

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Metrowest1](#)
Subject: TR040011 Portishead Branch Line (MetroWest Phase 1)
Date: 18 November 2020 21:17:40
Attachments: [DCO submission Ref 20025232.docx](#)
[Summary Ref 20025232.docx](#)

Dear Sir/Madam,

please find attached my submission (5,860 words) to the Planning Inspector about the application for DCO for the above. A summary is also attached (497 words).

If you have any questions please email [REDACTED] or telephone [REDACTED]

Yours faithfully,

Barry Cash

Portishead Busway Campaign

Ref:20025232 Summary by Barry Cash TR040011 Portishead Branch Line

The application for a DCO should be denied because:

1. The scheme is poor value for the taxpayer.
2. Reopening the railway does not offer the best service to the commuters of Portishead and Pill.
3. The proposal does not comply with the Government's National Policy statements.
4. It is not the best option for reducing fuel use and greenhouse gas emissions.

Advantages of a busway:

1. It would be cheaper than a railway. Current estimates for re-opening the railway are: £116m for one train per hour, and £175m for two trains per hour. Rough calculations show a busway could be created for about £45m.
2. A busway could provide a more extensive route than the railway. For example, the route could start at the far end of Portishead and travel into and beyond Bristol centre.
3. A busway will not interfere with the movement of freight trains (currently only ten per week).
4. A busway can be installed without interrupting freight trains or modifying the railway tracks.
5. A busway can provide a faster service than that provided by train.
6. While the official scheme provides only one train an hour, a busway could provide greater frequency.
7. It would be possible to adjoin an off-road cycle track 4km shorter than present route.

Topics covered in the full submission

13 Criticisms by the applicant of the Busway project and our responses.

Passenger demand. Only 23% of seats will be occupied and after 15 years only 31%

Habitats Directive – no Imperative reasons of overriding public interest.

Errors in WECA Mayors letter.

National Policy Statement for National Networks (2014). The following parts are not complied with or are achieved better by the busway

Page 9, States the requirements national Networks must meet.

p 25, section 3.6 legally binding carbon and environmental targets, switch to ULEVs

p 35, section 4.27 all projects must be subject to an options appraisal.

p 37 section 4.36 mitigating and adapting to climate change

Metrowest Phase 1: Outline Business Case Appendix 1.2, Option Assessment Report December 2017.

Nothing other than reopening the railway ever considered.

Section 6.2 Development of Objectives

Five key transport goals in the West of England joint local transport plan.

Section 6.3: To support economic growth

Supporting growth by enhancing transport links
MetroWest Phase 1 supporting objectives
Reducing traffic congestion

Section 6.4 Targets and benefits

Increase local economy
More frequent public transport
Increase number living within 30 minutes of key employment areas
Reduce highway congestion
Provide competitive journey times to Temple Meads
Improve accessibility to development sites
Reduce environmental impact
Provide alternative to car travel

Wider Scheme Outputs

7.3 Geographical Extent of Current and Future Transport Problems

Journey times, air quality etc.

The Busway project meets these objectives better than the Railway proposal.

If 2001 study was done today Busway would be likely choice.

Increasing the service.

Letter of support from James Freeman.

Codes of Conduct. Have they been complied with?

End