Bedford Town Centre Transport
Strategy

Option Screening and Assessment

Final Report

Bedford Town Centre Transport Strategy

Option Screening and Assessment

Final Report

Bedford Town Centre Transport Strategy

Option Screening and Assessment

Final Report

Contents Amendments Record

This document has been issued and amended as follows:

Status/Revision	Revision description	Issue Number	Approved By	Date
Draft		1	LEB	02/10/2014
Final	1	2	LEB	23/10/2014

Contents

Tables and Figures

Appendices

APPENDIX A R-A-G Scoring of Long-List of Scheme Measures

1   Introduction

Context

1.1   JMP Consultants Ltd has been commissioned to undertake the development of a Town Centre Transport Strategy for Bedford. Our work comprises the formulation of the transport strategy, with separate commissions developing the strategic and micro-simulation transport model development, and strategy business case.

1.2   Our commission focuses on the development of a transport strategy setting out the rationale and detailed changes and an assessment of economic and regeneration impacts of changes.

- Suite of modelling tools and outputs; and

- A business case for the strategy ready to be used to obtain funding.

1.3   This initial element of work focuses on the first two of these deliverables

Stages of the Study

1.4   The strategy development process has been broken down into four phases:

- Phase 1: Information gathering and initial option development;

- Phase 2: Option screening and assessment;

- Phase 3: Option development and appraisal; and

- Phase 4: Recommended strategy.

1.5   This report presents the findings from the second phase of the commission.

1.6   The 'Issues and Opportunities Report' (October 2014, JMP) provides a summary of Phase 1, setting out the detailed aims of the study, the study area, and presenting a detailed assessment of existing and future land use alongside current transport infrastructure, operation, travel patterns and accessibility. These were surmised into a list of key issues and opportunities and translated into ten Transport Strategy Objectives that will be used as the basis upon which to develop the strategy.

1.7   Following on from the completion of the issues and opportunities report, a long-list of potential scheme measures were developed, representing the final output of Phase 1.

Option Screening and Assessment

1.8   The purpose of Phase 2 of the study is to undertake an initial sift through the long-list of potential scheme measures in order to identify those schemes that are likely to be deliverable and will contribute to the strategy objectives.

1.9   The options sifting process applies a high-level PESTLE-type analysis, which considers the Political, Economic, Sociological, Technological, Legal, and Environmental issues relating to each scheme option. This process is described in the next section.

2 Option Sifting Process

Overview

2.1 An initial option sifting process of the long-list of scheme measures has been undertaken in order to identify the solutions with most the potential to take forward for further development. This is a high-level PESTLE analysis that applies a 'Red-Amber-Green' (RAG) ratings system.

2.2 The analysis seeks to consider the:

1. '**Political**' acceptability of a scheme and it fit with local and national policy and stakeholder opinion;

2. '**Economic**' implications of the scheme, in terms of both the impact upon the economy, as well as the costs of delivery;

3. '**Sociological**' impacts of the scheme, both positive and negative, in terms of mitigating or reinforcing social exclusion;

4. '**Technological**' implications in terms of innovation and robustness;

5. '**Legal**' issues surrounding implementation; and

6. '**Environmental**' impacts of the schemes.

2.3 The option sifting process will also focus upon the deliverability of schemes as a means for assessing whether a scheme can be taken forward. In addition we shall undertake an assessment of the strategic fit of each scheme to the wider policy requirements for housing growth and enhanced economic activity.

2.4 The actual PESTLE framework applied is presented in **Table 3.1** highlighting 'Red-Amber-Green' scoring system for each of the six areas of evaluation.

Table 2.1 Pestle Framework

Criteria	Green (+1)	Orange (0)	Red (-1)
Political	Political goodwill and support of policy	Neutral stance or conflicting views	Lobby groups against scheme, political anti-sentiment
Economic	Low cost and effective, potential to bring money into the economy	Net cost neutral, e.g. high cost – high benefit, low cost – low benefit	Expensive to install or maintain.
Sociological	Reduces social exclusion by reducing severance, promotes accessibility for disadvantaged social groups	No impact upon social groups or positive and negative impacts	Further reinforces social exclusion
Technological	Innovative solution	Standard technology	Unproven technology or out-dated technology
Legal	No legal powers / statutory processes required.	Requires some form of legal approval or statutory process (e.g. traffic management order)	Public inquiry required, consent orders rejected, compulsory purchase orders maybe required, compulsory purchase orders required
Environmental	Enhances the built environment, reduces noise, improves air quality	Neutral or positive and negative impacts	Reduces the aesthetic / amenity of local users, reduces noise quality, reduces air quality.

Scheme Assessment

2.5 The long-list of 213 schemes have been grouped into categories relating to the findings of the audits and policy reviews carried out for the 'Issues and Opportunities' Report (October 2014, JMP).

2.6 The scheme categories are listed below with the number of associated scheme in brackets:

i. Highways (28 schemes);

ii. Parking (16);

iii. Freight (15);

iv. Rail (8);

v. Bus (26);

vi. Park & Ride (6);

vii. Taxis & Private Hire (7);

viii. Waterways (6);

ix. Public Realm (20);

x. Walking (15);

xi. Cycling (24);

xii. Way-finding & Signage (14);

xiii. Sustainable Travel Planning (20);

xiv. Charging and Payment Systems (3); and

xv. Road Safety (5).

2.7   Each individual scheme has been assessed in isolation, with a Red-Amber-Green ranking given across each of the six criteria. The cumulative rankings are considered in order to bracket schemes into groups in order to assist the overall scheme sifting process.

2.8   Any scheme that has a two or more red 'flag' against is generally rejected, unless there is a clear approach to mitigating the negative impact identified. High scoring schemes with a predominance of green 'flags' will be taken forward for further detailed assessment, with all other schemes considered on a case-by-case basis.

Option Sifting

2.9   The result of the PESTLE analysis on the long-list of potential transport scheme measures is presented in **Appendix A**.

2.10   A total of 114 scheme measures (54%) were taken forward as high-scoring schemes that could potentially form the basis of one, or more, packages of transport strategy scheme measures. All of these schemes will be taken forward for further more detailed development prior to a more complete appraisal of the benefits of each scheme.

2.11   These scheme breakdown into the following designations:

- Major infrastructure schemes   44 (39%)
- Minor infrastructure schemes   20 (18%)
- Transport operation schemes   14 (12%)
- Partnership working schemes   20 (18%)
- Policy measures   16 (14%)

2.12   A further 49 scheme measures (23%) scored reasonably well and will remain under consideration as complimentary measures to support the development of the wider package of strategy measures.

2.13   Of the remaining 50 scheme measures (23%), 6 were rejected. The remaining measures are unlikely to be taken forward unless they are combined into larger schemes of complimentary measures or are considered likely to perform better in the context of a wider package of measures.

3 Next Steps

Phase 3

3.1   Phase 3 of the study will initially take the identified 114 high-performing scheme and develop them into more tangible schemes. This will include preliminary scheme drawings for highway, urban realm and walking and cycling infrastructure schemes; operational plans for public transport, taxi, and freight measures; and scoping notes for partnership working and policy measures.

3.2   The second stage of Phase 3 will then be to appraise the short-list of schemes in greater detail against both the Transport Strategy Objectives and wider DfT Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) metrics. Based upon the outcome of these appraisals the identification of potential packages of measures will then be undertaken. It is likely that at least two packages of measures will be identified, although there may be common elements to both packages. Additional, lower-scoring, scheme measures from the original long-list of schemes in Phase 2, will also be considered as part of the development of complimentary packages of measures.

3.3   The final element of Phase 3 will be to appraise the packages of measures in combination. This will utilise modelling tools and DfT TAG techniques.

Phase 4

3.4   Phase 4 will draw together the preferred packages of measures into a final strategy with a clear action plan for implementation.

R-A-G Scoring of Long-List of Scheme Measures