

## WY LTP2 ACCESSIBILITY STRATEGY – SWOT

<p><b>STRENGTHS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong activity at a strategic level led by Metro</li> <li>• Developing partnership working with key sectors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ HEALTH: Hospitals &amp; PCTs</li> <li>➤ EDUCATION: LSC &amp; FE Colleges</li> <li>➤ EMPLOYMENT: JobCentrePlus</li> </ul> </li> <li>• High quality PT information products &amp; services</li> <li>• Innovative public &amp; community transport schemes in some districts (e.g. Kirklees MetroLocal)</li> <li>• Links between district Highways &amp; Planning services (developing their Local Development Frameworks)</li> </ul>	<p><b>WEAKNESSES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Catch all’ strategy lacking focus / clear priorities</li> <li>• Out of date Action Plan</li> <li>• Weak delivery at local level by district authorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Uncertain roles &amp; limited ownership across the authority</li> <li>➤ Limited integration with highways capital programmes</li> <li>➤ Unsuccessful engagement with Local Strategic Partnerships</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Single target for PT accessibility at WY level deterring districts identifying &amp; acting on local priorities</li> <li>• Bus operators not motivated by LTP target</li> <li>• Delivery dependant on revenue funds &amp; partner commitment</li> <li>• Limited monitoring of schemes / little knowledge of impacts</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPPORTUNITIES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable PT network / no glaring strategic weaknesses</li> <li>• All LTP partners have Accession &amp; GIS mapping capabilities</li> <li>• Completed audit of Community Transport Sector <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Capacity building &amp; co-ordinated development?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Progress Report allows amendment to accessibility target(s)</li> <li>• Output based targets?</li> <li>• Local Area Agreements - involvement on a wider set of indicators</li> <li>• Locality working in districts – better geographic fit?</li> <li>• Local Transport Bill measures?</li> </ul>	<p><b>THREATS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased fuel costs impacting on passengers</li> <li>• Limited revenue funds for projects</li> <li>• Loss / non-replacement of staff &amp; technical mapping skills</li> <li>• Accessibility not prioritised in district LAA 2008-11</li> <li>• Government focus on economic competitiveness – is social inclusion slipping down local agenda</li> <li>• External partners unable to match LTP partners with commitment and resources?</li> </ul>