

... Not using Survey monkey for the reasons you have been informed of by numerous people, including councillors at last week's overview and scrutiny meeting. My responses are in italics for ease of use.

Welcome to the Local Transport Plan 4 consultation survey. We've identified these objectives and we'd like your views on their priority. from 1-5 (1 being most important)

1. *To ensure access to services for those who live in rural areas – by improving the ability of our road network to cope with the unexpected, and by working closely with 'ALL' transport operators to deliver a wider range of transport options, with priority given to subsidised public transport for those without a car. If you don't have a car and broadband isn't fast enough how are you going to work?*
2. *Make journeys easier and safer – by making bus and rail tickets compatible, interchangeable, and easier to buy and use. Most modern cities make their parking ticket serve as a transport ticket as well, to use on bus and rail all day. Providing 'real time' information at well-equipped transport stops, improving signage to walking and cycling routes and by helping people feel safe during their journeys (specially school transport) are other ways this could be achieved. Many successful examples exist on the continent in Holland and Germany etc. Increased focus on east west routes rather than the preoccupation with north south.*
3. *Promoting healthy lifestyles – by making sure any new developments maximise walking, cycling and bus use, by delivering and promoting active travel schemes and by reducing the number of short distance, single occupant car journeys on our roads.*
4. *Provide a good quality transport network for 'ALL' users – by being proactive in our asset management and by 'working closely' with the public, Highways England, rail and bus companies.*
5. *Enabling economic growth - by building new roads linking new developments to the transport network, has become a much disparaged mantra in recent times among city experts, (Based on the best-selling book 'Enough Is Enough by Rob Dietz and Dan O'Neill) and shows the lack of adventure in our cash strapped council. In truth the idea of reducing short distance car journeys has been LAST on this council's priority list anyway ! Successful business areas are attractive ones, the way our High Town used to be with it's trees, as people linger longer and shop more.*
6. *Do you have any further comments you would like us to consider?*
Yes, this document was clearly designed to obtain the desired responses of the protagonists in this scheme. instead of real ones from the public! It ignores an earlier consultation in which the public make clear that the order you have listed in this questionnaire is the the reverse of what the public requested. It is also impossible to complete this online while searching through hundreds of pages.

We have set out our spending priorities and would like to understand your priorities for transport spending (1 highest, 5 lowest). The figures shown are typical core funding allocations and exclude funding for major schemes.

7. *First priority - Public transport (shelters, kerbs etc.) £0.1M*
 8. *Secondly - Walking and cycling schemes £0.7M*
 9. *Thirdly - Road safety improvements and safer routes to school £0.4M*
 10. *Fourth - Planned/structural maintenance £9.5M*
 11. *Finally in last place - Revenue schemes for a cash strapped council may on the surface sound sensible, but that depends on how they are used. More houses ultimately means more traffic and none of the planned schemes will ultimately reduce traffic, and far from the suggestion of LTP 4 documents, SLR is NOT a done deal and HRR is even more remote as a possibility when, as the core strategy examiner rightly pointed out, it is not even modelled or listed in Highways England plans to 2020. Even our MP is opposed to the current plans. Anyone listening????*
- Reactive maintenance (highways, grounds, etc.) c.£6.5M/year
12. *Bus route subsidy c.£1.1M/year: More should be allocated to this! More action and less hyperbole!*
 13. *Road safety and sustainable transport promotions c £100k/year likewise a higher priority.*
 14. *Concessionary transport c £1.3M/year*

15. Do you have any further comments you would like us to consider?

Yes, our roads do need to be maintained but judged by the number of potholes found on recent journies, it's hard to see where you have been spending the amount claimed above. Seems you are more interested in supporting the ironmongery and traffic light industries, designed (according to a new report out today) to cause billions of pounds in lost minutes to industry due to the holdups they cause. (BBC Radio 25th January 2016)

16. Do you agree with the approach taken for this SEA? If not, please explain why?
If 'no' please explain

No. You should come back to the public with plain English, not jargonese which most lay members of the public won't comprehend, and I doubt many of the councillors will either. Much less will they have the time to wade through hundreds of pages. Note; Councillor Warmington read out an email from Herefordshire Transport Alliance about this very subject at the recent Overview and Scrutiny meeting, and much agreement was expressed in the hall with the points raised.

17. Do you agree with the findings of the SEA? If not, please explain why?

The Environmental Assessment of these Local Transport Proposals is plainly inaccurate and misleading in way too many areas ... I could provide a comprehensive list but I think you know what I am saying is true.

18. Do you have any recommendation for further indicators or parameters to include in the monitoring framework of the SEA?

Real life assessments not desktop modelling would be a good start. Also taking note of your own figures in documents produced by Highways England, Parsons Brinkerhoff and others who list 'adverse' impacts on air quality and other environmental issues, instead of dismissing them because they don't fit the desires of cabinet and other officers.

19. Do you feel the performance indicators (Page 36 LTP4 strategy and delivery) will accurately reflect the true picture of Transport in Herefordshire? If no please explain why.

No ... see all of the above ... plus it pays no real attention to linking with major arteries east of Ledbury. Much of the north to south traffic doesn't even enter Hereford but goes off to Gloucester or M50.

20. Which of the policies or schemes identified in LTP 4 will be most beneficial to you?

Properly supported public transport, walking and cycling, but this would also benefit motorists as with less traffic on the road they would not be faced with so much congestion, especially as demonstrated in school holidays when there is no school run and a huge reduction in hold ups.

21. Do you feel you will be disadvantaged by the policies or schemes identified in LTP 4?

Yes. The rush to fill the roads with more cars, which will be the result of more unsupported housing, while pedestrians and cyclists are already sidelined by intrusive ironmongery! On an environmental note, the loss of rural amenities, wildlife habitats, ancient woodlands and grade one farmland are also too much to lose.

22. Do you agree with the extent of the proposed strategic highway network.

No. Wasting millions of pounds on a road to nowhere when cutting essential services like respite care, care for the homeless (SHYPP), CAB and other similar issues, is NOT acceptable.