

Appendix A: Summary of key issues and suggestions raised during the public engagement on the Draft Interim Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy (MMTS)

Background

This document provides an overview of the key and/or most common issues and suggestions raised through the written comments/responses to the interim MMTS engagement. It also highlights where we have updated the interim MMTS document in response to these comments (including to incorporate suggestions made). As with similar previous engagements undertaken by Leicestershire County Council it does not, however, provide specific responses to individual comments received. All comments received during the engagement will nevertheless be retained for further use in developing the full MMTS.

(NB: the categorisation has been developed by the County Council and not by the responders)

The 'in-principle' need for a Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy (MMTS)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>General Overview</p> <p>The engagement responses indicated broad agreement with the principle of developing a Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy, with very few of the comments received seeking to dispute the need for a Strategy, and indeed most strongly supportive.</p> <p>Comments that were less supportive or opposed to the principle of the strategy overwhelmingly tended to cite concerns regarding one or more of the proposals and/or future workstreams set out within the interim strategy engagement draft document.</p> <p>Some key other views expressed in relation to this topic are set out/discussed further below.</p>	<p>N/A. Our response to specific concerns raised on the content of the interim strategy (including the proposals and future workstreams) are covered separately.</p>
<p>The interim strategy should include a clearer long-term vision and principles for developing the full strategy.</p>	<p>Agree in principle. In practice, however, there are currently key uncertainties which are likely to have significant implications for the content of the full strategy, which makes it both very difficult and potentially counterproductive to set out a fully formed vision for the full strategy at this time. These key uncertainties most notably include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential longer-term/permanent societal, economic and travel behaviour impacts of COVID-19 • Potential aspirations for the regeneration of Melton Mowbray town centre <p>Given these uncertainties, it is considered appropriate to allow for a degree of flexibility within the interim strategy in respect of the future parameters for developing the full strategy.</p> <p>However, within the updated interim strategy document we have sought to more clearly define the key issues that the proposed full strategy workstreams will seek to address, as well as explicitly set out 'key principles' for the revised workstream to explore potential changes to the central ring road/town centre highway network, which is intended to at least partially address this comment.</p>
<p>The strategy needs to be developed alongside Melton Borough Council's future plans for the town centre rather than as a standalone package.</p>	<p>Agree – see response to previous comment.</p>

<p>The scope of the strategy should be extended beyond the Melton Mowbray urban area to cover surrounding rural areas and villages.</p>	<p>The scope of the interim strategy is not limited by any rigid geographical boundaries or areas. Conversely, its content (including the proposals and future workstreams) has been determined by the strategy evidence base, which explicitly recognises the important role that Melton Mowbray plays in supporting the rest of Melton Borough.</p> <p>Most of the planned workstreams allow for the consideration of measures in surrounding rural areas and villages (including specific suggestions made during the interim MMTS engagement) where such measures align with the evidence and key issues identified through the strategy. It should also be recognised that transport improvements in and around Melton Mowbray are likely to benefit the Melton Borough as a whole, given the town's central role.</p>
---	---

Key existing transport issues identified through the Interim MMTS

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>General Overview</p> <p>The vast majority of comments received supported (and in many cases sought to amplify one or more of) the key existing transport issues identified through the interim MMTS engagement document.</p> <p>A wide range of other issues were also raised through the comments, with a minority of views less supportive or opposed to certain aspects of the key issues identified. The most common additional issues and objections raised are set out/discussed further below.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The strategy should reference the lack of electric vehicle charging facilities as an existing issue</p>	<p>This issue is picked up as part of the environment theme, within Chapter 3 (Future Challenges and Opportunities) of the strategy.</p>
<p>Various issues around town centre parking provision – e.g. quantity, pricing</p>	<p>Parking provision is picked-up as part of the evidence base around existing transport issues in Chapter 2 (Current Traffic and Transport Issues Within the Town) of the main interim strategy document and is identified as an area for further work/analysis within Chapter 5 (Development of the Full Strategy). The proposed workstream around town centre parking provision will provide the opportunity to further consider the specific comments raised during the engagement.</p>
<p>Various local traffic management concerns – e.g. speeding, nuisance parking</p>	<p>To remain proportionate, the interim strategy evidence base has had to focus on the more strategic traffic and transport issues within the town. Nevertheless, the future workstreams proposed through Chapter 5 (Development of the full strategy) of the interim strategy will provide the opportunity to consider more localised/detailed traffic management issues, including those raised during the interim MMTS engagement.</p> <p>A new workstream covering “local traffic management issues” has been added to chapter 5 of the interim strategy document in response to the comments raised during the engagement.</p>
<p>Greater consideration should be given to the needs of surrounding villages</p>	<p>The strategy evidence base recognises the important role that Melton Mowbray plays in supporting the rest of Melton</p>

	<p>Borough, and by extension the need to consider access to the town from across the wider borough as part of the strategy, as set out through the ‘access to opportunities’ theme in Chapter 3 (Future Challenges and Opportunities) of the strategy document. It should also be recognised that transport improvements in and around Melton Mowbray itself are likely to benefit the Melton Borough as a whole, given the town’s central role.</p> <p>Furthermore, most of the planned workstreams set out in Chapter 5 (Development of the Full Strategy) allow for the consideration of measures in surrounding rural areas and villages (including specific suggestions made during the interim MMTS engagement) where such measures align with the evidence and key issues identified through the strategy.</p>
Existing walking and cycling facilities are adequate/the issues with these facilities have been over-emphasised.	<p>The conclusions reached within the interim strategy have been informed by a comprehensive assessment of the existing cycling and walking infrastructure across the town, carried out in accordance with the approach set out through the Government’s Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans Guidance.</p> <p>The majority view from the responses received were that facilities were not adequate. Furthermore, the Government’s “Gear Change” vision for cycling and walking and associated Cycle Design Guidance (LTN 1/20), both published in 2020, has substantially further raised the bar in terms of what is considered to represent an adequate or good standard of cycling and walking infrastructure provision.</p>

Key themes on which to base the strategy

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>General Overview</p> <p>The engagement responses indicated strong overall support for the key themes identified through the interim MMTS engagement document, and many of the comments received sought to amplify one or more of these key themes.</p> <p>A minority of comments were less supportive and/or suggested the need for changes to the key themes. The most commonly cited reasons for this set out/discussed further below:</p>	N/A
<p>Opposed in-principle to the ‘growth’ theme and/or feel that the importance of this theme had been over-emphasised.</p>	<p>The principle of growth across the town has already been established through the adopted Melton Local Plan¹. The MMTS is integral to the delivery of the adopted Local Plan (as set out through policies IN1 and IN3 of the Plan) and will ensure that transport investments to support/mitigate the impacts of planned growth are maximised and coordinated. In this context, a MMTS that fails to acknowledge or address the transport implications of growth would not prevent growth from happening altogether; conversely, it is likely to result in a piecemeal, developer-led approach to investment that does not support growth to the same extent or result in the same level of wider benefits to the town (in terms of existing issues and the other themes identified through the strategy evidence base).</p> <p>It is also important to note that the key themes and issues outlined within Chapter 3 (Future Challenges and Opportunities) of the interim strategy have not been ranked or prioritised in any way. Correspondingly, the sequence</p>

¹ [Melton Local plan](#)

	<p>in which the five themes are presented within chapter 3 should not be interpreted as a “priority order”. The strategy documents have been amended to provide a note to clarify this.</p>
<p>Insufficient emphasis on the ‘environment’ theme in view of the climate emergency, need to decarbonise the town’s transport system and/or address local environmental issues within the town.</p>	<p>Climate change and the need for decarbonisation of Melton Mowbray’s transport system feature prominently within the interim strategy’s evidence base and key issues under Theme 2: Environment, within chapter 3 (Future Challenges and Opportunities) of the strategy document. However, we have made some alterations to the key issues wording for this theme to bring this point across more strongly, taking on board the comments received.</p> <p>The traffic relief provided by the MMDR and other measures proposed through the interim strategy will be crucial to encourage increased walking, cycling and passenger transport use (and conversely reduce private car use) for short journeys within the town. This includes creating opportunities to improve walking, cycling and passenger transport facilities, such as the planned walking and cycling facility running alongside the MMDR, which will boost orbital walking and cycling connections around the town.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the full MMTS will provide a comprehensive response to the challenge of decarbonising the town’s transport system, as demonstrated by the range of proposed workstreams set out within chapter 5 (Development of the Full MMTS) of the interim strategy dedicated to developing in greater detail proposals to boost walking, cycling and passenger transport use as well as supporting the ‘electrification’ of road transport. Indeed, a key benefit of preparing the interim MMTS at this stage is that it provides more time and flexibility for currently emerging/insufficiently mature zero-carbon transport technologies and Government guidance to be considered as part of the full strategy.</p> <p>With this in mind, the scope of proposed Workstream 9 has been widened since the conclusion of the engagement exercise to incorporate exploration of emerging and future transport technologies in a broad sense (i.e. as opposed to focussing specifically on electric car charging infrastructure as previously) and more emphasis will be placed on the environment when scheme proposals are developed.</p> <p>It is also important to note that the key themes and issues outlined within Chapter 3 of the interim strategy have not been ranked or prioritised in any way. Correspondingly, the sequence in which the five themes are presented within chapter 3 should not be interpreted as a “priority order”. The strategy documents have been amended to provide text to clarify this.</p>

Need for the proposed policies (in respect of the MMDR alignment and standards and securing contributions towards the delivery of the strategy)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
--	--------------

<p>The engagement responses were overwhelmingly supportive of the inclusion of all of the proposed policies in the interim strategy.</p> <p>Of the minority of comments that were less supportive and/or opposed, almost all were related to one or more of the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The in-principle case for the MMDR • The design and alignment of the North and East (NE) MMDR scheme • The principle of growth in and around the town • Whether and to what extent developer contributions should be sought to fund the delivery of the MMDR and MMTS 	<p>Both the principle of growth across the town, and the in-principle need for a MMDR to support this growth, have already been established through the adopted Melton Local Plan. The fundamental case for the MMDR has not changed since the adoption of the Local Plan; its provision is essential to opening up areas of land for housing and employment growth and it will provide for people to travel by a number of modes and for the movement of goods and delivery of services.</p> <p>Similarly, the specific design and alignment of the NE MMDR² scheme have already been established through the granting of planning permission for the scheme in May 2019 and have been the subject of previous consultations/engagements, including as part of the scheme planning application process.</p> <p>The collection of developer contributions is essential to facilitate the delivery of the MMTS (including the MMDR) and thereby provide the transport infrastructure needed to support the adopted Local Plan. The principle of developer contributions towards the strategy has already been established through policies IN1 and IN3 of the Local Plan, with the approach set out through the policies within the interim MMTS simply seeking to build on this principle and ensure that transport investments to support/mitigate the impacts of planned growth are maximised and coordinated.</p>
---	---

Proposed reclassification and re-numbering of main roads within the town (Proposal B)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>General Overview</p> <p>The engagement responses indicated strong overall support for the proposals to reclassify and re-number roads within the town, and many of the comments received sought to highlight perceived benefits of the proposed approach.</p> <p>A minority of comments that were less supportive or opposed to the proposals. The most commonly cited reasons for this set out/discussed further below.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Sceptical about whether the proposed changes to road classifications and numbering will have any impact on traffic routeing (factors such as the use of sat-nav's were cited in support of this argument).</p>	<p>It is accepted that there are many factors which influence driver's choices over which roads to use for a particular journey. However, the classification and numbering of roads (and associated directional signage) nevertheless play a vital role in determining how people interpret the road network and decide the most appropriate routes to take, especially for less familiar users (e.g. visitors and/or longer-distance through traffic). The road classification also influences how each part of the road network is to be managed and what further changes/interventions to those roads might be appropriate in future.</p> <p>In these respects, the current road classifications and numbering within Melton Mowbray will cease to be appropriate once sections of the MMDR start to open and will therefore need to be changed in accordance with the proposals set out in the interim strategy. Conversely, taking a 'minimal approach', which leaves the existing road classifications and numbers as they are currently, would result in an illogical arrangement that is likely to confuse many drivers and potentially result in vehicles continuing to travel through the town unnecessarily (thereby failing to maximise the</p>

² [North and East Melton Mowbray Distributor Road Scheme](#)

		benefits of the MMDR). It could also potentially hinder the scope to pursue wider transport improvements within the town through the full MMTS.
Concerned about how the proposed 'downgrading' of roads will affect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the routes people choose to use (or are signed to use) for journeys into and within the town (e.g. will people still use the existing main roads for journeys into the town centre?) the future maintenance of affected roads 	As part of the proposed changes to the classifications and numbers of roads within the town, directional/destination signage will be reviewed and updated to ensure that road users travelling into and within the town are encouraged to use the most appropriate routes in all circumstances. Following reclassification and re-numbering, roads within the town will continue to be maintained in accordance with the County Council's risk-based approach to highway asset management, as set out through the Council's Highway Asset Management Policy and Strategy ³ . It is worth noting that the traffic relief provided by the MMDR (and associated road reclassifications) will help to reduce maintenance pressures on roads within the town.	
Concerns about wider proposals and emerging concepts/ideas included within the interim MMTS engagement document, particularly in respect of the central ring road.	Our responses to specific concerns raised on the wider proposals and future workstreams set out within the interim strategy are covered separately.	

Proposed changes to the route's lorries can use within the town (Proposal C)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>General Overview</p> <p>As with the proposed road re-classifications, the engagement responses indicated strong overall support for the proposals to extend lorry restrictions within the town, and many of the comments received sought to highlight perceived benefits of the proposed approach.</p> <p>A minority of comments that were less supportive or opposed to the proposals. The most commonly cited reasons for this set out/discussed further below.</p>	N/A
<p>Would like to see an outright ban on lorries within the town.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>How will the need for continued lorry access to the town for deliveries and loading be accommodated?</p>	<p>The additional lorry restrictions to be introduced within the town will be in the form of environmental weight limits, which permit continued access for loading and deliveries (i.e. to properties and businesses with the restriction areas). We have sought to minimise the number of lorries that would need to enter the weight restricted zone within the town for such purposes by excluding the main routes between the MMDR and the major industrial estates/premises on Leicester Road (current A607) and Saxby Road (current B676).</p> <p>It would not be practicable or legally permissible to introduce an outright ban on lorries within the town due to the continued need for loading/delivery access to premises within the proposed restrictions (especially within the town centre).</p>
<p>Sceptical about the need for additional lorry restrictions within the town once the MMDR is built and if appropriate signage is put in place to encourage lorry drivers to use the MMDR wherever possible.</p>	<p>Whilst the MMDR will substantially reduce the numbers of lorries passing through the town, the additional lorry restrictions within the town are needed to reinforce this. Without these restrictions, lorries may continue to use</p>

³ [Highway Asset Management Policy and Strategy](#)

	routes through the town in some cases – e.g. between the A606 Nottingham Road and A607 Leicester Road/B6047 Dalby Road, where travelling through the town would be shorter (and potentially faster) than travelling around the MMDR.
Welby Road is not suited to accommodate increased lorry traffic as envisaged through the strategy proposals.	<p>Welby Road is not a weight restricted route and is already a signed route for traffic to/from Holwell Works and Asfordby Business Park.</p> <p>That said, the need for any changes to Welby Road to accommodate the proposed re-routeing of the A6006 along this road, along with any resulting increase in lorry (and other) traffic, will be considered during the further development of these proposals.</p>

Proposed exploration of future changes to the central ring road (workstream 1)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>The engagement responses indicated an overall lack of support for workstream 1 as proposed through the interim MMTS engagement draft, with a majority of responses opposed. Based on the accompanying comments received, this appeared to be overwhelmingly a response to the specific suggested idea of converting the central ring road to a one-way system, as opposed to the broader principle of making changes to the central ring road or the broad aims/aspirations that this idea was seeking to achieve.</p> <p>Of the comments received in opposition to the one-way system concept, most cited one or more of the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That it could increase travel times and distances for some car journeys into and through the town centre and thereby reduce convenience for car users • That it could result in knock-on increases in vehicle congestion and pollution • That it could increase the speed of vehicles travelling around the central ring road • That it could increase traffic volumes along Sherrard Street and Leicester Street, and/or on key ‘rat runs’ such as Chapel Street/King Street/Sage Cross Street through the town centre • That it could cause problems in the event of road closures and incidents (e.g. accidents) by reducing the number of alternative routes 	<p>The idea of converting the central ring road to a one-way system (and subsequent ideas for Mill Street/Regent Street/Brook Street) emerged from early conceptual work to explore how radical it might be possible to be (i.e. ‘test the boundaries’) in making changes to the highway network in and around the town centre to support regeneration (albeit based on the limited information available at the time about likely regeneration proposals and aspirations) and removing barriers to increasing walking and cycling. The key principles underpinning this work, as well as the other options considered and reasons these were discounted prior to the engagement on the draft interim strategy, are set out within Chapter 5 of the interim MMTS document.</p> <p>The early conceptual work suggested that, in principle, the idea of converting the central ring road to a one-way system had the potential to facilitate regeneration and increased walking and cycling without causing ‘unacceptable’ worsening of traffic conditions within the town (unlike all the other options considered). However, it was recognised that the radical changes to traffic routeing that would arise from this idea would also have potential drawbacks (e.g. in terms of increased journey times and traffic volumes on certain roads) and that there was a need to seek wider public and stakeholder views on the overall concept before committing any additional resource to further exploring and developing it into a more detailed proposal.</p> <p>Given the largely negative reception to the one-way system concept during the engagement (both from the public and key stakeholders including Melton Borough Council and Melton BID), we are not intending to develop this concept further during the next stage of work and will instead seek to explore possible alternative options involving a more incremental approach, avoiding the need for any major reductions to traffic capacity and/or changes to traffic routeing within the town centre. The interim strategy document has correspondingly been updated to reflect this.</p> <p>Furthermore, the updated strategy more clearly sets out the key principles that will guide the further exploration and development of potential options for the central ring road and wider town centre highway network, to allay concerns and potential misconceptions regarding what this workstream is seeking to achieve.</p>
<p>In addition to the above, a significant number of comments expressed the view that the key principles and aspirations for the central ring road could be achieved without converting it to a one-way system – e.g. by narrowing but keeping it two way.</p>	<p>The possibilities of “two-way narrowing” or “partial pedestrianisation” of the central ring road were considered during the early conceptual work. However, traffic modelling undertaken as part of this work strongly indicated that such options would result in a major worsening of traffic conditions within the town (even allowing for the benefits of the</p>

<p>Equally, some comments suggested the even more radical change of pedestrianising (i.e. fully closing to traffic) some sections of the central ring road, in particular Sherrard Street and/or Leicester Street.</p>	<p>MMDR) and would therefore fail to strike an acceptable balance between the key principles for the town centre highway network (as set out within the updated interim strategy).</p> <p>Correspondingly, we do not consider either two-way narrowing or partial pedestrianisation of the central ring road to be reasonable options to consider during the next stage of work. That said, we will review these conclusions in light of any new evidence that emerges with regards to future travel demand and behaviour within the town.</p>
--	--

Proposed exploration of future changes to Mill Street/Regent Street/Brook Street (workstream 2)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>There was a mixed response to the engagement in respect of proposed workstream 2 and the associated concept of converting Mill Street, Regent Street and Brook Street to one-way eastbound running, albeit with significantly greater numbers supporting than opposed overall.</p> <p>Comments received in favour of the concept generally sought to amplify one or more of the potential benefits of the proposed approach identified through the interim MMTS engagement document.</p> <p>Of the comments that were less supportive or opposed to the proposals, the most commonly cited reasons were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scepticism about the principle and potential benefits of introducing new one-way restrictions within the town (with the range of more specific points raised being similar to those in response to proposed workstream 1 – as described previously) • Concerns about how the idea of converting Mill Street, Regent Street and Brook Street to one-way would work in conjunction with the potential wider changes to the central ring road (as suggested through workstream 1) • A desire to see more evidence in respect of the preceding points 	<p>Based on the responses received during the engagement to the idea of converting Mill Street, Regent Street and Brook Street to one-way running, there appears to be merit to evaluating this concept further during the next stage of work. However, we acknowledge that more evidence is needed to understand the specific benefits (or otherwise) of this idea and how it would interact/work in conjunction with any wider proposals for the town centre before deciding on whether or not it should be included in the full MMTS.</p> <p>In reflection of this, the interim MMTS document has been updated to combine the previously separate central ring road and Mill Street/Regent Street/Brook Street workstreams into a single workstream for the overall town centre highway network, along with setting out a clear set of principles that will guide the work.</p>

Proposed development of a cycle network for Melton Mowbray (workstream 3)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>General Overview</p> <p>The engagement responses indicated strong overall support for the proposal to develop a cycling network for Melton Mowbray, and many of the comments received sought to amplify one or more of the potential benefits of the proposed approach and conceptual network/routes identified through the interim MMTS engagement document.</p> <p>A significant number of comments expressed the need for the cycle network to be fully segregated from vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>A minority of comments that were less supportive or opposed to the proposals. The most commonly cited</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>reasons for this set out/discussed further below.</p>	
<p>Sceptical as to whether the provision of a comprehensive cycle network is justified or proportionate to the needs of Melton Mowbray.</p>	<p>The conclusions reached within the interim strategy have been informed by a comprehensive assessment of the existing cycling and walking infrastructure across the town, carried out in accordance with the approach set out through the Government’s Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans Guidance.</p> <p>The majority view from the responses received were that current cycle facilities were not adequate. Furthermore, the Government’s “Gear Change⁴” vision for cycling and walking and associated Cycle Design Guidance (LTN 1/20), both published in 2020, has substantially further raised the bar in terms of what is considered to represent an adequate or good standard of cycling and walking infrastructure provision.</p>
<p>Concerned about a potential lack of space to provide new dedicated cycling facilities and/or about the possibility of road space being reallocated to expand cycle and pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>Linked to the above, want to see more detail about the actual facilities proposed.</p>	<p>The proposed network outlined in the interim strategy provides the basis for completing the development of a Melton Mowbray Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) as part of the full MMTS, which will set out the facilities to be provided in respect of each of the proposed cycle routes in more detail. It should be noted that the proposed network is an initial concept, with scope to evolve through the development of the LCWIP to reflect the Government’s latest Cycle Design Guidance (LTN 1/20), emerging evidence around opportunities and constraints and analysis of wider transport implications.</p> <p>Further public engagement will be undertaken in relation to the LCWIP and full MMTS and as specific schemes are brought forward.</p>
<p>Some comments also expressed the view that the proposed cycle network should be expanded and/or more comprehensively linked into existing public rights of way (footpaths and bridleways) and other recreational facilities. Specific suggestions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of the ‘E13a’ bridleway (around the west of the town) southwards through the Melton Mowbray South Sustainable Neighbourhood, to meet Kirby Lane, including improved crossing facilities over the A607 • Extending the network further out to neighbouring villages, including along the disused Melton Mowbray to Scalford railway alignment and alongside the A607 • Improved pedestrian/cycle facilities for accessing public open spaces and waterways within the town. • Allowing usage of the proposed cycle network by all non-motorised users (NMUs), especially those sections connecting to the planned orbital NMU route alongside the MMDR 	<p>Noted. As described above, the proposed network outlined in the interim strategy is an initial concept, with scope to evolve through the development of the LCWIP. As part of this process, we will explore suggestions received during the public engagement and the proposed cycle network will be updated to incorporate suggested changes or additions where evidence supports this.</p> <p>Suggestions received during the engagement on this topic will be considered during subsequent work to complete development of the Melton Mowbray LCWIP (as proposed through Workstream 2). The proposed cycling and walking network (and other NMU) will be updated to incorporate suggested changes or additions where evidence supports this.</p>

Proposed exploration of opportunities to improve Melton Mowbray’s road passenger transport network and bus infrastructure (workstreams 4, 5 and 6)

<p>Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised</p>	<p>LCC Response</p>
---	---------------------

⁴ [Department for Transport Gear Change Document, 2021](#)

<p>General Overview</p> <p>The engagement responses indicated strong overall support for the proposed approach to exploring potential improvements to Melton Mowbray’s road passenger transport services and infrastructure, and many of the comments received sought to amplify one or more of the potential benefits of the proposed approach identified through the interim MMTS engagement document.</p> <p>Some comments raised additional issues/areas for investigation during the next stage of work, whilst a minority were less supportive or opposed to the proposed approach. The key/most commonly raised points are set out/discussed further below.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Bus services within the town are too expensive – the proposed workstreams should also seek to deal with this issue.</p>	<p>Affordability is a matter for wider consideration as part of the County Council’s planned Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) for Leicestershire as a whole, which will in turn inform any specific improvements proposed through the MMTS.</p>
<p>Sceptical that there is scope for improving road passenger transport services and/or that any changes would have a significant effect on usage.</p>	<p>Given the limitations and relatively low levels of usage of the town’s current bus network (as highlighted through the strategy evidence base) it is appropriate to explore what, if anything can be done to enhance road passenger transport provision in and around the town as part of the MMTS.</p> <p>Furthermore, undertaking this work as part of the strategy will facilitate a proactive, joined-up approach to dealing with several key interlinked challenges and opportunities facing the town’s road passenger transport network over the coming years, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How best to fulfil and make the most of passenger transport requirements and investment arising from planned developments across the town. • Pursuing the aspirations and possible investment opportunities emerging from the Government’s National Bus Strategy and/or Leicestershire County Council’s planned BSIP in response to this • Future reviews of the supported bus network within Melton Mowbray and Melton Borough, in accordance with the County Council’s Passenger Transport Policy and Strategy (PTPS) • Opportunities arising from potential future regeneration of Melton Mowbray town centre.
<p>Concerns about whether there is space to provide an expanded bus hub and/or that this might require space currently occupied by car parking or other facilities.</p>	<p>No specific proposals have been developed for a bus hub at this stage, and such proposals will in any case need to be linked to future proposals for regenerating Melton Mowbray town centre. As such, it is too early to discuss potential wider implications (e.g. on car parking).</p>
<p>Some more specific suggestions were also received regarding the potential location and/or configuration of the suggested bus hub, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating the proposed bus hub closer to the rail station, to improve connectivity and integration between the bus and rail services • Locating the bus hub on Wilton Road instead of St Mary’s Way 	<p>Work to date suggests that the creation of a single bus hub merits further consideration during the next stage of work and that St Mary’s Way is likely to be the best location for such a hub, given the close proximity to the town centre, the fact that many of the town’s bus services use the existing stops in this area and desire to increase integration between local and inter-urban services.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the interim MMTS document has been updated to clarify that possible alternative locations and</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating two smaller bus hubs to minimise/avoid any additional land/space requirement, and splitting local town services and longer distance/inter-urban bus services between these hubs 	<p>configurations for the potential bus hub will also be explored through Workstream 4, including the suggestions made during the engagement.</p>
--	---

Proposed approach to improving rail services and access at Melton Mowbray Railway Station (workstreams 7 and 8)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>The engagement responses indicated strong overall support for the proposed approach to pursuing improved rail services to/from Melton Mowbray, and measures to improve access at Melton Mowbray Railway Station. Many of the comments received sought to amplify one or more of the potential benefits of the proposed approach identified through the interim MMTS engagement document. Particular themes that were raised as issues/areas for improvement included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost, frequency, and reliability of existing services The need for earlier first trains and later last trains each day, and for more trains over the course of evenings and weekends The need for more direct rail connections from the town, including to Nottingham, Loughborough, and Grantham. In some cases, this included a desire to see the reopening of previously closed lines 	<p>The comments and suggestions received about the specific improvements people would like to see will be considered during the next stages of work. As set out within the strategy document, the County Council has no formal role in rail network planning and provision and therefore the delivery of any other existing or potential services will be reliant on securing the support and commitment of the rail industry and other key stakeholders.</p>
<p>Additionally, several comments referred to ongoing work commissioned by Melton Borough Council to prepare a strategic outline business case for improving connectivity between Melton and Nottingham (through Loughborough), suggesting that this should be included and supported within the MMTS.</p>	<p>Wording has been added to the interim strategy to acknowledge the ongoing MBC-led Melton to Nottingham connectivity work and to confirm that any emerging outputs and recommendations will be considered during the development of the full strategy.</p>
<p>Further comments were received in relation to the proposal to explore potential accessibility improvements at Melton Mowbray Railway Station concerning the sensitivity of the surrounding area and the resulting need to ensure that any specific proposals that emerge from this are sympathetically designed and located.</p>	<p>These comments have been acknowledged within the interim strategy, along with wording to clarify that the exploration of opportunities to provide accessibility improvements <i>“would need to be undertaken in partnership with the rail industry, Melton Borough Council and other stakeholders as appropriate”</i>.</p>

Proposed exploration of potential changes to parking in and around Melton Mowbray town centre (workstream 9)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
--	--------------

<p>The engagement responses indicated strong overall support for the proposals to explore potential changes to parking in and around the town centre.</p> <p>That said, the comments received highlighted a diversity of views concerning the key priorities that the parking review should seek to address, ranging from aspirations to see overall parking provision reduced or rationalised to support regeneration or public space initiatives and/or to encourage sustainable travel choices, to others expressing a desire for parking provision to be made more widely available and/or cheaper than at present.</p> <p>Several comments suggested exploring the potential for a 'park-and-ride' service and/or new and expanded parking facilities including multi-storey car parks.</p>	<p>The main interim strategy document sets out the key challenges and opportunities that any review of parking would need to consider. In doing so, the strategy recognises that there is a balance to be struck between exploring parking measures to encourage sustainable travel and reduce traffic volumes and/or facilitate wider opportunities in the town centre on the one hand, and maintaining essential access to the town centre for vehicle users on the other. Ultimately, any proposed changes to parking that emerge from the review would also need to align with wider plans or aspirations for regenerating the town centre.</p> <p>The comments and suggestions received about the specific parking changes people would like to see will be considered during the next stages of work.</p>
--	---

Proposed exploration of potential improvements to electric vehicle charging facilities in Melton Mowbray (workstream 10)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>General Overview</p> <p>The engagement responses indicated strong overall support for the proposals to explore potential improvements to electric vehicle charging facilities across the town, with many comments referring to the low quantity and quality of existing facilities.</p> <p>Some comments raised other points of relevance to the proposed workstream, whilst a minority were less supportive or opposed to the proposed approach. The key/most commonly raised points are set out/discussed further below.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The proposed workstream is insufficiently ambitious and/or committal on the provision of new electric charging facilities.</p>	<p>The full strategy will be as ambitious as possible in respect of expanding the town's electric vehicle charging infrastructure, albeit reflecting that this will be heavily reliant on the support of third parties (e.g. Melton Borough Council, private land owners, charging point operators, power supply companies) and will also be dependent on the resolution of current uncertainties around certain aspects of the technology, especially in respect of on-street charging facilities (e.g. a lack of agreed national standards for this). The planned approach and key challenges in respect of electric vehicle charging infrastructure are set out in more detail within the main interim strategy document.</p>
<p>Concerned that electric vehicles would not be capable of meeting all travel needs across the town and wider borough and that the continued need to accommodate/support existing internal combustion engine (ICE) and/or other emerging vehicle technologies should not be ignored.</p>	<p>It is recognised that electric vehicle technology may not be capable of supplanting all existing ICE vehicle use and that there will in any case be a substantial transition period as people switch to electric vehicles. Correspondingly, it is not intended that any expansion of electric vehicle charging infrastructure across Melton Mowbray through the MMTS would be 'at the expense of'/seek to penalise ICE vehicle users.</p> <p>Within the revised interim strategy document, the scope of the proposed workstream has been widened to consider "Emerging and Future Transport Technologies" in a broader sense (i.e. not just electric vehicles), partially in response to the comments received in relation to this workstream.</p>

<p>Additionally, Melton Borough Council's response to the engagement referred to ongoing initiatives they were exploring to install electric charging facilities in council car parks and expressed a desire to work jointly to develop proposals for new charging facilities across the town.</p>	<p>The interim strategy document refers to the need to work jointly with Melton Borough Council (MBC) to facilitate the roll-out of electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Reference has also been added to the ongoing initiatives being pursued by MBC in relation to this.</p>
--	--

Proposed development of a programme of travel behaviour initiatives for Melton Mowbray (workstream 11)

Summary of Responses and Key Issues Raised	LCC Response
<p>The engagement responses indicated strong overall support for the proposed development of a travel behaviour programme for Melton Mowbray, with comments in support largely mirroring those received in relation to the proposed cycle network and workstreams to explore improvements to passenger transport.</p> <p>Of the minority of comments that were less supportive or opposed to this proposal, the most commonly cited reason was scepticism about the overall impact and/or number of people who would benefit from a behaviour change programme, with some comments referring to factors such as the town's demographics and/or topography as reasons for holding this view.</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates that travel behaviour programmes are essential to support and maximise the benefits of wider sustainable transport investments such as those to be explored through the other proposed workstreams. Monitoring of previous travel behaviour programmes undertaken elsewhere in the County has shown such programmes to be effective.</p> <p>Notwithstanding some of the specific points raised during the engagement, the strategy evidence base identifies that there is scope to encourage significant increases in walking, cycling and passenger transport usage in and around the town, and therefore that delivering a programme of travel behaviour initiatives as part of the MMTS will be beneficial.</p>

Other Comments made in relation to the draft interim MMTS

Issue Raised	LCC Response
<p>The MMDR scheme isn't being delivered quickly enough.</p>	<p>The interim MMTS affirms the County Council's commitment towards the delivery of the MMDR, the principle of which was established through the adopted Melton Local Plan⁵ (as set out through policies IN1 and IN3 of the Plan). However, the detailed processes and timescales for delivering the MMDR are beyond the scope of the interim MMTS.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is important to note that major road schemes on the scale of the MMDR typically take up to 10 years from initial conception to prepare for construction, due to the wide range and complexity of work that must be undertaken, statutory procedures that must be followed and issues that must be addressed in order to reach 'shovel-ready' stage, crucially including the need to secure external (Government and/or developer) funding.</p> <p>The County Council having successfully secured scheme development funding from the Department for Transport (DfT, the North and East sections of the MMDR (NE MMDR) has progressed significantly faster than might have been anticipated and has provisionally secured funding through the DfT's Large Local Major Transport Schemes Fund. A full business case for the NE MMDR scheme is currently being prepared for submission to the DfT in Autumn 2021 for final approval. If confirmed, the Government will provide £49.5m towards the scheme's delivery. This will in turn enable construction of the NE the MMDR to commence in Spring 2022, with the scheme expected to open in 2024.</p> <p>As a key supporting document for the NE MMDR full business case, an approved interim MMTS will maximise the likelihood of final DfT approval for the NE MMDR scheme and its subsequent delivery in accordance with the above</p>

⁵ [Melton Local plan](#)

		timescales.
Various comments interpreting the numbering of the proposed workstreams as a “priority order” and, based on this, suggesting that certain workstreams should be higher or lower in the running order that set out within the interim MMTS engagement document.		The future workstreams outlined within Chapter 5 of the interim strategy have not been ranked or prioritised in any way. Correspondingly, the numbering of the workstreams should not be interpreted as a “priority order”, with all workstreams needing to be completed to develop the full strategy. The strategy documents have been amended to provide text to clarify this.
The strategy should also explore other emerging technologies and initiatives (e.g. electric buses, electric scooter schemes)		Within the revised interim strategy document, the scope of the proposed workstream to look at electric vehicle charging infrastructure requirements has been widened to consider “ <i>Emerging and Future Transport Technologies</i> ” in a broader sense (i.e. not just electric vehicles).
The strategy should also consider more localised traffic issues within the town (with a range of such issues being described)		An extra proposed workstream has been added to Chapter 5 of the interim strategy document confirming our intention to address residual local traffic management issues in and around the town (such as ‘rat running’ on residential roads and minor country lanes, speeding, or problems associated with on-street parking). The specific locations and issues to be explored through this workstream will be informed by feedback and evidence from members of the public and key stakeholders, including comments and suggestions received during the public engagement exercise held between January and March 2021.
What evidence gathering and/or assessments have been undertaken to inform the inclusion of the potential scheme ideas set out within the proposed workstreams?		<p>The potential scheme ideas set out in Chapter 5 of the interim MMTS document have been developed from evidence gathered over a number of years and/or wider policies and priorities. Additionally, the options considered to date for the central ring road (through Workstream 1) have been informed by initial conceptual design and modelling to help understand the implications of these options on traffic network performance and routeing. Summaries of all this evidence have been provided in the interim MMTS document.</p> <p>Having said that, all the scheme ideas set out in Chapter 5 of the revised interim MMTS document will need to be explored and assessed further in more detail, informed by the responses to the engagement as well as any wider emerging evidence and policies. The approval of the interim MMTS, including the future workstreams, will provide a foundation for this further work.</p>

DRAFT