



1. Public transport interchange at Temple Meads

TfGB and its member organizations would like to register our disquiet about **the failure to mention buses and transport interchange** in the Report and Recommendations entitled Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone RIF Infrastructure Programme before you under agenda item 5.

We are concerned that there appears to have been no consultation with external stakeholders such as amenity groups - TfGB or the Civic Society etc - , but more alarmingly, First Bus Group bus operator.

TfGB have been trying to contribute to the debate for quite a while now, but have been ignored. We have exciting and cost-effective proposals for a much needed bus interchange for Temple Meads and the Arena. These would not replace the Marlborough Street bus station, but would be part of a network of bus hubs around the city. That at Temple Meads being particularly important for its strategic connections with rail.

Whilst we recognise that the primary purpose of the report before you is to confirm funding for a revamped Temple Circus and approaches to the Arena site, in support of the TQEZ, we find the fact that buses are not mentioned at all rather strange, especially when there are lots of references to cycling, and to walking and pedestrians. Interchange does not seem to be mentioned either. Public transport is mentioned three times but this minimal and oblique reference to buses at Temple Meads is worrying when buses should at least be specified as something to factor in.

We would like to suggest to members of Cabinet that you make a recommendation (d) to add to those before you: **that these schemes must not prejudice the passage of frequent bus services into a future Interchange within the precincts of Temple Meads station and the Arena.**

In support of this, we would like to draw your attention to the 2012 background paper from Halcrow, Transport Report Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone which accompanies the RIF report. Its conclusions at para 7.1.1 are quite emphatic about the need for improvement in public transport services and acknowledgement that the roads will not be able to cope with the additional generated traffic

“ Overall it is clear that there has to be a significant investment in public transport infrastructure to meet the demand for travel to the Enterprise Zone. It is physically difficult and not in keeping with sustainable transport policy to provide additional highway capacity to provide the necessary access..... These are not realistic, especially when public transport, supported by walking and cycling, has the capability of offering a realistic alternative. Thus, the schemes proposed in this report concentrate on the improvement to public transport capacity, as well as improving walking and cycling routes for those with

shorter journeys..... If this potential is to be realised there has to be a step change in the provision of public transport services.”.

Despite a welter of statistical data about city-wide bus services it does not seem to consider the possibility of an interchange adjacent to the rail station. although conceding the possibility of the BRTs approaching close.

We are aware that BCC planners are talking about a 'dispersed interchange'. (There might be a case for this for some services). But if the intention is to serve the immediate vicinity of the station with little more than the existing services currently on the Station Approach, and hoping potential bus passengers walk several hundred yards across busy main roads, it will not promote modal shift.

This does not look like an interchange, nor does it comply with DfT standards for interchanges, and we fear that a once in a lifetime opportunity for a bus hub at Temple Meads will be lost.

2. Routing of bus services to/through Temple Meads

One conceptual problem is that the emphasis in the two reports has been on access to the TM Enterprise Zone. This rather overlooks the fact that it is also the site of the main railway station for Bristol and this may require easier connectivity to promote modal shift for travellers, as opposed to workers accessing employment.

We would also take issue with the statement at para 2.2.1 of Halcrow's report

“ Most areas of Bristol and its immediate surroundings have frequent bus access to Temple Gate or Old Market, and thus by proximity as noted above, to the EZ itself through short walks”

Old Market may be 'a short walk' for the fit when routes are properly signed (and we have asked for this for several years), but it can hardly be considered ideal or even adequate for all users. In fact the whole of East Bristol suffers from a complete absence of direct bus service to Temple Meads.

There is clearly a need for radical revision of bus routes in the area so that Temple Meads station and enterprise zone are better served, thus encouraging the desired modal shift.

This could include the use of the Friary area for bus interchange, and where appropriate for through services and new circular/orbital services, making use of Temple Back East to reach Temple Way, avoiding double use of the Temple Circus junction. The plan in the Council Report does not seem to show this Temple Back East route as safeguarded for buses.

The statement in the Halcrow Report at para 6.4.1) is also in agreement :

“There is scope for BRT vehicles to run through the Temple Quay area in future, to more directly align with Temple Meads station and the EZ.”

3. Safeguarded rail route

Finally, the plan for the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone in the RIF Report does not show the safeguarded rail route through the island site and plot TM01. Not to safeguard this route may prejudice the long term possibility of creating a tram-train connection for MetroWest.

4. Conclusion

We return to our main point that Bristol needs a proper bus interchange at Temple Meads, like every modern city. And so we urge you to include the additional recommendation to ensure **the passage of frequent bus services into a future Interchange at Temple Meads station.**

I regret imposing this level of detail but our efforts to achieve a detailed dialogue with the council have failed, and there is little transparency.

Martin Garrett
on behalf of TfGB 3 March 2014