

# Response ID ANON-FAT5-GHZN-7

Submitted to **Draft Infrastructure Investment Plan – 2021-22 to 2025-26**

Submitted on **2020-11-09 14:29:24**

## Questions

### 1a Do you support the inclusion of natural infrastructure in our definition of infrastructure?

Yes

### 1b Do you agree with the wording proposed for the revised definition?

Not Answered

### 1c. If you do not agree with the proposed wording of the definition of infrastructure, please provide your suggested changes and additional material to support your answers [200 word limit].:

MACS agrees with the investment hierarchy and inclusion of natural infrastructure in the definition of infrastructure. Concepts of future need must however take into account social and environmental goals, not merely forecast demand. Investment in infrastructure must support the changes in behaviour and attitudes (social, environmental and economic) which we want to encourage. A preference for renewing existing infrastructure rather than 'new build' is also an opportunity to make a lot of current, substandard infrastructure from pavements to train stations - more inclusive.

### 2a Do you agree that the steps proposed in the common investment hierarchy are the right ones?

Yes

### 2b. If you think any adjustments are needed to the proposed investment hierarchy, please provide suggested changes (and evidence, where appropriate) to support your answers.:

Too much existing transport infrastructure - train stations, bus stations (and indeed bus stops), ferries and ports etcetera - has poor physical access, for example including steps, no seating, poor colour contrast and way-finding. Where there is new-build infrastructure, we would of course expect it to also meet the highest possible access standards, so that it is available for everyone to use now and for future generations. This applies to evolving needs like EV charging points, increased blue accessible and EV accessible parking at transport hubs (leave the car) as well as major projects. Consultation with disabled people and Equality Impact Assessments are essential to ensure that new barriers are not built in inadvertently (for example, wholesale removal of kerbs in 'shared spaces' schemes which disadvantage blind people).

Rural and island connectivity are essential to maintaining healthy and diverse (for example in age groups) populations. Digital communications can have an important and growing role to play both for sustaining jobs, and for key services such as healthcare; however, transport links must also be sufficiently available, affordable and accessible (our 'Triple A' lock) and timetabling must ensure seamless multi-mode journeys are easy to make.

'Sustainable places' are those where a diverse range of different people live and can shop, work, get educated, socialise etcetera all close by. This not only enables people to physically reach local essential facilities (like shops, doctors, healthcare facilities, schools and jobs) but should generate good communities - places where people know their neighbours and will look out for each other. This will in the longer term encourage 'care in the community' and make it easier for people to remain independent in their own homes, should they wish to rather than necessarily relying on institutional care as they grow older or experience health, mobility problems and are more susceptible to social isolation and loneliness affecting their health and wellbeing. There will be a continuing need for care homes, and like other community facilities, they need to be located within people's own communities. The work of the Feeley review of independent adult social care is important in this context and needs to be supported by planning and placemaking policy.

There are great opportunities to achieve this through imaginative application of the Place Principle and '20 minute neighbourhood' concept utilising the principles of Democracy Matters to get designs right. Planning policy need to support this by curtailing monotonous single-type housing developments (such as over-provision of student flats in cities, limited accessible housing or of car-dependent residential estates on city peripheries).

An essential component of this vision of sustainable local communities which should be emphasised more in the strategy is the design and management of the public realm. Residential and high streets need to be attractive and accessible for walking and wheeling. Too many communities suffer from a legacy of poor quality, narrow pavements with streets designed for traffic moving at 30mph or more.

We need a move away from streets that are difficult to cross the road - or require a long wait to do so. Streets where there is nowhere to stop and sit to catch your breath or public realm that lacks toilets (including accessible and Changing Places toilets) within easy reach. Bus stops with no shelters. Streets without any trees or street art which aren't attractive to spend time in and are hard to navigate by people with visual impairments of cognitive conditions (neuro-diverse people and people with dementia). Making streets more attractive and accessible is an essential component of making sustainable, welcoming, safe places.

We would like to see utility companies make a bigger contribution to maintaining high quality public realm. Many streets are ripped up time and again (especially by telecoms firms) and telecoms cabinets and masts are appearing everywhere. While the investment in new and renewed utilities from water, gas to communications is welcome and much needed, we would welcome fresh thinking about how to manage the installation and maintenance of utilities most efficiently and to the public benefit.

### 3a Do you agree that a dashboard of indicators is the best approach to enable informed decisions to be taken about the long-term trade-offs and choices in our infrastructure investments? Please provide the reasons for your response.

**Please provide the reasons for your response.:**

With regard to the monitoring and evaluation proposals (for example the indicative dashboard on page 25), we would like to see inclusion of some more specific performance indicators which are aligned to the objective of creating inclusive accessible places, and to the strategic goal in the National Transport Strategy to "Reduce Inequalities".

**3b What outcomes (and/or indicators) do you think should be included in developing a common assessment framework for prioritising infrastructure investment?**

Please explain your answer:

**3c Are there existing tools or methodologies you are aware of which you think the Scottish Government could draw on or adopt in developing its framework?**

Please explain your answer:

**4a Do you support the planned approach to developing a new approach to assessing the contribution made by infrastructure investment to Scotland's emissions targets?**

Unsure

**4b. Please explain your response and support your response with evidence [500 word limit].:**

**5a What are your views on the accuracy and scope of the environmental baseline set out in the Environmental Report?**

Please explain your answer:

**5b What are your views on the predicted environmental effects of the Infrastructure Investment Plan as set out in the Environmental Report?**

Please explain your answer:

**5c What are your views on the proposals for mitigating, enhancing and monitoring the environmental effects set out in the Environmental Report?**

Please explain your answer:

**About you**

**What is your name?**

Name:

David Hunter

**What is your email address?**

Email:

macs@gov.scot

**Are you responding as an individual or an organisation?**

Organisation

**What is your organisation?**

Organisation:

Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland

**The Scottish Government would like your permission to publish your consultation response. Please indicate your publishing preference:**

Publish response with name

**We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?**

Yes

**I confirm that I have read the privacy policy and consent to the data I provide being used as set out in the policy.**

I consent

## Evaluation

Please help us improve our consultations by answering the questions below. (Responses to the evaluation will not be published.)

Matrix 1 - How satisfied were you with this consultation?:

Please enter comments here.:

Matrix 1 - How would you rate your satisfaction with using this platform (Citizen Space) to respond to this consultation?:

Please enter comments here.: