
Project:	Aylesbury Transport Strategy	Job No:	60489995
Subject:	Stage Three – Issues and Opportunities		
Prepared by:	Amanda Tobin	Date:	4 May 16
Checked by:	Kit Tang	Date:	13 May 16
Approved by:	Ian Burrows	Date:	13 May 16

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This technical note summarises the work that was done as part of Stage Three of the Aylesbury Transport Strategy (ATS). It builds on the work already summarised in Stage Two which was to set out the existing transport conditions for Aylesbury and both committed development and additional population and employment growth identified in the current draft Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP).
- 1.2 The purpose of Stage Three was to identify from the existing transport conditions what the transport issues are today and the potential issues will be in the future based on the predicted growth. As part of this stage, a workshop was held with Stakeholders on the 28th April 2016 (Thursday) to gather their input to these issues also.
- 1.3 The assessment of issues and opportunities at this stage will be drawn from:
- limited to initial modelling results from the Countywide VISUM transport model being undertaken in a separate commission,
 - the existing conditions presented in Stage Two,
 - the known spatial distribution of growth and
 - a high level discussion of the impact of this growth on the transport network from the stakeholder workshop.
- 1.4 Therefore, the ideas put forward for transport improvements at this stage are primarily based on a qualitative assessment of the information above. It is expected these will be developed further to form a more definitive transport strategy as additional evidence becomes available.
- 1.5 Below sets out the content of this technical note:
- **Section 2 - Issues and Opportunities:** Identifies the issues and opportunities arising from the existing conditions presented in Stage Two, workshop feedback and initial modelling results;

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited for the sole use of our client (the "Client") and in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM Limited and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM Limited, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM Limited.

-
- **Section 3 - Outcomes of Workshop:** Summarises the key outcomes of the stakeholder workshop in terms of the ideas put forward for potential improvements in the context of the growth in Aylesbury;
 - **Section 4 - Potential Mitigations:** Summary of potential transport improvements identified following the tasks above; and
 - **Section 5 - Conclusion:** A summary of the key outcomes of Stage Three and the next steps in developing the ATS.

2. Issues and Opportunities

- 2.1 Based on the information collected in Stage Two and presented in the report *Stage 2 - Existing and Future Conditions*, input collected from stakeholders in the ATS Stakeholder Workshop and initial modelling results from the Countywide VISUM transport model, a summary of the issues and opportunities for transport in Aylesbury have been collated into three categories, Highway Network/Car Parking, Public Transport and Walking/Cycling.
- 2.2 The issues and opportunities for each category above were grouped into a set of strengths and weaknesses for the existing situation and opportunities and threats for the future, known as a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis. The tables on the following pages summarise these for each of the categories.
- 2.3 Note, the information used from the Countywide VISUM transport model includes locations of congestion in the base year and future year scenarios. A separate commission is currently underway to model growth scenario options and initial modelling results have been provided for the purpose of this study. The results provided for the purpose of this work are from the 'Do Minimum' scenario which includes the local plan growth and already committed transport schemes. It is expected that future modelling work will be provided for future stages of the ATS, in order to develop a more refined set of options to be included in the strategy.

2.4 Highway Network/Car Parking

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aylesbury is a focal point of Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)'s road network. The town is connected to the wider highway network via the A41, A418 and A413 • The A4157 provides an internal semi-circular road around the north of the town providing an alternative route to crossing the central area • Employment sites are generally within the town centre and west along the A41, therefore well connected to the wider highway network • There is a clear public car parking price structure for short and long stays • Pay & Display car parking on-street in the town centre provides high vehicle rotation. It benefits short stay purposes as personal business and shopping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private vehicles are the primary transport mode within the study area. Average car ownership is 1.5 cars per household and approximately 66% of the residents and 76% of the study area employees travel to work by car • The highway network in Aylesbury is not growing as much as the new developments. The key north-south and east-west highway connections within Aylesbury are generally congested during peak hours. • Due to the radial highway network structure for Aylesbury, high volumes of through traffic are an issue through the town centre. • Arterial routes to/from Aylesbury are busy and congested during the morning and evening peak hours, particularly along the A41 and the southern links. • Road network has little to no resilience to incidents - road closures have a disproportionate effect on other arterial routes. • High supply of car parking may be one of the causes to the high number of car journeys to Aylesbury. Private parking (retail) is rarely enforced and often used to access the town centre rather than the businesses themselves. • Lack of availability of residential parking within the Old Town area of the town centre. • Controlled parking zones for residents are being implemented but they need to be expanded. • Lack of coach parking/drop off points, particularly at the town centre's main attractions (e.g. theatre, museum). • Rat running occurs to avoid the congested arterial routes. • There are roads currently experiencing congestion issues (based on the base year of the Countywide VISUM transport model), those roads showing the highest congestion (volume/capacity) in the peaks include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A4010 (Stoke Mandeville) ○ A413 (Whitchurch) ○ A418 on southern edge of Aylesbury town

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wendover Road and Walton Street approaching the gyratory ○ Approaches to the A418/Bicester Road/A413 triple roundabout ○ A 41 on both approaches to Aylesbury town ○ A413 Buckingham Road near the A4157 • Additionally, there are junctions with delays of more than three minutes in the peaks (based on the base year of the Countywide VISUM transport model), those include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rosborough Road/North Lee Lane ○ A41/Station Road/Townsend Road ○ A41/Martin Dalby Way ○ Eastcote Road/Wendover Road ○ Stoke Mandeville exit/Lower Road ○ Junctions along the A418 north of town centre
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New transport infrastructure (e.g. planned road network) can improve connectivity between Aylesbury and other towns. • Delivery of new link roads will support the significant growth committed and planned in the area (>30,000 houses in Aylesbury Vale, including 14,000 in Aylesbury by 2033) • Delivery of the proposed new primary link roads outside the town centre will create part of an external circular ring road and redirect through-traffic to peripheral routes rather than through the town centre, providing a more pedestrian friendly town centre. Implementation of new link roads will release capacity on existing inner roads and allow new bus priority infrastructure to be implemented on these roads. • Upcoming East West Rail service may encourage a mode shift from car journeys to rail • Reduce car journeys within Aylesbury town centre through the introduction of a Park&Ride system. However this would need to be supported by reduced parking supply in the town centre. Dedicated bus lanes must accompany the Park&Ride system. • Enforcing strict rules on parking near schools may reduce the number of 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many improvements on the highway network may attract more car journeys to the town centre. Restrictions to parking in the town centre need to be considered. • No improvements to the network resilience may cause severe traffic congestion when the High Speed 2 (HS2) construction starts. • Possibility of no funding for capacity upgrades on the highway network • The lack of enforcement on parking supply or price in private car parks (retail) may not discourage car journeys to the town centre. • A Park & Ride system based on buses to the town centre should not be introduced if not proven to be quicker than the car. Otherwise, it will not be used. • Initial modelling of the future scenario based on current local plan growth and committed new road links only has shown peak hour congestion¹ on some additional roads to those identified in the base year above: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Martin Dalby Way ○ A418 approaching A4157 ○ Mandeville Road

¹ Congestion taken from modelling plots provided by Jacobs 22 April 2016.

<p>car journeys to town and provide safer areas in the vicinity of schools.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ A418 approaching A41○ Portway Road○ Aylesbury Gyratory○ Walton Street○ Station Road at Stoke Mandeville○ Griffin Lane○ Rabans Lane○ Local roads in Southcourt and in vicinity of Stoke Mandeville hospital
---	---

2.5 Public Transport

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chiltern Railways provide direct rail access to London (Marylebone) and its rail journey times to/from London are favourable when compared to the private vehicle, which makes the train a valuable choice • The same rail line also links Aylesbury rail station to High Wycombe rail station, the largest town in Buckinghamshire. • Aylesbury town centre is served by local bus routes which cover the main residential areas and link roads. • Regional bus services supplement the local routes in accessing Aylesbury town centre to/from other key urban centres (High Wycombe, Milton Keynes, Hemel Hempstead, Chesham, Bicester and Oxford) • Aylesbury – Oxford bus service via Thame is the best performing route in the county and one of Arriva’s national exemplar “Sapphire” services. It has a comprehensive 7 day per week timetable, high quality buses, wifi etc. 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Transport does not have a high modal share, for commuting purposes, within the study area. Less than 10% of journeys to work are made by train or bus as the main mode. • Bus journey times are not competitive against private vehicle journey time (but on price bus journeys are competitive). • Arterial routes to/from Aylesbury are busy and congested during the morning and evening peak hours which affects the bus services as well. • Aylesbury town bus station is not fit for purpose. Its infrastructure is old (1960’s) and does not have capacity for new bus fleets that operators have invested in.
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching cycling, walking and public transport strategy is needed to encourage a mode shift away from the car where possible. • East West Rail service will make the route competitive to the private vehicle. Improved connectivity between Aylesbury and other towns. Aylesbury will be better connected to other employment centres, including Oxford, Milton Keynes and Cambridge with East West rail. • Whilst not a direct service, an improvement on the Chiltern Railway train frequency to High Wycombe would provide a stronger connectivity between the main town centres in Buckinghamshire. • Improved bus frequency/reliability would attract more bus passengers. Bus priority measures would help to improve reliability for congested routes. • Delivery of the planned new primary link roads outside the town centre will help shift demand away from the A41 and reduce congestion on this route, which may open doors to the obtain funding for Primary Passenger Transport Corridors (mentioned in the LTP3). • Relocation of the bus station to allow it to expand will raise the number of 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining existing highway network conditions will keep the bottlenecks on key roads entering Aylesbury and not support bus usage. • The current single line on the Princes Risborough route (East West Rail proposals) restricts the number of carriages and the speeds that trains can travel. • Transport system may not be accessible for aging population expected in future

public transport journeys. It can provide higher bus capacity and better conditions to passengers and, if close to the rail station provide a good interface between the two.

- Improving bus connectivity to Tring, Aylesbury Vale Parkway and Stoke Mandeville stations will support public transport growth. However, as part of this integrated ticketing between rail/bus services would need to be considered along with a parking strategy for the station and bus priority measures.
- An integrated bus ticketing system between operators would help to increase the public transport use.
-

2.6 Cycling/Walking

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flat topography and good existing cycle infrastructure creates easy access for cyclists and pedestrians. • Already an existing cohesive network of radial cycling routes into the town centre. • Employment sites are generally within the town centre which provides relatively short distances to services and main residential areas. 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private vehicles are the primary transport mode within the Study Area. • Ring road around town centre is a barrier to pedestrians. • No bypass to re-route the traffic away from the town centre. • High dependence on the private car for trips. • Car parking widely available within the town centre, encouraging car use. • Most existing cycling/walking facilities are on shared footways – can have some issues with cyclists not being courteous and sharing space. • Taking cycling routes off road loses priority, e.g. cyclists must give way at driveways, forecourts or access paths. • Cycle routes are not continuous and cycle infrastructure provision is variable along the routes. • Uptake of cycling in Aylesbury has not been as high as other Cycle Demonstration towns. • Many short trips are currently by car, these should be the focus of encouraging a mode shift to active modes. • Safety issue for cyclists and pedestrians at some roundabouts/complex junctions, evidence of collision history at these sites. • BCC does not have a cycling officer now – Sustrans tries to fulfil this role but noted is very difficult and resources are sparse. • Subway from town centre to Cambridge Street retail park heavily used, there are a lack of at grade crossings on Cambridge Street. • Lack of links between existing radial cycle routes • No sight line for pedestrians interchanging between Aylesbury bus station and rail station
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to provide a high quality walking/cycling network in new growth areas. • Shorter journeys could be made by active modes of transport. • A new cycleway will be built with the A4010 Stoke Mandeville bypass and bypass extension proposed as part of the HS2 mitigation measures • Consider evidence from other successful cycling towns to see what can work well in Aylesbury. 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abundance of parking and limited parking restrictions – does not encourage cycling and walking trips.

- Greater permeability for walking and cycling – keep car routes but make them longer/less accessible. Ensure the access to key destinations/attractors is very good and a priority for cyclists/pedestrians.
- Public transport, walking and cycling links should be completed at the same time as new development to encourage uptake of these modes within the growth areas.
- Legible London style signing should be provided to show people options and how easy they are. Already cycling times on posts – this should be expanded throughout the town.
- Introduce a cycle hire facility
- Increased levels of secure and convenient cycle parking definitely needed – especially at the bus/rail stations.
- Cycle routes to Waddesdon, Wendover and Grand Union Triangle route already planned.
- Given Stoke Mandeville was the origin of the Paralympics, all new infrastructure should ensure it provides accessibility to all.

3. Outcomes of Workshop

3.1 A workshop was held with ATS stakeholders on 28th April 2016 (Thursday) to gather their input on the strategy objectives, existing transport conditions in Aylesbury, future growth and potential transport interventions that should be included in the strategy.

3.2 A full summary of the workshop, including attendees, agenda and stakeholder input is shown in Appendix A. The revised strategy objectives based on input in the workshop are shown in Appendix B. Relevant points raised by stakeholders during the workshop are captured in the SWOT analysis of the previous section and a summary of the key themes for transport improvements identified by the stakeholders are shown below.

3.3 Highway Network/Car Parking

- Implement various link roads for traffic and reallocate road space to public transport on roads closer to the town centre.

3.4 Public Transport/Cycling/Walking

- Improve capacity, ambience and access to the town centre for bus station, relocate if necessary.
- Improve transport links to all three rail stations (i.e. Aylesbury town centre, Aylesbury Vale Parkway and Stoke Mandeville) in Aylesbury.
- Link new developments and key destinations to the town centre by active travel and public transport.
- Incorporate intelligent design into new developments to ensure that active travel and public transport are as attractive to use as the private vehicle, e.g. well connected pedestrian network.
- Complete gaps in cycling/walking network, particularly connections between the radial cycle network.
- Providing more travel information, e.g. walking times signposted and walking/cycling maps displayed at key locations.
- Improving access to travel information, e.g. incorporating more technology such as travel mobile apps and a single central place to get travel information online.
- Provide a central transport interchange that integrates bus, cycle and rail access and easily links to the town centre, possibly through an upgrade or relocation of the existing bus station.

-
- Run a travel awareness campaign, which may include a combination of hard and soft measures to support improvements to active travel and public transport infrastructure.
 - Implement an overarching strategy to connect new developments, both with each other and the town centre by active travel and public transport modes.

3.5 At the conclusion of the workshop, stakeholders were asked to prioritise the improvements identified above. Preference was given to improving the bus station and potentially creating a new transport hub that integrates public transport, cycling and walking and implementing an outer ring road that would take traffic away from the town centre and allow public transport priority improvements to take place on the roads closer to the town centre, improving public transport journey time reliability. Preference was also given to ensuring a strategic approach is in place for providing active travel and public transport access to all new development and ensuring good transport links are in place to all three rail stations around the town centre.

4. Potential Mitigations

4.1 Considering the improvements identified by stakeholders in the workshop and the opportunities identified in the SWOT analysis, a list of potential transport interventions for Aylesbury are identified in the table below, along with their links to the ATS objectives and potential timeframe for implementation.

Theme for Transport Improvement		Linked ATS Objective	Timeframe
			Short term: 2016-2020 Medium term: 2021-2030 Long term: 2031-2036
1	Improve transport links to Aylesbury, Stoke Mandeville, Aylesbury Vale Parkway and Tring rail stations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes • Improve accessibility to other urban centres and new growth areas 	Short term
2	Improve capacity, ambience and access to the town centre for the bus station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve transport access and movement in town centre • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes 	Short term
3	Complete gaps in cycling/walking network, particularly connections between the radial cycle network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve transport access and movement in town centre • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes • Reduce the risk of death or injury on the transport network 	Short term
4	Providing more travel information, e.g. walking times signposted and walking/cycling maps displayed at key locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes 	Short term

5	Improving access to travel information, e.g. incorporating more technology such as travel mobile apps and a single central place to get travel information online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes 	Short term
6	Consider evidence of success of past active travel and public transport travel campaigns and develop a package of programmes to target specific groups, e.g. travel planning for businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes 	Short term
7	Undertake a parking study to understand current supply and demand in order to reassess parking provisions and controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve transport access and movement in town centre 	Short term
8	Improve pedestrian crossings where safety is an issue or where major roads act as a barrier to pedestrian movements (eg Cambridge Street Retail Park is currently seen as a barrier to pedestrians)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve transport access and movement in town centre • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes • Reduce the risk of death or injury on the transport network 	Short term
9	Undertake more detailed studies for sites with existing pedestrian safety issues, eg. Haydon Road crossing at the Bicester Road roundabout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the risk of death or injury on the transport network • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes 	Short term

10	Assess the layout of the triple roundabout/ Royal Buckinghamshire Hospital Junction for existing safety issues and design improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve transport access and movement in town centre • Reduce the risk of death or injury on the transport network 	Short term
11	Implement new link roads to connect radial roads, to enable road space to be reallocated to public transport and provide active and public transport access to the town centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve transport access and movement in town centre • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes • Improve journey time reliability 	Short - medium term
12	Implement an overarching strategy to connect new developments, both with each other, to key destinations and to the town centre by active and public transport modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes • Reduce the risk of death or injury on the transport network • Minimise the impact of future growth on traffic levels, congestion and air quality • Improve accessibility to other urban centres and new growth areas 	Short – Medium term
13	Incorporate intelligent design within new developments to ensure that active travel and public transport modes are as attractive to use as the private vehicles, e.g. well connected pedestrian network within the development areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes • Minimise the impact of future growth on traffic levels, congestion and air quality 	Short - Medium term
14	Integrate public transport ticketing across all operators and all modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public modes • Improve accessibility to other urban centres and new growth areas 	Medium term

15	Consider new ways to re-design roads within central area of Aylesbury, such as shared space design (eg Cambridge Street Retail Park is currently seen as a barrier to pedestrians)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve transport access and movement in town centre • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes 	Medium term
16	Implement a low emission zone for the centre of Aylesbury, restricting HGV flows to essential movements, once through traffic has an alternative route	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve transport access and movement in town centre • Minimise the impact of future growth on traffic levels, congestion and air quality • Improve journey time reliability 	Medium term
17	Possibly as a next step to the short term bus station upgrade above, provide a central transport interchange that integrates bus, cycle and rail access and easily links to the town centre, possibly through an upgrade of the existing bus station or relocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve transport access and movement in town centre • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes • Improve accessibility to other urban centres and new growth areas 	Medium-long term
18	Run a travel awareness campaign, which may include a combination of hard and soft measures to support improvements to active and public transport infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes 	Ongoing

4.2 The table below summarises and cross reference the above themes for transport improvement against each strategy objective.

Theme for Transport Improvement	Strategy Objective					
	Improve transport access and movement in town centre	Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes	Reduce the risk of death or injury on the transport network	Minimise the impact of future growth on traffic levels, congestion and air quality	Improve journey time reliability	Improve accessibility to other urban centres and new growth areas
1		✓				✓
2	✓	✓				
3	✓	✓	✓			
4		✓				
5		✓				
6		✓				
7	✓					
8	✓	✓	✓			
9		✓	✓			
10	✓		✓			
11	✓	✓			✓	
12		✓	✓	✓		✓
13		✓		✓		
14		✓				✓
15	✓	✓				
16	✓			✓	✓	
17	✓	✓				✓
18		✓				

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 This report has drawn together analysis of the existing transport conditions in Aylesbury from Stage Two, information from the initial modelling results in the Countywide VISUM transport model and inputs from stakeholders gathered in the Stakeholder Workshop. It summarises the key issues and opportunities for transport within Aylesbury and identifies potential improvements for transport to be considered within the ATS.
- 5.2 The next stage of work will be to consider feedback to this report from stakeholders, develop a longer list of more detailed transport improvements for Aylesbury and consider emerging evidence from the ongoing modelling work that is being undertaken in parallel to the development of the ATS.
- 5.3 Specifically, the next steps in the study are defined below:
- Consider all evidence gathered to date and feedback on Stages One to Three to develop a long list of potential transport schemes to be incorporated into the ATS;
 - Assess this list against the strategy objectives and determine how the impacts of these improvements would be measured;
 - Identify any missing improvements from the assessment above;
 - Collect evidence from modelling being undertaken of future growth;
 - Use evidence of future conditions to assess the long list of options and identify any gaps and/or remove irrelevant schemes from the existing list;
 - Sift the long list of options into a smaller set of schemes, potentially grouped as packages;
 - Hold a second stakeholder workshop to discuss the suggested list of schemes and short list to a final selection for the ATS;
 - Draft the ATS for public consultation; and
 - Finalise the ATS based on stakeholder and public feedback.

Glossary

The following is a glossary of abbreviations used throughout the progress of the ATS.

AONB	Area of Outstanding National Beauty
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
ATCP	Aylesbury Town Centre Plan
ATS	Aylesbury Transport Strategy
AVDC	Aylesbury Vale District Council
BCC	Buckinghamshire County Council
BTVLEP	Buckinghamshire Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership
HEDNA	Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment
HELAA	Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation
JTW	Journey to Work
LSOA	Lower Layer Super Output Area
LTP	Local Transport Plan
MSOA	Middle Super Output Area
OAN	Objectively Assessed Need
ORR	Office for Rail and Road
PPTC	Primary Public Transport Corridor
SEMLEP	South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership
SEP	Strategic Economic Plan
SWOT	Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, Threat
TfB	Transport for Buckinghamshire
VALP	Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan

Appendix A

Summary of Aylesbury Transport Strategy Stakeholder Workshop

Introduction

The Aylesbury Transport Strategy (ATS) stakeholder workshop was held at Aylesbury Vale District Council's (AVDC) offices, on 28th April 2016 (Thursday), between 1pm and 5pm, with the aim of reaching a common understanding of the views that stakeholders hold on:

- Transport issues in Aylesbury today;
- The scale of growth around Aylesbury and the transport challenges associated with this growth; and
- Potential transport opportunities and interventions for Aylesbury.

Agenda

Below is the agenda for the workshop.

1. Strategy Context (1:40 pm – 1:50 pm)
2. Strategy Objectives (1:50 pm – 2:10 pm)
3. **Group feedback**
4. Existing Transport Conditions in Aylesbury (2:10 pm – 3:20 pm)
5. **Group feedback**
6. *Break (3:20 pm – 3:30 pm)*
7. Committed Growth & Impacts (3:30 pm – 3:50 pm)
8. Aylesbury Local Plan Growth (3:50 pm – 4:00 pm)
9. Potential Transport Challenges and Interventions (4:00 pm – 4:50 pm)
10. **Group feedback**
11. Next steps (4:50 pm – 5:00 pm)

Attendees

Below is a list of those people who attended the workshop. .

Name	Representing
Andrew Clarke	Buckinghamshire County Council (Passenger Transport)
Andy Kirkham	AVDC (Planning)
Anthony Blackmore	Transport for Buckinghamshire (Network Management)
Dave Roberts	Transport for Buckinghamshire (Network Management)
David Heathfield	Chiltern Railways
Del Tester	Buckinghamshire County Council (Development Management)
Hayley Jeffery	AVDC (Development Management)
Ian McGowan	Buckinghamshire County Council (Infrastructure Delivery)
Jack Mayhew	Buckinghamshire County Council (Growth & Development Strategy)
Joan Hancox	Buckinghamshire County Council (Transport Strategy)
Jonathan Clark	Buckinghamshire County Council (Strategic Access)
Peter Challis	Sustrans
Peter Williams	AVDC (Planning / DM)
Rachel Wileman	Buckinghamshire County Council (Strategic Planning)
Rebecca Dengler	Buckinghamshire County Council (Transport Strategy)
Sarah Gibson	Buckinghamshire County Council (Transport Strategy)
Susan Kitchen	AVDC (Development Management)
Thomas Fitzpatrick	Buckinghamshire County Council (HS2)
Paul Hodson	Buckinghamshire County Council (Localities)
Tom Burton	Buckinghamshire County Council (Public Health)
Siamak Khorgami	AECOM
Ian Burrows	AECOM
Andy Firman	AECOM
Kit Tang	AECOM
Chris Wood	AECOM
Amanda Tobin	AECOM
Tara Tanoz-Sargeant	AECOM

Strategy Objectives Feedback and Comments

The objectives of the ATS agreed with the Steering Committee were presented to the stakeholders, who were invited to provide their feedback on them. The table below summarises their comments.

Strategy Objective	Feedback
<i>Improve transport access and movement in town centre</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion to change objective name to “Permeability of Town Centre” • Defining town centre – larger than the area enclosed by the inner ring road- town centre has expanded and the ring road has become a barrier to pedestrian movement • Connectivity of town centre
<i>Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider One Transport Project within this objective • Suggestion to change the name of objective to “Non-car travel” • Ensure it covers consideration for reducing the need to travel e.g. faster broadband to encourage working from home. • Incorporate improved accessibility into this objective.
<i>Reduce the risk of death or injury on the transport network</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents often raise road safety concerns through local forums, particularly speeding in general and parking outside schools. With an aging population this will be more important at both new and existing developments. • If speeding is an issue, this needs to be identified through evidence.
<i>Minimise the impact of future growth on traffic levels, congestion and air quality</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion to change the focus of this objective to improving air quality, which can be achieved by reducing congestion.
<i>Improve journey time reliability</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to define ‘good’ journey times? • Which users are going to be targeted - active and public transport modes may come at a cost to private vehicle users. • Where does the Park & Ride fit in?
<i>Improve accessibility to other urban centres and new growth areas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the study area - split between strategic and local areas? • Planning permission is granted to developments on the outskirts of the existing town centre, which often include plans to improve the road near them. This approach should be reconsidered. Perhaps a more sustainable transport focus should be encouraged in new developments, i.e. developments need to be designed from the outset so that active and public transport modes are the quickest and most convenient ways to travel in order to help deter car use

Existing Transport Conditions in Aylesbury

A presentation was given by AECOM about the existing transport conditions in Aylesbury, followed by a session of smaller breakout groups amongst the stakeholders to discuss the transport issues for Aylesbury. Each group provided feedback to the wider workshop group at the end of this session and facilitators at each table took notes. The following is a summary of the current transport issues raised by stakeholders.

Highway Network

- Network was designed for inbound trips with Aylesbury as a destination, whereas now it is used for a large number of through trips.
 - o High volumes of through traffic are an issue through the town centre, there are no alternative viable routes around the town, i.e, link roads or bypasses.
- Linked trips – where people cross the town centre multiple times in a peak. For example dropping off children at school, returning home, driving to work. All these are short, cross town movements. Radial road network possibly contributes.
- Road network has little to no resilience- road closures have a disproportionate effect on other arterial routes.

Buses

- Regional bus services supplement the local routes in accessing Aylesbury town centre and key destinations. i.e. links to Stoke Mandeville Hospital
- The Aylesbury – Oxford bus service via Thame should be improved and enhanced
- Developer funding for Primary Passenger Transport Corridors (mentioned in the LTP3) has been obtained but the A41 is so heavily used that there is no public support or the political will to implement them at the moment.
 - o These should be considered in the long term when alternative viable routes exist and carriageway capacity can be reduced in favour of bus priority, which will reduce the use of the A41 by private vehicles.
- A stakeholder's view was that bus services are not reliable or necessarily direct routes to the town centre.
- A stakeholder's view was that the Rainbow bus routes are frequent but their journey times are not reliable.
- Bus tickets are different for each operator, no central ticketing system and needs more integration.
- More direct and faster public transport services are required.
- Bus station is not fit for purpose.
 - o 1960's bus station infrastructure can't cope with new bus fleets
 - o Operators have invested in new buses, but there is no capacity
 - o Hidden under shopping centre
 - o Needs investment
 - o Exhaust fumes from buses come into shopping centre above
- Bus ridership has steadied or increased [no figures were given]

Rail

- Station area and roads/bus services have little connectivity
- Station access - no sight line from (Aylesbury) station to the town centre
- East West Rail proposals-
 - o Single line on the Princes Risborough route restricts the number of carriages and the speeds that trains can travel.
 - o Journey time and capacity improvements
- Metropolitan line – run by TfL also has capacity and speed restrictions.

Car Parking

- Availability of residential parking in the town centre and beyond.
- Parents/students who drive to school take up parking near schools.
- No clear parking strategy
- Lack of coach parking/drop off points at the theatre and museum in the town centre.
- Need to distinguish between 24 hour car parks and those with limited opening hours.
- Private parking is rarely enforced and often used to access the town centre rather than the businesses themselves.

Walking & Cycling

- Quality of the infrastructure is just as important as the quantity.
 - o Overall journeys important – how do they get to where they want to go once the majority of the journey is completed? E.g. you arrive at the bus/rail station but how do you complete the final leg of your journey – it should be easy, quick and convenient.
- Most existing cycling/walking facilities are on shared footways – can have some issues with cyclists not being courteous and sharing space
- Taking cycling routes off road loses priority, eg cyclists must give way at driveways, forecourts or access paths.
 - o Routes are not continuous – cycle infrastructure provision variable along the routes
- Aylesbury is a “less successful” cycle demonstration town. There has been some change in the levels of cycling and infrastructure improvements have been made, but impacts are not as great as in other locations.
- Want to follow an “evidence” based approach of what works – is Aylesbury following a key strategy now? Or has the cycle demonstration town label clouded the issue?
 - o Should align the evidence from other, similar towns in the UK and Europe.
- Short trips - > 5 km are driven – these should be the focus of encouraging modal shift towards active and public transport modes of transport. Links to the model analysis of the existing trip patterns
- Roundabouts prove a barrier to less confident cyclists using on road routes.
- Cycling network should be publicised to residents and businesses along the routes.
- Due to government cutbacks, BCC does not have a cycling officer now –Sustrans tries to fulfil this role but noted is very difficult and resources are sparse.
- Greater permeability for walking and cycling – keep car routes but make them longer/less accessible. Ensure the access to key destinations/attractors is very good and a priority for cyclists/pedestrians. Motorist access should follow as a second consideration.
- Subway from town centre to Cambridge Street retail park heavily used, there are a lack of at grade crossings on Cambridge Street

Additional Issues Raised

- Lack of travel planning for businesses
 - o some the schools have them in place but not businesses.
 - o Travel plans are not followed up to make sure they are being implemented.
- LTP3 – some aspects of this are still valid, in some cases more specific than the LTP4 that has been approved, so they should both be considered.
- Deliverability – how will we measure what is put in?
- Queried if there is actually the political support for change to encourage walking and cycling e.g. A politician will happily open a new cycle parking area, but wouldn't want to be associated with opening a road closure to facilitate better access to it.
- Getting it right for the future and making longer term decisions is difficult, but necessary. As an example, increased physical activity equals better health for residents, but quantifying the longer term savings through business cases is needed.
- Aylesbury Transport Hub - tried to satisfy everyone but the public information centre was shut down within 1 year, and has now been closed for 6 years.
- Additional usage of the towpath and access over Canal and River trust land will be considered as long as it is suitable to cope with the additional usage in terms of width, surfacing and safety. The trust welcomes early contact from developers/district council/county council to discuss this.
 - o Access onto their land requires a commercial agreement but they are willing to consider the whole package and if improvements can be made with funding, they may be able to consider a lower connection license fee.

Committed Growth and its Impact

A brief presentation was given on the committed developments around Aylesbury. Below are some points raised by stakeholders.

- Much of the development is likely to be the South and East of Aylesbury
 - o Between HS2 line and Aylesbury
 - o Towards Arla Factory to the South East
 - o East of town, some large developments are yet to obtain planning permission
- Suggestions that growth and infrastructure should consider the current and future demographics of the town.

Future Challenges and Suggested Interventions

In this activity, the growth being considered in the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) was presented by Peter Williams of AVDC. This was then followed up with smaller breakout groups again to discuss the future impacts and opportunities for transport in Aylesbury based on this growth. The following are the key points that were raised in these discussion groups.

Highway Network

- New link roads within new developments should only be for local traffic. Other traffic should be directed onto peripheral roads
- Who will pay for future capacity upgrades to developer funded roads?

Bus

- Relocation of the bus station, to allow it to expand and cater for increased or improved services should be considered
 - o but keep it close to the rail station
 - o alternatively consider a series of dispersed, smaller bus stations, which also has issues in connecting them. Consider whether they would be within walking distance of one another.
- Improved bus frequency/reliability

Rail

- Parkway station does not align with the growth which is all in the South and East.
 - o Stoke Mandeville may be a better investment if the growth is closer to it, however a review of the requirements for bus interchange and cycle parking at this station would need to be undertaken to ensure it can cope with additional demand.
- Connectivity to Tring, Aylesbury Vale Parkway and Stoke Mandeville.
- East West Rail will bring journey time improvements and improved accessibility to the North and East.
 - o Aylesbury to Milton Keynes ~ 33 mins
- Wi-Fi on trains, allow people to be more productive whilst commuting.

Town Centre

- Growth in the town centre – takes out parking spaces, primarily residential or commercial land use.
- Improve public realm, pedestrian and cycle facilities.
- Redirect through-traffic to peripheral routes rather than through the town centre which would make the town centre more pedestrian friendly.

Car Parking

- Park and ride –if it can be proven/shown to be quicker. All plans so far would have users stuck in traffic in a bus rather than a car. Dedicated bus lanes to accompany it/them would be required
- Regeneration leads to lower car parking provision.

Walking/Cycling

- Public transport, walking and cycling links should be completed at the same time as new development. Otherwise new residents only consider travelling by private car from the start
- Legible London style signing should be provided – show people options and how easy they are. Already cycling times on posts – this should be expanded throughout the town
- Cycle hire – not sure it could be supported in Aylesbury
- Increased levels of secure and convenient cycle parking definitely needed – especially at the bus/rail stations
- Overarching cycling, walking and public transport strategy is needed
- Cycle routes to Waddesdon, Wendover and Grand Union Triangle route already planned
- Is there enough cycle parking to cope with current and future demand?

Additional Suggestions

- Need to match “motivation” and “infrastructure”. The new modes need to sell themselves visually
- Business travel plans should be implemented and enforced with employers in Aylesbury
- New developments should feature intelligent designs – promoted by town and country planning
 - o Link infrastructure – such as shops on cycling/pedestrian routes – parking should not be directly outside etc.
 - o E.g. Wokingham development which was designed with active travel/public transport first. New residents were advised they “don’t need a car”. Could Aylesbury follow this?
- The design of new housing areas should be a coordinated approach – e.g. planners, architects, engineers and operators all liaising throughout the process rather than only being involved at certain times of the process.
- Greater links to Tring?
- Digital mapping and support of facilities on maps is key. Highlight how close areas are and how journeys can be made by active modes/public transport.

Feedback – Top 3 Schemes by Group

Following the previous activity, each of the discussion groups reported back to the wider workshop what their top three priorities are for transport improvements in Aylesbury. These are listed below.

Table 1 – Walking/Cycling/PT

Ensure that the cycle/walking network is more complete – connections between the radial network (More complete walking / cycling routes)

Raise awareness – intelligent design of newer developments so that active and public transport modes are given equal weight – car parks less accessible easier walking routes etc. (Intelligent design of new developments)

Information easier to access, e.g. Legible London – walking times signposted, and incorporating more technology – mobile apps, single central place to get information. (Information campaign)

Table 2 – Walking/Cycling/PT

Central transport interchange that integrates bus, cycle and rail access and easily links to the town centre (Bus, rail and cycle hub linked to the town centre)

Travel Awareness campaign – combination of hard and soft measures as part of the new infrastructure (Travel awareness campaign)

Strategy to connect new developments, both with each other and the town centre by active and public transport modes

Table 3 – Highway Network

Ring Road – outside town centre with an associated package of PT measures for the town centre (Outer ring road & associated package of public transport measures (including bus station))

Bus station improvements – capacity and ambience, access to the town centre

Rail Station Access – for all three stations that serve Aylesbury including Stoke Mandeville – if development growth is in that direction, perhaps it should be made larger.

Table 4 – Town Centre & Parking

Link new developments to the town centre by active and public transport modes

Upgrade/relocate bus station

Ensure correct demographics are catered for and targeted – in both campaigns and transport provision (Ensure right demographics are catered for)

The top 3 suggestions from each group above were then ranked, using votes given by each stakeholder to their preferred improvements. Note, since there were repeated instances of bus station upgrades, these were incorporated into a single scheme suggestion:

Transport Intervention	Votes	% Votes
More complete walking / cycling routes	13	7%
Intelligent design of new developments	6	3%
Information campaign	10	6%
Bus, rail and cycle hub linked to the town centre	36	20%
Travel awareness campaign	8	4%
Network of active and public transport modes	9	5%
Link new developments to the town centre by active and public transport modes	20	11%
Ensure right demographics are catered for	15	8%
Outer ring road & associated package of public transport measures (including bus station)	42	24%
Rail station access (for all stations)	19	11%

The three schemes from above that received the most support are:

1. Implementation of an outer ring road with public transport measures (including bus station)
2. Bus, rail and cycle hub linked to the town centre
3. Link new developments to the town centre by active and public transport modes.

Appendix B

Revised Strategy Objectives

Revised Objective and Description
<p>1. Improve transport connectivity and accessibility within Aylesbury town</p>
<p>This is focused on making it easier to access and move around Aylesbury town, in order to make it more attractive to visit for work or leisure and spend time in. It supports the VALP in regenerating the town centre.</p>
<p>Lack of permeability for active modes, particularly across the ring road, outdated waiting facilities at the bus station, and high car use in the town centre have all been identified as barriers to movement and access within the town.</p>
<p>2. Improve accessibility to other urban centres and new growth areas</p>
<p>This is focused on improving existing transport links and providing more mode options to connect to surrounding urban centres and also ensuring this is provided to new areas of growth around Aylesbury. This would improve access to jobs for the local population both within Aylesbury and to other urban centres and enable growth. Barriers identified include a lack of express bus services to other towns and poor north-south and east-west connections. A number of new road links are also being considered for new development sites in Aylesbury. This will support housing and job growth within Aylesbury and the wider area.</p>
<p>3. Contribute to improved air quality by minimising the growth in traffic levels and congestion</p>
<p>Congestion levels on roads entering Aylesbury and in peak periods in some parts of the town centre have been raised as an issue with current levels of demand. There are also three existing air quality management areas within Aylesbury. Therefore an important consideration of the ATS will be to ensure that the future growth of Aylesbury does not make this issue noticeably worse and that transport infrastructure for new development is designed to encourage public transport and walking/cycling travel over private vehicle trips. Schemes may include initiatives that promote low carbon vehicles, improve efficiency of freight movements, reduce the need to travel and park and ride opportunities.</p>
<p>4. Improve journey time reliability</p>
<p>In order to achieve generally consistent journey times and therefore reliability on the local road and transport network, the strategy should consider ways to manage demand and improve the network capacity to meet the demands of growth. Providing a reliable journey time on the network will attract more investment in the town and therefore support economic growth. All users should be considered in this objective and schemes should reflect a wholistic strategy that considers priority for different users on the various road corridors, such as providing more priority for buses on existing inner roads, when new outer road links have been built for private car and freight traffic.</p>

5. Reduce the risk of death or injury on the transport network
Address current safety issues on the road and transport network identified through evidence of speeding or collision history and ensure that any transport mitigation scheme considered for the strategy does not increase risk to safety. Also taking into account the aging demographic in the area and in new growth areas.
6. Make it easier and more attractive to travel by active modes and public transport
Supporting and working with the other objectives of the strategy, this is focussed on reducing car use and encouraging the uptake of active modes and public transport for more trips. This will include improvements to infrastructure to provide a well-connected, easy to use and safe public transport and walking/cycling network that is also equally accessible to those of limited mobility, improvements to public transport coverage and service levels, access to up to date online information through initiatives such as the One Transport project and programmes to encourage non-car use for short to medium distance trips.