

Local Transport Plan (LTP) Substantive Comments and Recommendations

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
West Lindsey District Council	The plan is very aspirational and covers key themes	Noted	No change
	Reliance on the local transport boards for delivery could be considered reasonable, however there are to date no published terms of reference for these Boards nor transparency beyond limited member involvement. Equally the boards only cover a small geographical area and do not cover the rural areas, of which there are many across Lincolnshire. The question would therefore be, if there is greater reliance on these Boards for delivery, how will the decision process be administered, including accountability, and transparency and also how do projects which relate primarily or wholly to rural areas gain traction?	This is an issue around governance and delivery of the Local Transport Boards rather than a specific LTP issue. However, longer term new LTP guidance is expected and emphasis on local engagement is likely to be key to the production of revisions to future LTPs.	<p>Consideration or review of the roles and responsibilities of the Local Transport Boards and the need to develop a more delivery focused emphasis.</p> <p>Creation of Terms of Reference and Membership requirements.</p> <p>Consideration is given to the creation of Wider Reference Groups for the area Transport Boards to enable active engagement with local interest groups.</p>
	Many of the actions are attributed to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and whilst it is acknowledged this shouldn't be in isolation, it is not clear how these themes feed into/clearly align with planning policy. The importance of understanding how this works in practice is	<p>It is not the intention to load additional requirement onto development but to ensure that where evidenced adequate investment is made in transport provision.</p> <p>Ensuring clear linkages between LTP and Development Plans is</p>	Review of language around LPAs.

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
	<p>twofold, any additional requirements in development must be required through planning policy and where that occurs, there must be an assessment in terms of cost. It is not appropriate to continue to load requirements on to developers which may ultimately impact on the deliverability of development. Understand the relationship and expectations is key to ensure meaningful delivery going forward.</p>	<p>critical to this particularly for future delivery of both development and supporting transport investment.</p>	
	<p>Concern that LTP5 fails to recognise that RAF Scampton will become of strategic importance as the site is decommissioned. The entrance to the base is accessed via the A15 which is identified as one of the Route Action Plans for the County, rightly so, but the interdependency between this and the changing status of RAF Scampton and this designation is missing.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Include additional text identifying RAF Scampton as a strategic development site.</p>
	<p>The shift of focus from just connectivity within Lincolnshire to recognising the importance of Gateways and connectivity to other economic centres beyond the administrative boundary is heartily welcomed and does begin to provide support for key projects. However, the</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Additional text is added to highlight the importance of gateways including access points by road as well as rail. Policy can be strengthened in this context.</p>

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
	<p>gateways principle is still very light on enough detail to understand how this will be facilitated through partnership working and how potential projects will be supported and scoped. Moreover, the focus of gateways is in relation to rail and ports, in order for this concept to deliver the expected economic benefits all key gateways into the County should be included.</p>		
	<p>Digital connectivity Understand that the strategy relates specifically to transport, however the interrelationship between access, inclusivity and rural communities is extremely important and as such there is a need to recognise this interdependency and explore more innovative opportunities to facilitate 'access' to services in the context of transport and digital connectivity. In a post covid world these themes are not mutually exclusive.</p>	<p>Objective 1d does cover this issue but it could be strengthened.</p>	<p>Additional text to improve references to digital connectivity.</p>
	<p>Welcome the emphasis on active travel, recognising the health and wellbeing strand that runs through key objectives, including ensuring access to health facilities.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>
	<p>Limited reference to car parking although there is a strand in relation to</p>	<p>Consider this an issue to be picked up under the Area Transport Strategies as a county</p>	<p>To pick up issue under local transport boards.</p>

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
	supporting the local economy.	wide policy on car parking sits outside of our remit.	
	Welcome references to climate change and acknowledge that many solutions are urban based and fail to recognise the difficulties facing rural communities.	Agree with the sentiment in this comment and LTP attempts to articulate the difficulties faced in a geographically diverse and mainly rural area.	No change
North Kesteven District Council	The authority supports the priorities and ideas set out in the document but notes the difficulty and challenges of delivering them.	Noted	No change
	Achieving thriving and sustainable communities is an important outcome, but the challenge of dispersed and smaller communities delivering a range of services to reduce the need for movement is a significant one if populations are not sufficient to sustain schooling, shops etc and as such the need for transportation options will remain.	Noted	No change
	Considering the future ready green transportation priority, whilst understanding the importance of freight movement for economic vitality of the area it is suggested that the overall volume of movement should be considered within the context of whether improving rail connectivity is a real alternative to increasing	It is acknowledged that even if significant volumes of freight can be shifted to rail, road haulage will still be the dominant mode. The freight strategy recognises this and a balanced approach to supporting freight movement is proposed.	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
	the number of freight movements on the existing road network.		
	Would like to see more action on Electric Vehicles (EV).	EV strategy sets out an action plan to deliver EV infrastructure.	No change, ongoing work on identifying pilot areas for on street charging.
	Connectivity for tourism is too focused on the coastal resorts and does not significantly recognise the heritage and historic tourism offer.	There are references to tourism in general.	Additional paragraph to reference tourism offer beyond coastal resorts.
	It would assist in future planning if there was further expansion and greater clarification of the function of transport interchanges and the anticipated size /form etc., of this provision.	The LTP cannot identify specific locations at this time in part because of the potential blight it might create but mainly due to the need for significant work to identify locations and scale of interchanges,	No change, work is ongoing on identifying possible locations for interchanges.
	It is assumed the reference to district councils /local planning authorities in the implementation plan are deliberate reflecting where a specific planning issue /collaboration with planning is required rather than the wider district council.	In part although delivery of the broader concepts in the active travel areas may require support from the leisure sectors.	No change
	The draft document implementation plan will need some editing as column headings do not always reflect content.	Noted	Amendments will be made to reflect the errors identified
	Overall, this is a comprehensive document with an extensive range of evidence and supporting strategies behind its development. As such it is noted that there will be significant challenges	Noted	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
	going forward to deliver the extent of aims within the collective documents. As such the continued need to work in partnership and to lobby effectively for external resourcing is paramount to success.		
City of Lincoln Council	Endorses the overall approach within the LTP and with particular emphasis towards the promotion and development of sustainable modes of transport and the need for close partnership working to deliver an integrated transport network which is vital for an urban area such as Lincoln.	Noted	No change
	The Council would be interested in taking part in any future EV charging pilot schemes to explore how the barriers to on-street EV charging could be overcome. The roll-out and uptake of electric buses and taxis needs encouragement and support.	Noted, the EV strategy will require a range of partners to be effectively delivered moving forward.	No change
	While the rationale for having separate documents and strategies within the LTP is understood from a practical perspective, in areas like Lincoln it is critically important to have fully integrated transport systems in place e.g., bus/cycle/rail/walking to	The creation of the Local Area Transport Boards provides for this requirement and shows our strong support for the integrated approach identified. The need for individual modal strategies is an attempt to highlight and demonstrate the specific requirements for each mode and	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
	ensure maximum benefits can be achieved.	provide suggested approaches to be adopted within the Local Area Strategies.	
	Improvements to increase the uptake of cycling should be encouraged and investment made to make cycling a safer and attractive alternative e.g., need to provide secure cycle parking and cycle paths/routes.	As highlighted above the Cycling strategy provides policy and approaches in support of exactly that.	
	The relationship between the implementation of the measures outlined in the LTP and the role the Local Transport Boards play in delivery of those measures needs careful consideration and integration.	This is an issue around governance and delivery of the Local Transport Boards rather than a specific LTP issue. However, longer term new LTP guidance is expected and emphasis on local engagement is likely to be key to the production of revisions to future LTPs.	<p>Consideration or review of the roles and responsibilities of the Local Transport Boards and the need to develop a more delivery focused emphasis.</p> <p>Creation of Terms of Reference and Membership requirements.</p> <p>Consideration is given to the creation of Wider Reference Groups for the area Transport Boards to enable active engagement with local interest groups.</p>
South East Lincolnshire Council Partnership (SELCP) - Boston Borough Council,	Support the framework defined within themes that outline how Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) will respond to the social, economic, health and environmental, challenges LTP5 response	Noted	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
East Lindsey District Council, & South Holland District Council	for South East Lincolnshire Council Partnership that Lincolnshire faces. However, to be effective LTP5, needs to more closely connect to and reference the key subregional projects within these themes.		
	<p>The Introduction section is overly verbose in describing the contents of each chapter/section, and to keep an external audience engaged it could benefit from highlighting key content to come.</p> <p>It is therefore vital that within the introduction chapter, LCC seek to instil early confidence that LTP5 and all other LCC statutory documents are aligned with the local development, transport, and economic plans of its district authorities, whilst being clear about the headline LCC and district authority total budget requirements committed to deliver key infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>The LTP has been produced in line with current (Department for Transport) DfT guidance and the 6-page introduction (which includes 2 pages of maps) is not considered to be overly long.</p> <p>Chapter 4 sets out the basis of the Integrated Transport Strategy and identifies the clear linkages and alignment across the suite of strategic documentation.</p>	Revisions to introduction with some elements of chapter 4 being pulled forward.
	A key omission in the introduction of the draft LTP5 is that the document does not define the A17 as a 'major road' within a Lincolnshire context. The SELCP partners feel that this omission needs to be addressed, given the vital importance of the A17 in a local, regional, and national context.	The A17 is shown on the Strategic Highway Routes on the map in the introduction. There are several references in LTP 5 to improvements on the A17 to support economic growth and in particular the food valley. The freight strategy also identifies	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
		the A17 as a key corridor for investment.	
	Request addition of top line financial numbers defining investments required, LCC and subregional available funds and the strategy to meet any shortfalls.	At the time of writing LTP 5 the ability to identify scheme costs and potential budgets has not been completed. There is ongoing work to identify and fill some of these gaps and this will be fed into a revised LTP 5 implementation Plan when available.	Ongoing scheme development and costing work will help identify some of this missing information.
	Request a reference in the early text to, and create an appendix section where subregional authorities can supply spreadsheet tables defining their key costed projects set against actual short-, medium- and long-term timelines.	<p>In addition to costings there would need to be identified evidence of justification and need, how schemes would support the key LTP objectives and deliverability. Have schemes a Strategic outline business case (SOBC) developed?</p> <p>It is not the role of LTP 5 to create a “wish list” of schemes lacking strategic evidence.</p>	Development of the forthcoming implementation should address this issue.
	Insert within the chapter how LCC plans to physically deliver projects with its private sector partners. Give examples of past successes delivered on time and budget timelines, current procurement processes etc.	LTP 5 has been developed in line with DfT guidance. The Implementation Plan has been developed up to a current level of detail in line with existing information and understanding. The role of the LTP is to provide a strategic framework within which schemes can be identified and then delivered. At this time,	Implementation will be updated moving forward.

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
		it is for individual bids to identify the likelihood of successful delivery.	
	In chapter 2 a series of appropriate themed diagrams within a Transport Plan should come together as an overlay in a final key diagram to both identify and justify where priority projects within a region are needed. SELCP are concerned that this final co-ordinated diagram and the text that should accompany it is missing from this section.	Content to include additional diagrams covering deprivation and other areas requested but would be better placed in Chapter 3.	Develop and include additional diagrams and text.
	Ensure datasets being used to determine the future of transport infrastructure in LCC is varied and goes beyond timelines of recent covid impacts	The evidence base gathered and utilised is considered both consistent and varied. Much of the evidence has been gathered from Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership (GLLEP) work, existing development plans and LCCs own historic data. Whilst COVID impacts are yet to be fully understood it would seem inappropriate to ignore the existing impact on the transport system. It is also inappropriate to assume that travel and traffic will return to pre COVID conditions. We consider the balance of both short term and historic evidence to be	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
		balanced and appropriate.	
	Where Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUE) are being proposed introduce a funding mechanism built into the planning consents to develop and support sustainable access for a defined area of rural hinterland adjacent to that development.	Section 106 funding is already available so not clear what in addition this comment is seeking.	Clarify with consultee but this does not fall under LTP remit.
	Engage to commence work now on the long-term infrastructure projects that SELCP and other districts/councils have in mind, and to support enabling funding applications as required to agencies like Homes England to support feasibility and scheme development work.	Agreed, work of this nature is being developed as part of Local Transport Strategies.	No change.
	Ensure that all street/place-based schemes going forward have a significant degree of urban greening. Include a requirement for a SUDs programme to introduced which on existing or as part of new schemes requires as a minimum, permeable paving materials to use in pedestrian areas.	Agreed	Include relevant section in policy wording.
	Create a standard template for the modal implementation tables and revise all tables to match. Avoid using the term policy for proposed aims, but where relevant refer to the policies set	Agreed	Rework of tables to improve consistency.

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
	out in the previous chapter.		
	Boston should be promoted in the LTP5 as a location for an E-Bus trial.	The technical work identifies Boston as a leading contender for the development of E-Bus technology. This is reflected in a number of places throughout the suite of LTP documents. Additional development work is now required to develop SOBC for the project.	No change required in LTP.
Transport for East Midlands	Support for overall approach adopted in the plan.	Noted	No change
	The priorities identified for Lincolnshire in the draft LTP appear consistent with the strategic priorities TfEM has established and shared with industry partners across modes.	Noted	No change
	In respect to rail, it is right that the draft LTP recognizes that the Transport for the East Midlands (TfEM)/DfT Collaboration agreement provides a clear mechanism for promoting collective regionwide rail priorities and responding to industry reforms.	Noted	No change
	Continued partnership working and aligned objectives will be key to reversing long term trends of low Government transport investment in the East Midlands.	Noted	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
North East Lincolnshire Council	Very supportive of our references to wider connectivity including broad band and the fact we are not just focussed on physical connectivity. Also supportive of accessing ports, the A1 improvements and the wider freight strategy.	Noted	No change
	Would lie a reference to Cleethorpes to London rail service.	Noted, this is referenced in rail strategy.	No change
North Lincolnshire Council	Agree with the principles identified within the Plan and welcome the inclusion of the A15 (between the A46 and Junction 4 of the M180) for future improvements and the recognition of its importance as a strategic economic corridor, particularly with the emergence of the Humber Freeport.	Noted	No change
	Would like to highlight that the A46 Trans-Midlands Trade Corridor Study also includes the A15 north from Riseholme roundabout.	Noted	No change
Thurlby Parish	Acceptance that traditional farming and agricultural tractors and similar machinery will continue with unrestricted access. We would, however, wish to see restrictions on Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) and other large commercial vehicles in transit, when there are alternative and convenient main highway routing options.	The freight strategy acknowledges both the importance of HGV movements to the economy but also recognises that HGVs can cause intrusion in some localities. It proposes supporting modal shift from road to rail, focussing highway improvements that encourage HGVs to us the most suitable	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
		roads and routes and to improve driving training.	
	Requirement for designated safe lanes for walking and cycling and we would wish to see funding made available for this.	LTP highlights the need to Both walking and cycling strategies highlight the need for safe and direct routes for active travel. LTP	No change
	We are presently investing in equipment to help enforce speed limits. Any support from Plan 5 for additional controls and restrictions would be welcome.	The road safety partnership has its own strategy that has been cross referenced in the LTP. Supporting road safety is a key LTP 5 objective.	Share the response with Lincolnshire Road Safety partnership.
PEDALS Spalding Cycling Group	Broadly welcomes all the objectives in the plan promoting active travel and is pleased to note that the plan recognizes the health and environmental benefits of cycling.	Noted	No change
	Supportive of actions identified in the cycling strategy.	Noted	No change
	Raise concerns that the Area Transport Boards do not fully represent the locality and feels wider representation is necessary.	This is an issue around governance and delivery of the Local Transport Boards rather than a specific LTP issue. However, longer term new LTP guidance is expected and emphasis on local engagement is likely to be key to the production of revisions to future LTPs.	Consideration is given to the creation of Wider Reference Groups for the area Transport Boards to enable active engagement with local interest groups or a review of the roles of the Local Area Transport Boards.
	Page 4 of the Prospectus comments that "in rural areas cars are still essential for many". This is reflected in Objective 1b on page 10. This statement may be applied	The LTP recognises Spalding as a market town and not open countryside and as such it has an area transport strategy that seeks to improve connectivity	No change but comment to be passed to Area Transport Board.

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
	to many of the villages and isolated dwellings in South Holland's countryside. However, the town of Spalding and its immediate surroundings should not be described in this way. Facilitating more active travel in the town will not only benefit those who want to travel actively but will also potentially free up road space and parking space for those who have no alternative to using motor vehicles.	from its hinterland by active modes.	
	A plea for ongoing and more active consultation and local engagement.	The LTP consultation has conformed to guidance on the production of such a document.	Consideration is given to the creation of Wider Reference Groups for the area Transport Boards to enable active engagement with local interest groups or a review of the roles of the Local Area Transport Boards.
	Would welcome and support county wide information for and the promotion of cycling.	LTP provides significant policy support for the benefits of active travel and both the walking and cycling strategies identify a need to further develop and promote the benefits of active travel including promotional activity.	No change
	In the absence of a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan for South Holland PEDALS suggests that	LCWIPS have been produced for the major towns including Spalding. Further work is being developed for	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
	development should be through consultation with local users.	the smaller towns and communities not covered by the Area Transport Boards.	
	Would like to see reference made to increasing cycle capacity on trains in the rail strategy.	Noted.	To add a reference in rail strategy and include with any conversations with TOCs moving forward.
Deepings Neighbourhood Plan Group	The LTP does not sufficiently recognise the role of The Deepings area.	As a high-level document, the LTP cannot identify and list every community and its role. The focus on identifying the major settlements based on District Local Plan definitions has been used.	No change.
	Lack of reference to Neighbourhood Plans.	As referenced above the LTP cannot reference every town and parish neighbourhood plan.	No change
	Feel that references to case studies are undeveloped and suggest a local project be included.	Acknowledge that the LTP is light on case studies.	Consider inclusion of Deepings project as a case study within the walking or cycling strategies.
	Feels LTP lacks a detailed and costed programme.	Work is ongoing to further develop a more detailed set of costed interventions and projects.	Ongoing work will develop programme.
North Notts & Lincs Community Rail Partnership	The plan, a great improvement on LTP4, is one we wholeheartedly support.	Noted	No change
	Would welcome involvement with the Gainsborough Area Transport Board.	This is an issue around governance and delivery of the Local Transport Boards rather than a specific LTP issue. However,	Consideration is given to the creation of Wider Reference Groups for the area Transport Boards to

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
		longer term new LTP guidance is expected and emphasis on local engagement is likely to be key to the production of revisions to future LTPs.	enable active engagement with local interest groups or a review of the roles of the Local Area Transport Boards.
	Feel that the A631 is not given sufficient weight as a key east west link.	The A631 has not been identified as a route for RAP work and this is indicated in the LTP.	Consideration be given to investigating the A631 route as part of any future phase of RAP identification and inclusion in LTP of evidence supporting routes that are included.
	Inclusion of a second crossing of the Tent in Gainsborough.	An issue for the Local Area Transport Board	Comments to be passed to Transport Board
Orby Parish Council	Request that the LTP lists a bypass for Orby.	The LTP recognises the need to improve connectivity to the East Coast, however at present there is insufficient evidence to identify a specific scheme at Orby. Work is ongoing to look at options for improving coastal connectivity and a bypass for Orby is included within that work.	Pass comments onto project team.
Mr Stevens (resident Deeping St James)	General support for LTP themes and objectives.	Noted	No change
	Very supportive of approach to walking and in particular integration with public transport.	Noted	No change
	Requirement of cycle facilities to be continuous and removal of severance.	LTP highlights need to reduce severance for all active modes and identifies the need to	No change

Consultee	Comment Summary	LCC Response	Recommendation
		crate safe networks of routes that are well connected.	
	Supportive of approach towards buses. Would like to see better information provision and greater use of technology.	LTP supports expansion of bus investment in line with the BSIP response to government.	No change
	Supportive of a reopened station at Littleworth.	LTP identifies the possible need for new stations in Lincolnshire and commits to working with Network Rail to investigate where suitable sites might be.	No change
	Specific references to junction improvements in the Deepings.	LTP's role is not to list all minor highway improvements.	No change but response to be forwarded to highways.