bids – Tay Estuary Rail still outstanding</td>
<td>Cycling/walking programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Strategy (features Tourism)</td>
<td>Woodland Strategy – to be produced</td>
<td>Draft Environment strategy and air quality</td>
<td>Draft Countryside Access Strategy (including Core paths)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Strategy</td>
<td>Outdoor Access Strategy</td>
<td>Tayside Biodiversity Plan</td>
<td>Green (Travel) Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green space strategy</td>
<td>Cycling Strategy – part of LTS + study re commuting routes + currently study outside city – to see where it can be improved</td>
<td>Report re West End Regeneration</td>
<td>Climate Change study – looking at households, TTW pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity strategy</td>
<td>Biodiversity Action Plan</td>
<td>Reports re Central Waterfront development</td>
<td>Projects: Angus Rail Interchange (inc station upgrades at Arbroath, Montrose &amp; Carnoustie) partially complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Strategy</td>
<td>Timber Transport Partnership – priority routes for timber transport</td>
<td>Dundee city centre PARAMICS traffic model + model of central waterfront development</td>
<td>Traffic Counts, Cycle counts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling, walking and maintenance strategy is under development and due to be completed by January 2007</td>
<td>PARAMICS model of city centre (SIAS)</td>
<td>PARAMICS model for Kingsway</td>
<td>Work done to improve walking/cycling to schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Room for Growth’ rail study by Scott Wilson to complement the earlier national rail studies</td>
<td>RSI data for Kingsway</td>
<td>Tayside Biodiversity Action Plan (most of Angus) + Action Plan for Cairngorms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stirling**

- Paramics model of Stirling is currently being used to assess CTS schemes and new development proposed in the local plan and development options as part of the Structure Plan Alteration.

**Perth & Kinross**

- ‘Retail Study’ – looking at shopping patterns in Perth, includes existing and future catchments (trying to predict additional floor space capacity), based on telephone survey of shoppers, should be available in July 2006.

**Dundee**

- Safer Routes to School, Education Programmes, Integrated Children Plan

**Angus**

- Draft Community Plan

---

**East Stirling Rail Station feasibility study and M80/A80 corridor study considering the feasibility of rail park and ride opportunities near Bannockburn.**

- Structure Plan – being reviewed regarding GROS statistics

**Community Safety Strategy**

- Community Safety Strategy

**Structure Plan Alteration considering future development in Stirling and Clackmannanshire up to 2025.**

- Dundeeliftshare.com
- Dundeetravelinfo.com

**Draft Rural Strategy**

- Draft Rural Strategy (consultation)

---

- RSPA (in Cariston) + rural priority areas

- Council’s Financial Plan (capital programme is for next 3 yrs)
2.2 The following Accident and Safety issues were raised and considered.

**Table 2.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covered by Road Safety Plan; had concerns of safety on trunk roads (which they are not responsible for)</td>
<td>Safety Strategy to be updated</td>
<td>Dualling of A92 towards Aberdeen to Arbroath finished</td>
<td>Grade separated junctions have resolved most of the issues on A90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Information Note 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited safe overtaking opportunities</th>
<th>Access from local villages onto A9 considered as a big issue</th>
<th>A90 – improved</th>
<th>A92 – north of Arbroath &amp; A935 remain an issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City centre - met targets for 2010 already</td>
<td>No other particular blackspots - statistics follow national trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Accidents are the main issue</td>
<td>Traffic calming – targeted at hazardous locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited crossing opportunities on Kingsway create big barrier to pedestrians, cyclists and buses – seen as a key local/regional issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Access to Education.

**Table 2.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of PT is an issue in some rural areas</td>
<td>Safer Routes to school – very active in this field</td>
<td>Programmes with children re Travel safety and developing Safer Routes to School Travel Plan Exemplar</td>
<td>Encouragement of cycling / walking / walking buses – all schools need have Travel Plan by summer 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered school buses require significant amount of budget</td>
<td>Council provides transport for children with special needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey done re: School travel pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined school and public PT services available to access education</td>
<td>Schools being built through PPP contracts – merging or redeveloping schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility to school is a problem - congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLaren school (Callender) – biggest catchment area in Scotland</td>
<td>Dundee High School - attracts students from N Fife &amp; Angus</td>
<td>Organised buses 3x a day from Forfar (Angus college (in Arbroath) contact Jackie Howe) + other colleges –Dundee Uni, few students coming from Aberdeenshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of bus services from school to a central drop-off with a short walk to the bus stop</td>
<td>Dundee and Abertay Universities and Dundee College are significant traffic attractors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling/walking – even with Safer Routes to School, it’s parental decision how children get to/from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for school coordinators to encourage cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road cycling - route between Doune and Dunblane is 80% finished, subject to funding partners. Round the Forth cycle route is currently being developed by SESTRAN and Sustrans, with improvements/completion (within Stirling area) of missing links between Fallin, Cowie and Stirling and City centre (NCN76).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Modans High School in Stirling attracts cross boundary travel from other local authority areas. In addition, cross boundary travel is further</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
complicated with the location of college site, for example Forth Valley College has facilities at Falkirk as well as Stirling.

“Active Stirling” – promotion of activities in schools

2.4 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Access to Employment.

**Table 2.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunblane has wide catchment area from the north and west which adds pressure to town centre parking and station parking which is also shared with Tesco.</td>
<td>A lot of employment at the west side of Dundee, while much of the new housing is north and east</td>
<td>Dundee-Aberdeen Citylink used to stop in Angus, does not anymore (not profitable) – eg Brechin has no direct access to coach facilities to the North; Montrose - Aberdeen takes 2 hours</td>
<td>Biggest employers are in Forfar (mainly public sector)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross boundary travel for commuters is primarily between Stirling and Falkirk and Clackmannshire and to a lesser degree to Edinburgh and Glasgow.
2.5 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Access to Healthcare.

### Table 2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Larbert hospital where number of hospital services will be centralised by 2009 resulting in increased travel distances for patients, visitors and staff. A package measures for public transport, car sharing, walking and cycling and demand management will be introduced as part of the Travel Plan to encourage more sustainable travel to the new hospital.</td>
<td>Recent study of how PT will be provided between hospitals</td>
<td>Ninewells hospital – huge traffic attractor Car Parking an issue; DCC introduced Residential CPZ</td>
<td>Strathcathro hospital (near Brechin) is being redeveloped, with a new PT interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specialist clinical operations, for example Falkirk will increase ambulance movements resulting in difficulties accessing rural areas.</td>
<td>People travel to Ninewells, but Dundee (and Angus) residents need to travel to Perth for certain specialist healthcare</td>
<td>Have provided improved PT links to Ninewells including a Bus-only link to the Technology Park and a step change in interchange facilities and information provision at the hospital</td>
<td>Poor PT connections (3 buses needed to get from Brechin to Ninewells), no through tickets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance service currently being reviewed. There is currently an issue with non emergency transport with a service focus on paramedic care. Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) could be a potential solution to address low density population areas where public transport</td>
<td>Other travel to Stirling hospital (from Strathearn area) and to Dunfermline from South Kinross) – speak to NHS Tayside (who may have done a study)</td>
<td>Ambulance service – under review</td>
<td>Different health facilities – within Angus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is inadequate. However, region wide DRT could provide benefits to the rural population, although operating costs will be high.

Access to GP – varied, some issues for rural communities

Ambulance service (currently undergoing revision of its operational processes – probably move towards restricting to paramedic services) – will have a big impact on access to healthcare for a large % of population

Centralisation of health care– creates issues elsewhere

A recent study of Transport Implication of Access to Health Services is available

Post Buses and health transport not co-ordinated

Hospitals generate a lot of on-street parking

Access to healthcare could/should be a focus for a good regional DRT scheme

Access to hospital seen as the main issue, access to GPs is generally good

Difficult in some areas to access out-of-office hours GP/health services.

Some health facilities being build are not on the PT network (ie Montrose) –PT is playing catch-up role

NHS should contribute towards transport

2.6 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Access to Retail and Leisure.

Table 2.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Capacity study showing where shoppers have come is available. Study is being used to inform the Structure Plan Alteration.</td>
<td>No major regional issues as retail catchments are fairly self-contained. 90% of people from P&amp;K will shop in P&amp;K</td>
<td>Major increase in retail activity in city centre (and to a lesser extent at Kingsway retail parks) has resulted in greater traffic activity at weekend. Also attracting shoppers</td>
<td>Issues for young people – lack of night PT services to/from Dundee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from much further afield.

Access to food retail is usually OK, but residents often travel to Dundee, Aberdeen & Glasgow for non-food retail—Waterfront development in Dundee needs to be accessible for Angus

Poor interchange between bus and rail in Dundee

2.7 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Access to Other Services.

**Table 2.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access from rural areas to centralized services and facilities is a big issue.</td>
<td>Developing access to employment by sustainable means is important.</td>
<td>Accessibility to jobs, services and facilities – this is a key issue for Angus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Congestion.

**Table 2.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Localised hot-spots. 2 major city centre roundabouts – Customs and Craigs (Mon – Fri am/pm peak and Sat). Other congested corridors include A872 Glasgow Road, A9 Causewayhead Road, A905 Kerse Road and A84 Drip Road.</td>
<td>Tourist traffic on A9 – very seasonal (April – October)</td>
<td>Hot spots – city centre, Kingsway (particularly Swallow Hotel Junction), Tay Bridge (tolls), Claypot Junction</td>
<td>Road Traffic Reduction Act – have not set targets for Road Traffic reduction – but monitoring undertaken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tourist traffic on A84T, particularly through Callender. Other tourist towns include Aberfoyle, Tyndrum and Crianlarich.

A977 (via Crook of Devon) – HGV traffic ‘rat-run’ – no aspirations to upgrade – affected by conditions on Kincardine & Forth Road Bridges

Mainly weekday mornings and evenings & Saturday (Saturday = 90% of morning and evening weekday peak traffic over an extended period)

Localised problems

Most of the business traffic on the Kingsway does not seem to be affected by the traffic levels on Kingsway. However, studies suggest that the level of traffic on Kingsway will increase substantially and this issue would need to be dealt with.

### 2.9 The following Cross Local Authority Boundary issues were raised and considered.

#### Table 2.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross boundary local bus/express bus/coach operate between Perth &amp; Kinross, Fife, Clackmannshire and Falkirk and further afield towards Glasgow &amp; Edinburgh.</td>
<td>Fife is considering significant housing development on south side of Tay bridge for people working in Dundee (also in Structure Plan (SP))</td>
<td>Dundee is the region’s centre (from Angus’ point of view)</td>
<td>Relationship with Fife &amp; SESTRAN is an issue – seen as currently focused on Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT within the National Park area is currently considering using SPT’s booking facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better access to Dundee rail station from Angus is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle route feasibility studies completed for routes:</td>
<td>Need more co-operation with other LA’s re encouraging bus usage (people travelling from Angus, P&amp;K, Fife to Dundee in cars; Dundee</td>
<td>Part of the Dundee &amp; Angus SP strategy aims to ensure that the rate and amount of development is compatible with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• West Highland Way – Strathkelvin Way Access Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development

- Buchlyvie to Cobleland Access Route Study 2005
- Stirling to Manor Powis Access Route 2006
- Lowland Stirling Cycle Tour Study 2000

- Bus usage is increasing, retaining or enhancing the character of the Angus towns while focussing some development pressures towards Dundee to help redress the problems caused by ongoing population loss.

### Development of the Forth as a waterway


- The Western Gateway development in Dundee is a major growth area for Dundee and South Angus.

- The TACTRAN area is a “transport corridor” - between Central Belt and the North East.

### 2.10 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Economic Development.

#### Table 2.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major growth area - new village at Durieshill consisting of 2,500 houses.</td>
<td>Western edge of Perth - big development pressure (Broxten – both sides of the M90) - more details in LP; conflicts between local and national transport as trunk road goes through the town)</td>
<td>Western Gateway - planned new housing + business (next 5 – 10 years); for the past years a lot of housing development focused towards the East, the aim now is to redress the balance</td>
<td>Angus are trying to promote development around 7 market town within Angus, but also recognised the development of Western Gateway as an important growth area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The housing land requirement for Stirling is 5,500 new houses by 2017, including 2,500 within the Major Growth Area. The Structure Plan Alteration has estimated a further 3,300 house required by 2025.</td>
<td>Preparing alteration to SP based on population projections - GROS suggested 6% growth in population to 2024 (2004-based), P&amp;K SP assumes 3% growth) - working on how the population will be distributed within P&amp;K; some concerns that forecasts are on high side</td>
<td>70-80% of new houses on ‘brownfield’ sites</td>
<td>Population – until recently there has been a growing population (net immigration) now at 108K-109K, projections to 2024 show decline – more important than absolute decline is age structure (increase in older age groups, decrease in younger) (Dundee + Angus - the only LA within TACTRAN with population projected to decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better to concentrate development (easier to build a new school and/or other infrastructure than spread development</td>
<td>Average household size is dropping</td>
<td>Number of Dundee jobs is currently at its highest ever</td>
<td>Demographics – GROS projections are trend based projections and can therefore be influenced by policy measures. The Structure Plan sets out the strategic land use policy response to these projections, including addressing issues of falling population in some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport schemes going ahead: funding of P&amp;R, PT provision and corridor improvements</td>
<td>Kinross can't cope with the levels of expansion – looking at how this could be diverted – this would probably need to be dealt with in liaison with Fife (as the pressure is coming from Edinburgh)</td>
<td>Dundee planners do not agree with GROS predictions of population decline – they believe the downward trend has already levelled off</td>
<td>Transport and Economic development study commissioned by Scottish Enterprise Tayside (contact Michael Gale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail capacity study – part of SP</td>
<td>Population/household declines in Highland and East areas</td>
<td>Structure of the population (high % of elderly &amp; a lot of students who subsequently find employment elsewhere (though this is starting to change))</td>
<td>Development to increase in Forfar, developers pressured for cycling/walking path, PT connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific projects:
1) Bus interchange in Tyndrum (HITRANS interested) – major interchange for west coast bus operators
2) Killin (bus/coach turning facilities) – most go through but some need to turn – problem for scheduled buses;
3) P&R service at Springkerse operating 6 days (Mon – Sat), 7.30am to 18.30pm. The next phase of the P&R strategy is a site located at Kildean/Castle Business Park which already has planning permission and Public Transport Funding;
4) Public Transport Funding is being used to implement a landmark pedestrian/cycle bridge between Forthside development and the Rail Station Forecourt.

Pressures from West Central Scotland for Strathean expansion in Blackford + Auchterarder (800-900 houses – means 50% expansion of Auchterarder) – pressures from Glasgow commuters using Dunblane

New student residential houses planned – 300-400
Information Note 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auchterarder Master Plan raises the issues of access to Gleneagles station (NB A recent study has considered closing this station)</td>
<td>New schools redeveloped through PPP programmes</td>
<td>The Forth Road Bridge is the major obstacle for access to Dundee, along with capacity on railway line from Edinburgh</td>
<td>Probably the best development would be on the western boundary (since that is where most jobs are)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to ensure that walking is encouraged in new developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.11 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Climate and the Environment.

Table 2.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Strategy currently being finalised with action plan to monitor and reduce NO2 and PM10 levels in Stirling City centre and Bridge of Allan town centre.</td>
<td>Air Quality Management areas (map in Air Quality docs) - starting action planning to reduce NO2 and PM10 (plan to be finished by 1st March hopefully) and about to finalise a screening assessment taking in other aspects of the air quality - don’t anticipate any problems</td>
<td>Air quality - NO2 (PM10 pending) – assessment coming out soon</td>
<td>CO2 + PM10 – levels covered in environment report; Air quality measured and generally good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality issues in Stirling City centre and Bridge of Allan Town centre.</td>
<td>Hotspots of air quality - in town; Crieff – getting close to the limits of NO2</td>
<td>Increased noise is an issue</td>
<td>Annual Report re air quality (for 2005/06 – out soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation from PARAMICS model,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlands previously used only for traffic, will now be passed to environmental consultants to monitor NO2 and PM10 (on any new bridges etc)

Global warming issues – covered in action plans

2.12 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Freight.

**Table 2.12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber operations – strategic timber fund</td>
<td>Crianlarich station – proposal to increase facilities – build timber loading facilities + maybe also at Rannoch station) – speak to Frank Roach</td>
<td>No rail freight terminal in Dundee CC / Tayside (still manufacturing facilities in Dundee and Angus)</td>
<td>Identified issue – need to improve access to Montrose Port – Montrose Port Authority should be consulted in our consultations – (Harry Johannsen) &amp; should check view on Montrose port with British Port Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased transport of biomass with P&amp;K, mainly by road</td>
<td>Port – in discussion with Port Authorities (Forth Ports) – weight restricted road bridges over rail is a big issue; freight movements – oil, grain timber, agricultural products</td>
<td>Freight transport through Montrose Port – mainly pulp and wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottling plant in Blackford – (Highland Spring) freight facilities in Blackford (study – to take HGVs off the A9)</td>
<td>Rail sea interchange in Perth Harbour – feasibility study to be completed in mid</td>
<td>Issue – road quality for HGVs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Note 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freight transport Perth Harbour – minerals + timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now freed up capacity on rail as Tesco trains have been cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand and gravel operations + movements (south Kinross) – 300 tons come through Perth Harbour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Land Use Planning.

**Table 2.13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Strategy and Development Plan provide linkages between transport policy and land-use planning.</td>
<td>There are a number of land use issues such as location of housing, employment, education, retail and leisure facilities that are covered in detail in the Structure Plan and Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>LP – already focuses on linkages between land-use and transport policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.14 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Parking.
### Table 2.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Strategy – Assessment Framework and Action Plan published in Aug 2005.</td>
<td>No written strategy mentioned in LTS</td>
<td>Parking at Ninewells – run by private company, parking spreads into local community areas, big issue – DCC have introduced CPZ residents parking scheme in area surrounding hospital</td>
<td>Council operates free public car parking (seen as more sustainable than encouraging people to drive longer distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking issues at Dunblane Station following unsuccessful PTF bid to expand car park. Have just finished expansion of Bridge of Allan station to help it (this is seen as a big cross boundary issue) – idea to extend services from Dunblane to Blackford</td>
<td>Possibility of multi-storey parking facility in Perth, retail parking – marked as a problem, but surveys seem to show there is a number of available parking in Perth</td>
<td>Commuters from Fife – don’t park in the city centre, but usually heading westwards</td>
<td>Have short stay car parking + enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further details specified in LTS and CTS documents</td>
<td>Increase in disabled parking bays</td>
<td>A parking and pricing policy that restrains long stay commuter parking and accommodates variable stay shoppers’ parking has operated for some years now. This is currently under review</td>
<td>Availability of car parking in/close to town centres is seen as Top 20 issue (referring to a study of small towns throughout Scotland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on development site, but there is generally push for 2 car spaces per household. Within Stirling City centre, parking provision for new development, depending on the development use,</td>
<td>Pavement parking – issue in council housing areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carnoustie may warrant additional parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Notes from Local Authority Workshops
various from zero provision to 1 space per household.

Parking zones – the only zone is centre of Perth

Have 30 min limit waiting on a street, little seasonal parking problem (tourist parking) – usually leisure parks would look after (tourist season – early July – mid August)

Parking prices – reviewed every 2 years – check on web-site for details

Parking at Arbroath Rail Station is limited (land acquisition difficulties)

2.15 The following issues were raised and considered regarding use of the Private Car.

### Table 2.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car ownership is higher and an important factor in rural areas.</td>
<td>Low car ownership at the moment, but if jobs improve, there is potential for car ownership to increase significantly</td>
<td>Car ownership is an important factor for rural areas</td>
<td>Promoting car sharing (educational issue), some areas – e-business through home-based employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car ownership higher in suburbs and hinterland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although Students tend to walk car ownership is higher than might be expected. This causes parking difficulty in surrounding residential streets. University is developing a Travel Plan in collaboration with Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.16 The following Bus-related issues were raised.

**Table 2.16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University services – competition between 5 operators (very commercial services)</td>
<td>Stagecoach – based in P&amp;K – “probably have better buses than elsewhere”; new fleet, but still number of old doubledecker – would like to upgrade buses – this will be part of further assessment currently being undertaken); 98% of PT is operated by Stagecoach – small operators in Pitlochry and Crieff (running school services) + have few National Express services.</td>
<td>Bus Quality Partnership with main operator Travel Dundee; Strathtay buses are being taken over by Stagecoach, Fife + P&amp;K have Stagecoach too – may make it easier for integrated ticketing</td>
<td>Post buses services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the density of population – difficult to provide overall PT network – easier in large urban areas – commercial operators, also easier in more rural areas – the difficulties – where smaller areas and hinterland of larger towns (where marginally profitable commercial bus services (private operators – maximising revenue in large urban areas, in smaller areas operators seek to minimise costs, when cutting down services – first cut in large urban areas, rural as</td>
<td>Citylink currently serves Kinross</td>
<td>6am-11:30pm – bus services coverage considered good, some areas may get less night services or Sunday services; poorer areas perceive to get less services – or that services are not frequent enough. Some analysis available from SHS re regeneration areas.</td>
<td>Bus services promoted quite well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes from Local Authority Workshops
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Note 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First operator – commercial</strong> – have 5yr contract with the council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have seen growth in PT services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huge investment made in recent years to develop award winning bus/public transport infrastructure and information systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of designated coach spaces (people come on coach to tourist attractions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links north – part of express coach services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to link Dunblane and Stirling stations by PT due to the congestion at Dunblane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady, no radical change in frequency, bus service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local bus network in Angus ranges from frequent well used commercial services on Tayway and A90 corridors to low volume subsidised services operating less than 5 days a week linking rural communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is still a limited Post Bus network within the council area, but Royal Mail business review is ongoing and the future of these buses is uncertain; new residential areas now in place of shops, banks, post offices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ of bus network is tendered – ask for feedback – to-date options generally chosen based on professional judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited coach facilities – parking areas (apart from a bit at Discovery Point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited coach facilities – parking areas (apart from a bit at Discovery Point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Buses – have been cut back on postal routes – lost its local focus, HQ in Gloucestershire; the Council funds 2 post buses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.17 The following Rail-related issues were raised and considered.

**Table 2.17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access in Dunblane (feeding station for all directions; Perth and Kinross did a study for the Blackford corridor; issue might be resolved either putting additional parking in Dunblane (multi-storey) or opening a station in Blackford or combination of the two)</td>
<td>Transport links from Kinross – pushing for better links to Edinburgh airport – problem – Kinross does not have a rail station – Scottish Enterprise have done studies</td>
<td>Capacity on rail line to Edinburgh – issue (capacity of transport line, congested trains, ie need more and longer trains)</td>
<td>Rail connectivity with market towns (LP looks at this at some detail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Edinburgh – Perth rail frequency – big issue</td>
<td>There is a need for a local rail service as many stations in Tay Area receive very limited stopping trains. There is spare line capacity to provide this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Estuary Rail Study (looked at Montrose through to Perth and to Fife – then has been drawn back and now looking at hourly service between Arbroath and Perth – had STAGI and II appraisals. SE reluctant to sign off the projects (probably as NTS + Rail Strategy coming along. Angus would ideally like it to be extended to Montrose)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes from Local Authority Workshops**
2.18 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Park & Ride:

**Table 2.18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride – Springkerse P&amp;R operational 6 days a week between 7.30am – 18.30, 10 minute frequency (started 21 August 2006)</td>
<td>Kinross area – looking at P&amp;R to build this year – Megabus (city based service) and Citylink (currently serves Kinross) services; planned 140 spaces and to catch the traffic over Forth bridge</td>
<td>P&amp;R would benefit people travelling from Angus, Perth &amp; Kinross and Fife in addition to benefiting Dundee and should be considered as part of RTS; Park and Choose rather than Park and Ride should be considered to include car sharing, cycling (and possibly rail)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Park &amp; Ride site at Kildean/Castle Business Park, awaiting decision from Scottish Executive over planning application.</td>
<td>Other potential P&amp;R sides (in LP) – depending on the road solutions in the Western edge</td>
<td>Have major P&amp;R in Broxden (big success)+ small P&amp;R at Scoune (50 spaces – not very successful) – P&amp;R Broxden is currently an interchange for Megabus – looking to expand it (250 spaces) if expanded could give opportunity to have P&amp;R hospital (P&amp;R operates 6 days a week, Sunday services not attractive as there is ample free parking in the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Park &amp; Ride site, including bus/coach interchange at Pirnhall/Corbiewood (M80/M9) – to be developed as part of Major Growth Area.</td>
<td>Rail Park &amp; Ride at Stirling East (near to Bannockburn) to be developed as part of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Growth Area.

2.19 The following Taxi-related issues were raised and considered.

**Table 2.19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Taxicard system</td>
<td>Have taxicard system</td>
<td>No taxicard system</td>
<td>Have taxicard system</td>
<td>Have taxicard system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– but did not seem to be profitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxis – have a standard fare; issue – needs central booking system</td>
<td>Study re taxis to be completed soon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of taxi licences so recently increased by 10 (report available)</td>
<td>Taxi quality has decreased + probably don’t comply with DDA - no proper licence and standards set + issue of availability of taxis during the week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.20 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Interchanges.

**Table 2.20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee recently implemented and significantly upgraded</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Bus Station and Rail Station are located adjacent to each other, however there are further opportunities to fully integrate both sites</td>
<td>Dundee recently implemented and significantly upgraded</td>
<td>on street city centre interchange within 200m of rail station and another interchange at Ninewells Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Note 2

2.21 The following issues were raised and considered regarding the provision of Information on Public Transport.

Table 2.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Information Strategy to be developed in the near future.</td>
<td>Good – responsibility of the council; more work to be done with Traveline</td>
<td>Have journey planner – now updating to develop personalised journey planner – by adding postcode gives information on how one can walk, cycle, use PT + info if bus stop has a shelter etc</td>
<td>Comprehensive Public Transport Information Strategy; £1 million investment planned for Real Time Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should increase publicity of disabled accessible routes</td>
<td>Real time passenger transport information available for every bus and every stop in Dundee and RTPI displays at every shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.22 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Public Transport fares.

Table 2.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Stirling area this is less of an issue than joint ticketing</td>
<td>130% increase in rail fares (eg Pitlochry – Perth)</td>
<td>Dundee – Angus (nearly sharing real – time information)</td>
<td>Bus fares have increased – (10p on fare – perceived to be too high by public)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Samson/ Frank Roach may have data re fare growth – Passenger Focus Committee</td>
<td>Rail fares seem to vary significantly across the region</td>
<td>Rail fare – 28% increase in fare from Dundee to Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus fares – greater issue – competition commission are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
investigating Scottish Citylink – Stagecoach join venture nationally (National Express buses – could buy City Link ticket on them (Citylink cannot show NE services within their timetables anymore – and it’s the key bus between Pitlochry and Perth in the morning)

Joint ticketing – have done this from the point of view of contracted services – that if operators share a common route, the tickets are valid on whichever route they are on + have agreements with bus companies re fares

2.23 The following issues were raised on the subject of Social Inclusion.

Table 2.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled access – low floor buses are operating between Stirling and Killin (lot of people did not like these accessible buses, as for eg seating was very basic, high step coaches appear more comfortable). Overall, fleets are improving and any new services should be low floor accessible. In some places, however, rather than an Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) – never really had it; there has not been a demand for Dial-a-Ride – however maybe access to health could change this; Few people in Kinross-hire have been complaining of no availability of DRT schemes; Shopmobility operates in PKC and has its origin at Multistorey Car Park; the scheme is largely funded by the Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) – currently developing but not only to health and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) to health + have taxicard (major use is to health services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Bus Service</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible bus service in place would be more beneficial; this is difficult due to an insufficient number of journeys in rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dial a Journey</th>
<th>Disabled Access is improving, but still a long way to go; substantial proportion of city network has low floor buses and some access improvements have been done to bus stops and access. However, there is still a room for improvement. Number of smaller operators have also invested in few low access buses, for eg Strath Earn network uses double-decker wheelchair accessible buses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dial a journey – operates throughout the whole council area, and is used mainly by disability and mobility impaired; Its price fare structure is closer to taxi rather than bus.</td>
<td>Disabled access – fleet 100% low floor buses (TravelDundee) and increase in accessible taxis + taxicard system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-and-ride – operates into SW area (after losing of a bus service) and provides also an access to health.</td>
<td>Disabled access – budget to provide low floor vehicles (Stagecoach) – might look at low floor and low emissions buses; certain routes are wheelchair accessible, and public would be aware of these.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprived Areas - Raploch, Cornton and Cultenhove</th>
<th>Deprived areas – Muirton, Fairfield, Rutry, north of Blairgowrie – inaccessible (even by car – access to healthcare from there is a problem, big PT issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in disabled parking bays</td>
<td>Bus stop level access improvements – survey undertaken before/after (2000 bus users + 1000 non-users in Dundee City Centre; haven’t done a survey for smart bus shelters yet) – overall perceived improvement + increase in bus usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big issues regarding peripherality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes from Local Authority Workshops
2.24 The following issues were raised and considered regarding the issue of Tolls.

**Table 2.24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents probably don’t want any tolls</td>
<td>Abolish tolls on the Tay Road Bridge. Collection of tolls currently causes queuing and congestion in Dundee City Centre and beyond for all traffic, not just bridge traffic. Development of Dundee relies on there being no queuing at tolls on Tay Road Bridge and if tolls continue it will cost £13m to implement scheme to allow this.</td>
<td>Tolls should be abolished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.25 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Tourism.

**Table 2.25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle oriented, attempts to see the rest of Stirling – one of the reasons is that people come on coach tours (contact Tom Hunter for data on the split / statistics of PT and coach) P&amp;R study done by Atkins (available in August) – P&amp;R was not as important here as for retail; no cycle route to castle</td>
<td>Currently updating strategy</td>
<td>Recent increase in conference tourism (increase in hotel facilities)</td>
<td>Seen as very important – attractive small market towns, hills, beaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffers from lack of parking (around castle there is a location of</td>
<td>Major issue – how people get to here and onwards – check with</td>
<td>At the moment Dundee is mainly a day destination (visiting</td>
<td>Type of tourists data – not very reliable as not collected at local level,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.26 The following issues were raised and considered regarding Walking and Cycling.

**Table 2.26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycling is a part of the National Park strategy (statistics available through automatic counters)</td>
<td>Cycle network – the North Sea Route</td>
<td>Increasing each year</td>
<td>Have some Sustrans routes crossing Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently developing a Cycling Policy document that will clearly identify the council’s cycling strategy, along with an action plan for implementation. One of the first priorities</td>
<td>Can’t transport bike on a bus – should be looked at as very touristy area</td>
<td>Developing commuter routes/ previously mainly recreational circular routes – e.g. a route between Ninewells and City Centre has been provided (covered in Outdoor Access)</td>
<td>Cycling – generally have a good network of minor roads for cycling– from next year there should be a dedicated off-road cycling from Arbroath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will be to assess the adequacy of existing cycle infrastructure with regard to lining/signage in order that we may achieve clear continuity along each route. The cycling policy will identify strategic routes for development and how they link with the national network. In addition, the Stirling City Transport Strategy is about to be published and this document places heavy emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport modes. It is envisaged that cycling will be promoted through development of these policy documents and part funded through developer contributions, and other sources.

Walking – lot of Perth is within walking distance to the city centre – a lot could be done to promote this.

Cycle route maps + walking – developed on zonal basis – to connect communities.

No forest mountain biking, generally some mountain biking in the Glens.

North Sea Route + National Route – issue – the docks present a significant barrier as a pass is required to cycle through the dock area.

Developing coastal path – in Access Strategy (link from Dundee to north of Arbroath – in future extend to Montrose.

Core paths – currently going through consultation.
2.27 The following table represents a list of Other issues that were raised and considered throughout the Consultation meetings.

**Table 2.27**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>Perth &amp; Kinross</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>Angus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Waterways – canal network</td>
<td>Regional Airport aspirations – in Errol (P&amp;K), or Leuchars (Fife) (to attract low cost airline)</td>
<td>Air access to both local services, Edinburgh and elsewhere is an issue for Scottish economy; airport size not seen as issue, need to develop the market</td>
<td>Airport provision for budget airlines (airports in Glasgow and Aberdeen are on the “wrong” side of city from Angus’s perspective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways – passenger connection – get only cruise ships</td>
<td>Lot of traffic to the West (employment)</td>
<td>M90 + A90 need to be kept to capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport security and perceived safety is an issue. In Dundee there is 100% CCTV coverage on all buses and CCTV capabilities at every bus shelter in Dundee, with 10% being covered at any point in time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 **Conclusion**

3.1.1 A number of common issues were raised throughout the Consultation meetings which were common to all Local Authority areas. The main points as identified above are:

3.1.2 Various problematic Accident and Safety issues were identified in each of the areas. Whereas accidents on trunk roads were a primary issue in Stirling, pedestrian accidents were felt to be more of an issue in Dundee. Perth and Kinross pointed the safety issue on A9, particularly related to the safety at the intersections of trunk and local roads. A935 and A92 north of Montrose was a safety concern in Angus. The issue of safety and accessibility (for example Kingsway in Dundee) was a recurrent theme.
3.1.3 Safer Routes to Schools were mentioned in all instances, with all local authorities stressing the need to develop and / or maintain travel plans and safety programmes. Lack of public transport in rural and sub-urban areas was mentioned by all Local Authorities. The accessibility to services was linked to the issue of joint ticketing.

3.1.4 Access to employment has been impeded by transport issues in most of the local authorities. In Dundee the problem is linked to the separation of housing and workplace areas. Transport links to stations (Blackford, Dunblane) is an issue in Stirling area whereas the removal of services was mentioned in Angus.

3.1.5 The need to liaise with the NHS regarding access to healthcare was highlighted, particularly with regards to funding possibilities. Many Local Authorities mentioned particular areas where public transport access to hospital was problematic, due for example to connection issues or accessibility issues, which will be further influenced by the centralisation of health care facilities. The ambulance services are under review, which could have big impacts on access to healthcare in the future.

3.1.6 Congestion hotspots were highlighted in all areas, particularly during peak times. The issue of seasonal tourist traffic was raised in Perth & Kinross and Stirling.

3.1.7 In general different Cross Boundary issues were raised by each Local Authority, but included the relationship between areas and other Regional Transport Strategies (e.g. Dundee and SESTRAN), cross boundary bus services, and housing developments which impact on neighbouring authorities.

3.1.8 A number of major development areas were highlighted in each of the areas, and this can be seen as quite a big issue in terms of cross-boundary liaison (see 3.7). Whilst some areas are responding well to this (a number of specific transport projects were highlighted in the Stirling area) there were concerns that other areas (i.e. Kinross) are failing to cope with the level of expansion. Changing population structure was mentioned by each Local Authority area, and this could have major impacts on transport provision.

3.1.9 Air quality plans and assessments are pending or in operation in Perth & Kinross and Dundee. Air quality is good in Angus but the other authorities all mention specific environmental issues, i.e. traffic noise in Dundee and hotspots of air pollution in Dundee, Stirling and Perth & Kinross.

3.1.10 Freight issues varied for all areas, but ports issues were mentioned in Dundee and Angus as was the need to liaise with the Port Authorities.

3.1.11 A number of parking issues were mentioned, often conflicting, for example the need to restrict parking in some areas and increase availability and provision in others.

3.1.12 It was agreed that it is generally easier to plan for bus provision in urban areas whilst rural areas suffer from accessibility problems. There are a number of operators serving the TACTRAN area; Travel Dundee remains the main operator in Dundee, Stagecoach in the rest of the TACTRAN area. All authorities mentioned variation within their areas in terms of service, network range etc.
3.1.13 Capacity, accessibility, frequency and connectivity issues were all highlighted for rail services. Also station accessibility issues were highlighted in Stirling and Dundee, for travellers from Angus in particular.

3.1.14 Stirling currently has one Park & Ride site at Springkerse, Perth & Kinross have a major P&R facility at Broxden and a small P&R site in Scone. They are both looking to build/expand P&R schemes in the near future. P&R service in Angus and Dundee is an issue which has yet to be properly considered.

3.1.15 Difficulties were highlighted with Taxicard systems; some Local Authorities have no scheme, others which do are experiencing financial issues at present.

3.1.16 PT information is generally good in all areas, with strategies being developed in some areas in the near future.

3.1.17 Cross regional differences in fare levels across the TACTRAN area and increasing PT fares in PKC and Angus were highlighted as an issue, whereas in Stirling joint ticketing was seen to be more important.

3.1.18 All authorities are keen to pursue the idea of Demand Responsive Transport in order to improve accessibility. Disabled access bus fleets are variable between regions. Majority of buses in Dundee are low floor accessible, substantial proportion of city network buses in PKC are also low floor accessible. Overall, the availability of accessible buses is improving.

3.1.19 Most Local Authorities are developing or interested in increasing cycle provision. Cycling is seen as a good alternative of PT in all the areas.

3.1.20 Finally, air access was raised in most of the Stakeholder Consultations as a separate issue which wasn’t addressed on the list. Air access is seen as an important issue for expanding the economy and attracting ‘low cost airlines’ is generally seen as a good thing despite the environmental issues.
1 Introduction

1.1 A wider stakeholder consultation workshop was held on 3 August 2006 at the Discovery Point in Dundee, in order to ensure that all issues relevant to the preparation of the TACTRAN RTS are considered and understood and to fill any gaps in the list of previously-identified issues. The Workshop also considered relevant RTS Objectives and assigned priorities to the emerging draft Objectives.

1.2 The workshop was run in two parallel sessions, one focusing on transport related issues and objectives, the other focusing on environmental issues and objectives. Stakeholders were invited to attend the session they felt most appropriate to their area of interest.

1.3 Letters were sent out to some 200 stakeholders inviting them to participate. The workshop was attended by over 40 representatives from a variety of industries and other interested parties. The lists of the Key Stakeholders and attendees are presented in Appendix K and Appendix M of the Consultation Report.

1.4 An introduction to the workshop, the agenda which was followed, the views of the participants regarding the key regional transport issues and the overall outcome of the workshop are provided in chapters 2 and 3 further in this paper.

2 Workshop

2.1 The workshop lasted for approximately five hours with a break for lunch. The format for the workshop was as follows:

- Welcome and Introduction

  - Introduction to the TACTRAN RTS, overview of the workshop, introduction to emerging issues and a brief presentation of the context and trends (35 minutes)
Transport Group

2.2 The transport-related session was split into 3 groups each consisting of 8-13 wider stakeholders. At the beginning of the session participants were presented with the list of emerging issues which have been previously gathered from baseline sources and from consultations with a broad range of officers from constituent councils and from the representatives of health boards in the TACTRAN area.

2.3 The first exercise was designed to further explore transport-related issues (that is those known at present and those likely to occur in future). Participants were asked to use their knowledge of the area and their experiences to identify further issues and problems in the TACTRAN region. From the drafted list of issues, they were asked to consider which issues they felt to be most important and to identify whether the issue should best be addressed at the local, regional or national level. Once the issue have been assigned as regional, participants were then asked to consider the most appropriate mechanism for addressing the issue ie best practice, behavioural change, policy or some form of direct intervention. Feedback of key issues was then presented to all stakeholders at the end of the session. The findings of the session are presented in chapter 3.

2.4 In the second session participants explored and assigned priorities to the emerging draft objectives. Participants were presented with the list of draft objectives prepared by the study team. They were encouraged to amend, delete or add new objectives as they felt they were important for the TACTRAN RTS. Throughout the session, each group was informed of any objective amendments undertaken in the remaining groups. At the end of this exercise, each participant was given 8 votes (in the form of post-it notes) in order to score the objectives. By allocating as many of their votes as possible to the objectives they felt to be most pertinent to the development of the TACTRAN RTS, participants enabled the draft objectives to be prioritised. The feedback from each group was presented at the end of the exercise. The findings of the session are presented in chapter 3.

SEA Group

2.5 The SEA workshop began with an explanation of how SEA and environmental components of STAG were being tackled. A description of the approach to collating baseline information for the TACTRAN area was given and it was explained how this information was being used as
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one source in the identification of issues. Further information about some environmental issues had also been received from consultees.

2.6 The first exercise was designed to further explore baseline environmental issues. Participants were asked to use their knowledge of the area and their experiences from other projects to identify environmental issues and problems in the TACTRAN area and where possible participants were asked to identify specific examples of issues. The exercise was undertaken in 2 groups recording the discussions on flipchart. Handouts of the SEA topics were provided to stimulate wide ranging coverage of environmental issues. Feedback of key issues was then undertaken in a plenary session.

2.7 At the end of the feedback session participants were asked to use 5 dots and place these next to issues which they considered to be most important in the TACTRAN area. The findings of all parts of Exercise 1 are presented in chapter 3.

2.8 In the second exercise participants explored potential environmental objectives for the SEA taking account of the issues raised in Exercise 1. Each group fed back in plenary and the long list was compared with the study team’s draft objectives.

2.9 In the final part of this exercise participants were asked to brainstorm questions which could be asked to test whether the proposals in the RTS were meeting the SEA objectives (appraisal criteria). The findings of this exercise are also included in chapter 3.

3 Outcomes of the Workshop

Transport Group

3.1 Session 1: Issues

3.2 Participants were presented with the draft 21 Economy issues, 15 Accessibility issues, 11 Environment issues and 14 Health and Safety issues. Unfortunately, both timescales as well as different dynamics of each group did not enable all four categories of issues to be discussed within each group. Stakeholders who felt their area of interest was not discussed during the workshop were sent the list of draft issues for further comments.

3.3 The notes below present the participants’ reactions and views on the presented list of issues.

3.3.1 Yellow Group

3.3.2 The issues and comments that were raised in this group are as follows:

Economy Issues

- Need for increased promotion of TACTRAN region as a tourist destination
  - Tourism is seen to be the major future economy for the TACTRAN area. There is a need to promote integrated transport options for tourists including integrated ticketing. Integrated transport should incorporate taxi system as an experience from Europe demonstrates. Moreover, DRT system should be open to everyone.
  - It is important to promote other tourist areas to reduce the parking pressures at certain locations.
The aim is to promote tourism all year round. However there is an issue with transport services that are operated only at the peak times within certain tourist areas.

- Insufficient parking provision in rural / tourist areas
  - Parking issues considered in relation to tourism as above.

- Rail capacity constraints
  - Problem of capacity and overcrowding including a lack of luggage space – this might be resolved by better timetabling / frequency of trains. Similarly lack of luggage space on buses. It was noted however, that majority of issues related to rail capacity constraints are currently being already addressed.

- General congestion within city and town centres
  - Congestion is a constraint to buses (from P&K) and has an impact of their reliability / attractiveness.
  - Congestion has been also mentioned in relation to emergency services. The issue of congestion causing delays for ambulances was raised.

- Limited rail and bus commuting opportunities to Glasgow & Edinburgh
  - Issue of the connectivity to Edinburgh station.

- Increasing fuel costs
  - Access to petrol station problem at some locations, but not seen as an issue overall.

- Other
  - More information related to concessionary travel is needed.

### Accessibility Issues

- Lack of evening public transport travel options for rural communities
  - Access to school for children - consideration should be given to the establishment of Breakfast clubs in the morning and After-school clubs in the evening – Schools should provide transport from these.

- Limited accessible public transport for mobility impaired travelers
  - Issues regarding the attitudes of bus drivers towards disabled travellers – requires Disability Awareness training
  - Advanced booking (48 hours ahead) is not popular with disabled - health affected travellers
  - Concessionary travel scheme should be used in other means of transport ie DRT.

- Lack of integrated ticketing (bus / bus and bus / rail)
  - This issue was raised both as part of Economy issues and the promotion of tourism.

- Community severance caused notably by the Kingsway in Dundee and other settlements on trunk roads
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- This is an issue next to Kingsway, and is also a problem on A9.
- This issue is apparent in development (housing) areas and ties back into land-use and transport joint-planning.

Safety and Health Issues

- Limited car parking available at hospitals
  - Some see parking facilities at hospitals as an increased traffic generator. Hospitals with no car parking should be taken into consideration – ie as in Scandinavia.
  - Car parking should be tackled mainly through policy.
  - Need for parking facilities for staff who work shifts is only an “excuse” for parking. Green travel planning, car-sharing and public transport should be promoted to staff.
  - It was suggested to implement P&R facilities for major hospitals. From P&R sites a feeder services provided by volunteers should be considered. Regional transport agencies could coordinate the overall transport provision (as an experience from Europe suggests).

- Non-emergency transport to hospital (Ambulance service and voluntary provision)
  - An ambulance should be provided only for those in medical need. At the moment 40% of ambulance patient transport has nothing to do with medical need. Hub services to be considered.

- Lack of public transport provision to hospitals
  - For access to health facilities we should look at examples from Europe.
  - A problem is lack of and difficult cooperation and joint-thinking of transport teams and health bodies.

- Lack of public transport information at hospitals for staff, patients and visitors
  - More information should be provided regarding non-emergency transport i.e. under what condition an ambulance will be provided, what other options are available etc.

- Gaps in cycling and walking network
  - There is a need to promote walking / cycling and this can be done through education. However it is necessary that the facilities are in place first and routes are safe and enjoyable (ie not along a busy road).

- Road safety on rural roads (pedestrian / cycling / traffic)
  - Increasingly an issue as shopping deliveries are being facilitated by vans etc.

Other

- RTS general
  - RTS should be developed in a way that is also relevant to local people.
3.3.3 **Red Group**

3.3.4 The issues and comments that were raised in this group are as follows:

**Economy Issues**

- **Dispersed economic activity**
  - The group agreed that it is important to support and sustain employment in rural areas, but not to encourage the economy to spread into the countryside. It was pointed out that if businesses move to the rural locations they will require freight movement to support the dispersed economy. The group felt that there is mismatch in what the Scottish Executive wants for the economy and what Scottish Enterprise would like to achieve.

- **Lack of regional air connections to UK and European destinations**
  - The group felt that there was no demand for an airport in the region for business or leisure travellers. It was the group's feeling that air traffic to main UK hubs should be reduced and replaced by rail so give environmental benefits to all. It was also pointed out that Dundee might lose employees who choose to work away rather than in Dundee if links to other cities were improved.

- **Need for increased promotion of TACTRAN region as a tourist destination**
  - The group thought that making the region more attractive to tourists should be part of the transport strategy. Making reference to the coastal attractions in the region such as the North Sea Cycle route and the many ports that cruise ships come into were two suggestions. Bringing together community transport and cycling organisations was something the TACTRAN group could achieve.

- **Lack of coach parking facilities within popular tourist area**
  - Lack of coach parking was seen as a local rather than a regional issue.

- **Insufficient parking provision in rural / tourist areas**
  - Insufficient parking for cycles and freight was seen as an issue at both a regional and national level. Cycle paths are plentiful in the TACTRAN region. However, maps of the cycle way, more cycle hire and parking facilities are needed to encourage more use of the cycle way network. The group mentioned the European time directive which states that drivers must legally take a certain number of rest breaks. The group also pointed out that less freight parking is available to allow drivers to take a break because the land the HGVs used to park on has been sold off and used for other purposes. Another European Union directive states that in the future certain types of sealed container may only be allowed to stop in secure parking areas. Bearing the preceding two points in mind it may be necessary to allocate land for freight parking to ensure that it is set aside.

- **Rail service provision does not always reflect demand – overcrowding**
  - Rail service provision of both freight and passenger services does not reflect the demand there is for it. This is both a regional and national issue. The group
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mentioned the rise in rail passenger fares as being Scot Rail’s way of managing demand by pricing passengers off the trains. There is a demand for transferring freight from road to rail for goods such as whiskey. The regional transport strategy should take into account these demands.

- **Rail capacity constraints** – *highlighted as important for RTS consideration*
  - There are rail capacity constraints in the TACTRAN region which restrict the movement of certain types of freight and passengers. Some parts of the network are only single track and the network is not of sufficient gauge to carry 9 by 6 containers. This is seen as a major issue by the group.

- **Perception of peripherality**
  - Investors feel that TACTRAN is on the periphery and this puts them off investing in the area. The group felt that stopping inter-urban services at small stations like Springfield and Invergowrie added unnecessary delays to the rail journey time and should be dropped from these inter-urban services.

- **General congestion within city and town centres**
  - The congested roads that have to be used to access Edinburgh airport were seen as a barrier to the economic potential of the region as is the congestion in the centre of Perth, around the Kingsway shopping centre, the Tay bridge tolls, over the Forth road bridge and in central Scotland in general.

- **Poor links to external markets**
  - Creating more links to external markets were not seen as something that needed to be addressed in the regional transport strategy although the group felt that a rail link that went all the way to Edinburgh airport from the North would help the TACTRAN regions economy. It was also pointed out that Dundee might lose employees who choose to work away rather than in Dundee if links to other cities were improved.

- **Lack of rail freight terminal facilities** – *highlighted as important for RTS consideration*
  - Lack of a new freight terminal similar to the one at Grangemouth was something the group felt to be a major issue in the TACTRAN region. Accessing the port in Dundee is not smooth and using the roads surrounding Dundee is a problem for those moving freight.

- **Inadequate car parking in city and town centres**
  - Parking in city centres was not seen to be inadequate by the group. However, the times that are allocated for HGV drivers to access city centre pedestrian areas often force HGVs onto the road at the busiest times.

- **Limited express coach services from towns into major regional centres**
  - There is not an issue with limited express coaches in the TACTRAN area.

- **Limited rail and bus commuting opportunities to Glasgow & Edinburgh**
  - There is not an issue with limited rail and bus commuting opportunities to Glasgow and Edinburgh.

- **Bottlenecks and network constraints limiting economic growth**
Bottlenecks and network constraints were covered under the issue of congested roads above.

Increasing fuel costs
- Increasing fuel costs are a big national issue but not an issue that needs to be addressed by the regional transport strategy.

Limited access to new growth / development areas
- Limited access to new growth was covered in the accessibility section at the top.

Quality of road infrastructure for freight
- Quality of road infrastructure for freight is an issue on the A9 A90 in the region.

Access to ports/harbours – **highlighted as important for RTS consideration**
- Access to the port/harbour in Dundee and Montrose is a major issue. Development has gone on around the port which has made accessing it more and more difficult. Mention was made of the difficulty involved in manoeuvring an HGV around the vast number of mini roundabouts in the region to access the port. The group which was made up of a number of freight representatives feel that TACTRAN areas major potential is in developing shipping and in particular short sea based shipping.

**Accessibility Issues**

Limited daytime public transport options in rural areas
- Access to health services (local amenities on the issues list) is an issue that needs to be addresses at all three levels, local regional and national. At present there is a conflict between the NHS scheme which is consolidating services into fewer hospitals and the local need which is for more local services. The regional RTS must attempt to address this conflict of interest.
- Access to Universities and Colleges within TACTRAN area and beyond Access to colleges from home was seen as a problem in both Perth and Stirling. Due to the lack of transport people found that they had to move house to access study facilities or forfeit studying.

Lack of evening public transport travel options for rural communities
- Access to tourist attractions in the evening was seen as a regional and national problem. Special mention was made of how early the Glasgow – Edinburgh trains stop operating when the Edinburgh festival events continue on into the night.

Large school catchment areas within rural areas
- Access to schools was seen as a fundamental issue and a regional strategy that goes some way to reversing the trend that children are driven to work by car was essential. The habits children form by being driven to school is seen as both a national regional and local issue. The group felt that walking to school or taking the bus would be better for the children. It was hoped that if the children took a bus to school they might not feel they needed to buy a car as soon as they turn 17. The discussion continued and it became apparent that in Dundee some children do not go to school locally eg within their catchment therefore free school transport may not be available to them. Security was deemed to be
an issue in the minds of parents which prevented them from allowing their children to walk to school. The quality of the bus provided for school transport was an issue that would affect a young person’s choice to use a bus in the future.

- Cross regional variations in fare levels across the TACTRAN area
  - When fares were discussed no mention was made of the bus fares. Although it was pointed out that in real terms cars are cheaper to run and bus and train fares have increased in relation to the cost of running a car. The group felt that train fares were too expensive and a regional pricing policy would be beneficial. A mismatch in the price of travelling from Gleneagles by train as compared to the price of travelling from Dunblane has caused local parking problems at Gleneagles.

- Limited accessible public transport for mobility impaired travelers
  - Accessibility for the mobility impaired was discussed and thought to be important. Dundee City Council has a policy that all buses in Dundee must be of low floor design. This policy was thought to be admirable and should where possible form best practice across the region. However it was pointed out that in some rural areas getting low floor buses through can be difficult due to their low clearance.

- Poor interchange facilities at main rail stations - highlighted as important for RTS consideration
  - Improving the interchange facilities across the whole of Scotland was seen as necessary. Improving the interchange facilities within the TACTRAN region was something the regional LTS should address. The group were aware of examples of good interchange facilities abroad which could be used as best practice. In Dundee the bus station is not linked to the rail station which was seen as a problem. In order to improve interchange in the TACTRAN area new infrastructure is required.

- Lack of integrated ticketing (bus / bus and bus / rail) - highlighted as important for RTS consideration
  - Integrated ticketing was thought to be as necessary as improved interchange facilities. Ticketing systems, found in other regions, such as the “Zonecard” in the SPT area and the “One ticket” scheme in the SESTRAN area could be copied in the TACTRAN region.

- Community severance caused notably by the Kingsway in Dundee and other settlements on trunk roads
  - Community severance was not thought to be a problem in the TACTRAN area.
  - The Kingsway Shopping Centre in Dundee is causing such accessibility issues that the group felt it should be mentioned in the regional transport strategy.

- High cost of travel for those on lower incomes
  - High cost of travel for those on lower incomes was not thought to be a problem in the TACTRAN Area. Introducing other means of transport for those that cannot afford a car was thought to be a better solution than providing more bus or cheaper rail services.
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- Increasing elderly population - especially in rural areas
  - The TACTRAN area has an aging population and the regional transport strategy should reflect this.

- Connectivity gaps between housing and employment locations
  - Access to employment is an issue that the group felt needs to be addressed by the RTS. The population of Dundee has decreased and the number employed there has increased so travel into Dundee for work must have increased. A strategy that accommodates this increase in journeys makes sense. The Tay bridge tolls were mentioned because the group felt that they may be contributing to congestion on the bridge. The bridge crossing as a whole should feature in the RTS because it is key to providing access to employment.
  - Access to businesses such as berry and potato farms and tourist related industry such as Bed and Breakfasts etc in rural locations is an issue for people in the TACTRAN area.

- Connectivity gaps between housing and leisure locations
  - Access to entertainment facilities from rural locations was thought to be a key factor in ensuring that rural locations remain habitable and prevent all the people moving to the city.
  - Access to leisure via public transport is available to access places such as the West Highland way. However there are some missing PT links such as those that would take people east/west or west/east across the region (eg Callander to Glasgow)

- Insufficient connectivity between settlements
  - Connections between some settlements and the main trunk roads (eg A9 and A90) were seen as a possible problem area
  - In general public transport is not provided at the right time or right frequency to the places people want to go. A strategy to ensure that public transport times and frequencies reflect the public need should be included in the TACTRAN RTS.

Environmental Issues

- Congestion caused by high levels of seasonal traffic in tourist areas
  - Congestion caused by high levels of seasonal traffic is seen as a concern in Stirling and this is a local and a regional issue that the RTS should address.

- Pollution hot spots particularly within city and town centres – highlighted as important for RTS consideration
  - Pollution hot spots are both regional and local issues within town centres.

- Excessive levels of traffic / transport noise
  - Traffic noise although it was not deemed to be an issue for the RTS caused the group to mention that there is inconsistent agreement on what level of noise is acceptable.

- Climate change & global warming – highlighted as important for RTS consideration
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− Climate change and Global Warming is an issue that the LTS should address by planning for its effects. Consideration of the possibility of the sea level rising could be necessary due to the coastal position of the TACTRAN region.

■ Lack of promotion of sustainable transport choices to tourists
− Lack of promotion of sustainable transport to tourists was seen as an issue in the TACTRAN area particularly in the hospitality industry. The group referred to the need to look abroad for best practice and implement policies that encourage people via education that there is another way. People do not always have to or want to take a car.

■ Inadequate links between regional / national cycle networks
− Inadequate links between regional and national cycleways is something the group established as an issue. However one member of the group felt that ensuring cycle training was part of the national curriculum for school children was key to solving the environmental issue around cycle networks not being used.

■ Bikes on buses - limited provision and promotion of facilities
− The group felt that bikes should be able to be put on buses and the fact there is limited provision is an issue. Bikes can go in the undercarriage of a bus or with racks could travel on the back.

■ Increased car ownership in rural (sub-urban) areas - increased car borne commuting
− Increased car ownership in rural areas and increased car borne commuting was not seen to be an issue in the TACTRAN area.

■ Lack of integration between land-use and transport planning – highlighted as important for RTS consideration
− Lack of integration between land use and transport planning is a major issue which the RTS should address. By planning ahead and designing well unnecessary car journeys could be avoided.

■ Lack of control / influence on cross-boundary development – highlighted as important for RTS consideration
− The group felt that having control of local authority cross boundary development was one of the key reasons for having a regional transport strategy. The city regions policy was designed to address this issue.

3.3.5 Blue and Green Group

3.3.6 The issues and comments that were raised in this group are as follows:

Economy Issues

■ Dispersed economic activity
− Economic activity is concentrated in the three major urban conurbations so there is a need to develop links to these. This can therefore be highlighted as a policy issue; in order to reduce commuting difficulties we need to be more considerate when making planning decisions in the future.

mvaconsultancy
Lack of regional air connections to UK and European destinations
- Services from Dundee airport need to be expanded as presently air connections are very expensive and serve only a limited number of destinations. Airports are increasingly important as many business decision locations (e.g. RBS) are based around airports. However, it is important to examine such decisions within the context of climate change and the implications this could have for the environment. Surface access to airports in Aberdeen, Glasgow and Edinburgh was highlighted as a problem.
- The lack of regional air connections is not seen as big a problem for leisure travellers as they travel primarily through Edinburgh. But again surface access to other airports in Scotland was seen to be an issue.

Need for increased promotion of TACTRAN region as a tourist destination
- The need for better availability of information on public transport was highlighted in order to promote the region. However, it was felt that tourists don’t choose their destination based on the strength of public transport as they often choose to hire cars. It is important for TACTRAN to reflect other policies, for example the tourism strategy adopted by the executive.
- Road management is an important issue. Roads are not managed well for tourists, for example there is a lack of sensible places for tourists to stop and take pictures on the rural roads. This issue is cross-regional as some roads pass through more than one local authority area. Also the need for better road signage was highlighted throughout the region.

Rail capacity constraints – highlighted as important for RTS consideration
- Capacity and overcrowding is a big problem on trains at peak times in the urban centres; this greatly discourages users. Need to increase the number of local railway stations and expand local service.
- Travel to Aberdeen, Edinburgh and Glasgow is very expensive. There are no apex fares available on some routes. In order to be an attractive option rail service has to beat the cost of using a car for travel.

General congestion within city and town centres
- Can be an issue but area not seen to suffer as greatly as other cities in the UK (e.g. Birmingham, Manchester).

Lack of rail freight terminal facilities
- Not seen to be a big issue, more important was the need to consider the needs of truck drivers transporting freight by road.
Inadequate car parking in city and town centres - highlighted as important for RTS consideration

- Parking management need to be rethought in Dundee. Street parking is only available for one hour so locals opt to use car parks; this means less parking space for business and leisure visitors to the city. Existing car parks need to be used more effectively and we need to encourage a shift towards public transport, car sharing etc. Parking needs to be better managed.

- Lorry parking was raised as an issue. Often drivers are forced to park overnight in areas which are unsafe and unsuitable for them. Could areas which are unused at night, for example supermarket car parks, park and ride car parks, be opened up for this purpose?

Limited express coach services from towns into major regional centres

- Coach services are available but people still opt to use rail or cars. Better promotion is needed, particularly for tourists, as there is currently low awareness of coach services.

Limited rail and bus commuting opportunities to Glasgow & Edinburgh

- Often coach services are not viable options for business users because they don't arrive at destinations early enough.

- Again the problem of overcrowding into Edinburgh was raised.

Bottlenecks and network constraints limiting economic growth

- Bottlenecks are not necessarily a problem in this area but further south, which can cause problems in the area.

- Congestion highlighted on Dundee trunk road and Forth Rd Bridge which increases travel time. Economic growth could be affected by this; bridge can't carry freight anymore?

- However, there is no necessary and direct link between good transport and good economic growth.

Increasing fuel costs

- Can encourage commuters away from cars and towards public transport use but only if the capabilities are there.

Limited access to new growth / development areas

- Transport operators need to be involved in early stages of planning. The RTS need to stress the importance of locations and land use planning policy for future development areas.

Accessibility Issues

Limited daytime public transport options in rural areas

- A problem as services often don’t start early enough for commuters and finish too early in the evening.

Limited accessible public transport for mobility impaired travelers

- Often not enough space for both wheelchair users and people with prams.
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- Certain measures can cause conflict, for example tactile paving is good for the blind, but bad for wheelchair users.

- Poor interchange facilities at main rail stations
  - This was raised as an important issue which has been discouraging travellers.
  - Lack of park and ride facilities at key stations.

- Lack of integrated ticketing (bus / bus and bus / rail)
  - Certain bus passes cannot be bought on the buses in Dundee and must be purchased from ticket offices.

- High cost of travel for those on lower incomes
  - Travel on some bus routes, especially less popular ones, is very expensive. The cost of travel varies greatly between routes for some single trips although very low fares are available for regular travellers.

- Insufficient connectivity between settlements
  - More local connections are needed.

Environmental Issues

- Pollution hot spots particularly within city and town centres
  - Highlighted as a problem in Dundee. Increased number of cars at peak times means increased pollution; discourages people from using the pavements alongside such roads.

Other

- Safety at bus stops was highlighted as an issue which discourages people from using bus services.

SEA Group

3.4 Session 1: Key Environmental Issues

3.4.1 Group 1

3.4.2 The issues and comments that were raised in this group are as follows:

- Poor air quality in urban area. Airborne pollutants increased noise levels on major routes
- Impact of new infrastructure and upgrading existing routes (good or bad)
- Impact intertidal areas. Potential flood impact. Potential for new bridges. Run off into aquatic environment
- Increased emission. Long-term response to climate change. Which form of transport? Flood prevention schemes
- Consequences of air bourne pollution on physical structure. Loss of historic environment to new infrastructure. Built to service new routes
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- Potential on scheduled and unscheduled archaeology. Effect on rural communities and culture. Cultural important heritage to local communities
- Improve opportunity to travel by healthies means (cycle walking). Green space and good access. Public transport
- Stagnant population. Ageing population. Accessibility to services. Rural population lack of access
- Efficient use of material, recycling, maintenance

3.4.3 Group 2

3.4.4 The issues and comments that were raised in this group are as follows:

- Issue in urban areas
- N/A: Local not strategic
- Issue for development, traffic growth, etc
- Major issue carbon emissions, effect on sea levers, dependency on oil, air travel, modal shift, target, transport generators
- Protecting landscape: Moratorium on road building. Improving streetscape: De-auration of road space, reducing speed limits, change focus away from car
- Limit effect of transport on bio-diversity preserve and increase natural world
- Improve public health through active travel
- Accessibility, roads bisecting communities, poverty deprivation
- Construction affecting natural assets

3.4.5 Summary of Issues in Plenary

- Climate Change
  - greenhouse gas emissions
  - long – term response
  - forms of transport
  - flood prevention
  - dependency on oil
  - modal shift
- Health and safety
  - improving health
  - encouraging healthier transport
  - accessibility e.g. Greenspace
- Conserving and enhancing Biodiversity
  - protected species
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- habitats
- cumulative effects
- green corridor

- Landscape/Townscape
  - protecting Landscape
  - improving/protecting Townscape
  - public realm/spaces
  - airborne pollution

- Population
  - accessibility
  - rural populations – bisecting, alternatives
  - essential services

- Impact on historic settings/cultural identity
  - archaeological sites

3.4.6 Prioritised issues

- Climate Change (emphasis on dependency on oil) (12 dots)
- Health and Safety (emphasis on improving health and accessibility) (6 dots)
- Conserving and enhancing biodiversity (emphasis on cumulative effects) (6 dots)
- Landscape/Townscape (emphasis on protection) (2 dots)
- Population (emphasis on rural populations) (2 dots)
- Impact on historic settings/cultural identity (2 dots)

3.5 Session 2: Environmental Objectives

3.5.1 Group 1

- Climate Change
  - reduce emissions from transport over the TACTRAN area. Climate change adaptation strategy

- Health and Safety
  - to improve health and safety by providing appropriate means and modes of which contribute to a healthier safer lifestyle

- Biodiversity
  - conserve and enhance biodiversity

- Landscape/Townscape
  - improve and enhance the environmental characteristics of landscapes and townscapes of regional importance

- Population
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- support and respond to the needs of a demographically changing population
- To protect and enhance the cultural heritage and identity in the TACTRAN and adjoining areas
- Cumulative Impact
  - take account of the cumulative effects of strategic actions within and on the TACTRAN area

3.5.2 Group 2

- Climate Change
  - reduce CO₂ emissions through reduction in road traffic by:
  - increase in: walking and cycling, more trips by public transport, switch to more efficient vehicles
  - decrease: Private car journeys, oil dependency
  - decrease air travel in RTP area
  - decrease construction of transport infrastructure e.g. road building
  - moratorium on road building
  - freight: promote rail over road, reduce freight movement

- Health
  - increase in trips by foot and bike
  - improving accessibility of health facilities
  - reducing speed limits, zoning e.g. around schools, homes
  - making recreation more accessible

- Biodiversity
  - assess cumulative impacts of transport
  - protecting environments (designated), increasing and enhancing
  - increase green corridors
  - reduce off-lash/run-off
  - brownfield sites

- Landscape/Townscape
  - protecting designated sites
  - preserve existing landscape
  - amelioration of transport impacts
  - traffic calming, de-auration of road space, reduction in speed, paths, preservation of core path networks, public realm

- Population
  - accessibility to socially excluded groups
- rural communities bisected by busy roads: paths, minor road traffic calming

Culture
- minimise development on sensitive sites and landscapes
- opening access to culture

Air Quality and Noise
- air travel
- lower speed levels
- cut congestion
- plant trees

Soils and Geology
- avoid geological sites
- reduce run-off
- increase use of brownfield
- decrease emissions

Aquatic Environment
- reduce pollution
- drainage
- protect all watercourses

Material Assets
- recycling building materials
- sustainable use of natural resources

3.5.3 Summary of the draft Objectives in Plenary

- To reduce CO$_2$ emissions through transport measures. To develop a climate change adaptation strategy
- To improve health and safety by providing appropriate means and modes of transport which contribute to a healthier safer lifestyle
- To protect and enhance the biodiversity of the region and beyond
- To maintain or enhance the environmental characteristics of Landscape and Townscape
- To improve accessibility to essential services for socially excluded groups. To support and respond to the needs of a demographically changing population
- To protect and enhance the cultural heritage and identity in the TACTRAN and adjoining areas
- To improve air quality and reduce transport related noise pollution
- To take account of cumulative effects of strategic actions within and on the TACTRAN area
4 Conclusion

4.1 61 draft issues were presented to the workshop participants as gathered from previous consultations and baseline sources. In few categories additional issues were highlighted by stakeholders and added to the long list. Issues raised and considered as important in at least two groups were: (Tables 3.4 – 3.7)

- Need for increased promotion of the overall TACTRAN region as a tourist destination
- Insufficient parking provision in rural / tourist areas
- Poor interchange facilities at main rail stations
- Lack of coach parking facilities within popular tourist area
- Rail service provision and capacity constraints
- General congestion within city and town centres
- Lack of rail freight terminal facilities
- Quality of road infrastructure for freight
- Access to ports/harbours
- Limited daytime public transport options in rural areas
- Lack of evening public transport travel options for rural communities
- Cross regional variations in fare levels across the TACTRAN area
- Limited accessible public transport for mobility impaired travellers
- Lack of integrated ticketing (bus / bus and bus / rail)
- Inadequate links between regional / national cycle networks
- Lack of promotion of sustainable transport issues
- Lack of integration between land-use and transport planning
- Lack of public transport provision to hospitals

4.2 The issues that scored highly in the SEA group were (Para 3.5.7):

- Climate Change (emphasis on dependency on oil) (12 dots)
- Health and Safety (emphasis on improving health and accessibility) (6 dots)
- Conserving and enhancing biodiversity (emphasis on cumulative effects) (6 dots)

4.3 Top three objectives from as scored in the transport-related workshop were (Table 3.9):
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- To ensure that Scottish and regional economic growth, especially in key business/employment areas (particularly town and city centres) is efficient and is not hampered by inadequacy of the transport infrastructure and services
- To contribute to the achievement of the Scottish national targets and obligations on greenhouse gas emissions
- To improve safety (accidents) and personal security

4.4 The summarised objectives from SEA Group are presented in para 3.6.3.
1 Introduction

1.1.1 The RTS Guidance identifies the Health Boards as statutory consultees when developing Regional Transport Strategy. As part of the consultation process, telephone consultations were undertaken with representatives of NHS Forth Valley and NHS Tayside and the Scottish Executive’s Health Department. NHS Forth Valley covers Stirling and NHS Tayside covers the areas of Angus, City of Dundee and Perth and Kinross.

1.1.2 The consultations raised and considered a wider range of issues. These included the short, medium and long term access to health facilities / hospitals, levels of transport service provision and options available for the access, including the provision and the scope for the demand responsive, community and voluntary transport to health care; hospital car parking facilities, promotion of sustainable travel and public transport information for patients, visitors and staff; issues arising from hospital re-locations, non-emergency access for patients; and the scope for co-operation between health and transport teams. The views of consultees are presented further in this document.

1.1.3 The following stakeholders were consulted in the telephone-based consultations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Malcolm McWhirter</td>
<td>NHS Forth Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Public Health NHS FV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ken Armstrong</td>
<td>NHS Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Operations NHS Tayside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Hector MacKenzie</td>
<td>Scottish Executive Health Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.4 It should be noted that both Health Board consultees and their representatives were also invited to attend the Key Stakeholder Workshop at the Discovery Point in Dundee on 3 August 2006.

1.1.5 The following issues and comments were raised in the telephone consultations with NHS Tayside, NHS Forth Valley and the policy division of Scottish Executive Health Department.

**NHS Forth Valley**

- **Need for an increased promotion of sustainable travel option**
  - It was stressed that the forthcoming transport strategy should be looked at from a sustainability perspective. Promotion of sustainable travel options should be increased. This would help to reduce car use by giving car users the options of public transport. It has been noted that rising fuel prices (which further continue to increase) could play a role in encouraging car travellers towards public transport use. Promotion of sustainable travel should also include the consideration of a sustainable NHS workfleet.

- **Improving public transport links to Glasgow / Edinburgh**
  - While links to Perth & Kinross and Ninewells in Dundee were considered sufficient, especially with regard to road links, it was felt that public transport links to Glasgow and Edinburgh could be improved.

- **Hospital re-location and specialisation of clinics**
  - It was noted that relocation to a single site hospital in Larbert may create difficulties for people travelling from the Tayside area and elsewhere. Specialisation of clinics would have an impact on the increased distances travelled by patients to access special services and could have an impact on people travelling from less accessible areas.

- **Car parking capacity**
  - The issue associated with parking capacity on site at both Ninewells, Dundee and Stirling hospital was mentioned. People accessing the hospital park in the residential areas close to the hospital once the hospital car park is full.

- **Provision of Public Transport Information**
  - It was felt that there were gaps / weaknesses in the provision of public transport information to patients, visitors and staff.

- **Staff travel**
  - Staff generally commute by public transport, although this may be difficult (or inconvenient?) for staff working shifts. (Further information regarding travel plan can be found in the Health care strategy document)

- **Non-emergency transport and Demand Responsive Transport provision**
  - It was felt that a revised/improved taxi service (instead of DRT) could play a role in the provision of non-emergency services for patients who have no access to a car.
At present, Dial-a-journey provides linkages with NHS Forth Valley. It is regarded as a good DRT service and is used frequently by patients.

**NHS Tayside**

- **Car parking capacity and Promotion of sustainable travel**
  - It was mentioned that one of the main issues/challenges is to effectively manage the inflow of patients, visitors and staff who arrive by car - this has an obvious impact on car parking capacity. An option to deal with the current level of car parking facilities is to increase the promotion of green travel planning and promote alternatives to a car.

- **Provision of out-patient care locally**
  - A strategic issues/challenge to tackle is "how to undertake out-patient care which is done locally". While it is necessary to promote sustainable travel, it is also important to maintain the flexibility in the mobility of staff. This includes the transfer/movement of medical records, urgent goods etc.

- **Integrated and joint-working of health and transport teams**
  - Collaboration and increased joint working within both hospital teams/departments and hospital teams and public transport providers was felt to be necessary. It was noted already good working relationships and collaboration with Local Authorities (used eg in development of travel plans etc)

- **DRT provision**
  - When asked if DRT was seen as a good option for non-emergency access to health facilities, it was responded that Demand Responsive Transport may not necessarily be the answer and the focus (for Ninewells) is to provide a better public transport (bus) service. It was mentioned that in order to increase the use of public transport (bus) and increase the shift from car travel, public transport services have to become more attractive ie more reliable, more frequent, more comfortable etc.

- **Staff access**
  - At present staff commute via a combination of transport modes including car-sharing. In order to increase the promotion of sustainable travel options, it was suggested that various incentives/disincentives should be offered to encourage staff to choose ‘green’ modes of travel.
Scottish Executive Health Department

- **Remoteness of settlements**
  - The issue associated with the remoteness of settlements in parts of the TACTRAN region and the importance of considering the access and delivery from/to home to/from health for these rural areas was highlighted.

- **A need for transport assessment**
  - It is important that transport assessment is carried out for each change and that it reflects the views of population and local authorities; ensuring that all transport concerns have been fully addressed.

- **Integrated and joint working**
  - There is a need for greater co-operation between NHS bodies, transport providers, local authorities, social work and community planning in order to ensure that, through integrated policies, health facilities (and new developments) are accessible for everyone.

- **DRT Provision**
  - Criteria need to be set to determine who can use each type of service.

- **Non emergency transport**
  - Transport provision is not based on remoteness, but on medical need. Therefore consideration must be given to the options for providing access from rural areas which suffer from lack of public transport provision.

- **Parking charges at hospitals**
  - The aim is to find a balance between a standard tiered charging regime (charges increase with length of time) and the medical priorities – some treatments/consultations take longer than others.
1 Introduction

1.1 Second key stakeholder consultation workshop was held on 3 November 2006 at the Discovery Point in Dundee. The purpose of the workshop was:

- To update stakeholders on the progress of TACTRAN RTS development;
- To confirm schemes and interventions and identify new ones, and;
- To consider alternative strategy packages.

1.2 Letters were sent out to some 200 stakeholders inviting them to participate in the workshop. Over 30 representatives attended the event. The list of participants is presented Appendix M of the Consultation report.

2 Background

2.1 Since the last stakeholder consultation event, held on 3 August 2006, work has focussed on completing the RTS Issues and Objectives Report, a review and analysis of transport in the region, development of the TACTRAN Vision and a set of 18 objectives which would guide the appraisal and prioritisation of measures promoted to support delivery of the emerging Strategy. It was, therefore, important to bring the key stakeholders up to date with the current development and to hear their views on the strategy options and their further appraisal.

2.2 An introduction to the workshop, the agenda which was followed, the views of the participants regarding the regional transport measures and interventions are provided in chapters 3 and 4 further in this paper.
3 Workshop

3.1 The workshop lasted approximately five hours with a break for lunch. The format for the workshop was as follows:

- Coffee and Registration
- Welcome and Introduction
  - Overview of the workshop and RTS progress update (15 minutes)
- Option Generation
  - Consideration of schemes and interventions to achieve Strategy Objectives (140 minutes)
- Lunch
- Strategy Options
  - Consideration of alternative strategy packages and approaches (60 minutes)
- Next Steps and Closing Remarks (30 minutes)

Options Generation Session

3.2 The options generation exercise was organised into 3 breakout sessions each consisting of 8-12 stakeholders with cross-section of interests. For ease of identification, each group was colour-coded. At the beginning of each session participants were presented with the list of schemes which have been previously collated from:

- A review of the constituent authority Structure Plans, Local Transport Strategies, Community and Safety Plans;
- Analysis of the three strands of measures of work undertaken as part of the supporting study work; and
- Schemes nominated by TACTRAN Partners members and officers.

3.3 Participants were asked to scan over the list to identify gaps and highlight schemes which they had concerns with or which were likely to cause problems. The discussions were recorded on flipchart. Feedback from each group was presented to all stakeholders at the end of the exercise. Findings of each session are presented in chapter 4.

Strategy Options Session

3.4 The afternoon session focused on the process of alternative strategies development. The session was run with all stakeholders together. Participants were presented with the process of ‘shaping’ of the strategy and the effects of applying different weightings to the list of emerging schemes in order to achieve either balanced or economy, accessibility and/or

---

1 Having set the objectives the Strategy should achieve, three strands of work were undertaken to identify the types of measures which the RTS would be likely to contain. These are Network-based initiatives (covering physical infrastructure schemes and public transport supply on high demand corridors), Initiatives for specific areas and groups (aimed primarily at accessibility and providing minimum levels of service to specific localities); and Region-wide measures (measures affecting the whole TACTRAN area).
environment emphasised strategy. Examples of possible schemes favouring each theme were also demonstrated. Participants were encouraged to comment on the process and raise further issues related to the RTS development. The findings of the session are presented in chapter 4.

4 Outcomes of the Workshop

Options Generation Session

4.1 The notes below present the participants’ reactions and views on the presented list of measures.

- **Land Use Measures**
  - Need to incorporate transport plans into the use of sites – part of the planning process – an extension of SPP17 – more joined up thinking – big gap at present with development being the priority and transport ‘picking up the pieces’
  - It is of primary importance to get transport issues sorted out with land use planning, not only reducing but facilitating sustainable travel
  - Location of development is important – mix it up and make sure accessible by all modes
  - Time distance to travel to public transport needs to be looked at
  - TACTRAN should be liaising with developers from an early stage and public transport providers should be involved
  - Move away from ‘culdesac’ culture of development
  - Need for an increased transport integration with planning
  - Access/ownership of cars – requirement to consider global market and plan ahead
  - OAP/sheltered housing/doctors are often inaccessible and should be designed with access in place
  - Car free housing estates may become more attractive and are a valid planning issue, however if car free then access to public transport required
  - Better regulation of the contractors who carry out planning to ensure they do things that the council want (for example when implementing cycle measures on carriageways). The new carriageway which was built in Dundee (?) was expected to have a cycle lane 3m away from the main carriageway. There was no jurisdiction by the council regarding this and the contractors didn’t carry out these plans.
  - Land use – local markets local produce (emphasis on Reducing need to travel)
  - Local development plans – integrate with Sustainable Travel, (transport is a means to end) (links to 1, but needs to be spelt out)

- **Attitudinal and Behavioural Measures**
  - Habits will not change without economic benefit
- Sustainable travel awareness campaigns – national rather than regional issues – local schemes around Europe are important and successful as at a grassroots level
- Personalised Travel Planning (PTP) – highly successful, costly, good at changing behaviour/travel patterns
- PTPs should be replaced by ‘Smarter Choices’ programme looking at travel planning
- Tourism issue – tourists should be able to access travel options – advertising campaign required for promotion of this – expensive public transport system required to compete on international level in the tourist industry
- Advertise/provide/promote integrated ticketing and information on integrated travel – awareness is key
- Sustainable travel awareness campaigns – TACTRAN should not rely on national campaign and look to a regional one
- Training problem – bus/taxi drivers experience road rage are not disability aware etc – best practice training required across the region
- TACTRAN needs awareness of other regions – must consider the impact of, for example, TACTRAN area discouraging cars whilst neighbouring regions do not actively discourage cars, is TACTRAN area then at an economic disadvantage?
- Businesses need to use greener transport
- Encouragement of walking/cycling through education – ‘Safe Routes to Schools’
- Approach of TACTRAN should incorporate use of public transport, discouragement of cars or car usage
- Promoting tourism related transport, tourism and National Park needs, part provision/part marketing (see 263, 259 Care – too many roads? NB Stirling Tayside Timber Transport Group STTTG)
- Travel plans – expand concept not just businesses, but also communities

- Infrastructure Interchange Measures
  - Transport interchanges – design to accommodate cycling/walking – look at and consider all modes at interchanges – have to provide a seamless journey and highlight all modes (including/emphasis on walking/cycling)
  - Perth Rail interchange on list – Dundee required too or combine Dundee rail and bus station

- Infrastructure Rail Measures
  - TACTRAN to consider rail electrification
  - Skip-stop service required
  - Most important issues facing rail are capacity constraints – line speed, weights, gauges etc. Unless we provide solutions to capacity constraints new stations are ineffective. Increase rail capacity to reduce crowding on trains.

- Infrastructure Road Measures
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- Dundee Claypots junction – more of a safety, not congestion problem
- Additional Forth crossing – TACTRAN to take a view due to knock on effect for TACTRAN area, such as freight movement north to south etc
- Freight travel impacts heavily on the environment
- Maintain and improve the standard of bridges in the area. Important to the economy as many are sub-standard for carrying HGVs. Refurbishment needed on a local scale?

■ Infrastructure Non-motorised measures
- Seamless journey by public transport and provision for cycles etc
- Cycle carriage on Public Transport (Partially covered by 1)
- Stannergate to Douglas TCE Dundee National cycleway improvements
- TACTRAN “Town Competition” for the pedestrian, tourism? “Carbon neutral” concept!

■ Infrastructure Other Measures
- No rail freight in the TACTRAN area
- It was strongly felt that measure 24 (general freight depot at Blackford) is in contradiction to the COBRA appeal. A general freight depot at Blackford was specifically protested against by those campaigning for the re-opening of the station. It is feared a general freight depot would lead to further increased volumes of traffic on roads in the area, over and above those already caused by Highland Spring.
- Shipping is the greenest form of freight transport, if road freight had to account for costs to environment then water transportation would immediately become the more economically beneficial method
- Infrastructure interchange required for freight at points where ports meet road and rail
- Quality of infrastructure interchange, for example Kingsway to Dundee Port has bad health and safety
- Dundee Airport – access for those with mobility problems and wheelchair users – national problem but should be included in TACTRAN RTS as a view
- Air links to London, Edinburgh from TACTRAN areas
- Plans for airport expansions and extra runways go against the campaigns for climate change, need to square such decisions with the need for greener environment and reduced air pollution.
- Improved access to Dundee port including Stannergate bridge replacement
- Development of rail/road/ship freight facility at Dundee Port and improvement of associated road and bridge infrastructure serving the port
- Dundee harbour as marina
- Coastal Shipping Perth (needs studies), Montrose, Dundee 3 Ports + National Strategic
Management Bus Measures
- Supply before market – provision is often not there (e.g. Dollar)
- Unmet demand/need
- If transport is going to be truly integrated it needs to be accessible from the door.
- Re-implement the bus priority measures in Stirling.
- Need for a decent commuter service on the A9 Citylink Gleneagles service. The local commuters are not served well by this service at present.
- ID 24 – Improved bus/coach links from PKC to Edinburgh needs to include ‘from Angus’

Management Interchange Measures
- Integration of timetabling (National – regional dimension)

Management Non-motorised Measures
- Promotion of regional cycling and walking routes – take into account difference between commuter journeys and recreational journeys
- Bus capacity increased to accommodate push bikes (i.e. for tourists), prams, disabled access etc.
- Cycling strategies need to be developed by people who actually cycle / know and understand the issues which cyclists face. Cycling is seen to be too dangerous, and needs to take into account both cyclists and pedestrians.
- Provision of cycle stands (to encourage more cycling)
- Arterial roads/routes can act as a barrier? Crossing points Strategy – identify key situations where issue? Some specific measures, providing useful connectivity for non motorised traffic

Management Road Measures
- Speed management/enforcement – on trunk routes and urban areas – national issue which can be acted upon at the local level
- Co-ordination of roadwork’s/maintenance Connectivity – cumulative effect, Partial 144
- Parking facilities for Blue badge holders, accessing resource needs, buses and supporting lorries, disabled users
- Home zone/traffic calming
- Need more measures focusing on traffic reduction – this needs to be measured, then the target set

Management Other Measures
- Cars need to be considered to retain people in Dundee
- Need to utilise the fact that Britain is surrounded by water – moving freight by water, using under utilised ports. It was pointed out that Forth Ports are working very hard on a strategy for the area.
Information

- Information strategy dealing with public transport in TACTRAN local regions
- Technology – mobile phone service in the TACTRAN area must be improved to ensure teleservices for ticketing, transport information and DRT etc works
- WiFi internet access installed on buses – modal shift
- Instant ticketing/internet – one stop shop? Integration – national
- Accurate information – covered by travel line 201 and 202
- Trialling new technology utilising two national parks
- Full audit of all transport resources/needs avoid duplication schools/etc

Pricing

- Fares issues
  - Extend benefits of concessionary travel to those who cause the most congestion i.e. the commuters. It was pointed out that the concessionary travel schemes encourage people to travel more than they used to, thus raising questions over sustainability.
  - Standardise rail costs.
  - 265 and Freight Tolls removed from the Tay road bridge, need to provide some form of traffic control on the Southside (Care Specific, 309)

General statements and Policies

- Consider the disabled more in transport planning decisions. The disabled, particularly the blind, can be made prisoner by transport planning decisions and the reliance which society places on the car.
- Examples of best practice need to be transferred from one area to another within the TACTRAN region.
- Roundabout are not practical for cyclists – safety requirements – remove roundabouts and replace with junctions
- Cycling and walking need to be prioritised high up on the strategy.
- Park and ride must have walking/cycling facilities – multi modal
- Need to plan for consequences of new legislations i.e. the new laws on car seats have consequences for organisations which used to car share.
- More partnership and synergy with other RTPs and key strategies i.e. network rail strategy, route utilisation strategy.
- Road and transport structures need to be designed with the impact of climate change in mind i.e. make allowances for the effects of flooding and storms. Need to move beyond just considering air quality and emissions.
- Road design – rural areas sensitive landscapes Partially covered by 4 (needs to be more specific)
- Guidance for RTP – Bus operators and Local Authorities, emphasis on catering for all needs
- Integration of modes, right mode for right journey (Timetabling, care – rail (rural) funding 176 177)
- RTS – prosperity, economic – (local movement OKish, connectivity to key routes)
- Inter regional connectivity (partnership consultation) More partnership with adjacent RTPs
- Education hearts and minds – key issue
- Integrated travel requires best practice throughout
- Meeting all access needs for buses/railway (integration) (National issue, regional dimension)
- Measures promoting air travel could be big question mark in future!
- Need more management of demand! Not necessarily encouraging more air travel!
- Link in with National Strategy for Air Travel
- Rail proposals – sustainable if carrying quota of passengers, doing the right thing
- Care in prioritising big spend infra versus low spend soft policy option
- Congestion – how to deal? Negatives as well as positives.
- Training for PT and community transport drivers. Need to recruit and retain these drivers as without them services can’t be delivered. There is a notable shortage of drivers at present which greatly restricts services. If we are to have a successful PT system this is something which needs to be stressed as a vocation, not something in the short term.
- Carbon trading/off setting is important – national or regional issue?

4.2 The notes below present the participants’ reactions and general comments on further issues including the long list database.

- Re-arrange database (the long list) – by local/regional/national schemes
- Also indicate whether started already or planned
- Some schemes too detailed for RTS
- Stirling – after considering the map of proposed Regional/National schemes within the TACTRAN area the point was raised that Stirling had very little in the way of proposed schemes, yet they were very much in need of transport improvements. Some were concerned that Stirling is disadvantaged compared to the Tay area, and that focus would be directed towards the Tay/Dundee area and Stirling would miss out because of this. Stirling needs to be ‘dragged up to speed’. It was pointed out that this previous ‘under investment’ could be seen as a good thing as it would mean that Stirling could receive more of the funds arising from TACTRAN. It was pointed out that although TACTRAN differed from other RTS’ due to its lack of history, the partnership was truly regional and would not be concentrated specifically around certain areas.
Issues such as the Forth Rd Bridge, ECML etc are focused too much towards Fife and driven by national bodies, there needs to be more attention paid to the TACTRAN region. Stakeholders stressed the need for a well worked-out lobbying strategy so TACTRAN doesn’t miss out when compared to other major areas.

There is a danger of internal fighting over how the money is spent, but need to focus above and beyond this. The focus on regional difference can be a good thing – it could help to transfer examples of best practice from one area to another.

Community councils can be an excellent voice for local issues, and can inform councils of these. But communities need to want to actively change there is a danger of apathy. Also process needs to be followed through in full; often exhaustive community consultations occur on one occasion but this isn’t followed up by anything.

There is a need for a well-worked out lobbying strategy if TACTRAN is to have a successful and lasting impact. There are fears that other areas in Scotland have better lobbyists (i.e. Edinburgh) – will TACTRAN lose out because of this? TACTRAN needs to be there to represent its case.

Emphasis should be made on a greener environment and pollution controls. There is no point in expanding airports when planes are detrimental to the environment.

Concerns were raised that the strategies are not ‘joined up’ and cannot be effective because of this. The draft route utilisation strategy has been released before the regional transport strategies for example. It was stated that there is contact and connections across partnerships. They don’t operate in isolation.

If the RTS is to be truly effective the people making the policies need to come to the local areas and understand the issues which are present. There needs to be more focus on a grass roots level.

Again the issue of land use planning was raised. We need to change attitudes, and consider where people want to travel, where employment locations are situated etc in order to reduce the need to travel.

Questions were raised regarding the TACTRAN budget. Who spends this and dictates where it will go? What ‘teeth’ does TACTRAN have in relation to other organisations to dictate where the money will go? It was explained what funding has been awarded and the possible mechanisms for delivery.

If money is made available there needs to be a move made from best practice to statutory requirements.

The strategy, policy direction and schemes need to focus on the long term. It’s not about schemes today but the wider initiative, the bigger picture and the long term. Are we going in the right direction?

Questions were raised as to how the issues which have been raised within TACTRAN are being coordinated nationally.

With regard to the meeting, Stakeholders commented that they’d rather the options have been presented in a more manageable way which would allow...
them to read and understand them better. The list would have been better if organised in numerical order.

- The list was seen by some to be too detailed – it should be about area wide standards rather than specific schemes, and influencing things on a broader scale.
- The consultation process was seen as a good way to get everyone together to stimulate discussion.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Based on the comments received from stakeholders, the ‘long list’ has been revised accordingly. Few existing schemes have been modified to reflect the views of stakeholders; the following schemes have been added to the ‘long list’:

- No general freight depot at Blackford (parent scheme - Rail freight interchanges)
- Improve rail capacity constraints (line speed, weights, gauges etc) in order to improve services - RUSS Plus
- Improve bus commuter service on the A9 Gleneagles Citylink service (parent scheme - Increase frequency on the under-performing corridors where current frequency is less than 4 services per hour)
- Lobby for more use of Britain's ports, waterways and seas to move freight
- Extend benefits of concessionary travel to those who cause the most congestion i.e. the commuters
- Increased capacity on PT to accommodate cycles (for commuters and tourists), prams, wheelchairs etc (parent scheme - Develop and Implement a Regional Cycling strategy)
- Standardise rail costs (parent scheme - Introduce joint ticketing scheme between all modes/operators)
- Develop and Implement a Regional Cycling strategy (using those who cycle/know and understand the issues which cyclists face)
- Recruit, retain and better train PT and Community Transport drivers
- Design road and transport structures with the impact of climate change in mind i.e. make allowances for the effects of flooding and storms
- PT interpretation at sites including car parks, and pre-travel real-time information on the web and at travel termini/stops to increase sustainable mode choices (parent scheme - Information strategy dealing with PT in TACTRAN local regions)
- Incorporating transport plans into the use of sites as part of the planning process - an extension of SPP17 to facilitate sustainable travel (parent scheme - Land use planning controls to reduce need to travel)
- Make integrated transport accessible from the door / need to consider time distance to travel to PT (parent scheme - Minimum standards for PT services, infrastructure and information (including accessibility)
Information Note 33b

- OAP/sheltered housing to be designed with transport access in place (parent scheme - Land use planning controls to reduce need to travel)
- Move away from culdesac culture of development (parent scheme - Land use planning controls to reduce need to travel)
- Consider importance of carbon trading / offsetting
- Car free housing estates with PT provision (parent scheme - Land use planning controls to reduce need to travel)
- Better co-ordination between needs of cyclists and needs of pedestrians (parent scheme - Develop and Implement a Regional Cycling strategy)
- Better regulation of contractors to ensure new developments are favourable to PT users/cyclists (parent scheme - Land use planning controls to reduce need to travel)
- Personalised travel planning (PTP) - or replacement by 'Smarter Choices' programme looking at travel planning
- Advertising campaign to facilitate access to travel options
- Information strategy dealing with PT in TACTRAN local regions
- Advertise/provide/promote integrated ticketing and information on integrated travel (parent scheme - Advertising campaign to facilitate access to travel options)
- Cyclists parking (parent scheme - Develop and Implement a Regional Cycling strategy)
- Infrastructure interchange required for freight at points where ports meet road and rail (parent scheme - Rail freight interchanges)
- Quality of infrastructure interchange - e.g. Kingsway to Dundee Port has bad health & safety (parent scheme - Improved links (access) to major ports & transhipment points)
- Park & Ride must have walking/cycling facilities - multi-modal (parent scheme - Develop and Implement a Regional Cycling strategy)
- Dundee bus/rail interchange
- Need for businesses to use greener transport (parent scheme - Travel plans adoptions and their active pursuance by all Local authorities, Health Boards, major employers and communities)
- Rail electrification
- Skip-stop service required for rail
- Remove roundabouts and replace with junctions - bus priority & cycles
- Improve mobile phone service in the TACTRAN area to ensure teleservices for ticketing, instant ticketing/internet, transport information, DRT works etc (parent scheme - Information strategy dealing with PT in TACTRAN local regions)
- Wi-Fi internet access installed on buses
- Promotion of regional cycling and walking routes - take into account the difference between commuter journeys and recreational journeys (parent scheme - Develop and Implement a Regional Cycling strategy)
Speed management/enforcement on trunk routes and urban and rural areas - national issue which can be acted upon at the local level
More air links to London from TACTRAN areas
Stannergate to Douglas Terrace, Dundee, National Cycleway Improvements (parent scheme - Regional cycling network)
Dundee Harbour development as a Marina
Produce region-wide guidance on co-operation between Local authorities and PT operators
Improved access to Central Belt from TACTRAN area
Development of coastal shipping
Measurements of traffic reduction targets
Tayside Timber Transport network
Overall transport accessibility for mobility impaired and partially sighted
Road design - rural areas sensitive landscapes
Co-ordination of roadworks/maintenance
Provision of cycle stands (to encourage more cycling) (parent scheme - Develop and Implement a Regional Cycling strategy)
Improved access to Dundee port including Stannergate bridge replacement (parent scheme - Improved links (access) to major ports & transhipment points)
Integration of timetabling
Undertake full audit of all transport resources
Improved bus/coach links from Angus to Edinburgh (in competition with rail) (parent scheme - Improved bus/coach links from TACTRAN to Central Belt)
Trialling new technology utilising two national parks (parent scheme - Information strategy dealing with PT in TACTRAN local regions)
Development of rail/road/ship freight facility at Dundee port (parent scheme - Rail freight interchanges)
Promoting tourism related transport, tourism and National Park needs, part provision/part marketing
Integration of modes (right mode for right journey)
Inter-regional connectivity
Arterial routes acting as barriers - scope for crossing point strategy (parent scheme - Develop and Implement a Regional Cycling strategy)
Parking facilities for blue Badge holders (parent scheme - Regional Parking Management Strategy)
Home zone/traffic calming (parent scheme - Speed management/enforcement on trunk routes and urban and rural areas - national issue which can be acted upon at the local level)
Notes from Community Transport Meeting held on 21/11/2006

1 Introduction

1.1 During the Stakeholder Workshops, representatives of the various groups involved in Community Transport (CT) had sought to ensure that the emerging Strategy was founded on a full appreciation of the role of CT and the constraints and issues before it in further advancing that role.

1.2 Accordingly, a further consultation meeting was held with this interest group in November 2006 and included a comprehensive representation of DRT and Community Transport people in the TACTRAN region. The purpose was to:

- Discuss progress on developing Objectives and Options for the RTS
- Identify what CT can contribute and what are the key CT issues and needs and
- Clarify how CT can contribute and identify “best practice” in TACTRAN region and elsewhere

1.3 The list of participants is included in Appendix M of the Consultation Report.

2 The session

2.1 After brief round the table introductions the discussion on the Tay and Central Transport Regional Strategy (TACTRAN RTS) began.

2.2 David Whittle summarised what has happened so far on developing the TACTRAN RTS and asked to hear from the rest of the group about how we can cater for their needs within the strategy.

2.3 DW explained to the group that he had been at the TACTRAN RTS meeting that morning. He spoke about the options report and how the options had been generated. The development of the RTS follows Scottish Executive Guidance (STAG – Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance) which means finding out about the issues in the region and then setting objectives that solve the issues. 400 proposals have come in to date. Some 18 objectives have been categorised
under headings: Accessibility, Social Inclusion and Health and Wellbeing. And the purpose of the strategy is to bring all the disparate groups under one umbrella to meet the needs of a community in 15-20 years time.

2.4 DW referred back to a Stakeholder workshop which was held in Dundee. This workshop generated 40 further proposals for our consideration. The next step is to draft the final transport strategy ready to be published by 31 Mar 2007. Work on the TACTRAN RTS started in June 2006. In essence MVA have to do 4-5 months work in 4-5 weeks. The RTS can be developed and updated at 4-5 yearly intervals. The RTS needs to be inclusive, support peoples needs and aspirations, reduce the need to travel, and is sensitive to growing green agenda.

2.5 Working with Professor David Gray on rural aspects of the strategy MVA have looked at good practice in Scotland and in the UK and have completed accessibility analysis of the TACTRAN region using our own software. The analysis looks at where people live and what journeys they can make using Public Transport. We have looked at accessibility to Doctors, Hospitals and Major Centres using Public Transport, as logged by Traveline. The results of this analysis are that large parts of the TACTRAN area do not have access via commercial services to socially necessary facilities. DRT and Community Transport can fill the gaps.

2.6 Andrea Davison took over from this point and began by explaining that the TACTRAN area covers Angus, Perth and Kinross, Stirling, and Dundee.

2.7 She distributed a list of 73 RCTI (Rural Community Transport Initiative) funded schemes which George Davidson provided on request and asked the group to add their scheme to the list if it is not there.

2.8 A model developed by MVA was explained. The model we have made is about identifying which typology your area fits in, identifying what the transport is needed for and consequently choosing the most cost efficient transport solution to meet that need. The typology is defined by three items:

- The urban/rural classification (Scottish Executive)
- Closeness to a public transport corridor
- Car ownership in the area (Census, 2001)

2.9 Nine different forms of transport and eight methods of assessing an area were given to the group as a handout along with the model/matrix.

2.10 At this point the group were asked to look and see whether their form of transport or the form they represent was included in the list.

2.11 AD then explained the table and read through the example. She asked whether the model seemed sensible if its purpose was to ensure that everyone across the 4 authority areas was to attempt to do things in the same way.

2.12 The response to this was that some people felt that the definition of Community Transport needed altering because Community Transport can be for all types of passenger and can be provided from a range of origins to a range of destinations at any time of day.

2.13 Comments on the transport provision matrix include:
The Community Transport representative is not happy with the definition of CT and felt that CT could provide a solution to all the problems outlined in the matrix.

Add access to culture to the leisure category.

Developing a second matrix that covers access for those who cannot access or use conventional PT at all was suggested. This matrix would refer to those who live in both urban and rural areas.

2.14 There was a lengthy discussion which resulted in the following points which have been placed under headings to give some sense of order to them:

Funding

- Funding is an issue in the Community Transport sector.
- Funding can be obtained for rural projects from George Davidson at RCTI, Rural Community Transport Initiative. RCTI has spent (£16.5million) on rural initiatives and to date has funded 165 schemes.

Legislation

- Part of the strategy will be to point out which legislation needs to be changed to get progress.
- Community Transport have legislative barriers.
- Minibus Legislation, section 19 needs to be mentioned in the strategy.

Communication

- A dialog needs to be maintained between Regional Transport Partnerships
- Traveline will now accept telephone numbers for Community Transport Schemes. They are willing to distribute the information, both the telephone numbers and the conditions attached.
- In HITRANS a forum has been created and these council areas send two Community Transport representatives to the RTS meetings, this could be replicated in the TACTRAN area.

Recommendations

- We need to seek a social solution rather than a commercial solution.
- Community Transport can fulfil all the needs of people who cannot access traditional bus services.
- We should be recommending all inclusive integrated transport that everyone has access to – “An hourly link with the nearest town”
- A request was made that when the RTS has been drafted that the CT sector have an input.

Involvement and Influence on the Strategy

- The power that large bus operators have on the bus market should not be increased by the development of the TACTRAN Regional Transport Strategy.
A request was made that when the RTS has been drafted that the CT sector have an input.

The MASCARA (Demand Responsive Transport Services for increasing Social Cohesion in Urban and Rural Areas) team want to provide the best service possible we must not/cannot devalue Community Transport – we want to encourage it and make it grow and to make it more economical.

Concerns about how the TACTRAN board decide what goes ahead were aired? A request for the scoring mechanism to be made public was made.

In rural areas that are registered (hail and ride) services can stop at safe locations. In the Perth and Kinross region most services are registered this way, the TACTRAN strategy should state that any bus operators operating within the TACTRAN area must apply for this form of license.

The unmet demand for Community Transport has not been estimated.

The true number of people using Community Transport has not been established.

Sources of Information

www.flexible.transport.org

2.15 Previous contact has been made with the following people to request information on Community Transport and DRT:

- Andrew Warrington and John Berry Perth & Kinross Council
- John Elliot, Traveline
- Lesley Millar, Angus Council
- Lindsay Rouse, Stirling Council
- Trevor Docherty, Dundee Council

2.16 Following on from this meeting a copy of the conclusions and recommendations are to be sent to each of the people who attended the meeting because there was insufficient time to discuss them at the meeting.

2.17 A copy of the DRT/ Community Transport proforma is also to be made available to the meeting attendees so that they can tell us about the schemes they run.
1 Introduction

1.1 TACTRAN Draft RTS was published on 22 January 2007 for an eight week period consultation, during which all stakeholders and the public were invited to comment on the proposed Strategy and associated proposals for improving transport infrastructure, services and facilities.

1.2 Consultation undertaken by MVA to explore reactions and views of the Draft RTS was undertaken with various stakeholders, specialist groups and equality groups and comprised focus groups, a workshop and a survey of the public.

1.3 On 8th and 13th February four Focus Groups sessions were held in the Discovery Centre in Dundee. The purpose of these was to gain an in-depth understanding of specialist groups, equality groups and other stakeholders’ views, by focusing in on relevant areas of interest within the Draft RTS.

1.4 Stakeholders invited to participate in these sessions represented the following areas of interest:

- Walking and Cycling;
- Public Transport; (bus rail, taxi and community transport);
- Car Drivers and Motor Cyclists,
- Health Boards / Emergency Services;
- Disability groups;
- Freight;
- National Parks and Tourism;
- Enterprise and Education; and
- Environmental and Special Interests.
2 Results from Chapter 5 - Delivering Economic Prosperity

What do you think of the 7 bullet points for delivering economic prosperity?

- The representative of Tourism and the National Parks was pleased to see the last bullet point; (FG 1)
- One of the issues put forward for delivering the transport strategy was that the role and power of TACTRAN has not yet been fully defined. People would like to know what power TACTRAN will possess; (FG 1)
- The timber group notes the increase in timber production and the need to work with TACTRAN to devise routes for this freight, including modal shift from road to rail; (FG 1)
- The timber group would like to be included on discussions on transport in the region; (FG 1)
- The strategy is right but the challenge will be getting all the agencies to work together to get things to happen quickly; (FG 1)
- Those from an economic group felt that ‘Scottish Enterprise’ and the local enterprise agencies should be included. ‘Especially with economic prosperity, I would have thought that Scottish Enterprise have a role to play there’; (FG 1)
- The strategy should include ‘Visit Scotland’ in there when you are looking at the Tourism sector; (FG 1)
- A keen cyclist and environmentalist suggested that the 3 high level objectives should be “1. Delivering economic prosperity, 2. Connecting communities and being socially inclusive and promoting health and well-being and 3. Delivering environmental sustainability” (FG 2)
- Bullet 1 of 5.2.5 Add the ‘local footpath, cycleway and road network’ in place of ‘local road network’, or ensure paths come through strongly in the intervention section; (FG 2)
- One participant commented that TACTRAN will need to work hard to be included in the Strategic Projects Review because of two key issues: (FG 3)
  - competition with other Regional Transport Partnerships for a limited pot of money; and (FG 3)
  - the Scottish Government is coming up to a spending review and this is likely to result in less money available overall and a greater stress on public transport movements at the detriments of road improvements and freight. (FG 3)
- There was concern that the Scottish Executive and politicians often do not have a good understanding of how the whole freight business works. The process of getting the right understanding from political representatives is vital. There is a role for TACTAN in getting to the elective members (eg lobbying, education and understanding of the political scene); (FG 3)
- unless we get the economics right then it would be difficult to achieve in other areas such as sustainability and social inclusion; (FG 3)
TACTRAN region is becoming increasingly peripheral at the European level. The area is being viewed as further and further away in terms of freight and this has impacts in terms of inward investment from new companies coming to the area; (FG 3)

the delivering economic prosperity theme was viewed to be fully comprehensive; (FG 3)

Have tremendous problems with road works - the impact these have on the reliability standards which bus operators are supposed to achieve. There should be something getting the councils to recognise the role that they have in helping bus operators to operate reliably; (FG 4)

I’ve got a concern there that active travel actually crosses the boundaries between economic prosperity, social inclusion and environmental sustainability and I don’t think it’s adequately reflected in here; (FG 4)

Something needs to be added to all three sections, a recognition that active travel can contribute to economic prosperity – to access the employment opportunities, particularly for those who are socially excluded; (FG 4)

we’re in competition - if all fares are the same, then you’re in breach of the competition rules at the present time; (FG 4)

there’s no mention of any of the trade umbrella organizations, like the CPT and the CPA; (FG 4)

3 Results from Chapter 5 - Connecting communities and being socially inclusive

What do you think of the 5 bullet points for connecting communities and being socially inclusive?

3.1 Semantic issues:

‘local road network’ at the first bullet point should be changed to ‘local transport network’; (FG 1)

‘local footpath, cycleway and road network’ in place of ‘local road network’; (FG 1)

ensure that the definition of community transport meaning transport that a community can use is not confused with transport that is provided by volunteers; (FG 2)

3.1.1 Other comments:

the strategic planning of the councils and their land use policies should be mentioned here; (FG 1)

visitors to the National Park should be included in demand responsive transport, not just the local population; (FG 1)

there is a need for a public transport system that is open 24/7, 52 weeks of the year; (FG 1)

land use and development should be covered in these sections; (FG 1)
housing and the immediate environment actually restricts access to transport (cul-de-sac culture of development); (FG 1)

there is the need for a multi-mode model with regional transport coordination centres; (FG 1)

it will be impossible to achieve all the five points within the money available and it will come down to prioritising where the spending is targeted; (FG 3)

there’s still no mention in the strategy of how Community Transport and DRT link - and how they can feed into the mainstream of public transport; (FG 4) and

the key thing there is that communities are about facilities, and communities are about people having access to facilities, and very often the access to facilities is through walking or cycling or active travel, so there should be a bullet point in there about working with communities and sustainable travel organisations – to look at that sort of connectivity; (FG 4).

4 Results from Chapter 5 - Delivering Environmental Sustainability and Health and Wellbeing

What do you think of the 4 bullet points for delivering Environmental Sustainability and Health and Wellbeing?

4.1 Semantic issues:

- re-phrase ‘measures’ in the bullet points. It’s not clear what that means; (FG 1)
- adverse impacts should be explicitly noted, the word negative should be inserted; (FG 1)

4.2 Other comments:

- The National Parks rep would like ‘journey experience’ for travel within the National Park taken into consideration; (FG 1)
- The environmental impact of the delivery of goods, especially in rural areas, should be considered and initiatives designed to minimise any negative impact; (FG 1)
- People felt that SMEs and community outlets should have travel plans too and that travel plans should be re-visited and monitored, especially when there are staff and management changes; (FG 1)
- People were keen to see mention of facilitating the movement of freight off the road on to rail or sea; (FG 1)
- noise pollution or air pollution should be mentioned as an Impact on communities; (FG 1)
- travel plans should be implemented and monitored. There is the thought that producing travel plans ticks a box but has little effect; (FG 1)
- there is scope to look at travel plans at a community level; (FG 1)
- should try to facilitate the movement of freight off the road on to rail or sea for sustainability reasons and not necessarily for economic reasons; (FG 1)..
The group were supportive of the measures which reduce unnecessary car journeys; (FG 3)

One participant was in favour of measures that encourage sustainable travel, but felt it was important that the budget allocation is balanced. For example, spending a fortune on cycle lanes that very few people use was viewed unfavourably; (FG 3)

there’s something missing in this interpretation of health and well-being as only being related to the absence of pollution and it should be mentioned that walking and cycling contribute to healthy living; (FG 4) and

schools could be put into the ‘Active Travel Plans’ list. (FG 4)

5 CHAPTER 6 – INTERVENTIONS

A – Land and Planning related Measures

5.1 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

Should mention the role of taxis and private hire; (FG 1)

We should encourage SMEs to have travel plans and not just large employers (Action A2.1); (FG 1)

as well as improved access to Health Care, we should include access to shops and retail facilities; (FG 1)

(Action A5.1) as well as access to the National Parks, the strategy should address transport and movement around the parks; (FG 1)

(A3.1) ‘P’ notes that other types of parking should be addressed eg cycle and bus parking addressed; (FG 1)

they are only looking at car parking standards at new developments and thinks they should be looking at standards at existing developments; (FG 1)

Remember to consider motor cycles in A2 and A3; (FG 2)

(A1.2) Verify what we mean by this eg suggest we use the word new housing developments and Transport Assessments; (FG 2)

The group agreed that land use planning policy is a very important issue. Doing the most sensible thing in transport planning terms is not always the driving force in planning decisions being made and this generates a lot of problems; (FG 3)

If people are going to go to National Parks, the vast majority of cases will be car and not public transport. One woman commented "you can get train up to Blair Athol, but if you want to actually explore the area you need the car"; (FG 3)

One participant suggested that the car was not an essential part of visiting national parks. He cited examples from Europe where valleys were closed off to cars and shuttle buses were used instead. However, this would only be appropriate in areas with very high numbers of tourists; (FG 3)

Is it really feasible to actually engage with all of these planning levels centrally when you get down to the local planning level, and then if not, how are you going to handle it? (FG 4)
there's a requirement here for Health Boards to look at transport if they decide they're going to build another hospital, they can consider it and not do anything about it. It just says 'do a traffic (transport) impact assessment', it doesn't say it's got to do anything about it; (FG 4)

An important planning issue is the example of re-locating health centres so they are less central to the people who actually use them. Moving because they managed to procure a bit of land outwith the town centre. If the local council had some power over that ...; (FG 4)

there's a lack of consultation in the early stages to ensure that there is facilities or public transport of some kind to get people to these new sites (hospitals, retail, housing developments). This should be built in to the strategy; (FG 4)

in order to engage with the NHS, TACTRAN should offer transport expertise to assist the NHS in doing their Impact Assessments, and that way you've gotten in offering something; (FG 4)

B – Information Related Measures

5.2 Semantic Issue:

(Action B.1.5) change wording of 'Tourist attractions' to 'recreational/visitor networks' as there are not many attractions as such in the National Parks. (FG 1)

5.3 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

People need more than local or regional information, it has to be national or international and tie in to other areas to give a seamless transport experience; (FG 1)

A problem identified with information on public transport is the lack of fares information. The tourist visiting Scotland would not know how much their journeys around Scotland would cost; (FG 1)

In a strategy for this number of years, it has to be recognised that it’s a moveable feast (information measures). Technology changes so quickly; (FG 1)

You need a combination of the information system and individualised journey planning. If someone is not comfortable with technology, you have to do it on a face-to-face basis; (FG 1)

You need a map at a bus stop that shows where all the place names are, you've no idea where it goes to get from A to B; (FG 1)

People retain visual information far more than text. It should make use of maps and interactive technology; (FG 1)

The public transport system should be superimposed on a map (like the London Underground map); (FG 1)

Could also include the Traveline Scotland Journey Plan, the information for which is already there and was mentioned as being free in Sestrans; (FG 4)

‘Real time’ systems – perhaps looking at other technologies that are available that bolt on to that, such as text messaging services whereby you can stay at home, text the local bus stop to a number and it will tell you when your next bus is going to be due; (FG 4)
the world’s becoming very IT, but if you’ve got people with disabilities this is often a medium that isn’t available to them and older people certainly aren’t IT literate. You can’t forget the old ways of doing things to pass on information like radios and newspapers and things like that; (FG 4)

C – Measures designed to change attitudes and behaviour including demand management

5.4 Again, issues over the wording not being strong enough:

- The Action Point just says it seeks to promote flexible working in schools – it just needs to be a bit stronger;
- Take out the word “seek”….. if it said something like ‘actively promote’ rather than ‘seek to promote’;
- I think that’s a general problem throughout the whole document. There’s too many ‘consider’ ‘seek’ rather than actual stronger words;
- Another one on establishing a strategic regional partnership ‘will consider’ the need for a strategic parking policy; that’s ridiculous, it’s an absolute requirement if they’re going to do anything in the future in relation to ensuring that people consider using one form of transport or another, whether it be buses, bikes, it’s always talking about ‘considering’ – there’s nothing I’ve seen in this so far that’s got a commitment. It’s weak; and
- At least it’s saying it. I think overall, I’ve been quite pleased that the strategy has picked up the problems, but it’s not actually gone far enough in dealing with any of them.

5.5 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- The campaign to change attitudes and behaviour is going to have to be long-term, it’s not a quick one or two adverts on the radio or TV; (FG 1)
- Arnold Clark spends more on advertising cars in one week that the whole Scottish bus industry spends in one year; (FG 1)
- work with TV, press, radio, businesses, the whole community to make things happen; (FG 1)
- (Action C.2.1) a region wide car share scheme, can it be made into a cross-region car share scheme? (FG 1)
- the first bus in rural areas is too late for everyone to go to work; (FG 1)
- Of all the interventions in section C, the demand management is not well covered from the National Parks’ perspective. They would very much like to do some demand management because on busy bank holiday weekends, they have roads that are effectively 5 mile long cul-de-sacs; (FG 1)
- Winning hearts and minds is the ‘big hill we have to climb’ and it will be difficult to persuade people to change their travel attitudes and behaviour; (FG 3)
- many people (eg rural residents) often do not have a choice when making travel decisions; (FG 3)
One man commented that advertising campaigns alone will not achieve much: "Hearts and minds requires two things a stick and a carrot, you can't just do it benefits or disbenefits that force the hearts and mind along"; (FG 3)

There was concern that we may end up investing a large amount of money in advertising campaigns and then not be able to measure the effectiveness. It is very difficult to monitor progress towards targets unless large expensive surveys are carried out; (FG 3)

Accessing travel information required to ‘join up’ journeys was viewed as more difficult here than elsewhere in Europe; (FG 3)

Poor quality information was viewed to be because of the national issue of splitting transport into a number of competing enterprises; (FG 3)

The importance of making people aware of travel information websites was highlighted. For example, the Visit Scotland website could provide links to travel information websites; (FG 3)

From the provision of school transport point of view, the current system means that you now need lots of vehicles, whereas if you stagger school opening times by half an hour, you need one vehicle per two or three schools, rather than three vehicles for each school; (FG 4)

D – Walking and Cycling Measures

Two cycling related issues that arose were the provision to carry you bike on public transport and the other is the provision to use your bike as part of your commute and leave it at a park and ride facility. Another issue is the safety of cycling in the city, where cyclists have to use bus lanes. (FG 1)

5.6 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

there has been no reference to the National Regional Cycle Network; (FG 1)

Integrate Public Transport and cycling, so you can cycle to a bus stop and park your bike; (FG 1)

we need buses that can carry a dozen or more bikes to go to the national park. At present people have to drive if they want to take their bikes; (FG 1)

Scottish rail network has little capacity for bikes or luggage; (FG 1)

There is limited room for cyclists on the road networks, cyclists use the same lanes as buses which is not a good environment, belching fumes as well as not being physically safe; (FG 1)

this is very comprehensive; (FG 2)

Define what we mean by Safer Routes to School (possibly in the glossary) and include safety in traffic sense and a well being sense; (FG 2)

‘Cycle by design’ document would be very useful; (FG 2)

SUSTRANS have been doing work to link the national route into regional routes and into the local communities; (FG 2)
Ensure that parents are part of the Safer Routes to School work and that changing both their attitudes and minimising the effect of the restrictive legislation surrounding working with children; (FG 2)

Cycling and walking access to key destinations such as hospitals and colleges was viewed as too specific for a Regional Transport Strategy; (FG 3)

Improve the quality of ‘strategic walking routes’, I mean routes into our town centres, routes to our public transport and routes for health and recreation; (FG 4)

Tackle parents using the car to take the kids to school - they endanger themselves by parking inside the school, nobody can get anywhere near it (the school), and although some local authorities are taking action towards it, there’s many who just shut their eyes to it; (FG 4)

E - Bus-based Measures

5.7 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- Buses are more polluting than any other vehicle on the road, therefore, they are unsustainable unless they are full. At air pollution hotspots in the city, buses are causing the problem; (FG 1)

- The quality of the vehicles in terms of the emissions standards needs to be looked at, there’s no onus on buses to look at that; (FG 1)

- If you’re going to have an integrated transport system, you need different size of vehicles feeding into each other according to that particular market. With smaller vehicles acting as feeders, it’s more fuel efficient; (FG 1)

- A Dual fuel approach would be ideal, polluted hotspots you could switch to electric buses; (FG 1)

- quality contracts should be implemented; (FG 2)

- A number of participants thought that Arbroath bus station redevelopment seemed out of place as a general policy intervention; (FG 3)

- There’s nothing in here about ‘enforcement’. Local authorities and bus operators can work together and have wonderful bus/passenger priority measures, even investing in raising kerbs at the side of the road. However, cars parked in the bus stop, and cars blocking/using the bus route illegally, can be quite a significant problem. There needs to be some acknowledgement that ‘enforcement’ is needed; (FG 4)

- Bus operator concerns are: achieving the standards of frequency, for all the time that buses are delayed in traffic, you have to keep re-building that in, and it’s either going to be the cost of putting another bus into the service, in some cases the service might justify another bus, or you end up having to reduce the frequency, say from every ten minutes to every twenty minutes during the peak, which then puts people off because it’s a reduced service, so it’s a never-ending spiral, if you don’t tackle the key issue which is the speed of the journey; (FG 4)

- I’m strongly in favour of the idea of setting up some sort of minimum service frequency; and (FG 4)
If there are minimum standards you should be achieving them, not seeking to achieve them? It’s passing the buck. It’s saying here “Tactran will seek to achieve minimum standards”. (FG 4)

**F – Rail-based Measures**

5.8 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- Need a new Rail / bus interchange in Dundee; (FG 1)
- Railway tunnels / bridges and single tracks restrict the carriage of freight; (FG 1)
- Height of the tunnel prevents electrification; (FG 1)
- There is a need to do full accessibility audits at all rail stations in the TACTRAN area; (FG 1)
- Add to action F3.2, Do full accessibility (eg ease of physically getting into) audits at all rail stations in the TACTRAN area; (FG 2)
- Need a rail service from Dundee to Glasgow using semi fast rail; (FG 2)
- it was felt that details about train frequencies and improvements to specific stations were too specific; (FG 3)
- not clear what the expression ‘Park and Choose’ meant. It was suggested that it would probably be better to either not use the expression or add a definition to the document; (FG 3)
- The only problem not mentioned here, there is no connection in Dundee with bus services to the railway; (FG 4)
- Strong agreement to encourage more freight by rail; and (FG 4)
- Could also consider using the waterways to move freight. (FG 4)

**G – Measures associated with Improving Multi-Modal Interchange**

5.9 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- It needs to address multi-modal interchange across regions, for example, we need a Park and Ride at Tayport (Fife); (FG 1)
- The biggest inter-authority commuter movements are from Angus into Dundee City and that this is a badly served bus route. (FG 1)
- The problem with the bus service from Angus into Dundee is that the majority of the buses come into Dundee City Centre but the majority of the retail parks and the hospital are sited on the periphery; (FG 1)
- Express coach services shouldn’t need to come into the towns, there should be interchange facilities along the dual carriageways that interchange with local buses; (FG 1)
- Emphasise the land-use planning side of interchange. Have to be engaging with developers to take transport into account when they’re actually developing, so that interchange can be designed into a development; (FG 4)
The parking problems at urban rail stations have been noted, and they’re talking about building additional or bigger car parks, but it should be trying to encourage people to use the bus to get to the rail station; (FG 4)

Perhaps too much emphasis on Park and Ride – Park and Ride is very important, but getting to the main transport nodes by other public transport, or sustainable means is more important. (FG 4)

**H – Community and Demand Responsive Transport**

5.10 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- Concessions should be available on demand responsive transport provided by community transport operators such as shared taxis; (FG 1)
- TACTRAN should play a role in campaigning to remove the inhibitors on community transport and its integration with more regular public transport to enable them to compete for subsidised routes; (FG 1)
- Rural childcare providers should provide transport to keep parents out of cars; (FG 1)
- In rural areas, you have to look at the total transport demands including parcels, freight, mail and even hill-walkers. Examples of taxis taking rucksacks from B&B to B&B along walking routes; (FG 1)
- add ‘engage with DfT and overcome legislative barriers’; (FG 2)
- add in the scheme ‘Wheels to Work’ - the unemployed can get to work with a low cost motor bike; (FG 2)
- Needs to be a clear definition of what ‘Demand Responsive Transport’ is. Also, there needs to be more emphasis put on ‘capacity building’ in the CT sector; (FG 4)
- There’s an assumption that Demand Responsive Transport can only be delivered by CT? Don’t think that’s true. In which case, why isn’t it in with the rest of the bus stuff? (FG 4)
- The important thing is that the DRT is complementary, if you like, to the main bus and rail network, it doesn’t, in any way, seek to compete with it; and (FG 4)
- If taxicard is meant to be a concessionary…. something which plugs the gap... left by the people who can’t get on the buses who would otherwise have had concessionary fares, then fine. But if taxi card just means concessions for taxi users, then I don’t think it goes far enough. Point needs clarification. (FG 4)

**I – Road-based Measures**

5.11 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- Clacks – Stirling, Fife – Dundee. There is a need to look at cross-regional routes; (FG 1)
- Congestion on the Tay Bridge; (FG 1)
- A82 Crianlarich bypass – within the TACTRANS area but not mentioned here? (FG 1)
(Action I7.1) journey experience of transport initiatives within the national parks. Ensure that road design respects the area of scenic beauty, that we don’t have roundabouts and an urban road experience in an area of outstanding beauty; (FG 1)

The impact of potential commercial flights going into Leuchars (St Andrews International Airport) would have an effect. They would need an upgraded link between Dundee and Leuchars. There is a current rail link between Dundee and Leuchars; (FG 1)

Why is an upgrade of the A9 eg addition of at grad interchanges not in the paper? (FG 2)

It was thought that the intervention should be to address the problems with the Kingsway rather than specifically saying that we need to build a new road; (FG 3)

The Strategy Document should not include the words ‘A90 Outer bypass’ and should only include ‘investigate all possible options for A90 corridor for Dundee’; (FG 3)

One participant comments that the road based intervention identifies the three critical traffic problems in the TACTRAN region (I1, I2 and I3). However, only I2 is within TACTRAN’s control, the others are Scottish Executive issues; (FG 3)

the term ‘high priority vehicle lanes’ should be used as an alternative to ‘bus lanes’; (FG 3)

if there was a M9/A811 grade separated junction then that would relieve a lot of the traffic pressure in that particular corner of Stirling; (FG 3)

J – Freight-specific Measures

5.12 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

There should be an additional action under IV_J3. They need to look at current capability of rail to carry freight, - bridge height, bottlenecks, size of containers; (FG 1)

The timber industry is expanding the volume of timber that will be coming out over the next 10 years. Their work is to identify where and how much timber will be coming out of Stirling and Tayside and to assess transport provision and identify pinch-points on the roads. It is going to be an increasing issue and they would like to get TACTRAN involved; (FG 1)

TACTRAN should work with the Stirling and Tayside Timber Transport Group and the Forestry Industry and this should be put explicitly into the Strategy; (FG 1)

The timber currently is carried by road as there are limited opportunities for timber on rail. (FG 1)

It was felt that the most important intervention would be a good strong Regional Freight Quality Partnership. The FQP can actually start delivering interventions. A small Steering Group (with a large number of stakeholders) was proposed as this would make the partnership more manageable and effective (FG 3)

Weight restricted bridges were considered problem that the ports have. In Dundee access problems and weight restrictions are most problematic near the ports. In the future, coastal shipping will probably become more important. Weight restrictions on the road to the harbour, this will discourage business; (FG 3)
K – Air Transport Measures

5.13 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- No mention of Leuchars? (FG 1)
- Do not think that Dundee airport will have passenger growth as it cannot support more flights (size of the airstrip) and with a small business community, there would be insufficient demand; (FG 1)
- Is this strategy only looking within its own area or can we address links to other airports? (FG 1)
- Dundee airport can deliver one or two key services that deal with bulk demands to places like London, but a whole lot of travel people will always have to go to Edinburgh so access to Edinburgh remains one of the key things.”; (FG 3)
- “it’s important that TACTRAN working with Highlands and Islands becomes positive and not adversarial and that TACTRAN puts across the point that this is a facility for the area and not an airport for Dundee. It’s an airport in Dundee and its for the region”; (FG 3)

6 ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES CONSIDERED

6.1 Everyone at this group thought that the strategy had the right balance and did not think any of the alternative strategies were as good. (FG 1)

6.2 Here are the comments from Focus Group 3, where emphasis was placed on the economy:

- “Really feel very strongly that we need to concentrate on are the economic prosperity aspect of things if were not going to get that right were not going to achieve anything at all”;
- “If we don’t have economic prosperity then we don’t have the finances to make other elements sustainable”;
- “Economic development probably needs to have more weight and schemes skewed towards it”; and
- “Balance …….I’d skew it towards the economy if we could”.

6.3 Also in Focus Group 3, the importance of the environmental sustainability theme was stressed in relation to the tourism industry: “You can’t have tourism without good quality environment and that’s one of our key industries so there has to be a bit of balance there.”

6.4 Some positive comments about the strategy:

- As a strategy document it is fairly well-balanced. If you put too much emphasis on one or the other, you’re going to….somebody’s going to pay the price, somewhere down the line; (FG 4)
- To be honest, I think it’s one of the better documents; (FG 4)
- I think it’s more - ‘realistic’ is a word I would apply to it; and (FG 4)
I think – comparing it with the Sestran one – I think the Sestran one seemed quite complex – overly complex, and that, to me – the strategies have identified different problems and different approaches you can take, it just needs less ‘consideration’ of things and a bit more action in it.

7 CHAPTER EIGHT – MONITORING (20 minutes)

Be more specific about what we mean in the first economy sub-objective when we say limiting growth. Eg ask businesses the question. In your opinion is the transport infrastructure surrounding you limiting the growth of your company? Yes/No (FG 2)

The Stirling LA representative mentioned that economic change and transport infrastructure change is unlikely to show over the period of a year so perhaps the survey of businesses should be done less frequently; (FG 2)

Looking at the % residents making uncongested/ unreliable journeys was seen to be measuring dependant on peoples perceptions, which the LA and Stakeholders in the group did not like; (FG 2)

Accessibility - eyes glazed over at the hansen measure; (FG 2)

Environment - Why only CO2 as a measure? (FG 2)

Health & Well-being - We should add % of active mode (walk or cycle) trips made by TACTRAN school children as a measure; (FG 2)

Security and Safety - Do not replicate the accident statistics that are collected locally. Perhaps the measure should be to show a reduction at the regional level; (FG 2)

The group could not see why personal security was in the table. We could add: "Due to the fact many people report not using PT because they do not feel secure the TACTRAN strategy aims to measure and reduce this feeling of insecurity"; (FG 2)
1 Introduction

1.1 TACTRAN Draft RTS was published on 22 January 2007 for an eight week consultation period, during which time all stakeholders and the public were invited to comment on the proposed Strategy and associated proposals for improving transport infrastructure, services and facilities.

1.2 On 28th February five further Workshop sessions were held with groups of Key Stakeholders in the Discovery Centre in Dundee. The purpose of these consultations was to gain an in-depth understanding of the wider Stakeholders Groups views on the Draft RTS. Tables 6 in Appendix M detail the participants of the workshop and the groups in which they participated.

2 Results from Chapter 5 - Delivering Economic Prosperity

What do you think of the 7 bullet points for delivering economic prosperity?

- Delivering Economic Prosperity ('for TACTRAN' should be added); (FG 1)
- Confusion over the relative roles of Transport Scotland and Local Authorities; (FG 1)
- Scottish Enterprise isn’t mentioned here at all and given that economy is the number one agenda, the economic development body for Scotland is not mentioned here as a consultee; (FG 1)
- There are no delivery mechanisms for delivering economic prosperity, it’s about talking to this person, that person; (FG 1)
- We have producers here who are supplying ASDA with all their potatoes, they’re shipping them out in trucks. Why are we not talking to those producers? (FG 1)
- It has to be focussed on the particular needs of this area and this area should be reflected more in the strategy; (FG 1)
- Strategy balanced towards the public rather than the private sector. It’s all about talking to the public sector. And if we are talking about delivering economic prosperity, the people you should be talking to are large organisations and the private sector; (FG 1)
You could take this strategy to SESTran and shove it in. It has to be more specific to represent the TACTRAN region; (FG 1)

The Strategy should have reflected the economic base of TACTRAN. It should take cognisance of the local area, in particular the local industries, such as:
- Chemical sector;
- Forestry;
- Agriculture (soft fruit and root vegetables);
- Media;
- Tourism (Perthshire & Stirling);
- Biotech.

The economic impact of increasing transport costs to local producers. Any slight increase in the cost of transport has a great effect. The EU predicted 2 weeks ago that the price of DERV in the next five years is going to double; (FG 1)

One of the bullet points should be Travel Planning – getting people to work. This is addressed under the interventions but should be mentioned here and made more explicit; (FG 1)

However, if people don't have access to a car/transport, whether in rural/urban areas, the best roads in the world aren't going to do anything for them; (FG 3)

Road schemes are not sustainable – if roads are built/improved they will just fill up with people – need to look at ways of managing the growing demand on the road system; (FG 3)

when a housing scheme is built –it's outside the city and nobody ever thought of transport issues when they wanted to build the housing scheme. Need more coordinated planning; (FG 3)

Example of A92, which led to increased prosperity in Arbroath - housing has changed dramatically. People in Arbroath have jobs in Dundee; (FG 3)

Maybe we need less transport – with more people using computers, we don't need to travel so much, we need to travel differently; (FG 3)

FS felt that disabled access to transport is also important here – she wants to travel to go shopping, to go out for meals etc – these things all contribute to the economy; (FG 3)

There is a conflict of interest concerning economic benefit and retail centres, who are not in favour of reducing private car travel to/through their location; (FG 4)

More on recent trends/stats – trunk road traffic is not increasing so much now – it was down 2.5% in Dundee and Angus in 2005, yet the economy is still expanding; (FG 4)

The proposed relief road round Dundee will lead to further housing development, more cars commuting in and out of Dundee and therefore actually make the problem on the Kingsway worse in the long run, not better. (FG 4)
3 Results from Chapter 5 - Connecting communities and being socially inclusive

What do you think of the 5 bullet points for connecting communities and being socially inclusive?

3.1 Comments:

- This is a bit too politically correct. There should be more emphasis on connecting people with jobs; (FG 1)

- The work that we have done that overlaps with this was in the hospitality industry in rural areas. How do you get a sous-chef to work at a hotel 10 miles up the glen. That type of issue should come under connecting people; (FG 1)

- There is a huge project being planned at the end of Loch Tay, and we’re being asked ‘how are the punters going to get there by public transport?’ This is where DRT can come into play. We are underselling the possibilities of DRT enormously; (FG 1)

- 3rd bullet point – should be wider, should include education and leisure opportunities as well; (FG 3)

- IJ suggests there should be more clarification about the definitions used. Eg the last bullet point refers to DRT – need to define what you’re talking about, to make clear “this is what we understand by community transport” etc. DRT isn't just one-to-one transport; (FG 3)

- Suggestion that PT could include CT. Throughout the document, there's a narrow focus on what CT is and could be; (FG 3)

- Accessibility is not just physical – interchanges can be difficult, connecting times, seamless ticketing, security and safety are all issues; (FG 4)

- Often in a rural area, a bus stop will be at a road end, but there is no safe access to that road end – no pavement or footpath; (FG 4)

- Disabled people can access PT at a bus station, but may not be able to get to the bus station in the first place; (FG 4)

- Community and demand responsive transport also need good connectivity to scheduled services; (FG 4)

- There are lots of unused or infrequently used vehicles fleets around that could be put into action with a bit of thought – school buses, health board vehicles, post and so on; (FG 4)

- Planning and land use needs to take account of transport issues – particularly developments in remote areas; (FG 4)

- Integrated ticketing is needed but there are loads of practical issues – competition issues/restrictions; (FG 4)

- Bullet 3 – Transport should not be a bolt on at the end of the process, but needs to have a say much earlier in the process; (FG 4)

- Bullet 1 – should be about all road users – as it is worded, it implies drives only. (FG 4)
4 Results from Chapter 5 - Delivering Environmental Sustainability and Health and Wellbeing

What do you think of the 4 bullet points for delivering Environmental Sustainability and Health and Wellbeing?

4.1 Comments:

- They would like the strategy to address the impact of the green agenda (carrot and stick) on delivering economic prosperity. Would like recognition that as the environment agenda changes over the next 5-10 years, the strategy will respond to that. They feel there should be a piece added to this section to give confidence that the future effects of the green agenda are noted; (FG 1)

- Would like to have seen the impact of Peak Oil, Carbon Tax and the increasing costs of DERV; and how this will affect businesses in the TACTRAN region. It has been forecast that the cost of DERV will increase by 50% over the next 5 years; (FG 1)

- Travel Planning as a discipline should be in here; (FG 1)

- It seems to be impossible to marry these things – eg building roads will cause more emissions; (FG 3)

- Important to improve PT, in order to cut car use and emissions. This is where DRT comes in as well; (FG 3)

- We also need to look at fuel – examining the kinds of fuel used; (FG 3)

- Travel planning is key to environment and health issues. There is good technology and information available for personal travel planning, but the information needs to be fed back to local authorities and transport operators; (FG 4)

- In clusters of smaller businesses – retail and business parks – often they work together on travel plans, but then these are not monitored; (FG 4)

- Residential transport plans for new developments – some respondents think there is a threshold number of households before the developer has to do something about transport, so developers phase building so that they always come in under this threshold; (FG 4)

- New residential developments are often not PT friendly or public roads not built to the spec needed for buses – transport needs to get a say before plans are approved; and (FG 4)

- There should be some reference to the ageing/longer living population and the increasing demands on PT as a result. Good transport planning can enable people to stay in their own homes for longer. (FG 4)

5 CHAPTER 6 – INTERVENTIONS

A – Land and Planning related Measures

5.1 Comments and thoughts on this section included:
One participant who thought chapter 5 gave insufficient attention to ‘travel to work’ was pleased to see IV_A2, however, he thought this should be made more explicit and mentioned in chapter 5. There was consensus that there should be a bullet point in chapter 5, ‘delivering economic prosperity’ that explicitly states ‘travel to work’; (FG 1)

As well as parking standards at all new developments, they would like to see public transport considered with all new developments. (FG 1)

B – Information Related Measures

5.2 Comments:

- One respondent commented that this is the wrong way round, since the regional strategy should inform the local one; (FG 4)
- Strong consensus that TACTRAN should not replicate what is already being done, but should have an overview, share learning from good practice, maybe provide some minimum standards; (FG 4)
- TACTRANS needs to decide what it wants to be hands off or on, model SPT or overview. If hands on, then would need to eliminate the local authority role – not replicate; and (FG 4)
- Don’t forget walking and cycling and adjoining areas; (FG 4)
- Standard information panels for all modes of transport should be at all stops and termini; (FG 4).

E – Bus-based Measures

5.3 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- If you want to increase bus use, you need to increase the number of buses. Examples of having to book seats on buses for longer distance journeys; (FG 3)
- There are issues about disabled access on buses. Many companies have no disabled access, and even those who can take wheelchairs can often take only one at a time; (FG 3)
- there is not a great mention of QBPs in the document – there should be more of a focus on this – and there’s a training element to that as well; (FG 3)
- This section is really looking at commercial bus services, but when you’re looking at accessibility and integration, ‘bus based measures’ should include the smaller, not for profit community groups as well; (FG 3)
- Even if buses are improving in terms of low floor access etc, this may make them more accessible but they don't go everywhere at the right time/in the right direction; (FG 3)
- the main problem in Dundee which is most of the buses stop at 7pm; (FG 3)
- More focus needed on DRT. Socially subsidised bus routes run by commercial companies should stop – money should be put into demand responsive transport instead; (FG 3)

F – Rail-based Measures

5.4 Comments and thoughts on this section included:
Main emphasis is on improving the speed of inter-city services, to encourage people on to PT; (FG 3)

this is linked into the economic and environmental argument as well - faster inter-city links by rail will reduce use of air links; (FG 3)

Having better rail services, and better linked services, will affect tourism and the economy; (FG 3)

One caveat – if you increase the number of stations, you increase the journey times and this may not be appreciated by the communities concerned; (FG 4)

A number of existing stations were built in places where the need has now moved elsewhere. Need to think in terms of relocation or significant improvement to interchanges at existing stations (link to buses), rather than addition of stations; (FG 4)

There is a dislocation between TACTRAN and what the other RTPs say – Hitrans has done a lot of work on additional capacity and this is well supported – an hourly Edinburgh-Perth- Inverness service. – ‘Room for Growth’ report. TACTRANS needs to mention the importance of working between regional plans – particularly re the Ladybank issues too as this will involve SESTRANS too; (FG 4)

There is no mention of the West Highland line – there are 4 stops from Rannoch to Crianlarich, through the national park, that are in the TACTRANS area; (FG 4)

Something needs to be said about level crossings and how to get rid of as many as possible; and (FG 4)

Rail freight – there might be no specific intervention, but it should at least get a mention. Work is being done to look at rail access to Dundee port, a timber terminal at Crianlarich Lower. (FG 4)

G – Measures associated with Improving Multi-Modal Interchange

5.5 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

There are opportunities for links at the proposed Dundee west station – could link with a possible shuttle service to Ninewells? There will be 5 new villages in the area, lots of employment there too; (FG 4)

The need for P& R is ‘overwhelming’. Results form Stirling are very good – the model could be used elsewhere; (FG 4)

Stirling needs another one for vehicles coming from the west. P&Rs could be further out do transfer to PT is made earlier – e.g. Bannockburn; (FG 4)

The fares regime and frequency discourage use from Gleneagles – it’s half the price if you go from Dunblane. There’s a clear demand for better park and ride at Dunblane; (FG 4)

There is no mention of taxis and integration. If people were encouraged to use a taxi every so often instead of owning a second or third car, many households would not be under such financial pressure; (FG 4)

The bus station at Arbroath needs to link to the cycle network and the national cycle route; and (FG 4)

at the moment community transport schemes are not covered by the national concessionary scheme – this is a problem particularly for some disabled people. (FG 4)
H – Community and Demand Responsive Transport

5.6 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- In the RTS, CT is quite a narrow-functioning transport provider – it’s lumped in with health care providers and other stakeholders. Although CT does provide lots of services to people who require it because of mobility/disability issues, it's much more than this. Need to define understanding of CT. It's working in a range of areas (urban, rural, peri-urban), for ANYONE who has a transport problem. Mother & toddler groups, youth groups, health groups, adult groups etc. Opportunity to further support health, social inclusion within the area – shouldn’t be pigeon-holed.

H1.1 - forum

- must ensure it includes people from different geographical areas - the challenge will be how to represent the whole of the region; (FG 3)
- we've already got a nascent alternative transport providers forum in existence in the area – this should have a contribution to forum; (FG 3)
- Important that the forum will be able to influence the views of the board; (FG 3)
- It would be good if the forum could bring dial-a-journey to the notice of the board – other parts of the area just don't have it. Persuade them to expand/develop it; (FG 3)

H2.1 - expansion of DRT provision

- Support for this, but timescale (2-3 years) seems to be much too long. “We already have the knowledge – the research is there, the experience is there, it shouldn't take 2-3 years. But if you could have something on the ground in 2-3 years, that would be great”; (FG 3)

H3.1 - region-wide taxi-card scheme

- "Dundee's experience has been pretty disastrous with taxi card"; (FG 3)
- It doesn't give people the freedom to travel that they need – the subsidy hasn't been altered since 1992, but because of the number of card holders it's way over budget; (FG 3)
- it should still be part of the DRT discussion, despite the issues experienced. Should be seen as part of the PT system. Disabled people should be able to access PT in all its modes - aim is full accessibility/equality; (FG 3)
- All the taxi card schemes differ – eg in terms of eligibility, the number of trips, level of fare reduction etc. TACTRAN should definitely look at what's going on in the area, to see what the problems are, if they can be ironed out, if they can be improved, and how it can fit in with DRT; (FG 3)
- There isn’t a lot about the taxi trade in this document – should be more; (FG 3)
- AR argues for a national scheme – should extend the bus scheme to other forms of transport, for those who can’t use buses. If you can't access buses, and you don't drive, you're stuck. Need to have options; (FG 3)

J – Freight-specific Measures
5.7 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- A lot of work coming out of the ‘Freight Action Plan’ and TACTRAN should work to ensure that they are involved in any work that is done through the FAP; (FG 1)
- One of the actions from the Freight Action Plan is for Scottish Enterprise to do a piece of work on Intermodal hubs. Locally, they will look at the freight depot situation for the 3 mentioned ports; port volumes and initial technical appraisals; (FG 1)

K – Air Transport Measures

5.8 Comments and thoughts on this section included:

- Scottish Enterprise policy is not to promote Dundee Airport. It’s a question of prioritisation; (FG 1)
- Rather than be in External Connectivity, links to other airports should be an Intervention in section K. (FG 1)

6 ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES CONSIDERED

- The economy should not be allowed to predominate/impose itself on everything – needs to be done in conjunction. That's where the environmental/sustainability issue is so important; (FG 3)
- Sub-strategies would be useful. Eg focus on social inclusion - across all modes etc. (FG 3)

7 EQUALITIES

- The equalities emphasis is missing from the document. The word is not used a lot. Need to look at certain groups and see if they're treated equally, if there is discrimination. Eg ethnic communities; (FG 3)
- positive discrimination may be required for some groups; (FG 3)
- FS said disabled people ARE discriminated against eg when buses cannot accommodate wheelchairs; (FG 3)

8 CHAPTER EIGHT – MONITORING (20 minutes)

- Under economy, there was a concern about what the definition of ‘limiting growth’ refers to; (FG 2)
- Also under economy, the group felt that showing a change in annually would be difficult so perhaps it would be better to complete the survey every 2 or 3 years; (FG 2)
- In reference to congested/ unreliable journeys the group felt that there was a problem with perception of unreliable. Some people feel a minute’s delay is too long others think an hour is too long for example; (FG 2)
It was suggested that the actual question from the SHS should be used and comment made on how it should be interpreted given so as to be more specific; (FG 2)

Under **Environment**, why only CO2? (FG 2)

Under **Health and Well Being**, it was noted that mode share targets should be set for school trips; (FG 2)

Under **Security and Safety**, it was noted that accident statistics are done locally and there is no need to repeat these on a regional basis but perhaps looking at them aggregated would be useful; (FG 2)

9 **GROUP FIVE**

9.1 A separate discussion group was convened, comprising stakeholders who had attended one or other of the focus group sessions held on the 8th and 13th February. It was decided to focus the discussions on the aspects of delivery and monitoring, which had not been discussed at the earlier sessions.

9.2 In considering how the RTS would be delivered, stakeholders found difficulty in commenting on this aspect. Rather, the question led to stakeholders seeking clarity on the proposed arrangements and inter-relationships with the existing authorities as delivery bodies. The range of points raised covered:

- The continuing role of local authorities in the development and delivery of local schemes and initiatives
- The inter-relationship between regional and local strategies; who has the power? Who will drive delivery?
- TACTRAN should be issuing guidance at the regional level and setting priorities
- There is a need to get quick wins
- The need for major schemes, particularly the roads schemes, was questioned should the range of other initiatives prove successful
- There appeared to be a lot of interventions, many in conflict.

9.3 Each stakeholder was asked in turn to address the following question:

**From your perspective, what are your three main priorities for the RTS and were you to come back in three years time, what measures would you use to judge the success?**

9.4 From the perspective of the **motor cycle interests**, the priorities would be:

- Simple first steps to encourage the use of powered two-wheelers (PTWs) – secure parking, the ability to use bus and HOV lanes
- To encourage use of PTWs as a sustainable form of travel and a first choice after the car
- Improved road maintenance
- Increased awareness of PTWs from other road users

9.5 Success measures would include:
increased use of PTWs (measured via household survey), particularly for commuting
increase in facilities provided for PTWs

9.6 From the perspective of a **port operator**, key initiatives would include:

- Improvements to key access routes, particularly A90 Kingsway and A92
- Infrastructure improvements to aid access covering restricted road geometry and bridge weight restrictions
- A multi-modal approach to developing the business case for rail freight facilities, recognising these will need road access
- Initiating the proposed Freight Quality Partnership and being involved in it
- Measures to attract European business – quality of access and air services are related to the perception of the port; external links to the region are key.

9.7 Measures of success would be:

- Number of successful business cases made
- Bridges fixed
- Increase in coastal shipping
- Increase in employment levels
- Increase in throughput and fabrication activities
- Increase in number of cruise ships

9.8 From the perspective of providing **health services**, key initiatives would cover:

- Improved services for existing needs, not just handling future changes; local health centres provide a particular challenge for transport
- Improved integration of council and health buses
- Improved co-ordination of transport services

9.9 Measures of success would be:

- Improved accessibility to services (measured via accessibility mapping)
- More efficient use of vehicles – less to deliver more.

9.10 From the perspective of a **bus operator**, key initiatives would be:

- Bus priority is key; Dundee is good but other centres need improvements
- Enforcement of bus priority
- Co-ordination with operators on road works – local authorities have a role in keeping public transport reliable
- Addressing the issue of the school run – use of yellow buses advocated

9.11 Measures of success would be:

- Improved journey times on key corridors
Improved reliability statistics – keeping to schedule
Increased use of buses

9.12 The issue of access to health facilities was considered from the perspective of **community transport provision**. Key initiatives included:

- Recognition that health starts and finishes at the front door – provision of a hub and spoke system of public transport provision
- Co-ordination of the various separate service providers, eg McMillan and Marie Curie
- Co-ordination and provision of ‘call-back’ service – many stops are wasted through missed or changed appointments at hospitals
- Car-free hospitals

9.13 Measures of success would include:

- More people making their (currently) unmet demands in better quality vehicles
- Public transport service information linked and co-ordinated.

9.14 Two final general points were raised:

- Co-ordination with Visit Scotland on links between tourism destinations and travel arrangements
- A good measure of success would be that TACTRAN is held up as an example of good European practice.
1 Introduction

1.1 As part of the consultation, a survey was conducted as a paper-based questionnaire, electronic questionnaire and on-line survey. The categories of respondents were:

- Statutory Consultees:
  - Local Authorities; and
  - Health Boards;
- Other Statutory Bodies:
  - Scottish Executive;
  - Community Planning Partnerships;
  - National Park Authorities;
  - Scottish Natural Heritage;
  - Scottish Environmental Protection Agency; and
  - Historic Scotland;
- Regional Transport Partnerships;
- Key Stakeholders;
- Representatives of Other Groups; and
- The General Public.
1.2 The questionnaire consisted of open and closed questions on the following topics:

- Issues & Objectives;
- The Preferred Strategy;
- Proposed Interventions;
- Targets;
- Equality;
- Further Comments; and
- Demographic Information.

1.3 A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix I of the Consultation Report.

2 Summary of Responses

2.1 A total of 143 responses were received by the end of the consultation period (1700 on Friday 16 March), as follows:

- 28 electronic copies of the questionnaire.
- 28 paper copies of the questionnaire; and
- 87 written responses.

2.2 Of these 143 responses, 8 were duplicates (i.e. more than 1 form of response was used by the same respondent):

- 2 respondents submitted a written response and a completed hard-copy questionnaire;
- 4 respondents submitted electronic questionnaire and a written response;
- 1 respondent submitted both the electronic and the hard-copy questionnaires; and
- 1 respondent submitted 2 written responses.

2.3 9 responses were received after 1700 on Friday 16 March. It was agreed that a belated response from HITRANS would be included in the statistical analysis.

2.4 A list of all respondents is provided in Appendix J of the Consultation Report.

2.5 Responses received by the end of the consultation period from the 136 respondents included:

- 6 Statutory Consultees;
- 10 Other Statutory Bodies;
- 5 Regional Transport Partnerships;
- 31 Key Stakeholders;
- 50 Representatives of Other Groups (including local councillors and MSPs/MPs); and
- 34 members of the general public.

2.6 The pie chart in Figure 1 below illustrates this breakdown of respondents by category.
3 Overall Level of Agreement with the Strategy

3.1 Figure 2 presents the level of overall approval of the Preferred Strategy, based on the 54 questionnaires and 62 of the 87 written responses from which the level of support for the Preferred Strategy could be deduced.

3.2 From this consultation, there was strong agreement that the Preferred Strategy had the correct balance between its 3 strategic themes, overall, 76% of respondents either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the Preferred Strategy, as shown in Figure 2 below.
4 Other Key Statistics

4.1 The statistics in this section are based on the 54 questionnaire-based responses (27 paper and 27 electronic) received by the end of the consultation period. An inconsistent response received from one respondent using both the electronic and the hard-copy questionnaires has been excluded from this statistical analysis. Both responses are available on request.

4.2 Overall, there is strong agreement with the Objectives which the TACTRAN RTS should try to achieve, with 79% of respondents who either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the Objectives. See Figure 3 below.
4.3 As can be seen from Figure 4, 73% of respondents either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the analysis of the main issues facing TACTRAN.

Figure 3 Level of agreement with the Objectives

Figure 4 Support for the Analysis of Issues
4.4 There was majority support for the list of Preferred Strategy Interventions and Actions with 70% agreeing or strongly agreeing with the proposed interventions and actions, as shown in Figure 5 below.

![Do you agree with our Interventions and Actions?](image)

**Figure 5 Support for the Proposed Interventions**

4.5 There was less support for the set of targets which might be adopted in order to monitor and measure progress on achievement in meeting the RTS Objectives. 51% of respondents felt that these targets which appeared in the consultation draft were not ambitious enough. (See Figures 6 and 7 below for further details).
4.6 Regarding the possibility of the RTS having a negative impact on any of the key 'Equality Groups', 12% of respondents believe that the draft TACTRAN RTS might have a negative impact on any key equality group. See Figure 8 for details.
Do you think the TACTRAN RTS might have a negative impact on any equality groups?

- Yes: 59%
- No: 29%
- Don't know: 12%

Figure 8 Negative Impacts on Equality Groups
Appendix I
Public Consultation Questionnaire
Give us your views on the Tayside and Central Scotland Regional Transport Strategy

Public Consultation Ends 16 March 2007.

The Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership (TACTRAN) is made up of four local authorities, Angus, Dundee, Perth & Kinross and Stirling. It’s one of seven newly formed statutory Regional Transport Partnerships established under new legislation aimed at improving the planning and delivery of transport in Scotland.

In its first year the Partnership is drawing up a Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) which will address transport issues in the region over the next 10-15 years. The RTS will be the main regional framework guiding investment in transport in the Tayside and Central Region of Scotland, and will provide the strategic direction for transport policy in each of the four TACTRAN local authorities.

We have conducted some consultation to establish the transport issues across the region and to prioritise the objectives for the future, and this has informed the draft strategy which has now been prepared. We would now like your views on the draft strategy which will help us shape the final strategy. You can read the entire draft strategy document or a summary document at www.tactran.gov.uk.
Issues and Objectives

Chapter 3 of the RTS describes the Objectives which the RTS should try to achieve in order to improve transport within the TACTRAN area.

1) Overall, do you agree with the Objectives presented in the RTS?
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

2) If you have any specific comments on the Objectives please state them in the space below, referring to the relevant Objective number:

Chapter 4 of the RTS describes the key Issues affecting transport in the TACTRAN area.

3) Overall, do you agree with the analysis of the issues presented?
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

4) If you have any specific comments on the Issues, or feel there are any significant omissions which have been made, please state them in the space below:
The Preferred Strategy

Drawing on the Issues and Objectives for the RTS, we have developed a Preferred Strategy that is designed to address the diverse needs of the TACTTRAN region. Chapter 5 of the RTS sets out our Preferred Strategy, which has at its heart three key strategic themes:

- Delivering economic prosperity
- Connecting communities and being socially inclusive
- Environmental sustainability and promoting health and well-being.

5) Overall, do you agree with our Preferred Strategy?

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

Our Proposed Interventions

Chapter 6 of the RTS sets out under 11 categories (e.g. Land Use; Walking and Cycling, Bus, Rail etc.) a proposed list of **Interventions and Actions** which we propose to undertake in order to improve the transport system in support of our Preferred Strategy. Section 6 also indicates the types of interventions which would be included, or have higher priority, under the 3 Alternative Strategy scenarios we considered.

6) Overall, do you agree with our list of Preferred Strategy Interventions and Actions?

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

7) If you have any specific comments on the Interventions or Actions, or feel there are any significant omissions, please state them in the space below, referring to the relevant Intervention or Action number:

8) Do you have any comments on the Alternative Strategies Considered and associated Interventions, as discussed in section 6.4 of the RTS? Please indicate any comments in the space below:
Our Targets

Chapter 8 of the RTS suggests some possible Targets which might be adopted to monitor and measure progress on achievement in meeting the RTS Objectives.

9) Overall, do you agree that the Targets are appropriate?
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

10) Are the Targets:
    - [ ] Not ambitious enough
    - [ ] About right
    - [ ] Too ambitious
    - [ ] No opinion

11) If you have any specific comments on the Targets, or wish to suggest additional or alternative Targets, please state them in the space below, referring to the relevant section:
Equality

The TACTRN RTS will seek to ensure that the needs and requirements of any groups within society who may encounter barriers when using the Transport System, or who are deemed most likely to experience inequality, are addressed.

In particular we will aim to ensure that our RTS is fair to all and no one is at a disadvantage in using the transport system through:

- Gender
- Age
- Disability
- Sexual orientation
- Race; or
- Religion

12) Are you aware of any transport-related needs and issues that might be faced by particular equality groups that are not addressed within the TACTRN RTS?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t Know

If ‘Yes’, please explain why:

13) Do you think any aspect of the TACTRN RTS might have a negative impact on any equality groups?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t Know

If ‘Yes’, please explain which aspect and why:
Other Comments

14) Do you have any other comments on the TACTRAN draft strategy? If so, please write them below:

Information About You

In order to help us classify responses, please can you answer the following questions about yourself. These questions will be treated in the strictest confidence, will only be used to analyse our results, and will not be passed to any third parties.

15) Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
☐ Yes
☐ No

If 'Yes', please state which organisation:

If you are not responding on behalf of an organisation, please complete the remaining questions

16) What is your home postcode?

17) In general what are the three means of transport you most frequently use?
*Please rank your three most used means of transport, marking "1" against your most frequently used, "2" for your second, and "3" for your third most used means of transport.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Car (passenger)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>Community Transport</td>
<td>Van/HGV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>Other – please specify below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>Car (driving)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18) How many cars are normally available for private use by you or members of your household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19) Are you Male or Female?  
(Please select one option)

Male          Female

Thank you for your comments and feedback. Your input is greatly appreciated and will help to shape the development of the final TACTRAN Regional Transport Strategy.

**Data Protection**: Your details and answers will be kept on a database and used only for the purposes of this public consultation; they will not be used for any other purpose.

Paper versions of this questionnaire, including a **large print version** are available by telephoning **0131 220 6966** during office hours.

If you require a translation or assistance in completing this questionnaire, please do not hesitate to contact the TACTRAN team on 0131 220 6966.
Appendix J
Info Note 38 - Public Consultation list of Respondents
1 Public Consultation List of Respondents

1.1 A total of 143 responses were received by the end of the consultation period (1700 on Friday 16 March 2007), as follows:

- 28 electronic copies of the questionnaire.
- 28 paper copies of the questionnaire; and
- 87 written responses.

1.2 Of these 143 responses, 8 were duplicates (ie more than 1 form of response was used by the same respondent):

- 2 respondents submitted a written response and a completed hard-copy questionnaire;
- 4 respondents submitted electronic questionnaire and a written response;
- 1 respondent submitted both the electronic and the hard-copy questionnaires; and
- 1 respondent submitted 2 written responses.

1.3 9 responses were received after 1700 on Friday 16 March. It was agreed that a belated response from HITRANS would be included in the statistical analysis.

1.4 A list of all respondents is provided in Appendix J of the Consultation Report.

1.5 Responses received by the end of the consultation period from the 136 respondents included:

- 6 Statutory Consultees;
- 10 Other Statutory Bodies;
- 5 Regional Transport Partnerships;
- 31 Key Stakeholders;
- 50 Representatives of Other Groups (including local councillors and MSPs/MPs); and
- 34 members of the general public.
1.6 The pie chart in Figure 1 below illustrates this breakdown of respondents by category.

**Category of Respondents**

![Pie chart with breakdown]

**Figure 1 Disaggregation by Category**

**Table 1 List of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angus Council</td>
<td>Statutory Consultees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td>Statutory Consultees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>Statutory Consultees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Council</td>
<td>Statutory Consultees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Forth Valley</td>
<td>Statutory Consultees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Tayside</td>
<td>Statutory Consultees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Executive</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Community Planning Partnership</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Community Planning Partnership</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Community Planning Partnership</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Community Planning Partnership</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairngorms National Park</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Scotland</td>
<td>Other Statutory Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HITRANS</td>
<td>Regional Transport Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESTRANS</td>
<td>Regional Transport Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESTRAN</td>
<td>Regional Transport Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Transport Partnership</td>
<td>Regional Transport Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>Regional Transport Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern Angus</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Transport Forum</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRA</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Association</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of Passenger Transport (CPT)</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Right to Ride (Arbroath)</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Right to Ride (Errol)</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Accessible Transport Action Group (DATAG)</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First ScotRail</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forth Ports PLC</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth Tayside</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Rail Partnership</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest Housing Association</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets Scotland</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland (MACS)</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Action Group (MAC)</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Focus</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Community Transport Group</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Accessible Transport Alliance</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Association for Public Transport</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Enterprise Tayside</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOKES</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagecoach</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Road Bridge Joint Board</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Archeology Service Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Dundee</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRVS</td>
<td>Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT Scotland</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Scotland Roads AIU</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Alan Jack, Bridge of Earn</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee's Local Access Forum</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Rural Kinross-shire</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Racecourse</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitlochry Senior Citizens' Good Neighbour Association</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish and Southern Energy plc</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, Logistics &amp; Tourism (TLT)</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr John Mair Auchterarder PKC</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Young Auchterarder PKC</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Green Party (G. Burton)</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Bank (MP)</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Swinney (MSP)</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ruskell (MSP)</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseanna Cunningham (MSP)</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiona Baird (MSP)</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Jackson (MSP)</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and Bute Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Communities Dept. DDC</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnprior Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchterarder and District Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchterhouse Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balquhidder Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackford Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair Atholl and Struan Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braco and Greenloaning Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge of Allan Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broombridge Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughty Ferry Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambusbarron Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnoustie Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drymen Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errol Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fintry Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamis Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Lyon &amp; Loch Tay Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killearn Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lundie, Muirhead and Birkhill Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milnathort Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monifieth Community Council and Action Rail Monifi</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murroes &amp; Wellbank Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raploch Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Burgh of Arbroath Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scone Community Partnership</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathfillian Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmartine Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tealing Community Council</td>
<td>Representatives of Other Groups - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public (n=34)</td>
<td>General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses Received after 1700, Friday 16 Mar 2007**

- First
- Transform Scotland
- Dundee Green Party (R. Brenk)
- Kirriemuir Community Council
- Pitlochry & Moulin Community Council
- Tayside Recyclers
- General Public (n=2)
1 Introduction

1.1 The table below contains the name and organisation of every key stakeholder consultee in the TACTRAN RTS study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Older Peoples Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen, Angus &amp; Moray Archaeological Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberfeldy Motor Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberfoyle Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action of Churches Together in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison of Callander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AILLST Tourist Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Access Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Association of Voluntary Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Gold 50+ project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Housing Association Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Rural Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Transport Forum &amp; Multimodal Transport Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbroath &amp; District Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong of Crianlarich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Government for Older People Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and Minority Ethnic Elders Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Community Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Waterways Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broons Buses &amp; Taxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryans’ Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTCV Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Users Complaints Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ByCycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caber Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairngorms National Park Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Parliamentary Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Scotland Fire Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Scotland Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Scotland Racial Equality Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Shopmobility Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Key Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Sightseeing Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close the Gap Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRA - Campaign to Open Blackford Railway Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for Racial Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner for Children and Young People in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of British Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of Passenger Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoSLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crieff Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA (Community Transport Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists Touring Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dare Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafblind Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-a-Journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Drivers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docherty's Midland Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee &amp; Tayside Chamber of Commerce and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Access Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Accessible Transport Action Group (DATAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Blind &amp; Partially Sighted Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Key Stakeholders

Dundee College
Dundee Khawatee Group
Earnside Coaches
Edinburgh & Lothians Racial Equality Council
Educational Institute of Scotland
Elizabeth Yule
Enable
Engender
Ethnic Minorities Law Centre
EWS
Far Play Scotland
Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group - Scottish Head Office
Federation of Small Business
Ferguson Coaches
First
First Scotrail
Fisher Tours, Dundee
Forest Enterprise
Forestry Commission Scotland
Forestry Commission Scotland, Cowal & Trossachs Forest District
Forfar Chamber Business Group
Forfarshire Society for the Blind
Forth Housing Association Ltd
Forth Ports PLC
Forth Valley College
Freight Transport Association
Friends of the Earth Scotland
G&N Wishart
Glasgow Anti-Racist Alliance
Glenesk Travel
Goosecroft Coaches Ltd
Grampian Racial Equality Council
Great North Eastern Railway
Hamilton Coaches
Hamish Gordon Coach Hire
Harlequin Coaches Ltd
Help the Aged
Highland Rail Partnership
Hillcrest Housing Association Ltd
Historic Scotland
Hunter's Executive Coaches
IAM Motoring Trust
Inclusion Scotland
James Donald
JP Minicoaches
Kingshouse Travel Ltd
LGBT Youth Scotland
Living Streets
Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park
Mackie's Coaches
McColl's Coaches Ltd
McGill's Bus Services Ltd
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Meffan's Coaches Ltd
Mitchell's Coaches
M-Line Coaches
Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland
Montrose Chamber Group
Montrose Port Authority
Morrison's Travel
Motorcycle Action Group
National Express
National Farmers Union of Scotland
National Trust for Scotland
Network Rail
NFU Scotland
NHS Forth Valley
NHS Tayside
Passenger Focus
Paths for All Partnership
Paths to Health
Pegasus Travel
Perth & Kinross Association of Voluntary Services
Perth & Kinross Community Transport Group
Perth & Kinross Heritage Trust
Perth Airport
Perth Chamber of Commerce
Perth College
Perth Harbour
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Note 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perthshire Housing Association Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phab Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitlochry Station Liaison Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action in Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige Tours Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramblers Association Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACH Community Health Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNIB Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPB Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Accessible Transport Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Agricultural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Association for Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Association for Public Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Badgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Citylink Coaches Ltd / Stagecoach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Civic Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Consortium for Learning Disability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scottish Council for Development and Industry
Scottish Council for Minorities
Scottish Council of Jewish Communities
Scottish Council on Deafness
Scottish Cyclists Union
Scottish Disability Equality Forum
Scottish Enterprise Forth Valley
Scottish Enterprise Tayside
Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Scottish Executive
Scottish Executive Development Department
Scottish Executive Env & Rural Affairs Department
Scottish Executive Environment Group
Scottish Further Education Unit
Scottish Inter Faith Council
Scottish Landowners Federation
Scottish Natural Heritage
Scottish Pensioners’ Forum
Scottish Pensions Association
Scottish Refugee Council
Scottish Road Safety Campaign
Scottish Traveller Education Programme
Scottish TUC
Scottish Water
Scottish Wildlife Trust
Scottish Youth Parliament
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scottways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEA Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Studies Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidlaw Executive Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Sons Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagecoach East Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling and Tayside Timber Transport Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Business Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Council Environment Services - Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Council Environmental Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonewall Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmore Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &amp; K Sweeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Road Bridge Joint Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside Association for the Deaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside Biodiversity Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside Fire Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hotel Guest House and B &amp; B Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scottish Pre-Retirement Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Transport Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TRAN$form Scotland
Travel Dundee
University of Abertay (Dundee Business School)
University of Dundee
University of Stirling
Update
Virgin Trains
Visit Scotland
West Dunbartonshire Domestic Abuse Partnership
West of Scotland Racial Equality
West of Scotland Seniors Forum
Women@Work
Woods Coaches
WRVS
WWF Scotland
YWCA
Appendix L
Info Note 37 - List of Equality Consultees
1 Introduction

1.1 The table below lists the ‘Equality Groups’ invited to participate in TACTRAN RTS consultations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>Age Concern Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>Better Government for Older People Network (South Lanarkshire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>CoSLA, Spokesperson for Older People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>Help the Aged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>Scottish Older Peoples Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>Scottish Pensioners’ Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>Scottish Pensions Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>Senior Studies Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>STUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>The Scottish Pre-Retirement Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>West of Scotland Seniors Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and older people</td>
<td>WRVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>CACDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Capability Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Central Shopmobility Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Dare Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Deaf Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Deafblind Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Dundee Accessible Transport Action Group (DATAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Enable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Inclusion Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>RNIB Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Scottish Association for Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Scottish Consortium for Learning Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Scottish Council on Deafness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Scottish Disability Equality Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Sense Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Equality</td>
<td>Scottish Civic Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>Action of Churches Together in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>BEMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>Black and Minority Ethnic Elders Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>Black Community Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>Catholic Parliamentary Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>Central Scotland Racial Equality Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>Commission for Racial Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>Communities Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>Dundee Khawateen Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Religion</td>
<td>Edinburgh &amp; Lothians Racial Equality Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Religion</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Institute of Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Minorities Law Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Anti-Racist Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampian Racial Equality Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action in Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACH Community Health Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Council of Jewish Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Further Education Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Inter Faith Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Traveller Education Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Community Relations Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT Youth Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonewall Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close the gap Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Play Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish TUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women@Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dunbartonshire Domestic Abuse Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner for Children and Young People in Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

1.1 The tables below list the participants from the following consultations:

- workshops held on 22\textsuperscript{nd} and 26\textsuperscript{th} June 2006;
- workshops held on 3\textsuperscript{rd} August 2006;
- workshops held on 3\textsuperscript{rd} November 2006;
- targeted consultations 21\textsuperscript{st} November 2006;
- focus groups held on the 8\textsuperscript{th} and 13\textsuperscript{th} February 2007; and
- workshop Participants 28\textsuperscript{th} February 2007.

**Table 1 Local Authority Workshop Attendees 22\textsuperscript{nd} & 26\textsuperscript{th} June 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Dept/Service</th>
<th>LA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Cochrane</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ged</td>
<td>Gilmartin</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Community Planning</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Laing</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Madden</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>Millar</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Angus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Nisbet</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Angus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Prentice</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Angus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Pyper</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Angus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Robertson</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Angus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivien Smith</td>
<td>Community Planning</td>
<td>Angus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Brooks</td>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Trading Standards</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Docherty</td>
<td>P&amp;T Department</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Fleming</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niall Gardiner</td>
<td>P&amp;T Department</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Gellatly</td>
<td>P&amp;T Department</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Gibb</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan Gourlay</td>
<td>P&amp;T Department</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Harris</td>
<td>P&amp;T Department</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Page</td>
<td>P&amp;T Department</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Reekie</td>
<td>Social Work Department</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merill Smith</td>
<td>Leisure &amp; Communities Department</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persephone Beer</td>
<td>Environment Service</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brydone</td>
<td>Environment Service</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Deans</td>
<td>Environment Service</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Esson</td>
<td>Environment Service</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kyle</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Marshall</td>
<td>Environment Service</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Warrington</td>
<td>Environment Service</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Will</td>
<td>Environment Service</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Bell</td>
<td>Roads &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iain Binning</td>
<td>School Travel Coordinator</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 Wider Stakeholder Workshop Attendees 3rd August 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Masson</td>
<td>Angus Transport Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Bell</td>
<td>TACTRAN - Stirling Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Golding</td>
<td>Scottish Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Coplan</td>
<td>Scottish Pensions Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Yellowlees</td>
<td>First ScotRail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Brooks</td>
<td>Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick O'Shaughnessy</td>
<td>Visit Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Graham</td>
<td>COBRA - Campaign to Open Blackford Railway Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Falconer</td>
<td>Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Hearsum</td>
<td>Dial-a-Journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erl Wilkie</td>
<td>Cycling Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Roach</td>
<td>Highland Rail Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Scott</td>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeme Hodge</td>
<td>Angus Gold 50+ project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lee</td>
<td>Travel Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gibb</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Community Transport Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Laing</td>
<td>Tay Road Bridge Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt North</td>
<td>Forth Ports Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gale</td>
<td>Scottish Enterprise Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niall Gardiner</td>
<td>TACTRAN - Dundee City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Harry</td>
<td>Montrose Ports Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom McDonald</td>
<td>Scottish Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lauder</td>
<td>Sustrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Tough</td>
<td>University of Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Anderson</td>
<td>Scottish Enterprise Forth Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Milne</td>
<td>TACTRAN - Stirling Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Howden</td>
<td>TRANSform Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan Gourlay</td>
<td>TACTRAN - Dundee City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John MacKay</td>
<td>Cyclists Touring Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Rouse</td>
<td>Central Shopmobility Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjory Rodger</td>
<td>Confederation of Passenger Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Flanders</td>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Gollan</td>
<td>Dundee Society for Visually Impaired People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 2nd Wider Stakeholder Workshop Attendees – 3 November 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Masson</td>
<td>Angus Transport Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Humphry</td>
<td>ByCycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>COBRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjory</td>
<td>Rodger</td>
<td>Confederation of Passenger Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>Cycle Touring Club Tayside DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>Cycle Touring Club Tayside DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>Dochery</td>
<td>Docherty’s Midland Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Dundee Access Group for Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Dundee Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Gollan</td>
<td>Dundee Society for Visually Impaired People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Forth Ports PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Millar</td>
<td>Forth Ports PLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>Loch Lomond and Trossachs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus Groups and Workshops Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Wunsh</td>
<td>National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Milroy</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Patullo</td>
<td>NHS Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Sadler</td>
<td>P &amp; K Community Transport Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Anderson</td>
<td>Scottish Enterprise Forth Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Noad</td>
<td>Scottish Enterprise Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Davidson</td>
<td>Scottish Enterprise Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom MacDonald</td>
<td>Scottish Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Crerar</td>
<td>Tay Road Bridge Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Howden</td>
<td>TRANSform Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Tough</td>
<td>University of Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick O'Shaughnessy</td>
<td>Visit Scotland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 Targeted Consultations 21st November 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Davison</td>
<td>MVA Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whittle</td>
<td>MVA Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Hearsum</td>
<td>Dial-A-Journey Stirling – Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Sadler</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Transport Group (PKCTG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Prescott</td>
<td>R.D.W. PKCTG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Anderson</td>
<td>Dial-A-Journey Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Aitken</td>
<td>On behalf of Hospital Driving Service – Comrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Fletcher</td>
<td>Community Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gibb</td>
<td>Blairgowrie Freedom Coach Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Masson</td>
<td>Angus Transport Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus Groups and Workshops Participants

- Dennis Fisher | Community Transport Association
- Frank Muggridge | Strathcare
- Bill O’Driscoll | PKCTG & Perth & Kinross Public Transport Unit Forth
- Sandra Robertson | Valley Territory Manager WRVS
- Bill Michie | Kinross Volunteer Group & Outreach Centre
- Ann Munro | Kinross Volunteer Group & Outreach Centre
- Kathleen Coffey | WRVS

### Table 5 Draft RTS Focus Groups’ Participants 8th and 13th February 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Company/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morag Treanor</td>
<td>MVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Anderson</td>
<td>Scottish Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Dixon</td>
<td>Stirling and Tayside Timber Transport Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Brooks</td>
<td>Environment Dundee City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Masson</td>
<td>Angus Transport Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Brooks</td>
<td>Trossachs National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persephone Beer</td>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Anderson</td>
<td>Scottish Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Davison</td>
<td>MVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treavor Docherty</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Johnston</td>
<td>Senior Traffic Engineer, Angus Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Patullo</td>
<td>Operations Manager, NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Samson</td>
<td>Passenger Focus Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Gaunt</td>
<td>Representative for re-opening of Blackford Rail Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Scrutton</td>
<td>Better Government for Older People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Groups and Workshops Participants 28th February 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Company/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morag Treanor</td>
<td>MVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Longhurst</td>
<td>Scottish Council for Development and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan Gourlay</td>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Tough</td>
<td>University of Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gale</td>
<td>Scottish Enterprise Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Davison</td>
<td>MVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John MacKay</td>
<td>Cyclists Touring Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian McConnell</td>
<td>CTC Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Hutchison</td>
<td>Scottish Badgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Bell</td>
<td>Stirling Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Bryan</td>
<td>MVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Hamilton</td>
<td>Dundee Access Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Patullo</td>
<td>DATAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Goodall</td>
<td>DATAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Rees</td>
<td>Scottish Accessible Transport Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iain Johnstone</td>
<td>Community Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Torrance</td>
<td>Scottish Pensioners’ Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Scott</td>
<td>Angus Access Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Cochrane</td>
<td>Angus Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Biggar</td>
<td>MVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Robertson</td>
<td>Scottish Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Neil</td>
<td>City Sightseeing Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hart</td>
<td>Scottish Association for Public Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Lee</td>
<td>Travel Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Roach</td>
<td>Highland Rail Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Milroy</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Millar</td>
<td>Transport Manager, Infrastructure Services, Angus Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whittle</td>
<td>MVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Masson</td>
<td>Angus Transport Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Peat</td>
<td>First Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Wykes</td>
<td>Motorcycle Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Millar</td>
<td>Port of Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Patullo</td>
<td>NHS Tayside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sirs

RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION ON THE TACTRAN REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

The TACTRAN Regional Transport Strategy was considered by the members of the Council's Infrastructure Services Committee at its meeting on 8 March 2007.

The report and the meeting considered a range of inputs from officers and members, resulting in a variety of observations and comments on the strategy ranging from some general observations to some very specific comments on detailed aspects of the strategy.

Looking initially at general comments, whilst welcoming the development of a Regional Transport Strategy which tries to identify the issues facing the Region and individual parts of the Region, and also recognising the substantial amount of work which has been put into the development of the document by yourself, Council officers and consultants there were some concerns that the document is not easily understood by people reading it for the first time and coming new into the process. It is not clear who the document is aimed at. It is very technical in places and although section 1 does give a brief introduction to each section it does not explain the flow through the document and therefore it is difficult to follow through the document from the vision to the delivery of the objectives. It is therefore suggested that an expanded introduction is included in the document. It is also believed that it would benefit from a summary section to allow people to pick the elements which they feel they need to consider.

I have set out below a variety of comments on each section of the strategy. They range from some questions of principle to some details on specific observations. As you know from your attendance at the Infrastructure Services Committee on 8 March the Committee was concerned at the absence of any comment in the strategy relating to bridge tolling [and specifically with regard to the Tay Road bridge]. The Council is very strongly of the view that tolling harms economic development and the traffic queuing harms the environment and therefore there should be an intervention to promote removal of tolls.

Section 2 - The TACTRAN Region

Page 2.4 – 2.6

Whilst the cross-boundary and inter-authority movements shown are interesting they are of little value in determining strategy because they relate to arbitrary local authority boundaries.
They highlight the high level of commuting into the City of Dundee but they do not reflect for example the commuting from rural Perthshire into Perth.

Page 2.4, Para 2.3.2

Reference is made to cross-boundary movements. It should be made clear that this is the boundary between TACTRAN and neighbouring regional transport partnerships.

There is also some question over the quality of figures 2.4 and 2.5, particularly as the scale and size of the arrows are misleading as they do not reflect the scale of the movement.

Page 2.8, para 2.3.6

The last sentence refers to the housing in the southern belt of the region which will exacerbate problems. It is not clear from this section what the "southern belt" refers to. This could be interpreted in a number of different ways.

It would be beneficial if terms such as "southern belt" are to be used in the strategy that they are specifically identified either by defining the parts of the authorities that are included or by showing them in a diagram.

Page 2.10

Reference is made to the Tay Estuary Rail Study. This Council strongly supports the proposals within that study, the increased frequency of trains and increased stopping. However within this section there is a suggestion of the creation of new stations at Dundee West, Blackford and Greenloaning. Clearly, new stations are only viable if the train operators are prepared to stop at those stations and if stopping at those stations does not further restrict the use of existing stations to maintain speed and travel times.

Page 2.15, para 2.3.27

This section is looking at a range of issues around community transport, rural transport and demand responsive transport. It is essential that the needs of all people with access difficulties are properly assessed and addressed. There have been exchanges of correspondence in recent months from the Executive concerning the use of rural bus grant and demand responsive transport and the transfer of these to transport partnerships. It is essential that this strategy sets out a balanced approach which identifies the specific needs and alternatives for provision to improve accessibility to all groups relating to their specific needs and the nature of the location. This should ensure that people with access needs in rural and urban areas have their needs assessed and that funding is distributed to tackle their needs.

The strategy should also recognise the benefits of local input into these processes and local concerns at the proposals to re-allocate this funding to a regional control rather than to local authority control.

Page 2.16, para 2.3.28

This section deals with Park & Ride and Park & Choose, which is an important element in providing an integrated transport service and for tackling congestion on strategic and local networks, particularly in relation to the three main cities within the TACTRAN area.

It is important also not to see Park and Ride in isolation. Park & Ride needs to be looked at as part of an assessment for major route improvements, particularly if the congestion
problems are restricted primarily to the peak periods. Removal of the congestions through the provision of Park & Ride facilities could remove the necessity for significant capital investment in the short, medium and long term.

Page 2.17, para 2.3.30 – 2.3.32

The variety of port and harbour facilities within the Region should be seen and heralded as a success and opportunity to provide improved accessibility and improved economic growth. The ports are separately and independently an economic driver for local economies, and are in effect independent business units. The Transport strategy should be supporting all of these units as independent, not trying to direct or prioritise between them. It is important that the three ports are seen as independent ports with different facilities meeting different needs, and whilst there are accessibility problems to each of the ports, these need to be considered as an integrated but independent set of facilities, not as a choice between each. The officers and members of Angus Council feel very strongly that the strategy should reflect the need to improve accessibility to all three of the ports rather than one at the expense of the others, and therefore that three independent interventions are needed.

**Section 3 – Our Vision and Objectives**

Section 3 of the strategy usefully and concisely summarises the vision and interaction with the national transport strategy and the linkage between the objectives for this strategy with the six themes from the national transport strategy.

**Section 4 – Trends and Issues**

This section deals with a range of issues and their level of importance in the development of a strategy. However, it is not initially clear how these issues are addressed in the rest of the strategy. The interventions in section 6 and the prioritisation in section 7 relates to the objectives which were developed in terms of the vision. Only when studying Appendices A and B does it become evident that these trends and issues played a part in the development of the objectives in Section 3.

**Section 4.2 – Economy Issues**

Page 4.2, sections 4.2.5 – 4.2.7

These look at commuting patterns but like other parts of the strategy they look at these patterns in terms of the local authority areas, which can be misleading because they do not reflect the commuting patterns into specific centres and again would miss, for example, the commuting patterns into Perth from rural Perth & Kinross. It may be beneficial if information was available to look at commuting patterns into the main centres.

**Section 4.3 – Accessibility, Equity and Social Inclusion Issues**

Page 4.7, para 4.3.4

This deals in part with access to hospitals and makes reference to the times and success of getting patients to main hospitals. There is no indication as to what is categorised as a "main hospital" and where these main hospitals are located to give any indication as to where the issues or problems actually are.
This section deals with the complexity of public transport fares and their availability. Simplification and consistency of fares would certainly help.

Page 4.9, para 4.3.14

This identifies a number of key issues and there are some general statements about availability in public transport provision, both during the day and night. However there is no specific reference to the gaps in public transport in rural areas. This is a significant issue, particularly as Item A8 makes specific reference to insufficient/patchy taxi cards and/or DRT services. If issues are specifically going to relate to this level of detail then it is important that rural aspects are also picked up in these issues as a specific issue.

Section 4.4 – The Environment

No comments at this stage.

Section 4.5 – Health and Well-Being Issues

Page 4.12, para 4.5.4

This highlights the key issues in relation to health and well-being. Issue H2 makes reference to poor health "caused by lack of exercise, overuse of the car for short trips". Whilst poor health may be caused by a lack of exercise and gaining exercise by making all short trips by walking or cycling is probably a good solution, it is not correct to say that poor health is caused by the use of cars for short trips. Issue H4 identifies large school catchment areas, particularly in rural areas with reduced opportunities for walking and cycling as a cause of poor health. This needs specifically to be related to walking and cycling to schools, and clearly living in a rural area provides greater opportunities for walking and cycling, but the distance within large catchment areas may restrict walking and cycling to schools.

Section 4.6 – Safety and Security

No comments at this stage.

Section 4.7 – Integration

No comments at this stage.

Section 4.8 – Opportunities

Page 4.17

The third bullet point, under accessibility, makes reference to the extension of the concessionary travel scheme to young people. Whilst this is to be welcomed the benefits of this scheme only apply where there is public transport available for young people to use.

Page 4.18

The fifth bullet point, under integration, implies that you have to have a consistency in policy across the whole of the region to deliver integration. This is clearly not the case. Integration does not rely on consistency of policy, it only relies on rational and integrated policies. These policies can vary significantly across the region depending on the needs in that area. This is clear for areas such as parking where the parking demands and implications in rural
areas such as Angus differs significantly from the need to use parking and parking charges in the cities as a means of demand management. Such charges are not needed in a predominantly rural area like Angus.

Section 5 – Preferred Strategy and Alternatives Considered

General

This section sets out the preferred balanced strategy around the three themes of:

Delivering Economic Prosperity
Connecting communities and being socially inclusive
Delivering environmental sustainability and health and well-being

Whilst section 5.2 tries to explain the process of developing the preferred strategy through appendices A and B it does not explain where the three themes came from.

Appendices A and B are not easy to follow.

Appendix A briefly explains that the issues led to the objectives but you have to go to Appendix B to understand how.

Specific Comments

Page 5.2, para 5.2.4 Bullet 4

This section is a commitment to demand management. Clearly demand management in the form of car park charges or road pricing is not appropriate in rural areas, therefore this statement needs to be modified to apply it “only where appropriate”.

Section 6 - Interventions

Section 6 of the strategy looks at the range of interventions. Whilst outlining the process for the development of the intervention options and making reference to a web site option the strategy does not make clear in the introduction why the categories of intervention from A to K were concluded as being the way of packaging the interventions. It utilises the sub-objectives which were developed earlier in the process and outlined earlier in the strategy and uses these to indicate the impact the interventions will have.

Reference Case Assumptions

Page 6.2, paras 6.1.10 – 6.1.12

These paragraphs discuss the reference case without identifying the time basis of this reference case. This is significant in that the reference case as set out in 6.1.10 indicates these are interventions already in an advanced stage of planning which have not been subject to further appraisal for this strategy. It is implicit in this that they are ongoing and will be supported. The reference case schemes are a very small list of schemes which range in scale and nature from Dundee Waterfront Development to road safety awareness training.

It is not clear whether all of the schemes in the reference case appendix meet the criteria in paragraph 6.1.11 and have all of the necessary funding in place. Some of them would appear to require funding from future revenue or capital programmes. If this is the case then there are a number of other projects and strategies which are at a similar stage of approval and where works have commenced as part of these strategies.
General Comments

Whilst looking at the nature of interventions with a number of them relating to the development of strategies engagement with organisations and the development of policy frameworks, it should be made clear in setting the scene that the creation of Regional policies and strategies do not necessarily result in the same approach in all parts of the TACTTRAN region because they all have different challenges and issues.

It is therefore important to be very clear in this strategy that these specific interventions will focus on the areas where these will achieve most in dealing with the issues faced by those communities. It is also important to be very clear that the development of a regional strategy or regional best practice does not in itself suggest that TACTTRAN is the most suitable organisation for the delivery of that strategy and that in keeping with the policy of service delivery being as local as possible, most of these strategies and policy frameworks should be delivered by constituent partners, unless it can be demonstrated that there are significant benefits to be derived from them being delivered by TACTTRAN.

Specific Comments on Proposed Interventions

Page 6.5, para 6.2.30

It is unclear what is being proposed in action B1.2 and whether this is the creation of new systems, new paper systems and electronic systems or the co-ordination of existing systems operated and delivered by constituent authorities and other partners. It is important that in any intervention we are clear how this will be delivered.

Page 6.6, para 6.2.34

This paragraph indicates that demand management strategies and measures such as parking policies or road space re-allocation is appropriate across all of the TACTTRAN area. This is of course not the case and therefore the end of para 6.2.34 should end with the additional four words of “where this is appropriate”.

Page 6.6, para 6.2.40

It is noted that TACTTRAN has agreed to upgrade the Dundee Liftshare.com in advance of the strategy approval because revenue funding became available.

Page 6.6, para 6.2.41 & 6.2.42

These paragraphs relate to the development of a regional parking policy framework. It is important to recognise the impact that parking and the differing charging regimes can have on travel options. It is important to have a parking policy framework. It is however also essential that the parking policy framework reflects the differences in nature throughout the TACTTRAN area, the need for demand management in the cities of Perth, Stirling and Dundee and to recognise the lack of alternatives in rural Perthshire, Stirling and Angus and therefore the need to have different parking policies and parking strategies in these areas where parking charges can lead to social exclusion, and negative impacts on local economies.

Page 6.7, para 6.2.45

This paragraph promotes more walking and cycling, and the provision of cycle parking at stations and major bus stops.
Whilst the integration of services linked to walking and cycling must be welcomed this policy statement falls short of the ideal where cyclists can take their bicycles on trains and buses which will allow them to complete their journey at the other end. Paragraph 6.2.45 only makes references to providing facilities at the terminal points.

Page 6.8, para 6.2.57 - Action E1.2 (Quality Bus Partnerships)

This intervention is seeking to achieve minimum standards. There is a risk here that this could be misinterpreted as not seeking to provide the maximum service levels and maximum frequencies. This is particularly an issue with rural areas where the frequencies are very limited, especially off-peak. If the intention is to raise the minimum standard this needs to be clearly stated.

Page 6.8, para 6.2.57

Action E1.2 also makes reference to the partnership between TACTRAN and operators. This partnership must obviously include the individual local authorities not just TACTRAN and the operators.

Page 6.9, para 6.2.63 – Rail Based Measures

This paragraph indicates the linkage between the Regional Transport Strategy and the various rail related strategies at a national level. It is important as is highlighted in this paragraph that frequency and journey times are improved. However it is also essential that stopping patterns of trains properly reflects the needs of local communities.

Page 6.9, interventions F1 – F3

These set out the various desirable improvements in terms of frequencies, journey times, and the introduction of new services in line with the Tay Estuary Rail Study. However they are confused and confusing to anyone reading them and it may be better to indicate what levels of service we were looking for from the rail services rather than this mixed approach to the different aspects of the rail services. This is important because it is not clear in paragraphs 6.2.65 for example how frequently services will stop at the intermediate stations between Aberdeen and Dundee, and Dundee and Edinburgh.

Page 6.11 – Multi Modal Interchange

**Intervention G1**

Bus-based Park & Ride is an essential part of an integrated transport network, particularly where there are large inward commuting issues in relation to main centres. Therefore it is essential that a bus based Park & Ride is provided to support the range of other measures in tackling accessibility and congestion.

**Intervention G2**

This focuses on the proposed improvements at Dundee railway station. Dundee railway station is clearly a significant hub for the eastern part of the TACTRAN area, therefore proposals to improve the railway station as part of a wider regeneration in the Dundee waterfront area should be supported. However as a transport hub it is essential that this is not just seen as a railway station improvement, that it is clearly a major multi-modal interchange and therefore needs to be strategically linked to other public transport in the form of local buses and coach services as a major interchange.
Page 6.12, para 6.2.87

Parking for interchange with rail based Park & Ride again must be seen as an important aspect of a transport strategy. It is however important to ensure that this is adequately linked to the local parking regime and parking charges regime, so as not to impact on local communities.

Para 6.12, para 6.2.92 - Intervention G6 Integrated Ticketing Schemes

The Council strongly supports any initiative to simplify ticketing and make it easier for people travelling on public transport to gain access to and transfer within the network with the greatest ease.

Page 6.13, para 6.2.93 – 6.2.100

This section considers community and demand responsive transport. It is essential that these services are not seen in isolation. Community and demand responsive transport must be developed in close liaison with bus based public transport, particularly in areas where the quality and level of service is limited, ensuring that one area of service is not developed, provided or enhanced to the detriment of these other areas and therefore disadvantaging different groups.

Page 6.14 - Road Based Measures

These areas of the Transport Strategy are often the most sensitive with the polarisation of views coming to the fore in terms of the nature of the intervention and the prioritisation of interventions.

Intervention I1

Angus Council, Infrastructure Services Committee recognises the importance and significance of the improvement of the A90 corridor through Dundee and agree it must be seen as a high priority, options for upgrading the Kingsway should be considered including the other parts of the strategy, Park & Ride and bus priority which could significantly reduce the current peak hour congestion, Angus Council Infrastructure Committee is not supportive of a new “Outer Bypass” within its administrative boundaries.

Intervention I2

This proposes a new Tay crossing at Perth. This clearly will have a significant beneficial impact in and around Perth, however it will also have an impact elsewhere within the TACTRAN region. The potential diversion of traffic off the A90 on to the A94 at Perth will undoubtedly have an impact on the traffic in and around Dundee and therefore will have a potential impact on any proposed scheme or improvements on the A90 in Dundee. Diversion of traffic from the A90 on to the A94 which is a single carriageway will also have impact on local communities along that corridor. Clearly these need to be assessed and considered as part of that scheme proposal.

Page 6.15 - Intervention I4 Road Safety Improvements on the A92 North of Arbroath

The proposals in relation to this intervention are very strongly welcomed. The only issue relating to these proposals is whether they should actually be considered as part of the reference case as works in relation to these improvements are already well beyond the design stage with some being implemented on site in the current financial year. If they are
not considered to be part of the committed programme they must be Short Term High Priority.

Page 6.16 - Intervention J2 Improved Links to the Ports of Montrose, Dundee and Perth

As stated earlier when looking at the issues and vision the three ports serve different communities, different needs and create different opportunities for economic development and economic growth throughout the TACTTRAN area. The development of improvements in the corridors to these ports is essential to allow them to continue to develop. However these strategies should be developed independently, therefore linking the road improvements in the three areas together is inappropriate. A strategy should be produced separately for accessibility to each of the ports.

There is a very strong case for the improvements to the A935 connecting Montrose and the A90 at Brechin being included as part of the reference case as the works on parts of this scheme are already being funded by TACTTRAN through the current year's funding and funding in 2007/08. Therefore, as a reference case which has been well developed there is no need for TACTTRAN to investigate improvements. These schemes can be included in the short term programme and as they are currently being funded by TACTTRAN should also be identified as a high priority within that short term programme.

Page 6.19 – Page 6. 22

These pages look at the alternative strategies and highlight the schemes/interventions which would be added into the strategy if different weighting was given to the three different priority themes within this strategy. This of course distorts the reality. Assuming that the funding which was available for the delivery of these strategies is relatively fixed, then changing the weighting of the strategy would not simply add these schemes/interventions to the intervention programme. It would necessitate the removal of other interventions from the programme. It is important when introducing the alternative strategies that this is made clear, otherwise it could be assumed that these alternative interventions will be available in addition to those set out in the preferred strategy.

Section 7 Delivery

General Comments

This section considers the prioritisation and time frame for the delivery of each of the interventions. Therefore comments on section 6 should also carry forward.

The principles of prioritisation and putting a timescale on the delivery is essential.

The prioritisation of high, medium and low are reasonable but it is not clear how these have been arrived at for individual interventions.

The time categorisation is also reasonable in that it considers what can be delivered.

There are clearly issues related to the linkage between time and priority especially where the intervention is not in itself a delivery, for example it may be a short term high priority to develop a policy or strategy, or get a project in a national programme, however the programme makes no reference to the prioritisation or timescale for delivery. It is recognised that this is difficult because delivery of many of these will depend on available funding.
Trying to see how the intervention categories, priority and timeframe fit together is difficult, looking at sections 6 and 7. It would be much better if they were set out in a matrix.

Specific Comments

IH.1 – A92 North of Arbroath

Financial commitments have already been agreed for the work on the A92 route improvement programme therefore delivery of this must be considered as a high priority in the short term.

J2.1

This relates to the access to the ports mentioned earlier. It needs to be split into three separate interventions for Dundee, Montrose and Perth.

The interventions in relation to Montrose should be split into:

A Complete the on-line route improvements on the A935 between Brechin and Montrose (Short Term High Priority).

B Investigate further improvements to link Montrose with the Trunk Road Network (Short Term High Priority).

Section 8 – Monitoring

Measurement of success is very difficult when you have to resort to perception. Some thought should be given to how we measure the success of the specific interventions e.g. use of Park & Ride in addition to the broader objectives where the outcome can be influenced by other issues.

Funding

The key to the success of the strategy will be the available funding and how it is distributed. It would have been useful to have assessed the viability of the strategy and the sensitivity tested options against a variety of funding scenarios. As this has not been possible it will be essential to review it when the availability of funding is known.

Yours faithfully

Eric S Lowson
Director of Infrastructure Services
Dear Sir

TACTRAN Regional Transport Strategy
Draft for Consultation

I refer to the above document and formally submit Dundee City Council's response approved at Planning and Transportation Committee on 12 March 2007.

Dundee City Council strongly supports the preferred strategy as being the correct strategy for the TACTRAN region.

Dundee City Council note TACTRAN is preparing a Delivery Plan in parallel with the consultation process. The Council expects the Delivery Plan contained within the final published RTS to be used as a starting point for consultation with the constituent Local Authorities on funding of interventions and the statutory transport functions required.

In addition to the above, a detailed response to the published questionnaire is given in Appendix A to this letter.

If you have any queries regarding this matter please contact Niall Gardiner on 01382 433191.

Yours faithfully

Mike Galloway
Director of Planning & Transportation
TACTRAN RTS Consultation Questionnaire

Issues and Objectives

Chapter 3 of the RTS describes the Objectives which the RTS should try to achieve in order to improve transport within the TACTRAN area.

1. Overall, do you agree with the Objectives presented in the RTS?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

   Response: Dundee City Council strongly agrees with the objectives and sub-objectives presented in the RTS.

2. If you have any specific comments on the Objectives please state them in the space below, referring to the relevant Objective number:

   Response: No specific comments

Chapter 4 of the RTS describes the key Issues affecting transport in the TACTRAN area.

3. Overall, do you agree with the analysis of the issues presented?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

   Response: Dundee City Council strongly agrees with the analysis and key issues affecting transport in the TACTRAN area.

4. If you have any specific comments on the Issues, or feel there are any significant omissions which have been made, please state them in the space below:

   Response: Dundee City Council considers that an appropriate balance and understanding of urban and rural issues has been achieved in the RTS.
The Preferred Strategy

Drawing on the Issues and Objectives for the RTS, we have developed a Preferred Strategy that is designed to address the diverse needs of the TACTRAN region. Chapter 5 of the RTS sets out our Preferred Strategy, which has at its heart three key strategic themes:

- Delivering economic prosperity
- Connecting communities and being socially inclusive
- Environmental sustainability and promoting health and well-being.

5 Overall, do you agree with our Preferred Strategy?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Response:  Dundee City Council strongly agrees with TACTRAN RTS Preferred Strategy.

Our Proposed Interventions

Chapter 6 of the RTS sets out under 11 categories (e.g. Land Use; Walking and Cycling, Bus, Rail etc.) a proposed list of Interventions and Actions which we propose to undertake in order to improve the transport system in support of our Preferred Strategy. Section 6 also indicates the types of interventions which would be included, or have higher priority, under the 3 Alternative Strategy scenarios we considered.

6 Overall, do you agree with our list of Preferred Strategy Interventions and Actions?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Response:  Dundee City Council strongly agrees with the list of Preferred Strategy interventions and actions and the priority given to each intervention. However, with 40 of the 63 actions described as high priority, it is expected that further refinement of these priorities will be made while developing the delivery plan.

7 If you have any specific comments on the Interventions or Actions, or feel there are any significant omissions, please state them in the space below, referring to the relevant Intervention or Action number:

Response: Although bridge tolling is identified as an important issue (Issue No E12) and the Tolled Bridges Review Phase III is identified as an opportunity (page 4.17) any further mention of tolling on the Tay Road Bridge has been omitted from the document. Dundee City Council urges TACTRAN to include a statement within the RTS supporting the abolition of tolls on the Tay Road Bridge. Furthermore, in the event
that tolls on the Tay Road Bridge are not abolished as a result of the Tolled Bridges Review, Dundee City Council urge TACTRAN to include an intervention within their RTS to engage with Fife Council, SEStran, Tay Road Bridge Joint Board and the Bus Operators to investigate possible funding mechanisms for sustainable options to relocate the toll plaza to the Fife landfill.

Dundee City Council recognises that there are a number of interventions suitable for inclusion within the Strategic Transport Projects Review, but in particular considers that the strongest possible representation should be made to the Scottish Executive/Transport Scotland to include Interventions IV_F3 (Tay Estuary Rail Study recommendations), IV_G2 (Improvements to Dundee Rail Station), IV_i1(A90 Outer Bypass of Dundee), IV_G1(Bus Based Park & Ride schemes on strategic network) in the Strategic Transport Projects Review and if required the relocation of the Tay Road Bridge Toll Plaza (as outlined above) should also be included.

8 Do you have any comments on the Alternative Strategies Considered and associated Interventions, as discussed in section 6.4 of the RTS? Please indicate any comments in the space below:

Response: Dundee City Council notes the alternative strategies considered by TACTRAN, but as stated in response to questions 5 and 6 above, strongly agrees that the preferred strategy is the correct strategy for TACTRAN to pursue.

Our Targets

Chapter 8 of the RTS suggests some possible Targets which might be adopted to monitor and measure progress on achievement in meeting the RTS Objectives.

9 Overall, do you agree that the Targets are appropriate?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Response: Dundee City Council neither agree nor disagree with the current set of targets and the proposed methodology of monitoring. See response to question 11.

10 Are the Targets:

- Not ambitious enough
- About right
- Too ambitious
- No opinion

Response: Dundee City Council has no opinion on how ambitious the targets currently set are. See response to question 11.
If you have any specific comments on the Targets, or wish to suggest additional or alternative Targets, please state them in the space below, referring to the relevant section:

Response: The draft RTS currently proposes to directly monitor each sub-objective and this is causing difficulty as in a number of cases there are no directly appropriate and easily measurable targets available. In other cases subjective information is proposed. Targets must be objective and relatively easily measured and understood, without requiring significant resources.

Dundee City Council consider that appropriate targets should be set for the 6 main objectives - economy, accessibility, environment, health and well-being, safety and security, integration - using information that is readily available such as the Scottish Household Survey, Census data and information already available from the constituent Councils such as Road Traffic Reduction Act data, Accident Statistics data and other information/targets contained in Council Plans and Annual Performance Reports. More than one target could be set for each of the 6 main objectives.

Equality

The TACTTRAN RTS will seek to ensure that the needs and requirements of any groups within society who may encounter barriers when using the Transport System, or who are deemed most likely to experience inequality, are addressed. In particular we will aim to ensure that our RTS is fair to all and no one is at a disadvantage in using the transport system through:

- Gender
- Age
- Disability
- Sexual Orientation
- Race or
- Religion

Are you aware of any transport-related needs and issues that might be faced by particular equality groups that are not addressed within the TACTTRAN RTS?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

Response: Dundee City Council consider that all needs and issues faced by particular equality groups are addressed within the TACTTRAN RTS.

If 'Yes', please explain why:

Do you think any aspect of the TACTTRAN RTS might have a negative impact on any equality groups?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know
Response: Dundee City Council consider that the TACTRAN RTS will not have a negative impact on any equality group.

If ‘Yes’, please explain which aspect and why:

Other Comments

14 Do you have any other comments on the TACTRAN draft strategy? If so, please write them below:

Response: Interventions such as A90 Bypass of Dundee, Park and Ride and other road and rail projects cross local authority boundaries and Dundee City Council in general welcomes TACTRAN’s ability for strategic consideration of transport needs in the region. Dundee City Council urges that the benefits of such interventions are assessed on a truly strategic scale.

Dundee City Council note TACTRAN is preparing a Delivery Plan in parallel with the consultation process. The Council expects the Delivery Plan contained within the final published RTS to be used as a starting point for consultation with the constituent Local Authorities on funding of interventions and the statutory transport functions required.

Information About You

In order to help us classify responses, please can you answer the following questions about yourself. These questions will be treated in the strictest confidence, will only be used to analyse our results, and will not be passed to any third parties.

15 Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

• Yes
• No

If ‘Yes’, please state which organisation: Dundee City Council
Dear David

Re: Perth and Kinross Council formal response to RTS Consultation

I can confirm that Perth and Kinross Council approved the committee report that went to its Enterprise & Infrastructure Committee on the 7th March 2007. A copy of the report is attached to this letter. I can also advise that during the debate on the paper several issues arose generally in regard to potential additions to the strategy. These were, in no order of preference,

- In addition to dualing of the A.9 north of Perth there was a comment on the need for additional improvements along the A.9 Between Perth and Stirling, with emphasis on grade separated crossings at Blackford and Auchterarder
- There was a request for additional consideration to be given to the A.977 give the future forecast traffic increases
- Inclusion of a potential landmark foot/cycle bridge connecting Perth to Scone, there was strong support for this to be incorporated within the strategy
- The need for much greater clarity on the issue of Development Management particularly relating to Parking provision and Policy.

I appreciate that these comments will need to be reviewed and appraised within the framework of the existing draft strategy.

I hope these comments are of assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact me for clarification on any of these issues.

Yours sincerely

Alex Deans
Senior Transportation Officer
PERTH AND KINROSS COUNCIL
Enterprise and Infrastructure Committee – 7 March 2007

TACTRAN: REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY: DRAFT FOR
CONSULTATION

Report by the Executive Director (Environment)

This report provides a response to the publication of the Draft Regional Transport Strategy by the Regional Transport Partnership (TACTRAN)

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to:

i) welcome and support the TACTRAN ‘preferred strategy’ as highlighted in the draft Regional Transport Strategy

ii) agree the comments set out in the report as the basis for the Council’s response to the consultation draft Regional Transport Strategy

iii) Support the SUSTRANS Connect 2 bid for a new pedestrian/cycle bridge across the Tay.

INTRODUCTION:

1. As members will be aware, the Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership (TACTRAN) is one of seven Regional Transport Partnerships created under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005.

2. In the report to Committee on 29 November 2006 an update was given on the development of the Partnership. It was also advised at that time, that work was being progressed on the development of a Regional Transport Strategy (RTS), this being the principal statutory duty of the Partnership.

3. A steering group comprising the Director of TACTRAN, supported by key transportation officers from each of the Constituent Councils and the MVA Consultancy have now developed a consultative draft version of the document. As a principal member of the Partnership, and a statutory consultee to the process, the Council now have an opportunity to formally comment on the draft strategy. The full version of the strategy is available for inspection on the TACTRAN website www.tactran.gov.uk.
4. It is of note that the National Transport Strategy (NTS) for Scotland has recently been published and is subject to a separate committee report. It has always been the intention that this document would provide the policy framework for the new Regional Transport Partnerships in undertaking their activities. As can be seen from the draft document, the RTS takes broad national themes and priorities and develops these into a more regional perspective. This will, following Ministerial approval, form the framework in which the four local authorities in the TACTTRAN area will be expected to develop their transport strategies and carry out all their transport related activities.

BACKGROUND

5. The Regional Transport Partnership (RTP) has a statutory duty under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 to develop a RTS for the area comprising the four local authorities of Perth and Kinross, Angus, Dundee and Stirling. The RTS is required to set out a ‘Vision’ and ‘Objectives’ for meeting the transport needs for residents and businesses in the area over a 10-15 year horizon.

6. The legislation set out in the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 guides the development of an appropriate strategy. There is a general requirement in developing the RTS to consider: “The respects in which transport in the region needs to be provided, developed or improved and operated”. This has required quite an extensive data collation process, substantial qualitative and quantitative analysis and a widespread consultation exercise involving many of the key transport stakeholders across all of the local authority areas. In particular consideration has had to be given to a transport strategy that addresses and complements the following key areas, effectively the strategy must provide for:

   - enhancing social and economic well being and public health
   - promoting public safety, including road safety and the safety of users on public transport
   - being consistent with the principles of sustainable development and to conserve and enhance the environment
   - promoting social inclusion
   - encouraging equal opportunities and, in particular, the observance of the Equal Opportunities requirements
   - facilitating access to hospitals, clinics, surgeries and other places where a health service is provided: and
   - integrating with transport elsewhere

7. In developing the draft RTS the Steering Group has undertaken detailed transport planning analysis and a widespread consultation. The processes involved are set out via statutory guidance on the preparation of these strategies by the Scottish Executive. Details of the key supporting technical documents underpinning this draft strategy
are available for inspection on the following web page www.tactran.gov.uk.

8. The consultation period for the draft RTS will run for 8 weeks. During this time the RTP will consult formally with Constituent Councils, transport providers, relevant interest groups and Community Councils. There will be an opportunity for any other interested parties and the public generally to comment on the document as well. The consultation period will run until Friday 16 March 2007. Following the consultation TACTTRAN will review the draft RTS in light of any comments received. The Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 does require the RTP to submit its RTS to the Transport Minister by 31 March 2007 and it is anticipated the TACTTRAN Board will endeavour to meet this deadline.

DEVELOPMENT OF A DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

9. The first step in the approach to the document has been identifying the key transport trends and issues in each of the local authority areas. This has been done by a combination of activities, but principally by:

- consulting with a wide range of individual officers from each of the four authorities and collating and analysing available data
- reviewing key documents available eg Structure and Local Plans, Local Transport Strategies, Economic Development strategies etc
- consulting with a range of wider key transport stakeholders, including the Health Boards

The detailed appraisal of key trends, issues and opportunities is contained within the RTS Issues & Objectives Report, available on the TACTTRAN website www.tactran.gov.uk)

10. The next stage of the process involved developing the initial key issues phase of work and formulating an overarching ‘vision’ and comprehensive set of ‘objectives’ to base the future strategy upon. These objectives were developed by the TACTTRAN Board but are firmly aligned with key national themes: effectively comprising – Economy, Accessibility, Equity and Social Inclusion, Environment, Health and Well Being, Safety and Security and Integration.

11. The TACTTRAN ‘vision’ statement sets out the strategic direction and outcomes for the transport system over the next 15 years, which is to deliver:

‘a transport system, shaped by engagement with its citizens, which helps to deliver prosperity and connects communities across the region and beyond, which is socially inclusive and environmentally sustainable and which promotes the health and well being of all.’
12. On establishment of the wider vision and supporting objectives the next stage of the process was to ensure that the strategy being developed was geared towards the requirements of the TACTTRAN area as identified from the key trends and issues. The mechanism for this is relatively complex but in simple terms each of the objectives is 'weighted' to reflect how important it is in relation to delivering a strategy prioritised to the needs of the area.

13. The next stage of the process required a compilation of potential transport schemes or interventions, which could subsequently be considered as part of the strategy development process. These schemes or interventions consisted of either existing transport proposals within each of the four local authority areas, schemes identified through the consultation process and/or potential schemes identified through the technical analysis. The process by which schemes were generated, analysed and appraised is described in full in the full 'Options Report' available at www.tactran.gov.uk

14. Finally the schemes or interventions were then subjected to an appraisal and prioritisation against the weighted RTS objectives identified in the previous stage of the process. The schemes or interventions were then subsequently categorised by type of measure to be drawn upon for inclusion in the final strategy. A copy of the draft RTS is available for inspection in the Members Lounge highlighting the main projects and proposals for each of the four local authority areas.

THE DRAFT ‘PREFERRED STRATEGY’

15. In reviewing the region's transport infrastructure and considering in detail some of the key trends and issues surrounding all modes of transport, TACTTRAN has developed a ‘Preferred Strategy’ that addresses the many and diverse needs of the region. The strategy has in essence 3 key strategic themes, in order of importance:

- Delivering economic prosperity
- Connecting communities and being socially inclusive
- Environmental sustainability and promoting health and well being

16. These three key themes represent a balanced approach to meeting objectives and addressing the key issues for transport in the region, the themes are a reflection of the number and importance of issues faced in the region. Whilst TACTTRAN have as part of the general consultation exercise asked whether these key themes can be packaged in another order of importance, it is recommended that the Council support the balanced view taken by the TACTTRAN Board. In simple terms the order of importance can be changed by applying different 'weightings' to each of the themes.
17. Even under the preferred strategy economic prosperity has been highlighted as being the most important 'theme' for the region. This has resulted in some of the major road and rail infrastructure improvements in Perth and Kinross being included in the strategy, which I would suggest, are at this time the most important concerns for the Council.

18. It is of note that there are certain key infrastructure schemes in the area that are not part of the 'preferred strategy' at this point in time, principally the dualling of the A.9 and the improvements required in and around the western edge of Perth. These schemes would require additional emphasis given to economic objectives to be added to the 'preferred strategy'. This does not mean that these schemes should not be taken forward, only that on balance at this time there are other activities or schemes which better address core RTS objectives.

19. In relation to the future dualling of the A.9 it is recommended the Council request TACTTRAN engage with Transport Scotland to consider this project as part of the forthcoming Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR). This project, which would address many local safety issues as well as much wider economic development objectives, is of a national scale and would require significant levels of resources to move it forward.

20. In relation to the improvements needed in and around the western edge of Perth it is recommended the Council lobby TACTTRAN to reassess the pressures in and around this area. As potential improvements will not only benefit local traffic movements but have benefit to wider cross regional traffic this scheme should be considered as part of the 'preferred strategy, given the potential implications for Perth's future land use and economic development strategies. It is of note that the road network in and around this area has been highlighted as having significant operational issues using Transport Scotland's own Strategic Traffic Model.

21. The 'Preferred Strategy' has as its basis a series of key interventions across a range of transport activities. Appendix 1 highlights the particular interventions in the draft RTS that are directly related to Perth and Kinross Council area. A general comment is attached to each of the interventions in terms of support.

**ISSUES FOR THE COUNCIL**

**Major Projects**

22. The Council should note and support the references within the draft RTS to major capital projects in the Perth and Kinross Council area. TACTTRAN has made specific reference to key projects being developed and taken forward in and around Perth, principally proposals for a new crossing of the Tay, a major new bus and rail interchange in
Perth, improved rail services, improvements to Perth harbour and potential new Park & Ride sites.

23. The Council should highlight to TACTRAN that these projects need to be developed on a partnership basis as many of the projects, apart from addressing key transport issues, are closely linked in with other Council initiatives and services. Specifically the Council should ask TACTRAN to give due regard as to how management frameworks can be developed for projects in general particularly in relation to funding, project management and ultimately project delivery.

The A.977 Corridor

24. The draft RTS makes reference to particular corridors or roads which are expected to have significant increases in peak period congestion. The A.977 corridor from Kinross to Kincardine Bridge is referred to along with key other routes in the region as one of these roads. The draft RTS makes no specific reference to any intervention that seems to address this issue but the Council should request that TACTRAN consider this route and its future operation as a matter of importance.

25. The A.977 has been the subject of significant debate with the Scottish Executive over the last few years and is forecast to have significant additional traffic volumes with the opening of the new Kincardine crossing in 2009. This coupled with the concerns over the future role of the Forth Road Bridge, particularly in relation to heavy goods vehicles, may see the A.977 route take on an increasing level of importance for strategic traffic. This will have a major detrimental impact on the communities located along this route, particularly with respect to the community severance, noise impacts and safety related issues.

Development Control

26. Reference is made within the draft RTS to the issue of parking, both in relation to standards for new developments and establishing a regional parking policy framework. In relation to providing a framework for parking standards these issues are normally dealt with through the Council's own Development Control process and relevant standards.

27. It is not entirely clear what TACTRAN's views on the Roads Development Control process are or should be. Whilst there would seem to be a role in relation to large applications or applications that generate particular concerns or issues in relation to travel movement, as is effectively the role covered by Trunk Roads unit of the Scottish Executive, it would seem inappropriate for TACTRAN to concern itself with smaller applications many of which have to be dealt with on an individual basis and require a local or balanced view in appreciation of local and other wider planning issues.
28. It seems appropriate to ask TACTRAN how it intends to take a role in the Development Control process, given at this point in time it has no relevant powers. Potentially of more use to the local authority at this time would be a framework setting out a mechanism for ensuring appropriate rates for developer contributions set against future needs of the transport network, an area that is difficult to enforce at this time.

**Sustainable Transport**

29. The Council should be fully supportive of the aspiration to develop the already successful www.dundeeliftshare.com website into a regional car share scheme. It is suggested at the very least that this links into the equivalent SESTRAN scheme as there are significant linkages between the two partnership areas in terms of travel to work patterns. It is suggested the scheme be renamed www.tactranshare.com or equivalent giving a regional dimension to the scheme.

**Rail**

30. In relation to rail travel, the Council have been involved with the Highland Rail Partnership (HRP). The recent ‘Room for Growth’ Study outlined a recommended option to reduce journey times between Inverness and Edinburgh to 2 hours 45 minutes, a saving of 44 minutes on current times. This would give a much more competitive rail service for many current car trips on the A9. On the basis that this proposal can be demonstrated to be ‘complimentary’ to any enhanced Perth-Edinburgh improvements and promotes inter partnership working this proposal should be reflected within the draft RTS.

**Service Integration**

31. The draft RTS makes significant reference to the problems of achieving ‘integration’ between both transport modes and other service areas. A fragmented approach to organisation and supply through for example different operators, differing fare structures and ticketing regimes is a key factor in this. There is a good example of ‘integration’ in a public transport context within the Council area and this may be an area which can be expanded as part of a wider review of public and community transport provision on a regional basis generally. In Perth and Kinross, the Council’s Public Transport Unit, who are responsible for the planning, procurement and management of public, education and social work transport make better use of sometimes scarce resources by co-ordinating local bus services with education and social work transport. It is suggested this model could be used as a template for further consideration by TACTRAN in coordinating its approach to public transport generally.
Airports

32. It is noted that there is support in the RTS to improve services and facilities at Dundee Airport, an issue also reflected in the recent UK White Paper on Air Travel. However, it is recognised that prior to implementing any form of service or infrastructure improvements there will need to be a detailed technical and operational appraisal of the current site in particular its ability to take aircraft used by low cost airlines. It is suggested that consideration should be given by TACTRAN to potential alternative sites, in particular to the site at Errol, should there be practical constraints to enhanced facilities at Dundee.

Perth to Scone Cycle/Foot Bridge

33. SUSTRAINS the sustainable transport charity very recently announced it is making a bid to the Big Lottery Fund’s Living Landmarks: People’s Millions programme. SUSTRAINS bid is known as Connect2 and is designed, by virtue of high profile and landmark sustainable transport infrastructure projects, to trying to change people’s perceptions of their local area. The charity are looking to work with key partners around the UK to overcoming barriers that are dividing communities and making it difficult to travel by foot or cycle. After reviewing a series of potential projects nationally SUSTRAINS have identified a landmark crossing of the River Tay as a key project to be taken forward.

34. The need for a foot/cycle bridge from Perth to Scone has long been an aspiration of the Council. The proposal is contained within the Development Plan for Perth and fits in well with the ongoing work on developing core path plans. A key issue for the core path plan is to improve linkages from Perth city into areas of existing public access and the wider countryside around Perth and onwards. Improving access across the River Tay is crucial to this strategy.

35. The new footbridge has the potential to link a number of routes and become an important part of the wider sustainable transport network across the area. The proposed structure has the opportunity to be the latest in the line of prestigious crossings of the River Tay and the opportunity to become both a local and regional asset. The Council will be developing this project during these very early stages but would request the project becomes a key consideration on the TACTRAN RTS complementing many of its wider objectives.

36. SUSTRAINS is an extremely popular charity and is likely to receive a large amount of public support for its Connect2 proposals. Working with SUSTRAINS to further develop the foot/cycle bridge presents a tremendous opportunity for both Perth and Kinross Council and TACTRAN to create a significant asset in terms of sustainable transport provision.
NEXT STEPS

37. While the draft RTS is currently out to wider consultation, the Steering Group will be developing a delivery plan that will set timescales for the delivery of the various interventions identified as part of the strategy. The delivery plan will set the framework establishing the most appropriate method or source of funding for each intervention. This will clearly have an impact on future capital and revenue programmes within the Council.

38. There is also a requirement for the strategy to identify any other statutory transport functions that the RTP will itself need to ensure the strategy is delivered. Whilst it is accepted the Delivery Plan is work in progress the strategy is not clear in reconciling the relationship between the implementation of the strategy and the operational status of TACTTRAN. The status of TACTTRAN is particularly relevant if significant levels of funding are required for interventions, including the use of monies that are currently under the direct control of the Council’s.

39. Implementing major, integrated public transport improvements may have the optimum chance of success if TACTTRAN could take on additional functions. However, the statutory processes for this will require full and close co-operation with individual authorities and have to demonstrate significant advantages over current delivery arrangements. It is of note that the Scottish Executive has already advised local authorities of its intention to redirect Rural Public Passenger Transport Grant funding to the RTP’s.

40. As part of the consultation process TACTTRAN is also carrying out consultation on Strategic Environmental Assessment and Equality Assessment as part of the development process. The full SEA Environmental Report is available for inspection on the TACTTRAN website www.tactran.gov.uk. The Equality Assessment is being undertaken to ensure that the final strategy does not have any adverse impact on any particular groups.

CONSULTATION

41. The Head of Legal Services, the Council Secretary and the Executive Director (Corporate Services) have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

42. Whilst there are no direct resource implications arising from this report final approval of the RTS and its associated Delivery Plan may have significant impacts on future capital and revenue budgets. The RTP will
require resources to deliver its strategy and carry out its functions. TACTRAN’s core revenue costs are funded by 50% grant from the Scottish Executive and 50% by requisition from the four constituent authorities. In terms of capital funding there is already a commitment to provide an additional £35m nationally in financial years 2006/07 and 2007/08 and in the TACTRAN area the Council's are taking specific projects forward.

43. The Scottish Executive has made clear that the RTS, once in place, will play a key part in determining future funding though it should be noted approval of a strategy does not represent a commitment to funding any part of that strategy.

COUNCIL PRIORITIES AND PRINCIPLES

44. The recommendations within this report support the delivery of the following corporate priorities and/or corporate principles:

Priorities

➢ **Community Safety**: working towards creating safer communities in Perth and Kinross

➢ **Economic Growth**: working towards ensuring Perth and Kinross has a prosperous, sustainable and inclusive economy.

➢ **Environment**: protecting and enhancing the environment of Perth and Kinross.

➢ **Health and Care**: improving the health of all the people in Perth and Kinross.

➢ **Rural Communities**: supporting rural communities

Principles

➢ **Community Involvement**: ensuring that we engage effectively with the community, Community Planning partners and employees regarding our activities and decisions, providing opportunities for participation and feedback.

➢ **Equalities**: working towards equality of access to services, information and opportunities to participate in Council activities for all people in the community.

➢ **Partnership**: working with our Community Planning partners and all sectors of the local community to plan and deliver responsive and effective services.
➢ **Sustainability**: ensuring that we consider the long-term sustainability of our decisions

**CONCLUSION**

45. The draft RTS has highlighted the importance of major infrastructure improvements in Perth including the proposed new crossing of the Tay and major improvements to Perth rail station. The strategy also highlights key strands of work to be taken forward at the regional level which can support, enhance and give added value to many of the Councils current activities.

J F IRONS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (ENVIRONMENT)

---

**Contact Officer:** Alex Deans 01738 476585  
**Address of Service:** Pullar House, 35 Kinnoull Street, Perth, PH1 5GD  
**Date of Report:** 16 March 2007

---

**NOTE**

The following background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (and not containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to a material extent in preparing the above Report; (list papers concerned)

Scotland’s Transport Future: Guidance on Regional Transport Strategies, Scottish Executive, March 2006
APPENDIX 1: INTERVENTIONS IN THE DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

IV-A1
Land use planning policy and controls to help reduce the need to travel, particularly by private car

This intervention is supported. There will be a need for TACTRAN to be involved in strategic land use planning in the area. The close relationship between land use and transport planning may well require the development of dedicated modelling platforms to appraise these issues in detail. There will need to be close cooperation with the Council on this issue.

IV-A2
Travel Plan Guidance and support to large employers

This intervention is supported. The Council will work closely with TACTRAN on development of its own Travel Plan. It will be important to establish an effective framework for this area in relation to exact roles and responsibilities.

IV-A3
A consistent framework for parking standards at new developments

Given the diversity within the region the basis for this intervention is questioned. The case for a regional approach to development control is one that needs careful consideration before taking this issue forward.

IV-A4
Improved access to Health Care

This intervention is supported. In particular the relationship between PRI and NInewells Hospital is one that needs to be considered in great detail.

IV A5
National Parks Access

This intervention is fully supported. In particular the role of the A.93 needs to be considered in detail. The A.93 is a key connection between not just the Cairngorms National Park and TACTRAN but also between NESTRAN and the central belt of Scotland.

IV-B1
Develop, maintain and deliver a Regional Travel Information Strategy

This intervention is fully supported. There will clearly need to be a level of consistency across diverse parts of the region but also consistency with neighbouring RTP areas.

IV-C1 Use of awareness campaigns to increase the use of sustainable transport modes and/or reduce overall travel

This intervention is supported

IV-C2
Promote regional Car Sharing schemes

This intervention is supported

IV-C3
Establish Strategic Regional Parking Policy Framework

The area of Parking Policy is a complex issue involving a range of issues, many of them local. This intervention would need careful consideration before taking forward. Given the many and
diverse types of settlement in the region the need for a ‘single’ framework will require a thorough analysis of all the issues.

IV-C4
Develop measures to encourage sustainable tourism

This intervention is fully supported

IV-D1
Develop, deliver and monitor a Walking and Cycling Strategy for the region

This intervention is supported. There has been much good work done on these issues within the Council. It is suggested that TACTRAN liaise closely with relevant Council officers on this area to ensure integration with other Council priorities such as development of a core path network.

IV-D2
Safer Routes to School

This intervention is fully supported

IV-E1
Quality bus partnerships

This intervention is fully supported

IV-E2
Review bus frequency on key commuter corridors

This intervention is fully supported. There will need to be close cooperation between TACTRAN and the Council on issues E1 and E2 and a framework set up highlighting roles and responsibilities.

IV-F2
Improved rail services between Perth and Edinburgh

This intervention is fully supported. This issue is closely tied in with the development of Perth rail station. Again it is suggested that a framework to take these issues forward is made.

IV-F3
Additional hourly rail service between Arbroath and Perth as recommended by the Tay Estuary Rail Study (TERS) and possible extensions of this service to Stirling or Glasgow

This intervention is fully supported. As a part of a wider rail review in the region, it is suggested consideration is given to the opening of new stations along the route.

IV-G1
Bus based Park and Ride/Park and Choose network in Dundee, Perth and Stirling

This intervention is fully supported. It is suggested TACTRAN work closely with the Council on identification of potential new Park and Ride sites around the periphery of Perth.

IV-G3
Upgrading of the rail and bus stations in Perth, to provide a high quality integrated multi-modal interchange facility, along with improved links to the town centre

This intervention is fully supported
IV-G5
Rail based Park and Ride, enhanced car parking and passenger facilities at key rail stations
This intervention is fully supported particularly in relation to Perth main rail station

IV-G6
Integrated ticketing schemes
This intervention is fully supported

IV-H1
Region wide co-ordination of Community Transport
This intervention is fully supported

IV-H2
Expansion of Demand Responsive Transport services
This intervention is fully supported

IV-H3
Consideration of a TACTRAN wide TAXI-Card scheme
This intervention is fully supported. Interventions H1, H2 and H3 will require detailed liaison with the Council on each of these issues. A thorough analysis of these issues will be required prior to establishing whether TACTRAN would be the preferred body to take these issues forward in relation to best value and service delivery.

IV-I1
New crossing of the Tay linking the A9 to the A94 north of Scone, including a package of associated bus priority, cycle and pedestrian measures ‘locking’ in the benefits to Perth city centre.
This intervention is fully supported

IV-I5
Regional Road Safety Plan
This intervention is supported. It is suggested that a thorough review of the way Road Safety units in each of the constituent local authorities are set up and operate is carried out. A review should also consider whether there is merit in changing the way road safety is delivered in the region. The Council will require to be fully involved in these discussions.

IV-I6
Assist local authorities in securing additional resources to tackle the maintenance backlog on roads, bridges and street lighting
This intervention is fully supported

IV-I7
Meeting the needs of car and coach based tourists
This intervention is fully supported

IV-J1
A Regional Freight Quality Partnership
This intervention is fully supported
IV-J2
Improved road links to the Ports of Montrose and Dundee and Perth Harbour

This intervention is fully supported

IV-J3
Regional Rail Freight facilities

This intervention is fully supported
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TACTRAN REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY DRAFT FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

1 SUMMARY

1.1 This report outlines the purpose and content of the Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership's (TACTRAN) draft Regional Transport Strategy and asks Council to strongly support the preferred strategy and endorse Stirling City Council's response in Appendix A.

2 RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 Strongly support the Preferred Strategy as being the correct strategy for the TACTRAN region.

2.2 Note the purpose and content of the consultation and endorse Stirling Council's detailed response as contained in Appendix A.

2.3 Note that TACTRAN is preparing a Delivery Plan in parallel with the consultation process and agree that the Council expects the Delivery Plan contained within the final published RTS to be used as a starting point for consultation with the constituent Local Authorities on funding of interventions and the statutory transport functions required.

3 CONSIDERATIONS

Background

3.1 The Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership (TACTRAN) is one of 7 Regional Transport Partnerships (RTP's) created under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005.

3.2 TACTRAN covers the local authority areas of Angus, Dundee, Perth & Kinross and Stirling Councils. The TACTRAN Board comprises 10 councillor members from these local authorities, including 2 from Stirling Council, and currently 4 non-elected members.
3.2 The draft RTS was approved by TACTRAN Board on 16 January 2007 for an 8 week public consultation period beginning on 22 January 2007 and ending on 16 March 2007. As part of that consultation TACTRAN is also required to consult with the constituent Local Authorities, appropriate Health Boards and Community Planning Partnerships. This report will provide the response to the consultation draft RTS for Stirling Council.

**Purpose of RTS**

3.3 The purpose of an RTS is to provide a vision and objectives for transport in the region over a 10 to 15 year horizon to meet the transport needs of the area and set out a programme of projects, interventions and actions which will contribute to the achievement of these regional objectives.

3.4 The RTS will also provide a key steer for local transport strategies, support the National Transport Strategy and identify suitable projects to be included in the Scottish Executive's Strategic Projects Review.

**TACTRAN Draft RTS**

3.5 Copies of the full draft TACTRAN Regional Transport Strategy are available in the members lounge and also can be accessed on line at www.tactran.gov.uk. A summary document is also attached as Appendix B to this report. A brief summary of the draft strategy document is given in the paragraphs below drawing out interventions that are particularly pertinent to Stirling Council.

**Existing Transport Network**

3.6 The RTS describes the TACTRAN area and its transport network, noting that the area is at the heart of Scotland and is well placed and connected to other parts of Scotland. A description of the areas topography, demographics and transport system is given in terms of roads, rail, bus, ports, harbours, airports, walking and cycling infrastructure and community and demand responsive transport. A series of examples in terms of existing transport practices in the area is also given in this section indicating that there is existing good practice for TACTRAN to build on.

**Vision**

3.7 The vision for TACTRAN is stated as to deliver:-

‘a transport system, shaped by engagement with its citizens, which helps deliver prosperity and connects communities across the region and beyond, which is socially inclusive and environmentally sustainable and which promotes the health and well-being of all.’

**Objectives**

3.8 To help achieve this vision, it is supported by 6 objectives. They are:-

- To ensure transport helps to deliver regional prosperity.
- To improve accessibility for all, particularly for those suffering from social exclusion.
• To ensure that the transport system contributes to safeguarding the environment and promotes opportunities for improvement.
• To promote the health and well-being of communities.
• To improve the real and perceived safety and security of the transport network.
• To improve integration, both within transport and between transport and other policy areas.

A further set of 18 specific sub-objectives underpin these high level objectives.

Trends and Issues

3.9 The document then goes on to define the trends and issues for transport in the TACTRAN area under the headings of Economy; Accessibility, Equity and Social Inclusion; Environment; Health and Well-Being; Safety and Security; Integration. 49 issues to be addressed have been identified under these headings with several key issues being identified, as follows:-

• The region is peripheral to Scotland’s and the UK’s main economic centres and there is a need to maintain and improve the strategic transport links to support existing businesses and attract future investment, including reducing journey times for movement of people and goods;
• Where we live, where we work and where key services are located, have become increasingly distant from each other. The need to travel greater distances to reach many of the basic services places increasing burdens on the transport systems and people, particularly those in the more remote rural areas;
• Specialist healthcare services, in particular, have become increasingly centralised and this trend is likely to continue. An increasingly elderly population will place greater demands on healthcare services, yet find them harder to access;
• There is a need to improve integration between transport modes and between transport and land use planning;
• The standard of our public transport services, whilst good in many areas, is not the same for all; service levels, fares and vehicle standards vary across the region;
• Safety in using our transport system remains a major concern for many people. Much has been achieved to improve road safety but pedestrians, cyclists and motor cyclists in particular remain vulnerable when using the roads. More schools need to benefit from the ‘safer routes to schools’ initiative. Personal security concerns still affect some groups in society when using public transport; and
• There is a need to address climate change and the wider environmental impacts of transport locally and globally through changes in the way the transport system is developed and used.
Preferred Strategy

3.10 In order to address the issues and achieve the objectives and vision TACTRAN have developed a Preferred Strategy utilising three strategic themes:

- delivering economic prosperity;
- connecting communities and social inclusion;
- environmental sustainability and promoting health and well-being.

3.11 The Preferred Strategy gives a preference to delivering regional economic prosperity with the other themes of connecting communities and environmental protection & health improvement also seen as key to delivering a transport strategy tailored to the needs of the TACTRAN region. These key themes are underpinned by the objective to improve integration between transport modes and between transport, land use and other policy areas.

Interventions

3.12 A total of 39 interventions, with 60 supporting actions, are proposed to deliver the preferred strategy. The interventions most pertinent to Stirling are listed below:

- Additional hourly rail service between Arbroath and Perth as recommended by the Tay Estuary Rail Study (TERS) and possible extensions of this service to Stirling or Glasgow, with potential new stations;
- Bus-based Park and Ride/Park and Choose network in Dundee, Perth and Stirling;
- Upgrading of Stirling bus station to provide full integration with the railway station;
- Rail based Park and Ride, Enhanced Car Parking and passenger facilities at Key Rail Stations;
- Provision of new link road between A84 Kildean and A9 University, and a new M9/A811 interchange, completing Stirling’s Outer Ring Road, including a package of associated bus priority, cycle and pedestrian measures, looking in the benefits to Stirling City centre.

3.13 In addition to location specific interventions there are a number of general interventions, such as Land-use planning policy and controls to help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car; Develop, deliver and maintain a Regional Travel Information Strategy; Promote regional car-sharing schemes; Develop, deliver and monitor a walking and cycling strategy for the Region; Integrated Ticketing Schemes; Region-wide co-ordination of Community Transport provision and Expansion of Demand Responsive Transport Services.
Alternative Strategies Considered

3.14 In line with Scottish Executive guidance, TACTRAN considered a number of alternative strategies by placing more emphasis on each key theme (see paragraph 3.10 above). This produced some additional interventions and/or changed priorities for preferred interventions. Although required to consult on these alternative strategies, TACTRAN considers that the Preferred Strategy is the right one for the region and should be pursued.

Strategic Environmental Assessment and Equality Assessment

3.15 As part of the consultation process TACTRAN will also be carrying out consultation on the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Equality Assessment. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been undertaken in parallel with the development of the RTS and is the subject of a parallel consultation exercise. TACTRAN is also in the process of undertaking an Equality Assessment to ensure that the finalised strategy does not have an adverse impact on any particular group by seeking the views of a diverse range of stakeholder groups and individuals. Both of these consultation exercises will involve specific focus groups.

Delivery Plan

3.16 During the consultation period TACTRAN will be producing a delivery plan that sets timescales and milestones for the delivery of interventions and actions, against which progress can be monitored.

3.17 The delivery plan will then be used to identify:-

- what is the most appropriate method of funding each intervention and what statutory transport functions are required,
- which organisation should fund each intervention and which should have the statutory transport functions either separately or concurrently (Scottish Executive, TACTRAN, Local Authority or other public bodies) to deliver the strategy.

Stirling Council's Recommended Response to Consultation

3.18 Stirling Council strongly supports the Preferred Strategy as being the correct strategy for the TACTRAN region.

3.19 TACTRAN have published a questionnaire for consultation purposes. Stirling Council's detailed response to the questionnaire is given in Appendix A to this report.
3.20 Stirling Council considers that an additional rail based intervention should be included in the RTS, in light of Network Rail’s document *Scotland: Route Utilisation Strategy*, published on the 1st March 2007. The proposed intervention is **IV_F4 Operation of six-car trains between Dunblane/Alloa, Stirling and Glasgow/Edinburgh and associated upgrading works.**

3.21 Stirling Council note TACTRAN is preparing a Delivery Plan in parallel with the consultation process. The Council expects the Delivery Plan contained within the final published RTS to be used as a starting point for consultation with the constituent Local Authorities on funding of interventions and the statutory transport functions required.

**Officers’ Comments**

3.22 Officers’ comments on the draft strategy have been circulated through the weekly Information Bulletin.

4 **POLICY/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Implications</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity (age, disability, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability (community, economic, environmental)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate/Service Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Policy or Strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Implications</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Property or IT Systems</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal or External Consultations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy Implications**

**Equalities Impact**

4.1 Changes to the transport delivery system will have a significant influence on equal opportunities and have been considered in the RTS. TACTRAN will be undertaking an Equality Assessment to ensure the strategy does not have an adverse impact on equality groups.

**Sustainability**

4.2 The RTS will contribute towards the Council’s sustainability objectives by seeking to reduce the need to travel and by promoting alternative, more sustainable modes of transport than the private car.
Other Strategic or Policy Implications

4.3 The Regional Transport Strategy supports the aims and objectives of the Structure Plan and Local Plan, Council’s Road Management Plan and Stirling City Investment Plan 2005-15.

Resource Implications

4.4 There are no direct financial implications to the Council arising from this report. However, the subsequent approval of the final RTS by TACTRAN could have significant impact on staffing resources and both capital and revenue budgets.

Consultations

4.5 The Chief Executive, Director of Corporate Services and Director of Regeneration Services have been consulted and are in agreement with the contents of this report.

5 BACKGROUND PAPERS

5.1 TACTRAN Regional Transport Strategy, Draft For Consultation available at www.tactran.gov.uk.

5.2 Tayside and Central Scotland Regional Transport Strategy, SEA Environmental Report available at www.tactran.gov.uk.

5.3 Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership (TACTRAN) Regional Transport Strategy – Progress Update 1, Executive 7 November 2006.
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Date 5th February 2007 Reference REP755SC(CB)
TACTRAN RTS Consultation Questionnaire

Issues and Objectives

Chapter 3 of the RTS describes the Objectives which the RTS should try to achieve in order to improve transport within the TACTRAN area.

1) Overall, do you agree with the Objectives presented in the RTS?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Response: Stirling Council strongly agrees with the objectives and sub-objectives presented in the RTS.

2) If you have any specific comments on the Objectives please state them in the space below, referring to the relevant Objective number:

Response: No specific comments

Chapter 4 of the RTS describes the key Issues affecting transport in the TACTRAN area.

3) Overall, do you agree with the analysis of the issues presented?
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Response: Stirling Council strongly agrees with the analysis and key issues affecting transport in the TACTRAN area.

4) If you have any specific comments on the Issues, or feel there are any significant omissions which have been made, please state them in the space below:

Response: Stirling Council considers that an appropriate balance and understanding of urban and rural issues has been achieved in the RTS.
The Preferred Strategy

Drawing on the Issues and Objectives for the RTS, we have developed a Preferred Strategy that is designed to address the diverse needs of the TACTRAN region. Chapter 5 of the RTS sets out our Preferred Strategy, which has at its heart three key strategic themes:

- Delivering economic prosperity
- Connecting communities and being socially inclusive
- Environmental sustainability and promoting health and well-being.

5) Overall, do you agree with our Preferred Strategy?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Response: Stirling Council strongly agrees with TACTRAN RTS preferred Strategy.

Our Proposed Interventions

Chapter 6 of the RTS sets out under 11 categories (e.g. Land Use; Walking and Cycling, Bus, Rail etc.) a proposed list of Interventions and Actions which we propose to undertake in order to improve the transport system in support of our Preferred Strategy. Section 6 also indicates the types of interventions which would be included, or have higher priority, under the 3 Alternative Strategy scenarios we considered.

6) Overall, do you agree with our list of Preferred Strategy Interventions and Actions?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Response: Stirling Council strongly agrees with the list of Preferred Strategy interventions and actions. Stirling Council considers that an additional Intervention should be included in the rail based measures, in light of Network Rail’s document Scotland: Route Utilisation Strategy, published on the 1st March 2007. The proposed intervention is as follows: IV_F4 Operation of six-car trains between Dunblane/Alloa, Stirling and Glasgow/Edinburgh and associated upgrading works.

7) If you have any specific comments on the Interventions or Actions, or feel there are any significant omissions, please state them in the space below, referring to the relevant Intervention or Action number:
Response: Stirling Council recognises that there are a number of interventions suitable for inclusion within the Strategic Transport Projects Review, but in particular considers that the strongest possible representation should be made to the Scottish Executive/Transport Scotland to include Interventions IV_F3 (Tay Estuary Rail Study recommendations) and possible service extensions to Stirling and Glasgow, IV_G1 (Bus Based Park & Ride schemes on strategic network), IV_G4 (Upgrading Stirling Bus Station to fully integrate with railway station), IV_G5 (Rail based Park & Ride and enhanced car parking, for example Dunblane and new station at Bannockburn), IV_I3 (new link road between (A84) Kildean and (A9) University and new M9/A811 Interchange) in the Strategic Transport Projects Review.

8) Do you have any comments on the Alternative Strategies Considered and associated Interventions, as discussed in section 6.4 of the RTS? Please indicate any comments in the space below:

Response: Stirling Council notes the alternative strategies considered by TACTRAN.

Our Targets

Chapter 8 of the RTS suggests some possible Targets which might be adopted to monitor and measure progress on achievement in meeting the RTS Objectives.

9) Overall, do you agree that the Targets are appropriate?
   • Strongly Agree
   • Agree
   • Neither Agree nor Disagree
   • Disagree
   • Strongly Disagree

Response: Stirling Council notes that further work is required to develop a robust and smart set of targets.

10) Are the Targets:
   • Not ambitious enough
   • About right
   • Too ambitious
   • No opinion

Response: Stirling Council notes that the targets are not ambitious enough.

11) If you have any specific comments on the Targets, or wish to suggest additional or alternative Targets, please state them in the space below, referring to the relevant section:

Response: Stirling Council consider a number of the current targets proposed for monitoring in the RTS to be inappropriate. Some of targets identified will be difficult to measure, for example Accessibility and Integration. We are not sure how an annual survey of businesses is appropriate when the ‘strategy benefits’ could take years to be realised. Targets need to objective and relatively easily measured and understood.
The Council has already set targets for mode share, safety, etc against principal objectives within its City Transport Strategy. The monitoring section should also consider the implications of Road Traffic Reduction Act data and the desire for the Scottish Executive to stabilise future traffic growth levels.

**Equality**

The TACTRAN RTS will seek to ensure that the needs and requirements of any groups within society who may encounter barriers when using the Transport System, or who are deemed most likely to experience inequality, are addressed. In particular we will aim to ensure that our RTS is fair to all and no one is at a disadvantage in using the transport system through:

- Gender
- Age
- Disability
- Sexual orientation
- Race; or
- Religion

12) Are you aware of any transport-related needs and issues that might be faced by particular equality groups that are not addressed within the TACTRAN RTS?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t Know

**Response:** Stirling Council consider that all needs and issues faced by particular equality groups are addressed within the TACTRAN RTS.

If ‘Yes’, please explain why:

13) Do you think any aspect of the TACTRAN RTS might have a negative impact on any equality groups?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t Know

**Response:** Stirling Council consider that the TACTRAN RTS will not have a negative impact on any equality group.

If ‘Yes’, please explain which aspect and why:

**Other Comments**

14) Do you have any other comments on the TACTRAN draft strategy? If so, please write them below:

**Response:** Stirling Council note TACTRAN is preparing a Delivery Plan in parallel with the consultation process. The Council expects the Delivery Plan contained within the final published RTS to be used as a starting point for consultation with the constituent Local Authorities on funding of interventions and the statutory transport functions.
required, in particular the Council has joint Public Transport (Clackmannanshire) and Accident Investigation (Clackmannanshire and Falkirk) Units with two SESTran constituent councils.

TACTRAN should also take cognisance of the Council’s joint working with Clackmannanshire on the Structure Plan and future City Regions proposals.

Information About You

In order to help us classify responses, please can you answer the following questions about yourself. These questions will be treated in the strictest confidence, will only be used to analyse our results, and will not be passed to any third parties.

15) Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?
   - Yes
   - No

If ‘Yes’, please state which organisation: Stirling Council