

1. Introduction

As a highway/transport engineer I have tried to constructively comment on this aspect in the two sections town and infrastructure (transport).

It is a formidable document to follow and so I can understand if there has been a poor response from the public. as

I found the following features/ omissions made it a struggle to get to grips with a 'VISION' flowing down to more specifics, if needed:

- a the tactical fragmented nature of considered needs, favoured schemes and priorities, some at great detail and then some vague and none coming under an overriding plan/vision
- b no proper transport vision such as that clearly portrayed in 'The Walkable Core' draft by Arup in 2009 that appeared to have support of the day from what I can glean 'on line'.
- c no mention of restricting certain traffic into the town (maybe periodically)
- d agonisingly long winded explanations
- e unlikely/unrealistic needs

The document recently supplied by the Transport Group of the Stratford Society on a Strategic Overview...of SOA Transport Arrangements appears to cover all of our issues concisely giving the flexibility needed by not trying to be too specific in all cases.

I believe that document could be quickly adapted to an objective/s and a list of policies.

2. General comment for Transport matters

The overall major objective should be a major transport study tackling the problems identified and allowing for an assumed development over the next 20 years.

This main objective request is probably too late in the day and so you will have to progress with your tactical level of trouble shooting. However it should be in the NP and this would subsume items 1 and 2 of INF1 and really item 5 as well but you really are obliged to run with the latter not knowing all the required background input.

The traffic modelling that we are getting for developer schemes are generally limited to the immediate development only. The schemes coming from WCC and developers traffic modelling supposedly have a 10% excess capacity in them. Apparently a developer legally does not have to contribute to an improvement in capacity but only allow extra traffic from his scheme.

It is a shame that if we are going to spend money on a traffic/transport scheme to allow a development we cannot state that it must have 50% extra capacity so that we get at least 10 years of respite! What about putting that policy into your document?

Another reason for requesting a 50% cushion is that the accuracy of this traffic modelling can be + or – 20% and is difficult if not impossible to audit. This accuracy will depend on

whether there are errors in input, the very nature of the road systems and traffic. It is very unlikely that for instance the detrimental movement/manoeuvring of heavy good vehicles at the southern end of Clopton bridge can be accommodated in the model....?

3. Birmingham Road

Regarding the Birmingham Road situation I really believe we have lost a marvellous opportunity to provide some sort of relief road for that area. We now are at least aware of possible access to the back of the Maybird centre but we should be seriously considering using the rail line from the town station to the 'new' Parkway Station as an access road. An extravagant £7 million pounds on the Parkway Station, a medium to long term asset, has given us an opportunity to free up the rail line and no one has picked this up.

This of course will be controversial particularly as money has been spent on the old station but it is a case of overall best solution from what we have. The old station can still be a tourist and admin centre.

4. INF1

Should be

a) a main report as discussed above and the below will be ongoing to dovetail the main report

- merits of reliefs roads, one way systems
- possibility of re distributing traffic at peak times (although where has this come from?)
- increase shared space within the town road network as in the WCC 'Walkable Core' report for the town, (Arup, 2009)
- reduce some motorised access to town and improve inner town parking provision
- pursue park and ride facilities with town parking policy
- adopt consultant (JMP, 2013) recommendations for Birmingham Road

5. TC 13

Amend/add to title - Improving the balance between motorised vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists (shared space) -*use this term – it is the national terminology now.*

Prioritise your a, b and c by all means but do include all the streets identified in the excellent report –Walkable Core by Arup (2009), also refer to comments below on this report. The objectives of this report are succinctly written and would be brilliant in this part of the NP if not in an introductory section where I do not get the feel of 'shared space'.5 a) Comments on the Arup final report on the 'Stratford walkable core, 2009'.

Copies of this report appeared to disappear with World class Stratford and I have finally managed to get a copy.

This, in my opinion, is an excellent report bearing in mind it was presented in 2009 and appeared to be with wide ranging town support. It really has core material for our NP and is more significant today than when it was presented.

It introduces the issues in a rational and clear way that would be useful to incorporate into the NP.

1 Executive Summary

Spot on aims

Has the recommended, scheme option 2, disappeared with the demise of 'World Class Stratford?'

There appeared to be widespread discussion and acceptance of the recommended scheme if not the time frame. P8 and p 19

The historic spine route and sign de clutter are the only adopted elements of 15 recommendations. One more is pending (High Street 'pedestrianising') P7

What happened to the recommended delivery programme? P8

2 The Introduction

The wording here is just what is needed for our NP

3 A Strategic Business case

Stresses the need for 'a vision' as a constant check for the business case /funding based on the 'Shakespeare asset'

4 Consultation and liaison

Option 2 favoured – what happened to that? P 33

5 Shared space

This has been clearly identified here. Let's use this term more.

6 Development of assessment and monitoring criteria

Objectives set perfectly and then an excellent tabulation of assessing each objective resulting in Option 2. Can we not learn from such rationale?

6. Fig 2 Proposals map

a) I appreciate it is a small scale map but it appears that there is only one existing cycle route shown south east of the river and plenty of omissions on the north also.

Are proposed routes supposed to go on this map also? You have listed these.

b) can we emphasise 'Shared Space'

It would be good to mark ALL the proposed shared space streets in the town as identified in the Arup report ie Bridge, High, Wood, Sheep, Church, Southern lane (Windsor, Ely, Chapel ...)

7. TRANSPORT VISION – what I believe is needed

I attach my idea of VISION with some support refs

The aim is to improve access within the town of Stratford on Avon through a wholesale redesign of all roads (main and town centre) based on a shared transport corridor space approach, freeing up pedestrians and cyclists to enjoy the nature of the town in a safe environment.

To enhance this vision decisions to attract some traffic away from SOA are necessary combined with selected restrictions on town centre access for motorised traffic and a 20mph blanket speed limit in the centre and for some main roads.

a) Reminders of supporting intent by WCC to support THE VISION

An 'Accessibility Strategy' is vital to achieving the vision and objectives of The Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) [1]. It is essential to prevent congestion eroding quality of life, business and retail effectiveness. It must also reflect national, regional and local policy and it must attempt to reduce impact of transport on both the people and environment in terms of journey experience, safety, security, health and global warming [1].

It is noted that the primary aim of the County Council's Land Use and Transportation Strategy is to inspire sustainable patterns of development in the future for Warwickshire through the promotion of better integration of land use and transport[1]. The Land Use and Transportation Strategy contributes to achieving the key objectives set in the Local Transport Plan by promoting sustainable development which offers accessibility to all and giving people more travel options [2].

The Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG13) aims are to integrate planning and transport to promote more sustainable transport choices, promote accessibility to employment opportunities and services by public transport, cycling and walking and reduce the overall need to travel [1].

Also there is an action in the Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 to reduce congestion through encouragement to use sustainable modes of transport for short journeys in urban areas, promote changes in travel habits and the like.

It has already been stated above that a significant portion of journeys in the Stratford urban area are locally generated. Further housing, in particular, and business proposals are unlikely to change that trend. Simply adding another portion of a ring road in itself will not significantly improve congestion.

The councils will need to manage the introduction and acceptance of multi modal transport (shared space) rather than full integration to start with as there will need to be a massive mind shift to reverse the trend of increasing transport speeds through the 20 th century.

Refs

- [1] Warwickshire County Council, Warwickshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026: Accessibility, Pages 126-151
- [2] Warwickshire County Council, Warwickshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026: Land use and transportation, Pages 172-182
- [3] Warwickshire County Council, Warwickshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026: Walking strategy, Pages 348-362

Dr Richard Freer-Hewish July 2015

PhD Transportation and Highway Engineering

Submission to NP draft vers2final July 2015