

May 2010

**CAERPHILLY LDP UP TO 2021****GREENDOORSTEP SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT****TRANSPORT****1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The Greendoorstep group object to the overall transport plan of the LDP because it does not:

- REDUCE THE NEED TO TRAVEL (it will increase);
- ACHIEVE A MODAL SPLIT CHANGE IN FAVOUR OF GREEN TRANSPORT AT THE EXPENSE OF PRIVATE CAR USE

**2.0 AUTHORITATIVE PLANNING ADVICE AND GUIDELINE**

2.1 The advice from the Welsh Assembly government clearly indicates that plan must attempt to achieve the above and there are numerous references to this in all the Planning advice given by the Welsh Assembly, Department of Transport and in the LDP itself.

For example:.

2.1.1 The Wales Transport Strategy forward states: *We also set out the five key areas where we need to make substantial progress. These are:*

- Reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental impacts;*
- Improving public transport and better integration between modes*

**2.1.2 PLANNING POLICY WALES**

2.3.2 *Planning policies and proposals should:*

*(Sections 2.6, 2.7).*

- *Locate developments so as to minimise the demand for travel, especially by private car (Section 2.5, Chapter 8).*
- *Contribute to climate protection by encouraging land uses that result in reduced emissions of greenhouse gases, in particular energy-efficient development, and Promoting use of energy from renewable sources (Section 2.5, 2.9.2& chapter 12).*

*And new development is consistent with minimising the need to travel and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car.*

*Preparing accessibility profiles for public transport, walking, cycling and freight may assist local authorities in plan preparation and assessing possible development sites.*

### 2.1.3 TAN 18.

*Planning authorities should ensure that their development plan strategy is compatible with the aim of reducing the need to travel and provides greater choice of means of transport other than the private car.*

### 2.1.4 Smart alternatives CBC document

*Improvements to public transport to connect people to local jobs and to jobs in Cardiff and Newport will be a key ingredient to regeneration, as will the ability to move goods in and out of the County Borough.*

### 2.1.5 Department of Transport & health November 2009

The forward highlights the need to reduce carbon emissions

Page 36 recommends that *Planners and developers should work closely with transport officers to ensure the impact of existing and future developments is minimised on transport networks and reduces the need the travel*

Paragraph 72 also refers to public transport as a very important ingredient in reducing the need to travel

### 2.1.5 DETR Integrated Transport document 1998

The DETR Integrated Transport document titled '*The Governments consultation on developing an integrated transport policy: A report*'

Section titled 'A Consensus for Change' refers to people being principally concerned about local environmental effects such as air quality and noise and

*most accept that we cannot simply tackle congestion and pollution by building more roads*

The Guardian newspaper dated 18/3/09 refers the Department of Transport Report on increase in traffic and many schemes being rejected because of the ecological effects and government analysis showing that new road schemes can increase traffic by 8 – 10 % in a year.

2.2 The above aims are universally accepted and they are also fundamental to the aims of Caerphilly Greendoorstep Environmental Group.

## 3.0 CURRENT POSITION IN THE BASIN

3.1 Before assessing the LDP transport plan we need to bear the following in mind.

i) Caerphilly County has the highest net out-commuting figure of all the counties in Wales and Caerphilly Basin is probably much higher than the County as a whole.

- ii) The unemployment level is higher and average income level is lower than the Average for Wales.
- iii) The public transport system to access the jobs market outside the area is much worse (frequencies and journey times) and more expensive than any of the adjacent communities areas.
- iv) Many experts think that worldwide oil production has already peaked and demand will accelerate from India and China, resulting in petrol prices rising over the next decade.
- v) The Caerphilly basin has a very low level of provision of leisure, education and health facilities. Thus people need to travel outside the area for many basic needs.

## 4.0 DISCUSSION

4.1 The LDP land use policies should rectify the above problems as its main duty is to ensure that adequate land is made available for all the competing needs of the community.

4.2 In light of the problems highlighted above, we believe that there is more scope to reduce the need to travel and change to greener modes of transport in the Caerphilly basin than in any other area in South East Wales.

### 4.3 Relationship between population changes and traffic

4.3.1 Scenario A – Population of Caerphilly basin remains or decreases slightly due to the birth rate.

According to some sources this would still mean new houses would be needed due to smaller sized families. We dispute this as the divorce rate has now levelled off and is the lowest for 20yrs. Hopefully economic activity and prosperity would rise. This usually increases traffic. However research has shown that extra traffic is not required to increase business activity but the increase in prosperity leads to more disposable income for leisure trips. These are usually carried out in off peak periods so no new infrastructure is required.

4.3.1.1 A do nothing policy would see an increase in traffic but NOT at off peak times so no new infrastructure would be required.

4.3.1.2 However the LDP is not a do nothing policy. Its stated aims are (or should be) to reduce the need to travel, reduce out-commuting, increase green forms of travel at the expense of car use.

4.3.1.3 All central and local government policy is to reduce greenhouse gas emission from transport sources and increase social inclusion by improving accessibility to employment and services etc.

4.3.1.4 At present there is good road connection from Caerphilly Basin to the motorway network. The M4 junction 33 is only 6 min drive via a dual carriageway via Nantgarw. Therefore Caerphilly Basin should be an attractive place to establish a business.

4.3.2 SCENARIO B --- The population of the Caerphilly basin increases due to in-migration as proposed in the LDP

4.3.2.1 Caerphilly Basin has high unemployment, low wage levels, very high out-commuting levels, a severe shortage of recreation space, no entertainment facilities, low capacity and frequency of public transport to the employment sites, expensive public transport compared to neighbouring areas.

4.3.2.2 SPG3 states that in order to accommodate the 2,000 extra homes the developers would be obligated to spend £17million on road improvements in the Basin. This is even more reason not to encourage in-migration for Caerphilly Basin.

4.3.2.3 However, if the housing stock is increased by 10% as is proposed then due to the smaller home size the population may increase by 7%. There is likely to be an increase in economic activity rate, so the worst case scenario would be a potential increase in traffic of 10%.

4.3.2.4 The LDP policies are to reduce the need to travel, reduce out-commuting, improve the modal split in favour of green forms of transport .This should prevent the increase in traffic.

4.3.2.5 The success of this traffic reduction aim would be partly dependant on public transport improvement investments. The levy proposed for house builders in SPG3 should be used for investment in peak time public transport improvements.

4.3.2.6 SPG3 calculates that £17million or £8,000 per home is needed, i.e. an extra £8,000 must be built into the cost of each home built.

What can you get for £8,000? -- If the house owner worked in Caerphilly Basin they could get free travel in the Caerphilly basin for 16yr; or for 10yrs anywhere in Caerphilly Basin and the Cardiff area.

Total passenger receipts of all local buses in Caerphilly basin --£2million?  
Local and assembly re-imbursements & grants -----£1.5 million  
Fares collected in Caerphilly basin per annum in the region of £0.5 million.

Therefore the cost of these road proposals could pay everyone's bus fare in Caerphilly Basin for the next 34 years.

4.4 There are many references in WAG planning guides and CBC strategies etc to indicate that development should take place near to public transport nodes and not where it is likely to increase private car use.

4.5 In light of the fact that the LDP has demanded £17million worth of road improvements prior to building homes in Caerphilly Basin, it is questionable whether or not homes should be allocated here in the first place. As far as we are aware no public transport accessibility profile has been done for any of the housing sites in the area.

4.6 The LDP does not assess the public transport provision in the Caerphilly Basin at all, only to say the train journey time from Caerphilly to Cardiff is 17min. This does not take into account that the vast majority of people in Caerphilly Basin live remote from an existing or proposed railway station. Most of the employment sites in Cardiff are remote from the railway stations, the cost of train fares to Cardiff is amongst the highest per km in Wales and they are not competitive with the marginal cost of motoring.

#### 4.7 Scoping document SEA indicators and targets

4.7.1 Here is one example there are many more in the plans indicating the plans are poorly assessed and lip service only is being paid to environmental matters.

4.7.2 Scoping document SEA indicators and targets transport section to achieve the above aim.

4.7.2.1 d)—indicator –level of car ownership---target--- below the Welsh average.

At present the level of car ownership is below the Welsh average. It is believed that the reason for this is not because the public transport is competitive or that there is no need to travel but the population is older and there is less prosperity. Although we agree that it is good that the level of car ownership decreases it should not be achieved by maintaining poverty and an ageing population. Also using the Welsh average as a target is wrong if the Welsh figure rises then the Caerphilly figure rises. (All the counties figures could rise together then everyone reaches their target).

4.7.2.2 e)—indicator,--levels of public transport usage  
Target---increase in public transport patronage.

The main aim is to reduce the need to travel. Increased use of public transport could be an indicator that the need to travel has increased in general as well as car use. This probably has happened over the last 5/6yrs with the introduction of free bus passes where free bus pass use has increased the number of journeys taken but not at the expense of private car use. Public transport use in itself is a polluter but it the next worse option than the private car but only if the buses are not running with mainly empty seats.

A better indicator would be-- the total number of journeys made. Thus indicating the need to travel. This would also need to be linked in with

economic activity and prosperity. We need to increase employment rates and prosperity without increasing the need to travel.

Then of the journeys made what % are by walking, cycling and public transport. The modal split needs to improve with walking and cycling improving more than public transport and Public transport more than cars.

This figure would then reflect in the climate indicators.

#### 4.7.2.3 g) and i) -- School and travel plans.

We do not consider these should be included as indicators. They are tools for achieving the proposed indicator of the modal split and reducing the overall journeys. There are loopholes to this indicator, eg. a number of schools could be centralised and a school travel plan formulated but the amalgamation has resulted in more travel thus increasing the need to travel, getting a tick in the box but helping to defeat the aims of reducing travel.

#### 4.7.2.4 h) cycle routes and public rights of way

This indicator should not be in this section. The length of public rights of way bears little relation to the aims of this section. The rights of way that are presently inaccessible are nearly all in the countryside and do not affect the aims of this section which is to reduce car use .they are not usually used as an alternative to the car. The rights of way improvement plan mainly deals with existing rights of way.

A better indicator would be the “length of footpath or cycleway provided in the urban environment that would have the possibility of reducing car journeys”.

The only definite proposal to improve public transport in Caerphilly Basin is the proposal to retain land for Energlyn railway station. The advantage of this station would be to encourage people to use the train to come into Caerphilly.

4.8 The danger is that as more people demand to use the train to Cardiff at peak times the train companies put the fares higher as they will not invest money to increase the passenger carrying capacity. Over the last 5yrs or so the train companies have reduced the length of the coaches on the Rhymney valley line. The problem is how can the capacity of the trains be increased at peak times economically without investing in carriages which are only used for 1hr per day? In most urban areas they have increased the standing room on short journey trains at the expense of the seating capacity.

This is the obvious answer as a large % of the passengers on the crowded trains are on the train for between 10-17min only. However SEWTA and the LDP are doing the opposite by increasing the seating capacity on the trains.

4.9 There are no proposals in the plan to improve cycling facilities as an alternative to car use. The plans for cycle routes for Caerphilly Basin are all in the countryside and offer no alternative to a car journey. They are only useful as leisure routes.

## 5.0 Ring Road

5.1 It would appear there is an obsession with a ring road around Caerphilly, with a new south eastern road (mistakenly referred to as a by-pass) as the final quarter of the ring.

5.2 These proposals have appeared at every plan and have always been rejected as unnecessary and therefore will never attract any public funding. We feel that the local authority is trying to obtain a new south east road by building more homes and using the new homeowners to fund it.

5.3 This is a theme running through the LDP as new schools and roads are to be funded by new houses, even though more houses cannot be sensibly justified and would be contrary to all planning guidance.

## 6.0 Major road works on the Northern 'by-pass'

- We are opposed to any attempt to increase the traffic levels on this road
- The most effective way of reducing congestion on the junctions and roundabouts of this road is to reduce the overall levels of traffic at peak periods.
- A sensible, practical, sustainable transport policy, in line with present Central Government policies should result in a reduction of traffic on this road.
- Allowing an increase in traffic levels on the northern 'by-pass' is unacceptable.
- Pollution must be reduced, locally and globally. If the U K is to meet it's target for CO2 reductions then traffic on some roads must reduce.
- This road should be one of the areas where traffic is reduced.
- The road is not a bypass as it bisects the town and passes close to residential housing on either side with 2 schools at the St Cenydd roundabout.
- Other measures in the UDP, such as Caerphilly being a consolidation area and higher growth in the mid valley area, will lower traffic levels on the road.
- Expenditure on this road, other than for routine maintenance, would be contrary to national and local policies in planning for a reduction in traffic :-

- a) it would be an attempt to encourage commuters to stay in their cars rather than use public transport and have no benefit to the economy;
  - b) it does nothing to reduce the need to travel by car;
  - c) the whole of south east Wales is congested so any widening on this short length would be an irrelevance and a poor use of money;
  - d) a more cost effective use of this money , to help achieve the policy aims to reduce traffic , would be to allocate it for public transport and/or more sustainable projects.
- The council has used the national road traffic forecasts 1997<sup>1</sup>.to forecast /compare future traffic levels in Caerphilly. They have used the average of the high and low forecast, and applied that figure to forecast the future traffic levels in Caerphilly. THIS FORECAST SHOULD NOT BE APPLIED TO CAERPHILLY FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS;
  - The forecast is assuming a do nothing policy. Since these figures were published, Central Governments have decided that the forecast level of traffic was unacceptable and has introduced policies, which will not allow these forecast levels of traffic.
  - NRTF indicate that traffic will increase by 28% between 1996 and 2011. These forecasts are for km travelled not trips undertaken. The number of trips are not increasing, the trips are getting longer.
  - The NRTF forecasts are calculated on the assumption that the population will increase. The population of Caerphilly is forecast to drop during the plan period so the traffic level increase in Caerphilly due top population growth will be much less than the British average.
  - We consider the traffic levels on this northern route have peaked and will naturally decrease during the working day periods. If any increase occurs it will be due to evening off peak leisure use (which will not require an increase in capacity.)
  - The traffic congestion on the roundabouts of this road only occurs for short periods of the day and on average causes hold ups of no more than about 10min.This level of congestion is tolerable at present and it appears to have eased slightly over the last 2 yrs.
  - The Authorities commitment to 'green transport' is already questionable. If the planned expenditure proposed for this road<sup>3</sup> is allowed, and the road capacity is increased, then we are fearful that the incentive to improve PUBLIC transport will be diminished. The expenditure proposed for rail improvements at present in the Rhymney Valley will mainly serve to reduce traffic in Cardiff and not Caerphilly.



- The Council has mistakenly tried to link the level of traffic in the town centre with congestion on the roundabouts of this northern route.
- We see no reason to suggest that the economic well being of businesses in Caerphilly town centre will be damaged by traffic congestion on the northern road .
- The increase (if any) in traffic levels on the Caerphilly Northern Road will be lower than average for the County as a whole due to the following reasons;
  - i) The UDP aims to concentrate growth in the Mid valley corridor, thus reducing commuting from that area to Cardiff via Caerphilly.
  - ii) No expansion in capacity is planned by neighbouring authorities to accommodate any increase in traffic originating from this northern route, i.e. on the A470 from Nantgarw into Cardiff or the A469 from Caerphilly Mountain into Cardiff.
  - iii) Growth in economic activity in the Mid Valley corridor will not result in increased goods traffic on this northern route. Access to markets, which are mainly to the east, will be via Risca to the M4 at Newport.

The land to be safeguarded for these proposed improvements should be used for TREE PLANTING. Trees planted along the carriageway will help to reduce pollution locally. Trees will help to absorb much exhaust pollution such as CO, particulates and oxides of Nitrogen. Noise pollution will also be reduced.

## **7.0 Information gathering and communication with other groups**

7.1 A more professional assessment of the public transport provision from all communities in Caerphilly Basin should be carried out.

7.2 The Greendoorstep has been involved with various structure plans etc for nearly 20 yrs and have accumulated large amounts of useful information. As such we were looking forward to having early involvement in the LDP process, as active members of the community process, but we have not been allowed to participate, as promised by the Council.

7.3 We consider the LDP process should have adhered to the recommendations of the WAG, i.e:

*“Who will be involved? (Profiling the community and identifying the most appropriate range of interests, particularly hard-to-reach groups who do not usually participate in plan preparation”*

THIS PROCESS AS NOT BEEN CARRIED OUT

## 8.0 CONCLUSIONS

8.1 The LDP transport proposals are not compatible with the aims of national and regional authoritative guidance, nor its own aims and key objectives

8.2 there is no justification for any of the major road proposals in Caerphilly Basin in the LDPIdp.

8.3 By proposing the road improvements in Caerphilly Basin it is admitting it's policy of reducing out-commuting, the need to travel and diverting car use to green forms of transport is a failure.

8.4. It has not carried out an accurate assessment of the public transport provision in Caerphilly Basin with regard to access to employment, e.g. it does not seem to be aware that the peak time bus capacity to Cardiff has been reduced by 40% over the last 10yrs and peak time train capacity has also been reduced.

8.5 The targets and indicators etc. in the LDP and the SEAs for achieving it's aims are poorly thought out and will not indicate that the aims have been achieved (i.e to reduce congestion by minimising the need to travel, encourage alternatives to the car and make best use of the existing transport infrastructure).

8.6 future traffic growth on this northern route has been overestimated as the factors which could cause an increase in traffic on this road just do not exist. The Council's core plan policies are aimed at sustainability which means reducing the need to travel outside the county, yet this is contrary to that aim !

8.7 there are many contradictions, inaccuracies and ill-thought out proposals in the transport plan and indeed in the rest of the plan and as such the whole plan is unsound.

## 9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend the following proposals for improving the traffic situation in the Caerphilly Basin by reducing traffic , CO2 emissions and other pollutants.

9.1 Moratorium on all new housing in Caerphilly Basin until all the following are improved to a reasonable level:-

- i) public transport systems for out-commuting,
- ii) outdoor formal leisure areas and
- iii) net out-commuting figures for the Caerphilly basin have

9.2 Moratorium on all new road schemes that increase the capacity of the road network . This will naturally follow if proposal 1 is implemented.

**9.3 A reduction in rail fares is necessary prior to spending any public money on increasing rail capacity on the Rhymney Valley line.**

**The peak rail fare from Caerphilly to Cardiff (34p per mile) is nowhere near competitive with marginal mileage cost of a car (20p per mile), nor in comparison with similar rail journeys in other areas (E.g. Ebbw vale, Newport, Pontypridd, Taffs Well.**

**9.4 A 'Kickstart' type scheme must be introduced for bus travel from the Caerphilly basin to Cardiff central and to other employment sites on the outskirts of Cardiff (e.g M4 corridor), ensuring that all services have a minimum frequency of 3 per hour to Cardiff and Newport.**

**9.5 Any experimental bus schemes must be run for at least 3yrs to give passenger numbers a chance to increase.**

**9.6 Early morning and late night bus services need to be re-introduced even if a subsidy is required for unprofitable socially needed services.**

**9.7 Dedicated bus lanes and corridors are required to give bus travel a competitive advantage. (These may be required on roads outside the county).**

**9.8 Electric and lpg driven buses are required on routes travelling through polluted areas.**

**9.9 Measures to improve public transport 'take up' need to be based on proper research into what measures are likely to attract people from their cars onto public transport (already carried out in towns and cities across the world).**

# APPENDIX 1

## GREENDOORSTEP PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENT PLAN

1.0 We have stated in our transport submission that:

### **A PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSABILITY PROFILE IS REQUIRED FOR EACH COMMUNITY WITHIN THE CAERPHILLY BASIN.**

1.1 This should include:

- i) travelling times at commuting times to a range of job locations .
- ii) times leaving home to a range of times from when a person should start work. (We suggest start times from 07.00 to 09.00, although many people also need to start work at 06.00.
- iii) fares in comparison to marginal car costs per mile. [this should identify if any particular communities do not have good public transport access to a reasonable range of employment sites – an exercise such as this would not be expensive to carry out.

1.2 We as a group have already done this exercise in a matter of a few hours using the journey planner Traveline Cymru website (the information must be verified using up to date timetables as there are inaccuracies on the website).

WE HAVE IDENTIFIED MANY AREAS WHERE SERVICES SHOULD BE IMPROVED OR NEW SERVICES PROVIDED. IN THE MEANTIME HERE ARE SOME IMPROVEMENTS THAT ARE NEEDED URGENTLY.

### 1.3 TRAIN SERVICE

The LDP has noted that the train service in Caerphilly is suffering from capacity problems at peak times. This is true .However the biggest disincentive for passengers using the train is not the overcrowding but the cost.

### 1.4 BUS SERVICE

#### 1.4.1 Caerphilly - Cardiff No 26 route.

This route travels along one of the busiest commuter routes into Cardiff from Caerphilly, i.e via Nantgarw. Yet there is only an hourly bus service. Only 2 buses arrive in Cardiff before 09.00.

Over the last 10yrs 2,000 homes have been built along this route yet the early morning services and late night services have been reduced.

THE 26 SERVICE NEEDS TO BE INCREASED TO A 30 MIN SERVICE WITH SOME OF THE BUSES USING A QUICKER ROUTE, E.G. USING THE A470 .

#### 1.4.2 New hospital at Ystrad Mynach

The new hospital being built in Ystrad Mynach and the bus service to that hospital needs improving prior to it's opening. It is particularly important to re-introduce the early morning service which allowed people to get from the Penrhos area to Ystrad Mynach in time to access any employment opportunities in the new Hospital.

1.4.3 The Blackwood/ Crumlin / Ynysddu areas will also need better access to the Hospital. Increasing capacity will not increase passenger numbers unless the fares are reduced.

#### 1.5 Example of the type of public transport accessibility profile

Here is an example of the type of public transport accessibility profile information we would have liked the LDP to have carried out:

1.5.1 A random address of Drum tower view this is situated on the Penrhos /Castle Gate site proposal HG 1.73. This is a large site partly built and it is the nearest site to employment possibilities in Cardiff.

We have listed some employment destinations:

1. Welsh Assembly building, Cathays Park, near to the centre of Cardiff;
2. Atlantic wharf Cardiff Bay;
- 3 &4 Sites on the M4 corridor near to Caerphilly at Corryton and Pontprennau.

1.5.2 Information from Traveline Cymru journey planner and verified with latest timetables:-

1.5.3 Travel times to start work at 08.00 and 09.00 by bus and train to Cathays Park. Distance 7.5miles one way

- a) To arrive to start work by 08.00

The quickest journey is 43 min leaving home at 0702. Total time is 58min by bus . The cost is £17.40 per week  
This is also the first journey by bus .If an earlier start was required then it would involve a 23min walk to the railway station and would be a longer journey and more expensive.

- b) To arrive to start work by 09.00

Quickest journey is leaving home at 0801: Total time is 59min, cost is £17.40 [The cost of travel is 23p per mile which is uncompetitive with the marginal motoring cost of 20p per mile].

Buses are one per hour, so not convenient to mix bus /train: cost £28 /week

1.5.4 Similar to Longwood Drive industrial estate near junction 33 M4: distance 5miles

a) To start work at 0800

Leave home 0702 arrive at 0755 total time 58min to travel just 5miles  
Cost £17.40

b) To start at 0830 same bus total time 1hr 28min

To start at 0900 leave at 0801 58min

[Cost of travel is 35p per mile which is uncompetitive with the marginal motoring cost of 20p per mile].

1.5.5 Cardiff City Hall to Atlantic Wharf Cardiff.

a) The first bus does not arrive before 08.00

Train is the only option and involves walking in total for 31min each way and leaving home at 06.59 cost > £18 per week

b) To start work at 09.00

Leave home at 0744 total time 1hr 16min

[Unless you pay an extra £10 for a combined bus/rail ticket would reduce journey time to 59min].

1.5.6 To Cardiff Gate, Pontprennau.

a) There is only one option if someone needs to start work at 08.00.

Leave home at 06.29 combined rail /bus/walk total time 1hr 31min one way

b) To start work at 09.00

Leave home at 0714 total time taken is 1hr 46min, cost approx £30

[This site is within 3 miles of the Caerphilly County boundary and 6 miles of the Centre of Caerphilly yet it is almost totally impractical to use public transport to access employment there.

1.6 Many of the employment sites in Cardiff are now situated on the M 4 corridor. Increasingly more sites in Cardiff city centre are changing from employment to housing. The jobs are moving out of the city centre to places inaccessible by public transport from Caerphilly].

1.7 All the settlements outside Caerphilly County boundary have better access into Cardiff than Castlegate, ie. Newport, Barry, and Pontypridd

E.g. Upper Boat area which is Three miles from Castle Gate but further away from Cardiff Has 8 buses per hour to Cardiff taking 15min less than Castle Gate.

1.6 There are 12,000 people commuting into Cardiff from the Caerphilly County, 17,000 from Rhondda Cynon Taf and Merthyr Tydfil. [Per commuter Caerphilly has approx the same number of train journeys into Cardiff but has half the number of bus journeys. This indicates that there is room to increase the bus journeys from Caerphilly].

There are no plans to do this indeed the number of bus journeys into Cardiff have been decreasing.

1.7 A scheme called Kick-start was started in Caerphilly but this did not increase the bus journeys to destinations outside the area or at all at commuting times. The increase was mainly affecting shopping times and free bus pass trips.

## 1.8 TRAIN SERVICE

### 1.8.1 Example of costs:

The weekly fare from Caerphilly to Cardiff is £18.80 or £26.30 if using the Bus /train add on ticket. This is far too expensive .Compared with motoring cost and similar train journeys on other routes e.g. Taffs Well to Cardiff. The fares are high to temper demand in the peak period

Increasing capacity will not increase passenger numbers unless the fares are reduced. The daily peak fare is £5.10 or £7.00 for the bus add on fare. This means that the cost per mile 15mile return trip by train is nearly 50p per mile. If two people used the train compared with sharing a car then it would be costing them £14 (enough to pay£5 parking charge a gallon of petrol and £4 left to spend)or nearly £1 per mile. This is just not competitive.

There are ways of increasing capacity without spending large sums of money. e.g. re-arrange the seating arrangements more similar to the London underground which has more Standing room compared with seating room.

The standing areas need to have better facilities for holding on such as the straps on the London Underground trains. At the moment people stand in the aisles of the trains with little to steady themselves

The LDP proposes to retain land for the Energlyn Station. We agree with this proposal but yet again trying to increase demand without increasing capacity will only result in higher fares.

### 1.8.2 BUS SERVICE

Caerphilly - Cardiff No 26 route.

One of our members has used this service and has estimated that approx only 30 people from Caerphilly and further north, in total were using these two buses. Possibly 3,000 cars use this route into Cardiff so this bus service is only picking up about 1% of the commuters. The route is seriously under performing. As well as the frequency of the service being deficient the journey time is too long.

Over the last 10yrs 2,000 homes have been built along this route yet the early morning services and late night services have been reduced.

**THE 26 SERVICE NEEDS TO BE INCREASED TO A 30 MIN SERVICE WITH SOME OF THE BUSES USING A QUICKER ROUTE, E.G. USING THE A470 .**

The 26 route is the only direct bus service linking 2 of the 3 main towns in Caerphilly County and is only an hourly service.

Compare frequencies and journey times with other areas using part of the same route, such as:-

Maerdy – Cardiff No 132

This is a 15min service and is £2.40p cheaper per week from Pontypridd than Penrhos which is in the Basin.

Beddau – Cardiff No 400

This is a 15min service journey time which is 10min shorter for same part of the route. There is also a 30min service from Beddau to Cardiff, which is 10min quicker than the 26 route.

The new hospital is being built in Ystrad Mynach and the bus service to that hospital needs improving prior to it's opening. It is particularly important to re-introduce the early morning service which allowed people to get from the Penrhos area to Ystrad Mynach in time to access any employment opportunities in the new Hospital.

The Blackwood/ Crumlin / Ynysddu areas will also need better access to the Hospital. Increasing capacity will not increase passenger numbers unless the fares are reduced. The daily peak fare is £5.10 or £7.00 for the bus add on fare. This means that the cost per mile 15mile return trip by train is nearly 50p per mile. If two people used the train compared with sharing a car then it would be costing them £14 (enough to pay£5 parking charge a gallon of petrol and £4 left to spend)or nearly £1 per mile. This is just not competitive.



## APPENDIX 2

### Appendix 2.1

#### CAERPHILLY GREEN DOORSTEP FINAL STATEMENT/ROUND UP, OBJECTION DO 5460/1929.

#### Northern ‘by-pass’ improvements. (April 2001)

- We are opposed to any attempt to increase the traffic levels on this road.  
The most effective way of reducing congestion on the junctions and roundabouts of this road is to reduce the overall levels of traffic at peak periods.
- A sensible, practical, sustainable transport policy, in line with present Central Government policies should result in a reduction of traffic on this road.
- Allowing an increase in traffic levels on the northern ‘by-pass’ is unacceptable.
- Pollution must be reduced, locally and globally. If the U K is to meet it’s target for CO2 reductions then traffic on some roads must reduce.
- This road should be one of the areas where traffic is reduced.
- The road is not a bypass as it bisects the town and passes close to residential housing on either side with 2 schools at the St Cenydd roundabout.
- Other measures in the UDP, such as Caerphilly being a consolidation area and higher growth in the mid valley area, will lower traffic levels on the road.
- Expenditure on this road, other than for routine maintenance , would be contrary to national and local policies in planning for a reduction in traffic :-
  - a) it would be an attempt to encourage commuters to stay in their cars rather than use public transport and have no benefit to the economy;
  - b) it does nothing to reduce the need to travel by car;
  - c) the whole of south east Wales is congested so any widening on this short length would be an irrelevance and a poor use of money;
  - d) a more cost effective use of this money , to help achieve the policy aims to reduce traffic , would be to allocate it for public transport and/or more sustainable projects.

- **The council has used the national road traffic forecasts 1997<sup>1</sup>.to forecast/compare future traffic levels in Caerphilly. They have used the average of the high and low forecast, and applied that figure to forecast the future traffic levels in Caerphilly. THIS FORECAST SHOULD NOT BE APPLIED TO CAERPHILLY FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS;**
- **The forecast is assuming a do nothing policy. Since these figures were published, Central Governments have decided that the forecast level of traffic was unacceptable and has introduced policies, which will not allow these forecast levels of traffic.**
- **N.R.T.F. indicate that traffic will increase by 28% between 1996 and 2011. These forecasts are for km travelled not trips undertaken. The number of trips are not increasing, the trips are getting longer. Roads such as the Northern by-pass which are A roads in urban areas are only forecast to increase traffic levels by 16%<sup>1</sup>page 6. The largest increases being in Motorway traffic. No Motorways exist in Caerphilly so the traffic increase in Caerphilly should be much lower than the British national average.**
- **The N.R.T. forecasts are calculated on the assumption that the population will increase. The population of Caerphilly is forecast to drop during the plan period so the traffic level increase in Caerphilly due to population growth will be much less than the British average.**
- **The Council is basing their estimated northern 'by-pass' traffic levels on past increases in traffic levels<sup>2</sup>page 22. 1992-1998. Increases were due to 'one off' factors producing a 'quantum leap' in traffic levels. These factors were the opening of the Llanbradach by-pass (this produced the largest one off increase when many commuters started using cars instead of the train.). The opening of the Newbridge, Pontllanfraith and Ystrad Mynach by-passes introduced many commuters to the possibility of driving through the Caerphilly basin to work in Cardiff instead of their traditional routes through Risca, Cwmbran and Nelson. These 'one off factors' do not now affect future traffic growth. ( c.f. pre bypass of 19,000 & post of 36,500) There are no reasons to assume that the traffic levels on this northern route will increase at a higher rate than the national average for this type of road.<sup>1</sup>page 6 I.E. 16% increase (do nothing policy which does not take into account changing policies) over the plan period. YET THE COUNCIL ARE FORECASTING A 50% INCREASE ! !**

**We consider the traffic levels on this northern route have peaked and will naturally decrease during the working day periods. If any increase occurs it will be due to evening off peak leisure use (which will not require an increase in capacity.)**

- **The traffic congestion on the roundabouts of this road only occurs for short periods of the day and on average causes hold ups of no more than about 10min.This level of congestion is tolerable at present and it appears to have eased slightly over the last 2 yrs.**

- **The Authorities commitment to ‘green transport’ is already questionable. If the planned expenditure proposed for this road<sup>3</sup> is allowed, and the road capacity is increased, then we are fearful that the incentive to improve PUBLIC transport will be diminished. The expenditure proposed for rail improvements at present in the Rhymney Valley will mainly serve to reduce traffic in Cardiff and not Caerphilly.**

**In particular :**

- (i) **The substantial investments claimed by the council to be taking place on the Rhymney Valley line are actually taking place in Queen St. station in Cardiff. These are signalling improvements in Cardiff on the line going to Caerphilly. They are needed in order to improve the ability of Queen St Station to take more trains from the other Valley lines on the network. The Rhymney Valley line already has the capacity to run 5 trains per hour at peak periods. The frequencies of the peak period are adequate but the size of the trains is too small.**
- (ii) **The proposed new park and ride facilities will increase traffic in the town of Caerphilly.**
- **The Council has mistakenly tried to link the level of traffic in the town centre with congestion on the roundabouts of this northern route. They claim that in future traffic congestion on the roundabouts will encourage people to use town centre routes through Caerphilly. They offered no evidence to support this claim. Logically, in order to use the town centre routes motorists need to negotiate the same roundabouts. Therefore, once past the congestion, motorists can and will be able to drive relatively freely along the northern route, thus there will be no increased incentive to use town centre.**
- **Furthermore comparatively few work in north Cardiff and would want to try this route as a ‘short cut’. Even if town became busier during the peak periods, so what ? The peak periods are relatively short and outside the main shopping times and therefore not a problem. It is interesting to note that the so called ‘congestion’ is due , mainly , to local and not through traffic and this is can be substantiated by statistics, e.g. local average daily traffic flows through Caerphilly town centre to and from the A 469 mountain road is about 8,000 which is similar in magnitude to the 6,500 through Llanbradach (adjacent to its bypass) . Both figures reflect local traffic and are relatively small. Therefore the Councils argument is unfounded .**
- **We see no reason to suggest that the economic well being of businesses in Caerphilly town centre will be damaged by traffic congestion on the northern road . Increased traffic on this road during off peak periods (caused by increased retail business in the town centre) will not cause capacity problems.**
- **The increase (if any) in traffic levels on the Caerphilly Northern Road will be lower than average for the County as a whole due to the following**

reasons;

- i) **The UDP aims to concentrate growth in the Mid valley corridor, thus reducing commuting from that area to Cardiff via Caerphilly.**
- ii) **No expansion in capacity is planned by neighbouring authorities to accommodate any increase in traffic originating from this northern route i.e. on the A470 from Nantgarw into Cardiff or the A469 from Caerphilly Mountain into Cardiff.**
- iii) **Growth in economic activity in the Mid Valley corridor will not result in increased goods traffic on this northern route. Access to markets, which are mainly to the east, will be via Risca to the M4 at Newport.**

**THE COUNCIL IS SERIOUSLY OVERESTIMATING THE FUTURE TRAFFIC GROWTH ON THIS NORTHERN ROUTE. THE FACTORS WHICH COULD CAUSE AN INCREASE IN TRAFFIC ON THIS ROAD JUST DO NOT EXIST. THEIR CORE PLAN POLICIES ARE AIMED AT SUSTAINABILITY WHICH MEANS REDUCING THE NEED TO TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE COUNTY , YET THIS IS CONTRARY TO THAT AIM !**

**The land to be safeguarded for these proposed improvements should be used for TREE PLANTING. Trees planted along the carriageway will help to reduce pollution locally. Trees will help to absorb much exhaust pollution such as CO, particulates and oxides of Nitrogen. Noise pollution will also be reduced.**

## Appendix 2.2

**UDP 1996 - 2011**

**NEW EVIDENCE - CAERPHILLY GREEN DOORSTEP  
OBJECTION DO 5460/1929.**

**Northern 'by-pass' improvements.** (April 2001-amended 12.09.01)

- The Council forecast is assuming a do nothing policy. Since these figures were published, Central Governments have decided that the forecast level of traffic was unacceptable and has introduced policies, which will not allow these forecast levels of traffic.
- The N.R.T.F. indicate that traffic will increase by 28% between 1996 and 2011. These forecasts are for km travelled not trips undertaken. The number of trips are not increasing, the trips are getting longer. Roads such as the Northern by-pass which are A roads in urban areas are only forecast to increase traffic levels by 16% <sup>1</sup>page 6. The largest increases being in Motorway traffic. No Motorways exist in Caerphilly so the traffic increase in Caerphilly should be much lower than the British national average.
- The N.R.T. forecasts are calculated on the assumption that the population will increase. The population of Caerphilly is forecast to drop during the plan period so the traffic level increase in Caerphilly due to population growth will be much less than the British average.
- The council is basing their estimated northern "by-pass" traffic levels on past increases in traffic levels <sup>2</sup>page 22. 1992-1998. These increases were due to "one off" factors producing a "Quantum leap" in traffic levels. These factors were the opening of the Llanbradach By-pass (this produced the largest one off increase when many commuters started using cars instead of the train.) The opening of the Newbridge, Pontllanfraith and Ystrad Mynach by-passes introduced many commuters to the possibility of driving through the Caerphilly basin to work in Cardiff instead of their traditional routes through Risca, Cwmbran and Nelson. These "one off factors" do not now affect future traffic growth. ( c.f. pre bypass of 19,000 & post of 36,500)
- There are no reasons to assume that the traffic levels on this northern route will increase at a higher rate than the national average for this type of road. <sup>1</sup>page 6 I.E. 16% increase (do nothing policy which does not take into account changing policies) over the plan period. **YET THE COUNCIL ARE FORECASTING A 50% INCREASE !!**

- We suspect that the traffic levels on this northern route have peaked and will naturally decrease during the working day periods. If any increase occurs it will be due to evening off peak leisure use (which will not require an increase in capacity.)
- The authorities commitment to “green transport” is already questionable. If the planned expenditure proposed for this road<sup>3</sup> is allowed, and the road capacity is increased, then we are fearful that the incentive to improve PUBLIC transport will be diminished. The expenditure proposed for rail improvements at present in the Rhymney Valley will mainly serve to reduce traffic in Cardiff and not Caerphilly. In particular :
  - (iii) The substantial investments claimed by the council to be taking place on the Rhymney Valley line are actually taking place in Queen St. station in Cardiff. These are signalling improvements in Cardiff on the line going to Caerphilly. They are needed in order to improve the ability of Queen St Station to take more trains from the other Valley lines on the network. The Rhymney Valley line already has the capacity to run 5 trains per hour at peak periods. The frequencies of the peak period are adequate but the size of the trains is too small.
  - (iv) The proposed new park and ride facilities will increase traffic in the town of Caerphilly.
- The Council has mistakenly tried to link the level of traffic in the town centre with congestion on the roundabouts of this northern route.
- The council claims that in future traffic congestion on the roundabouts will encourage people to use town centre routes through Caerphilly. They offered no evidence to support this claim. Logically, in order to use the town centre routes motorists need to negotiate the same roundabouts. Therefore, once past the congestion, motorists can and will be able to drive relatively freely along the northern route, thus there will be no increased incentive to use town centre.
- Furthermore comparatively few work in north Cardiff and would want to try this route as a `short cut`. Even if town became busier during the peak periods, so what ? The peak periods are relatively short and outside the main shopping times and therefore not a problem. It is interesting to note that the so called `congestion` is due , mainly , to local and not through traffic and this is can be substantiated by statistics E.g. local average daily traffic flows through Caerphilly town centre to and from the A 469 mountain road is about 8,000 which is similar in magnitude to the 6,500 through Llanbradach (adjacent to its bypass) . Both figures reflect local traffic and are relatively small. Therefore the Councils argument is unfounded .
- We see no reason to suggest that the economic well being of businesses in Caerphilly town centre will be damaged by traffic congestion on the northern road . Increased traffic on this road during off peak periods (caused by increased retail business in the town centre) will not cause capacity problems.

- The increase (if any) in traffic levels on the Caerphilly Northern Road will be lower than average for the County as a whole due to the following reasons:
  - i) The UDP aims to concentrate growth in the Mid valley corridor, thus reducing commuting from that area to Cardiff via Caerphilly.
  - ii) No expansion in capacity is planned by neighbouring authorities to accommodate any increase in traffic originating from this northern route, i.e. on the A470 from Nantgarw into Cardiff or the A469 from Caerphilly Mountain into Cardiff.
  - iii) Growth in economic activity in the Mid Valley corridor will not result in increased goods traffic on this northern route. Access to markets, which are mainly to the east, will be via Risca to the M4 at Newport.

---

<sup>1</sup> DETR National Road traffic Forecasts 1997 supplementary appendix

<sup>2</sup> Caerphilly local transport plan. (Core doc.)

<sup>3</sup> Caerphilly Basin Community plan indicates 10million pounds expenditure.

---

## Appendix 2.3

### UDP 1996 - 2011 NEW EVIDENCE - CAERPHILLY GREEN DOORSTEP OBJECTION DO 5460/1929.

#### Northern 'by-pass' improvements (April 2001-amended 12.09.01)

- Expenditure on this road, other than for routine maintenance, would be contrary to national and local policies in planning for a reduction in traffic :-
  - a) it would be an attempt to encourage commuters to stay in their cars rather than use public transport and have no benefit to the economy.
  - b) it does nothing to reduce the need to travel by car;
  - c) the whole of south east Wales is congested so any widening on this short length would be an irrelevance and a poor use of money;
  - c) a more cost effective use of this money, to help achieve the policy aims to reduce traffic, would be to allocate it for public transport and/or more sustainable projects.
- The council has used the national road traffic forecasts 1997<sup>1</sup>.to forecast/compare future traffic levels in Caerphilly. They have used the average of the high and low forecast, and applied that figure to forecast the future traffic levels in Caerphilly. **THIS FORECAST SHOULD NOT BE APPLIED TO CAERPHILLY FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS;**

The forecast is assuming a do nothing policy. Since these figures were published, Central Governments have decided that the forecast level of traffic was unacceptable and has introduced policies, which will not allow these forecast levels of traffic.

The N.R.T.F. indicate that traffic will increase by 28% between 1996 and 2011. These forecasts are for km travelled not trips undertaken. The number of trips are not increasing, the trips are getting longer. Roads such as the Northern by-pass which are A roads in urban areas are only forecast to increase traffic levels by 16% <sup>1</sup>page 6. The largest increases being in Motorway traffic. No Motorways exist in Caerphilly so the traffic increase in Caerphilly should be much lower than the British national average.



The N.R.T. forecasts are calculated on the assumption that the population will increase. The population of Caerphilly is forecast to drop during the plan period so the traffic level increase in Caerphilly due to population growth will be much less than the British average.

The council is basing their estimated northern “by-pass” traffic levels on past increases in traffic levels<sup>2</sup> page 22. 1992-1998. These increases were due to “one off” factors producing a “Quantum leap” in traffic levels. These factors were the opening of the Llanbradach By-pass (this produced the largest one off increase when many commuters started using cars instead of the train.) The opening of the Newbridge, Pontllanfraith and Ystrad Mynach by-passes introduced many commuters to the possibility of driving through the Caerphilly basin to work in Cardiff instead of their traditional routes through Risca, Cwmbran and Nelson. These “one off factors” do not now affect future traffic growth. ( c.f. pre bypass of 19,000 & post of 36,500).

There are no reasons to assume that the traffic levels on this northern route will increase at a higher rate than the national average for this type of road.<sup>1 page 6</sup> I.E. 16% increase (do nothing policy which does not take into account changing policies) over the plan period. YET THE COUNCIL ARE FORECASTING A 50% INCREASE !!

We suspect that the traffic levels on this northern route have peaked and will naturally decrease during the working day periods. If any increase occurs it will be due to evening off peak leisure use (which will not require an increase in capacity.)

- The traffic congestion on the roundabouts of this road only occurs for short periods of the day and on average causes hold ups of no more than about 10min. This level of congestion is tolerable at present and it appears to have eased slightly over the last 2 yrs.
- The authorities commitment to “green transport” is already questionable. If the planned expenditure proposed for this road<sup>3</sup> is allowed, and the road capacity is increased, then we are fearful that the incentive to improve PUBLIC transport will be diminished. The expenditure proposed for rail improvements at present in the Rhymney Valley will mainly serve to reduce traffic in Cardiff and not Caerphilly. In particular :
  - (i) The substantial investments claimed by the council to be taking place on the Rhymney Valley line are actually taking place in Queen St. station in Cardiff. These are signalling improvements in Cardiff on the line going to Caerphilly. They are needed in order to improve the ability of Queen St Station to take more trains from the other Valley lines on the network. The Rhymney Valley line already has the capacity to run 5 trains per hour at peak periods. The frequencies of the peak period are adequate but the size of the trains is too small.
  - (ii) The proposed new park and ride facilities will increase traffic in the town of Caerphilly.

---

The Council has mistakenly tried to link the level of traffic in the town centre with congestion on the roundabouts of this northern route.

The council claims that in future traffic congestion on the roundabouts will encourage people to use town centre routes through Caerphilly. They offered no evidence to support this claim. Logically, in order to use the town centre routes motorists need to negotiate the same roundabouts. Therefore, once past the congestion, motorists can and will be able to drive relatively freely along the northern route, thus there will be no increased incentive to use town centre.

Furthermore comparatively few work in north Cardiff and would want to try this route as a `short cut`. Even if town became busier during the peak periods, so what ? The peak periods are relatively short and outside the main shopping times and therefore not a problem. It is interesting to note that the so called `congestion` is due , mainly , to local and not through traffic and this is can be substantiated by statistics.

E.g. local average daily traffic flows through Caerphilly town centre to and from the A469 mountain road is about 8,000 which is similar in magnitude to the 6,500 through Llanbradach (adjacent to its bypass). Both figures reflect local traffic and are relatively small.

Therefore the Councils argument is unfounded .

- We see no reason to suggest that the economic well being of businesses in Caerphilly town centre will be damaged by traffic congestion on the northern road . Increased traffic on this road during off peak periods (caused by increased retail business in the town centre) will not cause capacity problems.

**THE COUNCIL IS SERIOUSLY OVERESTIMATING THE FUTURE TRAFFIC GROWTH ON THIS NORTHERN ROUTE. THE FACTORS WHICH COULD CAUSE AN INCREASE IN TRAFFIC ON THIS ROAD JUST DO NOT EXIST. THEIR CORE PLAN POLICIES ARE AIMED AT SUSTAINABILITY WHICH MEANS REDUCING THE NEED TO TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE COUNTY , YET THIS IS CONTRARY TO THAT AIM !**

The land to be safeguarded for these proposed improvements should be used for TREE PLANTING. Trees planted along the carriageway will help to reduce pollution locally. Trees will help to absorb much exhaust pollution such as CO, particulates and oxides of Nitrogen. Noise pollution will also be reduced.

