

Individual respondents anonymised for privacy reasons. Local Authorities anonymised as a result of being in pre-election period at time of OSC consideration

Respondent	Comments
Private resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient public transport links. Specifically in Kingsbury • Frequency of services should be greater to Coleshill, Minworth and Fazeley
Local authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCC/LA already have a good working relationship • Several joint schemes in progress. Essential that this continues • LA Transport Strategy currently in development • Close alignment of LA's proposed strategic objectives with WCC's Key Themes • No cross boundary schemes on the indicative action plan. Scope to do so. Four schemes suggested for addition to the final Action Plan • LA supports the proposed LTP
Private sector business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTP4 important to respondent as a major employer in Warks • Owns some key sites in the county • Generates lots of commuter trips heavily dependent on cars • Seeking to implement demand management interventions • Strategic roads in Warks important for logistics • lists important policies for respondent; KP1 (support), KP3 (respondent also decarbonising), AT1 (support), AT2 (support, would like to be involved in working groups), PT1 (support), PT4 (support in principle, mindful of viability concerns); MV1 (support), MV2 (support, would like access to any data used/generated), MV4 (support in principle, will consider most appropriate HGV routing), MS1 (support), MS2 (agrees), MS3 support, especially re autonomous vehicles and EV charging), MS4 (supports, welcome further detailed consultation), MS6 (support in principle), F1 (support in principle, notes concerning viability), F2 (support in principle, not clear how this will be achieved), F4 (support and welcome, want more detail), F6 (support in principle, want detail),

	<p>F7 (will review more detailed guidance), ST5 (support in principle, would welcome further consultation on detail)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas where LTP could be strengthened – Not clear how the documents integrate together, could be considered generic, needs more of a focus on business as well as communities, needs further explanation of maximising developer contributions (MV3), Needs more on action plan development and scheme prioritisation/consultation, More focus on delivery (“Active travel infrastructure between Gaydon and Leamington Spa not delivered by WCC”, More detail on Park and Ride, More on suitable locations for DRT, Should emphasis modelling software used for TA at pre application, significant development should be defined.
Local authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Right goals and aspirations • Concerned about pace of change (too slow) • Not brave or radical • Continuation of existing approach that has achieved little • Active travel top of hierarchy is good. Think it may be symbolic • Infrastructure is slow to implement (K2L) • Comms around active travel should target motorists as well as cyclists/pedestrians • Should focus on improving active travel options within towns and improving active travel options between towns • Public transport strat lacks substance • Would like a policy of subsidising bus fares (more) • Car is important. EV wont solve all car related problems • Support proposals to promote non car dependent development. Want to understand how this relates to planning • Would like more 20 limits and ULEZs • Proposed LTP is a missed opportunity • Not radical enough • Needs targets.

Local authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A network of new cycle routes should be developed, in addition to making existing routes safer. • Safe cycling routes are welcomed but must be supported by safe and secure cycle parking / storage at relevant locations. • Public transport access between Leamington and Stratford is poor. • While the strategy identifies key strategies and objectives, it is unclear how these will be prioritised and resourced. It risks being something of a ‘wish list’. • Freight strategy - should seek to minimise damage to communities caused by the movement of freight vehicles.
Not-for-profit organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall broad support • PT1 - Want reference to supporting delivery of WM Rail Investment Strategy • PT2 - “new and improved” services, stations and interchanges • PT3 – Add something on “simpler fare structures” as these are a key regional ambition • Would like additional policy PT6 specifically supporting rail network enhancements to provide more freight capacity and improve rail connectivity • Freight strategy – not just WC main line that matters! Suggest change West coast mainline to “core main line rail network through Warwickshire” • Page 3 should mention the rail connected logistics terminals at Hams Hall and Birch Coppice. • Be more explicit about supporting rail infrastructure in F1
Private sector company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall supportive • Strong agreement with four key themes and overall transport vision • Key policies should reference importance of co-locating employment and residential development • Overall, keen to see more emphasis on working with developers as well as other partner organisations, and explicitly to support

	<p>developer led proposals for sustainable travel infrastructure and development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freight – be aware of developing govt policy • Freight - more emphasis on a shift to rail needed
Local Town Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for Integrated Transport Plan for Stratford which LTP4 doesn't deliver as too high level and not detailed enough • Want a town that is easy to move about in for all • Pedestrianised core • Multi-modal transport solutions, including public and private travel, active travel and "last mile" solutions
Local Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for travel hierarchy and that carbon reduction underpins policy choices • Community engagement is key • Core strategy does not clarify which, if any, of the key themes takes priority. WDC wants carbon reduction to do so. • WDC considers that a successful LTP4 needs to deliver the development strategy in SWLP. • AT – more detail, reference to design standards and link between infrastructure and behaviour change needed • PT – generally supportive esp. working with partners but stronger emphasis on value of PT in carbon reduction and reducing car dependency • MV – Low Traffic Neighbourhoods should be included here, benefit of network management on climate change, design guides should promote sustainable travel options • MS – welcome recognition of link between transport and place, improving places should be at the heart of transport decisions, 20 minute neighbourhoods need emphasising, promote active travel through improved town centres • ST – general support for this approach, design can be too car-focussed, people need to feel safe when travelling

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F – support; WCC needs to do more to facilitate the switch to alternative fuel vehicles and provide associated infrastructure • Dev Control framework – questions timing of RSAs and requests they occur after planning permission eg by condition; supportive of school travel plans and increased walking/pedestrian provision • Action and Monitoring Plans – more detail needed • Overall – not confident that net zero carbon will be achieved through these policies which don't have enough detail for them to be measurable
Private individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very supportive of plan in general • Environment should come first • Language should be stronger ie enable not encourage • Concept of modal shift and policies to enable it need to be stronger • Reduce motor-centric thought and focus on measures to reduce car dependency
Local authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports objectives of all strategies • We should focus on cross-boundary routes on all modes, by collaborating with respondent • Cotswold AONB – could PT5 be amended to acknowledge the Gloucestershire Community Rail Partnership due to our focus on Moreton-in-Marsh as key rail head for North Cotswold Line? • North Cotswold Line Task Force – we could use them to promote NCL rail and Moreton-in-Marsh improvements • Want more ambition on green infrastructure – saying we will be proactive. • Carbon emissions – want to work with us for our shared goals. • Supports Freight Strategy • Need to focus on collaboration on key routes such as A46, A429, A44 and rail, plus local routes, for cross-border issues around development and modelling. (Specific point – they think A429 shouldn't be in MRN)

Private individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children being driven to school is a major problem that we have ‘completely missed and ignored’ • Causes congestion, danger, emissions. Suggests parking fees for school drop-offs, and higher ‘car tax’ and other solutions outside our remit.
Private individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn’t clearly say supportive or not – most of the critical comments are to say we’re not doing things we have in fact included, but where the perception is they’re not being followed through on. Only one or two specific criticisms of policies/lack of. • Multiple (20+) comments suggesting minor wording changes to individual policies where we haven’t shown enough ‘commitment’. E.g. where we’ve said ‘we will seek to promote’ something, a comment says this should be ‘we will promote’. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Also, various comments where we have said measures ‘may’ include (because we will choose the most appropriate and not be able to use all), respondent says this must say ‘will’ include. • Core Strategy – ‘Warwickshire is not alone’ page is a ‘get out clause’. WCC should strive to lead. Car sharing, Car clubs and taxis should be mentioned, EVs don’t reduce congestion. • Active Travel – must keep promoting cycling as travel, not just sport. Believes signage is key to getting people cycling. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggests our tweets re: Road Safety can be ‘victim-blaming’ and excuse poor cycling. • Public Transport – environment should always be first listed priority (I think at one point we mention ‘economy’ first in PT strategy). Cross boundary ticketing needed, developments must have safe active travel routes to stations, Warwickshire should join TfWM. Pricing of rail not consistent – cheaper from Stratford to Bhm than from Nuneaton. Bus shelters are important.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motor Vehicles – there should not be a Motor Vehicle strategy. Could all fit into Managing Space. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need to talk more about induced demand from road building. Mention car clubs, car sharing, the waste of public space that parked cars take up. • Managing Space – same comments as under Motor Vehicles, broadly. We should make environment impact the first point always – page 6. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Doesn't support move to non-polluting private vehicles, says these references should be removed, as doesn't reduce car dependency. ○ Transport assessments are inadequate – WCC not robust enough with developers. • Safer Travel – actions needed, not just words in a strategy document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Replace VAS to make travel safer ○ Zero KSIs by 2050 not ambitious enough ○ We prioritise motor vehicle movements too often, e.g. new junction designs. ○ Education needs to be appropriate – focus on lights, not cycle helmets (Not quite clear what this point is getting at) • Freight – off road parking and charging facilities for freight needed, laybys not appropriate.
Local Transport Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not supportive • LTP says good things but too abstract, nothing of substance included, so will not achieve anything • Critical of: lack of Stratford specific plans; WCC not directly informing them; WCC not directly referring to Stratford documents. • Claims WCC still focused on road vehicle based investment.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT4 – developer funding for bus for Long Marston was not secured, despite what this policy says. • Generally this whole response is pro the Stratford-Honeybourne line reinstatement.
Local authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific criticisms of a few individual policies • Quick wins are needed, e.g. extending bus routes. • Core Strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bus understated throughout; development patterns (out of town shopping) hurts our plans; Action Plans clarity needed – when are they coming? • Active Travel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Walk/cycle not suitable for shopping trips or the less mobile ○ E-scooters need licences ○ PROWs need work [not for LTP?] • Public Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WCC need strategic, early work to promote buses, plus infrastructure, shelters, signs. • Motor Vehicles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Safety of P&R, park and stride sites – lighting etc ○ Charging points for EVs/hydrogen need a focus • Managing Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disappointed with statement – EVs most likely to be biggest significant change for rural locations – thinks we should focus on bus. • Freight Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Generally supports our strategy actually – key focus on HGVs using appropriate routes • Safer Travel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Says safety of women and children on public transport should be specifically covered.

Local transport group

- **Critical** of LTP because: very high level; consists mainly of policies, not detail; no long-term plan; not geographically specific to the needs of Warwickshire/Stratford. Does not support needs of Stratford town.
- Reactionary approach to transport
- Suggests we do what York City Council have done.
- (They have then supplied two documents explaining their approach to transport and how we could do things – but these aren't a response to the LTP consultation – pre-existing local documents. They also broadly suggest ideas that we agree with and suggest in the LTP)