

Integration of Local Transport with Popular Footpaths

1. SUMMARY

This report details the level of integration between the public transport network and popular footpaths.

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Oban, Lorn and the Isles Community Planning Group note the contents of this report.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 A request was made for a report detailing the public transport network integration with popular walks.

3.2 Community Council representatives and other groups attending the Community Planning Group on 13 March 2013 were asked to submit details of routes where they felt such integration was lacking. On 11 June 2013 the Community Planning group was reminded to submit their information to the Public Transport Officer, and then again on 11th September, 2013.

3.3 One response was received from Glenorchy and Inishail Community Council detailing two suggestions.

- Public transport on the B840 between Cladich and Ford
- Restoration of a ferry service between Portsonochan (South Port) and Taychreggan Hotel (North Port) on Loch Awe.

3.4 The Community Council's first suggestion is for a service along the south side of Loch Awe using the B840 between Cladich and Ford in order to make this area accessible to walkers. Unfortunately, there is at present no public transport along this road and little likelihood of any being provided due to low population along the route. In recent years the road has only been served as far as Eredine from the Ford end and then only on request on Wednesdays and Saturdays. That service was withdrawn when the last regular user ceased to travel. The council is not in a position to fund such a service even on an experimental seasonal basis. This area would be best served by some sort of commercial service possibly operating on certain dates to suit organised walking events.

- 3.5 The second suggestion was for a revival of ferry or other waterborne services on Loch Awe. In particular between Portsonochan (South Port) and Taychreggan Hotel (North Port). Provision of such a service, were it to be publicly funded, would be the responsibility of the council's Development and Infrastructure Services (Strategic Transportation). However, as with the suggested bus service there is no funding available for such a service and it is anticipated that demand would be low. The most practical proposition would be an "on demand" seasonal service provided by a private operator.
- 3.6 Further information on popular walks or footpaths was obtained from the council's Access Officer and is detailed in the attached appendix.
- 3.7 The council's Access Officer suggests that the routes in the attached appendix are the most popular, and in each case where there are public transport connections these are described. The description is based on the level of service during the day Mondays to Saturdays, and Sundays are only included where there is a service.

4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1 On the basis of the information in the attached appendix it can be seen that many of the routes are loops or 'out and back' to the starting point. As such many are easily accessed by public transport. The more remote starting or ending points are, by their nature, some distance from public transport and are in places where it would not be cost effective to provide it.
- 4.2 It has been demonstrated, therefore, that there is a high level of integration between pathways and public transport throughout the area.

5.1 IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Policy – None

5.2 Financial – None

5.3 Personnel – None

5.4 Equal Opportunities - None

5.5 Legal .None

5.6 Risk - None

5.7 Customer Service - Evidence of some good integration between pathways and public transport.

For further information please contact Douglas Blades (01546 604193).

Malcolm MacFadyen
Head of Facility Service