

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Committee	17th January 2006
Report Title	Warwickshire Provisional Local Transport Plan 2005 - Results of Public Consultation
Summary	The County Council has a statutory responsibility to produce a Local Transport Plan (LTP). The LTP sets out the County's Transport Strategy, and provides the framework for how transport and accessibility will be improved across Warwickshire over the next five years. A public consultation has been undertaken on the Provisional LTP, which was submitted to the Department for Transport in July 2005. Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee is invited to comment on the consultation responses and the proposed response of the County Council to the concerns and issues raised by consultees.
For further information please contact	Adrian Hart Transport Planning Tel. (01926) 735667 adrianhart@warwickshire.gov.uk
Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework?	Yes/No
Background Papers	Warwickshire Provisional Local Transport Plan 2005. Provisional Local Transport Plan Consultation – Research Report (November 2005).

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:- *Details to be specified*

Other Committees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cabinet, 30th June 2005. Rugby Area Committee, 9th November 2005. North Warwickshire Area Committee, 16th November 2005.
------------------	---

Other Committees (continued)

Warwick Area Committee, 22nd December 2005.
Stratford Area Committee, 23rd November 2005.
Nuneaton and Bedworth Area Committee,
30th November 2005.

Local Member(s)

(With brief comments, if appropriate)

.....

Other Elected Members

Councillor C K N Browne
Councillor Mrs E M Goode
Councillor Mrs J Lea

Cabinet Member

(Reports to The Cabinet, to be cleared with appropriate Cabinet Member)

Councillor M L M Heatley – for information.

Chief Executive

.....

Legal

I Marriott - agreed

Finance

C Holden - agreed

Other Chief Officers

.....

District Councils

Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Cabinet,
19th October 2005.
Stratford District Council Executive, 31st October
2005.
Rugby Borough Cabinet, 14th November 2005.
North Warwickshire Borough Council Executive,
12th December 2005.
Warwick District Council Executive,
12th December 2005.

Health Authority

Health and Well-Being Local Strategic
Partnership.

Police

Chief Inspector Geoff Beston.

Other Bodies/Individuals

See Background Papers and **Appendices A
and B**

FINAL DECISION

YES/NO (If 'No' complete Suggested Next Steps)

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS :

Details to be specified

Further consideration by
this Committee

.....

- To Council For approval of the Final LTP submission in March 2006.
- To Cabinet For approval of the Final LTP submission in February 2006.
- To an O & S Committee
- To an Area Committee
- Further Consultation

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –
17th January 2006**

**Warwickshire Provisional Local Transport Plan 2005 -
Results of Public Consultation**

**Report of the Strategic Director of
Environment and Economy**

Recommendation

That Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee is invited to comment on the consultation responses and the proposed response of the County Council to the concerns and issues raised by consultees.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 As Highway Authority, the County Council has a statutory responsibility to produce a Local Transport Plan (LTP). The LTP sets out the County's Transport Strategy, and provides the framework for how transport and accessibility will be improved across Warwickshire over the next five years. The quality of the LTP will influence the supported borrowing available for a range of transport improvements, including public transport, walking, cycling, traffic management, safer routes to school, casualty reduction and road/bridge maintenance.

2. The 2000 LTP

- 2.1 The County Council submitted its first Full LTP in July 2000, which covered the five year period from 2001/2–2005/6. The submission of the first LTP was made following a comprehensive review of the County Council's Transport Strategy in 1998/99. This review included extensive stakeholder and public consultation.

3. LTP Guidance

- 3.1 In December 2004, Department for Transport (DfT) issued guidance to all Highway Authorities on their requirements for the preparation of the second LTP, to cover the period from 2006/7–2010/11. DfT invited a Provisional LTP submission to be made by July 2005, with a Final LTP due by the end of March 2006.
- 3.2 Paragraph 5.16 of the LTP Guidance states that authorities should include evidence in their LTP that consultation processes have allowed timely and

effective opportunity for local communities and interested parties to contribute and influence the development of the Final Plan.

4. Consultation Prior to the Submission of the Provisional LTP

4.1 In preparing the Provisional LTP, the following consultation was undertaken:-

- (i) An issues consultation was undertaken with the LTP Wider Reference Group in January/February 2004.
- (ii) A Citizens Panel Survey was carried out with Warwickshire residents, which reported in April 2004.
- (iii) Meetings of the County Council's Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) Transport Theme Group were held in May 2004, November 2004, and March 2005.
- (iv) A meeting of the LTP Wider Reference Group Meeting was held in March 2005.
- (v) Meetings were held with officers from the five District/Borough Councils and a number of the Town Centre Managers.
- (vi) Meetings were held with a number of the adjoining highway/transport authorities, including Centro (the West Midlands Passenger Transport Executive).
- (vii) Targeted consultation was undertaken with stakeholders on a number of the specific LTP mode/delivery strategies, including Stagecoach in Warwickshire and the Strategic Rail Authority.
- (viii) Presentations were made to interest groups, e.g. Local Cycle Forums and Access Groups.
- (ix) Meetings with the Highways Agency were held regarding trunk road and motorway issues within Warwickshire.
- (x) A number of meetings were held with senior representatives from DfT and the Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM).

4.2 Prior to the LTP guidance being issued by DfT, the County Council had intended to consult the public on the Provisional LTP during Spring 2005. However, with the requirement for two versions of the LTP to be submitted in July 2005 and March 2006 respectively, the view was put forward that the Provisional Plan could be used for a wide-ranging consultation during Autumn 2005. This approach was endorsed by Cabinet on 30th June 2005. Cabinet also requested that the results of the consultation be brought before the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee prior to any amendments being made to the Final LTP.

5. Consultation Following the Submission of the Provisional LTP

5.1 The following consultation has been undertaken since the Provisional LTP was submitted to DfT in July 2005:-

- (i) The Provisional LTP was made available and publicised on the Warwickshire website, including the supporting Appendices.
- (ii) An on-line questionnaire was made available alongside the Provisional LTP on the website to seek feedback and support on the Plan.
- (iii) A DVD was produced and distributed to promote the achievements of the first LTP and the proposals contained in the new Plan.
- (iv) Week-long exhibitions were held at various locations across the County to publicise the LTP and encourage feedback.
- (v) Press releases were issued, and a number of radio interviews and photo shoots were undertaken.
- (vi) A meeting of the County Council's Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) Transport Theme Group was held in November 2005.
- (vii) Each of the County Council's Area Committees have had an opportunity to comment on the Provisional LTP through the Committee process. The points raised by each Area Committee can be found in **Appendix A**, under the following responses:-
 - a) Rugby Area Committee (RO66).
 - b) North Warwickshire Area Committee (RO67).
 - c) Warwick Area Committee (RO68).
 - d) Stratford on Avon Area Committee (RO69).
 - e) Nuneaton and Bedworth Area Committee (RO70).
- (viii) All five District/Borough Councils have brought the Provisional LTP before their Cabinet or Executive Committee for comment and/or endorsement.
- (ix) Further meetings with targeted stakeholders have been held, including the Highways Agency, Government Office and DfT. At the meeting with the Government Office and DfT, preliminary feedback was provided to the County Council on the Provisional LTP. This feedback was subsequently formalised in the LTP Settlement Letter, which the Authority received from DfT in December 2005 (see paragraph 6.8).

5.2 Consultation on the Provisional LTP has been undertaken in parallel with consultation on:-

- (i) The LTP Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Report, which was produced by Arup on behalf of the County Council.

- (ii) The draft Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan (CAROWIP), which is a sister document of the LTP.
- 5.3 The organisations listed in **Appendix B** of this report have had involvement throughout the development and preparation of both the Provisional and the Final LTP.

6. Results of the Consultation

- 6.1 Analysis of the consultation feedback has focused primarily on the results of the on-line questionnaire and the individual submissions made by consultees. A report setting out the analysis of the on-line questionnaire is provided as a background paper to this report, a copy of which will be deposited in the Members' Rooms. **Appendix A** meanwhile provides a schedule of all the individual submissions that have been made on the Provisional LTP, including the feedback received from each of the Area Committees and the five District/Borough Councils. A short discussion of the key issues arising from the consultation are set out below.

Summary

- 6.2 The total number of responses received, and the nature of the comments contained therein is broadly in line with previous consultations on the LTP. Those responding tend to fall into one of two groups, either a body or organisation with an interest in transport, or a private individual who has a single issue or concern.

On-line Questionnaire

- 6.3 Overall there was a disappointing response rate to the on-line questionnaire, with a total of 32 respondents. On reflection, this may be due to a combination of reasons:-
- (i) The new LTP is very much a development of the first LTP, and as such represents a rolling forward of proposals rather than a fundamental shift in emphasis or approach.
 - (ii) In order to be able to complete the questionnaire, respondents ideally required an understanding of the whole of the LTP. Given the size of the LTP (including the supporting Annexes), this was perhaps an unrealistic expectation to have.
 - (iii) Those with a single issue or concern to raise will probably choose to make an individual response rather than completing the more wide-ranging questionnaire.
 - (iv) The problem of consultation 'fatigue', arising from the levels of consultation which are undertaken these days as a matter of course by Local Government and other similar organisations.

- 6.4 It is not considered that the design of the questionnaire was a contributory factor to the low response rate. The questionnaire was very similar in design to other on-line events that have been successfully used in previous consultations undertaken by the County Council.
- 6.5 Due to the low response rate, it would not be statistically reliable to place much weight on the overall trends that emerge from the analysis of the on-line questionnaire. However, individual observations on specific matters are of value, and therefore have been considered.

Individual Responses

- 6.6 Overall there was a total of 76 individual responses on the LTP, including feedback from the five Area Committees and each of the District/Borough Councils. A summary of the key issues raised by each respondent is set out in the schedule in **Appendix A**.
- 6.7 As scrutiny of the schedule shows, there were a number of recurring issues raised by individuals in their consultation responses. The reference in the list of issues below refers to where in the schedule the principal response to this issue can be found. Where appropriate, subsequent references in the schedule to the same issue are referred back to the principal response.
- (i) Restoration of the Stratford–Honeybourne–Cheltenham railway line (Ref. R002).
 - (ii) Kenilworth Railway Station (R014).
 - (iii) Provision of a cycle route between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa (R019).
 - (iv) Stratford Parkway Railway Station (R022).
 - (v) Rugby East Parkway Railway Station (R041).
 - (vi) Stratford Western Relief Road (R043).

DfT Response to the LTP – The LTP settlement letter

- 6.8 In its settlement letter to the County Council, DfT has assessed the Provisional LTP as ‘promising’. The letter states that the LTP is of a good quality, is generally consistent with national, regional and local policy, and takes account of the ‘shared priorities’ for transport. The settlement letter also sets out a number of other strengths of the Plan, as well as areas where the Department would like to see improvements made in the Final LTP submission. These issues will be addressed as necessary in the finalising of the Plan over the coming weeks.
- 6.9 The Committee are invited to comment on the consultation responses and the proposed response of the County Council to the concerns and issues raised by consultees. Subject to comments by this Committee, it is proposed to send a copy of the schedule to all those who have responded to the LTP consultation.

This will provide them with a clear indication of what action is likely to be taken in response to the issues and concerns which they have raised. Amendments to the Provisional LTP will then be made prior to the Final LTP being put before Cabinet and full Council for final approval.

JOHN DEEGAN
Strategic Director of Environment and Economy
Shire Hall
Warwick

4th January 2006

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 17th January 2006
Warwickshire Provisional Local Transport Plan 2005 – Results of Public Consultation.

Schedule of Consultation Responses and the Proposed Response of the County Council

Summary of Responses Received

- R001 – Highways Agency (Colin Mercer)
- R002 – Audie Baker
- R003 – Cherington and Stourton Parish Council (Anthony Wells)
- R004 – John Brace
- R005 – J. Martin Stafford
- R006 – Stratford-upon-Avon Rail Transport Group (D. Goodman)
- R007 – British Motorcycle Federation (Richard Olliffe)
- R008 – Michael Brockington
- R009 – Freight on Rail (Philippa Edmunds)
- R010 – Alan Scaife
- R011 – Stratford-upon-Avon Town Management Partnership (Anthony Booker)
- R012 – North Warwickshire Borough Council (Jodie Ball/Dorothy Barratt)
- R013 – Peter Luff MP
- R014 – A Station for Kenilworth (S & S Van Tollen)
- R015 – A Station for Kenilworth (G. Taylor)
- R016 – A Station for Kenilworth (Anne Owen)
- R017 – A Station for Kenilworth (H. Buckley)
- R018 – A Station for Kenilworth (Mrs. E. Buckley)

R019 - Miss M. E. Poulton
R020 – Anne Wood
R021 – Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council (Nick Blamire-Brown)
R022 – John Power
R023 – Dr. G. M. Hilton
R024 – Shakespeare Line Promotion Group (Alan Bevan)
R025 – A Station for Kenilworth (David Owen)
R026 – K2L (multiple signatories)
R027 – A Station for Kenilworth (Stephen Dewsbury)
R028 – Bruce Mead
R029 – John de B Pollard
R030 – Action 21 Transport Group (Graham Hyde)
R031 – Nuneaton Friends of the Earth (Mike Wright)
R032 – Stratford-on-Avon District Council (Colin Staves)
R033 – Railfuture (Peter Hughes)
R034 – Mayor of Stratford-upon-Avon (Cllr Bill Lowe)
R035 – The Warwick Society (James Mackay)
R036 – Mike Avis
R037 – 20's Plenty (Janet Alty)
R038 – Centro (Jake Thrush)
R039 – Birmingham International Airport (Stephen Holt)
R040 – Cyclists Touring Club (Rodney King)
R041 – Rugby Rail Users Group (Alan Turner)
R042 – Cubbington Parish Council (David Morris)
R043 – Gordon Brace
R044 – David Bowie
R045 – Matthew Pinfield
R046 – Shottery Village Association (Ann Draycott)
R047 – James E. Philpotts
R048 – Elizabeth Hicks

R049 – Residents Against Shottery Expansion (Martyn Luscombe)
R050 – R. David Langman
R051 – Peter Donaghue
R052 – Stratford-upon-Avon Cycle Forum (Dr. Robert Bearman)
R053 – Nicholas Carr
R054 – Paul R. Stanton
R055 – David and Alison Higgins
R056 – Paul Webb
R057 – L. Reece
R058 – Rugby Borough Council (John Kerlake)
R059 – Warwick District Council (Helen Absalom)
R060 – Keith Vickery
R061 – Kenilworth Town Council (G. D. Symes)
R062 – Mr. And Mrs. P. Greenway
R063 – The Town Council of Royal Leamington Spa (Robert Nash)
R064 – CPRE (Ray Clipson)
R065 – Kenilworth Town Council (G. D. Symes)
R066 – WCC Rugby Area Committee
R067 – WCC North Warwickshire Area Committee
R068 – WCC Warwick Area Committee
R069 – WCC Stratford Area Committee
R070 – WCC Nuneaton and Bedworth Area Committee
R071 – Cotswolds Conservation Board (Malcolm Watt)
R072 – Ansley Parish Council (Jane Sands)
R073 – W. Eastop
R074 – Warwick Castle (Sarah Montgomery)
R075 – Cllr Appleton
R076 – The Town Council of Royal Leamington Spa (Robert Nash)
R077 – Stratford-on-Avon District Council (Colin Staves)
R078 – Wolfhampcote Parish Council (Andrew A G Grant)

Schedule of Responses Received

Reference No.	Name	Organisation	Date Received	Format	Summary of Key Points Raised	Proposed Response of the County Council
R001	Colin Mercer	Highways Agency	19/9/05	Letter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognises the need to work in partnership with the County Council. 2. Supports the County Council's initiatives to improve Accessibility, and looks forward to being consulted on schemes that affect the trunk road network, including the SPARK Major Scheme. 3. Confirms that the Highways Agency are keen to work with the County Council on road safety initiatives where there are shared benefits. 4. Supports initiatives in the LTP to reduce congestion and looks forward to being consulted on schemes that affect the trunk road network. 5. Supports the County Council's Air Quality Strategy and will work in partnership to address the existing Air Quality Management Area at Coleshill (M6/M42/A446). 6. Supports the general performance indicators that are relevant to the Highways Agency. 7. Welcomes the opportunity for a close working relationship on the LTP programme where it affects the trunk road network. 8. Looks forward to on-going discussions regarding M6 Junction 1 and other key points on the motorway/trunk road network around Rugby. Notes that these discussions should be extended to the M6/A46 Coventry 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. The County Council is keen to continue to work in partnership with the Highways Agency. 2. Noted. The County Council will continue to consult the Highways Agency on schemes that affect the trunk road network, including SPARK. 3. Noted. Work is already underway to develop this relationship. 4. Noted. The County Council will continue to consult the Highways Agency on schemes that affect the trunk road network. 5. Noted. The County Council is keen to continue to work in partnership with the Highways Agency to resolve this specific Air Quality Management Area. 6. Noted. 7. Noted. Discussions are ongoing with the Highways Agency in relation to some of the more significant improvement schemes in the County such as M40 Junction 15 (Longbridge) and A45/A46 (Tollbar End). As stated in point 3 above, work is now underway to develop closer working on safety issues. 8. Noted. It is intended to invite the Highways Agency to form part of the steering group for the proposed Rugby Transport Study. The County Council has already been contacted in relation to the M6/A46 study, and look forward to providing further input as the study progresses. 9. See response to point 2. 10. Noted. Amendments have been made to the

					<p>Eastern Bypass Study (now commissioned).</p> <p>9. Requests involvement in the continuing development of the SPARK Major Scheme given its proximity to Junctions 13 and 14 of the M40.</p> <p>10. Suggests that joint working is undertaken (with Warwick District Council) to secure a satisfactory Airport Surface Access Strategy (inc. a robust Travel Plan) at Coventry Airport.</p> <p>11. Welcomes the opportunity to discuss proposals for promoting a local bypass scheme for the A435 in lieu of the major proposals for a full bypass of Studley.</p> <p>12. Welcomes the opportunity to work with the County Council in relation to spatial planning, promoting sustainable development, and to assisting the development of regeneration priority areas.</p> <p>13. Supports the County Council's approach to Travel Plans and to adopting a suitable approach to the major developments at Coventry Airport and Warwick University.</p>	<p>relevant Area Chapter to include reference to joint working on Coventry Airport issues.</p> <p>11. Noted. However, from the work undertaken by Halcrow in 2001 concluded that there is no satisfactory low cost transport solution that might be delivered by the County Council within the conventional funding arrangements if the A435 were to be detrunked. Following confirmation of the revocation orders for the scheme, consideration will be given to what alternative measures to improve the environment and safety in Studley are appropriate.</p> <p>12. Noted. This will develop the work that the Highways Agency has contributed to in the recently completed Coventry/Solihull/Warwickshire Transportation and Regeneration Study.</p> <p>13. Noted. We will continue to work in partnership with the Highways Agency in relation to these and other significant developments.</p>
R002	Audie Baker	-	29/09/05	E-mail	<p>Objects to the failure to include any reference to the restoration of the Stratford – Honeybourne – Oxford/Cheltenham railway line in the Passenger Rail Strategy or Sustainable Freight Distribution Strategy.</p>	<p>This aspiration is in fact referred to in Chapter 3/The Area Strategies/Southern Warwickshire/ Paragraph 3.7.39 in the Provisional LTP. The existing evidence available to the County Council in respect of the potential re-instatement of the rail line between Stratford and Honeybourne is the Stratford-on-Avon Area Rail Study completed in 1995/96. This indicated that re-instatement of the rail line was technically feasible, but that there was very little demand, other than existing passengers who would be abstracted from other rail services. In the past, the main rail industry support has</p>

						highlighted the benefits for freight capacity. The aspiration is not referred to in either the West Midlands or Greater Western Route Utilisation Strategies, which are the current DfT rail policy documents covering this area. Having said that, it is accepted that circumstances may change over time and the Council would be happy to receive quantitative evidence of any local benefits which have not previously been appreciated. These will need to be weighted against any adverse implications for the town generally, for local residents and for road congestion (particularly at the Evesham Place roundabout).
R003	Anthony Wells	Cherington and Stourton Parish Council	05/10/05	Letter	Requests that smaller buses be used on bus service 23 (Stratford-Shipston-Brailes-Whichford) due to the loadings on the service, the damage that larger vehicles cause to the edge of the carriageway, and the potential for collisions with other vehicles on narrow roads.	This service offers the best value for money with a large vehicle. It is part of an all-day tendered package of services which includes home to school transport that could not be operated with smaller vehicles. Running the off-peak service with a smaller vehicle in isolation would not be cost effective.
R004	John Brace	-	05/10/05	E-mail	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers the Plan too long, repetitive and complicated. 2. Would like to see the LTP contain policies that will encourage, and not deter, pedestrian and public transport access to places of employment. Cites two examples of development that has taken place in recent years at Wellesbourne Airfield and in South Leamington off Europa Way. 3. Proposes that the County Council adopt a policy to extend footways to the last house in each settlement (excluding isolated houses and on minor roads that are lightly trafficked. Cites a local example on 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guidance on the preparation of Local Transport Plans issued by the Department for Transport sets out the expectation from Government of what should be included in an LTP. The County Council has taken into account this guidance, whilst at the same time seeking to produce a Plan that is clear, concise and without unnecessary repetition. 2. The policies contained in the Land Use and Transportation Strategy in Annex 2 of the LTP set out the County Council's approach to providing (where possible) sustainable access to new employment by walking, cycling and public transport. This policy conforms with

					Kineton Road, Wellesbourne, and suggests that this could be extended beyond the last house to the entrance to the Mill.	national guidance contained in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) Note 13, 'Transport'. 3. In the case of new developments, the County Council will seek to ensure that all new houses on the edges of settlements are provided with appropriate footway links. With regard to existing settlements, provision of new footways will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
R005	J. Martin Stafford	-	12/10/05	E-mail	Strongly urges that the LTP should include provision for the reopening of the Stratford – Honeybourne – Cheltenham railway line as a secondary route between Birmingham and Bristol, and to facilitate communication in the North Cotswolds.	Please see the response to R002 above.
R006	D. Goodman	Stratford-upon-Avon Rail Transport Group	13/10/05	Letter	1. Objects to the failure of the LTP to include the reinstatement of the Stratford – Honeybourne – Cheltenham railway line as a strategic transport scheme, and states that support for restoration of the railway south of Stratford was given by the SRA/Virgin Trains/GB Railways/The Railfreight Group/Centro/Gloucestershire CC at the Stratford Local Plan Inquiry in 2002/3. 2. Suggests that the County Council should recognise the international tourism role of Stratford, and as such the town should be on a through route to London, the South East (via the Cotswolds and Oxford), Heathrow and Gatwick via the airport links at Reading and Paddington), the South West and South Wales.	1. Please see the response to R002 above. Currently, there does not appear to be any substantive support from the rail industry or DfT for re-opening this line. 2. The LTP does recognise this role. Regarding the journey opportunities mentioned, these are already possible with existing rail services. If the reinstatement of the line does offer 'value for money', and is brought forward as a strategic initiative by DfT Rail or Network Rail, the County Council will take a view based on the details of the proposal at that time.
R007	Richard Olliffe	British Motorcyclists	19/10/05	E-mail	1. Sets out a definition of motorcycles and scooters, and identifies the benefits that	1-6. Comments are noted, however, the BMF submission received appears to be a standard

		Federation			<p>these modes can bring to a Transportation Strategy.</p> <p>2. Requests that the LTP considers how motorcycles and scooters can contribute towards reducing congestion.</p> <p>3. Suggests that motorcycles and scooters can play a role in addressing the accessibility agenda, including travel to work, shopping, healthcare and education.</p> <p>4. States that the safety needs of motorcyclists and scooters should be fully covered in the LTP rather than restricting access to them. Suggests a number of issues the Road Safety Strategy should cover in relation to these modes.</p> <p>5. Requests that the LTP recognises that motorcycles and scooters are more efficient and less polluting than other vehicles, particularly in terms of lower fuel consumption and reduced CO₂ emissions in urban areas.</p> <p>6. Identifies the Government's Motorcycle Strategy, which was published in February 2005, and highlights a number of the key aims that the Strategy hopes to achieve.</p>	<p>submission sent to all Local Authorities. The County Council's Powered Two Wheeler Strategy has been written and developed with the full input of the Warwickshire Powered Two Wheelers Forum, which includes representatives of the BMF, MAG and MCIA. The Forum has fully endorsed the County Council's strategy. During the development of the strategy the BMF's own published guidance, the Government's Motorcycle Strategy, the national advisory committee's report and other best practice were used and adopted. Therefore, all the comments set out are addressed in the strategy and it is not proposed to amend it further. One exception is that the Powered Two Wheeler Strategy does not include power assisted cycles, as is felt that these bear greater user synergies with normal bicycles and as such this mode is addressed in the Cycle Strategy.</p>
R008	Michael Brockington	-	19/10/05	E-mail	<p>1. Objects to the failure to include any reference to the protection/restoration of the railway line between Stratford and Cheltenham in either the Passenger Rail Strategy or the Sustainable Freight Distribution Strategy, and highlights a number of journey opportunities that are currently difficult by rail from Stratford-upon-Avon.</p> <p>2. Identifies the potential reinstatement of the route as a heritage railway.</p>	<p>1. Please see the response to R002 above.</p> <p>2. The reinstatement of the line between Stratford Station and Seven Meadows Road does raise similar environmental and traffic issues as a full heavy rail reinstatement, but potentially not as critical. However, if a scheme were to be brought forward, the County Council would take a view based on the details of the proposal at that time. The environmental and traffic concerns would possibly not be so acute in respect of a leisure/heritage railway between</p>

					3. Highlights the policy wording on the reopening of the route contained in the Provisional Worcestershire LTP 2005.	Honeybourne and Stratford (as far as Seven Meadows Road). 3. The implications of the reinstatement will differ between locations and clearly the County Council has to reach its own conclusions having regard to effects in Warwickshire.
R009	Philippa Edmunds	Freight on Rail	20/10/05	E-mail	1. Objects to the failure to include any reference to the protection/restoration of the railway line between Stratford and Cheltenham in either the Passenger Rail Strategy or the Sustainable Freight Distribution Strategy. Requests that the route be protected for possible future rail use. 2. States that support for restoration of the railway south of Stratford was given by the SRA at the Stratford Local Plan Inquiry in 2002/3, and that the SRA requested that the line be safeguarded for development in the longer term as part of the national network.	1. Please see the response to R006, point 1 above. 2. Please see the response to R006, point 1 above.
R010	Alan Scaife	-	21/10/05	E-mail	Requests that the proposal for a cycle route between Stratford and Warwick be included in the Final LTP and the Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan.	The County Council supports the proposal for a safe, convenient and direct route cycle link between Stratford and Warwick, and acknowledge that it would encourage more people to cycle between the two towns for leisure purposes than do so currently. The development of cycle routes within the main towns in Warwickshire however remains the priority over the next five years, therefore the County Council is unable to offer any financial assistance to the proposal over the forthcoming LTP period. The proposal is identified in the County Council's draft Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan in the 5+ year timescale (i.e. beyond 2010/11).

R011	Anthony Brooker	Stratford-upon-Avon Town Management Partnership	24/10/05	Letter	<p>1. Objects to the failure to include any reference to the protection/restoration of the railway line between Stratford and Cheltenham in either the Passenger Rail Strategy or the Sustainable Freight Distribution Strategy.</p> <p>2. States that the Town Management Partnership is pressing hard for an integrated transport plan for the town, and regards the re-opening of the railway line as an essential element of the plans for the future of transport for the town.</p>	<p>1. Please see the response to R002 above.</p> <p>2. The Council would be receptive to quantitative evidence of any local benefits which have not previously been appreciated.</p>
R012	Jodie Ball and Dorothy Barratt	North Warwickshire Borough Council (officer comments)	27/10/05	E-mail	<p>1. Kingsbury is not classified as a town within North Warwickshire, and any references to this effect should therefore be removed. Atherstone/Mancetter and Polesworth/Dordon are the main towns identified in the emerging Local Plan, with Coleshill classed as a Green Belt Market Town. The Warwickshire Structure Plan identifies Atherstone, Polesworth and Coleshill as Market Towns.</p> <p>2. Kingsbury is recognised within the Local Plan as one of five Local Service Centres, along with Water Orton, Hartshill, New and Old Arley, and Baddesley Ensor with Grendon.</p> <p>3. Welcome the improvements to the bus network in North Warwickshire, including the development of the Quality Bus Corridors. Request that Polesworth be considered for inclusion in the Nuneaton to Tamworth via Atherstone QBC.</p> <p>4. Identifies a number of specific textual points and matters of fact in the Northern Warwickshire area chapter, which should be</p>	<p>1. Noted. The text in the Plan will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>2. Noted. The text in the Plan will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>3. The text in paragraph 1.5.6 of the Provisional LTP incorrectly states that the QBC will be Nuneaton to Tamworth via Atherstone, and should in fact say Nuneaton to Atherstone via Hartshill (as per the text in the area chapter).</p> <p>4. Noted. The text in the Plan will be amended accordingly.</p>

					addressed in the Final LTP.	
R013	Peter Luff MP	MP for Mid- Worcestershire	27/10/05	Letter	<p>1. Objects to the lack of reference in the LTP to the restoration of the Stratford – Cheltenham railway line.</p> <p>2. Seeks confirmation that the County Council attaches the same importance to the possible re-opening of the line as Worcestershire County Council does in its LTP.</p>	<p>1. Please see response to R002 above.</p> <p>2. Please see response to R008, point 3 above.</p>
R014	S & S Van Tollen	Member of ASK (A Station for Kenilworth)	30/10/05	Letter	<p>1. Supports the proposal for Kenilworth railway station.</p> <p>2. Believes that it is in everyone's interests for there to be fewer cars on the road. Kenilworth becomes gridlocked at peak times, and a station would encourage people to travel more sustainably.</p> <p>3. Would like to be able to travel by rail from Kenilworth to Coventry, Warwick, Leicester, Birmingham, Leamington Spa, Rugby and London.</p>	<p>1. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>2. This is very much in line with the County Council's thinking.</p> <p>3. The details of a possible service to call at the new station have not been finalised but most of these journeys will be possible and the others will be by a change of train.</p>
R015	G. Taylor	Member of ASK (A Station for Kenilworth)	30/10/05	Letter	<p>1. Supports the proposal for Kenilworth railway station.</p> <p>2. Would like to be able to travel by rail from Kenilworth to Coventry, Warwick, Leamington Spa and Stratford-upon-Avon.</p>	<p>1. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>2. The details of a possible service to call at the new station has not been finalised but most of these journeys will be possible and the others will be by a change of train.</p>
R016	Anne Owen	Member of ASK (A Station for Kenilworth)	30/10/05	Letter	<p>1. Supports the proposal for Kenilworth railway station.</p> <p>2. A station in Kenilworth would allow her to travel without a car, and would be environmentally friendly.</p> <p>3. Would like to be able to travel by rail from Kenilworth to Coventry, Nuneaton, Warwick, Leicester, Birmingham, Leamington Spa, Stratford-upon-Avon, London, Loughborough, Nottingham and Oxford.</p>	<p>1. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>2. This is very much in line with the County Council's thinking.</p> <p>3. The details of a possible service to call at the new station has not been finalised but many of these journeys will be possible and the others will be by a change of train.</p>

R017	H. Buckley	Member of ASK (A Station for Kenilworth)	30/10/05	Letter	Supports the proposal for Kenilworth railway station.	Your support is noted and appreciated.
R018	Mrs. E. Buckley	Member of ASK (A Station for Kenilworth)	30/10/05	Letter	1. Supports the proposal for Kenilworth railway station. 2. Would like to be able to travel by rail from Kenilworth to Coventry, Warwick, Birmingham, Rugby and London.	1. Your support is noted and appreciated. 2. The details of a possible service to call at the new station has not been finalised but most of these journeys will be possible and the others will be by a change of train.
R019	Miss. M. E. Poulton	-	31/10/05	Letter	1. Supports the majority of the policies in the Cycling Strategy. 2. Notes that intra-urban cycle routes are only being considered in the next five years, and that implementation is likely to be in the longer term (i.e. 2016 onwards). 3. Objects to the omission of proposals in the LTP for a cycle route on the A452 between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa.	1. Support noted. 2. Warwickshire's policy is to encourage cycling for short local journeys by prioritising the development of cycling infrastructure in urban areas. Cycle route network plans for each of the five main towns have been developed in consultation with local cyclists. Whilst a number of routes have been implemented over the last LTP period, it will take sustained funding to form a network that makes cycling a more viable and attractive travel choice. During the LTP 2006-11, resources will therefore be focussed on further developing the cycle networks in Leamington Spa, Warwick, Nuneaton, Rugby and Stratford-upon-Avon. A five-year programme of priority schemes has been identified for each town, based on the anticipated level of funding for cycling over this period. This will take priority over developing longer distance inter-urban routes, which generally benefit fewer people, have less potential to encourage new cyclists and are not as cost-effective as urban cycle routes. However, the County Council will continue to work with Sustrans to further develop the National Cycle Network within the county, due

						<p>to it's strategic importance. This will include a route between Kenilworth and Warwick.</p> <p>3. The merit of improving cycling conditions along the A452 is recognised and supported in principle. However, the above commitments on developing cycle networks within the main towns means that the County Council is not in a position to commit funding from the LTP cycling budget towards this scheme in the next five years. Providing cycle facilities along the A452 is estimated to cost at least £1.2m, which is equivalent to around half of the countywide cycling budget over the whole LTP period. Development of an improved route between Kenilworth and Leamington will remain as a medium to long-term aspiration in terms of the allocation of LTP resources. However, should alternative sources of funding become available, we will seek to improve cycling facilities along the A452 within a shorter timescale. The wording within the LTP Cycling Strategy will be amended to reflect the above and the Kenilworth to Leamington route will be included as a named medium/long term proposed route in the Cycling Strategy Action Plan.</p>
R020	Anne Wood	-	31/10/05	Letter	Objects to the omission of proposals in the LTP for a cycle route on the A452 between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa.	Please see response to R019, points 2 and 3 above.
R021	Nick Blamire-Brown	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council (on behalf of Cabinet)	1/11/05	Letter	The Borough Council endorses the policies and proposals contained in the Warwickshire Provisional Local Transport Plan 2005, in particular the proposals for the North/South Corridor and the measures contained in the Nuneaton and Bedworth Area Plan.	Noted and welcomed.

R022	John Power	-	1/11/05	E-mail	<p>1. Suggests that rail should be considered from the proposed station at Bishopton as a way to get people into town from the park and ride site.</p> <p>2. Highlights that care should be taken that overdevelopment doesn't occur as a result of the proposed station at Bishopton.</p> <p>3. Supports the proposal for a second park and ride site south of the river in Stratford.</p> <p>4. Suggests that a bypass over the river on the southern side of the town should be built to enable the Long Marston site to be developed properly.</p> <p>5. Requests that the recreation ground in Stratford is not used for car parking for the theatre.</p> <p>6. Suggests that there should be more joined-up thinking within the County Council to provide better bus services for school children, and the benefits this would bring to traffic relief.</p>	<p>1. The construction of the proposed Stratford Parkway Station at Bishopton would offer this option to park and ride users.</p> <p>2. Agreed. However, the District Council as the local planning authority would decide this issue.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Noted. It is unlikely however that such major road construction in Stratford will be affordable unless funded through developer contributions.</p> <p>5. This is a matter for the District Council to address as owners and operators of the recreation ground car park.</p> <p>6. The County Council invests a significant amount of money every year in providing home to school transport for children across Warwickshire. Recently the County Council has purchased a fleet of branded School Links coaches that operate predominantly in the south of the County to bring children to school from the surrounding rural catchment areas. The County Council is currently developing an innovative schools 'drop and ride' pilot scheme in Warwick to help reduce congestion caused by the concentration of schools on the Myton Road. If successful, this type of scheme could be rolled out to other parts of the County.</p>
R023	Dr. G. M. Hilton	-	3/11/05	Letter	<p>Requests that the County Council make plans to route traffic related to the Abattoir on Rouncil Lane in Kenilworth from Banner Hill to the A4177. Suggests that this section of road is wide enough in many parts, and that the more narrow sections could be easily be widened with land acquisition from adjoining farmland.</p>	<p>Noted. The costs involved in land acquisition however make this proposal difficult to justify within current budgets.</p>
R024	Alan Bevan	Shakespeare	4/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Requests that the LTP includes</p>	<p>1. Policy PRS2 in the Passenger Rail Strategy</p>

		Line Promotion Group			<p>improvements to secure full and easy access for all railway stations, and makes specific reference to issues at Stratford, Henley and The Lakes stations.</p> <p>2. Supports the proposed bus/rail interchange at Stratford as part of the Cattle Market redevelopment.</p> <p>3. Seeks reference to the West Midlands RUS proposals for additional semi-fast trains between Birmingham and Stratford, and for the facing crossover at Stratford.</p> <p>4. Raises concerns over the operational impact of a new station at Bishopton on the Shakespeare Line trains, with their already constrained turnaround time at Stratford. Also concerned over the impact of the new station on the existing Stratford town station.</p> <p>5. Suggests that the reference in the LTP to the re-opening of the Cheltenham – Stratford line is unduly negative and unjustified. A future scheme could potentially fulfil strategic objectives and it is therefore invalid to specify a criteria based purely around local objectives. The LTP is also inconsistent with the support given for the scheme in the Worcestershire LTP.</p>	<p>is designed to meet this suggestion. A programme of works will be developed with rail industry partners on the basis of affordability and deliverability. The stations referred to could be included in this programme if appropriate.</p> <p>2. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>3. Agreed. Amendments have been made to include these points.</p> <p>4. Agreed. Both these issues will be fully considered in any further development of the proposed Stratford Parkway railway station at Bishopton.</p> <p>5. Please see response to R002, R006 point 2 and R008 point 3 above.</p>
R025	David Owen	Member of ASK (A Station for Kenilworth)	1/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Supports the proposal for Kenilworth railway station, as it would enable better access to long distance trains at peak times, when roads in Warwick District are near gridlock. The scheme would increase the ability of people to commute by public transport.</p> <p>2. Would like to travel by rail to Coventry, Nuneaton, Leicester, Birmingham,</p>	<p>1. Your support is noted and appreciated. This is very much in line with the County Council's thinking.</p> <p>2. The details of a possible service to call at the new station has not been finalised but most of these journeys will be possible and the others will be by a change of train.</p>

					Leamington Spa, Rugby and London.	
R026	Multiple signatories	K2L	4/11/05	Letter	Objects to the omission of proposals in the LTP for a cycle route on the A452 between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa to be brought forward as a priority scheme, ahead of the completion of the urban network in Warwick/Leamington Spa.	Please see response to R019, points 2 and 3 above.
R027	Stephen Jewsbury	ASK (A Station for Kenilworth)	4/11/05	Letter	1. Supports the proposals for a new station for Kenilworth, both in terms of providing an improvement in public transport in the Coventry – Leamington Spa corridor, and also the economic regeneration of the town. 2. Requests that a firmer level of commitment to delivering the station be given in the LTP.	1. Your support is noted and appreciated. 2. The County Council is totally committed to delivery of this scheme and is pursuing every opportunity to deliver it. However, in view of the substantial number of rail industry and other partners that need to be involved, it is not appropriate for the County Council to specify a delivery date for the scheme, which it may not be able to meet due to the actions of others.
R028	Bruce Mead	-	7/11/05	Letter	Requests that safety improvements are made to the A452 to encourage cycling. Submission implies that an off-road cycleway alongside the A452 would help both cyclists and motorists by reducing conflict between the two modes.	Please see response to R019, points 2 and 3 above.
R029	John de B Pollard	-	7/11/05	Letter	Suggests that the reason for declining cycle usage between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa has resulted from increasing motorised traffic, and the perceived/actual safety implications that this has on people considering cycling. Requests that a cycle route between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa be included in the LTP.	Please see response to R019, points 2 and 3 above.
R030	Graham Hyde	Action 21 Transport Group	7/11/05	E-mail	1. Questions whether Greys Mallory is the correct site for a park and ride to serve Warwick and Leamington Spa. Suggests that Warwick needs car parking facilities at various points around the periphery of the	1. A series of studies commissioned by the County Council have indicated that, at least initially, only one site to the south of Warwick and Leamington Spa serving both towns will be financially viable. A site at Greys Mallory is

					<p>town, e.g. Tournament Fields development and at Warwick Parkway, served by frequent shuttle buses. This could be supplemented by congestion charging during peak times.</p> <p>2. Supports the proposals in the Cycling Strategy, but would like to have seen more prominence of it in the core strategies.</p> <p>3. Suggests that the targets set in the cycling strategy are too modest and should be more challenging, backed by more investment. Requests that the previous LTP's commitment to spending at least 5% of the annual investment on road improvements to improve facilities for cyclists should be repeated in the new LTP.</p> <p>4. As a key commuter route in Warwick District with a low level of cycle usage, request that a cycle route between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa be proposed in the Cycling Strategy.</p> <p>5. A number of specific comments/ observations are made regarding Policies PRS2/3/5/6 in the Passenger Rail Strategy.</p>	<p>predicted to be most beneficial in transport terms by helping provide additional car parking capacity and removing the most traffic from the network during the peak traffic periods. Once the first site is established and operating successfully, then additional park and ride sites can be considered. Environmental and planning issues related to bring forward park and ride in the green belt (as allowed for in PPG13) will be considered as part of the forthcoming Local Plan public inquiry in 2006.</p> <p>2. Cycling is an element of all core strategies and is reflected as such within these documents.</p> <p>3. Provisional cycle usage target is viewed as challenging given the ongoing trends in cycling levels. However, existing cycle count data will be further analysed to ascertain whether there are signs of a rise in cycle use in order to assess whether an increase in cycle usage over the next 5 years is realistic and achievable. The target regarding spending levels has not been carried through to the new LTP because expenditure on improvements for cycling has far exceeded this level over the past five years. As such, it is no longer viewed necessary to set a target on this.</p> <p>4. Please see response to R019, points 2 and 3 above.</p> <p>5. Your support is appreciated. The comments are noted and appropriate amendments will be made. The comment on Policy PRS3 is understood, but in the interests of clarity, an amendment of the text is not proposed.</p>
R031	Mike Wright	Nuneaton Friends of the	7/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Bus and train fares are too high in Warwickshire compared to other areas such</p>	<p>1. These fares are set by commercial operators over which the County Council, whilst</p>

		Earth		<p>as the West Midlands.</p> <p>2. Operators who run subsidised services have no incentive to encourage more users, as they are paid to run empty buses.</p> <p>3. Rail fare anomalies exist which can change travel patterns, e.g. Nuneaton to London on Virgin or Chiltern (from Warwick Parkway).</p> <p>4. Identifies the length of time it takes to get from Nuneaton to Warwick by train.</p> <p>5. Requests that the LTP includes the provision of a good quality, frequent, passenger rail service between Stafford, Lichfield, Tamworth, Polesworth, Atherstone, Nuneaton and Rugby. Scope also exists for park and ride to be promoted at Atherstone and Polesworth due to their proximity to the A5 and the surrounding rural area.</p> <p>6. Rail services from Nuneaton to Birmingham are often late and overcrowded.</p> <p>7. Better integration is needed between bus and rail facilities, in terms of signage and information.</p> <p>8. Supports the proposals for a cycle link from Coleshill to BIA/NEC, and requests that good quality cycle parking is provided as part of the scheme. Notes that routes within the main towns of the County are likely to be more important during the Plan period.</p> <p>9. Suggests that some of the signage on the recently opened NCN Route 52 from Whitestone to Nuneaton is confusing in places, and that lack of maintenance of</p>	<p>sympathetic to your views, has no control on the matter.</p> <p>2. The majority of subsidised service contracts place the revenue risk on the operator, who is therefore incentivised to maximise passengers and revenue. In any event, many subsidised services do not run empty. In addition, there are a number of all-day tendered service packages that include home to school transport that could not be operated with smaller vehicles.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Noted. This is also a concern of the County Council. The proposals for a step-change in public transport in the North/South corridor should reduce the journey time.</p> <p>5. An appropriate amendment has been made to the text and map in the Passenger Rail Strategy.</p> <p>6. Noted.</p> <p>7. Agreed. Policy PRS2 in the Passenger Rail Strategy is designed to address this need.</p> <p>8. Support noted.</p> <p>9. Noted. This matter will be pursued with Sustrans and British Waterways.</p> <p>10. Noted. As stated in paragraph 2.3.61 of the LTP, the County Council will use the new guidance the Government is expected to issue shortly in developing a new speed management strategy.</p> <p>11. Not accepted. The County Council does not believe it would be possible to implement an exclusion zone around schools that only applied to 4-wheel drive vehicles.</p>
--	--	-------	--	--	---

					<p>some canal-side routes can lead to cyclists suffering from multiple punctures.</p> <p>10. Consideration should be given to introducing a default 20mph speed limit on residential streets. More pedestrian crossings/crossing patrols are needed, for example Lutterworth Road, Nuneaton.</p> <p>11. Asks whether an exclusion zone for 4 Wheel Drive vehicles could be introduced around schools to improve safety.</p>	
R032	Colin Staves	Stratford District Council (on behalf of Executive Committee)	7/11/05	Letter	<p>1. That the County Council be advised that future highway improvements affecting the network in Stratford must be informed by a comprehensive traffic survey to be undertaken as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>2. That the County Council be requested to consult further on the proposed changes to the Local Transport Plan, prior to its submission.</p> <p>3. That the County Council consider the need for further work to identify specific actions to address the transport problems of Kineton and Wellesbourne.</p> <p>4. That the County Council consider the need to make a case to justify the provision of a parkway station in Stratford before a commitment is given in the LTP.</p> <p>5. That the County Council consider the need for effective traffic management measures to deal with traffic problems at the Grove Road/Arden Street junction.</p> <p>6. That the County Council consider the need for stringent measures to address problems associated with delivery vehicles, most notably in Stratford.</p> <p>7. That the County Council take into</p>	<p>1. Noted. Traffic data for Stratford is kept up to date with regular surveys. It is not considered that a comprehensive traffic survey is necessary. Representatives from the County Council will meet with the District Council to discuss its concerns.</p> <p>2. Due to the limited remaining time available for the submission of the Final LTP and the County Council's own committee processes, it will not be possible for any further consultation to be undertaken on the Plan.</p> <p>3. Noted. The County Council will use the information provided by the District Council in its Committee Report to inform the Plan of the specific problems and issues in Kineton and Wellesbourne.</p> <p>4. Initial feasibility work was undertaken as part of the work to develop the Stratford Transport Strategy. This identified a number of pre-conditions to justify the scheme. Serious consideration is currently taking place of delivering some of these – i.e. increased services to Birmingham and London and platform capacity improvements at Stratford Station. In addition, the cost of the scheme would be substantially reduced by sharing the</p>

					<p>account the objectives and priorities concerning transport and public accessible areas as contained in the Draft document '2020 Vision for Stratford-upon-Avon'.</p> <p>8. The District Council reserves its position to make further comments on the Provisional Plan in light of the above comments, and that a meeting be held between the two authorities to address the concerns of the District Council.</p>	<p>facilities at the newly opened park and ride site. A report will be made to the County Council's Stratford Area Committee when the full implications of the scheme are known and prior to any steps to formally promote it as a County Council sponsored scheme. If the District Council would appreciate a presentation at that time, this could be arranged.</p> <p>5. An experimental improvement has been in place at this junction over the last 12-18 months, which appears to have resulted in a reduction in traffic queuing at the junction and on the key approach roads at certain times of the day. The County Council will continue to monitor the scheme to establish whether a more permanent improvement would benefit traffic management within the town.</p> <p>6. The greater enforcement of on-street parking within Stratford District as a result of the Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement (DPE) should result in less problems with delivery vehicles, particularly within Stratford town centre.</p> <p>7. Noted. The District Council has provided the County Council with a copy of the draft document.</p> <p>8. See response to point 2 above.</p>
R033	Peter Hughes	Railfuture	8/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Fundamentally endorses the principles, priorities and objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>2. Welcomes the recent development of Warwick Parkway and Coleshill Parkway, and identifies Kingsbury has a potential role to play in offering a park and ride facility. Requests that as part of the refranchising process, the LTP should promote a stronger case for the station than is currently argued</p>	<p>1. Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>2. Your support is noted and appreciated. The County Council is committed to delivery of a new station at Kingsbury and is pursuing opportunities to bring it forward. However, in view of the substantial number of rail industry and other partners that need to be involved, it is not appropriate for the County Council to specify a delivery date for the scheme, which it may not</p>

					<p>in the LTP</p> <p>3. Endorses the proposed half-hourly rail service and new stations promoted in the North/South Corridor, irrespective of progress with Bus Rapid Transit.</p> <p>4. Seeks reference to the West Midlands RUS proposals for additional off-peak semi-fast trains between Birmingham and Stratford, and for the facing crossover at Stratford.</p> <p>5. Raises concerns over comments regarding the reopening of the former Stratford – Honeybourne rail line, and notes that similar text is not provided in the LTP regarding the future use of the ex-Great Central line through Rugby.</p>	<p>be able to meet due to the actions of others.</p> <p>3. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>4. Agreed. Amendments have been made to include these points.</p> <p>5. Please see response to R002, R006, point 2 and R008, point 3 above.</p>
R034	Councillor Bill Lowe	Mayor of Stratford-upon-Avon	9/11/05	Letter	<p>Objects to the failure to include any reference to the restoration of the Stratford – Cheltenham railway line in the LTP.</p>	<p>Please see response to R002 above.</p>
R035	James Mackay	The Warwick Society	9/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Supports the five overall LTP objectives and suggests an amendment to the third objective.</p> <p>2. Suggests that environmental problems caused by transport should be dealt with throughout the County, and not just where opportunities exist.</p> <p>3. Suggests that crime and fear of crime could be improved by encouraging more people to walk.</p> <p>4. Suggests some wording changes in relation to reaffirming the role of the LTP and its impact on climate change.</p> <p>5. Suggests some wording changes to Strategic Priority 5 to reaffirm its intention.</p> <p>6. Raises some questions over the LTP</p>	<p>1. Noted. The suggested change to the wording of the third objective is accepted and will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>2. Noted and supported in part. Revised wording to read: “problems will be dealt with <i>where specific issues exist</i> across the County”.</p> <p>3. The Walking Strategy aims to increase levels of walking to bring a wide range of benefits.</p> <p>4. Noted and supported in part. Revised wording to read: “The LTP will aim to reduce transport emissions in line with Government policy and stated commitments, whilst ensuring that levels of accessibility are maintained by sustainable modes of transport.”</p> <p>5. Noted and supported in part. Revised wording to read: “To attempt where possible to</p>

				<p>targets, and the specific absence of a target for walking.</p> <p>7. Strongly supports the Accessibility Strategy.</p> <p>8. Suggests that the prime means of reducing road casualties should be altering drivers' behaviour and reducing speed, rather than teaching children how to get out of the way of vehicles that threaten their safety.</p> <p>9. Disappointed that the LTP suggests that road pricing is unlikely to be considered before 2011, despite the imminent development of a regional pilot scheme. Suggests Warwickshire should be part of this pilot project in order to gain the benefits at the earliest opportunity. In the interim, support is given for measures that reduce traffic growth and encourage the use of modes other than the car.</p> <p>10. Suggests that proposals for individual junction improvements should not be pursued, as the benefits of such schemes are questionable.</p> <p>11. Questions whether the congestion target for Warwick is appropriate, and suggests that a measure that expresses peak journey times as a multiple of off-peak journey speeds.</p> <p>12. Raises concerns of the impact of the designated Air Quality Management Area in Warwick town centre on tourism, and requests that it considers a wider area than just the town centre.</p> <p>13. Questions whether Warwick is dominated in employment terms by the</p>	<p>reduce the environmental impacts of transport, both globally and locally.”</p> <p>6. Monitoring levels of walking countywide is not feasible and therefore an overall target has not been set. However, levels of walking will be monitored on an annual basis through indicators for mode share of journeys to school and journeys to work. Performance indicators BV187 on footway conditions and BV178 on ease of use of footpaths and rights of way are also of relevance to walking.</p> <p>7. The support is noted and welcomed.</p> <p>8. The County Council believe that altering drivers' behaviour and teaching children about road safety are both essential to reducing casualties. As such, the County Council regards them as complementary rather than alternatives.</p> <p>9. Noted. A pilot scheme is currently being considered for the West Midlands conurbation, albeit excluding Coventry. The findings of the pilot will be observed by the County Council, however it is unlikely that road pricing will be a more widely acceptable policy instrument before 2011.</p> <p>10. Noted. However, schemes will be carefully assessed to ensure they are beneficial and not simply moving the problem to the next junction.</p> <p>11. This is not considered either practical or meaningful. What off-peak period would be chosen: busy daytime off peak, or quiet late night off-peak?</p> <p>12. Responsibility for defining the area to be covered by an Air Quality Management Area lie with the relevant District/Borough Council, in</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p>County Council.</p> <p>14. Reaffirms concerns previously expressed regarding the proposed park and ride site at Greys Mallory.</p> <p>15. Suggests that any parking problems arising from the displacement of unauthorised parking should be dealt with by reducing the demand for car trips by making walking, cycling and public transport better alternatives.</p> <p>16. Welcomes the continuing progress towards a satisfactory traffic management scheme for Warwick town centre.</p> <p>17. Questions the proposed spending of £2m on Portobello Bridge, and that there is no evidence that the bridge requires any more than very minor maintenance. Any scheme to widen this bridge will need to respect its design, setting and listing.</p>	<p>this case Warwick District Council.</p> <p>13. Noted. Revised wording to read: "Warwick is dominated by a number of major employers, including the County Council, IBM, National Power Transco and Warwick Hospital."</p> <p>14. See response to R030, point 1.</p> <p>15. Noted, The LTP contains many measures to enhance facilities for alternative modes and encourage their use. However, the LTP represents a balanced delivery programme of improvements for all modes. Within Warwick the determination of the best balance of provision for the town will be heavily influenced by the Warwick Town Centre Forum, which the Warwick Society is actively engaged in and will therefore influence. Park and ride is not required in order to deliver Decriminalised Parking Enforcement. However, park and ride will provide additional long term car parking capacity for the town and help reduce traffic levels accessing the town.</p> <p>16. Noted.</p> <p>17. Both of the metal widenings at Portobello Bridge are weak (as evidenced by numerous inspection reports), the upstream one critically so, such that it has been closed for some time. The County Council approved a scheme in 2001 to remove these extensions and widen the bridge on the upstream side. The scheme included junction improvements at Greville Road and Rugby Road. It proved not possible to agree the principles of this scheme with English Heritage because of the visual impact on the bridge.</p> <p>The need to deal with the weak extensions</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

						remains, and this is the strengthening scheme included in the Provisional LTP. As yet the County Council has no detailed plans as to how this might be achieved and what, if any, highway improvements might be included. A further public consultation on the whole issue will be carried out before any scheme is adopted. The County Council fully recognise the historic asset of Portobello Bridge as a designated Grade 2 Listed Building, and the need for the approval of English Heritage for any works.
R036	Mike Avis	-	10/11/05	Letter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The draft LTP is thoughtful, sincere and comprehensive, particularly the sections covering cycling. 2. Notes that there is no percentage growth target for cycling. 3. Requests that the text on changing attitudes in the Cycling Strategy is strengthened. 4. Requests that the design and modification of suburban and rural roads should consider the needs of competitive cyclists who use these roads for training on. 5. Requests that the Plan should more widely reflect the issue that reduction of congestion will be a lost cause without modal shift to walking, cycling and public transport. 6. Notes that the former Radio Station site in Rugby is the greenest brownfield site he has ever seen. 7. Agrees that the restoration of local/semi-fast rail services at Rugby should be a priority and needs maximum pressure. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted and appreciated. 2. The Provisional LTP target for maintaining current levels of cycling is viewed as challenging given the ongoing trends in cycling levels. However, existing cycle count data will be further analysed to ascertain whether there are signs of a rise in cycle use, in order to assess whether an increase in cycle usage over the next 5 years is realistic and achievable. 3. Noted. The wording in the strategy will be amended to reflect this comment. 4. Modifications to such roads will normally be made to improve safety for road users. The County Council will take into account the needs of cyclists in the design of any such improvements. 5. It is considered that the Plan does already reflect this point. 6. Noted. 7. Noted and agreed. 8. It is proposed that this scheme will be deleted from the Plan. 9. The County Council has recently increased

					<p>8. Objects to the proposal for Rugby East Parkway Station.</p> <p>9. Would like to see quality access and fully dropped kerbs throughout the Rugby area and in rural areas where possible.</p> <p>10. Suggests that bypasses should not be built as they become race tracks for through traffic, and have junctions that are barriers for pedestrians, cyclists and people with disabilities.</p>	<p>its funding for installing dropped kerbs. Priority for spending tends to be within the main urban areas of the County, although schemes in the rural areas of Warwickshire are also considered.</p> <p>10. Noted. New road building is rare and considered only when other solutions cannot deliver the required improvements to the environment, safety or to facilitate economic development.</p>
R037	Janet Alty	20's Plenty	10/11/05	E-mail	<p>1. Support the call by the Slower Speeds Initiative, Transport 2000, Living Streets and the Safer Streets Coalition for 20mph to become the maximum traffic speed on streets where people live, work, shop and play.</p> <p>2. Suggests that a properly enforced 20mph limit on these streets has the potential to reduce death and serious injuries by 50%, as well as creating a safer environment for walking and cycling.</p> <p>3. Suggests that in order to achieve this, more resources should be allocated to local safety schemes, including innovative traffic calming.</p> <p>4. Suggests that resources for enforcing 20mph speed limits should also be made available.</p>	<p>1. Noted. As stated in paragraph 2.3.61 of the LTP, the County Council will use the new guidance the Government is expected to issue shortly in developing a new speed management strategy.</p> <p>2. Noted. As stated in paragraph 2.3.61 of the LTP, the County Council will use the new guidance the Government is expected to issue shortly in developing a new speed management strategy.</p> <p>3. Noted and accepted. The County Council would like to devote more resources to casualty reduction (local safety) schemes, but this obviously depends on the total resources available.</p> <p>4. Enforcing speed limits is primarily a matter for the police rather than the County Council.</p>
R038	Jake Thrush	Centro	11/11/05	E-mail	<p>1. Welcomes the policies and proposals that promote public transport for cross-boundary journeys between Warwickshire and the West Midlands conurbation.</p> <p>2. Endorses the need for a new station in Coleshill.</p> <p>3. Notes that the West Midlands RUS</p>	<p>1. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>2. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>3. These new station proposals are included in the 'Stakeholder Aspirations' section of the RUS.</p> <p>4. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>5. Your support is noted and the points made</p>

				<p>makes no reference to new stations at Kenilworth, Kingsbury, Galley Common, Arley, Bermuda, Hawkesbury, Stratford Parkway and Rugby East Parkway.</p> <p>4. Supports the need for an extra hourly off-peak semi-fast service from Birmingham to Stratford.</p> <p>5. Supports the need for timetable and service pattern review between Birmingham and Leamington Spa (both via Coventry and Solihull), and the need to safeguard local frequency/capacity given the increased frequency of Birmingham – London services on the West Coast Main Line from 2008.</p> <p>6. Notes that the replacement of the Stafford – Nuneaton local service will have a significant impact on the County Council's future specified Minimum Service levels for Atherstone and Polesworth.</p> <p>7. Welcomes the recognition of the operational constraints caused by the short platform lengths at Lapworth and on the Birmingham – Stratford line.</p> <p>8. Notes that the West Midlands RPA is still to be published, and that future growth targets may therefore need to be aligned to a different timescale.</p> <p>9. Supports the need for improved station facilities and the need to work closely with DfT in the delivery of their 'Access for All' programme.</p> <p>10. Supports the need to safeguard sites with the potential for delivering rail improvements.</p> <p>11. Supports the need for real time information at Warwickshire stations, as this</p>	<p>are appreciated.</p> <p>6. Noted.</p> <p>7. Noted.</p> <p>8. Agreed.</p> <p>9. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>10. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>11. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>12. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>13. Noted. The Final LTP will reflect the findings of all the public transport studies. Currently, the LRT study has not been completed so the text in the LTP cannot be finalised.</p> <p>14. Noted. This issue will need to be explored in developing the public transport strategy for the corridor.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>will complement existing funding commitments from Central Trains and Centro across the conurbation and the wider travel to work area.</p> <p>12. Supports the need for improved transport interchange at key rail stations across the County.</p> <p>13. Notes that the LTP makes very little reference to the Centro lead LRT study, for which the County Council jointly funded the initial piece of work. Suggests that it is premature to dismiss LRT at this stage when the economic study has yet to report its findings.</p> <p>14. Suggests that there is a conflict between the medium to longer term BRT and heavy rail aspirations, as there is insufficient demand in the corridor to justify both modes, and that a more coherent longer term strategy needs to be established.</p>	
R039	Stephen Holt	Birmingham International Airport	11/11/05	E-mail	<p>1. Confirms that the general emphasis of the new LTP in relation to surface access is supported. The Airport Company intends to work in partnership with the County Council to improve surface access to Birmingham International Airport.</p> <p>2. Notes that the Airport Company has previously expressed support for the findings of the BIANCA Study, Coleshill Parkway, and proposals for a new bus service between Tamworth and the Airport. The Airport Company has financially supported the 777 bus service, along with the Buster Werkenbak scheme.</p> <p>3. Notes that text in relation to the Draft</p>	<p>1. Noted. The County Council is keen to work in partnership with the Airport to improve surface access.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted. The County Council will also be responding separately to the overall draft Masterplan proposals by the end of March 2006.</p> <p>4. Noted. These will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>5. Noted. These will be amended accordingly in both the Surface Access Strategy and the Northern Warwickshire area chapter of the LTP.</p>

					<p>Airport Master Plan needs to be updated in the Strategy.</p> <p>4. Requests clarification in the text in relation to the Surface Access Strategy and BIA's Surface Access Strategy, along with references to Birmingham and Coventry Airports.</p> <p>5. Suggests a number of textual changes/clarification to the Surface Access Strategy, the LTP generally, and the area chapter covering Northern Warwickshire.</p>	
R040	Rodney King	CTC	13/11/05	E-mail	<p>1. Suggests that congestion charging could be used as a tool to manage M40 Junction 15 (Longbridge) more effectively, and help improve conditions for cyclists.</p> <p>2. Suggests that the County Council is not working to the national standards for cycle lane widths, and cites the example of the recently completed cycle scheme on Emscote Road, Warwick. Suggests that the County Council will not achieve its aims for improving cycling by implementing the current internal cycle design guidelines.</p> <p>3. Requests that the text on cycling in future LTP Annual Progress Reports be reviewed by the Warwick District Cycle Forum before it goes to print.</p> <p>4. States that overall the draft LTP is an excellent document that has been prepared within good consultation processes.</p>	<p>1. Not accepted. Local charging at this junction would displace traffic to inappropriate routes, including through Warwick, and would not help cyclists.</p> <p>2. Internal design guidelines for cycleway construction have been amended so that the stated desirable minimum width for cycle lanes is 1.5m, in line with national guidance.</p> <p>3. Not accepted. The LTP Annual Progress Report is a statement of achievement over the previous year, and as such is not subject to debate or consultation.</p> <p>4. Noted and welcomed.</p>
R041	Alan Turner	Rugby Rail Users Group (RRUG)	14/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Welcomes any initiatives in the LTP that contribute towards improving Rugby railway station, the station and its environment.</p> <p>2. Notes that RRUG have recently produced their first manifesto, and directs the County</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted for action. The other rail user groups in the County will also be added as links from the website.</p>

					<p>Council to the website link for information.</p> <p>3. Requests that the County Council provide a link to the RRUG website from its own website.</p> <p>4. Welcomes the identification of the need for improvements to the bus/cycle/ pedestrian links to and from Rugby station, and sufficient car parking for users. Also welcomes the minimum target set in the Plan for half-hourly services between London and Birmingham via Northampton, and the need to improve capacity in the Rugby – Coventry – Birmingham – Wolverhampton corridor.</p> <p>5. Reserves judgement on the proposal for a new Parkway Station east of Rugby, and seek clarification on how the County Council has come to its conclusions on the proposal.</p> <p>6. Highlights a number of concerns over the lack of cycle provision in the scheme to improve the railway station, and disruption to rail services during the construction works. Requests that the County Council follow up these points of concern with Network Rail, and involve RRUG in any discussions.</p>	<p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5. It is proposed that this scheme will be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>6. Noted. Discussions are ongoing with Network Rail over the scope and content of the scheme for the railway station, and its impact on rail services during construction. The County Council will keep RRUG informed of any developments as they occur.</p>
R042	David Morris	Cubbington Parish Council	15/11/05	Letter	<p>Suggests a number of observations on local bus services, in terms of reliability, customer services, and the lack of available space for bicycle/pushchair storage. Also suggests the need for better bus stop infrastructure in terms of shelters and access for the disabled. Notes the lack of bus services from the Cubbington area to doctors, hospitals and dentists without the need for</p>	<p>Services in this area are operated on a commercial basis by Stagecoach in Warwickshire. The County Council is currently working with the operator to try and develop routes that will meet passenger needs more closely in the Cubbington area.</p>

					two bus changes	
R043	Gordon Brace	-	17/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Objection noted. However, the road will remain in the Plan as an integral part of the housing development at Shottery and for the traffic relief benefits it would deliver to Stratford town centre. Delivery of the road will be reviewed as part of the Transport Strategy for Stratford planned for 2006. This review has been prompted by the deferral by the District Council of the housing development at Shottery.
R044	David Bowie	-	17/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R045	Matthew Pinfield	-	18/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R046	Ann Draycott	Shottery Village Association	18/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R047	James E. Philpotts	-	18/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R048	Elizabeth Hicks	-	18/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R049	Martyn Luscombe	Residents Against Shottery Expansion (RASE)	18/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R050	R. David Langman	-	18/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R051	Peter Donaghue	-	18/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.

R052	Dr. Robert Bearman	Stratford-upon-Avon Cycle Forum	19/11/05	E-mail	Requests that the LTP includes reference to the development of Quiet Lanes. Suggests that installation costs would be low, but the benefits to sustainable modes of transport and increasing recreational opportunities would be considerable. Suggests a number of locations in Stratford District where the implementation of Quiet Lanes would be beneficial.	During the LTP period, the County Council will review the costs and benefits of implementing Quiet Lanes, based on experience elsewhere in the UK to date.
R053	Nicholas Carr	-	21/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R054	Paul R. Stanton	-	21/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R055	David and Alison Higgins	-	21/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R056	Paul Webb	-	21/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R057	L. Reece	-	22/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R058	John Kerslake	Rugby Borough Council (on behalf of the Cabinet)	22/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Supports the LTP objectives and overarching principles, and will continue to work in partnership with the County Council to develop the LTP and support its implementation.</p> <p>2. Strongly supports the proposal to carry out a transport study of the town in the early part of the LTP period, and should particularly consider the issue of town centre parking.</p> <p>3. Strongly supports the improvements that</p>	<p>1. Noted. The County Council will continue to work in partnership with the Borough Council to implement the LTP.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Borough Council will be a key member of the steering group for this study. Parking provision within the town will be a key issue for the study to address.</p> <p>3. Your support is noted and appreciated. A number of similar schemes are proposed in the Rugby area in the LTP.</p> <p>4. Noted. Officers from the County Council liaise</p>

				<p>have been made to bus service 4, and requests that further funding be brought forward to improve the routes detailed in the Plan.</p> <p>4. Suggests that priority should be given to reinstating bus routes that have been removed, for example to the Paddox area. Direct routes to Walsgrave Hospital and between hospital facilities need to be introduced. Better bus services should also be considered for the Ansty/Shilton/Barnacle area.</p> <p>5. States that some of the wording in the LTP in relation to the former Rugby Radio Station is potentially misleading.</p> <p>6. Objects to the proposal for Rugby East Parkway station on the grounds of concerns over the impact it may have on the viability of the existing station.</p> <p>7. Identifies certain rural areas of the Borough that urgently need improvement in terms of accessibility. The findings of some work undertaken by the Borough Council were debated by the Partnership and Community Panel in September 2005, and are included as an appendix with the Borough Council's LTP response.</p> <p>8. Requests that more concentration should be given to community transport schemes for areas not served by other means.</p> <p>9. Supports the intention to provide enhanced integrated transport facilities for taxis and private hire vehicles at the railway station.</p> <p>10. Notes that air quality has been designated as a strategic issue that needs</p>	<p>regularly with all local bus service operators to work to improve and increase services. Requests for new or improved bus services are dealt with based on need and resource availability.</p> <p>5. Noted and agreed. A form of words has been agreed by officers from the two authorities that address this issue.</p> <p>6. It is proposed that this scheme will be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>7. The County Council welcome the Borough Council's findings in relation to rural access and will use this information to inform the evidence base for the Accessibility Strategy and future accessibility assessments.</p> <p>8. In the short term, the County Council will consider undertaking a feasibility study, in conjunction with operators and the voluntary sector, to evaluate whether better co-ordination among community transport operators in the Borough can be achieved. The study could also consider alternative ways forward for medium and longer-term involvement of community transport in accessibility solutions for the Borough.</p> <p>9. Noted. This is being pursued as part of the discussions with Network Rail over the scope and content of the scheme to improve the railway station.</p> <p>10. Noted and welcomed. The County Council is keen to work with the Borough Council to develop an Action Plan to address the designated Air Quality Management Area in Rugby.</p> <p>11. Support noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>to be addressed through the LTP. Supports the measures described in the LTP to address air quality issues in the town centre.</p> <p>11. Supports the development of enhanced walking facilities and routes, and urges their early development.</p> <p>12. Raises concern over the quality and safety of existing footways where maintenance work is considered overdue.</p> <p>13. Acknowledges the considerable work that has been undertaken on cycling schemes during the first LTP period, and identifies further priorities for investment. Highlights further maintenance concerns.</p> <p>14. Identifies the projected shortfall in both short and long stay parking in the town centre, and states that its consideration should be a priority.</p> <p>15. Identifies the importance of meeting the projected implementation date for the introduction of decriminalisation of parking enforcement in the town.</p> <p>16. Notes the importance of the implementation of the Western Relief Road to delivering other parts of the transport agenda. Requests an early start on the project.</p> <p>17. Suggests that the expected increase in traffic around the railway station will increase the need for a junction improvement at Mill Road/Butlers Leap.</p> <p>18. Notes the importance of school crossing facilities and patrols, and requests that funding is concentrated on location where these are lacking (e.g. Stretton and</p>	<p>12. Noted. Specific problems will be identified during routine checks and addressed as part of a rolling programme of maintenance works.</p> <p>13. Priorities noted, and incorporated into the Action Plan.</p> <p>14. Noted. This issue will be considered as part of the proposed Rugby Transport Study.</p> <p>15. Noted. The County Council will continue to work towards the projected implementation date of the end of 2006/07.</p> <p>16. Noted. Subject to addressing some issues at the southern end of the route near Potford's Dam and obtaining full approval of the scheme from Central Government, a start on site could begin in 2007.</p> <p>17. Noted and agreed. This junction is being considered as part of the transport assessment for the redevelopment of the former Alstom/GEC and Cattle Market sites. It is likely that the County Council will seek developer funding towards an improvement of the junction, if the impact of traffic from the developments are detrimental to its operational performance.</p> <p>18. Noted. As stated in Policy RS11 of the Road Safety Strategy, the County Council will provide school crossing patrols for children age 5 to 11 at sites that meet the national criteria.</p> <p>19. The County Council has recently increased its funding for the installation of dropped kerbs. This should allow the programme of improvements to be accelerated.</p> <p>20. Noted. Investment in Safer Routes to School in Rugby will continue throughout the LTP period.</p> <p>21. Noted.</p> <p>22. Noted. The Warwick/Leamington</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>Brinklow).</p> <p>19. Requests that the programme for installing dropped kerbs be accelerated, and existing crossings should be brought up to standard.</p> <p>20. Supports the continued investment in Safer Routes to School in the area to address safety and relieve congestion.</p> <p>21. Requests that consideration be given to bus stop size and location in the town centre as part of any improvements in the town centre.</p> <p>22. Notes the increasing traffic using Coventry Airport and its impact on the Borough, and requests that measures to reduce the impact be reflected in the LTP.</p> <p>23. Notes the increased traffic on certain approach roads to Rugby as a result of the expansion of the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal, and requests that measures to reduce the impact be reflected in the LTP (e.g. speed restrictions).</p> <p>24. Notes that freight traffic using Magna Park is using unsuitable approach roads in the Borough, and measures should be taken to prohibit these (e.g. B4027).</p> <p>25. Suggests a number of wording enhancements to the Passenger Rail Strategy, and some resultant wording amendments for the Eastern Warwickshire section of the LTP.</p>	<p>Spa/Kenilworth/Whitnash Urban Area Chapter demonstrates commitment to pursue improvement measures in conjunction with the Highways Agency and Coventry City Council.</p> <p>23. Noted. The issue will be referred to the County Council's Freight Quality Partnership.</p> <p>24. This issue has been investigated by the County Council, and no evidence has emerged that HGV's are taking unsuitable routes to or from Magna Park. However there is an arrangement with the management of Magna Park that if HGV's are identified as visiting Magna Park then action will be taken. The 'B' road network is expected to carry its share of all types of traffic including HGV's, however the B4027 does not appear on the County Council's advisory lorry route map.</p> <p>25. In some cases, it appears that the current wording does reflect the suggested changes. In other cases, an appropriate amendment has been made to the text. The exception is the comment on Policy T3, which comes from the Warwickshire Structure Plan and is existing approved policy.</p>
R059	Helen Absalom	Warwick District Council (officer comments)	22/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Confirms that there is no conflict between the LTP and the Warwick District Local Plan.</p> <p>2. Pleased to note the proposals for the park and ride to serve Warwick and</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. The support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>3. Noted. A suitable paragraph has been included in the relevant Area Chapter.</p> <p>4. Noted. Additional references have been</p>

					<p>Leamington Spa, and Kenilworth railway station.</p> <p>3. Suggests that a paragraph is added to the LTP to cover the South West Warwick development, and the commitment of funding towards town centre improvements in Warwick, M40 Junction 15, improvements to bus services and safer routes to school.</p> <p>4. Requests that closer links are made to the relationship of the proposals in the area chapter to the designated air quality management areas in the District.</p> <p>5. Highlights a number of minor textual issues in the Warwick/Leamington Spa/Kenilworth/Whitnash area chapter.</p> <p>6. Requests that the County Council investigate proposals for providing a cycle route from Kenilworth to Leamington Spa, including the proposed Safer Route to School from North Leamington School to the town centre.</p>	<p>included in the relevant Area Chapter.</p> <p>5. Noted.</p> <p>6. Please see response to R019, points 2 and 3 above.</p>
R060	Keith Vickery	-	22/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R061	G. D. Symes	Kenilworth Town Council	22/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Endorses the proposals for Kenilworth railway station, and gives full support whenever action is required to deliver the scheme.</p> <p>2. Requests that the Town Council receive direct advice as and when developments occur in relation to the provision of the station.</p>	<p>1. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>2. The County Council is happy to agree to this suggestion.</p>
R062	Mr. And Mrs. P. Greenway	-	23/11/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.

R063	Robert Nash	The Town Council of Royal Leamington Spa	24/11/05	Letter	Requests that urgent consideration be given to the creation of a dedicated cycle route between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa on the A452.	See response to R019, points 2 and 3 above.
R064	Ray Clipson	CPRE	24/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Strongly supports the need for better public transport services, particularly in rural areas and those without access to a car for all/part of the day. However, these need to be timed to meet peoples' needs and to integrate with other public transport services.</p> <p>2. Recognises the need to reduce traffic speeds in rural areas and through villages, but requests that this is done sympathetically in terms of design to maintain the character of the county.</p> <p>3. Requests that the County Council should strongly aim to reduce street clutter in rural areas, villages and towns, and cites Stratford as an example of somewhere in the County where this is a particular problem.</p> <p>4. Makes some suggested textual changes to the Plan to clarify a number of matters.</p> <p>5. Objects to the proposed Stratford Western Relief Road.</p> <p>6. Suggests that a low cost relief road should be considered for Studley on the A435.</p> <p>7. Suggests that the County Council should develop a countywide free travel pass for older and disabled people as suggested in the government concessionary fares scheme from April 2006.</p> <p>8. Suggests that volunteers be trained for manning of mobile speed guns, as has</p>	<p>1. Your support is noted and appreciated. The point regarding timing is agreed.</p> <p>2. Accepted. Where measures to reduce speed are to be introduced, it is agreed that they should be designed as sympathetically as possible to maintain the character of the county.</p> <p>3. Noted. Periodic reviews of street furniture and highway signage are undertaken throughout the County. The County Council has recently undertaken a desktop exercise to establish a more co-ordinated approach for undertaking area-wide environmental improvements, including the provision of new/revised street furniture and highway signage.</p> <p>4. Noted. The majority of the points raised can be reflected in the wording of the Final Plan.</p> <p>5. Please see response to R043.</p> <p>6. Noted. Following confirmation of the revocation orders for the scheme, consideration will be given to what alternative measures to improve the environment and safety in Studley are appropriate.</p> <p>7. Free countywide concessionary travel is currently being negotiated with the five District/Borough Councils in Warwickshire. Discussions so far appear to be promising.</p> <p>8. Decisions as to how speed limits should be enforced are primarily a matter for the police rather than the County Council.</p> <p>9. Noted. As stated in paragraph 2.3.61 of the LTP, the County Council will use the new guidance the Government is expected to issue</p>

				<p>been undertaken in other parts of the country.</p> <p>9. Suggests that in line with future DfT guidance, the speed limit through all villages should be 30mph (or less near schools).</p> <p>10. Suggests that trials should be undertaken on narrow country roads by replacing the white lines down the middle of the road with a grass strip, and make grass verges more obvious.</p> <p>11. Suggests that car sharing should be promoted for trip generators such as Warwick Technology Park and other similar out-of-town employment locations.</p> <p>12. Supports the proposed station at Bermuda/Griff, and its inclusion on the Bus Rapid Transit route. Also strongly supports the extension of Bus Rapid Transit to Ansty.</p> <p>13. Supports the provision of a new western entrance to the NAC, Stoneleigh. Request that improvements to the A46 Stoneleigh Interchange do not include improvements to lighting due to its high elevation in a rural area. Requests that consultation is undertaken over changes to the B4115 given that it is the signed cycle route from Warwick to Coventry.</p> <p>14. Strongly urges the County Council to oppose expansions of operations at Coventry Airport until improvements have been made to the A45/A46 junction and improvements to public transport accessibility.</p> <p>15. Strongly supports the proposal for a new station in Kingsbury, and suggests that</p>	<p>shortly in developing a new speed management strategy.</p> <p>10. Deliberate introduction of grass strips would compromise both the safety of the highway and its structural integrity.</p> <p>11. Noted and agreed. The County Council works with large employers to encourage them to adopt Green Travel principles for their employees, both in terms of how they access the workplace and the journeys they make as part of their job. The County Council has strict guidelines for Green Travel in relation to new development.</p> <p>12. Noted.</p> <p>13. Noted. Comments have been passed to County Council's Development Control section who are dealing with the proposed improvements.</p> <p>14. The County Council is liaising with the Highways Agency and Coventry City Council regarding the required improvements associated with the airport expansion. The County Council has and will continue to work closely with the Highways Agency regarding the level of acceptable impact resulting from any airport expansion. This has been the subject of a Public Inquiry, and the County Council is confident that all the matters are being adequately explored in this process and that a balanced approach to further expansion will be set out by the Inspector.</p> <p>15. Coleshill Parkway is a committed scheme, and construction is programmed to start shortly. The completion of the station will trigger a substantial up-grade of bus services in North Warwickshire. The County Council also</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>this should be a higher priority than the new station at Coleshill. However, the proposed bus service improvements at Coleshill are supported, particularly the link to Birmingham International.</p> <p>16. Suggests that better linkages between the railway stations in Nuneaton and Bedworth and the town centres can be achieved through better design.</p> <p>17. Supports the reinstatement of through heavy rail services (and increased service frequency) between Coventry, Nuneaton and Leicester.</p> <p>18. Supports the provision of parkway stations and park and ride facilities, but requests that parking is provided on brownfield land rather than Green Belt.</p> <p>19. Supports the upgrading of the West Midlands to Felixstowe rail route, and providing rail access to Judkins Quarry.</p> <p>20. Objects to the currently published route of the Rugby Western Relief Road, and suggests that the route be changed to run along the route of the former railway line.</p> <p>21. Strongly supports the early reinstatement of the through stopping services from Rugby to London and to the capacity of the Rugby – Wolverhampton corridor.</p> <p>22. Objects to the proposed Rugby East Parkway station proposal on the grounds of the detrimental impact it may have on the existing station and its services.</p> <p>23. Suggests that the Bilton Bypass scheme be pursued even with the Western Relief Road in place, in order to improve the</p>	<p>supports a new station at Kingsbury, but currently there are a number of deliverability issues with the proposal.</p> <p>16. Agreed. The Masterplan for Nuneaton and Bedworth town centres recognises this issue. Improvements will be pursued through the implementation of the Masterplan proposals</p> <p>17. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>18. Your support is noted and appreciated. Brownfield land would normally be preferred except where local circumstances determine otherwise.</p> <p>19. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>20. The development of proposals for the Rugby Western Relief Road has considered a number of alternative alignments, including an alignment that follows the route of the former Rugby – Leamington Spa railway line. This alignment was discounted due to its ecological impact and the fact that it would remove any possibility of the railway line reopening in the future.</p> <p>21. Noted.</p> <p>22. It is proposed that this scheme will be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>23. A decision will be made on Bilton Bypass once the Rugby Western Relief Road has been built. Notwithstanding this, construction of Bilton Bypass would adversely affect residential areas, especially Cheshire Close, and would risk attracting traffic back to this route from the Western Relief Route if it were improved.</p> <p>24. Unfortunately there are insufficient funds available at present to reinstate this service. It should be noted that the previous 555 service was very poorly used.</p> <p>25. The County Council is working with</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>environment of the village.</p> <p>24. Requests that better public transport links be provided between Kenilworth, Balsall Common, Meriden and Birmingham International, through reinstatement of the 555 service between Warwick/Kenilworth and BIA.</p> <p>25. Requests that better public transport be provided between Coventry, Kenilworth, Warwick, Charlecote and Stratford, possibly including links to Stratford and Warwick Parkway railway stations.</p> <p>26. Suggests that service frequencies at Hatton (particularly towards Birmingham) should be reinstated to hourly. Notes that the land currently used for ballast dumping could be used for an extended station car park, which would increase the usage of the station and improve its overall environmental quality.</p> <p>27. Questions whether the site identified for the second park and ride site in Stratford is the correct one, due to its location in a designated Area of Restraint and adjacent to the Stratford Town Conservation Area. Notes that the site is not currently identified in the Local Plan, and that further work will be needed to investigate it in due course.</p> <p>28. Suggests that the redevelopment of the former MOD base at Long Marston should only proceed with the reinstatement of the Stratford – Honeybourne railway line.</p> <p>29. Appears to suggest support for the proposed Stratford Parkway railway station, in terms of its role in supporting recent development at Bishopton and Timothy's</p>	<p>Coventry City Council to deliver a step-change in public transport in the North/South Corridor between Nuneaton, Bedworth, Coventry, Kenilworth, Leamington Spa and Warwick. These improvements will aim to integrate with the existing public transport network, including bus services from Leamington Spa and Warwick to Charlecote, Stratford and Warwick Parkway.</p> <p>26. Agreed in respect of both points. The County Council is developing plans for additional car parking at Hatton and Lapworth.</p> <p>27. The general area referred to in the LTP for the second site is considered the only viable location for a southern park and ride facility to serve the town.</p> <p>28. This is primarily a land use issue which will be determined by the District Council as local planning authority.</p> <p>29. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>30. During the LTP period, the County Council will the costs and benefits of implementing Quiet Lanes, based on experience elsewhere in the UK to date.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>Bridge Road, and that good pedestrian/cycle access should be provided from these areas to the new station to encourage its use.</p> <p>30. Requests that the County Council consider/investigate areas suitable for Quiet Lanes, such as those that have already been introduced in Norfolk and Surrey following public consultation.</p>	
R065	Mr. G. D. Symes	Kenilworth Town Council	28/11/05	Letter	<p>1. Welcomes the concepts driving the Plan and supports the guiding principles and issues arising. Raises some concerns that there may be more aspirations than commitments in the Plan.</p> <p>2. Welcomes the Air Quality Strategy, and are surprised that Warwick Road in Kenilworth does not feature.</p> <p>3. Requests that Kenilworth is considered within any traffic improvements in the Warwick University – Warwick/Leamington Spa, including the proposals for Bus Rapid Transit.</p> <p>4. Notes that bus services have been rationalised in the town over recent years. Requests that public transport in the north west of the town is improved.</p> <p>5. Suggests a new link with the A46 from the Glasshouse Lane area would relieve pressure on both the St. John’s Island and at the A46/A452 interchange at Thickthorn.</p> <p>6. Acknowledges the work that has been undertaken in traffic and transport terms to support the master planning exercise for the town centre. Questions what solutions have been identified through the consideration of the various options in the traffic modelling</p>	<p>1. Noted. The LTP contains a wide range of schemes and proposals. These will be brought forward as resources permit over the next five years and beyond, using a combination of LTP and other funding sources (e.g. S106 developer funding). The Delivery Strategy contained in Part Four of the Provisional LTP sets out the measures contained in the Plan that will be delivered during the LTP period given the likely resources available to the County Council.</p> <p>2. Noted. Information provided by Warwick District Council as part of the development of the Air Quality Strategy highlighted that the junction of Warwick Road with Sainsbury’s is close to triggering the declaration of an Air Quality Management Area. Monitoring will continue to be undertaken by the District Council to inform any future action required at this location.</p> <p>3. Noted. The development of the University will be required to assess and address any traffic impacts, both within Warwickshire and Coventry. A Bus Rapid Transit scheme proposal is currently being developed from Coventry city centre to the University, which subject to its financial viability will be planned to include services to Kenilworth.</p>

				<p>exercise. Makes a commitment to continue to work with the District and County Councils to resolve the conflicting interests of shoppers and residents as the proposals develop.</p> <p>7. Suggests additional text within paragraph 1.6.22 to reflect the need for the identification and implementation of measures to manage the impact of traffic within Kenilworth town centre, and to improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.</p> <p>8. Requests that the impact of traffic from the expansion of Warwick University and the NAC is considered in the town centre as well as at the junctions of Gibbet Hill, Stoneleigh Road and Thickthorn.</p> <p>9. Acknowledges the proposed improvements for cycle links from Warwick to Coventry via Kenilworth and also from Kenilworth to Warwick University. Requests whether any monitoring has been undertaken of the route across the Common since it was introduced last year. Suggests that a more integrated approach will be needed if routes are to be beneficial, rather than pursuing short lengths of cycleway in isolation.</p> <p>10. Requests that a safe cycle route along the A452 between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa be promoted through the LTP.</p> <p>11. Welcomes the commitment of the County Council to pursuing the provision of a new railway station to serve Kenilworth. Notes the potential train service identified</p>	<p>4. Noted, however insufficient funds are available at present to address this issue.</p> <p>5. New links on to the A46 would require the approval of the Highways Agency, who have highlighted safety issues on the section of the A46 between the Thickthorn and Stoneleigh interchanges. Because of the safety issues and close proximity of the Thickthorn and Stoneleigh junctions it would not be feasible to pursue the introduction of an additional junction at this location.</p> <p>6. Noted. Details of the options considered for traffic management as part of the Kenilworth Master Planning exercise are provided in the Joint Scrutiny Committee Report of February 2005, which the Town Council were represented at.</p> <p>7. Noted and agreed.</p> <p>8. Noted. See comment on point 3.</p> <p>9. An integrated approach is being pursued through continued implementation of cycle route network plans for each of the five main towns within the County. However, it will take a sustained period of funding to create joined up networks. In Kenilworth, cycle facilities are being developed as part of National Cycle Network route 52, a strategic route linking Warwick – Coventry – Nuneaton and beyond.</p> <p>10. See response to R019, points 2 and 3 above.</p> <p>11. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>12. Noted, however insufficient funds are available at present to address this issue.</p> <p>13. There are many roads classified as C or D within the County that carry more than 5000 vehicles per day. The flows have remained</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>from the North/South Corridor Strategy. Appreciates that a strong business case will be needed to justify the investment in a station, along with any necessary track and signalling work.</p> <p>12. Seeks resolution of the lack of bus services on the former X17 route (Mill End/Dalehouse Lane) and around the Castle.</p> <p>13. Notes with surprise that Dalehouse Lane is classified as a 'D' road, but carries over 5000 vehicles per day and acts as a key link to the A46.</p> <p>14. Considers that speed limits on certain roads in the town are too high (Coventry Road) or unclear (e.g. Upper Spring Lane) and seeks resolution that that they are addressed appropriately.</p> <p>15. Raises a number of issues regarding the signing of through traffic in the town centre, poor signage to the town and the Castle, and the signing of Kenilworth from the Shires Retail Park as being via the M40 and A46.</p> <p>16. Requests that in the context of the low amount of on-street parking in the town, that the effects of implementing Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement are carefully considered.</p> <p>17. Identifies two old bridges in the town that are still carrying heavy traffic (Townsbroom and Washbrook). Notes that routine maintenance is undertaken regularly on structures, and requests that removal of vegetation be undertaken as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>static on this route for a significant period of time (over 10 years). If Dalehouse Lane were to be re-assigned as a B road, it would be reproduced as such on all road maps and could encourage drivers to enter Kenilworth via this route. Given the residential nature of this route and the lack of any specific benefits that would arise from re-classification, the County Council would be unlikely to pursue it as a priority.</p> <p>14. Speed limits will continue to be set in accordance with County Council policy, which is due to be reviewed when new national guidance is published shortly – see paragraph 2.3.61 of the Provisional LTP.</p> <p>15. There are no destinations other than “Kenilworth” signed through the town, other than Balsall Common and Leamington Spa, which are the next significant settlements in each direction on the A452. The signing on the A452 in the vicinity of the Shires Retail Park will be reviewed. Improved signing to the town and castle from the A46 is a matter for the Highways Agency.</p> <p>16. A comprehensive survey of parking in Kenilworth has been carried out and the implementation of Decriminalisation of Parking Enforcement (DPE) will be informed by the analysis of the data obtained. As has occurred in Stratford, the impact of DPE will be monitored following implementation.</p> <p>17. Noted. These concerns will be passed on to the County Council's Bridge Maintenance section.</p> <p>18. The County Council, who devised this initiative, are fully supportive of it.</p> <p>19. Noted. Work on the High Street is included</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>18. States that a streetscape committee has been set up in the town during the last year, and that areas for improvement and action are being identified. Seeks support from the County Council on this initiative.</p> <p>19. Requests that High Street and Common Lane in Kenilworth receive some major repair in terms of road maintenance. Also identifies a number of footways that are in poor condition, and some that are overgrown. Welcomes Policy HM11 in the Highway Maintenance Strategy, and looks forward to its implementation.</p> <p>20. Considers that Crackley Lane should be included in the roads to be gritted in the area, as the road has become an important commuter route.</p> <p>21. Suggests that an annual service for gullies is insufficient in many cases.</p> <p>22. Suggests that it may not be necessary to replace all old and damaged signs, and that some rationalisation may be possible. Requests that better directional signage for the town and its attractions would be welcomed.</p> <p>23. Notes with concern the state of lamp columns in the area and the impact this has on visual amenity.</p> <p>24. Welcomes the policy to improve the co-ordination of utilities and contractors, particularly in the context of the major Severn Trent works that are ongoing and the proposed road works that are likely to occur in the coming years as part of the town centre redevelopment.</p> <p>25. Welcomes action to replace all old and</p>	<p>in the County Council's five-year maintenance programme. Works to part of Common Lane are included in the programme for the next financial year (2006/07).</p> <p>20. Treatment of this road falls outside the County Council's current Winter Service policy, and adjacent high priority parallel routes are treated in adverse weather.</p> <p>21. Noted. A review of the frequency of gully emptying is currently taking place as part of the Term Maintenance Contract.</p> <p>22. Noted. This will be undertaken as part of the County Council's ongoing maintenance and Streetscape initiatives.</p> <p>23. Lamp columns in High Street are in the programme to be painted in the next financial year (2006/07).</p> <p>24. Noted.</p> <p>25. The junction has been designed with the minimal amount of equipment, except on Bridge Street where additional push button units have been provided to assist the large number of children crossing at this location. Additional guard railing was provided at the request of the Head Teacher of Abbotsford School.</p> <p>26. Currently, it is proposed that The Clock would be retained as the main bus-bus interchange, but it is envisaged that some bus services would operate via the new railway station once it was open.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>damaged signs if there is a need for this but suggests that the recent upgrading of New Street/Bridge Street signal junction has resulted in a significant increase in street clutter in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>26. Notes the proposal for a new public transport interchange at the railway station, and asks whether any thoughts have been given as to the rerouting of bus services if this were to replace the existing interchange at the Clock.</p>	
R066	-	Rugby Area Committee	9/11/05	Meeting	<p>1. Requested clarification over the wording in paragraphs 3.5.50 and 3.5.51 regarding stopping services and longer distance services at Rugby railway station.</p> <p>2. Requested that the proposals for Rugby East Parkway be deleted from the Plan due to concerns over the impact such a facility would have on patronage at the existing station.</p> <p>3. Raised concerns over the ongoing delay in the delivery of the Rugby Western Relief Road.</p> <p>4. Requested that additional London-bound rail services be provided in the AM peak from Rugby.</p> <p>5. Requested that access by public transport to Walsgrave Hospital from the surrounding rural areas be improved.</p> <p>6. Requested that the proposed Inter-Urban Quality Bus Corridor between Rugby and Coventry make reference to serving Binley Woods.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The text will be clarified accordingly.</p> <p>2. The proposal will be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>3. Noted. Subject to addressing some issues at the southern end of the route near Potford's Dam and obtaining full approval of the scheme from Central Government, a start on site could begin in 2007.</p> <p>4. Noted. The County Council will continue to lobby for improvements to rail services serving Rugby.</p> <p>5. In the short term, the County Council will consider undertaking a feasibility study, in conjunction with operators and the voluntary sector, to evaluate whether better co-ordination among community transport operators in Rugby Borough can be achieved. The study could also consider alternative ways forward for medium and longer-term involvement of community transport in accessibility solutions for the Borough.</p> <p>6. Noted. The text will be amended accordingly.</p>
R067	-	North Warwickshire	16/11/05	Meeting	<p>1. Noted that as advocates on behalf of the travelling public of Warwickshire, there was</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p>

		Area Committee			<p>a need to negotiate with providers of public transport to ensure that passengers have good quality, safe journeys.</p> <p>2. Requested that members be kept informed of any future developments regarding transport.</p> <p>3. Welcomed the proposals for Atherstone Bus Station.</p> <p>4. Requested that further investigation be undertaken on identifying funding for the A51 Dosthill Bypass, in conjunction with Staffordshire County Council.</p> <p>5. Approved the proposals contained in the LTP for the Northern Warwickshire area.</p>	<p>3. Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>4. Noted. The County Council will continue to work with Staffordshire County Council and Tamworth Borough Council in relation to this proposal, particularly in terms of securing further developer contributions to fund the remaining sections of the road.</p> <p>5. Noted.</p>
R068	-	Warwick Area Committee	22/11/05	Meeting	Noted that the LTP does not include proposals for a cycle route between Kenilworth and Leamington Spa.	Please see response to R019, points 2 and 3 above.
R069	-	Stratford Area Committee	23/11/05	Meeting	<p>1. Suggested that publicity should be given on the A46 signage to the effect that the newly opened park and ride site allows children to travel free.</p> <p>2. Questioned whether 28% traffic growth is still expected in Stratford-upon-Avon over the plan period.</p> <p>3. Suggested that Public Transport in the rural areas of the District should be entirely demand responsive in the future.</p> <p>4. Suggested that through traffic will be forced through Stratford town centre if the Western Relief Road proposals are dropped from the LTP.</p> <p>5. It was noted that there were differing views regarding the proposals for Stratford Parkway railway station.</p> <p>6. Suggested that restoration of the former</p>	<p>1. This suggestion will be investigated and implemented if feasible.</p> <p>2. Traffic growth over the 10-year period between 1994 and 2004 was 13% in Stratford. The LTP Congestion Strategy aims to ensure that journey speeds within Stratford should not deteriorate by more than 10% over the 5-year Plan period.</p> <p>3. Noted. The County Council is currently working with Stratford District Council on an action plan aiming to implement a district-wide demand responsive community transport scheme by the end of this financial year. It will serve the district by zones, each of which will be able to use the service on two days per week during the day, prioritising access to a local market town and two additional major service destinations. There are budget constraints on</p>

					<p>Stratford – Honeybourne rail line should be pursued with private money, for example from the developers of the former Long Marston MOD depot.</p> <p>7. Noted the position regarding the A435 Studley Bypass, and raised concerns over the legacy that would be left with the County Council by the Highways Agency.</p> <p>8. Requested that more priority be given towards providing for cyclists.</p> <p>9. Strong support was given for wider consultation early in 2006 on the various strategic transport issues relating to Stratford-upon-Avon and its environs.</p>	<p>the project that prevent it being totally demand responsive, and it is not suitable for work journeys. However, once implemented it is a significant step for demand-responsive, flexible services from rural areas. The County Council will monitor patronage and accessibility outcomes closely to inform project development.</p> <p>4. Noted and agreed. The aim of the Western Relief Road is to reduce traffic in Shottery and the town centre. Please also see response to R043.</p> <p>5. Noted. A report will be made to the County Council's Stratford Area Committee when the full implications of the scheme are known and prior to any formal steps to promote it as a County Council sponsored scheme.</p> <p>6. Noted.</p> <p>7. Noted. Following confirmation of the revocation orders for the scheme, consideration will be given to what alternative measures to improve the environment and safety in Studley are appropriate.</p> <p>8. Noted.</p>
R070	-	Nuneaton and Bedworth Area Committee	30/11/05	Meeting	<p>1. Identified the need to urge the Highways Agency to improve the A444/A5 Red Gate junction, which is considered to be a major traffic hazard and safety issue.</p> <p>2. Identified the need for improvements to the A444/Griff island junction (particularly when motorists detour from the M6 at Junction 3 when accidents occurred), and also improvements to the feeder Gypsy Lane junction.</p> <p>3. Questioned Whether there is adequate funding to deliver the LTP and the prospect</p>	<p>1. Noted. The issue will be raised with the Highways Agency at the next joint liaison meeting.</p> <p>2. Noted. Issues in relation to the Gypsy Lane junction are being considered alongside the other problems associated with the Griff roundabout.</p> <p>3. The LTP programme is a long term vision, and as such, not all of the schemes are capable of being delivered in the current programme. The Delivery Strategy contained in Part Four of the Provisional LTP sets out the measures</p>

					of obtaining further funding. 4. Identified the lack of public transport from Nuneaton Town Centre to the A444 leisure complex.	contained in the Plan that will be delivered during the LTP period given the likely resources available to the County Council. 4. Transport issues between the Town Centre and the leisure complex on the A444 will be addressed in the medium term by the implementation of a step-change in public transport in the North/South Corridor, as described in Part Three of the LTP. Some bus services do currently serve the leisure complex during the daytime, however these are mostly for the benefit of employees rather than users.
R071	Malcolm Watt	Cotswolds Conservation Board	29/11/05	Letter	1. Welcomes the contents of the LTP, in particular the references to the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan. 2. Seems to suggest that there are some erroneous references to the Cotswolds AONB Management 'Strategy' rather than 'Plan'. 3. Notes that the Countryside Strategy contained in Annex 2 of the LTP makes reference to the Management Plan, and welcomes the opportunity to work with the County Council to implement these proposals over the coming years.	1. Noted. 2. Noted. The text will be amended accordingly. 3. Noted and welcomed.
R072	Jane Sands	Ansley Parish Council	29/11/05	E-mail	1. Highlights that the main concerns of the Parish Council regarding transport relate to the speed of traffic. Requests that consideration be given to reducing traffic speeds in sensitive areas from 30mph to 20mph. 2. Notes that a mobile speed van has been in place on a number of occasions in Ansley Common on the B4114 Coleshill Road, which they suggest has generated a large	1. Noted. As stated in paragraph 2.3.61 of the LTP, the County Council will use the new guidance the Government is expected to issue shortly in developing a new speed management strategy. 2. Noted. As explained in Policy RS20 of the Road Safety Strategy, the County Council supports the Government's safety camera initiative. Paragraph 2.3.60 states that partnerships are only allowed to take part in the

					number of fines. Suggests that this would be an ideal and proper opportunity to put a permanent speed camera in place.	scheme if they abide by the rules and guidelines updated annually by the Department for Transport. The rules include criteria for new safety cameras. The site in question does not at present meet the criteria for a fixed camera to be installed.
R073	W. Eastop	-	01/12/05	Letter	Objects to the proposal for the Stratford Western Relief Road on a number of grounds.	Please see response to R043.
R074	Sarah Montgomery	Warwick Castle	01/12/05	Letter	<p>1. Welcomes the measures identified in the Plan to improve public transport, reduce dependency on the car and improve road safety.</p> <p>2. Notes the recognition that the LTP gives to the importance of tourism to Warwickshire and the benefits that Warwick Castle brings to businesses in Warwick. Suggests that visitors to the Castle have a set of unique of transport requirements compared to commuters, and that the availability, reliability and cost of public transport (particularly at weekends) prohibits its use by visitors to the Castle.</p> <p>3. Outlines the contribution that the Castle makes to reducing congestion in the town, in terms of high car occupancy, linked trips, significant access by coach, and measures to encourage access by bus and rail.</p> <p>4. Suggests that the growth in traffic in Warwick over the last four years cannot be attributed to visitors to the Castle, as numbers have not substantially increased over that period. Would welcome nonetheless improvements to highway infrastructure, in particular the links to the</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Public Transport Strategy aims to improve bus and rail services within the County for both residents and visitors. This includes an intention to improve the frequency of services in evenings and on Sundays.</p> <p>3. Noted. The Castle's views will be valuable in developing future transport proposals during the life of this LTP through the Warwick Town Centre Forum.</p> <p>4. Noted. The castle should be reassured that the County Council is working with the Highways Agency to identify improvements to the strategic road network that will benefit Warwick and address congestion and safety issues, particularly at M40 Junction 15.</p> <p>5. Noted. This approach is addressed in the LTP Parking Strategy.</p> <p>6 and 7. Noted, however, parking provided to serve those travelling from the south and west to Warwick and Leamington will reduce pressure for parking in the town centre, providing additional capacity for those travelling from other directions.</p> <p>8. The Walking Strategy focuses on encouraging more walking in the main towns.</p>

					<p>strategic network at the M40.</p> <p>5. Suggests that future changes to town centre parking in Warwick should concentrate on discouraging their use by regular commuters to ensure that spaces are available for visitors.</p> <p>6. Suggests that the use of Park and Ride is not appropriate for visitors to the Castle and the town, as the addition of delay and uncertainty into the total journey experience will deter visitors. Park and Ride should be designed to provide long term parking for commuters to ensure that parking spaces in the town centre are available for visitors.</p> <p>7. Notwithstanding these comments, suggests that the Park and Ride site location will only serve commuters and visitors from Junction 13 of the M40, and will not provide a suitable facility from other directions.</p> <p>8. Welcomes the initiative to improve facilities within market towns and specific leisure attractions, and would like to see improvements to pedestrian signage in the town centre. Requests that Warwick be added to the list of locations in the Walking Strategy where improvements will be made.</p> <p>9. Suggests that any bus shuttle provided between Warwick and Stratford will not be well used due to users requiring access to a car for their further destinations. Any efforts to provide such a facility should concentrate on commuter traffic, which has the largest impact on peak period congestion.</p>	<p>Warwick is therefore one of the locations where pedestrian improvements will be prioritised.</p> <p>9. Noted. The principal aim of the shuttle service would be to provide a sustainable alternative to the car for tourists visiting both Stratford and Warwick.</p>
R075	Cllr Appleton	-	04/12/05	E-mail	<p>1. Suggests that the Southam area is not covered in sufficient detail in the LTP.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Appropriate text has been included in the LTP.</p>

					<p>Requests that the LTP makes more reference to the economic interactivity of the area with Northampton, Daventry and Banbury.</p> <p>2. Suggests the LTP should identify the rail link to Rugby, and the need for greater collaboration with Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire over cross-boundary rural bus services.</p>	<p>2. Noted. Appropriate text has been included in the LTP.</p>
R076	Robert Nash	The Town Council of Royal Leamington Spa	05/12/05	Letter	<p>1. Welcomes the priorities set out in the LTP, and consider it to be a very positive and consistent strategy.</p> <p>2. Raises concerns over the air quality issues at Bath Street/Clemens Street, and requests what specific measures are proposed to address the problem.</p> <p>3. Notes the recent incidents that have occurred on the A452 near to Victoria Park, and ask that further traffic speed reduction measures be considered in addition to the recent implementation of an advance warning sign.</p> <p>4. Suggests that the LTP does not promote sufficient priority towards the proposed Park and Ride scheme for Warwick and Leamington Spa, and request that greater emphasis be placed upon it. Also requests that full consultation take place with the public and other interested to determine the most effective and suitable location for the Park and Ride scheme.</p> <p>5. Endorses the general strategy of promoting the use of public transport, and cites the success of the Route 66 bus service of efficient public transport.</p> <p>Suggests that the expansion of Sunday bus</p>	<p>1. Your support is noted and appreciated.</p> <p>2. Work is currently being undertaken by consultants acting on behalf of the County Council to identify what measures are required to bring air quality levels in existing Air Quality Management Areas within an acceptable standard. Once this work is completed, it will be used as an input to the Final LTP.</p> <p>3. Noted. As stated in paragraph 2.3.61 of the LTP, the County Council will use the new guidance the Government is expected to issue shortly in developing a new speed management strategy.</p> <p>4. Noted. Full consultation would be carried out on the detailed development of any Park and Ride site. A case has been made to Warwick District Council that a site to the south which serves both towns would provide the most transport benefits and this has been accepted in their 2nd deposit draft Local Plan. This case was supported by a series of 3 independent reports from consultants which progressively narrowed down the site selection from a broad range of sites located around both towns, to a single site to serve both towns. Such a site gains operational benefits from being able to serve both towns from a single facility. The use of a</p>

					services would further promote this as a viable alternative to the car.	single site also helps support the business case for park and ride in the area. 5. Noted. Sunday services on Route 66 are due to be increased from hourly to half hourly with effect from January 2006.
R077	Colin Staves	Stratford District Council (on behalf of the Avon Area Community Committee)	13/12/05	Letter	<p>1. The Committee concurred with the District Council's Executive Committee (see consultation R032).</p> <p>2. Raised concern over the considerable increase in traffic using the B4632, which is believed to have occurred as a result of the Bridgetown development, the opening of the Southern Relief Road Eastern Extension, and movements in relation to the former MOD site at Long Marston.</p> <p>3. Raised concern over the lack of an overall solution to traffic problems in the area, and the lack of a strategy in the LTP to address the problems.</p> <p>4. Noted that there is no formal mechanism for referring adopted Parish Plans to the County Council, as they often make reference to traffic and transport matters.</p> <p>5. Requested that the County Council be invited to attend a special meeting to discuss the overall strategy for managing transport and traffic in the area, and the proposals for the rural areas covered by the Committee</p>	<p>1. Noted. See R032 above.</p> <p>2. The County Council continuously monitor traffic at a number of sites around Stratford, including the B4632 near Clifford Chambers. Data from these counts suggests that in line with the trend across the town, traffic has risen over the last 10 years on this route. However, since the Southern Relief Road Eastern Extension was opened in 2003, traffic on the B4632 has in fact slightly declined.</p> <p>3. Within the funds available to the County Council through the LTP process, there are insufficient resources to fully address all of the shortfalls in the transport network of the County. The LTP aims to deliver a more efficient transport system through the way in which it is managed, whilst at the same time trying to provide sustainable transport provision to offer an alternative to the car. The various mode and delivery strategies, along with the geographic sections of the Plan that cover Stratford District (Southern and Western Warwickshire) set out the County Council's strategies to address transport problems in this part of Warwickshire.</p> <p>4. Officers from the District Council have been asked to address this issue, in conjunction with representatives from the County Council's Department of Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy Department.</p>
R078	Andrew A G	Wolfhampcote	16/12/05	Letter	1. Suggests that the Southam Shuttle bus	1. The primary purpose of the Southam Shuttle

	Grant	Parish Council			<p>service is a waste of public funds, and is poorly used by local people. Suggests that this is due to the majority of people in Flecknoe wanting to travel to Rugby or Daventry rather than Southam. Requests that the bus be rerouted to serve Daventry.</p> <p>2. Requests that a bus timetable be provided near to the bus stop in Flecknoe.</p>	<p>is to open up journey opportunities from the surrounding villages. Improved access to Southam supports its role as an important market town, and opens up longer journey opportunities (albeit via a change of bus) to Rugby and Leamington Spa.</p> <p>2. Noted. This request will be passed on to the County Council's Public Transport Operations group.</p>
--	-------	----------------	--	--	---	--

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –
17th January 2006**

**Warwickshire Provisional Local Transport Plan 2005 -
Results of Public Consultation**

LTP Consultees

The table below provides a list of all bodies and organisations who have been consulted throughout the development of the LTP.

ASK (A Station for Kenilworth) Action 21 Advantage West Midlands Arriva Midlands Barford Residents Association Birmingham City Council British Waterways Central Trains Centro (West Midlands Passenger Transport Executive) CEPOG (West Midlands Chief Engineers and Planning Officers Group) Chiltern Railways CLARA (Central Leamington Residents' Association) Connexions Council of Disabled People Countryside Agency Coventry & Warwickshire Chamber of Commerce Coventry & Warwickshire Partnership Coventry & Warwickshire Learning and Skills Council Coventry City Council CPRE CTC Warwickshire Community Volunteer Service English Heritage Environment Agency First Wyvern Freight Transport Association Friends of the Earth Geoff Amos Coaches Gloucestershire County Council	Government Office for the West Midlands Guide Dogs for the Blind Association Heart of England Tourist Board Highways Agency JobcentrePlus Johnson's Coaches Leamington Society Learning and Skills Council Leicestershire County Council Living Streets Mid-Warwickshire Chamber of Commerce Mike De Courcy Coaches Motorcycle Action Group Network Rail Midlands North Warwickshire Borough Council North Warwickshire PCT Northamptonshire County Council Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council Nuneaton & Bedworth Pedals Oxfordshire County Council Railfuture Midlands Ramblers Association (Warwickshire) Road Haulage Association Royal Leamington Spa Chamber of Trade Rugby Borough Council Rugby Civic Society Rugby Cycle Forum Rugby Primary Care Trust Rugby Rail Users Group Rugby Town Centre Company Rural Transport Partnership SALRUA Shakespeare Line Promotion Group Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
---	--

LTP Consultees (continued)

<p>South Warwickshire Primary Care Trust South Warwickshire Tourism Ltd Staffordshire County Council Stagecoach in Warwickshire Stratford Blue Stratford College Stratford Cycle Forum Stratford on Avon District Council Stratford Society Stratford Town Management Partnership Sustrans The National Federation of Bus Users Transport 2000 Travel West Midlands University & Kenilworth Station Campaigners Upper Avon Navigation Trust Virgin Trains Warwick Business Forum Warwick Castle</p>	<p>Warwick District Council Warwick District Cycle Forum Warwick Society Warwick Town Centre Business Group University & Kenilworth Station Campaigners Warwickshire Ambulance Service Warwickshire College Warwickshire County Council Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service Warwickshire Freight Quality Partnership Warwickshire MPs and MEPs Warwickshire Parish Councils Warwickshire Police Road Safety Unit Warwickshire Powered Two Wheeler Users Forum Warwickshire Rural Community Council Worcestershire County Council</p>
---	---