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1.0 Introduction

Stirling Council is in the process of revising its local transport strategy, which is now ten years’ old, and has produced a ‘Main Issues Consultation Report’ to reflect current challenges. We have set out the transport ‘package’ that is required to help deliver the growth aspirations contained within the Stirling Local Development Plan and the Stirling City Development Framework.

1.1 Issues

The Main Issues Consultation Report suggests that the key issues our LTS needs to address are:

- Road safety;
- Road maintenance;
- The transport network having gaps so not everyone able to access jobs, services and opportunities;
- Lack of opportunities to walk and cycle;
- Enabling economic growth;
- Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors;
- Impacts of traffic on health and the environment; and
- Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling.

Addressing all these issues can only be undertaken in partnership with everyone: public sector agencies, private sector providers, and Stirling’s people.

1.2 Objectives

To address these issues and help deliver our aspirations, we want to ensure that our transport network results in:

- **Safer Stirling**: fewer accidents and casualties;
- **Connected Stirling**: journey times are maintained and improved, and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling improved
- **Active and sustainable Stirling**: more trips made by walking, cycling and public transport;
- **Inclusive Stirling**: a transport network which enables everyone to access jobs, services and opportunities;
- **A Quality Place**: our streets enhance Stirling as a place and the experience of people in it; and
- **A well maintained and managed integrated transport network**: one that works for everyone.

The consultation on transport issues in Stirling ran from 2nd August to 30th September 2016. The approach included engaging with key stakeholder organisations, and the public through meetings and public consultation events. The main source of feedback from the public has been through an online survey.
Overall 513 respondents completed the questionnaire. Eight Community Councils, eight key stakeholder organisations, three residents, two neighbouring local authorities and one regional transport partnership also provided detailed comments.

1.3 Engaging with key stakeholders: community councils and organisations

35 key stakeholder organisations were sent a letter informing them of the LTS consultation and inviting them to forward their views. A letter was also sent to every Community Council in Stirling. Articles were included in Stirling Council's Community Newsletter and Stirlingshire Voluntary Enterprise e-bulletin. 20 meetings were also held with representatives from a number of the organisations.

1.4 Engaging with key stakeholders: the public

In order to ensure maximum public awareness of the LTS consultation, it was advertised using the following:

- Public consultation events: 22 events were held throughout the area;
- Press Advert;
- Press Release;
- Stirling Council’s website;
- Social Media;
- Leaflets;
- Posters; and
- Email to all Stirling Council employees.

1.5 Report Structure

Section 2 of this report presents a summary of the main results of the public consultation.

Section 3 presents a summary of the main results of the consultation undertaken with community councils and key organisations.

A full list of key stakeholder organisations we engaged with, including a list of meetings and organisations who provided a response can be found in Appendix A.

More details of how we engaged with the public can be found in Appendix B.

A summary of issues raised during meetings, and of organisations’ responses can be found in Appendix C, with full responses in Appendix D.

A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix E and full analysis of the results can be found in Appendix F. The proposed localities map for Stirling is in Appendix G.
2.0 Summary of questionnaire results and main issues raised: the public

The main source of feedback from the public was through an online survey. Overall 513 respondents completed the questionnaire.

2.1 Summary of questionnaire results

Key issues
99% of 506 respondents agree that the following issues need to be considered when delivering the second Local Transport Strategy:

- Road Safety;
- Road Maintenance;
- Ability of transport network to enable everyone to access jobs, services and opportunities;
- Opportunities to walk and cycle;
- Ability of the transport network to promote and accommodate economic growth;
- Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors;
- Impacts of traffic on health and the environment; and
- Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling.

Of the 165 respondents who added comments about the issues:

- 32% of respondents feel public transport is an issue; and
- 27% of respondents feel lack of safe cycle routes is an issue.

34% of the 244 respondents who provided comments regarding other important issues that should be contained within the LTS answered ‘public transport’, with the following public transport issues specifically being mentioned:

- Access to Forth Valley Royal Hospital;
- Frequency of services;
- Lack of provision of public transport;
- Lack of connectivity between rural areas and between rural area and city;
- Routes;
- Impact of lack of public transport on older people and mobility impaired;
- Lack of public transport in the evenings;
- Cost of public transport; and
- Integrated bus and rail services.

Rural and city issues
The top three most important rural issues were ranked by 490 respondents as:

- Road safety (29%);
- Road maintenance (26%); and
- Road maintenance (18%).
The top three most important city issues were ranked by 491 respondents as:
- Road safety (27%);
- Road maintenance (25%); and
- Quality of roads and street environment (19%).

Objectives and overarching strategy
There is strong support for the proposed objectives and overarching strategy:
- 89% of 417 respondents think the proposed objectives will help address the issues they feel need to be addressed.
- 82% of 381 respondents think that the overarching strategy will help deliver the proposed objectives.

Delivery plans
In terms of the delivery plans:
- 54% of 262 respondents said they agree/strongly agree that the measures in the City Transport Plan will address the key issues.
- 50% of 262 respondents said they agree/strongly agree that the measures in the Active Travel Plan will address the key issues.
- 48% of 262 respondents said they agree/strongly agree that the measures in the Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan will address the key issues.

From the 115 respondents who felt that other measures should be included in the delivery plans (Active Travel Plan; City Transport Plan; Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan):
- 29% provided ‘other comments’ on:
  - Public consultation;
  - Pollution and climate change;
  - Funding and timescales in Active Travel Plan; and
  - Equality.

- 26% stated that measures that provide opportunities to walk and cycle are:
  - Segregated cycle paths;
  - Shared pavements; and
  - Comprehensive strategic cycle and walking network plan.

- 23% stated that measures related to public transport include:
  - Frequency of public transport;
  - Cost of public transport;
  - Provision of public transport;
  - A wider network of park and ride to cover all geographical routes into the city centre;
  - Coordination between bus and rail services so buses wait for trains as much as possible;
  - Rural public transport;
  - Public transport to access services; and
Public transport to access Forth Valley Royal Hospital.

Car or bus travel: increase in traffic congestion
The majority of 290 respondents (75%) would be prepared to accept no more than a 10 minute increase in journey time because of an increase in traffic congestion, with 60% using the same mode but with a different route or time if the journey time increased to beyond what they consider to be acceptable.

When asked what they would be prepared to do to minimise congestion in the long term 56% of 304 respondents stated they would use public transport more often, 48% said they would cycle more often, 38% said they would walk more often and 20% said they would be travel less often, if their journeys permitted.

Car driver
49% of 249 respondents who currently travel as a car driver do have the option of using a different mode of travel, for example: walk; cycle; car share; use bus or rail.

Respondents would be able to make this travel choice:
- 42% five days or more;
- 22% three days or more;
- 21% two days or more;
- 12% one day; and
- 3% four days a week.

About respondents’ travel
The majority of 418 respondents (72%) gave work as the reason for their main daily trip, with 63% of 408 respondents making this journey 5 days per week and 54% of 415 respondents making this journey as a car driver.

When asked about the duration of their main trip (one-way), 40% of 408 respondents stated that it normally lasts between 0 and 15 minutes, with 33% of respondents stating between 16 and 30 minutes.

Origin – Destination Travel Data
The 151 respondents who travel from the City of Stirling for their main daily trip are travelling to:
- The Urban North (57%);
- The Urban South (25%);
- North Rural Stirling (4%);
- South Rural Stirling (2%);
- Falkirk (4%);
- Clackmannanshire (2%);
- Outwith Forth Valley (7%); and
- Within the City of Stirling, which covers part of Urban North and Urban South (76%).
The 141 respondents who travel from the Urban North for their main daily trip are travelling to:

- The Urban North (62%);
- The Urban South (21%);
- North Rural Stirling (5%);
- South Rural Stirling (2%);
- Falkirk (2%);
- Clackmannanshire (1%);
- Outwith Forth Valley (10%); and
- Within the City of Stirling, which covers part of Urban North and Urban South (69%).

The 102 respondents who travel from the Urban South for their main daily trip are travelling to:

- The Urban North (51%);
- The Urban South (34%);
- North Rural Stirling (4%);
- South Rural Stirling (3%);
- Falkirk (4%);
- Clackmannanshire (3%);
- Outwith Forth Valley (4%); and
- Within the City of Stirling, which covers part of Urban North and Urban South (79%).

The 65 respondents who travel from the Rural North for their main daily trip are travelling to:

- The Urban North (36%);
- The Urban South (17%);
- North Rural Stirling (23%);
- South Rural Stirling (2%);
- Falkirk (3%);
- Clackmannanshire (2%);
- Outwith Forth Valley (16%); and
- Within the City of Stirling, which covers part of Urban North and Urban South (50%).

The 65 respondents who travel from the Rural South for their main daily trip are travelling to:

- The Urban North (21%);
- The Urban South (16%);
- North Rural Stirling (3%);
- South Rural Stirling (21%);
- Falkirk (5%);
- Clackmannanshire (0%);
- Outwith Forth Valley (37%); and
• Within the City of Stirling, which covers part of Urban North and Urban South (45%).

Infrastructure
From the 318 respondents who stated what would encourage them to walk or cycle more often, 53% stated more/improved cycle and walking paths, in particular:
• Wider footways;
• Safe crossing points;
• Safer roads;
• Better, safer cycling infrastructure;
• Better cycling routes into Stirling from Clackmannanshire;
• Continuous and direct cycle routes;
• More dedicated cycleways;
• Cleaner and better maintained routes;
• Well connected routes;
• Cycle routes that are kept free of ice and snow;
• Slower traffic; and
• More / better cycle parking in the city centre.

From the 346 respondents who stated what would encourage them to use bus or rail more often:
• 42% stated more frequent services / stops; and
• 24% stated cheaper fares.

From the 269 respondents who answered what would encourage them to use the Park & Ride more:
• 47% stated ‘nothing’:
  o Already use it;
  o Time constraint;
  o Not convenient;
  o Don’t drive;
  o Not applicable to current situation;
  o Not viable as route not close to P&R sites;
  o Other options such as walk/cycle into Stirling city are available and more attractive / viable;
  o Rely on car and need during day for job;
  o Don't favour this option;
  o Don’t trust buses would stick to schedule; and
  o Frequency of bus services.
• 19% stated more locations / routes/ stops.
• 19% stated ‘other’:
  o When it significantly improved journey time;
  o Better advertising of service, including provision of information regarding locations /costs/ service timings;
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- A more reliable bus service;
- More drop off / pick up points in city centre;
- Secure and free parking with good public transport links;
- Duration of journey;
- Parking in city centre being limited and expensive / less parking available in city centre;
- Knowledge that a parking space is likely to be available;
- More security and spaces where you can actually open the doors fully;
- Cycle parking; and
- Nextbike station at the park and ride.

- 9% stated more frequent services / greater range of times.
- 5% stated cheaper fares / free.

Strategic Environmental Assessment – Environmental Report: Overall LTS Comments

30 respondents provided comments regarding the overall LTS when considering the Strategic Environmental Assessment – Environmental Report, with:

- 40% of comments relating to ‘other issues’:
  - Accessibility;
  - Collection of rubbish and keeping Stirling clean;
  - Craigs roundabout;
  - Protecting environment and assets;
  - More environmental friendly travel modes;
  - Increase in emissions; and
  - Partnership working; specifically between Stirling Council Internal Departments.

- 23% of comments relating to ‘walking / cycling’:
  - Safe crossing points;
  - Cycle routes to suit all cycling capabilities’;
  - Look to other countries such as Amsterdam for good examples of active travel;
  - Priorities pedestrians and cyclist in city centre;
  - Behaviour change is also needed; and
  - Cyclists not using cycle lanes.

- 23% of comments relating to ‘public transport’:
  - Lack of rural public transport; and
  - High cost of public transport”.

- 10% of comments relating to ‘traffic’:
  - Increasing traffic volumes; and
  - Concerns regarding the volume of lorries and vans travelling through Bridge of Allan.

- 3% of comments relating to ‘major infrastructure projects’:
  - Concerns regarding Kildean-Cornton Link Road.
Socio-economic data
- 83% of 510 respondents own a car;
- 40% of 510 respondents are male;
- 60% of 509 respondents are female;
- 51% of 509 respondents are in the 45-64 age group, 32% are in the 25 – 44 age group, 13% are in the 65+ age group, and 3% are in the 16-24 age group; and
- 61% of 508 respondents are working full-time, 16% are working part-time and 16% are retired;
- 36% of 509 respondents live in the Urban North;
- 25% of 509 respondents live in the Urban South;
- 15% of 509 respondents live in the Rural North;
- 11% of 509 respondents live in the Rural South;
- 6% of 509 respondents live in Clackmannanshire;
- 3% of 509 respondents live in Falkirk;
- 4% of 509 respondents live outwith Forth Valley; and
- 37% of 509 respondents live in the City of Stirling, which covers part of Urban North and Urban South.

2.2: Summary of issues raised at public events

Overall the issues raised at the public events can be split into the following themes:

Opportunities to walk and cycle
- Lack of cycle parking;
- Lack of dedicated cycle lanes;
- Incomplete cycle routes; and
- Quality of street environment.

Public transport
- Recent cuts in public transport services;
- Lack of public transport in general;
- Unable to access Forth Valley Royal Hospital using public transport;
- Unable to access employment using public transport, especially in rural area; and
- Cost of public transport.

Road Maintenance
- Lack of maintained roads and pavements.

Parking
- Lack of enforcement;
- Parking around schools; and
- Parking in cycle lanes.

Road Safety
- Speeding traffic.
3.0 Summary of main issues raised: community councils and organisations

The main issues raised by key stakeholder organisations can be split into the following themes:

Active Travel
- Lack of dedicated active travel revenue and capital funding from Stirling Council;
- No Active Travel Steering Group; and
- No detailed Active Travel Action Plan.

Public Transport
- Lack of public transport services, especially in rural area;
- Lack of public transport adversely affecting vulnerable groups;
- DRT good idea but only if able to link to scheduled bus service;
- Improving connectivity in South West of Stirling; and
- Cost.

Access to jobs, services and opportunities
- Lack of public transport affecting access to key services; and
- Distances to travel in rural west Stirling may preclude walking or cycling to above.

Road Maintenance
- Maintenance of roads in rural area, including winter gritting and maintenance of pavements;
- Maintenance of roads and paths in some city areas, eg, Braehead;
- Maintenance of non-adopted paths that are well used;
- Provide schedule of maintenance work so all paths are maintained to a suitable standards of use; and
- Lack of pavements in some rural areas, eg Balfron.

Parking
- Lack of parking enforcement;
- No Parking Strategy consulted on as part of exercise; and
- More consideration to be given to vulnerable groups, eg, disabled and older people.

Road Safety
- Concerns regarding speeding traffic through some villages;
- 20mph limits to be applied city wide and in residential areas; and
- Include cyclists as vulnerable users.

Modal Shift
- Consider promoting working at home.

Community Engagement
- Engaging with community before a project commences and throughout lifecycle of project.

**Opportunities to walk and cycle**
- A more integrated and connected network of foot and cycle paths is required;
- Key routes to walk and cycle;
- Factor in providing seats / bike racks along walking / cycling routes;
- Extending bike hire schemes to rural area;
- Segregated cycling lanes from fast moving traffic, eg, in Causewayhead;
- Comfort Partnership needed;
- Walking and cycling infrastructure needs to be of a consistent standard that is easy and accessible for all types of user; and
- Cycle network to be completed as a priority.

**Major road building schemes**
- Viewforth Link Road: objections received from Braehead Community Council and Kings Park Community Council;
- M9 motorway junction onto A811: objection received from Kings Park Community Council;
- Kildean - Cornton - Airthrey Road: objections received from Bridge of Allan Community Council; Causewayhead Community Council raised concerns; University of Stirling’s support is highly qualified at this stage;
- Bridge of Allan Station Relocation: objection received from Bridge of Allan Community Council; Causewayhead Community Council raised concerns; and
- Request by Dunblane Community Council for Transport Scotland to bring forward removal of Keir roundabout.
Appendix A: Engaging with key stakeholders: organisations

A letter was sent to the following key stakeholder organisations, informing them of the LTS consultation and inviting them to forward their views on:

- The issues and priorities the LTS needs to address;
- How we propose to address these issues (objectives / overarching strategy / targets / delivery plans etc); and
- How any LTS delivery and monitoring process captures and promotes the activities of your organisation that address the issues identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cycling Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Living Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sustrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scotrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transport Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Road Haulage Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Paths for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Freight Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Network Rail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional and Neighbouring Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sestran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tactran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hitrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clackmannanshire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. East Dunbartonshire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Falkirk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park Authority (LLTNPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Perth and Kinross Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Argyll and Bute Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. North Lanarkshire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Stirling and Tayside Timber Transport Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. NHS Forth Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emergence Services: Police; Fire Service; and Ambulance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Forth Valley College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University of Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cycle Stirling (Forth Environment Link)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sustainable Stirling (Forth Environment Link)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Stirlingshire Voluntary Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Taxi operators in Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stirling Area Access Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prudential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. FES Electrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. United Auctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ogilvie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. All Stirling Community Councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electronic communication

- An email regarding the LTS consultation was sent to the Community Planning Partnership: Tackling Poverty and Inequalities Group;
- Articles appeared in the following e-newsletters
  - Stirling Council Community Newsletter
- Stirlingshire Voluntary Enterprise e-bulletin

**20 meetings were held with key stakeholders:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Member modelling session</td>
<td>21/07/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Future Major Infrastructure Projects</td>
<td>24/08/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cross boundary constraints and opportunities</td>
<td>21/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transport Issues in LLTNP</td>
<td>26/08/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Active Travel Plan: workshop 1</td>
<td>9/08/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Active Travel Plan: workshop 2</td>
<td>7/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Higher Education</td>
<td>19/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Public Transport Operators</td>
<td>1/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. DRT Operators</td>
<td>08/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Prudential</td>
<td>22/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bridge of Allan Community Council</td>
<td>16/08/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wallace Area Forum</td>
<td>25/08/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Kings Park Community Council</td>
<td>6/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Area Five Community Forum</td>
<td>22/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Raploch Community Partnership, Community Council and Church reps</td>
<td>28/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cornton Community Council</td>
<td>28/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Causewayhead Community Council</td>
<td>3/10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Braehead Community Council</td>
<td>26/09/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Economic Growth</td>
<td>21/10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. NHSFV</td>
<td>24/10/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses
Responses were received from:
Eight Community Councils:
  1. Bridge of Allan
  2. Balfron
  3. Braehead
  4. Buchannan
  5. Dunblane
  6. Kings Park
  7. Killearn
  8. Causewayhead

Eight key stakeholder organisations:
  1. SNH
  2. Paths for All
  3. Cycle Stirling
  4. University of Stirling
  5. Stirling Area Access Panel
  6. Sustrans
  7. Killearn Community Futures Company
  8. Network Rail

One regional partnership and two neighbouring local authorities:
  1. Tactran
  2. East Dunbartonshire Council
  3. Clackmannanshire Council
Appendix B: Engaging with key stakeholders: the public

In order to ensure maximum public awareness of the LTS consultation, it was advertised using the following:

Press Advert
- Prior to the consultation beginning, two adverts were placed in local newspapers (the Stirling Observer and The Courier) stating where and when the LTS public consultation events would be taking place.

Press Release
- A press release also appeared in the Stirling Observer prior to the LTS consultation and again mid-way through the process (27 July; 31st August and 2nd September).

Social Media
- The overall consultation was advertised on Facebook and every individual event was also advertised. Twitter was also used to promote the consultation.

Leaflets
- Leaflets advertising the overall consultation and the online questionnaire were distributed to encourage participation and completion of the questionnaire by as many people as possible.

Posters
- Posters were sent out to the majority of the venues to promote the event.

Stirling Council’s website
- The consultation was advertised on Stirling’s Council website. A webpage was also set up to explain why the consultation was taking place and how people could respond, links to all the documents and an online questionnaire were included.

Email
- As one of the biggest employers in Stirling, an email was sent to all Stirling Council employees advertising the online questionnaire and consultation.

Public Consultation Events
- 22 public consultation events were held throughout the area, including attending the Cowie Fun Day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Area Planning Forum</th>
<th>Number attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Cambuskenneth Village Hall</td>
<td>Wallace¹</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cambusbarron Community</td>
<td>Forum Five ²</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ includes communities of Braehead & District, Bridge of Allan, Cambuskenneth, Causewayhead, Cornton, Mercat Cross & City Centre, Raploch, Riverside.
² includes communities of Borestone, Broomridge, Cambusbarron, Kings Park and Torbex.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Raploch Community Campus</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cornton Community Centre</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cowie Centre</td>
<td>East Stirling</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Old Viewforth, Pitt Terrace</td>
<td>Wallace and Forum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Allan Centre, Bridge of Allan</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The Dunblane Centre</td>
<td>Dunblane</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mayfield Centre, St Ninians</td>
<td>Forum Five</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Balfour Centre, Plean</td>
<td>East Stirling</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Callander Burgh Chambers</td>
<td>Trossachs Area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Killelearn Village Hall</td>
<td>Rural South West</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cowie Fun Day</td>
<td>East Stirling</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Blairdrummond Community</td>
<td>Trossachs Area</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Muir Hall, Doune</td>
<td>Trossachs Area</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gartmore Village Hall</td>
<td>Trossachs Area</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hillpark Community Centre,</td>
<td>East Stirling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strathblane Library</td>
<td>Rural South West</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Killin Lesser Hall</td>
<td>Breadalbane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Crianlarich Village Hall</td>
<td>Breadalbane</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Drymen Library</td>
<td>Rural South West</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The Alpha Centre, Fallin</td>
<td>East Stirling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 includes communities of Bannockburn, Cowie, Hillpark & Milton, Plean, Polmaise and Throsk.
4 includes communities of Callander, Gartmore, Kilmadock, Port of Menteith, Strathard, Thornhill & Blairdrummond and Trossachs
5 includes communities of - Arnprior, Balfron, Buchanan, Buchlyvie, Carron Valley & District, Croftamie, Drymen, Fintry, Gargunnock, Killearn, Kippen and Strathblane.
6 includes communities of Balquhidder, Killin and Strathfillan (and St Fillans National Park).
**Appendix C: Summary of issues raised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting with key stakeholders</th>
<th>Summary of main points raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Member modelling session** | - Any consideration of new / relocated stations should consider a halt at Causewayhead.  
- Is congestion a short (eg peak hour) or extended problem (eg peak period)?  
- People won’t change behaviour until forced / people unlikely to walk/cycle more.  
- What are the impacts of City Development Framework on likely trips?  
- What are the scenarios without the link roads?  
- What will be the impact of the Kildean to Airthrey road link on the Causewayhead/Alloa Rd/ Airthrey Rd roundabout?  
- How do we fund the package? |
| Date: 21/07/16 | |

**Attendees:**  
- Councillors: McLoughlin, Farmer, Thomson, Simpson and Weir;  
- Stirling Council Officers  

| **2. Future Major Infrastructure Projects** | |
| Date: 24/08/16 | - What are the assumptions of demand based on? In particular, trips generated by City Development Framework?  
- What mitigation measures will be put in place to maintain pedestrian and cycle routes across Queens Rd / Snowdon Pl after Viewforth Link goes in?  

**Attendees:**  
- Kings Park Community Council;  
- Bridge of Allan Community Council;  
- Dunblane Community Council; and  
- Stirling Council Officers. |
### 3. Cross boundary constraints and opportunities

**Date:** 21/09/16

**Attendees from:**
- Clackmannanshire Council,
- East Dunbartonshire Council,
- Falkirk Council;
- North Lanarkshire Council;
- Sestrans;
- Tactran; and
- Stirling Council.

- What impact will housing proposals in Clackmannanshire / Fife (Long Gannet) / Falkirk have on attractiveness of Durieshill and South Stirling Gateway?
- Strategic park and ride (coach and rail): relationships with Clackmannashire and Falkirk.
- Concern re congestion in Stirling City, especially on A9 / Bannockburn and Causewayhead affecting cross boundary services to Alloa / Falkirk / hospital.
- Rarely does planning process take account of neighbouring authorities identifying major developments along the same corridor, and their cumulative impact.
- Agreed for Stirling to circulate cross boundary issues, authorities to consider consequence, and hence take a view as to whether these are issues that would benefit from working on together
  - Falkirk: A9 / A905 / A872 / NCN76;
  - Clacks: A91 / A907 / NCN76; and
  - E Dunbartonshire: A81 (nb preparing a STAG for the A81 corridor, including considering enhanced p&r at Milngavie) / Active travel loop (Mugdock-Strathblane-West Highland way) / Green network access into Campsie Fells / road safety on A81.

### 4. Transport Issues in LLTNP

**Date:** 26/08/16

**Attendees from:**
- LLTNP;
- Transport Scotland;
- Tactran; and
- Stirling Council

- Need for road bridge to enable development of Callander to south of River Teith beyond the current LDP period;
- Public realm / High Street aspirations for Callander;
- Seasonal parking issues in Drymen and Balmaha;
- LTS TVRA reflect Five Lochs Visitor Management Plans;
- Road safety in Glen Ogle;
- Ability to access jobs, services and opportunities across rural area;
- Concern amongst communities re road maintenance;
- Access (to/from Crianlarich / Tyndrum) via A82;
- Development of long distance active travel routes, including linking NCN765 to NCN7 at Callander; and
- Need to establish transport package and contributions process for Callander;

### 5. Active Travel Plan: workshop1

**General**
### Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy: Consultation 2nd August – 30th September 2016

#### Date: 9/08/16

**Attendees from:**
- Cycle Stirling;
- Stirling Council;
- Sustrans;
- Tactran;
- Active Stirling;
- Recyke-A-Bike;
- Scottish Natural Heritage;
- Cycling Scotland;
- Clackmannanshire Council; and
- Representative from Mark Ruskell, MSP, office

- The action plan needs to have a lot more detail in it, with specific timescales, detail of each action, estimated costs for implementation.
- Governance;
- Strategic and economic development;
- Infrastructure and maintenance;
- Promotions and travel planning;
- Education;
- Workplaces;
- Partnership working; and
- Monitoring
  - Consistent collection of core indicators from a number of different partners and collated centrally and fed into an annual report to showcase progress towards modal shift.

#### 6. Active Travel Plan: workshop 2

**Date: 7/09/16**

**Attendees from:**
- Cycle Stirling;
- Stirling Council;
- Tactran;
- Cycling Scotland;
- Sustrans;
- Stirling Bike Club; and
- University of Stirling.

- Most significantly from this process, participants highlighted the need for a more robust action plan as well as the need to reinforce that in order to increase modal shift significantly, a safe, convenient, coherent and attractive walking and cycling network is needed.
- Please see Appendix C for more details.

#### 7. Higher Education

**Date: 19/09/16**

**Attendees:**

The University:
- Considering undertaking surveys to better determine the actual levels of staff/student car ownership/use.
- Has received some resistance to the increases in annual car parking permit costs.
- Nextbike is being well used.
| Alan Buchan (Sabbatical Student President, Forth Valley College); |
| Tony Kopsch (Head of Facilities, Stirling University); and |
| Stirling Council officers. |

| Potential improvements on existing cycle routes: the Riverside route; Alloa Rail Bridge (personal (safety/lighting) and the underpasses at the roundabouts (personal safety). |
| FV College. |
| The college are preparing a new campus transport policy for the Falkirk Campus, expected to be rolled out to all three campuses in the future. |

| Park and Ride: |
| Could the Castleview Park & Ride bus service go via the college? |
| Potential for proposed new Park and Ride sites to the north of Cornton/Causewayhead / in vicinity of Manor Powis to help serve the University. |

| Pedestrians and Cyclists |
| How can personal safety (and perceptions of personal safety) be maximised for pedestrians and cyclists at the Customs (‘Clock’) roundabout and also Drip Road? |
| A preference was expressed for segregated pedestrian and cycle facilities where possible. |
| The need to create a fully integrated cycle network which served all of Stirling was identified as of critical importance. |

| Other: |
| Kildean to Airthrey Road Links were identified as requiring very high quality active travel and public transport facilities designed into them from the outset. |
| Money spend on new roads could soon be negated/wasted as the potential introduction of autonomous vehicles would reduce congestion and ease the flow of traffic without additional road capacity. |
| Should the Council invest in Electric Vehicle Charging and/or Hydrogen Vehicle Fuelling facilities? |
### 8. Public Transport Operators
**Date:** 1/09/16  
**Attendees from:**  
- First Midland Bluebird;  
- Hunter’s Executive Coaches;  
- John Ferguson Minibus Hire;  
- Mackie’s Coaches;  
- Stagecoach;  
- Angus Council;  
- Clackmannanshire Council;  
- Stirling Council.

- Will improvements be made to the cycle links from Stirling Council boundary where Clacks have installed high-quality cycle routes on their side into Stirling City/the Stirling Council area.  
- Will Stirling Council support new dedicated bus infrastructure such as bus lanes, bus gates, etc.

### 9. DRT Operators
**Date:** 08/09/16  
**Attendees from:**  
- Buchanan Cabs Ltd;  
- Kingshouse Travel Ltd;  
- Highland Glen Travel Ltd;  
- Drymen Taxis; and  
- Stirling Council.

- It was felt that many of the proposals were too focussed on Stirling City and did not take full account of the needs of rural communities.

### 10. Prudential
**Date:** 22/09/16  
**Attendees from:**  
- Prudential; and  
- Stirling Council.

- Current problems re parking on site.  
- Concern over pedestrians crossing A84 (20-30 bus users from Callander).  
- Concern over future congestion at Craigforth:  
  - Exacerbating access issues out of Prudential  
  - Decreasing attractiveness of location
| **11. Bridge of Allan Community Council**  
Date: 16/08/16 | • Uncertainty of future / assumptions that strategy is based on (traffic / demographics);  
• Relocation of station;  
• Benefits of Kildean to Cornton and Cornton to Airthrey links;  
• BoA being a net loser;  
• Interpretation that references to Stirling = Stirling City rather than Stirling District; and  
• Level of detail (order of process: strategy priorities / scheme identification / developing scheme details) |
| --- | --- |
| **12. Wallace Area Forum**  
Date: 25/08/16 | • How can predictions be made regarding future given the number of variables that exist?  
• Request to keep people / communities informed, both of strategy/programme progress, as well as scheme development and progress. Suggest LTS newsletter.  
• Concern regarding speeding on Easter Cornton Rd (nb also concerns re extent of traffic calming measures on Easter Cornton Rd).  
• What is the evidence for the Kildean to Cornton Rd and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Rd links?  
• Why isn’t the proposal to close Cornton Rd level crossing included in the LTS?  
• Concern that Kildean to Cornton Rd and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Rd links / Airthrey Kerse development / Network Rail proposals to build road bridge is a stitch up to enable development.  
• What is the reasoning behind proposing relocation of Bridge of Allan station? |
| **13. Kings Park Community Council**  
| • Concern re current and potential traffic problems at Craigforth. Enquired whether prudential would be involved in discussions.  
• How is the package of measures to be funded? |
### Date: 6/09/16
- Given relationships between many issues / mitigations, important that the whole package is able to be delivered.
- Can city transport package be delivered without Viewforth link road?
- If A811 Dumbarton Rd is realigned, need to set out measures to address additional traffic on Back O Hill road.
- Split views on desirability / need to re-align A811.
- Good to take traffic from Port St / Dumbarton Rd for local air quality reasons.
- Southern ring road (Viewforth Link + increased traffic on Snowden Place / Queens Rd) must not severe active travel routes into the City.
- Coach access into the Top of the Town, and coach parking across City both remain issues.
- Request to be more involved in City Park development.

### 14. Area Five Community Forum
**Date: 22/09/16**
- Concern that M9/A811 will increase rat running along Kersebonny Road. What mitigation measures will be put in place?
- Current cycle signs are insufficient to safely promote routes and guide cyclists. Are additional on-road marking to complement the signs possible?
- Ensure that pavements and streets are accessible for all.

### 15. Raploch Community Partnership, Community Council and Church reps
**Date: 28/09/16**
- Concerns re volume and speed of traffic along Drip Road. This is exacerbated by delays on Back O Hill Road. Fears this will be exacerbated further by increasing journey times on Back O Hill Road.
  - Castle Business park car parking overspills into residential areas;
  - Concern over the safety of shared surfaces;
  - Concern over goods vehicles using shared surface to park on pedestrian areas;
  - Concern over the timing of all the potential development and the potential disturbance / safety issues caused by construction traffic etc;
  - Concern over new residential development increasing rat running / construction traffic also some sites currently used for parking, which will become displaced; and
  - Could heavy traffic on Back O Hill Road displace rocks.

### 16. Cornton Community Council
- Timing of crossing at school is too short.
- Cycle signage on Cornton Road is wrong.
| Date: 28/09/16 | • Location of development determines where infrastructure is required.  
• Need to provide jobs before housing.  
• Concerns over safety on Cornton Rd raised by Kildean to Cornton Rd link (i.e. more traffic passing Cornton Primary).  
• So much development could be occurring at the same time (eg rail bridge / Airthrey Kerse / prison redevelopment / Kildean to Cornton link). Raises concerns re volumes and safety of roads at these times as well as disturbance.  
• Closure of Cornton level crossings, especially Easter Cornton level crossing increases distance to Wallace High.  
• How can we keep cyclists off the road where there are cycle facilities?  
• Concerns re school bus connection times. |
| 17. Causewayhead Community Council | • Extensive cycle network required.  
• Investment in cycling is a waste of money as not many people do/will cycle.  
• Can we force cyclists to use cycle facilities and keep off the road?  
• Are the Kildean-Cornton Rd and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Rd links justified?  
• The link roads plus proposed network rail bridge is a fix to enable Airthrey Kerse development.  
• What are the next steps for communities i.e.  
  o Feedback summary of consultation  
  o Feedback Council decision  
  o Keep communities aware of next steps  
    ▪ Annual programmes  
    ▪ Programme reviews  
    ▪ Scheme development  
    ▪ Formal consultation  
    ▪ Scheme success |
| Date: 3/10/16 | • Concerns about increase in traffic volumes related to Viewforth Link Road.  
• Resurfacing of roads, and white line markings in Braehead.  
• Increased traffic on approach from Craigs Roundabout to Linden Roundabout. |
### 19. Economic Growth

**Date:** 21/10/16  
**Attendees from:**  
- Go Forth Stirling; and  
- Stirling Council.

- Key to working at home: broadband being fit for purpose (e.g. upload speed).  
- Broadband quality also impacts on tourism, especially in rural areas.  
- Incentives needed for more people to use Next Bike hire scheme, e.g., cycle X miles, get X amount money off cup of coffee  
- Promotion and practical solutions are also required: adult cycle training; cycle buddy scheme; infrastructure in place.  
- Transport issues raised through BID questionnaire: access and parking to Stirling city centre for residents, tourists and visitors.  
- One-way system on Murray Place / Station Road causing traders concern re potential effect on businesses.  
- Station Gateway project explained, in particular the benefits of the one-way system and associated streetwork improvements; linking the station, Forthside, bus station to the city centre.  
- Businesses in Upper Craigs want the street to fully opened and commissioned an architect to design a potential scheme. Viewforth Link Road and associated public realm improvements may address this.  
- Suggestion: Wellgreen car park provides a discounted season ticket to Council staff for parking on top two floors.  
- BID final ballot date is scheduled to take place in June 2017.

### 20. NHSFV

**Date:** 24/10/16  
**Attendees from:**  
- NHSFV; and  
- Stirling Council.

- Hospital is keen to reduce its number of Did Not Attends (DNAs). Providing information with the appointment letter re how to access hospital via car, public transport, train, community transport, may help reduce this figure.  
- Access needs to be considered in terms of: Physical; Psychological; and Social.  
- Transport for carers needs to be considered, as well as transport for patients.
- Scottish Health and Inequalities Impact Assessment Network (SHIIAN) includes transport and travel.
- As well as delivering the LTS via the Community Planning Partnership, it should feed into the Integration of Health and Social Care. The integrated joint board includes reps from the third sector and housing – linked up, joint working.
- It was suggested we contact the Chief Officer for Stirling, Shiona Strachan.
- The integration agenda: opportunity for providing better coordinated and consistent transport; challenge: reviewing and potential rationalization of service level agreements with third sector.
- More emphasis is now on / will continue to be on technology and healthcare, eg, videolinks and telephone calls instead of ‘in person’. Balance risk / benefits.
- Key aspect of Health and Wellbeing Strategy is looking at Health and Inequalities, eg, travel time to GPs.
- Rural issues also need to be focused on in the City Deal, and solutions need to be realistic.
- Active Travel Hubs providing ‘one stop’ information may help people access hospital using modes other than public transport, eg, car share / community transport.
- Third sector may help fill the gap left by public transport services that have been removed. For patients / for carers / for visitors / need to allow for flexibility, eg, appointment, then have to get blood tests, then have to wait for prescription.
**Summary of issues raised by Community Councils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Council</th>
<th>Summary of Issue Raised</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Buchanan          | Access to healthcare is key issue where scheduled public transport is unworkable. Travel for medical reasons differs from other travel as these journeys are absolutely essential and often needed by those who are not in a position to find alternatives means of getting there. The expansion of DRT to Buchanan is very welcome indeed.  
**Response:** The LTS objective “An inclusive Stirling” will help to ensure the transport network enables everyone to access jobs, services and opportunities.  
Poor management of traffic during busy times has led to gridlock on the B837 and inherent safety issues.  
**Response:** The existing double yellow lines on the Main Street, Balmaha, were extended to deal with increased parking. We are unaware of any issues on the B837. During periods of significant traffic volumes the Police close the road between Balmaha and Rowardennan (the C6).  
Road condition and verge maintenance are major concerns. Buchanan residents have often expressed concern about the condition of roads in Winter and the C6 in particular. A measure that captures how safe the community feels would be welcomed. | Access to services / Public transport | Traffic Management | Road Maintenance |
Residents of Buchanan Smithy have said they are prevented from walking safely between villages due to the poor condition of the pavement.

**Response:**

The B837 and C6 are treated in accordance with the Winter Service policy. This is due to be reviewed during summer 2017 and these comments will be considered at this time.

The footways throughout the Stirling Council area are prioritized based on condition and available funding.

Parking in Balmaha is big issue on sunny days. The Stirling Council Parking Strategy should be considered within this document.

**Response:**

The Council are currently introducing decriminalised parking enforcement. It is suggested that a ‘settling-in’ period is allowed before review of the Council’s current parking strategy in 2019/20.

Whilst DRT will be a great step forward, it does have the disadvantage that people cannot travel without booking the day before. A measure of how this impacts on residents’ connectivity may provide a baseline to support reintroduction of a regular public transport service in the future.

**Response:**

Any fixed-timetable bus service in rural areas is likely to be infrequent, whereas DRT has the ability to cater for appointment times, shop etc. opening and closing times, times of clubs and societies and other time-specific needs. If it were possible to operate a bus every 15 minutes or so, then this advantage would be negated, but an hourly service is the highest frequency
that is ever likely to be achievable in a rural area, with 2-hourly or lower frequencies much more common.

Scheduled after-school transport at Balfron High School is no longer available. The after-school programme is regarded as part of the wider curriculum and all pupils are encouraged to engage in the after-school activities and supplementary study times. Pupils in the Buchanan Community Council area will have to rely on DRT which needs to be booked a day in advance.

**Response:**
This issue has been the subject of discussion involving Education and Public Transport officials and community representatives. Pupils can book DRT either online or via the Council’s phone number (01786 404040 option 3 then option 1) for the days they are scheduled to undertake after school activities. After meeting with Balfron High School and parents, however, a trial is being carried out where pupils can notify the school by 12:00 if they require a DRT that evening and the school will inform the transport unit of the names of the pupils.

The Road Safety plan is welcome. Buchanan Smithy residents have strongly advised their Community Council that they would like to see measures installed to reduce the speed of traffic through the village.

**Response:** Noted
Residents were never consulted on the Drymen to Balmaha paths project and, despite the huge sum of money allocated, the condition of the footpath along the B837 to Milton of Buchanan in particular was not adequately addressed. **Response:** The Drymen Community Trust led on the project, with Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park Authority the supporting Authority.

The East Loch Lomond Visitor Management Group has had the remit of developing the Visitor Management Plan for the area which feeds into the Stirling Council Transport strategy. No consultation has taken place with the current Buchanan Community Council. The Community Council has no knowledge of the Balmaha to Rowardennan Consultation in 2013 on traffic management options referenced in the transport consultation documentation. **Response:** The 2013 Consultation was conducted by the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park Authority, who are also responsible for the Visitor Management Plan.

While the report’s proposal for local initiatives on walking, cycling and safety for Bridge of Allan, subject to improvements to unmaintained and unclean footpaths and cycle tracks are to be welcomed and encouraged, the Community Council remains highly sceptical about the level of traffic growth predicated in the report and finds the same advances for major road traffic intervention projects to be substantially overstated. **Response:** It is important that a LTS is informed by whatever sources are available. In particular this LTS was informed by a transport appraisal in accordance with Transport Scotland’s Development Planning and Management: Transport Appraisal Guidance which included traffic modelling using industry accepted model and modelling techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Drymen Community Trust led on the project, with Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park Authority the supporting Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The East Loch Lomond Visitor Management Group has had the remit of developing the Visitor Management Plan for the area which feeds into the Stirling Council Transport strategy. No consultation has taken place with the current Buchanan Community Council. The Community Council has no knowledge of the Balmaha to Rowardennan Consultation in 2013 on traffic management options referenced in the transport consultation documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2013 Consultation was conducted by the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park Authority, who are also responsible for the Visitor Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that a LTS is informed by whatever sources are available. In particular this LTS was informed by a transport appraisal in accordance with Transport Scotland’s Development Planning and Management: Transport Appraisal Guidance which included traffic modelling using industry accepted model and modelling techniques.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bridge of Allan**

**Major Road Building Schemes:**
- Kildean – Cornton – Airthrey
- Bridge of Allan Station Relocation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings Park</th>
<th>Major Road Building Schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object to Viewforth Link Road. Object to A811 realignment. Object to M9 motorway junction onto A811. <strong>Response:</strong> Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Generally agree with the aims of the Local Transport Strategy but are not totally convinced by the traffic assessments or the chance of achieving 5% modal transfer. **Response:** We acknowledge that it is difficult to predict exactly what will happen in the future, hence it is crucial that the Council:  
  - Monitors those trends which affect congestion;  
  - Compares observed trends against the predicted trends; and  
  - Reviews the programme based on progress i.e.: observed v predicted trends. | Modal Shift |
| Would like to see a more integrated and connected network of foot and cycle paths. **Response:** The LTS proposes this aspiration is addressed via the Active Travel Plan ‘Walking and Cycling to a Healthier Stirling’, the key elements of which are:  
  - A collaborative programme with partners to promote and maximise walking and cycling;  
  - A programme of walking and cycling infrastructure measures which creates safe, high quality routes;  
  - A programme of school travel planning and the prioritisation of safer routes to school measures; and  
  - Assisting business, employers and new developments to establish travel plans. | Active Travel |
### Killearn

We appreciate that the Council wishes to support the local economy, protect the environment, promote healthy lifestyles and encourage the use of public transport. However, some of this may be difficult to achieve in rural areas such as south west Stirlingshire. The distances to travel in rural areas may preclude walking or cycling to work or to access services, unless these are located nearby.

**Response:** The Council will continue to work with communities and partners to improve travel choices, via the Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan, and Connected Communities programme. At the same time for the majority of residents, visitors and rural industries, there are few opportunities to significantly reduce motor vehicle use.

The recent and previous reductions and cancellations in bus services, especially the B12 service between Balfron and Stirling, mean that it is difficult to encourage the use of public transport. After 14.15 there is no bus from Stirling to Balfron until 17.40, making it more arduous for people to attend appointments and access services and shops. It is impossible to visit the Forth Valley Royal Hospital on a Sunday by public transport from south west Stirlingshire, to the distress of both patients and relatives. The removal of the late afternoon bus from Stirling has adversely affected the pupils attending after school activities at Balfron High School.

Some communities in our area have minimal bus services (Drymen, Croftamie) and others no public transport at all (Fintry). The latter have access to the Demand Responsive Transport scheme, but linking with fewer scheduled services.

**Response:** The Council considers DRT to be a mode of public transport, as are bus, coach and rail services. All of these modes can be used by anyone for any journey purpose. Drymen, Croftamie and Fintry all have access to DRT.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Killearn</th>
<th>We appreciate that the Council wishes to support the local economy, protect the environment, promote healthy lifestyles and encourage the use of public transport. However, some of this may be difficult to achieve in rural areas such as south west Stirlingshire. The distances to travel in rural areas may preclude walking or cycling to work or to access services, unless these are located nearby. <strong>Response:</strong> The Council will continue to work with communities and partners to improve travel choices, via the Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan, and Connected Communities programme. At the same time for the majority of residents, visitors and rural industries, there are few opportunities to significantly reduce motor vehicle use. The recent and previous reductions and cancellations in bus services, especially the B12 service between Balfron and Stirling, mean that it is difficult to encourage the use of public transport. After 14.15 there is no bus from Stirling to Balfron until 17.40, making it more arduous for people to attend appointments and access services and shops. It is impossible to visit the Forth Valley Royal Hospital on a Sunday by public transport from south west Stirlingshire, to the distress of both patients and relatives. The removal of the late afternoon bus from Stirling has adversely affected the pupils attending after school activities at Balfron High School. Some communities in our area have minimal bus services (Drymen, Croftamie) and others no public transport at all (Fintry). The latter have access to the Demand Responsive Transport scheme, but linking with fewer scheduled services. <strong>Response:</strong> The Council considers DRT to be a mode of public transport, as are bus, coach and rail services. All of these modes can be used by anyone for any journey purpose. Drymen, Croftamie and Fintry all have access to DRT.</th>
<th>Access to services, employment and opportunities via active travel modes</th>
<th>Public Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Information on this can be found on the council’s website at [www.stirling.gov.uk/drt](http://www.stirling.gov.uk/drt). Also, on 6 March 2017, First will introduce service B9, which will operate a circular Balfron-Killearn-Croftamie-Drymen-Balfron route at certain times during the day.

For rural areas the most important key issues are probably
- Road maintenance;
- Gaps in transport network; and
- Impact of traffic on health and environment.

**Response:** Noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Braehead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewforth Link Road:</strong> concerned with the potential increase in traffic using Pike Road and Linden Avenue to link with the Eastern edge of the city. We will NEVER support a transport plan that turns Pike Road, Broom Road and Linden Avenue into an arterial route. We would be particularly concerned with an increase in delivery vehicles of all sizes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** The Viewforth Link Road package includes measures to discourage the use of Pike Road/ Broom Road/Linden Avenue as an arterial route.

While we recognise the importance of the priority routes, there are roads in Braehead that haven’t been resurfaced in years – this is not acceptable.

**Response:** The roads network throughout the Stirling Council area are prioritized based on an agreed matrix, which considers condition, traffic volume, skid resistance etc. The roads in Braehead will eventually be upgraded but the timescale will be determined by available funding.

On the approach from Craigs Roundabout to Linden Roundabout, we would like the council to consider turning the left hand lane into a “turn left” lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in transport network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse Impacts of traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Road Schemes: VLR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braehead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volumes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Braehead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewforth Link Road:</strong> concerned with the potential increase in traffic using Pike Road and Linden Avenue to link with the Eastern edge of the city. We will NEVER support a transport plan that turns Pike Road, Broom Road and Linden Avenue into an arterial route. We would be particularly concerned with an increase in delivery vehicles of all sizes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** The Viewforth Link Road package includes measures to discourage the use of Pike Road/ Broom Road/Linden Avenue as an arterial route.

While we recognise the importance of the priority routes, there are roads in Braehead that haven’t been resurfaced in years – this is not acceptable.

**Response:** The roads network throughout the Stirling Council area are prioritized based on an agreed matrix, which considers condition, traffic volume, skid resistance etc. The roads in Braehead will eventually be upgraded but the timescale will be determined by available funding.

On the approach from Craigs Roundabout to Linden Roundabout, we would like the council to consider turning the left hand lane into a “turn left” lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volumes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only. This would help considerably the problem of increased traffic slowing residents down in exiting Braehead using this roundabout. The building of the Burghmuir Retail park has exacerbated this problem with cars having to travel to Linden Avenue in order to turn around and access the retail park car park.

Response: As the majority of traffic is going straight ahead or turning round to the right, a dedicated left hand turn lane would not assist residents in exiting from Linden Avenue any quicker.

Residents of Colquhoun Street have on a number of occasions asked for something to be done about people parking their cars on the street for hours at a time while they go to work. Residents have been offered a pay and display/resident’s permit system but believe that to be too inconvenient for themselves and their visitors. Action requested: (1) bear this factor in mind when looking at parking in the immediate vicinity of the city centre and (2) consider alternatives to the pay and display/resident’s permit system that better serve residents wishes.

Response: Designating the area as a residents only parking area was indeed proposed for this area in 2009. Unfortunately the restrictions available for the Council to use are limited and Residents Parking bays is really the only method of controlling parking within the street. However, this would require each resident to purchase an annual parking permit from the Council. This then restricts where their friends and visitors park, so Pay and Display areas are generally included in any residents parking area, to provide non-residents the facility to park. As with all new restricted parking areas it displaces vehicles elsewhere in the area, so careful consideration will need to be given to the extent of any future restricted parking area.

Cycling schemes are very much in fashion, but improvements to the path network for walking are not so well considered. Braehead has many paths in a shocking state of disrepair – if you want walking to be more attractive, you
have to ensure the paths are in good order, the vegetation around it is kept in well order and, that old community council chestnut, you do something to also change attitudes to dog fouling. With a twenty year transport strategy, it may take twenty years to change dog owners’ attitudes. Let’s get started on both at the same time.

Modal shift also requires parents and children to have their attitudes to road safety increased – this could take years and should start now.

**Response:** Stirling Council has begun a programme of upgrading street lighting and the defective paths in and around the Braehead area. This will continue for the next few years until all footways and footpaths are in an acceptable condition.

In the plan, consideration doesn’t seem to be given to encouraging more people to work from home – this alone could help reduce traffic congestion.

**Response:** Noted

Millhall Road links Braehead with Springkerse and the Peak. While the railway goes through the road and makes it impractical for car options, it is a hugely important resource in Braehead for walking and cycling – this key route should be part of your thinking.

**Response:** This has been included within the Active Travel Action Plan.

We would like Stirling Council, and other partners to start thinking of Braehead as being part of the city centre and to think of options accordingly.

**Response:** The Local Development Plan defines the City Centre in terms of land uses – predominately the extent of the area which is largely commercial
rather than residential. Nonetheless the critical interactions between a city centre and its surrounding neighbourhoods should be recognised.

We are very perplexed why Stirling Council spend thousands of pounds building flower beds on the dual carriageway between St Ninians and Linden Avenue and using white lines to reduce the carriageway to one lane – why not create a better cycle path instead?

**Response:**
This was carried out as part of a wider civic improvement programme. The introduction of a cycle lane was considered but current guidance and best practice guided us away from this at the present time because there are no dedicated cycle facilities at either Borestone or Linden Avenue Roundabouts.

You need to consider making places for bikes to stop along cycle paths and provide seating/bike racks accordingly

**Response:** This has been included in the Active Travel Action Plan.

When planning cycle routes, you tend to plan them from the Railway Station towards the University. We would like to be part of these schemes as well. Braehead Community Garden would provide a nice hub point to the east.

**Response:** The continued development of the cycle network across Stirling is included in the Active Travel Action Plan.

**Dunblane**

Bus provision is a problem for Dunblane. Over the last few years, bus services have been withdrawn or seriously reduced. The LTS talks about modal shifts away from use of private cars. This is not going to happen unless there is a much improved bus service both within Dunblane, to Stirling and other local towns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response:</th>
<th>The LTS proposes measures to encourage a modal shift. The extent to which this occurs will depend on a number of factors some of which are within the influence of the Council, and some not (such as the majority of public transport services).</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach parking is non-existent in Dunblane now, there are no designated bus parking areas. This issue has been raised for several years and nothing has been done by the Council to provide any suitable bus parking bays.</td>
<td>Economic Growth via tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The Council will work with the Dunblane Community Partnership to consider opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no proposals to extend any of the bike hire schemes to Dunblane, this needs to be addressed.</td>
<td>Active Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Your request has been forwarded to Next Bike UK (tel: (0)20 3405 7060).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Charrette identified Active Travel in Dunblane as a key theme. Work is currently being done to draw up action plans for this theme in conjunction with the Council. We ask that the Council continues to support this theme.</td>
<td>Active Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Noted. The Active Travel Action Plan was adopted alongside the LTS on 8th December 2016.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCN 765 is moving from Glen Road to A9. We have a concern that once this is done the Glen Road route would not be maintained even for walking. As you are aware this route is prone to tree fall and land slips. This is a very popular walking route, we would ask for assurances from the Council that land slips and fallen trees are dealt with. There is a volunteer group that does basic maintenance but are less able to deal with any of the larger landslips.</td>
<td>Maintenance of Paths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Any issue that cannot be dealt with via the volunteer group should be reported to the Council, where it will be dealt with accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of decriminalization is still ongoing with an expected start date towards the end of 2016. It is vital that this process is completed without any further delays beyond the end of 2016. Dunblane is under huge pressure with parking and the lack of enforcement is no longer acceptable. Once the system is implemented we expect daily visits from the enforcement officers Monday to Saturday.</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The Council will be required to enforce in all communities and the enforcement regime will be tailored to suit each area during the days and hours the parking restrictions apply. Each area will expect this level of service from the Enforcement Team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking is an ongoing major issue for Dunblane. There is no provision by the rail operator for any parking provision for commuters. This situation cannot be allowed to continue. Dunblane has in excess of 100 cars parked on the B8033 each day in addition to commuters clogging up on street areas and car parks such as the Millrow. This will only get worse when the new train services start in December 2018 offering faster journey times into Edinburgh and Glasgow.</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Noted. The Council will work with the Dunblane Community Partnership to explore opportunities with relevant partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millrow parking management/extension has been discussed for many years with no sign of any serious attempt to extend the car park. This issue need to be addressed.</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> It was agreed by the Parking Strategy Review stakeholders group in 2008 when Dunblane’ parking restrictions were introduced, that Millrow car park should remain free until the car park was extended. However whilst a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
detailed design was carried out there has been no funding identified (cost estimate in region of £300K) and as such this extension was never progressed past the design stage.

We are concerned that with ongoing Council cuts and the emphasis on the City of Stirling that Dunblane is becoming a lesser priority. We cannot accept this and ask that the Council assures us that Dunblane will not take lower priorities and that the Council demonstrate how this will take place.

**Response:** Noted. The City Area Transport Plan, which was adopted alongside the LTS on 8th Dec 2016, includes Dunblane.

The main issue which affects Dunblane on the A9 is the Keir roundabout. Any car journey between Dunblane and Stirling has to use the Keir roundabout. We believe that Transport Scotland need to bring forward the project to remove the roundabout.

**Response:** Noted. This comment will be forwarded to Transport Scotland.

**Balfron**

We are concerned that the trends described in table 3 appear to suggest a worsening of transport provision and behaviours in terms of decreasing public transport patronage, decrease in cycling, and fewer people with access to employment and healthcare appointments within 60 minutes. These issues are of particular concern for a rural community like Balfron, and there is a real danger of isolation for those vulnerable groups within the community who do not have access to cars.

We would urge the Council to adopt a policy of supporting public transport provision to enable Balfron to continue to be the thriving centre of West Stirlingshire life.

**Council Priorities**

**Strategic Transport**

**Public Transport**
Response: The Council supports bus services in the Balfron area to the extent that it is able, given current budgetary constraints, at a time when both bus operators and local authorities are striving to reduce costs.

The Council will continue to work with communities and partners to improve travel choices via the Connected Communities Programme, and the Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan.

Over the past year Balfron Community Council has carried out an extensive consultation with the local community on transport and access issues and possible solutions for Balfron. The attached report: 'A Space For Living', summarises the key points identified through this consultation. We are pleased to note that this corresponds well to the key issues highlighted in the Local Transport Strategy, and that the proposed rural delivery plan echoes many of the points raised by the local community.

We are now in the process of taking the learnings from our consultation and devising a viable Masterplan which we shall be sharing with the Council, and would further urge the Council to support us in delivering holistic rather than piecemeal solutions to the needs of the community within Balfron.

A Space for Living: A report on the transport, access and amenities consultation in Balfron 2015-16.

Response: noted

Main issues raised from consultation (in order of proportionality):
1. Road Safety: Speeding; Lack of safe pedestrian crossings; Increase in Traffic Volume.
2. Parking: Capacity; Lack of enforcement; Illegal parking.
3. Amenities: Lack of high quality play facilities; Littering and dog fouling; The availability of well-maintained and attractive public spaces.
4. Walking and Cycling: Lack of maintained paths; Lack of pavements; Unmaintained pavements; lack of bike parking.
5. Public Transport: Cost; Lack of services; Poor quality of rolling stock.
7. Planning.
8. Access: Lack of access for mobility impaired; lack of paths and connectivity.

**Response:** noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causewayhead</th>
<th>Concern re lack of driver adherence to speed limits. Impression seems to be negligible levels of enforcement. No mention of applying 20mph speed limits city wide.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Enforcement of speed restrictions is a matter for the Police. Stirling Council currently has no plans to introduce 20-mph speed limits throughout all villages or towns or in Stirling City Centre though this may be one option that can be considered to support LTS objectives, as the LTS does seek to ensure safe residential streets for all users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As usual this subject is high on the complaints list of all road users and large amounts of money are needed to bring many roads back up to standards of purpose and user safety. Some of the minor roads in the locality of Causewayhead may need attention soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> These roads will be considered along with all other roads in the Council area and work will be prioritized based on condition and traffic volume etc. The carriageway condition is determined from the results contained in the Scottish Road Maintenance Condition Survey (SRMCS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A road is planned from Kildean to Airthrey Road. This seems a very costly “road to nowhere” and dividing the Airthrey Kerse into two parts. The plan to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Road Safety**
build this road in terms of cost benefit justification would surely only be considered if large housing and rail transport modal infrastructure developments on Airthrey Kerse are given permission. Such “schemes” as mentioned if permitted, would have major detrimental environmental impacts on the Airthrey Kerse land and for all residents in Causewayhead and other nearby communities.

**Response:** The proposed Kildean to Cornton road and Cornton Road to Airthrey Road links have long been included in the Council’s transport strategies to relieve congestion in and around Clock Roundabout / Back o Hill Road/ Causewayhead Road, and so on. The proposals are not dependent on other proposals. In addition, the Kildean to Cornton Rd link not only redistributes traffic away from Clock roundabout and Back O’Hill Rd, but also creates a significant active travel and public transport link between the Bridge of Allan, Cornton and Causewayhead communities and Forth Valley College, Castleview Business Park and the City Park. Further opportunities for the University will open up if a Cornton Rd to Airthrey Rd link is also pursued.

Causewayhead already has cycle lanes and cycle routes but utilisation seems very low. This is maybe due to the fact that the lanes are not physically segregated from fast moving traffic flows creating an environment which is not conducive to cycling activity. It is also of note that some of our local residents are not able to carry out these activities and pro campaigners should take this into account.

**Response:** Noted. The route is on the National Cycle Network and the Council will continue to work with partners to explore opportunities to improve it.
Causewayhead attracts many visitors mainly to the Wallace Monument and/or en route to various other attractions in the Stirling area. The street environment on the main A9 route near Causewayhead roundabout is attractive and has pleasant garden plant displays.

The environment can suffer however from littering and “gum” fouling. There are also the usual problems of driver speeding, traffic noise and exhaust particulates pollution. As far as traffic calming is concerned it would seem there is a local residential street review currently being undertaken.

**Response:** Traffic calming would not be beneficial as this is a main artery into the city and further restrictions would exacerbate congestion in what is an already busy corridor during peak periods. No residential street review is currently planned, apart from yellow restrictions on each junction.

It would seem that Causewayhead residents and visitors have reasonably good access to most travel modes for both local and distant destinations. There is for example a local “Causewayhead” bus that serves residential streets and “loops” to and from Stirling centre. Also, buses to other destinations in Clackmannanshire and Fife can also be boarded at Causewayhead. Longer distance coach travel is also available via Stirling bus station. The “free” bus pass is much valued by those who can avail themselves of this facility. Rail mode facilities are nearest at Stirling and Bridge of Allan with Dunblane and Alloa as options.

In terms of road journey times delays caused by traffic congestion, it would seem such problems will not be solved by building more and more road space in Stirling as it will just “fill” up again and cause more “grief”.

**Response:** The level of growth proposed by the Stirling Local Development Plan and the City Development Framework will bring additional trips onto a limited transport network. Left unchecked this will result in congestion which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Place</th>
<th>Travel within and beyond Stirling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causewayhead attracts many visitors mainly to the Wallace Monument and/or en route to various other attractions in the Stirling area. The street environment on the main A9 route near Causewayhead roundabout is attractive and has pleasant garden plant displays. The environment can suffer however from littering and “gum” fouling. There are also the usual problems of driver speeding, traffic noise and exhaust particulates pollution. As far as traffic calming is concerned it would seem there is a local residential street review currently being undertaken. <strong>Response:</strong> Traffic calming would not be beneficial as this is a main artery into the city and further restrictions would exacerbate congestion in what is an already busy corridor during peak periods. No residential street review is currently planned, apart from yellow restrictions on each junction.</td>
<td>It would seem that Causewayhead residents and visitors have reasonably good access to most travel modes for both local and distant destinations. There is for example a local “Causewayhead” bus that serves residential streets and “loops” to and from Stirling centre. Also, buses to other destinations in Clackmannanshire and Fife can also be boarded at Causewayhead. Longer distance coach travel is also available via Stirling bus station. The “free” bus pass is much valued by those who can avail themselves of this facility. Rail mode facilities are nearest at Stirling and Bridge of Allan with Dunblane and Alloa as options. In terms of road journey times delays caused by traffic congestion, it would seem such problems will not be solved by building more and more road space in Stirling as it will just “fill” up again and cause more “grief”. <strong>Response:</strong> The level of growth proposed by the Stirling Local Development Plan and the City Development Framework will bring additional trips onto a limited transport network. Left unchecked this will result in congestion which</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will affect trips both in and through the City area. To prevent congestion undermining Stirling City's attractiveness we will need to:

- encourage more trips to be made by walking, cycling and public transport; and
- provide significant additional road capacity.

We propose that we maximise the numbers walking, cycling and using public transport such as park and ride first before adding significant capacity to our road networks.

We will review the programme based on progress i.e.: observed v predicted trends:

- if congestion isn’t growing at the rate predicted, proposals to increase road capacity could be put back; and
- if congestion is growing faster than predicted then additional measures to increase the proportions of walking, cycling or using public transport, or the additional road capacity measures may need to be considered.

The traffic modelling indicates that even if we manage to achieve a significant modal shift additional road capacity will be required in the long-run.

It is also important to recognise that infrastructure enhancements, such as new roads, can:

- Be required to redistribute traffic to enable improvements to the quality of public realm and/or road space reallocation for active travel routes; and
- Open up new linkages, not just for motor vehicles, but for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>There is concern with regard to the environmental effects to local areas including residents in Causewayhead regarding delivery package 3 (DP3) and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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delivery package (DP5). *(Nb states DP5 in response, but talks about DP6 below)*

**DP3 Kildean to Airthrey Flank Distributor Road:**
This road will slice the Airthrey Kerse into two parts causing fragmentation of green belt. Increased flooding dangers, increased traffic in surrounding areas causing more noise and exhaust pollutions will result. As mentioned previously there seems little justification for such a road at this present time but much justification for local folk to say “no” to this plan.

**Response:** This LTS was influenced by a transport appraisal in accordance with Transport Scotland’s ‘Development Planning and Management: Transport Appraisal Guidance’ which included traffic modelling using industry accepted modelling techniques. This traffic modelling indicated the need for a Kildean to Cornton Road and Cornton Road to Airthrey Road link.

The Strategic Environmental Assessment, which was undertaken as part of the LTS development, states for both the Kildean – Cornton and Cornton – Airthery that there is “Potential for longer-term benefits from reduced congestion, emissions and air pollutants.”

**DP6 Relocation of Railway Station to Causewayhead:**
There is a lot of concern about this plan as well. The amount of land that network rail will commandeer for the new railway bridge indicates they must have in mind using a massive area of the Kerse land for a railway station and large park and ride facilities. Smothering such a large area of ground for this purpose will cause loss of green belt, increased flooding risk, and increased noise and pollution for residents in the vicinity. Much justification for local folk to say “no” to this plan.

**Response:** The transport appraisal informing the LTS suggested investigating the benefits of relocating Bridge of Allan Station from the edge of one
| community to a location where it is on the edge of three communities and hence more accessible. |  |
**Summary of issues raised by key stakeholder organisations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary of Issue Raised</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Area Access Panel</td>
<td>Although there are some comments relating to the needs of disabled users and an ageing population, there really isn’t any specific actions which would help these groups in this document. Page 16 captures the impact of physical difficulties and long term conditions which is excellent, but there is little weight given to this 'need' throughout the document. <strong>Response:</strong> An overarching objective of the LTS is to achieve an inclusive Stirling, where we ensure the transport network enables everyone to access jobs, services and opportunities. This objective is reflected throughout the document including the identified actions under the Walkable Stirling heading such as ensuring routes to local facilities, and also residential streets are accessible by all, including people with mobility difficulties.</td>
<td>Inclusive Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintaining Strategic Access within the City Transport Plan will mean that parking provision will have to be sensibly developed as many people travel in from rural locations, also elderly and disabled people who cannot walk far will need appropriate disabled parking facilities and the fact that we face an ageing population, otherwise these people will be excluded from the city and be forced to socialise and spend their money elsewhere. <strong>Response:</strong> noted</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographic changes have consequences, planners of the LDP have to take into account the social changes that housing expansion causes. Roads which were lightly used, now become very busy, creating pollution and a danger for</td>
<td>Supporting new developments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pedestrians and schoolchildren who have to use their now inadequate crossing points.

Response: Stirling Council were required to undertake a transport appraisal of its proposed Local Development Plan. The transport appraisal is available on the council website.

The appraisal concluded that to support and enable the growth proposed in the LDP, without severe congestion, then the following needed to be undertaken:

- Maximising the proportion of people walking, cycling and using public transport.
- Maximising the capacity of the existing local road network.
- The need for new roads links within the local road network at strategic locations.
- Improving the capacity of existing motorway junctions.
- Consider additional interventions on the motorway and rail networks.
- Improving transport choices and modes between existing and proposed developments in Plean, Cowie, Fallin and Throsk and Stirling City.

The actions identified in the transport appraisal are required to enable delivery of the LDP. They are accordingly included within both the LDP Action Plan and the City Area Transport Plan.

The LTS, based on the transport appraisal of the LDP, will support the delivery of the LDP.

On the rural question of public transport, for young people who are not car owners, regular transport to Glasgow and Stirling is very expensive with an even more limited schedule being offered. This does not help with employment prospects or the economics of low income families, or increased utilisation of PT, or reducing carbon capture as these points are all linked.
**Response:** The [Young Scot National Entitlement Card](http://www.youngscot.org) (NEC) gives travel discounts to 16-18 year olds, or full time volunteers under the age of 26.

It is good that there is recognition of the importance of Stirling Station as a destination and travel hub, but the existing toilet facilities don’t reflect the key importance of its future role, not just with transport but providing an attractive and interesting social hub.

In general, Stirling City and most rural villages do need public conveniences if visitors wish to be encouraged. A Comfort Partnership for the City is long overdue.

**Response:** Noted. There are currently no plans to introduce a Comfort Partnership in the city, due to the number of toilets already available (bus station; Thistle Centre; numerous eateries). We will continue to monitor the situation via the Active Travel Action Plan.

The quality of maintenance of roads continue to be poor in the whole of the Stirling Region (an example of this is the road between Strathblane and Dumgoyne).

**Response:** Additional funding is being sought to raise the condition of Stirling Council’s roads to the average condition of the roads throughout Scotland. However this will take many years to achieve based on the current level of funding.

Nothing is mentioned of improving public transport connectivity in the South West of Stirlingshire, for example, improving the Balloch and Dumbarton 309 Bus services to the East side of Loch Lomond, Drymen and other villages.
**Response:** Service 309 operates under a contract let by Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT), to which Stirling Council contributes financially. On 6 March 2017, First will introduce service B9, which will operate a circular Balfron-Killearn-Croftamie-Drymen-Balfron route at certain times during the day. The Council has also sought to improve connectivity in the south-west of the Council area by expanding Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) provision in the area during 2016 to replace low-frequency bus services. Any further expansion, however, will depend upon the availability of funding.

It may be a Scottish Government initiative, but it is only right that there should be a cost benefit analysis carried out on spend on this Plan as many people cannot take advantage of the physical benefits of this lifestyle, yet can be isolated by the finite cost consequences of changing transport infrastructure to suit the cyclist and pedestrian.

**Response:** It is important that the LTS takes into account all users, acknowledging that not all options are available for all users. The LTS will improve the way people can travel around Stirling. Expanding their choice of travel is important in improving the connectivity of our communities, improving social inclusion and achieving sustainable community development.

Opportunities to walk and cycle

**Response:** Yes it will make a difference. The Council obtaining enforcement powers gives total control on all enforcement that takes place and being directly within the control of the Council, we are in a much better place to respond to local community concerns. It has always been envisaged that the enforcement team parking attendants will regularly visit rural villages as part of their duties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel options within Stirling City</th>
<th>There are some obvious traffic pinch points in Stirling City – the Craigs Roundabout, the A9/Union Street Roundabout and the junction at Back O’Hill with the Sainsbury’s/McDonalds outlets. It would be good to know that these three traffic points could be improved in the future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response: Works to both improve the capacity of these junctions, and help relieve traffic(including Kildean-Cornton Road / Cornton Road – Airthrey Road Links) are included in the City Area Transport Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active and Sustainable Travel</td>
<td>In the “Active and Sustainable Stirling”, you will need to strike a balance with users who don’t walk, who don’t cycle and may choose not to use PT as it is costly and time consuming as well as limiting what goods one can return to home with. If people find their trips too difficult and intrusive, they will go elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: The LTS will improve the way people can travel around Stirling. Expanding their choice of travel is important in improving the connectivity of our communities, improving social inclusion and achieving sustainable community development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Stirling</td>
<td>In “Inclusive Stirling” the details are unspecific for improving accessibility, which means that regulatory Standards BS8300 (Design of Buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people), Transport Scotland good practice guide for roads, and ultimately The Equality Act 2010, may not be enacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: The Council will continue to refer to the appropriate Standards to ensure improved accessibility for all people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Model</td>
<td>In your questionnaire, you state “traffic modelling suggests we need…..”, As a user of discrete event modelling of manufacturing processes for many years,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this statement is wrong. The practitioner sets up the model using certain parameters and this will lead to an outcome based on the variables included in the model, so the outcome is never an absolute, it is only an estimate based on statistical events inputted into the model.

**Response:** This LTS was informed by a transport appraisal in accordance with Transport Scotland’s Development Planning and Management: Transport Appraisal Guidance which included traffic modelling using industry accepted model and modelling techniques. Nonetheless, we acknowledge that it is difficult to predict exactly what will happen in the future, hence it is crucial that the Council:
- Monitors those trends which affect congestion;
- Compares observed trends against the predicted trends;
- Reviews the programme based on progress i.e.: observed v predicted trends
  - if congestion isn’t growing at the rate predicted, proposals to increase road capacity could be put back; and
  - if congestion is growing faster than predicted then additional measures to increase the proportions walking, cycling or using public transport, or the additional road capacity measures may need to be considered.

I note that there are no conclusions or outcomes highlighted in the Plan relating to section 5. Quite a bit of data is unrecorded.

It is a pity that you cannot state in the City or elsewhere, the number of disabled parking bays, either on-street, or off-street!

**Response:** Disabled Parking locations are all shown on the City Centre parking map that has been available on the Councils website for many years. This information will be updated and improved once the Council receives on street enforcement powers. It is also worth noting that any vehicle displaying a valid...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy: Consultation 2nd August – 30th September 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blue Badge</strong> can park free of charge and without time limit within any “on street” or “off street” car park Pay and Display parking bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why is the council not developing locality plans for the West side of Stirlingshire?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The LTS has developed locality plans for locations in and around the City in the City Area Transport Plan and for the rest of Stirling in the Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 7.2 (Road Safety Plan).</strong> In your Vulnerable Groups, I think cyclists are a vulnerable category too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Cyclists are classed as vulnerable users in the road safety plan and actions are assigned to this group. For some reason the ‘pedal cyclists’ group is missing from the initial list of vulnerable users but are identified in the main text, this will be corrected in future documents. Some cyclists don’t dress appropriately and are not visually obvious in all weather conditions; some cyclists don’t use lights but cycle in dark conditions; cyclists are required to abide by the statutory regulations and laws that govern road users, e.g. The Road Traffic Act 1988, like car drivers, some do not; the nature of some roads (twisty, limited views, poor camber, potholes, damaged surfaces, projecting greenery, traffic travelling too fast, drivers who overtake at blind spots, frustrated drivers, etc.) makes cycling inherently dangerous. In your Road Safety Plan you analyse data from the analysis of accidents, this unfortunately cannot take into account the analysis of ‘near misses’, ‘speeding’ or illegal driving behaviour like ‘reckless driving’, so many aspects of driver safety will go undetected. Perhaps the use of random cameras could provide information which is otherwise missed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The use of “engineering” is often underestimated in making roads safer, but is also very expensive. It would be interesting to know how many “road safety audits” are carried out every year and how many lead to positive action being taken?

**Response:** Cyclists are a vulnerable road user group and are identified in the Road Safety Plan as such. There was unfortunately an omission in the section summary headings, this will be corrected in future documents. Cyclists are not compelled to wear any particular type of clothing though it is hoped that cyclists would dress appropriately for the conditions they are cycling in. The Police remain the only organization empowered to enforce the Road Traffic Act as it relates to road users. We do endeavour to make roads as safe as possible for all road users, but this like all aspects of road maintenance and improvement, this has to be prioritised.

We do not analyse ‘near misses’ or indeed any source of information that is not collected in a controlled fashion. We do have access to a great deal of traffic data, including speed, which does inform individual accident investigations. Speeding is prevalent but inappropriate speed is accepted to be a much greater factor in accident occurrences. We can try to influence behavioural and anti-social aspects of driving/riding where possible, but ultimately the Police are the only organization that can enforce. Cameras can be used in very particular circumstance to capture behaviour, but are an expensive way of getting information.

Stirling Council does not underestimate the effectiveness of engineering measures and has for a number of years prioritised infrastructure improvements (bend realignment, junction upgrade, etc.) at accident cluster sites with the highest severity of injury. Road Safety Audits are unfortunately not designed to examine the existing road network, but rather are a tool to ensure any new or improved infrastructure is as safe as possible. Sites with common factors are
studied on a prioritised basis as are routes. Discrete sites are becoming harder to identify as accident numbers fall, which has led to the more pro-active route and area studies becoming an important tool.

There has to be a better means of attracting and holding tourists with more cafes and a wide variety of shops at ‘the top of the town’ through better transport links. Similarly the Riverside/Forthside area is a completely undeveloped area with huge potential for a mixed variety of users. If you are looking for good ideas, just look at the Riverside Walk in San Antonio which is truly impressive – we could have a similar development in Stirling!

Response: noted

In ‘Weaknesses’ it is not mentioned that one of the causes of traffic congestion and the creation of “pinch points” is also directly related to the siting of primary retail areas where little thought has been given to traffic activity. In ‘Threats’ surely the potential increase in urban development (via the LDP) whether in the City Centre or outlying areas must also have a significant impact on traffic volume too?

Response: Stirling Council were required to undertake a transport appraisal of its proposed Local Development Plan and the development proposed therein. The appraisal was used to inform the LTS, hence the packages of measures included in the LTS are designed to take account of future development.

The ‘Delivery Themes’ are not inclusive as there is no recognition of the disabled population (circa 20%) who cannot walk, cannot cycle and may not be able to use public transport. There has to be provision for a planning requirement to include car access to disabled parking locations.

Response: An overarching objective of the LTS is to achieve an inclusive Stirling where we ensure the transport network enables everyone to access
jobs, services and opportunities. This objective is reflected throughout the document.

A transport review of public transport in Stirling was undertaken in 2016, and considered how we can improve public and community transport services for people who rely on these to travel across Stirling to access communities, to access jobs, services, leisure and recreation and health and wellbeing opportunities. The review makes a number of recommendations in relation to:

- Maximising opportunities for a range of transport solutions, including car clubs, liftshare, community transport, commercial services, pooled-public fleet, supported services, education and social care services and taxi-card.
- Increased partnership working and establishment of a cross agency Public Transport Working Group to improve co-ordination, smarter use of data and information and implementation of recommendations and solutions.
- The development of locally focussed delivery arrangements by working with communities and partners to identify and bring forward solutions.

The recommendations of the transport review were incorporated within the LTS document, and will be delivered during 2017/18.

The relevant Design Standards and Guidance are consulted when designing parking locations / disabled parking bays / access to parking bays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since 2010 when the council kindly asked the Access Panel to suggest increasing Disabled Parking Bays in the City Centre, there has been no additional locations or capacity review carried out. In the general provision for on-street and off-street Disabled Parking Bays, BS8300 states “designated parking spaces should be provided to reflect changes in local population needs and allow for flexibility of provision in the future.” As part of the LTS, there</th>
<th>City Area Transport Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
should be a section which includes outcomes based on an (annual) Accessibility Audit as detailed in Section 6 of Transport Scotland Guide for Roads, 2013.

Response: The Council are currently introducing decriminalised parking enforcement. It is suggested that a ‘settling in’ period is allowed before review of the Council’s current parking strategy in 2019/20.

When designing roads the relevant standards and accessibility audit processes are adhered to, to allow access for all.

“Greener Motoring” – Private and Housing associations build substantial blocks of housing where there is no thought given to providing play parks for children, a general corner shop for convenience items, a library or pharmacy, or even a community hall (and to a lesser extent, local care homes and schools). It is also necessary in rural locations for drivers to have to travel substantial distances for petrol. All of these elements are necessary to have a community to live and function. Without them, it creates a waste of mineral resources (fuel) and pollution as people are forced to travel by car.

Response: noted. The LDP seeks to concentrate development in settlements to assist critical thresholds to be met to support the maintenance or provision of local facilities. It could be added in “Local Path Networks”, as well as providing access to local facilities: it (could) link rural villages, for example, Balfron to Killearn and Balfron to Buchlyvie as these are popular walking links.

In terms of the LTS Delivery Programmes, we will undertake an access audit and improvement programme, to ensure that pedestrian routes to local centres within and outwith the city are accessible by all, including people with mobility difficulties, where resources allow.

Towns, Villages and Rural Area

Response: noted. The LDP seeks to concentrate development in settlements, to assist critical thresholds to be met to support the maintenance or provision of local facilities. It could be added in “Local Path Networks”, as well as providing access to local facilities: it (could) link rural villages, for example, Balfron to Killearn and Balfron to Buchlyvie as these are popular walking links.

When designing roads the relevant standards and accessibility audit processes are adhered to, to allow access for all.
Response: The Balfron to Killearn link is already on the Active Travel Action Plan and the other can be added.

Walking and cycling is a laudable objective, but we do live in a climate which just doesn’t make this desirable or safe every day of the year. Cycling in the dull and dark days of winter has its risks on busy road areas and this element alone may preclude some journeys to school for the very young. Any plan or infrastructure project should allow for contingencies.

It should also be recognised that it may not be possible to change routes to school to make them more cycle friendly as recent schools were built and enlarged in capacity (Balfron High School for example), where access roads through dense housing areas were not improved for the school size; as a result more buses and cars are now faced with a journey along narrow roads which are patently dangerous and inappropriate to mix cyclists too.

Response: New infrastructure projects and improvements should always consider vulnerable users. It is recognised that sharing existing street space safely can be difficult in some circumstances.

It will not be possible to make walking and cycling desirable on all trips. At the same time we will try and make walking and cycling as desirable for as many trips as possible to support transport, health and environmental objectives.

In ‘Access to Healthcare’ it is disappointing not to see some action by Local Authorities to improve the route to FVRH from Stirling, specifically the A9 running through the village of Plean. Given the traffic volume and the dangerous features and a primary school right on the Main Street, an alternative route should be developed as a matter of priority for people travelling from the north.
**Response:** The LTS includes a proposal to develop a Route Action Plan for the A9 to assess and prioritise interventions along the route.

It is good that there is a plan to Integrate the Bus and Rail Station to strengthen the services of this key travel hub for Stirling.

**Response:** noted

The Panel welcome the use of Toucan Crossings.

**Response:** noted

City Park – I have seen this very promising concept, but have concerns about the re-aligned A811 terminating into the Back o Hill Roundabout. There are enough entrances/exits to this small roundabout. It may be safer to build a new roundabout on the adjacent dual carriageway.

**Response:** noted

‘Forthside developments’ – If possible segregate riders from pedestrians with a line on the footway. This is a well-used pedestrian area used by families and it makes sense to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists maintain a discipline to keep to their side. We would also advise upon a flat and level approach to the proposed new bridge with no crossfall and a flush transition from path to bridge surface.

**Response:** Noted. As part of the Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP), the Council will highlight where and when segregated or shared use facilities should be provided.

| City Area Transport Plan / City Development Framework / Active Travel Action Plan / Connected Communities | Response: The LTS includes a proposal to develop a Route Action Plan for the A9 to assess and prioritise interventions along the route. | City Park – I have seen this very promising concept, but have concerns about the re-aligned A811 terminating into the Back o Hill Roundabout. There are enough entrances/exits to this small roundabout. It may be safer to build a new roundabout on the adjacent dual carriageway. | ‘Forthside developments’ – If possible segregate riders from pedestrians with a line on the footway. This is a well-used pedestrian area used by families and it makes sense to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists maintain a discipline to keep to their side. We would also advise upon a flat and level approach to the proposed new bridge with no crossfall and a flush transition from path to bridge surface. | Response: Noted. As part of the Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP), the Council will highlight where and when segregated or shared use facilities should be provided. |
The River’ Park – It is presumed that approaching paths and the Pedestrian Bridge will have clear widths of 2000mm, as advocated in Sect.5.2. of BS 8300. If the width is less than this, passing places will need to be incorporated.

**Response:** noted

Improving Attractiveness of Public Transport – The promotion of Public Transport and low fares would be a positive move.

**Response:** The cost of fares is determined by private bus operators and not the Council.

Supported public and community transport – All categories are important, but an increase in Accessible Taxi Cars is overdue and would be very welcome.

**Response:** A report, part of which looks at Stirling Council’s fleet and accessible vehicles, was presented at the Planning & Regulation Panel, on Tuesday 31 January 2017. This comment has been passed to Stirling Council’s Licensing Board.

Maintaining lower costs for DRT use, would benefit low income rural families and make essential transport to such locations like FVRH more accessible for the elderly and disabled.

**Response:** DRT fares are already held as low as we can comfortably accommodate and have not been subject to frequent revision. The issue of cost to the customer is that which DRT is specifically designed to address. It does not provide any service that is not already available to the general public at full commercial rates (i.e. by taxi/private hire car).

Not all the Platforms at Stirling Station are accessible; this requirement is long overdue, and should be a key point included in the Local Transport Plan.
**Response:** This is the responsibility of Scotrail and Network Rail. We are aware that the issue is being considered.

There is considerable concern over Platform 8 (from Alloa) as it is a well-used connection point.

**Response:** This is the responsibility of Scotrail and Network Rail. We are aware that the issue is being considered.

Air – This is a very welcome bus link as both Edinburgh and Glasgow Airports are difficult to access by car.

**Response:** Noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Response:</strong></th>
<th>Please ensure that all new Bus Shelters include a simplified form of seating for elderly and physically disadvantaged pedestrians.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td>This comment has been passed onto Stirling Council’s Public Transport Unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** We monitoring a number of cycling routes and are committed to increasing the number of counters on the cycle network in Stirling. The Annual Monitoring Statement, which is used to inform our annual programme of works and priorities, contains the annual average daily total of cyclists on monitored routes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balfron – There is a need to review disabled parking in a number of areas in Balfron (surgery, pharmacy, post office), not just the Co-op car park where disabled bays don’t actually comply with BS8300 due to the incline of the whole car park. There are other issues which severely reduce the capacity of this car park for daily users.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The Council have indicated to Transport Scotland as part of their application for Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) powers that it intends to review parking local restrictions / policy after the first year of implementation of its DPE powers, in order that issues around enforcement and available parking space can be assessed against the communities / residents comments and concerns. Specific concerns meantime can be addressed by contacting Roads and Land Service, although it should be noted that of the car parks causing concern some are out with the Council’s control, at the surgery for instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crianlarich – The railway platform (going South?) is not accessible to wheelchair users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> This is the responsibility of Scotrail and Network Rail, and as such your comment has been forwarded to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drymen – The Disabled Parking Bay adjacent to the Pharmacy is now a year overdue!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> this has now been installed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TVRA
Dunblane – Consideration should be given with the NCN765 to ensure “through town” that shared surfaces have a defined line for cyclists to ensure that accidents don’t occur with pedestrians.

**Response:** NCN765 does not run along any shared off road surface in Dunblane. Nonetheless, as part of the ATAP Council will highlight where and when segregated or shared use facilities should be provided.

Dunblane - There may be a need to add dropped kerbs to both ramps over the ‘Green Bridge’ as well as more dog waste bins!

**Response:** Dropped kerbs have been programmed. Dedicated dog bins are no longer installed. Residents are asked to bag the waste and dispose of it in ordinary litter bins.

Fintry – Surprised that parking on the Main Street is not listed for improved control, as this does cause a conflict with passing traffic. There is little evidence of footways on the east side due to land being in private ownership…how can this be improved?

**Response:** Unless parked traffic is causing a safety or access problem it would be inadvisable to restrict it. Parked vehicles tend to slow passing traffic. However, these matters can be investigated further.

Killearn – As above. The road junction at Station Road and the A875 becomes obstructed due to parking on the east side of the road on the A875; some thought should be given to make this section of the road safer.

**Response:** Proposals to provide a crossing at this junction were objected to by the community council.
Thornhill – The suggestion to use railings to stop people parking on footways is not the best solution as people with sight loss cannot see railings and they will be a barrier to negotiating the footway.

**Response:** This has been requested and ruled out on a number of occasions. The majority of the footways in Thornhill are not wide enough to accommodate railings. Regardless of this, we would not erect railings along the full length of a footway through a village. Railings should be used sparingly at locations where pedestrians may be at higher risk, eg central islands at split puffin crossings, sections of footpath adjoining another where there is a risk of pedestrians walking straight out onto the road, in the vicinity of schools.

Throsk – It is good that there is recognition of the need to improve bus shelters.

**Response:** Noted.

Balfron / Callander / Cowie/ Croftamie / Doune / Drymen / Dunblane / Fintry / Gartmore / Killin / Strathblane/Blanefield -Suggest any pedestrian crossings are upgraded to Toucan.

**Response:** Traffic signal controlled pedestrian crossings (puffin crossings) are only installed where the appropriate assessment has been carried out and the outcome of that assessment is that this type of crossing should be installed. Toucan crossings, which have provision for cyclists, are only installed at locations where the crossing will link a cycle route on either side of the road. It would not be appropriate to install toucan crossings at any of the locations listed above as none of them provide a link on an existing cycle route.

The controlled crossing in Doune is a toucan crossing.

**Paths for All**

We welcome the development of the new local transport strategy. We recommend that active travel - including walking – should be emphasised to Active Travel
| SNH (Scottish Natural Heritage) | We suggest that you change the order of the delivery plans so it reflects the mode hierarchy as outlined on page 31. Our preferred order would be: 1) Active Travel Plan; 2) City Transport Plan; 3) Towns Villages & Rural Area Transport Plan; 4) Road Safety Plan; and 5) Road Asset Management Plan.  
It would also be useful to know the timescales for delivery of the action plans. | LTS |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The order of the delivery plans as present reflects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overarching importance of road safety;  
The need to maintain our existing assets for the benefits of all users; and  
Active Travel Action Plan, which is a framework that key partners can work on together, as a set sub set of the City Area Transport Plan and the Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan.

The mode hierarchy applies across all delivery plans. Each of the delivery plans includes timescales where relevant.

We would like to see a greater commitment to reducing speed limits e.g. introducing 20mph zones in all residential areas. On p27 the plan says speed limits ‘could’ be reduced in residential areas yet there is no mention about doing this in the Road Safety Plan. We recommend that a commitment to reduce speed limits across all residential areas is included in the Strategy as this would increase active travel by making Stirling safer and more attractive to walkers and cyclists.

**Response:** The Road Safety Plan focuses on those problems that have been identified as a particular factor in involvement in accidents on roads in the Stirling Council area. If a reduced speed limit is found during the course of an investigation to be the best option to reduce accidents, this will be examined, but it is not the place of the Road Safety Plan to suggest a large scale change without any basis. Stirling Council currently has no current plans to introduce 20-mph speed limits throughout all villages or towns or in Stirling City Centre though this may be one option that can be considered to support LTS objectives.

The Road Safety Plan (p54) identifies motorcyclists on the list of vulnerable users but omits cyclists. We recommend that you include cyclists on the list of vulnerable users.
**Response:** Cyclists are classed as vulnerable users in the road safety plan and actions are assigned to this group. The ‘pedal cyclists’ group is missing from the initial list of vulnerable users but are identified in the main text, this will be corrected in future documents.

We recommend that you place more emphasis on cross boundary links in the Strategy. We have been working with the local authorities within the Central Scotland Green Network (CSGN) to map out strategic walking and cycling routes. Stirling Council has taken an active role in these discussions so it is disappointing to see that the missing links between Stirling-Forth Valley Royal Hospital (FVRH) and Stirling-Denny are not referenced in the active travel, particularly as they are in the CSGN strategic routes map. The Towns, Villages and Rural Areas Plan does refer to the Stirling-Denny link, however the Stirling-FVRH is not included. We recommend both routes are included in the Active Travel Plan and in the Towns, Villages and Rural Areas Plan.

**Response:** Noted. We will continue to work with neighbouring Local Authorities to develop the CSGN strategic routes map. Nonetheless Stirling Council will direct scarce resources to where they have the most benefit for Stirling residents.

The action plan does not provide sufficient detail of what the actions are and when they will be delivered. As highlighted in our comments on the LTS it would be useful to see more clearly defined actions with specific timescales for delivery to ensure the necessary momentum for delivery of the actions.

**Response:** One of the actions is to develop and deliver the Active Travel Action Plan in Partnership, which will produce more clearly defined actions /specific timescales for delivery. The delivery programmes and actions therein have been phased to achieve the LTS targets, including modal shift targets. If these targets are not met the Council will need to review delivery and/or targets.
We feel there has been a missed opportunity to create more off road paths that link into and help form the green network. More could also be done to open up the area along the River Forth for walking and cycling and this would fit well with the proposed River Projects in the Stirling CDF. Improving opportunities for active and recreational travel green networks can also help improve biodiversity, health & well-being, enhance the local amenity and contribute towards mitigating the effects of climate change.

**Response:** The LTS delivery programmes (including the Active Travel Action Plan) will be reviewed on an annual basis to allow for any developments to be taken into account, such as the City Region Deal projects.

| **Cycle Stirling** | Participants in the Workshops highlighted the need for a more robust action plan as well as the need to reinforce that in order to increase modal shift significantly, a safe, convenient, coherent and attractive walking and cycling network is needed. 

Through the workshop process, it was identified that, most significantly, the Active Travel Action Plan (in Appendix B & C of the Active Travel Plan) requires more detail, with specific timescales, detail and estimated costs for implementation allotted to each action, as well as potential delivery partners identified. The action plan should also be prioritised and in line with the CAPS vision of 10% by 2020. 

**Response:** One of the actions is to develop and deliver the Active Travel Action Plan in Partnership, which will produce more clearly defined actions /specific timescales for delivery. The delivery programmes and actions therein have been phased to achieve the LTS targets, including modal shift targets. If these targets are not met the Council will need to review delivery and/or targets. | Active Travel |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy: Consultation 2nd August – 30th September 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Stirling Council to establish an Active Travel Steering Group.**  
**Response:** An Active Travel Steering Group will be established, and will feed into the LTS Programme Board.  
Stirling Council needs to commit a dedicated proportion of revenue and capital funding to active travel or identify the appropriate budget to fund this work.  
**Response:** The delivery of the projects within the LTS delivery programmes will require the allocation of funding within the Council’s revenue and capital budgets. In addition, the Council will work with partners such as Scottish Government, Tactran, Transport Scotland, Network Rail, ScotRail, Sustrans and other to secure joint funding of projects where possible. Council has also adopted a policy to secure contributions from developers towards the cumulative impact of developments.  
Well-defined timescales and cost for active travel interventions are required in the same way that they exist for roads investment: if active travel is to be regarded as a priority then this commitment needs to be made for investment.  
**Response:** One of the actions is to develop and deliver the Active Travel Action Plan in Partnership, which will produce more clearly defined actions /specific timescales for delivery.  
Local policies need to reflect and incorporate the Active Travel Plan.  
**Response:** Some of the actions the Council can take forward on its own, while many require the Council to engage with a range of partners, from providers of the strategic road and rail networks such as Transport Scotland, Network Rail and ScotRail, to public transport providers, businesses and communities. |
<p>| Active Travel Plan: Governance |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The NHS can take a prominent role in promoting walking and cycling from a health perspective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There should be a plan of work and clear rationale for why those projects have been selected, as this will help to manage expectations of partners and stakeholders, as well as provide a ‘bigger picture’ of why specific projects are taken forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that support from delivery partners is sought where Council capacity is unable to deliver, tapping into resources available through different organisations. A clear recognition of who is able to support the plan and stating these against actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> One of the actions is to develop and deliver the Active Travel Action Plan in Partnership, which will produce more clearly defined actions /specific timescales for delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need to identify a list of projects in the City Development Framework and Local Development Plan and the associated active travel work that should be undertaken for each. Routes should be included in the strategic mapping.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The ATAP will be updated to include the relevant City Region Deal projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of an action relating to a network of Active Travel Hubs throughout Stirling (with the potential to release pressure on Demand Responsive Transport).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Travel Plan:</strong> Partnership working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Travel Plan:</strong> Strategic / economic development and planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tourism-related walking and cycling needs to be addressed as a significant development opportunity

Need to identify actions relating to integration with public transport and other modes of travel, to ensure that door-to-door journeys without cars are simple and convenient.

Working with public transport providers to ensure integration.

Identify key interchanges that require access and facilities for active travel.

**Response:** All noted.

An action on 20mph zones implementation should be included for strategic locations across the area.

**Response:** The LTS does seek to ensure safe residential streets for all users/How this is to be achieved is for consideration.

Walking and cycling infrastructure needs to be included at the beginning of the planning process as well as in Local Development Plans, and new road infrastructure must also be compatible with active travel.

**Response:** The LTS was revised in parallel with the LDP. This is covered in Supplementary Guidance 14: Ensuring a Choice of Access for New Developments, which sets the framework for how the Council will consider the transport and access issues in relation to new development and changes of use where planning permission is required.

It is suggested that more evidence is gathered on where people walk and cycle and prioritise investment on capital and revenue to match these priorities.
Inclusion of journey times/efficiency of active travel modes and public transport – there needs to be some cost-benefit analysis of routes to highlight the effectiveness of these options against car travel – helps to ‘sell’ the package of active travel.

**Response:** along with the LTS Annual Monitoring Statement, the current monitoring and evaluation framework will be developed as part of the ATAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Travel Plan: Infrastructure and maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be a statement and commitment in the action plan on the standard and consistency of a cycle network that is easy and accessible for all types of users. Safe, convenient and consistent infrastructure is key, if this is not provided then there will not be modal shift.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:** The Council will consider whether to highlight where and when segregated or shared use facilities should be provided.

There needs to be a commitment to deliver the indicative routes that are highlighted on the maps and include clear timescales and potential costs. Additional routes should be considered for inclusion.

**Response:** The delivery programmes and actions therein have been phased to achieve the LTS targets including modal shift targets. If these targets are not met, the Council will need to review delivery and/or targets.

There needs to be a coordination or schedule of maintenance work included in the plan to ensure that all paths are maintained to a suitable standard for use.

**Response:** The footways throughout the Stirling Council area are prioritized based on condition and available funding. Likewise the roads network throughout the Stirling Council area are prioritized based on an agreed matrix, which considers condition, traffic volume, skid resistance etc.
An action on consistent and comprehensive signage to information and advice on active travel is vital, and this must be consistent across the providers of information.

**Response:** noted.

The health aspect of active travel is promoted heavily and potentially use partnership with the NHS to ensure this is more effectively projected to the public.

**Response:** NHSFV remains one of our key partners and we will continue to work closely with them to promote the health benefits of active travel.

Stirling Council to utilise and work with existing route planner resources.

**Response:** Stirling Council promotes a number of route planner resources including GoToo, Traveline and Walkit.com.

Stirling Council to develop a core list of active travel-related events/days that they will be supporting/promoting consistently each year across different Council departments.

**Response:** Will be discussed by the Active Travel Partnership.

Education needs to be included in the Steering Group (to cover all educational establishments) ensuring high level buy-in to active travel in education, with

- Campaigns to cut across both primary/secondary/tertiary education – consistency throughout the education system.
- Targets for number of Cycle Friendly Schools should be included in the plan.
- Targets for number Cycle Friendly Employers should be included in the plan.
- Targets for employee engagement programmes also to be included in the plan.

**Response:** Outcome targets have been included in the LTS. Output targets will be considered for the delivery plans.

Monitoring is important. There should be:
- Consistent collection of core indicators from a number of different partners and collated centrally and fed into an annual report to showcase progress towards modal shift.
- Quantitative and qualitative indicators included, such as the amount (e.g. m²) of cycle infrastructure implemented as well as how people view different infrastructure.
- The Steering Group should provide a reporting mechanism to provide updates towards local targets.
- Targets need to contribute to other policy goals e.g. education, carbon saving, economy, social.
- The establishment of a monitoring strategy for local information and data with consistent indicators and measurements is needed.
- The plan and any monitoring/reporting needs to be inclusive of all types of users.

**Response:** noted

**Additional Cycle Routes which should be considered:**
- Town centre:
  1. Goosecroft road (west side) between Burghmuir Retail Park and stations.
  2. BP garage via Kwik Fit to station.
- West links:

**Active Travel Plan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Strategic Cycle Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town centre:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Goosecroft road (west side) between Burghmuir Retail Park and stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BP garage via Kwik Fit to station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Prudential to Cambusbarron via North Kersibonny Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Prudential to Drip bridge south side of A84.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>To Doune via Chalmerston Road, Blair Drummond (school/hall/bus stop/campsite/Camphill), Cuthill Brae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Hayfords Mill footbridge beside M9 to Polmaise Road/Wardie Road to Bannockburn Heritage Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Across Stirling via Bannock Burn green heritage route, links with Ladywell Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Protect/enhance old routes south via Brucefields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To South:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A91 crossing points – near interchange to A872 and Durieshill, Cowie Road, Station Road, Pike roundabout for Ladywell Park/Thunderbridge link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Link from near Auchinbowie House beside A872/M80 to Dunipace/Denny Old Road East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Add new upgraded link from Cowie to near Fallin – alternative to current NCN 76?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ladywell Park to Thunderbridge direct link crossing Pike Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Crossing A907 from NCN 76 to Blairlogie via Blairmains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Cornton rail crossing link is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Baxters Loan via Wanderwrang to B8033 and possibly under bypass to B824.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Doune to Stirling via Cuthill Brae as above number 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>As above – the villages need links with Stirling from west, south, east and north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>It is difficult to see what is being proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Some existing routes also need upgrading e.g. NCN 7 from Strathyre to Callander, Buchlyvie to Aberfoyle, Aberfoyle to Callander.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **University of Stirling** | **Response:** We would wish that Stirling Council recognises the economic worth of the University and provides a framework for transportation within the Local Transport Strategy which is supportive of the University's **Strategic plan** for continued growth.

The Council is also aware of the University's Campus Masterplan of 2012.

**Response:** The importance of the University to Stirling is recognised and reflected in the LTS. Of particular concern is maintaining the best possible access by all modes.

Existing pedestrian routes from the City Centre to University of Stirling are neither intuitive, nor attractive and in a number of areas lack the simple design principles of being secure, well lit, having commonality of materials and in many places lack sight and desire lines.

The above initiative highlighted in the LTS should include the provision of a high standard intuitive, attractive, safe and strongly themed pedestrian route direct from the City Centre to the University Campus in order to encourage walking and to assist visitors with wayfinding between the two locations.

**Response:** The City Area Transport Plan and the Active Travel Action Plan will consider how to maximise the active travel route between the City Centre and the University.

The University Campus currently benefits from a high standard of public bus services including the "UniLink" initiative. As a minimum the LTS should ensure that the current level of service is maintained. | **Economic Growth**

<p>| <strong>Active Travel</strong> | <strong>Public Transport</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is noted that First Bus are proposing to withdraw the 58 service from the University Campus however the University is continuing to liaise with them regarding maintaining this service. Support for this service via the LTS process should be encouraged.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Following discussion with representatives of Stirling University, First Midland Bluebird replaced Service 58 with Service 54D, offering journeys at the times the University considered the greatest need to arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to provide improved signage within the City Centre especially near to the train and bus stations to direct those commuting to the University to the correct bus stops. Furthermore, real time bus information is a must and consideration should be given to how technology shall respond to this e.g. smart phones/watches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Suggestions will be considered as part of the Stirling Station Gateway project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of a Quality Bus Corridor to support travel to and from the Campus is welcomed and the University looks forward to contributing towards the detailed proposals in the near future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The shortcomings of the existing pedestrian route(s) between the University and the city centre have been highlighted above. These shortcomings also apply to various cycle routes associated with the Campus which are often disjointed, contain significant elements of inconvenience and are considered unsafe in places. The University requests that a specific attention is given to routes between, for example, the Campus and the City Centre, Bridge of Allan, Causewayhead and the already established cycle route network in Clackmannanshire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Travel</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response: Noted. With the exception of University-Bridge of Allan which is on NCN765, improvements to these routes are included in the ATAP.

The segregation of cycle routes, material choices, lighting, signage and traffic signalling are all areas that require improvement. The cycle link between the City Centre and the University is disjointed with either a lack of clarity of routes or non-existent routes e.g. from the train station to the Clocktower roundabout and the Causewayhead/Cornton road signalised junction. The current cycle provision appears an afterthought 'bolted' onto pavements or residential streets.

Response: The Council is currently investigating these issues.

Existing links between the University and the motorway network are tortuous and congested at various points. It is anticipated that the provision of both the Kildean to Cornton Road and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Road links could serve to enhance all modes of travel to and from the Campus by the inclusion of high standard provision for pedestrians, cyclists and bus users alongside improved car based travel.

While the University is supportive of these routes in principle, no details are currently provided and therefore the following information is requested:
- The modelling of road layouts and junctions along the length of Airthrey Road to Causewayhead Road and in particular the characteristics of the junction at Airthrey Road, outside the Campus;
- The forecast changes in traffic levels in and around the Campus including, for example, Airthrey Road and Hillfoots Road;
- Clarification of the proposed changes to the operation of the main University roundabout entrance on Airthrey Road and the Innovation Park junction on Hillfoots Road;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-C-A Link Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Consideration of the possibility that the Campus road network could be used as a "rat run" between the Hillfoots villages, the Kildean to Cornton Road and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Road corridors and the M9 Junction 10 at Craigforth. For example, the distances between the A91/B998 roundabout at Logie Kirk and M9 Junction 11 at Keir and M9 Junction at Pirnhall are 7.5km and 8.8km respectively. The provision of the Kildean to Cornton Road and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Road links would, if traffic routes through the Campus, be of the order of 5.5km to the M9 Junction at Craigforth - a far shorter distance which is likely to be attractive to a number of car drivers. Similarly the proposed links might result in additional traffic on existing congestion hot spots thereby potentially encouraging traffic through the Campus.

Given the above uncertainties, the University's support for the provision of the Kildean to Cornton Road and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Road links is highly qualified at this stage.

**Response:** The network benefits of Kildean-Cornton Road and Cornton Road - Airthrey Road links have been considered via the transport appraisal which informed the LTS. The forecast changes in traffic levels will be forwarded. No detailed design of road layouts has been undertaken so there is no information to forward with regard to such.

The route through the university is both controlled and contains traffic calming. As the scheme progresses we will work with the university to identify the likelihood of potential impacts in and around the university.

The draft LTS does not describe the proposed location of a relocated "Bridge of Allan" train station however it is assumed that this would sit somewhere to the east of Cornton Vale Prison. If this is the case, it is requested that it is supported by direct and high standard walking, cycling and bus links to the University in order to encourage greater use of the rail network.
Response: The transport appraisal informing the LTS suggested investigating the benefits of relocating Bridge of Allan Station from the edge of one community to a location where it is on the edge of three communities and hence be more accessible. If such a proposal were to be found beneficial and be progressed, the Council would seek to maximise the ability to access it by all modes.

It is appreciated that such a proposal is likely to be a long term aspiration and therefore, in the interim, Stirling Council should seek to improve walking, cycling and bus links to the existing Bridge of Allan train station to/from the University. We have referenced the requirements for such routes within the sections above.

Response: We will work with the University to identify potential improvements between it and Bridge of Allan Station.

The LTS refers to the SPG on a number of occasions. Appendix D of the Guidance contains the Council's Car Parking Standards. It is noted that the standards recognise that where a development contains a mix of differing facilities then each part should be considered in its own right and the appropriate parking provided to give an overall total parking figure. This approach is welcomed and forms the basis of a Campus parking review that is ongoing at the present time. It is however noted that the Standards do not currently allow for an element of greater car use that can be associated with off centre developments such as the University Campus. It is therefore requested that in parallel with the drafting of the LTS that this aspect of the SPG is also given consideration.

Response: All the LDP supplementary guidance notes will be reviewed in 2017. Nonetheless, the car parking standards are maximum standards that apply across the Stirling Council area. They are therefore more aligned with the
requirements of ‘off-centre’ developments with lower provision sought in more accessible locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustrans</th>
<th>Overall we strongly support Stirling Council’s ambition to achieve modal shift away from journeys being made by car to be replaced by more sustainable modes of transport, such as walking, cycling and public transport.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would like you to ensure that the relevance of walking and cycling will be considered when addressing all the key issues and not seen as an isolated issue in itself.

**Response:** The LTS, and its supporting delivery plans, establishes a range of interventions to improve the existing network, to build capacity within the transport network where required, but with a clear focus on a shift to increase active travel and sustainable transport solutions. In addition the ATAP interventions are embedded in the City Area Transport Plan and the Towns, Villages and Rural Areas Transport Plan to ensure that active travel is not seen as an isolated issue.

Rural settlements are often linked by roads with a speed limit of 40 – 60 mph with no adjacent pavement or path. This makes it very challenging and for people to walk and cycle between them. The impact of a collision between motor vehicles and people walking or cycling along these roads is likely to be severe. Walking and cycling facilities separated from traffic are needed between settlements, broadly following the main roads, in order to improve safety and enable more walking and cycling.
Those living in rural areas without access to a car are more isolated from services, jobs and opportunities. The provision of more high quality paths between rural settlements will help to overcome this and provide a relatively cheap travel option for many people. The greater provision of electric bicycles would also help extend the potential range of cycle journeys, further increasing access.

**Response:** The options for addressing the transport and access issues within the rural areas are limited. The Council will work with communities and partners to improve travel choices and provide safe walking and cycling routes where opportunities exist, however for the majority of residents, visitors and rural industries, there are few opportunities to significantly reduce motor vehicles.

Improving actual and perceived safety of cycling is necessary in order to encourage more people to cycle in urban areas, particularly along busy roads. Additional cycle facilities separated from traffic, including segregated cycle lanes and dedicated crossing facilities at junctions are needed, as well as wider adoption of 20 mph speed limits.

**Response:** noted

We agree the objectives could be a useful framework to address the key issues, including modal shift, however there are potential conflicts between some objectives, depending upon how they are interpreted. Most notably between ‘enable more trips to be made by walking, cycling and public transport’ and ‘maintain and improve journey times…’.

We would support preferentially improving journey times for sustainable modes of transport, through measures such as bus priority and dedicated cycle facilities, which will help to achieve modal shift. However we would not support using this objective to place a higher value on reducing journey times for journeys made by car, than for people travelling on foot and by bicycle. For...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Safety</th>
<th>LTS Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improving actual and perceived safety of cycling is necessary in order to encourage more people to cycle in urban areas, particularly along busy roads. Additional cycle facilities separated from traffic, including segregated cycle lanes and dedicated crossing facilities at junctions are needed, as well as wider adoption of 20 mph speed limits. | We agree the objectives could be a useful framework to address the key issues, including modal shift, however there are potential conflicts between some objectives, depending upon how they are interpreted. Most notably between ‘enable more trips to be made by walking, cycling and public transport’ and ‘maintain and improve journey times…’.

We would support preferentially improving journey times for sustainable modes of transport, through measures such as bus priority and dedicated cycle facilities, which will help to achieve modal shift. However we would not support using this objective to place a higher value on reducing journey times for journeys made by car, than for people travelling on foot and by bicycle. For... |
example, this can lead to long wait times for people walking and cycling at crossings and signalised junctions, thereby making travelling by these modes of transport much less attractive than travelling by car. Traffic modelling should not be used as a justification for prioritising travel by car.

In addition, the final objective seems to imply that an effective way to reduce transport emissions is to reduce congestion, perhaps by ensuring you ‘keep the traffic moving’. However the best way to reduce emissions (and reduce air pollution) is to achieve modal shift, reducing single occupancy car journeys and increasing the proportion of journeys made by walking, cycling and public transport.

Implementing road capacity increases is not a sustainable long-term solution to reducing congestion and will work against measures Stirling Council are proposing to achieve modal shift.

Since they make it more convenient to travel by car, more people will do so. In the medium to long term the additional road capacity inevitably fills up leading to an increase in traffic volumes, with congestion ultimately returning.

**Response:** The growth proposed in Stirling by the LDP and City Development Framework mean that both a significant modal shift and additional road capacity measures are required in the long-term. Nonetheless we will seek to maximise modal shift in the first instance. We believe the nature of Stirling allows us to provide an extensive active travel network which will not be compromised by seeking to maintain good vehicular access on a handful of key routes. It should be noted that due to the level of proposed growth, even with road capacity improvements, vehicular journey times will be significantly increased and journey times via the active travel network are likely to be quicker for internal trips.
The best way to tackle congestion is to make all sustainable transport modes easier and more attractive for people to use, in combination with measures which make it less convenient to make journeys by car.

**Response:** Congestion is a factor of the number of vehicular trips and the capacity of the road network. The number of vehicular trips depend on the travel options people have. Whilst we will seek to maximise the travel options people have, it is unlikely that sufficient will switch to prevent congestion from occurring. In Stirling’s context we must also remember that this is against the backdrop of a significant number of additional trips on all our transport networks.

We would like you to include ‘cyclists’ on the list of vulnerable groups in the Road Safety Plan.

**Response:** Cyclists are a vulnerable road user group and are identified in the Road Safety Plan as such. There was unfortunately an omission in the section summary headings.

We would like to emphasise the importance of implementing a Parking Strategy in Stirling City and its vicinity, which supports sustainable transport.

**Response:** noted.

Introduce 20mph speed limits onto most streets within Stirling and your other main settlements in order to improve road safety and create streets which are attractive on which to walk and cycle.

**Response:** Stirling Council currently has no current plans to introduce 20-mph speed limits throughout all villages or towns or in Stirling City Centre though this may be one option that can be considered to support LTS objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commit to the introduction of a Car Club in Stirling.</th>
<th><strong>Response:</strong> In July 2016 E-Car were awarded the contract to run a car club in Stirling. An initial 8 vehicles are situated around Stirling and testing is almost complete. The full launch of the car club will take place once Stirling Council completes it city wide Transport Regulation Order and assigns dedicated on-street parking bays for the car club vehicles. This is expected to occur in spring 2017.</th>
<th>Sustainable Travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce direct, on-street segregated cycle routes as part of Stirling’s proposed cycle network.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The Council will consider whether to highlight where and when segregated or shared use facilities should be provided.</td>
<td>Active Travel: infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| We welcome the action to develop a monitoring plan. In advance of this we suggest the following changes to the monitoring section in the Active Travel Plan:  
- An additional indicator(s) are added to measure changes in the amount of walking and cycling, to provide a more detailed picture than reporting the modal shares. For example percentage change in users on key routes, based on automatic cycle counters and/or your city centre cordon count.  
- KSI targets should be adapted to factor in a measure of exposure, ideally based on the amount of walking and cycling, which could be drawn from user data above, e.g. casualties/km cycled.  
**Response:** Using measures of exposure is of course the ideal. Such measures could be used if a reliable, repeatable source of information was available for the council area level. | Indicators and targets |
Sustrans recommends that Stirling Council commits a dedicated proportion of its own budget (revenue and capital) to walking and cycling to fund the Active Travel Plan.

**Response:** The LTS sets out the transport package and its costs. Adoption of the LTS is not a financial commitment by the Council. The Council’s budget setting process determines the amount of money available for all projects across the entire spectrum of local authority responsibilities.

The action plan requires further detail, including the addition of specific timescales for delivery, as well as potential delivery partners. This is particularly true of the cycle infrastructure proposals. Also the various infrastructure improvements need to be prioritised, potentially using short, medium and long term.

**Response:** One of the actions is to develop and deliver the Active Travel Plan Action Plan in Partnership, which will produce more clearly defined actions /specific timescales for delivery.

We welcome the strong focus on School Travel Plans. We would like to emphasis the role of pupils, who should be fully involved in the process. It fulfills many of the experiences and outcomes of Curriculum for Excellence (CfE). The links between it and CfE should be included on the School Travel Plan template (on page 21) and Sustrans Scotland can supply these.

**Response:** these links have been incorporated into the STP template, where relevant.

While the Active Travel Plan is very specific regarding proposed infrastructure improvements it lacks a similar level of specificity for behaviour change measures and the actions relating to it are too generic (i.e. ‘promote walking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Prioritisation of projects</th>
<th>School Travel Plans</th>
<th>Active Travel Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sustrans recommends that Stirling Council commits a dedicated proportion of its own budget (revenue and capital) to walking and cycling to fund the Active Travel Plan.</em></td>
<td>The LTS sets out the transport package and its costs. Adoption of the LTS is not a financial commitment by the Council. The Council’s budget setting process determines the amount of money available for all projects across the entire spectrum of local authority responsibilities.</td>
<td>One of the actions is to develop and deliver the Active Travel Plan Action Plan in Partnership, which will produce more clearly defined actions /specific timescales for delivery.</td>
<td>These links have been incorporated into the STP template, where relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and cycling in Stirling’). A clear plan for this area needs to be articulated to guide the Council’s future investment.

The most effective behaviour change measures are targeted, focused smarter choices interventions that are aimed at engaging people and influencing their behaviours, enabling them to make a change. These should be a package of measures which can include information and promotion, campaigns, training, events and travel planning all targeting different audiences in different settings.

**Response:** One of the actions is to develop and deliver the Active Travel Plan Action Plan in Partnership, which will produce more clearly defined actions /specific timescales for delivery.

The Active Travel Plan includes most of the essential recommendations in the Active Travel Strategy guidance issued by Transport Scotland and Sustrans. It contains measures to improve infrastructure (including a proposed cycle network and measures to improve walking), behaviour change training and promotion measures as well as an action plan and monitoring.

**Response:** noted

A recommended item that is missing is a high-level cost estimate for completing the cycle network.

**Response:** This has now been included in the ATP,

We suggest links to the planning process are included in the Active Travel Plan, as per page 32 of the Main Issues Report. Walking and cycling infrastructure identified in the Active Travel Plan needs to be included in the Local Development Plan, so that developers construct it where it forms part of a development site or provide financial contributions where it is external,
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| **Response:** The requirements for developers in included in Supplementary Guide (SG) ‘Ensuring a realistic choice of access for new development’. It should be noted that:  
| • the SG seeks to ensures a safe and realistic choice of access by all modes; and  
| • the SG rather than the ATAP is the better place to make clear the requirements of new developments. |

| **Killearn Community Futures Company** | Concern was expressed at the diminution of the bus service in Killearn, both to Stirling and to Glasgow. In particular the loss of the late afternoon service has reportedly caused considerable inconvenience to those dependent on public transport.  

Concern was also expressed that the loss of this service affects pupils attending Balfron High School who wish to attend after-school activities and it is queried that the school bus pass is not accepted for a return journey home outside the normal school hours.  

Whilst it is appreciated that economies are required, KCFC would also point out that a loss of public transport falls disproportionately on those who rely solely on public transport to access other villages and towns and will also lead directly to a greater use of private cars which is hardly in line with any ecological policies.  

KCFC support Killearn CC in their response to the Local Transport Strategy of Stirling Council and wish to join their voice in confirming the points made in their submission.  

**Response:** The Council supports bus and Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) services in the Killearn area to the extent that it is able, given current budgetary constraints, at a time when both bus operators and local authorities are striving to reduce |

|  | Public Transport / TVRA |
First Midland Bluebird maintains an hourly bus service to and from Glasgow for most of the day on Mondays to Saturdays with journeys, some of which are Council-supported, operating into the late evening with a 2-hourly service on Sundays. This compares well with the situation in many other rural communities. Commercial bus provision reflect the fact that Public transport demand from Killearn tends to be orientated more towards Glasgow than towards Stirling.

| Network Rail | Page 18 refers to the Network Rail Scotland Route Study, Draft for Consultation. We have now published the final document (on 14th July) so you may wish to update the reference.  
Page 22 refers to the Route Study increasing the frequency of services to Stirling to one train per hour. This does not reflect the 2043 aspirations included in the Route Study.  
Response: noted | LTS document |
## Summary of issues raised by Tactran and neighbouring local authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary of Issue Raised</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactran</td>
<td>Tactran agrees that key agencies consider opportunities for improving co-ordination and reporting of progress against the issues identified in Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy this and already works closely with the Council as one of its partner authorities on issues of regional significance. In progressing such issues Tactran sees there are opportunities to report at both Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) and Local Transport Strategy levels.</td>
<td>Key partnership working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In general the key issues identified are comprehensive though it is recommended that security is added to the list reflecting the RTS Objective in that regard. It is noted that there is an Outcome Indicator in the MIR for security.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              | It is noted that the stated LTS objectives do not fully reflect the RTS Objectives. Consideration could be given to adding objectives related to:-  
  - Economy - ensure transport helps to deliver (regional) prosperity;  
  - Environment - ensure that the transport system contributes to safeguarding the environment and promotes opportunities for improvement; and  
  - (Safety &) Security - to improve the (real and) perceived safety and security of the transport network. | Issues, Objectives and Indicators          |
|              | **Response:** The LTS makes clear that its transport objectives seek to support broader economic, environmental and social objectives.                                                                                   |                                             |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactran notes that the Delivery Plans reflect most key projects identified in the RTS Refresh Delivery Plan 2016 – 21, though the following omissions are noted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ▪ Project AT3.7 NWCN Long Distance Route: Stirling to Drymen - section between Balfron and Drymen.  
  **Response:** This is included in the Active Travel Action Plan.  |
| ▪ Project AT3.13 Aspirational NCN755 Cycling Route: Drymen to Strathblane.  
  **Response:** The ATAP includes routes from Drymen to Killearn and Killearn to Strathblane which would allow this journey.  |
| ▪ Project AT3.22 Regional Walking and Cycling Route: Cowie – Denny.  
  **Response:** This will be considered as part of the Durieshill developments.  |
| ▪ Project B15.1 Assist with development of a successful multi-operator and multi-modal travel ticket.  |
| ▪ Project TI7.1 Real Time Information - Stirling Council.  
  **Response:** We are reviewing smart ticketing options and will consider opportunities to take forward real time information.  |
| ▪ Project CC2.1 Eco-driver training.  
  **Response:** This will be continued where regional funding is available.  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Developer contributions should also be sought for regional projects, where relevant.

**Response:** noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
At the consultation event we provided some comment on what we consider to be the key issues and corridors in relation to Clackmannanshire. However for clarity we would reiterate these as being:

- A907 corridor between Alloa and Manor Powis, onwards to Stirling University, Stirling City centre and strategic network.
- A91 Corridor between Hillfoots villages to Manor Powis, onwards to Stirling University, Stirling City centre and strategic network.
- NCN 76 Round the Forth, specifically improvements at Manor Powis for cyclists and pedestrians to link the NCN76 into Stirling.
- Cycle improvements adjacent the A91 and Hillfoots Road to connect with the NCN 768 at the Clackmannanshire boundary to Stirling University and Stirling City centre.
- Public transport connections between Stirling, Alloa, Hillfoots and Clackmannan. Ongoing concerns over the future of commercially operated services are a key concern.
- Public transport connections between Stirling and Fife via Alloa.
- Congestion on public transport corridors impacting on bus service reliability, particularly on the A907 between Causewayhead and Manor Powis.
- Rail services to Fife and Edinburgh from Stirling via Alloa.
- Uncertainty over the move to a level 3 partnership in the SEStran area may impact on bus services between Clackmannanshire and Stirling.

**Response:** noted

Clackmannanshire Council would welcome the opportunity to work with Stirling Council on the development of transport interventions on these corridors where possible as part of the implementation of the Local Transport Strategy.

**Response:** noted and the offer welcomed.
In general we consider the key issues have been captured in the main issues report and the policy direction is robust. It has been noted that there is significant traffic growth forecast in the Stirling area, which will also likely impact on traffic volumes in Clackmannanshire. While many of the discussions focused on the modelling of the Local Transport Strategy and the Local Development Plan, we consider the use of the model to provide a reasonable estimation of likely impacts and required mitigation measures. A key factor in managing the forecast traffic growth is to reduce the use of the private car both in Stirling and Clackmannanshire by shifting travel onto more sustainable modes.

**Response:** noted

| **East Dunbartonshire** | East Dunbartonshire Council agrees with the principles and priorities in the Transport Issues Report however, requests that cognisance is taken of the following issues:

- East Dunbartonshire Council has commissioned a further study on the A81 utilising STAG principles to appraise options for the A81 corridor to supplement the 2015 A81 study. This study is currently in progress and emerging options for the corridor should be considered when developing the Stirling Local Transport Strategy as options will have implications for residents in the south western villages of the Stirling area.

- Following publication of the 2015 Active Travel Strategy, East Dunbartonshire Council has aspirations of creating a circular ‘Loop’ route around the perimeter of the East Dunbartonshire area. This proposed route would cross into Stirling Council land at Strathblane and re-enter East Dunbartonshire at Mugdock, exact route details are unclear at this stage. Stirling Council responded to the Active Travel Strategy consultation and indicated support for this project however indicated that any costs of infrastructure works on Stirling land would require to be borne |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Growth; modelling; Modal Shift in both Stirling and Clackmannanshire</th>
<th>TVRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Travel Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by East Dunbartonshire Council. While precise locations for any works are at an early stage, East Dunbartonshire Council would request that this proposal is considered when developing the Stirling Council Local Transport Strategy.

• East Dunbartonshire Council has carried out various works on Stockiemuir Road (A809) to improve safety on this route which has historically witnessed several casualties over the years. East Dunbartonshire Council notes that safety is a priority in the Stirling Transport Issues Report and requests that these works are considered when developing priorities and that a partnership approach is adopted to ensure optimum safety on this corridor.

• East Dunbartonshire Council is currently developing a Green Network Strategy. The two main strands of this work are improving access to the green network and protection of bio-diversity. An emerging priority is improving access to the Campsie Fells. As the Campsie Fells form the natural boundary between the two authorities it is requested that this priority is considered when developing the Stirling Council Local Transport Strategy.

• East Dunbartonshire Council supports the Edinburgh Glasgow Improvements Programme and notes Phase 2 proposes full electrification of services on the Stirling/Alloa and Dunblane lines which serves to benefit residents of Stirling and East Dunbartonshire. The Council notes Stirling identifies enhancing rail services and enhancing access between Stirling and Scotland’s cities in its City Transport Plan section but does not mention EGIP specifically. East Dunbartonshire Council requests that consideration is taken of the EGIP programme in developing the Stirling Council Local Transport Strategy."
| Response: noted |  |
### Summary of issues raised by specific residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam Short</td>
<td>The suggested strategic road building proposals are unprecedented in the Stirling area particularly in the context of this day and age when the environment and sustainability are clear Council objectives.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Significant investment and development is expected for Stirling over the next 10 years, expected to increase traffic levels by 22% at the busiest times. To stop congestion which will affect the efficiency of trips both in and through the City as well as national networks, we will encourage more people to walk, cycle and use public transport but as the traffic grows we will eventually have to make more space by building new roads.</td>
<td>Road building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The traffic growth assumptions are questionable.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> This LTS was influenced by a transport appraisal in accordance with Transport Scotland’s ‘Development Planning and Management: Transport Appraisal Guidance’ which included traffic modelling using industry accepted modelling techniques.</td>
<td>Traffic modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There needs to be far better correlation between planning permissions and transport planning in order to reduce the need to travel in the first place or to ensure that development is focussed on good transport nodes.</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Development sites have been determined through the LDP which has included transport considerations. Detailed planning submissions (subject to size and nature of the proposed development), including developments coming forward outwith identified LDP allocations will be subject to detailed Transport Statements and Assessments, in accordance with national transport policy, and in line with the LDP’s</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementary Guidance SG14: Ensuring a Choice of Access for New Developments.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Place aspirations should be applied to the settings of Causewayhead and Bridge of Allan and not just city centre streets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> The aspiration Stirling to be ‘a quality place where our streets enhance the quality of Stirling and add to peoples’ experience of it’ applies to the whole of Stirling including the towns, villages and rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Real meaningful investment is required to support walking, cycling and public transport.** |
| **Response:** The Council will continue to build active travel into wider highways projects and work with partners to take advantage of funding opportunities such as Smarter Choices Smarter Place (SCSP) Fund and Sustrans Community Links Fund. |
| Active and sustainable travel: funding |

| **Andrew Abbess** |
| Funding and timescales to be included in the Active Travel Plan. |
| **Response:** Indicative costs and timescales are included. |
| Active Travel Plan: Funding and timescales |

| Add removing through traffic/rat runs from residential areas. Good example is the closing of Ogilvle Road in Torbrex where it use to join with Glasgow Road. |
| **Response:** This is just one of what might be appropriate responses to particular traffic situations each of which will be assessed individually. |
| Safer Stirling |

| Under safer streets there should be reference to increasing policing of drivers who use mobile phones and drivers who do not give enough space when overtaking people on bikes, in a similar way to West Midland Police recent initiative. |
| **Response:** These are matters for the police. |
| Safer Stirling |
| Reference should be made to introducing cycle routes segregated from motor vehicles & pedestrians on routes where speed limit is not reduced to 20 mph. **Response:** Noted | Active Travel: Infrastructure |
| Should responsibility for implementation of a school travel plan not lie with Roads Department? **Response:** Responsibility lies with the Education department as better able to liaise with schools. | Active Travel Plan: school travel |
| No mention of extending Stirling – Alloa railway to Dunfermline. **Response:** This is a matter for the rail authorities. | Rail |
| The Stirling Road Safety plan failed to include people riding bikes as vulnerable road users! Or mobile phone use as a poor behaviour or close overtaking of cyclists as poor behaviour. **Response:** Cyclists are a vulnerable road user group and are identified in the Road Safety Plan as such. There was unfortunately an omission in the section summary headings, this will be corrected in future documents. Use of mobile phones while driving and poor vehicle driver behaviour are matters for the police. | Road Safety |
| A change of emphasis from "Road Safety" to "Road Danger Reduction" would also benefit vulnerable road users. Road Safety teams who have a target to reduce accidents have a perverse incentive to remove vulnerable road users from the road network. The strategy of only focusing on accident locations also results in no "Road Safety" action being taken roads where high traffic speed or high traffic volume have already resulted in the withdrawal of people on bikes or on foot. | Road Safety |
**Response:** Noted.

The main issues report refers to "new pedestrian bridges" in the new river park. These must be "pedestrian and cycle" bridges.

**Response:** Noted.

**Alan Hutton**

It is unclear what investment will be undertaken in the Active Travel Plan and when.

**Response:** Indicative costs and timescales are included in the Active Travel Action Plan.

The Active Travel Plan is almost entirely Stirling and National Park focused, once again ignoring the Rural SW and Strathblane/Blanefield in particular—all parts that are not 'Stirling facing'.

**Response:** A range of actions outside of Stirling city are listed in the ATAP under work with Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park and under proposed route creation and improvement under the cycle network. More detailed consideration of proposed work outside the city is given in the Towns, Villages and Rural Areas Plan.

Walking and cycling are important to our local community—for residents, for visitors and for the local shops and cafes that both groups patronise and might do in greater numbers.

The John Muir Way goes through the village (and will follow one of our new paths), the West Highland Way passes close by and the two long-distance paths cross on our ground. We have an excellent network of local walking routes.
Our area includes most of Mugdock Country Park, and the Loch Ardinning Reserve and Ballagan Glen—both owned and run by the Scottish Wildlife Trust. To capitalise on our existing assets, and to further pursue in this locality the laudable goal of active travel (and recreation) rightly emphasized in the draft LTS, other key path projects are vital.

**Response:** More detailed consideration of proposed work outside the city is given in the Towns, Villages and Rural Areas Plan.

### Points raised at public meeting held at East Plean Primary School 22nd June 2016

- Could the speed be reduced to 20mph throughout the village?
- Could the Council/police investigate the installation of average speed cameras at either end of the village?
- Increase police speed traps, vary times with an emphasis when school comes out.
- Speeding of traffic coming onto roundabout at Munnoch Way from all directions.
- Speed of heavy goods vehicles in the evenings.
- Speeding vehicles going down Burnside Crescent.
- Access bellmouth at Cardrowan Road very dangerous due to poor visibility splays.
- Concerns that residents of William Simpson Home are at risk due to speed of vehicles and the backdraught of heavy goods vehicles.

**Response:** Stirling Council currently has no current plans to introduce 20-mph speed limits throughout all villages or towns or in Stirling City Centre though this may be one option that can be considered to support LTS objectives. Concerns about speeding will be passed on to the Road Safety team.

- Pavements throughout entire village too narrow, especially for baby buggies.

### Road Safety / TVRA

### Maintenance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation, branches etc impinging on already narrow footpaths to Old Plean.</td>
<td>This will be passed to the Roads Maintenance team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot holes and raised manholes at Old Plean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage obscured as a result of tree branches etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School flashing warning sign currently broken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns that wheelchair users are at risk on pavements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> This will be passed to the Roads Maintenance team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent illegal parking at Old Plean.</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> This will be passed to the Safer Connected Communities team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the Council move back the 30mph limit to the other side of Plean Industrial Estate?</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> Concerns about speeding will be passed on to the Road Safety team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School crossing patrol officer not been given priority.</td>
<td>School Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong> This will be passed to the appropriate department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues raised at public consultation events: Wallace Area

**Topic 1: Maintaining Strategic Access – reducing congestion on strategic routes to reduce pollution and maintain reliable journey times.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Bridge of Allan 15 Aug 16** | - Vehicle near misses at mini-roundabout at Henderson St / Inverallan Rd.  
- Mini roundabouts on Henderson St not seen by drives going straight along Henderson St. Do not stop for those turning right!  
- Cars on Henderson Street travelling to uni often don't stop at mini roundabout at bottom of Well Rd. Accident about to happen.  
- People using min roundabouts on Henderson St as 'turning' junctions - 360o change in direction - causes confusion and near misses!  
- Safety of mini roundabout Henderson St / Well Rd.  
- Vehicles still driving down union street against traffic flow.  
- Concerns of safety at Keir roundabout going from BoA to Dunblane.  
- Increasing traffic making crossing Doune to Bridge of Allan increasingly problematic.  
- Speed of traffic A9 (Perth) onto Keir roundabout safety issue.  
- Congestion on causewayhead and Alloa Roads.  
- Concerned about additional congestion if ‘Grahams’ plans go ahead.  
- Increased traffic pollution on Henderson St if Airthrey Kerse housing goes ahead. | - Reduce freight vehicles from Keir roundabout via Henderson St.  
- Traffic lights at Keir roundabout. At least at busy times.  
- Lights at peak time at Keir roundabout  
- traffic lights at Keir.  
- restrict parking on Henderson St and Keir St to help flow of traffic.  
- Speed control measures on Henderson St.  
- Road markings urgently required on new road surface off Cornton Rd.  
- Avoid adding pollution / traffic by not developing Airthrey Kerse and not adding Kildean Link Rd. Fix current issues - pot holes; public transport; cycle access etc.  
- Air quality: Henderson St already has air pollution problem. No suggestions from department address this. Start by monitoring?  
- Clearer view from end of Henderson St heading east.  
- Bigger roundabout at bottom of Well Rd? (if there is enough space).  
- Mini roundabout at Fountain Rd /Henderson St  
Henderson St Issues: vastly increasing traffic in last 2 years. Dividing BoA and reducing quality
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- Pollution Henderson St. Number of cars to school.
- Enforce parking restrictions.

of life. Why increase? Is it able to limit heavies?
Measure traffic volume.

Topic 2: Promoting modal shift and sustainable communities – maximising the ability of Stirling’s residents to walk, cycle and use public transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cambuskenneth 2/08/16 | • Insufficient cycle parking.  
• Insufficient dedicated cycleways. | • Consider provision of subsidised buses.  
• More cycle parking in city centre.  
• More cycleways.  
• Make a safe off-road cycle link to avoid Manor Powis Roundabout between Alloa and Cambuskenneth. |
| Bridge of Allan 15 Aug 16 | • Lack of safe/dedicated cycle routes in BoA & more dangerous ones that suddenly end.  
• Cycling not safe. Cars parked on cycle lanes.  
• Cyclists don't always use cycle lanes - infuriating to drivers.  
• Cycle path on east side of Cornton Rd was put there to avoid entrances to houses on east side. Cyclists still insist on riding on road or on pavement on west side. They do not allow for vehicles exiting from driveways.  
• Cyclists not using cycle lanes where provided.  
• Crossing the road at Fountain Rd (Domino's to the carpet shop). Very busy.  
• No safe place to cross on Henderson St (after the mini roundabout on Keir St) until almost at the University.  
• Overpriced public transport - cheaper to take car.  
• Elderly residents and public transport. | • Improve cycle lanes. Improve bike parks at rail station and encourage leaving cars at home. Discounts for walking/cycling to station.  
• Comprehensive network of cycle routes in BoA.  
• Create dedicated off road cycle lanes.  
• Indicate on pavements cycling not allowed.  
• Cycle lanes both sides of road. BoA – Keir.  
• Develop the 'chicken run' in Bridge of Allan to make it attractive to visitors / residents.  
• Safety at bus stops / better night time lighting.  
• Create a proper, fit for purpose and affordable public transport network. |
| • Refuse bins on pavements / roads esp on collection day - impeding wheelchairs/buggies etc; also overhanging hedges restricting pavements. |
### Topic 3: Maximising the attractiveness of Stirling City Centre – enhancing the accessibility and attractiveness of Stirling City Centre for residents and visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambuskenneth 2/08/16</td>
<td>• Empty Shops.</td>
<td>• Ban smoking everywhere. • Proper weather proof link between rail and bus station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge of Allan 15 Aug 16</td>
<td>• Litter. • Frightened by kids hanging about smoking / bikes etc at entrances/exits. • Thistle's building is very unattractive. Would rather go to Perth to shop.</td>
<td>• Pedestrianise Broad Street, create cafes and tourist shops. Make it a nicer area to walk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues raised at public consultation events: Trossachs Area

Topic 1: Reducing the impact of traffic on communities – recognising the traffic demands of our rural economies and managing that traffic to make our settlements safe and pleasant places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Doune 31 Aug 16| • Too many HGVs use village to access A84 and A820 – impose a 7.5 ton weigh limit.  
   • What are the Roads Dept going to do about inaccurate road signage in Castlehill / Murray Park / Main Street Doune?  
   • Surely better to resurface roads than to just fill in the holes.  
   • According to Mr N Pirrie, Roads Dept SDC, there is no problem with traffic congestion + adequate parking within Doune. |                                                                                               |

Topic 2: Improving access to jobs, services and opportunities – promoting the ability for all to access services and opportunities both within the settlements and beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Blairdrummond 30 Aug 16 | • Make the A811/M9 proposed junction connect in all 4 directions, not just to/from Glasgow & Edinburgh.  
   • Need to have good public transport and walking/cycling links to railway stations and employment. |                                                                                               |
| Doune 31 Aug 16 | • Create more job opportunities in rural areas.  
   • Regularity and reasonably often is important for bus service. |                                                                                               |
Topic 3: Improving the opportunities to walk and cycle – promoting the ability for all to safely access local facilities by walking and cycling, and enhancing healthy leisure and tourism infrastructure.

| Event Location | Issues                                           | Solutions                                                      |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------|                                                               |
| Doune 31 Aug 16| • Please have a maintenance programme for clearing pavement between Doune and Buchany. | • Re-instate the bus through Argaty from Doune to Dunblane. To get to Dunblane from Doune at a reasonable time you need to go via Stirling – 2 hours! |
Issues raised at public consultation events: Forum Five

Topic 1: Maintaining Strategic Access – reducing congestion on strategic routes to reduce pollution and maintain reliable journey times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cambusbarron 03 Aug 16 | • Congestion / Pollution at Park Place Roundabout when work starts on G/Hill.  
• Lack of investment in walking and cycling.  
• Need to invest in building good cycleways. | • Stop building roads and focus strategy on reducing traffic volumes.  
• Parking charge strategy to limit city centre parking.  
• Council has desire to increase walking and cycling but transport plan only seems to have budget allocated for road schemes? No figures on walking and cycling plan but £4 million for A811 Motorway Junction etc. Suspicious when talk is of modal shift but £ allocated to major roads projects.  
• Main Issues Report 7.7 RTS Deliver Plan – No mention made of extending Stirling – Alloa rail link to Dunfermline now Longannet closed. Reopening Stirling – Alloa is less motor vehicles in Stirling. Extending to Dunfermline may do similar. |
| Mayfield Centre 18 Aug 16 | • Borestone Roundabout: peak times gets blocked by Bannockburn traffic trying to access Stirling via St Ninians post office. Traffic wells up on Glasgow Rd and blocks Barnsdale and Borestone exits. Do something please. | }
### Topic 2: Promoting modal shift and sustainable communities – maximising the ability of Stirling’s residents to walk, cycle and use public transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
• Lack of cycling infrastructure that is deemed safe is discouraging modal shift.  
• Safety at St Ninians PS crossing – car often go through when children crossing.  
• People discouraged from walking and especially cycling by: 1. Traffic speed, 2. Traffic volume. Reduce both in residential areas – more 20mph speed limits like Edinburgh. | • Fix part-time 20mph signs outside Stirling High School before new term starts.  
• St Ninians PS crossing – more/better signs to make motorists better aware.  
• More 20mph speed limits and home zones.  
• More cycle routes with people on bikes physically separated from motor vehicles.  
• 5% of transport budget annually allocated to walking and cycling improvements. |
| Mayfield Centre 18 Aug 16 | Cycling into city centre via Melville Terrace / Port St. | • Inform people with learning difficulties prior to changing bus stops within city centre through Streets Ahead Riverbank, Riverside.  
• Segregated cycle network required. |

### Topic 3: Maximising the attractiveness of Stirling City Centre – enhancing the accessibility and attractiveness of Stirling City Centre for residents and visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cambusbarron 03 Aug 16 | • Too many motor vehicles in city centre.  
• Need pedestrian and cycle priority and motor vehicles rerouted for through journey. | |
Issues raised at public consultation events: East Stirling

**Topic 1: Maintaining Strategic Access – reducing congestion on strategic routes to reduce pollution and maintain reliable journey times.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cowie</td>
<td>• Lack of direct bus services to Forth Valley Royal Hospital.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Aug 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plean</td>
<td>• A9 from Plean needs upgrading.</td>
<td>• Viewforth Link: Brilliant plan. Reduces congestion at Craigs Roundabout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Aug 16</td>
<td>• concerns re increased traffic due to new houses in Cowie and proposed ones on Throsk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillpark, Bannockburn 06 Sep 16</td>
<td>• Viewforth Link: Brilliant plan. Reduces congestion at Craigs Roundabout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallin</td>
<td>• Encourage use of park and ride.</td>
<td>• Make Park and Ride bus cheaper than city centre parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sep 16</td>
<td>• Encourage cycling.</td>
<td>• Support Stirling Cycle Hub.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic 2: Promoting modal shift and sustainable communities – maximising the ability of Stirling’s residents to walk, cycle and use public transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plean</td>
<td>• Park and Ride and Rail needs to be considered in Bannockburn Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Aug 16</td>
<td>• £ Investment.</td>
<td>• Fast cycle superhighways for longer distances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Topic 3: Maximising the attractiveness of Stirling City Centre – enhancing the accessibility and attractiveness of Stirling City Centre for residents and visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Location</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fallin 16 Sep 16</td>
<td>Too much traffic passing through city.</td>
<td>Invest in road infrastructure to give choice to avoid city centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues raised at public consultation events: Rural South West Stirling

Topic 1: Reducing the impact of traffic on communities – recognising the traffic demands of our rural economies and managing that traffic to make our settlements safe and pleasant places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rumble strips dangerous for cyclists.</td>
<td>Spend more on making better quality roads instead of rumble strips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People parking on roads and footpaths.</td>
<td>Parking enforcement or bollards to prevent parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding in villages.</td>
<td>20mph speed limit through villages and encourage HGV’s to bypass villages where possible. Also traffic calming measures such as give way to oncoming traffic may work, or traffic lights which turn red when approaching vehicles is exceeding 30mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists on A81 slow traffic between Killearn and Blanefield, road is winding and narrow.</td>
<td>Off road cycle path would improve traffic flow and cyclist safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow traffic in villages.</td>
<td>Only apply 20mph speed limits in villages where necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor public transport links (too few buses).</td>
<td>More bus services linked to train services (Milngavie in particular) would encourage more to use public transport instead of cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor public transport links to Stirling.</td>
<td>More frequent buses travelling to Stirling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic claming on Killearn side of war memorial is leading to dangerous overtaking of bikes.</td>
<td>Need to maintain/clear the verges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road out of Strathblane towards Wennoxtown is very dangerous for walkers.</td>
<td>Expenditure on road maintenance such as potholes and white lighting must be maintained/increased.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Topic 2: Improving access to jobs, services and opportunities – promoting the ability for all to access services and opportunities both within the settlements and beyond**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Poor bus service (expensive, old buses, not coordinated with train times in Milngavie especially, bus to Glasgow takes too long as it goes around houses). Lack of coordination with trains. Limited links for Milngavie.</td>
<td>• Limited stop at key times. Cross-boundary coordination of train/bus services, liaise with bus/train companies. Shorter bus journeys to Glasgow (less stops). Frequent shuttle buses to train stations for Milngavie, Bearsden and Maryhill into Glasgow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mostly single occupancy cars commuting to Glasgow due to lack of park &amp; ride.</td>
<td>• Encourage car sharing for work in Glasgow and create park &amp; ride facility in Milngavie. Car sharing websites/apps or possibly a car club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic going West and North (A811 to Perth) uses Craigforth roundabout.</td>
<td>• Complete new junction to serve West and North connections as well as South and East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cycle route from Strathblane to Milngavie not safe.</td>
<td>• Improved cycle route from Strathblane to Milngavie station would encourage more people to cycle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topic 3: Improving the opportunities to walk and cycle – promoting the ability for all to safely access local facilities by walking and cycling, and enhancing healthy leisure and tourism infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No suitable cycleway from Strathblane to Milngavie.</td>
<td>• Cycle links to Milngavie must be made safer. Used to have pavement all the way along the A81. Running/walking events to show feasibility of walking in Milngavie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Strathblane cycleway stops at Station Road and needs to extend further South.</td>
<td>• Link new Strathblane cycle track with wider network at Beachtree. Additionally, road should be narrowed at bridges to slow traffic. Should join with cycleway in Milngavie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor links from villages to West Highland Way.</td>
<td>• Create more footpath links from villages to West Highland Way. Footpath down Station Road to West Highland Way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dangerous exit from new cycle track in Strathblane on to Station Road.</td>
<td>• Extend cycle way further South than Station Road with a safer exit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cyclists cause congestion on main roads.</td>
<td>• Provide off road routes. Cycle path to Killearn/Balfron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public transport links from rural areas to Larbert are getting more and more difficult.</td>
<td>• More frequent links to Larbert and Falkirk area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speeding in villages.</td>
<td>• More speeding controls in villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large gaps in bus times.</td>
<td>• Increased frequency of buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bus and train services very infrequent, prices very high as bus routes are cross boundary.</td>
<td>• Improved bus and train connectivity/frequency. Work with other councils to solve cross boundary issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve path links from village to Moor Road (gates are locked)</td>
<td>• Improve path from railway track by joining track to houses on Station Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New railway path is heavily used but access from Station Road is dangerous and unsuitable for wheelchairs or parents with children.</td>
<td>• Better promotion of John Muir Way. Accommodation and camping facilities promoted on route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paths on Station Road Blanefield are not very good for walking.</td>
<td>• Improved selection of transport choices for rural based aging population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bottom of Station Road to join the new cycle path, which is very dangerous for kids.</td>
<td>• Pavement (A81 to Milngavie) used to exist and could be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The top of the Cuit Brae where the WHW is on the road could do with a path.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consideration for aging population in rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reinstated with minimum effort. Also need to cut back vegetation adjacent to pathway.

- Develop cycle path to link Station Road to Dumgoyne and NCN (old railway line), involve Sustrans.)
Issues raised at public consultation events: Dunblane

Topic 1: Reducing the impact of traffic on communities – recognising the traffic demands of our rural economies and managing that traffic to make our settlements safe and pleasant places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Car Park now seems full of shoppers.</td>
<td>Restrictions on HGVs passing through Perth Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic speeds on Perth Road.</td>
<td>Another deck added to Tesco’s car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra parking required once electric trains start running in 2018.</td>
<td>Free parking for 1 hour opposite Victoria Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restrict car parking in Cathedral car park to four hours free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 min parking on High Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No parking near schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking at abattoir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No parking on pavements / at junctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign walking and cycling routes in green areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topic 2: Improving access to jobs, services and opportunities – promoting the ability for all to access services and opportunities both within the settlements and beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent huge cut in bus services.</td>
<td>investigate cohesive walking and cycling route from Dunblane to Bridge of Allan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>park and ride on outskirts of Dunblane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good cycle network between communities suitable for disabled scooters and bikes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topic 3: Improving the opportunities to walk and cycle – promoting the ability for all to safely access local facilities by walking and cycling, and enhancing healthy leisure and tourism infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle routes incomplete.</td>
<td>20mph in residential street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Keir Road nightmare for cyclists. | Parking enforcement.  
|                                    | Cycle network completed as priority.  
|                                    | Properly marked cycle paths on roads.  
|                                    | Lower speed limits.  
|                                    | Prioritisation of active travel network routes. |
Appendix D: Full Consultation Responses

Transport Scotland’s response to LDP consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph Number:</th>
<th>Policy number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site reference: Stirling Settlement Statement – Land Safeguarded for Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Programme reference: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Report reference: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation (maximum of 2000 words)

Transport Scotland has been working collaboratively with the Council throughout the preparation of the LDP, specifically on the transport appraisal of the cumulative impacts of the LDP spatial strategy based on DPMTAG principles. Transport Scotland has welcomed the level of engagement during the plan process and is satisfied with the approach taken to assess the nature and scale of the potential impact and identify required measures to facilitate delivery.

Scottish Planning Policy details on page 10 that Development Plans should be consistent with the policies in SPP and set out a spatial strategy which is both sustainable and deliverable, providing confidence to stakeholders that the outcomes can be achieved.

SPP states in paragraph 274:

“In preparing development plans, planning authorities are expected to appraise the impact of the spatial strategy and its reasonable alternatives on the transport network, in line with Transport Scotland’s DPMTAG guidance. This should include consideration of previously allocated sites, transport opportunities and constraints, current capacity and committed improvements to the transport network. Planning authorities should ensure that a transport appraisal is undertaken at a scale and level of detail proportionate to the nature of the issues and proposals being considered, including funding requirements. Appraisals should be carried out in time to inform the spatial strategy and the strategic environmental assessment. Where there are potential issues for the strategic transport network, the appraisal should be discussed with Transport Scotland at the earliest opportunity.”

Paragraph 275 states:

“Development plans should identify any required new transport infrastructure or public transport services, including cycle and pedestrian routes, trunk road and rail infrastructure. The deliverability of this infrastructure, and by whom it will be delivered, should be key considerations in identifying the preferred and alternative land use strategies. Plans and associated documents, such as supplementary guidance and the action programme, should indicate how new infrastructure or services are to be delivered and phased, and how and by whom any developer contributions will be made. These should be prepared in consultation with all of the parties responsible for approving and delivering the infrastructure..."
Paragraph 278 states: "While new junctions on trunk roads are not normally acceptable, the case for a new junction will be considered where the planning authority considers that significant economic growth or regeneration benefits can be demonstrated. New junctions will only be considered if they are designed in accordance with DMRB and where there would be no adverse impact on road safety or operational performance."

The Proposed Plan details within the Stirling Settlement Statement on p220 the ‘Required transport enhancements to the transport network’. The ‘Proposals’ listed include:

- Council aspiration for a rail halt park and ride near Bannockburn/Cowie.
- Council aspiration for a new M9/A811 slip road which is not promoted by the Scottish Government.
- Improvement at Craigforth M9 junction 10.
- Pirnhall Roundabout Improvements.

Transport Scotland consider the way in which the transport enhancements have been represented could cause confusion to the reader as there is no clear link between the requirement for infrastructure and the Proposed LDP allocations. There is also no information pertaining to timescales or delivery of schemes. Furthermore, as the plan has also included aspirational schemes within the list, this could cause confusion as there is no additional information relating to schemes which are committed and have a delivery mechanism in place and those which do not and are subject to further study.

**Modifications you wish to see made to the Plan** (maximum of 500 words)

It is recommended that the reference to the transport enhancements listed within the table should be amended as follows:

### Stirling Settlement Statement on p220

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Enhancements to the transport network | Short Term improvements up to 2019  
  - Replace Cornton Crossings with bridge in vicinity (Network Rail project). |
| Medium Term improvements identified in LDP DPMTAG |
  - A route between Kildean Roundabout/Drip Road to Cornton Road (Kildean Link Phase 1).  
  - A route between Cornton Road and Airthrey Road (Kildean Link phase 2).  
  - A route between St.Ninians Road and A9 Burghmuir (Viewforth Link Road).  
  - Improvements to key roundabouts in Stirling.  
  - A91 upgrade/dualling.  
  - Pirnhall Roundabout Improvements. |
| Longer Term improvements which require further study |
Potential improvements to M9 junctions at Craigforth and Kier and Council aspiration for a new connection at the A811.

Council aspiration for a park and ride near Bannockburn/Cowie.

As it stands the plan includes a lack of information in relation to specific schemes namely who will be responsible for their delivery. The above information is recommended to be included as this clearly details the infrastructure that is required over and above that already identified as part of development allocations and those which have been investigated within the LDP DPMTAG appraisal. The list sets out the phasing for the infrastructure, detailing transport improvements required to deliver the plan and those which are longer term aspirations. The plan now sets out schemes which have been assessed and those which require further appraisal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph Number: Policy 3.3 paragraph (a)</th>
<th>Policy number: 3.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site reference: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Programme reference: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Report reference: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation (maximum of 2000 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proposed Plan includes ‘Policy 3.3: Developer Contributions’ however, this does not mention the DPMTAG transport appraisal work that has been undertaken and does not take cognisance of the infrastructure identified to facilitate delivery of the plan, nor does it detail how the infrastructure will be delivered and by whom.

Policy 3.3 states:

“(a) Developer contributions will be sought in situations where a development (or combination of developments) creates a need for new, extended or improved public infrastructure, facilities or services. The need to seek contributions towards additional infrastructure will be determined through considering existing capacity and also cumulative development pressures arising from other proposals in the Local Development Plan.

(b) Contributions will be sought for both critical and necessary infrastructure (as outlined with SG16) and where secured through a Planning Obligation (a Section 75 Agreement or other legal agreement as necessary), be consistent with Circular 3/2012.”
Consequently, the reader is unaware of the significant volume of appraisal work undertaken or the outcomes of this work. Specifically, the plan does not mention the need for developer contributions to deliver the required infrastructure, how this infrastructure will be delivered and by whom, in accordance with SPP.

**Modifications you wish to see made to the Plan** (maximum of 500 words)

It is recommended that the Proposed Plan is amended as follows:

‘**Policy 3.3: Developer Contributions**’

a) Developer contributions will be sought in situations where a development (or combination of developments) creates a need for new, extended or improved public infrastructure, facilities or services. The need to seek contributions towards additional infrastructure will be determined through considering existing capacity and also cumulative development pressures arising from other proposals in the Local Development Plan. **The initial outcomes and future development of the LDP DPMTAG Transport Appraisal will be taken into consideration as part of this process.**

It is considered the Plan should reflect the DPMTAG study, the infrastructure identified within, its outcomes and the requirement for development contributions to deliver the infrastructure identified to facilitate the LDP spatial strategy.

---

**Please fill in the paragraph number, policy number, site reference, action programme reference or the environmental report reference that your representation relates to.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph Number: N/A</th>
<th>Policy number: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site reference: N/A</td>
<td>Action Programme reference: Key Transportation Projects (page 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation (maximum of 2000 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Action Programme details on p10 the ‘**Key Transportation Projects**’ which include:

<p>| Improve ments at Craigforth, M9 junction10 | DPM-tag process highlights that improvements at Craigforth are required. Work required to understand the most | TBC | 2027 - 2037 | Maintenance of acceptable journey times between a growing Stirling and Scotland’s cities and between Stirling and its hinterland; and maintaining acceptable journey times and safety on the trunk road network | DPM-tag process has highlighted the need for improvements to address queuing and journey times in the Craigforth area. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M9/A811 New Junction</td>
<td>New slip roads would improve access to city centre and reduce traffic on other key routes in and around the city.</td>
<td>£14.2m</td>
<td>2027-2037</td>
<td>Plan new junction to maximise strategic access to Stirling City and minimise traffic to/from trunk roads within the City area. DPM-tag process has highlighted the need for new M9 junction to maintain journey times at acceptable levels.</td>
<td>SC to work with Transport Scotland to plan and deliver new junction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keir Roundabout Improvements</td>
<td>Grade separation proposed in STPR to reduce congestion and accidents on A9/M9.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Grade separation proposed in STPR to reduce congestion and accidents on A9/M9.</td>
<td>Transport Scotland to deliver project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is considered that the information for the above ‘Key Transportation Projects’ is not correct and should be amended to reflect the LDP, DPMTAG study and its outcomes. As stated in SPP, the Action Programme should detail how new infrastructure is to be delivered and phased, and how, when and by whom any developer contributions will be made. The Action Programme does not currently provide this level of detail which is critical to the delivery of the plan and any development management decisions.
Modifications you wish to see made to the Plan (maximum of 500 words)
The ‘Key Transportation Projects’ table within the Action Programme is recommended to remove the entries relating to ‘Improvements at Craigforth’, ‘M9/A811 junction’ and ‘Keir roundabout improvements’. These entries are recommended to be grouped together into one single entry entitled ‘Future strategic transportation improvements’ which outlines all 3 schemes which are potentially linked and need for further study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>project</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Project cost</th>
<th>Project timescale</th>
<th>Relationship to LDP and SDP</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longer Term Enhancements to the transport network</td>
<td>Potential improvements to M9 junctions at Craigforth and Kier and Council aspiration for a new connection at the A811.</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>2027+</td>
<td>Identified in LDP and DPMTAG appraisal requiring further study.</td>
<td>Further study required to determine full rationale, potential scheme details, timescales, cost, delivery &amp; phasing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is essential that the Proposed Plan and Action Programme are aligned ensuring consistency. In accordance with SPP proposals included within the Proposed Plan require to be included within the Action Programme detailing specific information on the next steps and the methods and approach for delivery.
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy Consultation: Tactran Response

Question
Should key agencies consider opportunities for improving co-ordination and reporting of progress against the issues identified in Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy?

Tactran agrees with this and already works closely with the Council as one of its partner authorities on issues of regional significance. In progressing such issues Tactran sees there are opportunities to report at both RTS and LTS levels.

Question
Are the following the key issues that need to be taken into account in delivering the LTS2?

- Road Safety;
- Road Maintenance;
- The transport network having gaps so not everyone able to access jobs, services and opportunities;
- Lack of opportunities to walk and cycle;
- Enabling economic growth;
- Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors;
- Impacts of traffic on health and the environment; and
- Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling.

Are there issues we have overlooked?
What are the main city and rural transport issues that you would like to see addressed?

In general the key issues identified are comprehensive though it is recommended that security is added to the list reflecting the RTS Objective in that regard. It is noted that there is an Outcome Indicator in the MIR for security.

Question
Will these transport objectives help us to address the issues you feel need to be addressed?

It is noted that the stated LTS objectives do not fully reflect the RTS Objectives. Consideration could be given to adding objectives related to:-

- Economy - ensure transport helps to deliver (regional) prosperity;
- Environment - ensure that the transport system contributes to safeguarding the environment and promotes opportunities for improvement; and
- (Safety &) Security - to improve the (real and) perceived safety and security of the transport network.

Question
Are other indicators required?
Are other targets required?

Tactran has no suggestions for other indicators or targets.
Question

Do you think the measures in the delivery plans will address the issues identified in this report?

Are there particular measures you:
- Strongly agree or disagree with?
- Feel are missing?

Tactran notes that the Delivery Plans reflect most key projects identified in the RTS Refresh Delivery Plan 2016 – 21, though the following omissions are noted:-

- Project AT3.7 NWCN Long Distance Route: Stirling to Drymen - section between Balfron and Drymen.
- Project AT3.13 Aspirational NCN755 Cycling Route: Drymen to Strathblane.
- Project AT3.22 Regional Walking and Cycling Route: Cowie – Denny.
- Project B15.1 Assist with development of a successful multi-operator and multi-modal travel ticket.
- Project TI7.1 Real Time Information - Stirling Council.
- Project CC2.1 Eco-driver training.

Additional Comment

Tactran has a further comment regarding Developer Contributions (page 32), that contributions should also be sought for regional projects, where relevant.
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy Consultation: East Dunbartonshire Council response

"East Dunbartonshire Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Stirling Council Transport Issues Report for consultation and submits the following comments for consideration.

East Dunbartonshire Council agrees with the principles and priorities in the Transport Issues Report however, requests that cognisance is taken of the following issues:

• East Dunbartonshire Council has commissioned a further study on the A81 utilising STAG principles to appraise options for the A81 corridor to supplement the 2015 A81 study. This study is currently in progress and emerging options for the corridor should be considered when developing the Stirling Local Transport Strategy as options will have implications for residents in the south western villages of the Stirling area.

• Following publication of the 2015 Active Travel Strategy, East Dunbartonshire Council has aspirations of creating a circular ‘Loop’ route around the perimeter of the East Dunbartonshire area. This proposed route would cross into Stirling Council land at Strathblane and re-enter East Dunbartonshire at Mugdock, exact route details are unclear at this stage. Stirling Council responded to the Active Travel Strategy consultation and indicated support for this project however indicated that any costs of infrastructure works on Stirling land would require to be borne by East Dunbartonshire Council. While precise locations for any works are at an early stage, East Dunbartonshire Council would request that this proposal is considered when developing the Stirling Council Local Transport Strategy.

• East Dunbartonshire Council has carried out various works on Stockiemuir Road (A809) to improve safety on this route which has historically witnessed several casualties over the years. East Dunbartonshire Council notes that safety is a priority in the Stirling Transport Issues Report and requests that these works are considered when developing priorities and that a partnership approach is adopted to ensure optimum safety on this corridor.

• East Dunbartonshire Council is currently developing a Green Network Strategy. The two main strands of this work are improving access to the green network and protection of bio-diversity. An emerging priority is improving access to the Campsie Fells. As the Campsie Fells form the natural boundary between the two authorities it is requested that this priority is considered when developing the Stirling Council Local Transport Strategy.

• East Dunbartonshire Council supports the Edinburgh Glasgow Improvements Programme and notes Phase 2 proposes full electrification of services on the Stirling/Alloa and Dunblane lines which serves to benefit residents of Stirling and East Dunbartonshire. The Council notes Stirling identifies enhancing rail services and enhancing access between Stirling and Scotland’s cities in its City Transport Plan section but does not mention EGIP specifically. East Dunbartonshire Council requests that consideration is taken of the EGIP programme in developing the Stirling Council Local Transport Strategy."
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy Consultation: Clackmannanshire Council response

Thank you for inviting Clackmannanshire Council to your recent consultation event and inviting us to comment on the forthcoming strategy.

In general we consider the key issues have been captured in the main issues report and the policy direction is robust. It has been noted that there is significant traffic growth forecast in the Stirling area, which will also likely impact on traffic volumes in Clackmannanshire. While many of the discussions focused on the modelling of the Local Transport Strategy and the Local Development Plan, we consider the use of the model to provide a reasonable estimation of likely impacts and required mitigation measures. A key factor in managing the forecast traffic growth is to reduce the use of the private car both in Stirling and Clackmannanshire by shifting travel onto more sustainable modes.

At the consultation event we provided some comment on what we consider to be the key issues and corridors in relation to Clackmannanshire. However for clarity we would reiterate these as being:

- A907 corridor between Alloa and Manor Powis, onwards to Stirling University, Stirling City centre and strategic network.
- A91 Corridor between Hillfoots villages to Manor Powis, onwards to Stirling University, Stirling City centre and strategic network.
- NCN 76 Round the Forth, specifically improvements at Manor Powis for cyclists and pedestrians to link the NCN76 into Stirling.
- Cycle improvements adjacent the A91 and Hillfoots Road to connect with the NCN 768 at the Clackmannanshire boundary to Stirling University and Stirling City centre.
- Public transport connections between Stirling, Alloa, Hillfoots and Clackmannan.
- Ongoing concerns over the future of commercially operated services are a key concern.
- Public transport connections between Stirling and Fife via Alloa.
- Congestion on public transport corridors impacting on bus service reliability, particularly on the A907 between Causewayhead and Manor Powis.
- Rail services to Fife and Edinburgh from Stirling via Alloa.
- Uncertainty over the move to a level 3 partnership in the SEStran area may impact on bus services between Clackmannanshire and Stirling.

Clackmannanshire Council would welcome the opportunity to work with Stirling Council on the development of transport interventions on these corridors where possible as part of the implementation of the Local Transport Strategy.

We trust you find the above information of use in finalising your Local Transport Strategy, however if you wish to discuss this further then please do not hesitate to get in touch.
**Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy Consultation: Cycle Stirling’s Workshop Responses**

**Introduction**

On 9th August 2016 Cycle Stirling hosted a workshop for interested stakeholders to formulate a collective response to Stirling Council’s consultation on its Local Transport Strategy (LTS), with a particular focus on the associated Active Travel Plan. On 7th September 2016, a further stakeholder workshop was held to review the outcomes of the first event and provide the opportunity to make further amendments to the response.

**Response**

Through the workshop process, it was identified that, most significantly, the Active Travel Action Plan (in Appendix B & C of the Active Travel Plan) requires more detail, with specific timescales, detail and estimated costs for implementation allotted to each action, as well as potential delivery partners identified. The action plan should also be prioritised and in line with the CAPS vision of 10% by 2020.

The outcomes of the workshops have been thematically set out below in response to the Active Travel Plan. Those responses that are in bold are considered priorities for inclusion into the plan.

**1. Governance**

**a) Stirling Council to establish an Active Travel Steering Group.**

- The membership should include:
  - elected members / Councillors
  - key stakeholders from across Council departments
  - representatives from organisations that cut across the four themes of the Active Travel Plan
  - representative to feed back to the Community Planning Partnerships

- The Action Plan should highlight the regularity of the meeting for the Steering Group.

- Steering Group should be responsible for tracking the progress of the Active Travel Plan, and in particular, hold the named leads of each action in the Plan accountable and producing a progress report.

**b) The existing active travel working group perhaps needs to be widened or replaced with the Steering Group (or feed into it).**

**c) Stirling Council needs to commit a dedicated proportion revenue and capital funding to active travel or identify the appropriate budget to fund this work e.g. a specific percentage of transport budget committed in the Action Plan. The Action Plan should begin to identify what funding sources are available alongside their resource commitment.**

- In relation to this, well-defined timescales and cost for active travel interventions are required in the same way that they exist for roads investment: if active travel is to be regarded as a priority then this commitment needs to be made for investment.

**d) Stirling Council to facilitate better coordination between different departments to ensure better integration of active travel into existing and planned key projects.**
e) Active travel to be highlighted and championed at a senior level in the Council to ensure that all opportunities (in particular relating to funding) are given the prominence required to be progressed.

f) Standard training to be provided to all involved in active travel infrastructure projects and guidance documents fully adopted and utilised to ensure standards are consistent and coherent across all projects.

g) **Local policies need to reflect and incorporate the Active Travel Plan** and a review of policies should be undertaken to ensure that any conflicts across policies are addressed.

2. **Partnership working**

a) Local knowledge from communities/groups should be used to understand opportunities and barriers are at a micro-level e.g. as has been done in Dunblane (consultation, audits or local champions).

b) **The NHS can take a prominent role in promoting walking and cycling from a health perspective** and their influence should be fully utilised - the action plan needs to identify relevant actions that relate to them.

c) Other groups who are key and need to be involved in discussions are the National Park, Education, University of Stirling, Stirling Bike Club, but there are others that have not yet been identified.

d) Ensure that we can combine work, consistent monitoring and information/resources to help support active travel initiatives is particularly important and the plan should identify where this is possible.

e) **There should be a plan of work and clear rationale for why those projects have been selected**, as this will help to manage expectations of partners and stakeholders, as well as provide a ‘bigger picture’ of why specific projects are taken forward.

f) Working with communities to ensure that they are on board with any active travel plans for their local area.

g) **Ensuring that support from delivery partners is sought where Council capacity is unable to deliver, tapping into resources available through different organisations**. A clear recognition of who is able to support the plan and stating these against actions.

h) Stirling Council to consult with Stirling Area Access Panel on infrastructure projects – access for most vulnerable group ensures everyone can access facilities.

3. **Strategic / economic development and planning**

a) **Need to identify a list of projects in the City Development Framework and Local Development Plan and the associated active travel work that should be undertaken for each. Routes should be included in the strategic mapping.**

b) Inclusion of an action relating to a network of Active Travel Hubs throughout Stirling (with the potential to release pressure on Demand Responsive Transport) to promote:

   o Active travel information
   o Car sharing
   o Public transport information/links
   o Bike racks

Potential Active Travel Hub locations could include:

   o City Centre
   o University
o Park and Ride (Choose) sites
  o Callander
  o Aberfoyle
  o Tyndrum
  o Balfron.

c) **Tourism-related walking and cycling needs to be addressed as a significant development opportunity**, with the need for appropriate infrastructure, information and events/rentals etc. to encourage and sustain tourism to the area.

d) Utilise the first draft of the Local Transport Strategy/Active Travel Plan to include the scope for pilot projects, that then can be reviewed/expanded in future versions examples include:
  o late night Park & Ride services to the city centre/The Peak.

e) Identify a new approach to accessibility to transportation options through Park & Ride addressing cost/timetable, and recognising the vital need that they feed into main employment centres.

f) **Need to identify actions relating to integration with public transport and other modes of travel, to ensure that door-to-door journeys without cars are simple and convenient.**
   o Working with public transport providers to ensure integration
   o Identify key interchanges that require access and facilities for active travel.

g) **An action on 20mph zones implementation should be included** for strategic locations across the area.

h) **Walking and cycling infrastructure needs to be included at the beginning of the planning process as well as in Local Development Plans**, and new road infrastructure must also be compatible with active travel.
   o Identifying developer contributions an ensuring that these developments have active travel as part of their travel infrastructure is vital to forward planning for active travel.

i) It is suggested that more evidence is gathered on where people walk and cycle and prioritise investment on capital and revenue to match these priorities.

j) **Inclusion of journey times/efficiency of active travel modes and public transport** – there needs to be some cost-benefit analysis of routes to highlight the effectiveness of these options against car travel – helps to ‘sell’ the package of active travel.
   o This needs to also be inclusive of wider indicators that are assigned to active travel e.g. health/wellbeing/air pollution/sustainability etc.

k) Needs to be explicit in how other strategic routes are linked into the network in as well as the associated funding that may be attached to them.

4. **Infrastructure and maintenance.**

a) **There needs to be a statement and commitment in the action plan on the standard and consistency of a cycle network that is easy and accessible for all types of users.** Safe, convenient and consistent infrastructure is key, if this is not provided then there will not be modal shift.
   o This should include existing as well as new infrastructure, incorporating maintenance and upgrades into action plans.

b) **Strategic mapping (see Appendix)** – there needs to be a commitment to deliver the indicative routes that are highlighted on the maps and include clear timescales and potential costs. Additional routes should be considered for inclusion.
c) Low cost or small improvements should be included to link up the existing network and make it more usable and coherent.
d) Paths networks can be audited, using local knowledge etc. to identify missing links, accessibility issues, maintenance needs.
e) **There needs to be a coordination or schedule of maintenance work included in the plan** to ensure that all paths are maintained to a suitable standard for use.
   - Maintenance can be fulfilled by different groups (e.g. council/communities/volunteers) but that this is clearly set out at the beginning of any project or established for existing paths.
f) Standardised, consistent and coherent signage across core active travel networks to be audited and implemented.
g) Recognition that some infrastructure can actually make journeys harder for those cycling, e.g. having to dismount; having to come off of the main carriage way and use toucan crossings – making cycling secondary to car traffic – needs to be a way to address this.

5. **Promotions / travel planning**
a) There needs to be a stronger reflection of national active travel promotional marketing messaging at local level campaigns (e.g. campaigns by Cycling Scotland/Sustrans/Paths for All/Cycling UK).
b) A nuanced approach should be taken towards the promotions and messaging of different modes of active travel with a recognition that the underlying principles are the same, but ensuring messaging is tailored.
c) **An action on consistent and comprehensive signage to information and advice on active travel is vital, and this must be consistent across the providers of information** (e.g. additional Active Travel Hubs/Destination Stirling etc.)
   - a. Inclusion of an action on relating to developing a strategic network of locations for consistent information (e.g. how this ties into the strategic locations of potential Active Travel Hubs).
d) The health aspect of active travel is promoted heavily and potentially use partnership with the NHS to ensure this is more effectively projected to the public.
e) **Stirling Council to utilise and work with existing route planner resources, as so many available, rather than investing in producing new resources to offer route planning** (unless there is a unique and specific reason for the development of a localised route planner).
f) Stirling Council to develop a core list of active travel-related events/days that they will be supporting/promoting consistently each year across different Council departments.
g) An action to be included regarding behaviour change campaigns to address physical barriers for those walking and cycling and enforce rules, with the potential to partner with local police force:
   - o Cars parked on pavements (sticker campaign?)
   - o Bins on pavements
   - o Cars parked in advisory cycle lanes

**Education**
h) Campaigns to cut across both primary/secondary/tertiary education – consistency throughout the education system.
i) **Education needs to be included in the Steering Group** (to cover all educational establishments) ensuring high level buy-in to active travel in education.

j) Managing expectations and ensure that there is a clear understanding of the purpose of the travel plan as well as level of involvement required from school stakeholders (parents/staff/pupils/council etc.) as well as ensuring local area/community understands and is incorporated.

k) Support for communities to develop resources to maintain walking / cycling bus – funding for these programmes to become available?

l) Incorporation into the curriculum – could Active Travel be integrated into eco-schools curriculum?

m) **Targets for number of Cycle Friendly Schools should be included in the plan.**

**Workplaces**

n) **Targets for number Cycle Friendly Employers should be included in the plan.**

o) Targets for employee engagement programmes also to be included in the plan.

p) Developing an accreditation path e.g. bronze/silver/gold would be a potential way to hold employers more accountable (or create more willingness) to deliver active travel developments.

q) Help to implement champions – potential to work with Sustrans programme and resources here?

r) Facilities to be provided by employers should be included within travel plans and is significant in helping to shift behaviour.

6. Monitoring

a) **Consistent collection of core indicators from a number of different partners and collated centrally and fed into an annual report to showcase progress towards modal shift.** Partners need to be identified to ensure that there is collaboration for different types of monitoring.

b) **There should be quantitative and qualitative indicators included**, such as the amount (e.g. m²) of cycle infrastructure implemented as well as how people view different infrastructure. There is a sustainability issue relating to funding for this kind of data collection which needs to be planned for.

c) **The Steering Group should provide a reporting mechanism to provide updates towards local targets.**

d) Systems to make it easy to get information from local communities/users etc. would get more on-the-ground information. This could be promoted through local groups to get to network users, and allowing Stirling to disseminate relevant information to other partners (e.g. email/form online?)

e) **Targets need to contribute to other policy goals** e.g. education, carbon saving, economy, social – need to be reflected across all documents (and vice versa).

f) What monitoring tools should be used? **The establishment of a monitoring strategy for local information and data with consistent indicators and measurements is needed.**

g) Are Stirling Council signed up to the National Highways and Transport Satisfaction Survey? Other Councils have suggested that the National Highways and Transport Satisfaction Survey is a good national benchmarking survey. This or something similar would be useful to employ.
h) The use technology for more regular reporting and monitoring should be included. Live data, open data and links to the CDF digital district are all potential avenues for more dynamic monitoring.

i) When regularly reporting to the public use impressive numbers e.g. attendees at specific events rather than small increases in modal shift.

j) Need to ensure that cross-section of population is captured in any surveys – i.e. rural and city, and captures economic inequalities.

k) The plan and any monitoring/reporting needs to be inclusive of all types of users – those with limited mobility/disabled etc. – walking and cycling can exclude these users who can still obviously be “non-motorised users”.

Appendix: Additional Strategic Routes
In the maps and notes below, please find some additional routes that should be considered for inclusion on the Strategic Cycling Network.
1. Strategic Cycle Network Map – Urban Stirling

Town centre
1. Goosecroft road (west side) between Burghmuir Retail Park and stations
2. BP garage via Kwik Fit to station
West links
3. Prudential to Cambusbarron via North Kersibonny Road
4. Prudential to Drip bridge south side of A84
5. To Doune via Chalmerston Road, Blair Drummond (school/hall/bus stop/campsite/Camphill), Cuthill Brae
6. Hayfords Mill footbridge beside M9 to Polmaise Road/Wardie Road to Bannockburn Heritage Centre
7. Across Stirling via Bannock Burn green heritage route, links with Ladywell Park
8. Protect/Enhance old routes south via Brucefields

To South
9. A91 crossing points – near interchange to A872 and Durieshll, Cowie Road, Station Road, Pike roundabout for Ladywell Park/Thunderbridge link
10. Link from near Auchinbowie House beside A872/M80 to Dunipace/Denny old road

East
11. Add new upgraded link from Cowie to near Fallin – alternative to current NCN 76?
12. Ladywell Park to Thunderbridge direct link crossing Pike Road
13. Springkerse/Forthbank to Manor Powis roundabout
14. Crossing A907 from NCN 76 to Blairlogie via Blaimains

North
15. Cornton rail crossing link is missing
16. Baxters Loan via Wanderwrang to B8033 and possibly under bypass to B824
2. Strategic Cycling Network Map – Rural Stirling
17. Doune to Stirling via Cuthill Brae as above number 5.
18. As above – the villages need links with Stirling from west, south, east and north.
19. It is difficult to see what is being proposed.
20. Some existing routes also need upgrading e.g. NCN 7 from Strathyre to Callander, Buchlyvie to Aberfoyle, Aberfoyle to Callander.
Thank you for consulting Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) on Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy (LTS) 2017-2027, Main Issues Consultation Report, Draft for Council.

Background
SNH supports the objectives of the Strategy as outlined in the Executive Summary and in section three. We welcome the reference to the Stirling City Development Framework (CDF). The CDF contains proposals which will have a bearing on the transport infrastructure and the policies that guide it such as the development of a new City Park, a new junction from the M9 to the west of Stirling and a new park and ride facility. It’s not clear how the Strategy and the Delivery Plans will fit with the projects in the CDF, however we appreciate the CDF is still in the early stages of development and is working to a different timescale from the Transport Strategy. We would welcome the opportunity to work with you to maximise the opportunities for green infrastructure and active travel that the two projects present.

Comments on the Strategy
We suggest that you change the order of the delivery plans so it reflects the mode hierarchy as outlined on page 31. Our preferred order would be; 1) Active Travel Plan 2) City Transport Plan 3) Towns Villages & Rural Areas Transport Plan 4) Road Safety Plan 5) Road Asset Management Plan. It would also be useful to know the timescales for delivery of the action plans.

We would like to see a greater commitment to reducing speed limits e.g. introducing 20mph zones in all residential areas. On p27 the plan says speed limits ‘could’ be reduced in residential areas yet there is no mention about doing this in the Road Safety Plan.

We recommend that a commitment to reduce speed limits across all residential areas is included in the Strategy as this would increase active travel by making Stirling safer and more attractive to walkers and cyclists.

It would be useful to highlight opportunities to integrate public transport walking and cycling within the list of items that need to be taken into consideration in delivering the LTS2 (see p24).

The Road Safety Plan (p54) identifies motorcyclists on the list of vulnerable users but omits cyclists. We recommend that you include cyclists on the list of vulnerable users.

Comments on the Active Travel Plan
We recommend that you place more emphasis on cross boundary links in the Strategy. We have been working with the local authorities within the Central Scotland Green Network (CSGN) to map out strategic walking and cycling routes. Stirling Council has taken an active role in these discussions so it is disappointing to see that the missing links between Stirling-Forth Valley Royal Hospital (FVRH) and
Stirling-Denny are not referenced in the active travel, particularly as they are in the CSGN strategic routes map. The Towns, Villages and Rural Areas Plan does refer to the Stirling-Denny link, however the Stirling-FVRH is not included.

We recommend both routes are included in the Active Travel Plan and in the Towns, Villages and Rural Areas Plan.

The action plan does not provide sufficient detail of what the actions are and when they will be delivered. As highlighted in our comments on the LTS it would be useful to see more clearly defined actions with specific timescales for delivery to ensure the necessary momentum for delivery of the actions.

We would like to see a greater commitment to reducing speed limits e.g. introducing 20mph zones in all residential areas in the Active Travel Plan. This would make Stirling safer for cyclists and pedestrians and show the Council’s commitment to delivering the actions in the Cycle Action Plan for Scotland (CAPS).

We feel there has been a missed opportunity to create more off road paths that link into and help form the green network. More could also be done to open up the area along the River Forth for walking and cycling and this would fit well with the proposed River Projects in the Stirling CDF. Improving opportunities for active and recreational travel green networks can also help improve biodiversity, health & well-being, enhance the local amenity and contribute towards mitigating the effects of climate change.
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy Consultation: Paths for All

Paths for All welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation.

We do not have the local knowledge to comment on the detail of the proposals but would like to make some general points. We will limit our comments to those aspects that have direct relevance to the work and objectives of Paths for All.

Summary
- We welcome the development of the new local transport strategy.
- We recommend that active travel - including walking – should be emphasised to align it with the National Walking Strategy (NWS), the Cycling Action Plan for Scotland (CAPS) and the Long-term Vision for Active Travel in Scotland.
- We would be very pleased to explore appropriate partnership work to promote the development of paths; walking, cycling and active travel or discuss any of our comments.

Background
Paths for All is a Scottish charity founded in 1996. We champion everyday walking as the way to a happier, healthier Scotland. We want to get Scotland walking: everyone, everyday, everywhere.

Our aim is to significantly increase the number of people who choose to walk in Scotland - whether that's leisure walking or active-choice walking to work, school or shops. We want to create a happier, healthier Scotland, where increased physical activity improves quality of life and wellbeing for all. We work to develop more opportunities and better environments not just for walking, but also for cycling and other activities, to help make Scotland a more active, more prosperous, greener country.

Our work supports the delivery of the Scottish Government’s Active Scotland Outcomes Framework, the National Walking Strategy (NWS), the Cycling Action Plan for Scotland (CAPS) and the Long-term Vision for Active Travel in Scotland.

We do this through our work with community and workplace health walking, path network development and active travel policy development. We are a partnership organisation with 28 national partners.

Our core funder is The Scottish Government and we are also supported by Transport Scotland, Life Changes Trust, Macmillan Cancer Support and SNH.

Active Travel
Our vision is for walking and cycling to be the natural choice for short journeys, creating a healthier, socially inclusive, economically vibrant, environmentally friendly Scotland.

Active Travel is about improving quality of life and quality of place. And with over 50% of all driven journeys in Scotland being less than 5km, and 26% less than 2km,
there is plenty of scope for achieving a significant shift to walking and cycling as the most sustainable forms of transport.

The Smarter Choices, Smarter Places (SCSP) programme is Paths for All’s grant scheme to support behaviour change initiatives to increase active and sustainable travel modes.

Comments
We welcome the development of the strategy. We do not have the local knowledge to comment on the detail of proposed schemes but would like to make some general points.

We welcome that the Strategy sets out the national, regional and local policy context – referring to the National Walking Strategy, Cycling Action Plan for Scotland, ‘A More Active Scotland’, etc.

As has been identified the Strategy should support the delivery of the NWS – which has three strategic aims:

- Create a culture of walking.
- Better walking environments throughout Scotland.
- Ensure easy, convenient independent mobility for all.

In particular the NWS makes the links between active travel, health and the environment.

Relevant actions in the NWS include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 To increase the awareness and availability of the opportunities and benefits of walking to residents and visitors to Scotland (including everyday walking for pleasure, for health, to school, to the park, playing golf, hillwalking etc.)</th>
<th>1.2 Walking opportunities increase within Health and Care Service delivery programmes e.g. health walk referral, walking routes at hospitals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Develop and mainstream initiatives that support mode shift from driven to walking journeys e.g. walking as part of every journey and integrated with use of public transport</td>
<td>1.5 Support and enable schools and youth organisations to get young people to walk as part of their everyday commuting and learning activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Develop high-quality, well maintained walking (and cycling) networks in every local authority area, particularly in lowest 15% SIMD areas; Ensure existing routes are maintained and promoted effectively.</td>
<td>2.2 Promote everyday walking for short journeys to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pollutants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Prioritise and support good quality walking environments, including green infrastructure, through planning and</td>
<td>2.4 Ensure all households in Scotland’s urban areas are no more than 5 minutes’ walk from promoted, publicly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development (land use, transport, housing etc.) at national and local authority levels in both urban and rural areas.
accessible and attractive greenspace, parks or local path networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5 Ensure all future planning policies / developments prioritise walking</th>
<th>3.1 Prioritise the protection of vulnerable road users to ensure that pedestrians of all abilities and other users are safer on Scotland’s roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Ensure designs for public and private developments deliver secure connectivity within communities for pedestrians</td>
<td>3.3 Ensure existing or developing walking / cycling / active travel plans assist with delivery of NWS and AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Ensure all local authorities, national park authorities and other land managers adopt the Path Grading System across Scotland</td>
<td>3.6 Increase the percentage of footways (by authority and nationally) deemed in good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Promote safe, courteous and responsible shared use practices on footpaths, recreational and urban paths/trails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We welcome that there is recognition that provision of opportunities to walk and cycle is a key issue for the Strategy.

We are aware of the council’s commitment to this to date – and have supported related work through Smarter Choices Smarter Places:

- 2015/16 Initiatives supported: Personal Travel Planning, Signage, Mapping & Infrastructure Promotion, School Based Activities, Community Events & Engagement, Walking, Cycling.
- 2016/17: School Travel Planning officer; Cycle Safe Schools including Dr Bike, fun bike maintenance and led rides; Active Travel Employer Engagement Programme encouraging organisations to promote sustainable transport; Stirling Cycling Festival; Active travel network signage review with a focus on city centre signs for pedestrians.

**Current levels of walking and cycling**

It is encouraging that there has been an increase in adults walking and cycling when travelling to work (11.4% in 2007/08 and 15% in 2014). The percentage of adults who walk as a means of transport has increased, with 54.9% walking one or more days a week in 2007/08 compared to 86% walking one or more days a week in 2014. This is a good foundation on which to build the strategy.

We welcome the ambition to achieve an active and sustainable Stirling. We consider that to achieve this there should be a hierarchy of priority:

1. Within towns - shorter trips are more likely to be walkable and cycleable.
2. Multi modal – walking in particular can be a major part of public transport trips
3. Trips between towns – potentially cycleable.
4. Longer distance – emphasis will tend to be on public transport.
We welcome that indicators will include the numbers and proportion of trips by walking, cycling and public transport. This should include multi modal trips – e.g. when walking is associated with use of public transport.

We welcome the intention to implement an Active Travel Plan and to improve opportunities for walking and cycling through the Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan. We are therefore pleased that we are identified as a key stakeholder.

Paths for All and our partners can support actions proposed in the strategy and we would be pleased to discuss this. This could include funding, resources and training. Examples include:

- SCSP funding.
- Workplace walking resources and training.
- Links to health walks.
- Community paths – grants, training, support and resources.
- The Step Count Challenge – an online workplace resource.
- Walk once a Week – a schools programme delivered by Living Streets Scotland.
- Community street audits.

We would be very happy to engage further in the development of the strategy and the Active Travel Plan in particular and discuss any of the points we have raised.
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy Consultation: Stirling Area Access Panel

Overall, there are excellent sections of the Strategy which does assess in detail City and Rural needs, but it features almost exclusively on the Scottish Government led framework for change which is biased towards enforced physical activity; how effective this evolves to be, is not known. Although there are some comments relating to the needs of disabled users and an ageing population, there really isn’t any specific actions which would help these groups in this document. There are some statistics, but the information is light and misses some demographic detail relating to traffic movement in Stirling City or evidence of what people think what features are working, and what is not. The Strategy addresses a myriad of challenging issues, and perhaps not all the comments here are relevant. Page 16 captures the impact of physical difficulties and long term conditions which is excellent, but there is little weight given to this ‘need’ throughout the document.

“Maintaining Strategic Access within the City Transport Plan will mean that parking provision will have to be sensibly developed as many people travel in from rural locations, also elderly and disabled people who cannot walk far will need appropriate disabled parking facilities and the fact that we face an ageing population, otherwise these people will be excluded from the city and be forced to socialise and spend their money elsewhere.

“Towns Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan” I live in Balfron and in the last 23 years, the village has nearly doubled in housing size. This means more people, more cars, and an additional burden on local service provision. Yet, we see no improvement in infrastructure with roads, parking and other amenities all falling short of what is now needed. Demographic changes have consequences, planners of the LDP have to take into account the social changes that housing expansion causes. Roads which were lightly used, now become very busy, creating pollution and a danger for pedestrians and schoolchildren who have to use their now inadequate crossing points. Planners need to take a holistic view of housing development in the future and go beyond just sewerage provision!

It is good that there is recognition of the importance of Stirling Station as a destination and travel hub, but the existing toilet facilities don’t reflect the key importance of its future role, not just with transport but providing an attractive and interesting social hub. Low cost transport provision to Stirling’s visitor spots (The Castle, Bannockburn Battlefield Centre, Wallace Monument, etc.) from the Station during the summer months would perhaps provide a needy visitor link making key Stirling highlights more accessible for day visitors. In general, Stirling City and most rural villages do need public conveniences if visitors wish to be encouraged. A Comfort Partnership for the City is long overdue.

On the rural question of public transport, for young people who are not car owners, regular transport to Glasgow and Stirling is very expensive with an even more limited schedule being offered. This does not help with employment prospects or the economics of low income families, or increased utilisation of PT, or reducing carbon capture as these points are all linked.
There seems to be no evidence that the council recognises the importance of the agricultural and farming role within its Region, or of the significant finance which it generates, its food production, or preserving wildlife and the countryside heritage which makes Stirling an attractive place to live and visit.

The quality of maintenance of roads continue to be poor in the whole of the Stirling Region (an example of this is the road between Strathblane and Dumgoyne) which is a danger to cyclists and road vehicles. I understand that the council have to prioritise their funding, but the current situation is only getting worse.

We talk about less pollution, but why does the council still run diesel waste collection vehicles when electric or hydrogen vehicles have been the way forward for an number of years? Why also does garden waste need to be transported from West Stirlingshire to East Polmaise, the processing should be centralised, or one developed in the West – or even cross-council agreements if that is more economical and pollution friendly?

You talk of transport networks and road links, but nothing is mentioned of improving public transport connectivity in the South West of Stirlingshire, for example, improving the Balloch and Dumbarton 309 Bus services to the East side of Loch Lomond, Drymen and other villages. There must be opportunities to broaden the service and to potentially encourage a relatively dense people population in the West of the country to enjoy many activities within Stirlingshire? As the LTS states, DRT has confined advantages and is only accessible to a limited group of people.

The Scottish Government’s document ‘Designing Streets’ is very much a cosmetic exercise in the designed environment, again there is little recognition of the needs of the elderly and disabled individuals, and when there is formal recognition, the document states superseded Standards (DDA 2005); overall a very disappointing document which provides little design benefit to improve accessibility for more than a fifth of society. One must also question why the Government chooses to prioritise pedestrians and cyclists first – on health grounds, yet actively support the beer and spirit industry which has significant social consequences through misuse in our society?

“Opportunities to walk and cycle” it may be a Scottish Government initiative, but it is only right that there should be a cost benefit analysis carried out on spend on this Plan as many people cannot take advantage of the physical benefits of this lifestyle, yet can be isolated by the finite cost consequences of changing transport infrastructure to suit the cyclist and pedestrian.

It is mentioned in the LTS that parking enforcement will soon be the responsibility of the council and not the police, but will it make a difference as enforcement doesn’t currently exist in most small rural villages where it is continuously abused?

There are some obvious traffic pinch points in Stirling City – the Craigs Roundabout, the A9/Union Street Roundabout and the junction at Back O’Hill with the Sainsbury’s/McDonalds outlets. It would be good to know that these three traffic points could be improved in the future.
Section 4 is generally a comprehensive and a well thought-out section. In the “Active and sustainable Stirling”, you will need to strike a balance with users who don’t walk, who don’t cycle and may choose not to use PT as it is costly and time consuming as well as limiting what goods one can return to home with. If people find their trips too difficult and intrusive, they will go elsewhere.

In “Inclusive Stirling” the details are unspecific for improving accessibility, which means that regulatory Standards BS8300 (Design of Buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people), Transport Scotland good practice guide for roads, and ultimately The Equality Act 2010, may not be enacted. It would have been nice to see evidence of potential actions:

- Ensure that primary crossing points have dropped kerbs which meet BS8300.
- Provide adequate on-street disabled parking in Stirling City and all rural villages based on an annual review of the (population) needs of Blue Badge Holders to allow access to retail outlets, pharmacy and Post Offices, Surgeries, Schools, Hospitals, etc.
- Provide disabled parking within 40 meters within the primary entrance of a building.
- Ensure that disabled parking bay layout and dimensions comply with BS8300.
- The use of Puffin and Toucan (for cyclists too) crossings should be promoted with lesser crossings upgraded in key pedestrian routes.
- All Footways should be smooth, slip resistant and maintained to a good standard and be kept free of leaf litter and puddles.
- Streetscape elements should be grouped together, all be a min. of 1000mm in height, be colour contrasting and positioned so that they don’t become a hazard to people with physical and visual impairments. This include regularly positioned seating (always with a back-rest), bins, bollards, plant boxes, sign posts, A-Boards (where approved), wheeled bins and guard rails. Pavement Cafes should be located adjacent to the building frontage and be surrounded by a continuous physical barrier. All unnecessary and redundant furniture should be removed from the footway.
- Road Crossings should include the use of tactile surfaces.
- Shared Pedestrian/Cycle Routes should be restricted to where the flows or cyclists or pedestrians are low. (Guide Dogs and the RNIB have identified that shared surfaces pose a threat to vulnerable users, including those with physical, sensory or cognitive impairments.) Simple segregation is a safe and efficient approach to shared surfaces.
- BS5489:2003 is the Code of Practice for Lighting, and includes recommended table of light levels for different areas; light levels should be checked as a matter of course.

In your questionnaire, you state “traffic modelling suggests we need…..”, as a user of discrete event modelling of manufacturing processes for many years, this statement is wrong. The practitioner sets up the model using certain parameters and this will lead to an outcome based on the variables included in the model, so the outcome is never an absolute, it is only an estimate based on statistical events inputted into the model.

Section 5 is very interesting, showing a decrease in traffic movement, including the use of bikes, and a reduction in road maintenance compared to Scotland as a whole.
Park and Ride seems to be successful. I note that there are no conclusions or outcomes highlighted in the Plan relating to this section. Quite a bit of data is unrecorded.

It is a pity that you cannot state in the City or elsewhere, the number of disabled parking bays, either on-street, or off-street!

Section 6. Delivery Plans - why is the council not developing locality plans for the West side of Stirlingshire?

Section 7.1 It is good to see that Street lighting is being upgraded.

Section 7.2 (Road Safety Plan). In your Vulnerable Groups, I think cyclists are a vulnerable category too. Some cyclists don’t dress appropriately and are not visually obvious in all weather conditions; some cyclists don’t use lights but cycle in dark conditions; cyclists are required to abide by the statutory regulations and laws that govern road users, e.g. The Road Traffic Act 1988, like car drivers, some do not.; the nature of some roads (twisty, limited views, poor camber, potholes, damaged surfaces, projecting greenery, traffic travelling too fast, drivers who overtake at blind spots, frustrated drivers, etc.) makes cycling inherently dangerous.

In your Road Safety Plan you analyse data from the analysis of accidents, this unfortunately cannot take into account the analysis of ‘near misses’, ‘speeding’ or illegal driving behaviour like ‘reckless driving’, so many aspects of driver safety will go undetected. Perhaps the use of random cameras could provide information which is otherwise missed.

The use of “Engineering” is often underestimated in making roads safer, but is also very expensive. It would be interesting to know how many “road safety audits” are carried out every year and how many lead to positive action being taken?

Section 7.3 (City Transport Plan) In “Opportunities” you state that there is an opportunity to extend the city centre environment. This is an understatement as it is obvious that the city functions are polarised -- there are the shoppers and there are the tourist attractions, and unfortunately they don’t intermix to the economic benefit of all. Shoppers confine themselves to the shopping areas, and visitors are interested in the Castle area. There has to be a better means of attracting and holding tourists with more cafes and a wide variety of shops at ‘the top of the town’ through better transport links. Similarly the Riverside/Forthside area is a completely undeveloped area with huge potential for a mixed variety of users. If you are looking for good ideas, just look at the Riverside Walk in San Antonio which is truly impressive – we could have a similar development in Stirling!

In Section 7.3 City Transport Plan, in ‘Weaknesses’ it is not mentioned that one of the causes of traffic congestion and the creation of “pinch points” is also directly related to the siting of primary retail areas where little thought has been given to traffic activity. In ‘Threats’ surely the potential increase in urban development (via the LDP) whether in the City Centre or outlying areas must also have a significant impact on traffic volume too?
The ‘Delivery Themes’ are not inclusive as there is no recognition of the disabled population (circa 20%) who cannot walk, cannot cycle and may not be able to use public transport. There has to be provision for a planning requirement to include car access to disabled parking locations.

Further, since 2010 when the council kindly asked the Access Panel to suggest increasing Disabled Parking Bays in the City Centre, there has been no additional locations or capacity review carried out. In the general provision for on-street and off-street Disabled Parking Bays, BS8300 states “designated parking spaces should be provided to reflect changes in local population needs and allow for flexibility of provision in the future.” As part of the LTS, there should be a section which includes outcomes based on an (annual) Accessibility Audit as detailed in Section 6 of Transport Scotland Good practice Guide for Roads, 2013. The Audit should assess the needs of vulnerable users:

- Disabled people with a range of impairments, both temporary and permanent.
- People with young children.
- People carrying heavy shopping.
- Older people.
- Children.

The objectives of the Accessibility Audit are:

- To make the trunk road network safer and more accessible for all users by the avoidance of barriers to movement along and across trunk roads.
- To ensure that the current and future needs of disabled users within this scheme are recognised and developed.
- To ensure that the infrastructure provided is in accordance with current good practice.
- To ensure that there are no elements of infrastructure within a scheme that will endanger or unnecessarily impede disabled users.

All capital investment schemes that impact upon trunk road infrastructure should be subject to an Accessibility Audit. These include:

- All major and minor improvements.
- Traffic management schemes.
- Traffic calming schemes.
- Structural maintenance schemes.
- Developments impacting upon the trunk road.
- Re-determination schemes.

The Accessibility Audit is a means of checking design decisions in a formal and consistent manner throughout the design process by involving appropriate groups with the Audit process.

In ‘Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan’, there are a couple of points: ‘Greener Motoring’ – Private and Housing associations build substantial blocks of housing where there is no thought given to providing Play Parks for children, a general ‘corner shop’ for convenience items, a library or pharmacy, or even a community hall ( & to a lesser extent, local care homes and schools). It is also necessary in rural locations for drivers to have to travel substantial distances for petrol. All of these elements are necessary for a community to live and function,
without them, it creates a waste of mineral resources (fuel) and pollution as people are forced to travel by car.

It could be added in ‘Local Path Networks’, as well as providing “access to local facilities” it (could) link rural villages, for example, Balfron to Killearn and Balfron to Buchlyvie as these are popular walking links.

7.5 Active Travel Plan ‘Walking and Cycling to a Healthier Stirling’
Walking and cycling is a laudable objective, but we do live in a climate which just doesn’t make this desirable or safe every day of the year. Cycling in the dull and dark days of winter has its risks on busy road areas and this element alone may preclude some journeys to school for the very young. Any plan or infrastructure project should allow for contingencies.

It should also be recognised that it may not be possible to change routes to school to make them more cycle friendly as recent schools were built and enlarged in capacity (Balfron High School for example), where access roads through dense housing areas were not improved for the school size; as a result more buses and cars are now faced with a journey along narrow roads which are patently dangerous and inappropriate to mix cyclists too.

7.6 Ensuring a Choice of Access for New Developments
Excellent section, but how do you ameliorate the problems of the past with existing access – speed bumps do not resolve the issue?

In ‘Access to Healthcare’ it is disappointing not to see some action by Local Authorities to improve the route to FVRH from Stirling, specifically the A9 running through the village of Plean. Given the traffic volume and the dangerous features and a Primary School right on the Main Street, an alternative route should be developed as a matter of priority for people travelling from the North.

It is noted that the proposal to use low carbon vehicles by Local Authorities, which I mentioned earlier.

Appendix A: City Transport Plan
It is good that there is a plan to Integrate the Bus and Rail Station to strengthen the services of this key travel hub for Stirling.

The Panel welcome the use of Toucan Crossings.

City Park – I have seen this very promising concept, but have concerns about the re-aligned A811 terminating into the Back o Hill Roundabout. There are enough entrances/exits to this small roundabout. It may be safer to build a new roundabout on the adjacent dual carriageway.

Parking – as discussed earlier, you must consider an annual review of Disabled Parking Bays to ensure that there is an adequate quantity available in key spots within the City.
‘Forthside developments’ – If possible segregate riders from pedestrians with a line on the footway. This is a well-used pedestrian area used by families and it makes sense to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists maintain a discipline to keep to their side. We would also advise upon a flat and level approach to the proposed new bridge with no crossfall and a flush transition from path to bridge surface.

The River’ Park – It is presumed that approaching paths and the Pedestrian Bridge will have clear widths of 2000mm, as advocated in Sect.5.2. of BS 8300. If the width is less than this, passing places will need to be incorporated.

Improving Attractiveness of Public Transport – The promotion of Public Transport and low fares would be a positive move.

Supported public and community transport – All categories are important, but an increase in Accessible Taxi Cars is overdue and would be very welcome. Maintaining lower costs for DRT use, would benefit low income rural families and make essential transport to such locations like FVRH more accessible for the elderly and disabled.

Improving Attractiveness of Public Transport – Rail. Not all the Platforms at Stirling Station are accessible; this requirement is long overdue, and should be a key point included in the Local Transport Plan.

There is considerable concern over Platform 8 (from Alloa) as it is a well-used connection point.

Air – This is a very welcome bus link as both Edinburgh and Glasgow Airports are difficult to access by car.

Appendix B: Towns, Villages and Rural Area Transport Plan – Bus Shelters – Please ensure that all new Bus Shelters include a simplified form of seating for elderly and physically disadvantaged pedestrians.

NCN – There seems to be a vast amount of money being spent on cycle networks (£3M++) throughout the Stirling Region. It would be sensible to review the cost-benefit-analysis of these actions with feedback on the utilisation of these routes as it may be the case that only a minority of the public will benefit from these capital schemes?

Towns, Villages and Rural Area……2028/9 – Aberfoyle – Good to see that Footways will be improved as they are particularly poor in width and condition close to the Health Centre on Main Street and are completely blocked on ‘bin day’ to the passage of wheelchair and pedestrian users, forcing them to step onto the carriageway which is dangerous.

Balfron – There is a need to review disabled parking in a number of areas in Balfron (Surgery, Pharmacy, Post Office), not just the Co-op car park where disabled bays don’t actually comply with BS8300 due to the incline of the whole car park. There are other issues which severely reduce the capacity of this car park for daily
users. Will the pedestrian crossing just up from the Co-op be upgraded to a Toucan crossing?

Callander – Upgrading all pedestrian crossing points to Toucan crossings?

Cowie – As above.

Crianlarich – The railway platform (going South?) is not accessible to wheelchair users.

Croftamie – Provide Toucan pedestrian crossing points.

Doune – As above.

Drymen – The Disabled Parking Bay adjacent to the Pharmacy is now a year overdue! The provision of crossings, as elsewhere, should be Toucan.

Dunblane – Consideration should be given with the NCN765 to ensure “through town” that shared surfaces have a defined line for cyclists to ensure that accidents don’t occur with pedestrians. Similarly, any crossings should be upgraded to Toucan standard. There may be a need to add dropped kerbs to both ramps over the ‘Green Bridge’ as well as more dog waste bins!

Fintry – Surprised that parking on the Main Street is not listed for improved control, as this does cause a conflict with passing traffic. There is little evidence of footways on the East side due to land being in private ownership...how can this be improved? Again, ideally any pedestrian crossings should be Toucans.

Gartmore – Provide Toucan pedestrian crossing points.

Killearn – As above. The road junction at Station Road and the A875 becomes obstructive due to parking on the East side of the road on the A875; some thought should be given to make this section of the road safer.

Killin – Provide Toucan pedestrian crossing points.

Strathblane/Blanefield – Suggest any pedestrian crossings are upgraded to Toucan.

Thornhill – The suggestion to use railings to stop people parking on footways is not the best solution as people with sight loss cannot see railings and they will be a barrier to negotiating the footway.

Throsk – It is good that there is recognition of the need to improve bus shelters.

In this section, it is surprising to find that communities are still requesting speed control (except Tyndrum, strangely). Many if not all of these villages already have some physical element of speed control – if this aspect of road engineering has not proven to be effective, perhaps camera control may be a better intervention.

Specifications’, ‘Recommendations’, Policies, CAPS, .....and so on. It seems as if Local Authorities have to manage a ‘juggling act’ where the effectiveness addressing each documents outcome must be in serious doubt. It is noted that some of these plans are quite aged, up to 9 years old, how can they be relevant now, and should the council not be asking for a refresh if still required?
At recent meeting of the Board of Directors of Killearn Community Futures Company, discussion took place following a report from Margaret Harrison, chair of Killearn Community Council, regarding the newly introduced bus service covering our village.

Concern was expressed at the diminution of this service both to Stirling and to Glasgow. In particular the loss of the late afternoon service has reportedly caused considerable inconvenience to those dependent on public transport. Concern was also expressed that the loss of this service affects pupils attending Balfron High School who wish to attend after-school activities and it is queried that the school bus pass is not accepted for a return journey home outside the normal school hours.

Whilst it is appreciated that economies are required, KCFC would also point out that a loss of public transport falls disproportionately on those who rely solely on public transport to access other villages and towns and will also lead directly to a greater use of private cars which is hardly in line with any ecological policies.

KCFC support KCC in their response to the Local Transport Strategy of Stirling Council and wish to join their voice in confirming the points made in their submission.
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy Consultation: Sustrans response

1 Introduction

Sustrans Scotland welcomes the opportunity to comment on Stirling Council’s Local Transport Strategy main issues report and associated Active Travel Plan. We have answered the Main Issues Report consultation questions, except where they relate to individual travel patterns.

Overall we strongly support Stirling Council’s ambition to achieve modal shift away from journeys being made by car to be replaced by more sustainable modes of transport, such as walking, cycling and public transport. For example the specific target within the Stirling City area for a 10% reduction in car modal share by 2027. So that these targets are clear, we would like to see a table in the LTS showing the existing and targeted modal split for journeys within Stirling City to include targets for walking and cycling, which are currently shown as ‘to be determined’ (page 46).

2 Main issues report (MIR) consultation questions

2.1 Do you agree that the above issues need to be considered when delivering the LTS2?

We agree with the key issues set out for LTS2. We note there is considerable overlap between them. For example the issue ‘lack of opportunities to walk and cycle’ is related to the other key issues, as described below, and should not be seen in isolation.

• *Road Safety* - improving safety, and perceived safety, of people walking and cycling, especially along busy roads is necessary in order to persuade more people to use these modes of transport.

*Road Maintenance* – a similar level of priority needs to be given to maintaining pavements and paths as is given to roads, in order to help make journeys on foot and by bicycle at least as attractive as journeys made by car.

• *Transport network having gaps so not everyone is able to access jobs, services and opportunities* – relevant to Stirling Council’s ambition to create a complete strategic cycle routes network and improve walking routes.

• *Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors* – it is important that high quality walking and cycling facilities are provided to enable people to use these modes of transport for everyday journeys, leisure and tourism. Paths should also be included as part of this issue.

• *Impacts of traffic on health and the environment* – enabling more journeys to be made on foot and by bicycle will help achieve modal shift, reducing traffic volumes and therefore reducing the negative impacts of it on people’s health (e.g. by reducing air pollution) and the environment (e.g. reducing carbon emissions).
• **Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling** – completing strategic walking and cycling networks increases people’s travel options enabling more people to travel in these ways. In turn, this will reduce journey times for all by making more efficient use of limited street space, thereby reducing congestion.

We would like you to ensure that the relevance of walking and cycling will be considered when addressing all the key issues and not seen as an isolated issue in itself.

2.2 Are there any other important issues you think should be included?

No.

2.3 What are the main city and rural transport issues that you would like to see addressed?

As discussed previously, many of the listed issues relate directly to walking and cycling, aside from where this is explicitly mentioned. Many of the issues are equally important in both rural areas and the city, such as maintenance. It is clear that both areas present some different challenges, particularly relating to walking and cycling.

**Rural**

Two issues we feel are particularly important for Rural Stirling are road safety and gaps in the transport network.

*Road Safety* – rural settlements are often linked by roads with a speed limit of 40 – 60 mph with no adjacent pavement or path. This makes it very challenging and for people to walk and cycle between them. The impact of a collision between motor vehicles and people walking or cycling along these roads is likely to be severe. Walking and cycling facilities separated from traffic are needed between settlements, broadly following the main roads, in order to improve safety and enable more walking and cycling.

*Transport network having gaps so not everyone is able to access jobs, services and opportunities* – those living in rural areas without access to a car are more isolated from services, jobs and opportunities. The provision of more high quality paths between rural settlements will help to overcome this and provide a relatively cheap travel option for many people. The greater provision of electric bicycles would also help extend the potential range of cycle journeys, further increasing access.

*Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors* – completion of off-road inter settlement links (e.g. between Stirling and Callander) will support leisure and tourism journeys by bicycle. Such routes are important to support the local economy in rural areas and can also be a precursor to people travelling more regularly by bike. Sustrans have evaluated the economic impact of a number of long distance national cycle network (NCN) routes, based on spending (e.g. on food & drink and accommodation) by people undertaking single and multi-day trips by bicycle on sections of the network. Most recently we studied a 46 mile section of NCN route 78 between Oban and Fort William. It is estimated this supports 68,000 cycle trips per
year, which contributes approximately £360,000 in spending in the local economy and supports an estimated 8.6 full-time equivalent jobs. The opportunity cost of not building these path networks in rural Stirling, is that communities miss out on this source of income to the local economy.

City

Road Safety - improving actual and perceived safety of cycling is necessary in order to encourage more people to cycle in urban areas, particularly along busy roads. Additional cycle facilities separated from traffic, including segregated cycle lanes and dedicated crossing facilities at junctions are needed, as well as wider adoption of 20 mph speed limits.

Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors – many measures in the Active Travel Plan relate to redesigning roads and streets to make them more walking and cycling friendly. However it is even more important that all new developments are designed in this way from the start, by adhering to Designing Streets. This means for example:

- designing new residential streets which are people friendly and ensure slow speeds through their layout, such as by avoiding long straight stretches of carriageway
- providing walking and cycling paths which are fronted by properties, rather than around the back of them, so that people feel safe and secure to use them
- linking paths to wider networks and where possible using developments to improve existing routes

2.4 Will our transport objectives help us address the issues you feel need to be addressed? Will the overarching strategy help deliver the above objectives?

Objectives

- Active and sustainable Stirling: Encourage and enable more trips to be made by walking, cycling and public transport.
- Safer Stirling: Reduce accidents and casualties.
- Connected Stirling: Maintain and improve journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling.
- Inclusive Stirling: Ensure the transport network enables everyone to be able to access jobs, services and opportunities.
- A Quality Place: Make the most of our existing streets to enhance the quality of Stirling as a place and peoples’ experience of it.
• A well maintained and managed integrated transport network: Minimise congestion impacts, and thus emissions, on the strategic transport network, as well as supporting better transport connectivity.

As stated above, Sustrans strongly supports the first objective regarding modal shift. However the amount of modal shift you achieve, will depend on how easy and convenient you make it to use these modes of transport, compared to journeys made by car.

We agree the objectives could be a useful framework to address the key issues, including modal shift, however there are potential conflicts between some objectives, depending upon how they are interpreted. Most notably between ‘enable more trips to be made by walking, cycling and public transport’ and ‘maintain and improve journey times…’. We would support preferentially improving journey times for sustainable modes of transport, through measures such as bus priority and dedicated cycle facilities, which will help to achieve modal shift. However we would not support using this objective to place a higher value on reducing journey times for journeys made by car, than for people travelling on foot and by bicycle. For example, this can lead to long wait times for people walking and cycling at crossings and signalised junctions, thereby making travelling by these modes of transport much less attractive than travelling by car. Traffic modelling should not be used as a justification for prioritising travel by car.

In addition, the final objective seems to imply that an effective way to reduce transport emissions is to reduce congestion, perhaps by ensuring you ‘keep the traffic moving’. However the best way to reduce emissions (and reduce air pollution) is to achieve modal shift, reducing single occupancy car journeys and increasing the proportion of journeys made by walking, cycling and public transport.

2.5 Do you agree or disagree that the measures in these delivery plans for Stirling will address the above key issues?

Many of the measures in the delivery plans will help to address the key issues and to achieve modal shift.

However implementing road capacity increases is not a sustainable long-term solution to reducing congestion and will work against measures Stirling Council are proposing to achieve modal shift. Although these schemes are promoted as delivering journey time savings and reducing congestion, these are only short term benefits. Since they make it more convenient to travel by car, more people will do so. In the medium to long term the additional road capacity inevitably fills up leading to an increase in traffic volumes, with congestion ultimately returning. The best way to tackle congestion is to make all sustainable transport modes easier and more attractive for people to use, in combination with measures which make it less convenient to make journeys by car. This also relies on developments being sited in locations which maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel and housing is of a sufficient density to support public transport.

Also we would like to emphasise the importance of implementing a Parking Strategy.
in Stirling City and its vicinity, which supports sustainable transport. As highlighted in the MIR, this is of central importance to the success or failure of other measures in Stirling’s delivery plans which aim to encourage modal shift. If parking is relatively abundant and low cost, it makes travelling into the city by car much more attractive than using more sustainable means of transport, therefore more people will choose to travel by car, undermining Stirling Council’s expenditure on other sustainable transport measures.

Finally, we would like you to include ‘cyclists’ on the list of vulnerable groups in the Road Safety Plan.

2.6 Are there any other measures you feel should be included in any of the delivery plans?

There are several additional measures we recommend are included in the delivery plans, including the Active Travel Plan, in order to help achieve your targets of reduction in car use and modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport. They are:

- Commit to the introduction of a **Car Club** in Stirling. Parking spaces should be dedicated to car club cars and required in new developments. No firm commitment is currently made to this in the MIR. Car clubs in Scotland have been shown to reduce car ownership (ownership of ‘at least one car’ decreases from 41% of individuals to 25 % after joining a car club).

- reduce annual mileage driven (average reduction in miles driven of 967 miles a year after individuals join a car club)\(^1\).

- Introduce **20mph speed limits** onto most streets within Stirling and your other main settlements in order to improve road safety and create streets which are attractive on which to walk and cycle.

- Deliver **I Bike** – a Sustrans Scotland project which promotes cycling in schools. Over the first 4 years of delivery across Scotland, it has reproducibly led to modal shift in recipient schools resulting in an average:

  4 percentage point reduction in the modal share of children being driven to school
  6 percentage point increase in the modal share of girls cycling to school
  8 percentage point increase in children cycling (both to/from and outside of school).

- Introduce direct, on-street **segregated cycle routes** as part of Stirling’s proposed cycle network. Places which have introduced this type of cycle route, such as Seville have seen rapid increases in cycling modal share. Physical separation between people cycling and traffic is important, in order to encourage people of all ages and levels of cycling experience to cycle, particularly on busy roads. In limited instances, wide shared use paths, adjacent to the road can be an
appropriate solution. However, care must be taken to ensure that this
does not disadvantage people on foot. In urban areas and, in
particular, places with high levels of walking, segregated cycle lanes
are often needed to cater for cycling without making walking less
attractive.

- **Work in partnership with bus operators**, in order to make all aspects
  of journeys by bus more attractive to potential users and reverse
decaying bus patronage.

3 Specific comments on the Active Travel Plan

3.1 Consistency with the Active Travel Strategy guidance

The Active Travel Plan includes most of the essential recommendations in the Active
Travel Strategy guidance issued by Transport Scotland and Sustrans. It contains
measures to improve infrastructure (including a proposed cycle network and measures
to improve walking), behaviour change training and promotion measures as well as an
action plan and monitoring.

Although these main areas are broadly covered, there are several aspects in each
area that we would like to see improved.

3.2 Infrastructure

- A recommended item that is missing is a high-level cost estimate for
  completing the cycle network. While being an internal guide for the level of
  funding required, the costings are also important to demonstrate to the
  Scottish Government and CAPS stakeholders, the level of ambition in terms
  of proposed cycling infrastructure in Stirling. Sustrans will use the
  information from strategies across Scotland, to show the appetite for more
  cycling infrastructure, strengthening the case to Government for increased
  investment.

- Further text should be included in the Active Travel Plan to introduce the
  cycle network and its purpose. In particular the standard of cycle provision
  must be clearly defined. Sustrans supports cycle networks that are designed
  to be suitable for all ages and abilities (e.g. for years 8 to 80). The network
  standard is important to inform the type of cycle facilities which are designed
  on links on the network.

- An action is needed to audit the existing cycle network relative to the
  network standard, to establish if upgrades are needed.

- We suggest links to the planning process are included in the Active Travel
  Plan, as per page 32 of the MIR. Walking and cycling infrastructure
  identified in the Active Travel Plan needs to be included in the Local
  Development Plan, so that developers construct it where it forms part of a
development site or provide financial contributions where it is external.
• We suggest you remove the funding condition from action number 17, relating to cycle parking. Cycle parking is relatively cheap compared to building cycle routes and you do not attach a funding condition to actions relating to this (actions 15 and 16).

• Finally, we don’t think ‘Utilise Sustrans Community Links Fund’, i.e. spending funding, should be a specific action in the plan. It is the delivery of infrastructure projects identified in the plan which is important and these are already covered by other actions and the cycle network schedule.

### 3.3 Behaviour change, training and promotion

• While the Active Travel Plan is very specific regarding proposed infrastructure improvements it lacks a similar level of specificity for behaviour change measures and the actions relating to it are too generic (i.e. ‘promote walking and cycling in Stirling’). A clear plan for this area needs to be articulated to guide the Council’s future investment, such as through the Smarter Choices, Smarter Places (SCSP) programme, year on year over the lifetime of the Active Travel Plan.

• The most effective behaviour change measures are targeted, focused smarter choices interventions that are aimed at engaging people and influencing their behaviours, enabling them to make a change. These should be a package of measures which can include information and promotion, campaigns, training, events and travel planning all targeting different audiences in different settings. One of the most successful outcomes of the SCSP demonstration towns was increasing the modal share for walking, in large part due to behaviour change measures, such as Personal Travel Planning. Stirling should draw from the learning of this programme to inform their plans for behaviour change, particularly around walking promotion.

• We welcome the strong focus on School Travel Plans. We would like to emphasise the role of pupils, who should be fully involved in the process. It fulfills many of the experiences and outcomes of Curriculum for Excellence (CfE). The links between it and CfE should be included on the School Travel Plan template (on page 21) and Sustrans Scotland can supply these.

• Page 3 states a future activity will be “development and promotion of an urban walking route planner”, however action plan action number 3 suggests you will promote existing websites. We support the latter, as there are already many existing resources in this area.

### 3.4 Action Plan

The action plan requires further detail, including the addition of specific timescales for delivery, as well as potential delivery partners. This is particularly true of the cycle infrastructure proposals. Also the various infrastructure improvements need to be prioritised, potentially using short, medium and long term.
3.5 Monitoring

We welcome the action to develop a monitoring plan. In advance of this we suggest the following changes to the monitoring section in the Active Travel Plan:

- An additional indicator(s) are added to measure changes in the amount of walking and cycling, to provide a more detailed picture than reporting the modal shares. For example percentage change in users on key routes, based on automatic cycle counters and/or your city centre cordon count.

- KSI targets should be adapted to factor in a measure of exposure, ideally based on the amount of walking and cycling, which could be drawn from user data above, e.g. casualties/km cycled.

- The school travel plans and cycle training indicators are made more informative by reporting percentages, rather than raw numbers, as follows:
  - The percentage of schools with a school travel plan.
  - The percentage of primary schools which deliver Bikeability level 2 training on road, or the percentage of primary school pupils which receive it.

4 Assistance with monitoring and reporting

Sustrans Scotland will share all relevant data sources which we hold to assist Stirling Council with progress reporting on the Active Travel Plan (and LTS).

Our Hands up Scotland Survey is a school travel survey performed by all local authorities, which is co-ordinated, analysed and reported on by Sustrans Scotland. Results are shared with Stirling Council each year in May.

Every year we perform route user surveys on the NCN across Scotland, sometimes within the Stirling Council area. These provide annual usage estimates at each site by mode, based on manual counts, as well as qualitative data such as journey purpose and perceptions of the route. We are happy to share previous results and discuss commissioning future surveys. We also own a small number of automatic cycle counters on the NCN in and around Stirling. We are keen to work with Stirling Council to collate this data with data from the automatic cycle counters you own.

In addition, we monitor a selection of Community Links projects delivered in partnership with local authorities. For instance we are surveying access to Stirling and Dunblane stations, as before and after monitoring of your Community Links projects in these localities.

5 Funding

Sustrans recommends that Stirling Council commits a dedicated proportion of its own budget (revenue and capital) to walking and cycling to fund the Active Travel Plan.
This could follow the lead of City of Edinburgh and Dundee City Councils by initially allocating 5% of the transport budget, and increasing it incrementally.

As highlighted on the MIR page 32, by allocating funding to the Active Travel Plan, Stirling Council can use it to bring in the same amount of funding again from Scottish Government funded active travel grant schemes, which require 50% match funding, doubling your budget. While capital funding is needed to construct new infrastructure it is just as important that Stirling Council allocates revenue funding to deliver behaviour change interventions such as training and promotion, some of which can supplement staff resources (e.g. I Bike).
Dear Sir/Madam

STIRLING LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: COMMENTS ON STIRLING LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2017—2027

The University of Stirling welcomes the opportunity to comment on the above particularly given the University's strategic role as a driver of economic growth, contributing to the Stirling area as a major education provider, employer, business entity, research and innovation centre, cultural and arts hub, and centre of excellence for sports.

The Campus accommodates:

- 12,800+ students: (9,450+ undergraduate students & 3,390+ postgraduate students)
- 1,500+ staff;

We would wish that Stirling Council recognises the economic worth of the University and provides a framework for transportation within the Local Transport Strategy which is supportive of the University's Strategic plan for continued growth - http://www.stir.ac.uk/about/our-strategy/?o=/

The Council is also aware of the University's Campus Masterplan of 2012.

Observations on the LTS Main Issues Report Consultation

Various infrastructure interventions are outlined in the draft LTS Appendix A "City Transport Plan" under a number of headings including the following:

Walkable Stirling: Improve Routes into City Centre.

Existing pedestrian routes from the City Centre to University of Stirling are neither intuitive, nor attractive and in a number of areas lack the simple design principles of being secure, well lit, having commonality of materials and in many places lack sight and desire lines.

The above initiative highlighted in the LTS should include the provision of a high standard intuitive, attractive, safe and strongly themed pedestrian route direct from the City Centre to the University Campus in order to encourage walking and to assist visitors with wayfinding between the two locations.

Improving Attractiveness of Public Transport

The University Campus currently benefits from a high standard of public bus services including the "UniLink" initiative. As a minimum the LTS should ensure that the current level of service is maintained.

It is noted that First Bus are proposing to withdraw the 58 service from the University
Campus however the University is continuing to liaise with them regarding maintaining this service. Support for this service via the LTS process should be encouraged.

There is a need to provide improved signage within the City Centre especially near to the train and bus stations to direct those commuting to the University to the correct bus stops.

Furthermore, real time bus information is a must and consideration should be given to how technology shall respond to this e.g. smart phones/watches.

Introduce bus priority measures including Quality Bus Corridors: City Centre to P&R sites; University; Clackmannanshire & Falkirk (see also corridor improvements)

The provision of a Quality Bus Corridor to support travel to and from the Campus is welcomed and the University looks forward to contributing towards the detailed proposals in the near future.

City Pedestrian and Cycle Networks: Core Routes

The shortcomings of the existing pedestrian route(s) between the University and the city centre have been highlighted above. These shortcomings also apply to various cycle routes associated with the Campus which are often disjointed, contain significant elements of inconvenience and are considered unsafe in places. The University requests that a specific attention is given to routes between for example, the Campus and the City Centre, Bridge of Allan, Causewayhead and the already established cycle route network in Clackmannanshire.

The segregation of cycle routes, material choices, lighting, signage and traffic signalling are all areas that require improvement. The cycle link between the City Centre and the University is disjointed with either a lack of clarity of routes or non-existent routes e.g. from the train station to the Clocktower roundabout and the Causewayhead/Cornton road signalised junction. The current cycle provision appears an afterthought 'bolted' onto pavements or residential streets.

Strategic Road Network

Existing links between the University and the motorway network are tortuous and congested at various points. It is anticipated that the provision of both the Kildean to Cornton Road and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Road links could serve to enhance all modes of travel to and from the Campus by the inclusion of high standard provision for pedestrians, cyclists and bus users alongside improved car based travel.

While the University is supportive of these routes in principle, no details are currently provided and therefore the following information is requested:

- The modelling of road layouts and junctions along the length of Airthrey Road to Causewayhead Road and in particular the characteristics of the junction at Airthrey Road, outside the Campus;
- The forecast changes in traffic levels in and around the Campus including, for
example,
• Airthrey Road and Hillfoots Road;
• Clarification of the proposed changes to the operation of the main University roundabout entrance on Airthrey Road and the Innovation Park junction on Hillfoots Road;
• Consideration of the possibility that the Campus road network could be used as a "rat run" between the Hillfoots villages, the Kildean to Cornton Road and Cornton Rd to Airthrey
• Road corridors and the M9 Junction 10 at Craigforth. For example, the distances between the A91/B998 roundabout at Logie Kirk and M9 Junction 11 at Keir and M9 Junction at Pirnhall are 7.5km. and 8.8km. respectively.
• The provision of the Kildean to Cornton Road and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Road links would, if traffic routes through the Campus, be of the order of 5.5km. to the M9 Junction at Craigforth - a far shorter distance which is likely to be attractive to a number of car drivers. Similarly the proposed links might result in additional traffic on existing congestion hot spots thereby potentially encouraging traffic through the Campus.

Given the above uncertainties, the University's support for the provision of the Kildean to Cornton Road and Cornton Rd to Airthrey Road links is highly qualified at this stage.

**Bridge of Allan Railway Station Re-Location**
The draft LTS does not describe the proposed location of a relocated "Bridge of Allan" train station however it is assumed that this would sit somewhere to the east of Corton Vale Prison. If this is the case, it is requested that it is supported by direct and high standard walking, cycling and bus links to the University in order to encourage greater use of the rail network. It is appreciated that such a proposal is likely to be a long term aspiration and therefore, in the interim, Stirling Council should seek to improve walking, cycling and bus links to the existing Bridge of Allan train station to/from the University. We have referenced the requirements for such routes within the sections above.

**Supplementary Planning Guidance “Ensuring a Choice of Access”**
The LTS refers to the SPG on a number of occasions. Appendix D of the Guidance contains the Council's Car parking Standards. It is noted that the standards recognise that where a development contains a mix of differing facilities then each part should be considered in its own right and the appropriate parking provided to give an overall total parking figure. This approach is welcomed and forms the basis of a Campus parking review that is ongoing at the present time. It is however noted that the Standards do not currently allow for an element of greater car use that can be associated with off centre developments such as the University Campus. It is therefore requested that in parallel with the drafting of the LTS that this aspect of the SPG is also given consideration.

Finally, University of Stirling is appreciative of the opportunity to contribute to the development of the Local Transport Strategy which as evidenced above, needs to
support the wide range of economic activities, not just education, that take place on the campus. The University looks forward to contributing to the further evolution of the LTS and is keen to be kept fully informed as the process moves forward.
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy Consultation: Mr Hutton (a Stirling resident)

Support for Active Travel: A Response

Although strongly supporting its aims I am less than enthusiastic about the Active Travel Plan in the LTS documentation, first because it is unclear what investment will be undertaken and when and, second, because the plan is almost entirely Stirling and National Park focused, once again ignoring the Rural SW and Strathblane/Blanefield in particular—all parts that are not ‘Stirling facing’.

In 2012, within the Stathblanefield Community Development Trust, we established a Path Development Group to pursue what was a priority area in the 2011 local CAP. Over the last four years, with much voluntary effort and with great personal support from Richard Barron and Penny Stoddart of SC (but with no real financial resources from the Council) we have raised over £230,000 of outside funding to complete three large and two smaller path projects. We are discussing at the moment, with SC Roads staff, work at Station Road Blanefield which will allow us to complete the new safe multi-user path link from Blanefield to the Strathblane end of our community. Once again we will be applying for external funding.

Walking and cycling are important to our local community—for residents, for visitors and for the local shops and cafes that both groups patronise and might do in greater numbers.

This autumn we will be progressing an application for the accreditation of the Strathblane Community Council area as a ‘Walkers are Welcome’ community, under a UK-wide scheme to encourage walking and help support local economic activity.

Our strengths are obvious: the John Muir Way goes through the village (and will follow one of our new paths), the West Highland Way passes close by and the two long-distance paths cross on our ground. We have an excellent network of local walking routes (three walks information boards have been set up at key points in the village and a Walks around Strathblane booklet produced and sold - both with outside funding. Our area includes most of Mugdock Country Park, and the Loch Ardinning Reserve and Ballagan Glen—both owned and run by the Scottish Wildlife Trust.

To capitalise on our existing assets, and to further pursue in this locality the laudable goal of active travel (and recreation) rightly emphasized in the draft LTS, other key path projects are vital. These include:
— the cleaning-up of a previously existing walking route alongside the A891 from Strathblane to Ballagan, leading to the SWT Reserve at Ballagan Glen; and,
— the clearing of the pre-existing footway up the side of the A81 towards Mungavie as far at the SWT Loch Ardinning Reserve entrance.

Both are relatively low cost projects that would restore access on foot from the village to two of our most important walking and wildlife assets.

Just as important are two more major projects:
— the creation of an off road cycle route from Strathblane as far as Mugdock Country Park where it could join paths through the Park to Milngavie Station and to the beginning of the new cycle routes into Glasgow being created by East Dunbartonshire - this is an important potential commuting route for those working in the greater Glasgow area and an off-road route out from the city for recreational cyclists; and
— (even more important for recreational cycling) the continuation of the multi-user path along the old railway track from Station Road in Blanefield to Dumgoyne extending NCR755 and completing a gap in the network just as significant as that on the Stirling-Callander route (but not, of course, involving the City of Stirling!).

It is particularly disappointing to see this latter route (described as 'Killearn to Strathblane') listed in the Walking and Cycling Policy documentation with no proposed action beside it! A study of what is required was done in 2006 jointly by SC and Sustrans and the SCDT in Strathblane has now completed the first 600 metres of that route. It would be great to get some SC support for these four important local projects which are completely in line with your policy objectives over the timeframe of the LTS— or are we forced to continue to operate here as the ‘Independent Republic of Strathblane’?
I refer to the above document and offer the following observations.

It is obvious that a lot of time and effort has gone into producing the document which runs to almost 150 pages and includes a wide range of technical data and a range of scenarios with respect of traffic growth and transportation strategies. I would therefore query if it is then easily readable for many residents, laymen, Community Councils and other interested parties. I know others have found it “hard going” in this context and therefore suggest that it needs to be a lot more concise if it is to be seen as a transparent communication tool.

Aspects of the delivery plans are based on an assumption that 28% traffic growth by 2037 - I would seriously query the accuracy of making such a long term forecast particularly in the volatile economic and political world that we find ourselves in today. Table 3 shows a 10% decrease in traffic in the city between 2007 and 2014 (also mentioned on Page 23) so it is not clear how some very significant sea change is going to result in a 28% increase in traffic. You will also know that traffic modelling is far from being a precise science. The figures presented in the report with respect to increased travel times could therefore be considered to be alarmist.

The recognition that sustainable travel has to play in the strategy is laudable as is the recognition that value has to be attached to Quality of Place standards (page 19). Stirling is potentially a very walkable and cycleable city. The walking network is comprehensive however the cycle network is fragmented, frustrating and in fact dangerous on a number of fronts with insufficient resource being given over to meaningful initiatives as opposed to the ever increasing proliferation of fingerpost signs and isolated patches of green paint and white lining which simply contributes to streetscape clutter and does little to encourage cycling or make it safe. Footpaths and cycle routes are frequently overgrown and plagued with dog fouling and litter. Classical examples are the “chicken run” and the Bridge of Allan to Cornton cycle path which have seen no improvement whatsoever in the 30 years that I have used them.

Public transport to/from Bridge of Allan is, in general, of a very acceptable standard.

The Quality of Place objectives referred to in the document should also include the settings and open spaces associated with the various suburbs and communities that make up the wider Stirling area - not just Stirling city centre streets. The high standard overarching environment in and around.

Stirling is exactly why people come here to live and work and why businesses and are attracted to. It is therefore important that this benefit is protected. I am therefore concerned that some of the suggested interventions significantly compromise Quality of Place objectives and various community standards as follows.

Kildean - Cornton and Cornton - Airthrey Road Link
This Kildean to Cornton scheme is very likely to have very major implications on the hydrology of the flood plain. As you are aware, both Riverside and Bridge of Allan have flooding issues which are very likely to be exacerbated by any new infrastructure associated with a river crossing. Just how much background investigation has taken place regarding flood risk associated with this scheme is unclear however it has been shown time and time again that interfering with the hydrology of flood plains carries a range of potential risks. The project should not be given any credence until the risk is fully understood.

In addition, the Cornton - Airthrey Link significantly compromises the greenbelt between Bridge of Allan and Corton/Causewayhead and is therefore a Quality of Place consideration.

I suggest that there is potential for both schemes to lead to an increase in traffic along immediately adjacent existing roads and streets. For example, some Hillfoots drivers may be drawn through Causewayhead to access the M9 as opposed to using the A91.

Both links would result in the greatest road building projects that Stirling has seen in a significant number of years - the last was probably the A91 Eastern Distributor Road circa 1988 which was built to relieve traffic on Causewayhead Road. Whilst relief was experienced for a while, I understand that traffic on Causewayhead Road subsequently returned to previous levels thereby illustrating that road building is not a sustainable long term solution to travel demand. If the two schemes are constructed they may provide some relatively short term relief however the flood plain and greenbelt will have been compromised forever.

I have also noted in the LTS online questionnaire (Q. 22) that it simply references “limited road building” - this is very misleading given the above potential proposals.

**Bridge of Allan Station Relocation**

Presumable this too would sit within the greenbelt and introduce traffic, light pollution and significant car parking. Also train related noise (deceleration and acceleration) and possibly air quality nuisance close to residential areas are potential impacts. The justification for a relocated station seems to be based on adjacent population numbers which is simplistic. Cornton and Westhaugh are already served by bus services which provide ready access to Stirling train station and the city centre and I doubt if in reality there would be a significant increase in train patronage given the existing availability of public transport. A station somewhere along Corton Road would also draw traffic down along Cornton Road Bridge of Allan which has recently seen some attempt at traffic calming. There would then appear to be a tension between increasing traffic movements and improving road safety.

Car parking at the existing station site is seen as a problem although I would have to say that I have always been able to park at the station or only 5 minutes’ walk away. There is potential to provide parking along the A9 corridor in a similar fashion to that provided in Dunblane along the dual carriageway south of the Four Ways Roundabout. Given the above, there is no substantial case for relocating the station to the detriment of the greenbelt, neighbouring properties and existing stations users.
Clock Roundabout Area Major Upgrade
This is an attractive area for walkers, cyclists, tourists etc. given its very close proximity to Stirling Bridge and views to the Wallace Monument. Mention of a “major upgrade”, which presumably means even more road space, traffic signals(?) etc. is then a concern as it compromises various Quality of Place objectives mentioned in the LTS and other Council policy guidance.

Similarly any modification to Causewayhead Roundabout would probably result in a loss in landscaping etc. thereby turning the focal point of Causewayhead into nothing much more than a high spec junction.

Many of the above strategic interventions are traffic based and involve very significant costs. It has been shown time and time again that road building is not a long term sustainable solution and is also in conflict with a range of other Council place making and transportation policy objectives.

I therefore suggest that the strategy needs to place more emphasis on sustainable travel supported by good land use/transport planning. I have often queried why the new Forth Valley College and St. Modans High were ever built away from good transport hubs. Half of Forthside is still underdeveloped after very many years yet it sits alongside the train and bus stations.

I am not at all convinced that the projected growth in traffic and the associated congestion mentioned in the LTS will and result in the detriment of the Stirling economy etc. as other towns and cities are also faced with traffic problems so Stirling would not have some isolated disadvantage.

Therefore suggest that the need for any significant road traffic based interventions are overstated, would result in only short term relief and detract funds form more sustainable transportation investment.

I would like to see clear evidence how the LTS consultation exercise has, at the end of the day, been meaningful and reflected the views of community councils and local residents otherwise the strategy will be seen as a fait accompli.

To summarise:
- The traffic growth assumptions are questionable;
- Quality of Place aspirations should be applied to the settings of Causewayhead and Bridge of Allan and not just city centre streets;
- Real meaningful investment is required to support walking, cycling and public transport.
  Cycle infrastructure investment has been woefully inadequate in the past;
  The suggested strategic road building proposals are unprecedented in the Stirling area particularly in the context of this day and age when the environment and sustainability are clear Council objectives. They have the potential to change the whole character of the area;
- There needs to be far better correlation between planning permissions and transport planning in order to reduce the need to travel in the first place or to ensure that development is focussed on good transport nodes.
Finally, both Bridge of Allan and Causewayhead are great places to live so the old adage “if it isn’t broke don’t fix it” is very relevant to both communities.
Introduction

We would like to hear your views on transport issues in Stirling, to inform Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy (LTS2) for 2017-2027.

Please put your completed questionnaire in the Questionnaire Box, alternatively send it to us by Friday 23 September 2016 (NOW EXTENDED TO FRIDAY 30 SEPTEMBER 2016):

Transport Planning
Stirling Council
Teith House
Kerse Road
Stirling
FK7 7QA

An online version of the questionnaire can be found at: www.stirling.gov.uk/lts

Many thanks for taking a few minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.
ABOUT YOU

Please note that all information you provide us with will be treated as confidential and you will not be identified in any findings or reporting.

Please tick one box only for each answer

Q1. Do you own a car?
   - Yes
   - No

Q2. Sex
   - Female
   - Male

Q3. Age Range
   - 16 – 24
   - 25 – 44
   - 45 – 64
   - 65+

Q4. Employment Status
   - Working Full Time
   - Working Part Time
   - Unemployed
   - Student
   - Retired
   - Other

Q5. Where do you live?
   - North West Rural Stirling
   - South West Rural Stirling
   - Eastern Villages
   - Bannockburn
   - Braehead & Broomridge
   - Bridge of Allan

   - Cambusbarron
   - Causewayhead
   - Cornton
   - Dunblane
   - Kings Park
   - Raploch
   - Riverside & Cambuskenneth
   - St Ninians & Whins of Milton
   - Town Centre & Mercat Cross
   - Torbrex
   - Other (please specify)
KEY ISSUES

We propose to take the following key issues into account in delivering LTS2:

- Road Safety
- Road Maintenance
- Gaps in Transport network
- Lack of opportunities to walk and cycle
- Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors
- Impacts of traffic on health and the environment
- Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling

Q6 Do you agree that the above issues need to be considered when delivering the LTS2?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Please Comment:

Q7. Are there any other important issues you feel should be included?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Please specify:
**RURAL AND CITY ISSUES**

Please rank the **THREE** most important **RURAL** transport issues that you would like to see addressed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Second most important</th>
<th>Third most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in transport network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of opportunities to walk and cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of traffic on health and environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other issues (please specify and rank):**
Please rank the **THREE** most important **CITY** transport issues that you would like to see addressed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Second most important</th>
<th>Third most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in transport network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of opportunities to walk and cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of traffic on health and environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other issues (please specify and rank):

For more information and to complete our brief questionnaire please visit: [www.stirling.gov.uk/lts](http://www.stirling.gov.uk/lts)
OBJECTIVES

To ensure that the issues identified are addressed, it is proposed that the following objectives are adopted to shape LTS2:

- **Active and sustainable Stirling**: Encourage and enable more trips to be made by walking, cycling and public transport
- **Safer Stirling**: Reduce accidents and casualties
- **Connected Stirling**: Maintain and improve journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling
- **Inclusive Stirling**: Ensure the transport network enables everyone to be able to access jobs, services and opportunities
- **A Quality Place**: Make the most of our existing streets to enhance the quality of Stirling as a place and peoples’ experience of it
- **A well maintained and managed integrated transport network**: Minimise congestion impacts, and thus emissions, on the strategic transport network, as well as supporting better transport connectivity.

Q10. Do you think the above objectives help us address the issues you feel need to be addressed?
   - Yes
   - No

Please Comment:

Q11. Will the overarching strategy (see poster at end of questionnaire) help deliver the above objectives?
   - Yes
   - No

Please Comment:
ABOUT YOUR TRAVEL

Q12: The reason for your MAIN daily trip is:
- Work
- Education
- Social
- Other (Please specify)…………………………………………………………

Q13: Where do you travel FROM (please specify)……………………………….

Q14: Where do you travel TO (please specify)……………………………….

Q15. How many days do you make this journey?
- Five+ days
- Four days
- Three days
- Two days
- One day

Q16. How long does this journey USUALLY take?
- 0 - 15mins
- 16 - 30 mins
- 31 - 59 mins
- 1-2 hours
- 2+ hours

Q17. What is the MAIN mode of travel you normally use for this journey?
- Walk
- Cycle
- Rail
- Bus
- Car share
- Car driver
- Car passenger
- Park and Ride
- Community Transport
- Other (please specify)…………………..
CAR OR BUS TRAVEL

Q18. What would be the MAXIMUM increase in journey time you would be prepared to accept because of an increase in traffic congestion?

- 0-5 minutes
- 6-10 minutes
- 11-20 minutes
- 21-30 minutes
- 31-40 minutes
- 41-50 minutes
- 51-59 minutes
- 1 hour+

Q19. What would be the consequence of your journey time increasing beyond what you consider to be acceptable?

- Not to make the journey
- Change my travel mode
- Use the same mode but with a different route or time
- Other (please specify)..................................

CAR DRIVER

Q20. If you currently travel as a car DRIVER, do you have the option of using a different mode of travel, eg, walk / cycle / car share / use bus or rail for this trip?

- Yes
- No

Q21. If YES, how many days during the week would you be able to make this choice?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5+

For more information and to complete our brief questionnaire please visit: www.stirling.gov.uk/lts
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy: Consultation 2\textsuperscript{nd} August – 30\textsuperscript{th} September 2016

INFRASTRUCTURE

Traffic modelling suggests we need both more people walking, cycling and using public transport, as well as targeted road building / increasing the capacity of the road network through infrastructure improvements.

Q22. To minimise congestion in the \textbf{long term} and if your journey permitted, would you be prepared to:

☐ Travel less often ☐ Cycle more often
☐ Walk more often ☐ Use public transport more often

Please select all that apply

Q23. Please state what would encourage you to \textbf{WALK OR CYCLE} more?

Q24. Please state what would encourage you to use \textbf{BUS OR RAIL} more?

Q25. Please state what would encourage you to use \textbf{PARK AND RIDE} more?
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy: Questionnaire

DELIVERY PLANS

The Local Transport Strategy will be delivered via a number of delivery plans including:

• City Transport Plan (CTP)
• Towns, Villages, Rural Areas Transport Plan (TVRA)
• Active Travel Plan (ATP)

Reference copies of these plans are available at the LTS Consultation Events, or online at:  http://my.stirling.gov.uk/services/transport-and-streets/transport-policy

Key Issues

• Road Safety
• Road Maintenance
• Gaps in transport network
• Lack of opportunities to walk and cycle
• Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors
• Impacts of traffic on health and the environment
• Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling

Q26. Do you agree that the measures in these delivery plans for Stirling will address the above key issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Plan</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know / Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment on any of the above three plans

Q27. Are there any other measures you feel should be included in any of the delivery plans?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Please comment:
ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

The Council have undertaken a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the LTS Main Issues Report which identifies the likely effects the LTS will have on the environment if implemented. The main aim is to give the environment the same level of consideration as social and economic factors when making decisions about future transport in the Stirling Council area. The findings of the assessment are presented in an Environmental Report.

Reference copies of the Environmental Report are available at the LTS Consultation Events, or online at: http://my.stirling.gov.uk/services/transport-and-streets/transport-policy/local-transport-strategy-consultation

Q28. Please provide any comments you have on the Strategic Environmental Assessment - Environmental Report.
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy (LTS)
Overarching Strategy to help develop Stirling’s Transport networks

Quality Place: Our streets enhance the quality of Stirling as a place and peoples’ experience of it
  • Ensure that our street environment enhances the quality of Stirling’s urban and rural environment.
  • Ensure that our street environments are safe, pleasant; easily navigable and connected for all users.
  • Reduce the impacts of traffic which have adverse health impacts and diminish the quality of place.

Context
Movement and communication are essential parts of our lives. We must ensure that Stirling’s transport networks support:
  • The Economy.
  • The Environment.
  • Society.

The LTS sets out the transport ‘packages’ required to support the Council’s growth aspirations within:
  • Stirling Local Development Plan (LDP).
  • Stirling City Development Framework (CDF).

Active and Sustainable Stirling: More trips by walking, cycling and public transport to promote healthy lifestyles and reduce carbon emissions
  • Walking and cycling to be the first choice for short trips.
  • Provide an environment that supports and promotes public transport.
  • Ensure sustainable travel choices are at the heart of an integrated transport network.
  • Support emerging technologies that enable transport’s carbon emissions to be reduced.

Safer Stirling: Reduce accidents and casualties
  • Reduce the number of accidents and casualties.
  • Ensure our transport networks and streets feel safe and secure for all users.

Inclusive Stirling: The transport network enables everyone to access jobs, services and opportunities
  • Ensure there is a choice of modes of travel to access jobs, services and opportunities.
  • Transport networks, including streets, to be usable by all.

Well-maintained and managed integrated transport network
  • Maximise efficiency of transport network.
  • Maintain safety and minimise whole life costs of our transport networks through maintenance programmes.

Connected Stirling: Maintain and Improve journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling.
Maintain and improve:
  • Strategic road and rail links between Stirling and Scotland’s other cities, and beyond.
  • Transport links into Stirling City and key employment areas.
  • Transport links between the City and Stirling’s rural towns and villages.

For more information and to complete our brief questionnaire please visit: www.stirling.gov.uk/lts
Stirling’s Local Transport Strategy: Questionnaire

For more information and to complete our brief questionnaire please visit: www.stirling.gov.uk/lts
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

- **Do you own a car?**
  - Yes, 83%
  - No, 17%

- **Your sex?**
  - Male, 40%
  - Female, 60%

- **Your age?**
  - 16-24: 32%
  - 25-44: 51%
  - 45-64: 13%
  - 65+:

- **Employment status?**
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

- Working full-time: 61%
- Retired: 16%
- Working part-time: 16%
- Unemployed: 3%
- Student: 2%
- Other: 2%
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

Do you agree that the above issues need to be considered when delivering the LTS2?

- Yes, 99%
- No, 1%

Where do you live? (Respondents:509)
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

What are the main RURAL transport issues that you would like to see addressed? Please rank what you think are the 3 most important RURAL issues:

- Road Safety
- Road Maintenance
- Transport network having gaps so not everyone is able to access jobs, services and opportunities
- Lack of opportunities to walk and cycle
- Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors
- Impacts of traffic on health and the environment
- Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling
- Other (please specify below)

The chart shows the percentage of respondents who ranked each issue as their most important, second most important, and third most important.
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

What are the main CITY transport issues that you would like to see addressed? Please rank what you think are the 3 most important CITY issues

Road Safety
- Most important: 27%
- 2nd most important: 15%
- 3rd most important: 12%

Road Maintenance
- Most important: 25%
- 2nd most important: 14%
- 3rd most important: 13%

Transport network having gaps so not everyone is able to access jobs, services and opportunities
- Most important: 14%
- 2nd most important: 13%
- 3rd most important: 11%

Lack of opportunities to walk and cycle
- Most important: 18%
- 2nd most important: 13%
- 3rd most important: 13%

Quality of roads and street environment for residents and visitors
- Most important: 19%
- 2nd most important: 15%
- 3rd most important: 8%

Impacts of traffic on health and the environment
- Most important: 14%
- 2nd most important: 12%
- 3rd most important: 7%

Journey times and travel options to, within and beyond Stirling
- Most important: 11%
- 2nd most important: 10%
- 3rd most important: 10%

Other (please specify below)
- Most important: 1%
- 2nd most important: 3%
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

Do you think the above objectives help us address the issues you feel need to be addressed?

- Yes, 89%
- No, 11%

Will the overarching strategy help deliver the above objectives?

- Yes, 82%
- No, 18%
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

The reason for your main daily trip is?

- Work: 72%
- Social/leisure: 14%
- Shopping: 6%
- Other: 5%
- School run: 3%
- Education: 3%

How many days a week do you make this journey?

- 5 days or more: 63%
- 4 days: 13%
- 3 days: 14%
- 2 days: 5%
- 1 day: 5%
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

How long does this journey normally take? (one way)

- 0-15 mins: 40%
- 16-30 mins: 33%
- 31-59 mins: 19%
- 1-2 hours: 6%
- 2+ hours: 1%

What is the main mode of travel you normally use for this journey?

- Car driver: 54%
- Bus: 12%
- Cycle: 11%
- Walk: 10%
- Car share: 6%
- Rail: 5%
- Car passenger: 2%
- Other: 1%
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

What would be the maximum increase in journey time you would be prepared to accept because of an increase in traffic congestion?

And what would be the consequence of your journey time increasing beyond what you consider to be acceptable?

- Use the same mode but with different route or time: 60%
- Change my travel mode: 14%
- Not make the journey: 11%
- I have no choice: 7%
- Other: 5%
- Change job: 2%
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

If you currently travel as a car driver, do you have the option of using a different mode of travel, e.g., walk/cycle/car share/use bus or rail for this trip?

- Yes, 49%
- No, 51%

If YES, how many days a week would you be able to make this choice?

- 5 days or more: 42%
- 4 days: 3%
- 3 days: 22%
- 2 days: 21%
- 1 day: 12%
Appendix F: Analysis of questionnaire results

To minimise congestion in the long term would you be prepared to: Please select all that apply

- Use public transport more often: 56% agree
- Cycle more often: 48% agree
- Walk more often: 38% agree
- Travel less often: 20% agree

Do you agree or disagree that the measures in these delivery plans for Stirling will address the above key issues?

- City Transport Plan: 54% agree, 34% neutral, 12% disagree
- TVRA Plan: 48% agree, 36% neutral, 16% disagree
- Active Travel Plan: 50% agree, 38% neutral, 11% disagree
Appendix G: Proposed Localities Map of Stirling

Stirling Council Localities: Potential Configuration

Locality 1 - STIRLING RURAL NORTH
Population 11,200
Households 4,750
*3 Intermediate Datazones:
Highland
Callander and Trossachs
Carse of Stirling

Locality 2 - STIRLING RURAL SOUTH
Population 12,400
Households 5,162
*3 Intermediate Datazones:
Blane Valley
Balfron and Drymen
Kippen and Fintry

Locality 3 - STIRLING CITY NORTH,
DUNBLANE & BRIDGE OF ALLAN
Population 31,800
Households 12,600
*8 Intermediate Datazones:
Dunblane East
Dunblane West
Bridge of Allan and University
Forth
Cornton
Ripplech
Causewayhead
City Centre

Locality 4 - STIRLING CITY SOUTH
AND EASTERN VILLAGES
Population 34,400
Households 15,100
*10 Intermediate Datazones:
Cowie
Fallin
Plean and SE Rural
Bannockburn
Hillpark
Broomridge
Brasshead
Cambusbarron
Borestone
King's Park and Torbrex
Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

A total of 81 consultation responses on the SEA were received; 78 anonymised responses to the public consultation, plus Historic Environment Scotland (HES), Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH). Careful consideration has been given to all the responses received. A total of 24 responses received from the public consultation were identified as being more appropriate to the overall LTS Strategy consultation and have been considered within the LTS Strategy consultation report.

Table H1 – Consultation Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>City Development Framework Re-align A811 with Millennium Way and Back O'Hill: you have given this intervention a score of significant negative effects for the historic environment, and we agree with this finding. In view of the score, we are concerned that the assessment does not indicate any exploration of reasonable alternatives, or of potential mitigation measures.</td>
<td>Table D2 of the Environmental Report has been updated to highlight the alternatives considered and the potential mitigation measures identified as part of the City Development Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>Paragraph 1.1.4 states that the ER will ensure that the environmental implications of adopting the LTS2 (and of alternative forms of the strategy that might be chosen to achieve similar objectives) are explicit when the decisions on how or whether to proceed to adopt are taken. However, it is not clear where the assessment of alternative forms of the strategy has been recorded.</td>
<td>Due to the high-level strategic nature of the LTS and the proposed options it was not possible to identify reasonable alternatives to specific options. As such it was determined the most suitable approach to offering viable and reasonable alternatives was to consider options which could delay or negate the requirement to implement those options which were assessed as having a more significant negative environmental impact. These lower effect options were included in the packages proposed for earlier implementation. Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, these will be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>The implication of both the consultative draft LTS and the ER is that the packages presented are the Council’s preferred option. In view of this, it is not clear where any reasonable alternatives to both the package combinations, and the individual projects / actions within them, have been identified or assessed. Reasonable alternatives should relate to different ways of delivering elements of the strategy. Such alternatives could range from different visions for the strategy to alternative objectives and actions for delivery.</td>
<td>Due to the high-level strategic nature of the LTS and the proposed options it was not possible to identify reasonable alternatives to specific options. As such it was determined the most suitable approach to offering viable and reasonable alternatives was to consider options which could delay or negate the requirement to implement those options which were assessed as having a more significant negative environmental impact. These lower effect options were included in the packages proposed for earlier implementation. Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, these will be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>The methodology of your approach to assessment of alternatives is unclear. You explain that reasonable alternatives were grouped into delivery packages according to perceived lower environmental effects, and that these packages are proposed for earlier implementation than those with more significant negative effects. This suggests that there has been some environmental assessment and filtering of alternatives which is not recorded in the ER.</td>
<td>Due to the high-level strategic nature of the LTS and the proposed options it was not possible to identify reasonable alternatives to specific options. As such it was determined the most suitable approach to offering viable and reasonable alternatives was to consider options which could delay or negate the requirement to implement those options which were assessed as having a more significant negative environmental impact. These lower effect options were included in the packages proposed for earlier implementation. Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, these will be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>3.4 As discussed it would have been helpful if the assessment had been clearer, showing the environmental effects for all the possible scenarios (i.e. the different packages as and if being implemented at different stages) and identification at this stage of alternatives within the packages.</td>
<td>The alternatives considered in the SEA focused on the implementation of packages in an order judged to minimise the environmental effects, by providing the alternative of implementing options with less environmental impact which would delay or negate the need to implement options identified as having a more negative environmental impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>3.8 We therefore recommend that another ER is prepared with consideration of alternatives within the different packages, also taking into account other reasonable alternatives proposed by consultees. We would be happy to assist the Council with this task if necessary and would welcome being consulted again.</td>
<td>The Council’s will publish an updated version of the SEA Environmental Report taking consideration of all comments submitted through the consultation. The support of SEPA as a key partner in the SEA process is welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>4.6 Section 5.4.1 reads: ‘If the full range of Stirling Core Area Delivery Packages are not implemented satisfactorily, the mitigation option of avoiding road infrastructure proposals with the most significant negative environmental impacts should be given serious consideration.’ We would welcome further clarification on what it is meant for ‘not implemented satisfactorily’.</td>
<td>Section 5.4.1 has been updated to clarify that the successful implementation of the Core Area Delivery Packages is defined in terms of delivering the forecast benefits of each package, measured against the congestion and air quality targets set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>In general we would recommend preparing a revised version of the ER in order to provide an update on alternatives, on the monitoring indicators and other missing information as explained our detailed response below.</td>
<td>The Council’s will publish an updated version of the SEA Environmental Report taking consideration of all comments submitted through the consultation. The support of SEPA as a key partner in the SEA process is welcomed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mitigation

| HES        | Forthside / Harbour Developments and Additional River Forth Projects Whilst both negative and positive effects are indicated for cultural heritage from these interventions, the commentary does not provide any information on the nature of these effects, or indicate whether any mitigation measures have been sought or identified. | Commentary in table D2 has been updated to detail the positive and negative effects identified and the proposed mitigation measures. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>In terms of cumulative impacts, you have identified that a number of large developments, including numerous new car parks, could negatively impact on historic views and the landscape setting. Whilst we agree with this finding, the proposed mitigation measure is insufficiently detailed to give confidence that it can be delivered effectively.</td>
<td>Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, the concerns outlined will be assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>Mitigation is most likely to be effectively implemented if it is clear what the mitigation measure requires, how and by what mechanism it will be delivered, and when. We recommend that you consider expanding on the mitigation information provided to include this information, or to identify where more work needs to be done to clarify such details.</td>
<td>Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, the concerns outlined will be assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>Table 5.1 outlines proposed mitigation measures for each SEA Topic. It is proposed to mitigate direct impacts on the historic environment through excavation and reporting. You should be aware that excavation and reporting are not always the most appropriate or effective form of mitigation, and we would have expected to also see detailed design and siting form part of the mitigation strategy. Similarly, for setting impacts, the mitigation identified is restricted to screening and interpretation; again, consideration of siting and design options are likely to be more effective in mitigating these types of effects. It is important that the mitigation hierarchy is applied correctly in considering mitigation.</td>
<td>The cultural heritage mitigation measures contained within Table 5.1 of the SEA Environmental Report have been updated to specifically refer to the mitigation hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPA</strong></td>
<td>4.3 In page 41 under WATER we would recommend stating clearly that SUDS should be used to help reduce pollution from runoff from roads and use any opportunities to retrofit SUDS to existing roads. Also Page 41 refers to fish migration barriers - new road culverts/bridges should allow fish passage and take any opportunities to ease fish passage on existing crossings.</td>
<td>Table 5.1 of the Environmental Report has been updated to highlight the use of SUDS to reduce pollution from runoff from roads and the requirement for new culverts/bridges to allow fish passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPA</strong></td>
<td>6.3 Enhancement opportunities have been identified as the introduction of blue and green infrastructure features than can clean discharge and also slow down flow. Mitigation measures are to be identified using modelling to decide the best option for reducing fluvial and surface water flooding, including a range of green infrastructure e.g. rain gardens, green roofs, attenuation ponds, trees and SUDS. We support these proposals and would recommend that further betterment to existing flood risk areas could be investigated and include measures such as upgrading culverts and bridges where they increase flood risk, although modelling should also be used to establish that any works do not pass on flood risk elsewhere.</td>
<td>Table 5.1 in the Environmental Report has been updated to include betterment to existing flood risk areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SNH</strong></td>
<td>we recommend that any infrastructure developments associated with the implementation of the Transport Strategy are co-ordinated with those in the CDF to minimise the environmental impact and maximise opportunities for mitigation and biodiversity enhancement.</td>
<td>As major projects develop further and funding is committed, the proposals set out in the CDF and LTS will develop closer links, including more detailed assessment of effects. Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, these will be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HES</strong></td>
<td>We note that you have not yet identified monitoring indicators for the historic environment. Monitoring indicators should be clearly linked to the predicted effects of the plan, and should also be able to monitor the degree to which mitigation measures have been integrated into related PPS or lower level projects. This will be particularly important where the detailed identification and delivery mechanisms for mitigation have not yet been established.</td>
<td>Noted. Monitoring indicators have been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Consultation</strong></td>
<td>A periodic or Post-Strategy assessment and analytical comparison against the pre-plan position should be carried out to evaluate what impact the plan is/has ACTUALLY in comparison to the assessment which is in reality an educated guess on potential impact.</td>
<td>The baseline information (section 3.3 of the Environmental Report, pages 19-30) provides the baseline for the pre-plan position. The monitoring plan element of the Environmental Report (section 6, pages 47-51) provides a plan to monitor the effects of the strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Consultation</strong></td>
<td>I could not see anything on pollution levels. Are these being monitored before and after implementing the LTS?</td>
<td>The baseline information (section 3.3 of the Environmental Report, pages 19-30) provides the baseline for the pre-plan position. The monitoring plan element of the Environmental Report (section 6, pages 47-51) provides a plan to monitor the effects of the strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPA</strong></td>
<td>2.1 In Figure 3.1 – Summary of baseline environmental data - we note there are some gaps identified for flooding, aquaculture, energy use and waste. Please note that up to date information is available from other SEA consultations on the Stirling area.</td>
<td>Noted. The baseline data in Fig 3.1 covering Flooding, Aquaculture, Energy Use and Waste has been updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>2.2 Information on baseline is required to check the effects of a certain plans, programmes and strategies (PPS) on the environment. We recommend looking at the information provided in Section 3 of the ER for the Local Development Plan Proposed Plan consultation as it provides updated information on the State of the Environment in Stirling.</td>
<td>Noted. The baseline data in Fig 3.1 has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>5.2 Having been sent the revised version of the table on the 21 September we are now generally content with the proposed indicators, however we would request that the ER is updated to include indicators for waste and energy under MATERIAL ASSETS.</td>
<td>Noted. The baseline data for Material Assets in Fig 3.1 covering Energy Use and Waste has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNH</td>
<td>The Atlas of Living Scotland (<a href="http://www.als.scot/">http://www.als.scot/</a>) and SNH’s Sitelink website (<a href="https://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/">https://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/</a>) are both useful information sources.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plan not fully assessed

| HES | Additional Strategic Network Interventions New Bannockburn Rail Station: this has been given a neutral score for Cultural Heritage. However, as the proposed site is within the Bannockburn Inventory battlefield, I would have expected the scoring and commentary to reflect the possibility of some effects on this heritage asset. | Table D2 of the Environmental Report has been updated to reflect that the approximate area suggested to site the proposed new South Stirling Rail Station is included within the Bannockburn Inventory Battlefield. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>Strategic Network Interventions: Improving Trunk Road Connectivity The commentary for the three interventions under this heading notes potential impacts on historic environment assets. We agree with these findings, although we would recommend that the potential for negative effects on setting are also recognised here. It is unclear why the scoring for cultural heritage indicates no effects.</td>
<td>Table D2 of the Environmental Report has been updated to ensure the assessment accurately reflects the impacts identified for each intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>We do however have concerns in relation to the proposal for realignment of the A811, and the significant negative effects that this is likely to have on the setting of heritage assets in the vicinity, particularly Stirling Castle. It is not clear from the LTS or the Environmental Report how far the design and route of this road might be constrained by other PPS, or whether any reasonable alternatives have been identified or explored. We would welcome early involvement in further discussion relating to this element of the draft LTS.</td>
<td>Stirling Council welcomes continuing discussion with officers from Historic Environment Scotland's through their involvement in the City Commission and relevant CDF group regarding the proposed realignment of the A811 as part of the City Park proposal within the City Development Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>&quot;improvements to health, air, carbon emissions and potentially the built heritage from increased active travel or public transport use in preference to private vehicles&quot; is listed as one bullet point. This statement contains several positive impacts that should each receive due attention. Impacts on health and wellbeing through a more active lifestyle is an important point.</td>
<td>Noted. Effects on Human Health were considered in the SEA as one of the key areas of potential environmental effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>It is very important to consider environmental impacts. My understanding is that Bridge of Allan is already suffering from poor air quality because of traffic going through the village. I would be against any development that increases traffic in this area. I also think it important to consider mental health factors as well as physical. It is important to be able to see green space and any erosion of facilities that hinder residents' current ability to see into the distance, free of development, traffic noise and emissions, will have a negative impact. For me, I can cope more easily with pockets of congestion more easily than I can cope with urban creep. It is important to protect the nature of valued communities.</td>
<td>Regular air quality monitoring by Stirling Council, including a site in Henderson Street, Bridge of Allan, has not identified any breaches of air quality. See Stirling Council's '2014 Air Quality Progress Report' and the 'Sustainable Stirling Annual Report 2015/16' available on the Council Website for full details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>It should be noted that significant road interventions will not deliver long term environmental benefits and in the interim encourage traffic growth.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Reduced congestion and better road safety are huge benefits, along with public health but the environment needs to be taken into account more on this. Would like to see plans to increase biodiversity and make this area nicer for all.</td>
<td>Noted. The proposal to include green and blue infrastructure within the mitigation options to be developed for a number of the proposed LTS actions will support an increase in biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>The negative impacts associated with the fact that new improvements in transport facilitate development and therefore negate any potential positive gains from the improvements. Furthermore it does not truly factor in environmental impacts associated with the changes such as moving BoA station will mean many existing users will be further from the station and therefore may need to drive to the station rather than walk, further from BoA centre therefore more likely to drive or not take train at all and do commute by car. For example existing properties may then need to car, or drive to station, this will also effect house prices in those existing properties. The new road at Airthrey indicates that it will improve Henderson street (A9) but in fact more cars will travel along Henderson street rather than turn of and drive down Allan Vale Road and on to Cornton road. So do not see the benefits there environmentally.</td>
<td>The environmental effects of the proposals to relocate Bridge of Allan Station and the Kildean to Cornton and Cornton to Airthrey road links include consideration of the likely effects on traffic accessing/using the proposed infrastructure. The proposal to relocate Bridge of Allan station would result in an increased number of residents living within a reasonable walking distance of the station. Comments regarding transport facilitating development and this negating positive gains from the transport improvements, and the new Kildean to Airthrey link have been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>The Report appears to be comprehensive. My only concern is that Climate Change is not given enough emphasis. We need to stop burning fossil fuels altogether and require everyone to use carbon-free transport for all journeys.</td>
<td>Climate change is considered in the SEA as one of the 12 areas of potential environmental effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>4.5 In page 44 we note that the impact of the CDF is considered in the cumulative effects ‘In addition to population growth projections, number of visitors expected to travel to City Development Plan venues, attractions and events could be well above numbers modelled for Plan interventions, significantly increasing traffic, congestion and associated pollutants, and increasing disturbance to species.’ We welcome the mitigation measures proposed, however would suggest further modelling to consider the impact of tourism from the CDF on the LTS.</td>
<td>As major projects develop further and funding is committed, the proposals set out in the CDF and LTS will develop closer links, including more detailed assessment of effects. Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, these will be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>We also note that the modelling did not consider the increase in visitor numbers and associated traffic if all the CDF projects are implemented. Given that one of the main aims of the CDF is to attract visitors to Stirling we would welcome the revised version of the ER to introduce this factor and consider the resulting effects.</td>
<td>Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, the concerns outlined will be assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>We therefore welcome the reference to the City Development Framework and the links to the delivery of the LDP. We however note that the projects in the CDF are subject to funding approval and that some factors related to this have not been considered in the modelling of the LTS.</td>
<td>In order to deliver best value from limited resources, the traffic modelling undertaken to help inform the LTS consultation was unable to consider every combination of different external factors, for example alternative timescales for the development of specific sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNH</td>
<td>The Stirling City Development Framework should be added as it has a proposal to create a new City Park that include a new junction from the M9 to the west of Stirling and a new park and ride facility.</td>
<td>The Stirling City Development Framework is included in the Environmental Report, as a relevant PPS and where City Development Framework proposals impact on the transport network these have been included in the environmental assessment, see table D2. As major projects develop further and funding is committed, the proposals set out in the CDF and LTS will develop closer links, including more detailed assessment of effects. Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, these will be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNH</td>
<td>We agree that the Scoping Report has identified the key environmental issues. However we recommend that the Stirling Local Transport Strategy Review is subject to a HRA to fully assess the impact on European sites within the plan area.</td>
<td>Where any project option that has potential to impact on European sites proceeds beyond outline stage, this will be subject to a Habitats Regulations Appraisal and an Environmental Impact Assessment as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of SEA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The SEA is a statutory requirement with the objective that the environmental effects of plans/policies/strategies are considered during the decision making process, as such it is an integral part of the development of the strategy and not separate to it. It is not clear what route is meant by &quot;key station gateway route&quot; however, regular air quality monitoring by Stirling Council has not identified any breaches of air quality in Stirling City. For full details, see Stirling Council's '2014 Air Quality Progress Report' available on the Council's website. It is assumed the reference to &quot;bypass&quot; refers to the existing A91 to the east of Stirling. The provision of appropriate screening will have been part of the design and construction of this now existing route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Consultation</strong></td>
<td>Considering the wider environment is not separate to the strategy but a fundamental part of it - walking and cycling will rise further if the environment is improved. As a start, impacting air quality and noise on the key station gateway route, improve screening of the bypass further to improve the quality of experience of all users of this route.</td>
<td>Noted. The SEA is specifically focused on the environmental effects of the strategy to ensure these are appropriately considered. Comments requesting a greater emphasis on accessibility and inclusiveness in the LTS Strategy development have been considered in the LTS Report Consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Consultation</strong></td>
<td>Hard copy: It is important that an environmental assessment is done, however why can't there be as much emphasis on accessibility and inclusiveness as on the environmental assessment. If I can't get out then my environment is limited to four walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>The SEA seems like a solid piece of work and it is difficult to argue with its conclusions. If the premise is that the Environment must have the same consideration as social and economic factors then it probably meets that criterion. However, I might argue with the basic premise. Social or Economic Development must be the main driver, without those kinds of opportunities communities die. Then there is little point in having a pristine environment that people cannot live or work in.</td>
<td>Noted. The SEA is a statutory requirement with the objective that the environmental effects of plans/policies/strategies are considered during the decision making process. Social and Economic Development is considered within the LTS Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>A perfect environment is no use to anyone if we have no wealth. Giving the environment the same level of importance as the economy is a fundamental flaw.</td>
<td>Noted. The SEA is a statutory requirement with the objective that the environmental effects of plans/policies/strategies are considered during the decision making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>A step in the right direction</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Admirable in its scope and aspirations</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>As usual the motorist wins to the detriment of all others</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Complicated to read for the layperson</td>
<td>A non-technical summary of the SEA was included in the Environmental Report (pages 5-8) and made available as a separate document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Did not have time to read.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>far too much information provided, need to be a lawyer to understand all this please abbreviate</td>
<td>A non-technical summary of the SEA was included in the Environmental Report (pages 5-8) and made available as a separate document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Haven't read it and don't have time</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I agree that modal change to active travel reduces pollutants, noise and improves health, environment and are particularly effective and attractive to locals and tourists when they support/enhance green networks as active travel routes. It is important that roads, housing and other developments do not create severance of important river networks and urbanise the remaining City green and blue networks e.g. at Forthside, Kildean, Airthrey, Kings park/Castle and Brucefields. The attractive settings, approaches and views to the castle and beyond and across the river to the Ochil’s should be protected and recognised as peaceful assets for local and tourists to enjoyed by active travel. Roads and overdevelopment seem likely to destroy the assets.</td>
<td>The SEA process influences the development of public sector plans, policies and strategies in order to ensure that these do not create unacceptable negative environmental impacts. The Council will continue to consider options for the river, city park and other green infrastructure projects and will take these comments on board in deliberations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I believe that, while environmental issues are an important factor in this report, social issues should take precedence where appropriate, and economic issues will have to be balanced with environmental issues.</td>
<td>The SEA is a statutory requirement with the objective that the environmental effects of plans/policies/strategies are considered during the decision making process alongside social and economic effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I do not feel qualified to comment on the report.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I do not think it is going far enough to protect the environment.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I hope this survey isn't just part of your required consultation, as PR and decisions have already been made</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I note that what is described as the Kildean to Cornton Link Road would have largely negative impacts.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I strongly suspect that this whole exercise is designed to allow the Council to claim that they have public support for various plans when this is in fact clearly not the case.</td>
<td>The SEA is a statutory requirement with the objective that the environmental effects of plans/policies/strategies are considered during the decision making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I think I may have completed this form more than once.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>It all looks very nice and attractive but full of jargon. It is aimed to be vague and non-committal on many areas. Just words really. If you ARE serious about less cars on the road then you have to provide good public transport. If that means less frequent runs on some city services and some sent to rural areas like Fintry then that is good. By not having this service we cannot access good shops and services in the city, that is NOT EQUITABLE. What we need are the basics first. Better rural bus services to areas that do not have them, better road surfaces. Rural areas pay the same taxes but get fewer services. We do not have access to what the Council provide for others.</td>
<td>Noted. While the use of 'jargon' has been minimised some technical terms cannot be avoided. A non-technical summary of the Environmental Report is provided on pages 5-8 of the report. Comments regarding provision of public transport and quality of road surfaces have been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>It would be nice to give a summary?</td>
<td>A non-technical summary of the SEA was included in the Environmental Report (pages 5-8) and made available as a separate document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>It's always good to keep an eye on the environment when making changes.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Looks fine to me.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Not got time to read it after the length of this survey!</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Responding as a commuter (train and bike) travelling from Edinburgh to University of Stirling.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>See q27</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>See: UWE Bristol: Impact of road transport on air quality not given sufficient priority in UK transport planning Scottish Environment Link paper 17-08-2016 (transport planning has hard copies of articles Magnetite pollution nanoparticles in the human brain</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>So long as it is taken into consideration when new transport strategies are implemented it will be helpful.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Sorry I don't have the relevant degree to answer this</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Sorry, no time to read.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Sounds encouraging.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>The Assessment and findings of the Environmental Report seem reasonable, but how can we be sure that decision-makers and relevant officers will be paying attention and ensuring mitigation measures and opportunities will be implemented?</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>This is a link to a download doc. As I am working on a mobile device this is not accessible to me now.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>This is all very well, but are the people who need to actually reading this and taking any notice? Is it just a tick-box exercise?</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Too much information on one spreadsheet, should separate the different groups</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Too long a report for any comment</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>too many hang-ups over environment - there are more important things to think about like poverty.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Too many questions - too much additional reading and understanding for a survey! Gave up half way through.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>too much jargon and acronyms and box ticking.</td>
<td>Noted. A non-technical summary of the SEA was included in the Environmental Report (pages 5-8) and made available as a separate document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Will have to read this later</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>You're having a joke now!</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>6.2 The ER also identifies that the most likely flood impacts as a result of any of the proposed works within the strategy are from an increase in surface water runoff due to an increase in areas of hardstanding, landform alterations and problems with culverts. Whilst surface water impacts are likely to be a concern in most areas, there are also fluvial impacts which should be considered adjacent to watercourses. Land raising within the functional floodplain in order to create or maintain roads may lead to increased flood risk elsewhere through loss of storage and conveyance of flood water. This may not only be from the footprint of the road but where it cuts off flow pathways and diverts water away from its natural course. Watercourse crossings (bridges and culverts) also require careful design to ensure they do not exacerbate flood risk.</td>
<td>Noted. Where options assessed as having more significant environmental effects proceed beyond outline stage, these will be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment considered in LTS Consultation Report |
### Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>A cheaper solution is to make the bus tickets 1£ return. Make safe cycle routes between Stirling and other Towns. Like Tullibody. The oil is running out. The price is low because America is trying to cripple Russia, as the Yankers want to rule the planet by force. Thanks to the stealing and corruption of the Bankers &amp; Politicians the world is in a deep recession, so again there is a reducing need for oil. But when the price of oil goes up in a few years to reflect it's real market value. Working people will no longer be able to both eat and drive a car. They will need cheap buses. So why not ignore everything I've said and go encourage more car ownership and the costs that go with it.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>A major benefit to the environment would be to have a radically different approach to rubbish and cleansing, both in the streets and in the countryside. This should be treated as a matter of far greater importance than it currently is. Tourism is a major earner; visitors frequently comment on the beauty of the countryside and Stirling itself, and the rubbish that despoils these places. It's also depressing for those who live here.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Awareness of different needs and accessible for people who have disabilities</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Find it difficult to go to the link and return to my questionnaire. I regard the environment as supremely important and would like a survey done of lorries and vans in Henderson St and why they are there. The feeling is that many are cutting off from the Weighbridge on the motorway and something needs to be done to make it less attractive for them and less pollution.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Hope that some emphasis and expenditure will be allocated to public transport from rival areas not all on cycle routes and the towns as is usual. We are not all able to cycle, especially 45 miles to hospital!</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I could not see a specific commitment to build more segregated cycle infrastructure in this report, or indeed SMART objectives.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I would love it if we could pedestrianise the whole town centre. There could be temporary access, as there is now in the pedestrianised area, for deliveries, and maybe some access for blue badge holders. Other than that, we could have no traffic within 2km of town centre. Much more space for pedestrians and cyclists, space for markets etc, and a cleaner and greener town centre.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>inconsistency on roundabouts. sometime straight ahead in left or right lanes. or not marked at all. also the disappearing lanes on the craigs roundabout that were never fully reinstated after the changes 5+ years ago. very confusing for locals . visitors just cannot cope.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>It is time Scotland takes a leaf out of the Amsterdam model from the 70's and encourage more people to cycle safely improving health and the environment I feel as a cyclist who cycles in some European countries we are very far behind. An example for me is the stupid chevrons going down Burghmuir Road from St Ninians this should have been incorporated into safer cycling.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>It is time to phase out petrol engines using incentive schemes as well as encouraging use of public transport. Multiple vehicle households should be discouraged with financial penalties.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Journeys for working families tend to have more than one purpose and time is often of the essence. - Drop/pick up children at/from childcare/nursery/school - get to/from train station for commute - food shop - kids clubs</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>just need better bus service and better prices like Edinburgh 8 miles out they pay £1.50 we pay tree times that same distance</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>My only comment here would be a distributional one. Further development of tourism (to which I am not opposed) may well increase the traffic flow on the A81 (as might new access roads between the M9 and the A811) thus increasing some environmental, and road safety impacts on SW Rural communities (esp. ours) and enhancing the need for traffic calming measures.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Open Bannockburn Railway Station Park and Ride New Bus Station (hard copy)</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Present road planning in town centre increases travel time and so emissions</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Stirling suffers from very little road congestion apart from the rush 5 minutes at the end of the working day around the bridge clock roundabouts. Congestion might be a good incentive to reduce the volume of traffic so should not be addressed as a priority. Priority of investment in active travel could offer co-benefits of reducing traffic volume at no further cost. Evidence shows that roadside planting affects driver behaviour. Installation of trees and other planting can improve safety, and offer co-benefits for biodiversity, air quality and visual amenity. Attention to flood management is welcome especially where it uses strategies from the Sustainable Urban Drainage System approach that slow the flow rather than simply displacing the problem elsewhere. This will also require that discrete council departments work together more effectively, seeking opportunities to manage water before it reaches the roads as well as dealing with the capacity of existing drainage.</td>
<td>Comments regarding traffic congestion and investment in active travel which are not specific to the SEA ER have been considered in the LTS Consultation Report. Comments supportive of inclusion of trees and planting and the use of the Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) approach are noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Strategic Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>The withdrawal of First Bus routes prevents children accessing various after school sports clubs at High School. The withdrawal has had an immediate and significant impact on the lives, education and ultimately the health of children in various rural communities and their families. It has meant that private cars are also making multiple journeys to and from Balfron, as compared to the previous situation when the bus picked pupils up to bring them back to the outlying villages.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>There are far too many ticket machines in Stirling. Also in Dunblane. Why pay money to go to Stirling Town Centre when you might not buy anything. Better to use Out of Town area such as Springkerse.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>This could be a brilliant opportunity to change people’s perceptions on how they get around. I have noticed since I came to live in this area a year and a half ago that more people walk and cycle here (I previously lived in Angus and hardly anyone went anywhere without one of their cars)</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>When cycle routes suit a certain type of cyclist, not a regular commuter who wants to get somewhere fast. They should consider if the cyclist needs to cross a main road to access them.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>While understanding the need to reduce carbon emissions and traffic congestion as well as encouraging individual health awareness, I fail to see why rural areas should suffer such savage cuts to transport which are causing so many problems to everyday living for vulnerable people.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Stirling Council Response and any amendment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Will not hold my breath for safer roads leading from my home in to get to work in Stirling. Have to cycle for childcare reasons also bus fares absolutely daylight robbery.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Building cycle paths whilst cyclists continue to use the adjacent road is a total and utter waste of money and resources. My son and I walked from Menstrie to Causewayhead one Saturday along a brand new cycle path/pavement - we saw 13 cyclists only two were using the cycle path the other eleven were on the road.</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>I feel we need safe cycle routes walks NGOs paths and reliability in the bus service in order to lower carbon</td>
<td>Comment not specific to SEA ER. Comment has been considered in LTS Consultation Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>