

## **Transport & Parking Report**

*Members: Ian Heggie (Chairman), Jonathan Birkett (Vice Chairman), Jenny Fradgley (Secretary), Roger Bennett (WCC), Roger Davis (SS), Elizabeth Dixon (Accessible Stratford and SS), Martyn Luscombe (Stratford Voice), Paul Ogden (SDC), Robin Sankey (SS), Geoff Turton (SDC), Clive Thomas (STC), and Pat Whitehouse (Retail) who replaced Joanne Sainsbury in early 2011.*

When the Town Management Partnership ceased operations, the Society consulted members through the Society's web page and also consulted members of the TMP through their Newsletter. Members were asked whether they thought the Society should take over the TMP's Transport & Parking Group. The answer was a resounding YES and the Business Improvement District asked if they could join the group as an equal partner. The Town Council also supported re-activation of the group and nominated Clive Thomas to represent STC on the group. The remaining members either volunteered, or were appointed -- based on their skills and experience -- by the Chair and Vice Chair. The first meeting was held on 22 April, when the group approved their terms of reference. The group agreed to meet monthly and review their operations at the end of 2010 to decide whether to continue. The December meeting carried out this review and agreed to continue operations for at least another 6 months.

The group has had a busy year and most of the key documents prepared are in the process of being placed on the Society's web page. The five main issues dealt with included:

(i) Proposed Stratford Parkway station. The group worked jointly with the Town Council on this. We had several reservations about the proposals. Many were of a technical nature and related to the traffic forecasts, lack of recognition that many of the current passengers are students travelling on low-cost fares and we had concerns about the way the costs had been prepared. However, we were mainly concerned that an un-manned station would not be DDA compliant (hence neither of the town's two stations would be able to properly accommodate passengers with disabilities) and that the Parkway station may result in the eventual closure of the existing town station. We likewise did not accept WCC's claim that additional parking could not be provided at -- or close to -- the existing town station. Since then, the government has withdrawn the original funding for the scheme and WCC is attempting to identify alternative funding sources. We will continue to oppose the present scheme until we are satisfied that it will not adversely affect the existing town station and that the new parkway station will be fully DDA compliant. [The Group's report on the project can be found here.](#)

(ii) Honeybourne rail line re-instatement. The last major study of this project was carried out by Halcrow Fox in 1996. It was a low-cost scheme that used a barrier controlled level crossing to get trains over the Evesham Place roundabout. However, in spite of being low cost, the scheme incurred an annual operating deficit of over £500,000. The new proposals plan to use cuttings with vertical sides and dive-under bridges to get past Evesham Place and Wetherby Way. This would seriously increase costs. We were therefore concerned that the scheme would be less economically viable than the Halcrow Fox scheme, while the dive-under bridges and cuttings would create serious technical problems in the vicinity of the Sanctus Road

bridge. In spite of these reservations, we nevertheless suggested that WCC should not dismiss such proposals out of hand and should be more open minded about the possibility of eventually reinstating this rail link. [The Group's report on the project can be found here.](#)

(iii) Demonstrating the value of a "civilised" street. We discussed the idea of trialling a shared space scheme in Windsor Street. It could be an ideal trial. Large numbers of coach passengers currently have to cross this busy road, often in large groups. Turning the street into a shared space scheme would slow down traffic and create a more pedestrian-friendly environment. We invited Guide Dogs for the Blind to join us in this discussion and we agreed to work jointly with them to try and create a civilised street. In the context of the current financial crisis, progress would be slow, although many of the initial steps are low cost and could be introduced incrementally as funds became available. We continue to work on this scheme. [The Group's proposals can be found here.](#)

(iv) BID parking survey. Two major parking surveys were carried out during the year, one by the BID and the other by the Town Council. The BID survey focussed on parking for employees (i.e., commuter parking) and parking for customers (mainly shoppers). The STC survey, on the other hand, focussed on residents' parking needs. The group helped to design the BID survey and contributed to the 3-page summary of the final report and it's Action Plan. Needless to say, the main recommendations included: (i) Park & Ride could -- and should -- be made more attractive to commuters; (ii) the half-hour parking limit in Bridge, Street, High Street and Union Street is no longer fit-for-purpose and should be replaced by a 1-hour limit; (iii) on-street and short stay parking charges should be reduced to make them more competitive with Warwick and Leamington (Stratford's short-stay tariff is higher even than Touchwood's); (iv) the long-stay tariff should be adjusted to discourage short stay users and lowered for stays of over 4 hours; (v) parking spaces should be clearly branded (e.g., for commuters, shoppers, etc.) to ensure they are used by the correct users; and (vi) the town needs to change the perception of parking in Stratford by launching a well-designed PR campaign. [A copy of the main findings of the survey, together with it's recommendations, can be found here.](#)

(v) Replacing Lucy's Mill bridge. Stratford Voice made a presentation to the group about Lucy's Mill Bridge and the desirability of replacing it with a new, fully DDA compliant alternative. The group generally supported the proposals, but understood that WCC had ruled out a replacement on the grounds that it could not be built within land currently owned (or controlled) by WCC. Private land would have to be compulsorily purchased and the owners had indicated that they would strongly oppose compulsory purchase proceedings. Against this background, the group suggested that Voice should attempt to raise sufficient funds to commission a technical feasibility study to ascertain whether a replacement bridge could be designed to fit within the land already controlled by WCC. The group offered to provide a letter of support for the scheme and suggested several ways in which the required funds might be raised to undertake the design exercise as a "community" project. If a replacement proved feasible, the project would then be handed back to WCC who would be expected to implement the scheme. [A copy of the Voice's proposal to replace the bridge can be found here.](#)

The group also commented on WCC's Local Transport Plan - version 3 (11 pages of comments, including 2 Annexes) and WCC's signage proposals for roads around the former Cattle Market site which is due to be redeveloped. [The comments on WCC's LTP3 can be found here](#), while the [letter sent about WCC's signage proposals can be found here](#).