

## EMCCA Mayor's Transport Strategy Consultation

### BUSINESS/ORGANISATION QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FORM

Draft responses from Derby Cycling Group highlighted in green

1. Have you read and understood privacy notice? **yes**
2. Responding as individual or on behalf of business or organisation? – gives link to relevant form if former **organisation**

#### Section 1: The aim of the Mayor's Transport Plan

See the Aims section of 'The Mayor's Transport Plan - Discussion Document' for information to help you answer the questions in this section. Please complete all questions in this section to move on.

#### 3. To what extent do you agree that the following statement conveys an appropriate level of ambition for the Mayor's Transport Plan?

*By 2040, communities in the East Midlands will benefit from reliable, inclusive and sustainable connectivity through integrated transport and high-quality digital infrastructure, broadening access to opportunity and reducing reliance on private cars, while driving investment across the region.*

Choose from - Strongly agree / Agree / **No view** / not sure / Disagree / Strongly disagree

#### 4. Please rank the four strategic themes of the Mayor's Transport Plan in order of your agreement, with 1 being the theme you most strongly agree with and 4 being the one you least agree with (increase modal choice **[1]**; better connect communities **[2]**; create greater economic opportunity **[4]**; protect our environment **[3]**)

#### 5. BOX Is there anything more you would like to tell us about the ambition of the Mayor's Transport Plan? Are there any aims or goals you would change, add or remove?

- Derby Cycling Group represents over 350 members in the Derby and surrounding area and we focus our response especially on cycle transport, the wider active travel arena and the integration of these with public transport.
- We have said that we have no view on the benefit statement in question 3 because there is insufficient information in the Plan to show how the aspirations will be financed or delivered and so we cannot tell if it will succeed or not. We do however strongly support most of the ambitions defined in the Mayor's Transport Plan and sincerely hope it does deliver the desired outcomes.
- We strongly support the general aims, direction and priorities of the Transport Plan and like the way it seeks a more equitable balance between planning for all modes of transport.
- We also agree with and support the aim to create more and better integration between transport networks.
- We are pleased note and strongly agree with the really important statement on P34 "Providing options beyond the car is not anti-car, it is pro-social mobility". It is also helpful that the contribution of active travel to health and wellbeing are acknowledged. Well done.
- We have noted, on P13, the critical paragraph: "better balancing the needs of different users". This looks like the old discredited Derby City LTP3 mantra of "a balanced approach for all areas of transport" which wasn't defined and didn't deliver. The LTP needs a definition of "balance the needs". There is one on P38, regarding the "whole street approach" in respect of maintenance works, but it needs to be applied to network design as a whole. It

also needs to be more specific ***“...more balanced, especially with regard to walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport”***. In my opinion, these should be prioritised on every project according to a transport hierarchy (see later).

- There are, however changes to the aims and goals that we would like to see. A major omission, which we would like to see rectified in the final document, is that, in comparison to those for public transport, active travel goals and actions are too vague and nebulous. There need to be more concrete, specific, SMART objectives for active travel, especially cycle transport, demonstrating what will be delivered. On P35, for example, we totally agree with the statements in column 2 paragraph 2, but they are vague and nebulous. How will they be done? Where is the plan to create the active travel networks?
- Within active travel, cycle transport is clearly subordinate in the LTP and often missing, even down to there being no cycle logo on the graphics for key policy overview (P25) or modal choice (P26 and elsewhere).
- Missing from the Transport Plan are any quantitative targets (which need to set stretched ambitions) and monitoring methods to check progress against objectives. We would like to see tangible deliverable targets and milestones to a more ambitious and aggressive timescale.
- We particularly welcome the theme “Increase Modal Choice”, but within that, cycle transport needs to be most prominent. The cycle network is by far the most incomplete, so it needs especially strong goals and ambition to bring it up to the level of even the current walking and public transport networks. We recommend stating this as an aim or a goal, and following it up with detailed policies.
- To ensure active travel networks are specifically developed at an accelerated rate, we need a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and this must be stated in the Transport Plan.
- The LTP needs to contain more specific objectives, targets and actions in the active travel arena. Things like “Working with partners to deliver...” needs to be replaced with “Create a cycle network plan and a priority plan for its delivery”, etc
- Within the theme “Increase Modal Choice” / goal “Active, healthy and vibrant places” we are not pleased with vague, wishy-washy the actions set out on P40. There are no concrete actions relating to the creation or improvement of cycle networks. We would like to see 1) a cycle logo alongside parent and child in the header to show it’s about cycling as well as walking; 2) the statements “working with ... partners ...(wishy-washy statement)” replaced with more punchy, specific actions such as
  - a) Undertake a cycle network review
  - b) Create a cycle network development plan, an LCWIP (ie the finished network (to a level) and a plan of priority schemes (eg top 10 in Derby)).
  - c) Change first bullet from “... key focus on safe routes to school” to ***“... key focus on safe routes to school and transport and employment hubs”***
  - d) Change second bullet to read ***“Create and deliver training and information resources to support people to use active modes”***
  - e) Change third bullet to read ***“Create and deliver a plan of targeted travel behaviour creation and change programs”***.
  - F) Change fifth bullet to read ***“Implement the national standards for cycling infrastructure (LTN1/20) and for walking (Manual for Streets) ”*** There is no need “review and set” standards, just implement the standards which already exist.
- There needs to be a goal or aim to state that journeys by bike, on foot or wheeling will be increased as a proportion of all journeys made. The point of the networks must be to increase the number of journeys made (not just to make them better) and we would like a statement to this effect in the Transport Plan.

- We would like to see the inclusion in the Transport Plan of the notion of a **transport hierarchy** where the most vulnerable users (walkers, wheelers, then cyclists etc) are at the top. We would then like to see it stated that transport planners will deal with connectivity and safety of users at the top as their first priority when designing any scheme and ensure it fits around the needs of the more vulnerable. This Transport Plan seems to be trying to address this, and I think the specific reference to a transport hierarchy would be helpful to ensure it is delivered.
- Tourism is not mentioned much but tourists need to have the same transport choices as other travellers. We recommend implementation of cycle routes which support tourist and also local travel, such as the proposed Derwent Valley Cycleway, as EMCCA funded projects.
- We strongly support the notion of Better Connected Communities, especially locating local services (schools, health, local retail etc) close to residential places and are supporters of concepts such as 15 minute neighbourhoods. We also prefer the centralisation of major services in city, town and district centres, which enable multi modal transport routes to be created into them from all directions.
- Within Better Connected Communities, the LTP needs to define how transport and spatial planning will be integrated when different authorities are responsible for each, otherwise it risks failing to deliver better connectivity. There is a major issue with the goal of better connected communities where the Transport Plan is owned by EMCCA and the Mayor but its delivery is highly dependent on spatial planning which is owned by the constituent local authorities.
- On P41, within Better Connected Communities, we have three comments:
  - First we would like an additional bullet (number 2): “Engage with active travel stakeholders, especially network end users, for input of ideas and needs, and involve them in on-going reviews and consultations”. Some sort of Active Travel Forum framework is needed, maybe at two levels – one in the local areas, feeding into an EMCCA level.
  - Secondly, under the bullet “Deliver localised healthy neighbourhood / community-based schemes with partners” we would like to see the text changed to “**...community-based schemes with partners, especially the network users**”.
  - Finally, Mobility hubs are mentioned – what are these? There needs to be a definition or description so we can see if these are what we want or not.
- On P42, within the theme “Greater Economic Opportunity” / goal “integrated, sustainable and resilient network”. Firstly there is the bullet “Prioritisation of investment to reduce road danger” – what is this? It’s too vague. We need more specific deliverables, such as the implementation of a Vision Zero strategy and 20s Plenty policy, and other things such as public awareness campaigns of pedestrian and cyclist’s rights on the highway (eg latest highway code hierarchy of responsibility etc).
- P42, final bullet references “...Key Route Network (the most important roads)...” This needs to be “**the most important roads, and cycling and walking routes**”.
- We would like an extra bullet under the goal “Decarbonise travel...” , to describe how an uptake in naturally low or zero carbon modes of transport would be achieved “**Create the means for low carbon transport by expanding and improving walking, wheeling and cycling networks**”.
- Within the “What’s Next” section on P48:
  - Firstly, it only mentions working on strategic interventions for road and rail networks. There needs to be strategic planning for cycling, walking and public transport networks as well. These should be stated here.
  - Secondly, because there are no concrete objectives earlier in the LTP document about the development of the cycling and walking networks, this has to be included in “what’s next”, otherwise there is no explicit commitment to cycle transport or walking and wheeling.

- Under Sub-Strategies on P49, the **Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)** for the EMCCA region must be referenced in the LTP document. Because the LCWIP is not mentioned once in the Transport Plan and because it is a critical document in relation to active travel, it follows that this therefore must be a sub-strategy and should be referenced here. In our view, the lack of any reference to the LCWIP is a major omission from the Transport Plan and should be added to the final document, or at the very least it should be identified here as a sub-strategy document.

## Section 2: Key priorities to deliver the Mayor's Transport Plan

Analysis of the issues, challenges and opportunities facing the EMCCA region has helped to shape the direction of the Mayor's Transport Plan and its policies. This has resulted in the emergence of a set of 22 policies sat within seven goals. These define the key areas of focus for the Plan, which have been developed in collaboration with the constituent authorities. See the "Key Priorities" section of 'The Mayor's Transport Plan - Discussion Document' for information to help you answer the question in this section.

### 6. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the emerging policies detailed below will enable the Mayor's Transport Plan to meet its first goal

**To strengthen and extend the public transport network - by making it more accessible, reliable, and affordable. A user-friendly system, with seamless connections between different travel modes.**

Bringing public transport nearer more people **Agree** ; Improving reliability **Agree** , journey times and frequencies **Agree** ; Enhancing the passenger experience **Agree** ; Supporting simpler and more affordable public transport tickets **Agree** ; Improving the ease of switching between different types of transport e.g. bus and rail **Strongly agree**

For each option choose Strongly agree/Agree/No view/Not sure/Disagree/Strongly disagree

### 7. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the emerging policies detailed below will enable the Mayor's Transport Plan to meet its second goal:

**To support active, healthy and vibrant places** Creating transformative cycling, walking & wheeling (aids or wheeled devices used by people with limited mobility) networks, **Strongly agree** Integrating active modes (walking, wheeling and cycling) into our wider transport networks **Strongly agree** Supporting people to use active modes with training and information **Strongly agree**

For each option choose Strongly agree/Agree/No view/Not sure/Disagree/Strongly disagree

### 8. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the emerging policies detailed below will enable the Mayor's Transport Plan to meet its third goal:

**To connect communities and new homes** - Designing our places to bring people closer together **Strongly agree** ; Focusing new housing and employment developments in well-connected areas **Strongly agree** ; Enhancing the quality of our public spaces **Agree** ; Increasing provision of shared transport (e.g. hire bikes, car share clubs, e-scooters) **Strongly agree**

agree ; Better connecting communities by active and sustainable travel options Strongly agree

For each option choose Strongly agree/Agree/No view/Not sure/Disagree/Strongly disagree

**9. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the emerging policies detailed below will enable the Mayor's Transport Plan to meet its fourth goal:**

**To facilitate a productive and inclusive economy** Working collaboratively to influence funding decisions to invest in the strategic growth corridors No view Supporting efficient operation of our transport networks No view

For each option choose Strongly agree/Agree/No view/Not sure/Disagree/Strongly disagree

**10. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the emerging policies detailed below will enable the Mayor's Transport Plan to meet its fifth goal:**

**To promote an integrated, sustainable and resilient network** Improving the climate resilience of our transport networks; Strongly agree Making our roads safer by following the 'Safe System' approach, so people, vehicles and road infrastructure interact in a way that secures safety Strongly Agree; Improving maintenance of our networks so our assets (roads, pavements, bridges, lighting etc) stay in good condition for longer Strongly agree

For each option choose Strongly agree/Agree/No view/Not sure/Disagree/Strongly disagree

**11. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the emerging policies detailed below will enable the Mayor's Transport Plan to meet its sixth goal:**

**To improve our unique natural and historic environment** Supporting the protection and enjoyment of our environments Agree; Reducing the negative impact of transport and travel on the environment Agree

For each option choose Strongly agree/Agree/No view/Not sure/Disagree/Strongly disagree

**12. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the emerging policies detailed below will enable the Mayor's Transport Plan to meet its seventh goal:**

**To decarbonise travel as part of net zero** Working with partners to support increased provision for low and zero emission fuels for all transport modes No view

For each option choose Strongly agree/Agree/No view/Not sure/Disagree/Strongly disagree

**13. BOX Is there anything more you would like to tell us about the emerging policies presented above? Are there any policies you would change, add or remove?**

- We have answered Agree or Strongly Agree to those goals with policies relating to active travel because we strongly support the aims of these; however we cannot say whether or not these will actually enable the outcomes desired because there is insufficient detail about how they will be financed and delivered. We are supportive of the general ambition of the Transport Plan and are especially supportive of policies 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 21.

- We particularly support policies 6, 7 and 8, which explicitly aim to deliver more and better cycle transport networks and to promote cycle transport as a means of travel. We agree that active travel should be the automatic first choice for local, everyday, journeys.
- A major issue is that the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for the EMCCA region is not mentioned at all. The Transport Plan must reference LCWIP and state how it will be delivered. In our view the LCWIP must be at EMCCA level, albeit built from input from active travel users in local areas, because only through EMCCA can we get properly integrated regional active travel routes, especially for cycle transport. Only an EMCCA LCWIP can deliver this, not local authority plans.
- Modal Choice: Policies 6, 7 and 8 are all good for cycle transport, we strongly support these.
- Better Connected Communities: Policy 9 needs to be turned the other way round: we would prefer it to say ***“Design our places to bring key services close to the people they serve”***.
- Policy 13 needs to be more assertive, we would prefer ***“Connect communities with more and better active and sustainable travel options”***
- Greater Economic Opportunity: Policy 15 (efficient operation of transport networks) needs to include the need to make more equal distribution of space between motorised and non-motorised transport. Reallocation of road space can often be done without impacting motor traffic capacity; fair distribution of space needs to be explicitly planned for everywhere and needs to be referenced in the Transport Plan.
- Policy 18 should refer to initiatives such as Vision Zero and 20s Plenty. In addition, some explicit mention of reducing vehicle speeds to reduce road danger is needed within the Transport Plan.
- Related to Policy 19 is the heading on P37 “A Reliable System - Repairing our highways”. This needs to say ***“...highways and paths”***. Cycle paths and also pavements are part of the highway network and must be maintained to the same standards, using the same or similar monitoring and intervention processes. We would like the Transport Plan to acknowledge maintenance of cycle paths (and indeed pavements) in the same breath as road carriageways.

14. Below are some of the ways the Mayor’s Transport Plan could support EMCCA’s wider inclusive growth ambitions. Please rank them in order of importance to you, with 1 being the most important and 8 being the least important. A transport network that...

- Makes it easier to get around without needing to rely on private car ownership **1: most important**
- Offers affordable fares and ticketing **7**
- Reduces the negative impact of transport on our neighbours such as air quality & noise **5**
- Allows for future innovation and accounts for changes in the way we live **6**
- Reduces social isolation particularly in rural areas **8**
- Makes it easier to get to education training and employment **3**
- Facilitates active lifestyles to improve the health of our communities **2**
- Supports the movement older and vulnerable people including children **4**

15. BOX Would you like to suggest any other ways in which the Mayor's Transport Plan could improve inclusive access to health, skills, prosperity and growth across the region, or tell us anything more about your answers above?

- Of the “inclusive growth ambitions” above, reducing the reliance on the private car is by far the most important; if realised it unleashes huge potential for travel and spatial planning. The trick is how to enable this when the main need is creating space for more things like a comprehensive and integrated cycling network, while the roads are still full of cars. A large proportion of investment in alternatives to the car is required to redress the imbalance that

has occurred over the previous several decades. The playing field of transport choices needs to be levelled.

- We suggest some ways below we think would help improve inclusive access across the region.
- Regarding rural and some lower density urban transport networks, we need to integrate cycle transport with public transport by having cycle stands at bus stops, so people can travel to the bus by bike, and create Park and Cycle schemes, maybe alongside Park and Ride bus schemes. These would stretch the reach of public transport.
- Allowing bikes to be carried on the bus, on trams and on trains. This enables more multi-modal travel (eg bike/bus/bike, or bike/train/bike etc).
- Page 35 of the Transport Plan references the "...promotion of behaviour change...". We also need to enable the creation of new behaviours by better design and more comprehensive links to new-build locations.
- The roads need to feel more welcoming and safe for cycling; a ban on parking in cycle lanes, on cycle paths and on pavements and strong enforcement of that can help. Too often space allocated for cycling is abused by people parking on it, often forcing cyclists into the main carriageway and hence the relative danger that people want to avoid.
- Reallocation of more road space in favour of active travel and public transport.

**16. Below are some of the ways the Mayor's Transport Plan could improve the experience of using our transport network. How important do you think each of the following are in improving the way that our transport network is designed in the future?**

- Managing future travel demand on the transport network to address congestion caused by projected population growth **V important**
- Improving the safety and personal security of people using the transport network **V Important**
- Removing obstacles to walking, including with a pram or pushchair, and wheeling (e.g. inconsiderate parking, blocking pavements, a lack of dropped kerbs) **Important**
- Improving priority for buses and trams on the road network **No view**
- Improving priority for cycling on the transport network **V important**
- Improving maintenance of roads, pavements, bridges, lighting etc **V Important**
- Ensuring better access to green spaces in our neighbourhoods **Important**
- Focusing new housing development and employment in areas that are well connected to the transport network **V important**

For each option choose from V important/Important/No view /Not sure/not v important/not at all important

**17. BOX Would you like to suggest any other ways in which the Mayor's Transport Plan could improve the way that our transport network is designed in the future, or tell us anything more about your answers above?**

- We think most improvements in network design would come by first establishing a transport hierarchy where active travel is at the top, followed by buses and other public transport, with private cars being planned around the needs of other modes. We would like the Transport Plan to establish such a transport hierarchy.
- We need the Transport Plan to focus on raising the quality and coverage of those modes which are least well developed, to bring them up to the level of the most developed modes. The cycle network is the one which is least developed; in each urban centre it is strongly disjointed and does not connect regionally and so needs most attention. There could be an

initial focus on filling in gaps in the local networks and improving the poorest quality parts, and forging ahead with routes already in development (such as the Derwent Valley Cycleway) while planning the larger scale new routes.

- We would like the end users of the various networks to have greater opportunity to be involved in discussing the issues they have, how they think things could be made better and to have more influence on transport decisions that affect them. Special efforts should be made to involve more disadvantaged or under-represented demographics in this consultation. This could be some sort of forum, but does need to reach out proactively to communities.
- Removing barriers to cycle transport, both physical and metaphorical, will help more people consider starting to cycle. Some examples are safer roads with fewer cars, lower traffic speeds, fewer parked cars, better crossings, more cycle permeable neighbourhoods and no discriminative barriers or bollards.
- We would like to see an ambition to provide secure cycle parking at all public destinations.
- Regarding the “Vision and Validate” approach to decision making and planning (P21), this must include enforcement of the resulting priorities on planning bodies and developers to ensure they are carried through into developer plans, with rejection of schemes which do not fulfil the Transport Plan ambitions. We would like to see the Transport Plan describe how the Vision and Validate approach will be enforced.
- Major improvements could be made to integrate cycle transport with public transport, with cycle routes to all bus, tram and rail stations, secure cycle parking at all transport hubs and at certain bus stops, allowing bikes on buses, trams and more on trains, and so on.
- We would like to comment that the bus improvement plan must specifically not degrade cycling routes in order to improve buses, as was recently planned by Derby City Council on Duffield Road in the city.
- Priority 3 refers specifically to highway maintenance. Our experience is that this is done against a set of processes and parameters designed around risks to motor vehicles and ignores the often far greater risks of “lesser defects” on cycles and cyclists. Firstly we would like Priority 3 to cover roads and pathways; we would like the Transport Plan to state that pavements and cycle paths adjacent to roads and those away from roads to all be considered in the same way as roads.
- We would like a policy to say that intervention thresholds set for pavements, paths and cycle paths will be set.
- Most importantly, we would like it recognised in the Transport Plan that for roads to be maintained in a safe state for cycles, there need to be different parameters to identify defects which are significant to cycles compared to those significant to cars. A narrow, linear, defect can be catastrophic for a cycle but no issue for a car. This could be achieved in a number of ways: better intervention thresholds, reflecting the risks to cycles could be applied everywhere or different thresholds could be applied “on the cycling line” (which includes the centre of the road on the approach to right turns etc) than on the rest of the road. In our view, the “whole street approach” discussed on P38 lends itself to this reappraisal of defect interventions and we would like it referenced here in the Plan.
- On P38 there is mention of the use of AI in preventative maintenance of “road surfaces”. The use of AI in this way would also make it easy to apply different intervention thresholds in areas of the road used for cycling than for driving-only; the threshold for intervention could be dynamic based on the road position of the defect and it would be automated once the AI engine was programmed with a map of all roads. Any place where cycling is likely (eg the left lane of the road, but also centre of the road on the approach to right turns) compared to where cycling is unlikely (eg on the right hand lane of a dual carriageway, away from right turns), needs to have the more stringent thresholds applied.
- We would like to see funding from damaging road schemes in our area, such as the A38 Derby Junctions scheme, reallocated to sustainable travel projects supporting local



transport. As part of the “Rethinking Transport Funding in the EMCCA Region” report by Friends of the Earth, we produced a list of alternative cycle network schemes which could be funded instead of the A38 scheme. Our list can be found here: <https://derbycyclinggroup.org.uk/site/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Alternatives-to-A38-Derby-Junction-Grade-Separation-V3.0-.xls>

**18. Which of the following challenges, if any, regularly have a negative impact on your business or organisation? Please select all that apply.**

- Congestion slows journeys down
- Congestion impacting the movement of goods and services
- A lack of suitable bus routes to take people where they want to go
- A lack of suitable rail routes to take people where they want to go
- A lack of suitable walking, wheeling & cycling routes to take people where they want to go
- A lack of information to assist in making journey planning decisions
- A lack of public transport services in my area at the time people need to travel
- Lack of evening and Sunday bus services
- Public transport services that are too infrequent or unreliable
- Public transport service connections that are not well co-ordinated
- Tickets that are not transferable between different public transport services
- Public transport services that are overcrowded
- Affordability of travel by car when factoring in the cost of parking
- Affordability of public transport services
- Safety when driving on the road network
- Safety when travelling by public transport
- Safety when walking, wheeling and/or cycling

**19. BOX Are there any other transport related challenges your business or organisation faces in making journeys around the EMCCA region that you would like to tell us about, or tell us anything more about your answers above? [last free text box]**

- Our organisation is a group of members who all use cycles as a significant means of transport. We talk to members of the public, many non-cyclists or lapsed cyclists, many who would like to cycle but are “afraid to ride on the road”. There are several big challenges for us that we hope this transport plan will help to address.
- We need to plan a cycle network that gets people from their front door to wherever they want to go. In Derby that could be anywhere in the city because Derby is compact and generally has a good geography for cycling. However the cycle network does not go everywhere; often the first and last mile is missing or the network stops just where you need it most. The starting point for good infrastructure is a good plan, so we need the EMCCA Transport Plan to deliver a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for the whole region. LCWIP is not even mentioned in the current Plan, it must be referenced fully in the next draft.
- The current D2N2 LCWIP is out of date and the Derby part especially is of poor quality. It needs to be redone and redone properly, with engagement of local transport users.
- We need the network to be designed to good standards; for cycling, this is LTN1/20, so we need the Transport Plan to simply state that LTN1/20 will be used as the baseline for all cycle

infrastructure (any limitations on its implementation in specific schemes needs to be stated as exceptions, of which there are many valid ones, with reasons why they cannot be realised).

- Then the network can then be built (routes to and parking at all destinations), hopefully focussing first on filling in network gaps while planning bigger, new routes.
- The next challenge is that people's travel habits are well established. If someone drives everywhere, they know the road network but they won't realise that there is a cycle network, even if it is world class. So campaigns and initiatives are needed to introduce communities to their local cycle network, advocate for its use and provide services to help people understand how to cycle, teach people to ride and show them how they can make their own specific journeys using the cycle network. It's about **creating** new travel behaviours, which we think is a better way to think than "behaviour change".
- Poor driver behaviour makes cycling feel unsafe, even though it is not a particularly dangerous activity. Initiatives to engender more benevolent driver behaviours, backed up by collaboration with police forces on enforcement of road traffic law, would help make cycling feel safer
- The amount of traffic on the road can make cycling feel intimidating, which can be interpreted as "feeling unsafe". Wider policies to reduce the number of motor vehicles on the road, especially heavy and light goods vehicles, will help enable more people to decide to cycle.

#### **Section 4: Improvements to our bus network**

EMCCA will take responsibility for public transport functions in April 2026. This means that EMCCA will work with bus operators to improve bus services and administer such things as concessionary fares. There will be a transition period as staff move across from the Councils to EMCCA, bringing with them their extensive local knowledge and expertise. We have included several questions in this section to seek your feedback on how we take forward this work to improve the bus network in the region. All questions in this section are optional.

##### **20. When do your staff typically travel to and from the business or organisation?**

- Weekdays
- Weekends
- Both weekdays and weekends
- Never - staff work remotely
- N/A

##### **21. Considering business hours and shift working, when do your staff typically travel to and from the business or organisation? Please select all that apply**

- Between 6am and 9:30am
- Between 9:30am and 3pm
- Between 3pm and 6:30pm
- Between 6:30pm and 11pm
- Between 11pm and 5:30am
- All of the above
- N/A
- Other (please specify below)

##### **22. As an organisation or business, do you offer salary sacrifice travel schemes (e.g. Discounted Robin Hood Annual Pass in Nottinghamshire)**

- No
- Not sure
- N/A
- Yes (please specify below)

**23. As an organisation or business, do you promote public transport services for commuting and business travel?**

- No
- Not sure
- Yes
- N/A

**24. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of the bus network serving your business or organisation? Passenger Experience:**

Safety travelling to the bus stop **No view**; Safety on the bus; **No view** Safety at the bus stop; **No view** Access to public transport information (e.g. real-time, apps, timetables) **No view**; Access to journey planning information; **No view** Accessibility at stops and shelters; **No view** Accessibility at bus stations **No view**; Accessibility to vehicles **V Dissatisfied**; Ability to get a seat on the bus; **No view**

For each option choose from - V. satisfied/satisfied/no view/ not sure/dissatisfied/ v. dissatisfied

**25. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of the bus network serving your business or organisation? The Network and Infrastructure**

Punctuality of service **No view**; journey time **No view**; distance to bus stop **No view** Integration with other bus and rail services **No view**; Time of service (morning/late evenings etc) **No view**; frequency **No view**; quality of bus stations **No view**; quality of bus stops and shelters; **No view**

For each option choose from - V. satisfied/satisfied/Noview/Notsure/dissatisfied/ v. dissatisfied

**26. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of the bus network serving your business or organisation? Fares and Ticketing**

Affordability of fares **No view** Simplicity of fares; **No view** Integration of fares **No view**

For each option choose from V. satisfied/satisfied/no view not sure/dissatisfied/ v. dissatisfied

**27. To what extent do you agree that the following improvements would encourage people to use the bus more often to travel to your business or organisation premises?**

Quicker journeys times on local bus services **No view**; Better connections between bus and rail/tram services **No view**; Local bus services near you operating more frequently **No view**; Local buses near you operating later in the evening **No view**; Local buses near you operating earlier in the morning **No view**; Local buses serving more destinations **No view**; More Sunday bus service **No view**; On-demand bus services that could be booked with an app **No view**; Services operated with more accessible vehicles **Agree**; Services operated with

electric or zero emission vehicle **No view** improved waiting facilities (stops/stations/shelters) **Agree**; Real-time bus information at stops and interchanges **No view**; Safe and pleasant walking routes to and from stops **Agree**; Improved punctuality of services **No view**; Improved reliability of journey times; **No view** Contactless payment options; **No view** multimodal ticket options; **Agree** multi operator ticket options **Agree**

For each option choose on spectrum of Strongly agree to strongly disagree

**28. Overall, how would you rate public transport (bus, rail and tram) in the area serving your business or organisation?** **No view**

Choose from spectrum of v satisfied to v dissatisfied

## **Section 5 About your business or organisation**

### **29.30.31. Questions about business or organisation**

**33. BOX 33. Is there anything more you would like to tell us about how changes or challenges to the transport network in the EMCCA region impact your business or organisation?**

- We would like to take up the point on page 13 of the Transport Plan: Regarding transport "The people who use it need to be at the centre of how it's planned." We totally agree with this statement, and want to be involved in conversations about the future development of the cycle network in our local area, how it connects to neighbouring places and to be a conduit for the needs and aspirations of our 350-plus members, but there is no information in the Transport Plan about how that engagement will happen. We need the Transport Plan to define how users will be at the centre of transport planning and how local authorities will be made to participate with the same fervour that the statement on P13 offers from the Mayor. We would also urge that any such participation forum considers the old Derby City Council active travel forum terms of reference as a template (we can supply a copy if requested) because we think these are close to what is needed.