

Responder	Issue	Action
	<p>As of April 2015, Highways England took over the powers of the Highways Agency. We suggest that the references to the Highways Agency in the Transport Strategy are amended to reflect this change.</p>	<p>Change text accordingly</p>
	<p>The Transport Strategy identifies a number of improvements on the local road network. We are currently undertaking a series of infrastructure studies across the region in order to understand the impact of development on the SRN and identify areas of the network where development will have a severe impact. There are two studies within South Yorkshire relevant to Rotherham, one covering sections of the M1 and one covering sections of the M18. It is likely that these studies will identify improvements to the SRN which are necessary to facilitate development within Rotherham. We request that any appropriate improvements identified through the infrastructure studies should be included within the Transport Strategy and other relevant Local Plan documents. We will seek to work with you and the other authorities in the Sheffield City Region to determine what mitigation is required and how it will be delivered.</p>	<p>Add information as addenda to finished strategy</p>
	<p><i>Principal settlement transport plans</i> We welcome the development of these transport plans as they support the objective of integrated transport and land use planning. It is hoped that these plans will provide a coordinated approach to delivering sustainable travel options and funding for mitigation schemes where required. We would seek to work with you on the production of these plans; particularly for development areas which we predict will have a significant impact on the strategic road network. We would also like to work with you to identify any mitigation measures required and to identify funding sources for these improvements.</p>	<p>Involve stakeholders including HE in the production of the plans</p>
	<p>We suggest that the term 'motorways' is amended to 'strategic road network' to be consistent with our terminology and the terminology used in the Rotherham Sites and Policies document.</p>	<p>Whilst wishing to avoid confusion the term Motorways was preferred to enable wider public understanding. Where the term is first used in the text a footnote will be added to refer to the SRN</p>
	<p>We support your approach of placing greater emphasis on shifting travel demand from car to bus, train, tram, bike or walking as opposed to building new roads and increasing road capacity. This is in line with DfT Circular 02/2013 which in relation to capacity enhancement states 'Only after travel plan and demand management measures have been fully explored and applied will capacity enhancement measures be considered.'</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b></p>
	<p>We would like further information on the status and timescales of the road improvement schemes contained in the 'schemes identified through Local Plan examination and potentially funded by CIL' section. We are particularly interested in the Cumwell Lane/A631 Bawtry Road and A630 West Bawtry Road/A630 Rotherway junction schemes because of their proximity to the strategic road network.</p>	<p>Due to the uncertain nature of CIL funding and the list of projects any further detail will be included as an addendum.</p>

Responder	Issue	Action
	<p><i>Integrated Transport and Land Use</i></p> <p>The proposed target for this objective is vague and it is not clear how it will be monitored. Targets should ideally be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time bound). With regards to the specificity of the targets we recommend that the target incorporates further detail such as what would be considered a substantial development and what would be considered sustainable travel. With regards to measurability we recommend that detail is provided on which aspects of sustainable travel will be monitored. In addition, a mechanism for identifying achievable mode shift targets for new developments would be useful.</p>	<p>We acknowledge that the targets are somewhat vague for this. The large number of developments and their diversity means that sustainable transport solutions may vary considerably, both between developments and from year to year due to the mix of developments that come forward. Data is currently collected on the number of travel plans implemented annually and also the percentage of Rotherham's workforce covered by a travel plan. In addition SYPTE has data on the number of Travelmaster tickets that are issued to residential developments. It is felt that due to the annual variation in new build developments, target setting would not be a valuable exercise. The measures of sustainable travel are made using the annual cordon counts as a general proxy for the whole of Rotherham. Substantial developments are considered to be those that trigger a requirement for a transport assessment/statement and a travel plan. This detail is found in the Local Plan Sites and Policies Good practice guidance and is too lengthy to be incorporated in the Strategy document.</p>
	<p>We support the use of sustainable transport or travel plan conditions. However for monitoring purposes it may be more useful to look at the number of developer travel plans approved by the Council.</p>	<p>This data is collected annually and recorded as a cumulative total. It has some inherent problems as the number of individuals covered by a plan may vary between 50 and 5000 employees. We are currently working on a statistical presentation that will take these factors into account. This will be incorporated in the monitoring data and targets in the future.</p>
	<p>We support a robust approach to monitoring congestion and delay along main roads which interact with the strategic road network. A robust monitoring approach to congestion and delay will allow for the early detection and remediation of issues. Congestion and delay monitoring may form an important aspect of monitoring the impact of new developments. Monitoring is an important element in identifying 'trigger points' for additional mitigation measures where required.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support</b>, no action required. Monitoring will be reported annually.</p>
	<p>SYPTE agree with the immediate priorities of job creation and improving transport affordability.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support</b>, no action required</p>
	<p>The document refers to the planning context and the importance of the Sheffield City Region (SCR). The SCR Strategic Economic Plan is not mentioned in detail and it could be argued that any transport strategy should align with this plan to take full advantage of any devolution funding going forward.</p>	<p>As the Transport Strategy aligns with the SCR Transport Strategy there was not felt to be any necessity in reiterating the SCR economic plan.</p>
	<p>It is also noted that no reference is made to linkages to the specific developments in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID), which is partially in Rotherham and plays a key role in the growth of the city region.</p>	<p>At the present time there are not even any outline proposals for transport infrastructure relating to AMID. As and when proposals come forward the Strategy will be updated to reflect the changes.</p>
	<p>SYPTE agree that the road network in the area is close to capacity and that alternatives to the car need to be provided and promoted.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support</b>, no action required</p>

Responder	Issue	Action
	<p>The ticket prices are lower than those quoted. The Travelmaster is now £1,050, the FirstRotherham monthly is £52 and the Student ticket for 16-18 year olds, which allows travel on any mode within South Yorkshire is only £14.20. As quoted in the strategy the Rotherham Bus Partnership has allowed for lower priced and more flexible ticketing options.</p>	<p>Correct text or delete prices, the inaccuracy reflects the changes that have taken place during the development of the strategy.</p>
	<p>SYLTE welcome the focus on high quality public transport and the promotion of the range of sustainable transport options.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b></p>
	<p>Several of the key challenges and objectives rely heavily on the provision of an efficient public transport system and align directly with the key objectives of the SYLTE. It should also be noted that they would be carried out with co-operation from SYLTE.</p>	<p>SYLTE is mentioned as a partner in all public transport related aspects of the strategy.</p>
	<p>The themes and actions are all interrelated to a certain extent but what is unclear is each of these directly effects the outcomes.</p>	<p>Figure 10 in the Strategy shows the high level outcomes to which the themes and actions will contribute. Since other factors [unrelated to transportation measures] will also contribute to these outcomes it is felt that the monitoring provides sufficient indication of the effects of implemented measures.</p>
	<p>SYLTE welcomes the changing of focus from cars to more sustainable modes and the acknowledgement that previously this has led to preferences for developments based on car access.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b></p>
	<p>As stated the preference should be given to development that is accessible to everyone by frequent public transport, walking and cycling.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b></p>
	<p>The strategy correctly notes the importance in using the planning process to fully promote sustainable travel through Transport Assessments and Travel Plans as well as the need to use the Community Infrastructure Levy to fund highways and transportation projects which enable new developments</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b></p>
	<p>Themes 1 and 2 actions – SYLTE would question if the principal settlement action plans been developed?</p>	<p>The principal settlement action plans will be developed over the early period of the strategy.</p>
	<p>SYLTE welcomes the objective of improving public transport so it provides alternatives to the private car.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b></p>
	<p>It is noted and agreed that rail is the weakest of the modes in the area, especially when considering commuting to places such as Sheffield. No mention is made of the possibility of the new mainline station at Parkgate. The strategy also highlights the relatively good bus network.</p>	<p>Whilst not specifically mentioning Parkgate, the strategy does indicate the desirability of a new mainline station</p>

Responder	Issue	Action
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	Page 31 - Parkgate is no longer owned by British Land.	To be corrected in text
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	Inadequate public transport network – The development of Aldwarke Lane Link Road, Parkgate will add significant improvements to the journey times especially southbound. This route would also allow for a further park and ride sight to service the Tram Train.	The Aldwarke Link road is in the early stages of planning and is not yet a committed scheme however a note will be added at an appropriate point in the text
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	Theme 3: To improve rail services and access to stations and to ensure SCR is served by high speed rail – A new station is mentioned but its location is not specified.	The location of a new mainline station is by no means decided and probably requires a formal business case to be prepared, prior to any announcements.
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	Theme 4: To improve connectivity between major settlements – SYPTE welcome the promotion of both the BRT and Tram Train schemes and notes that the strategy acknowledges their significance in improving the links between Rotherham and Sheffield and the wider city region.	<b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	To develop public transport the connect people to jobs and training – As stated SYPTE will seek developers to fund public transport improvements and/ or promotion.	<b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	Theme 6: Developing user friendly and accessible public transport with high quality integration between modes (including walking and cycling) – Again SYPTE welcomes this theme and the point that just providing public transport services is not enough. These services must be useable and accessible.	<b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	Theme 7 and 8: To improve safety on public transport and to work with operators to keep fares affordable. – The Rotherham Bus Partnership is key to this and has already had a number of successes in reducing ticket prices as mentioned above.	<b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	Are the Integrated Transport Block and the Maintenance Block/ Highway Maintenance Funding components of the LTP grant funding?	Yes
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	As SYPTE understand it the Integrated Transport Block is allocated on a formula relating to congestion, air quality, accessibility etc. The funding is allocated to the Combined Authority by the DfT and used to deliver safe roads etc.	Addressed in revised text
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	Page 63 The Pool Green Scheme is now complete.	Addressed in the revised text

Responder	Issue	Action
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	<p>Page 64 The Comprehensive Spending Review has allowed a much better understanding of how these funds will be allocated.</p>	<p>The CSR post-dated the last version of the Strategy. Where information is available this will be updated in the final version of the text</p>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	<p>It should be noted that the information in the Tram Train bid is out of date and that the bid for funding was submitted in partnership with SYPTE, SCC and RMBC, not individually.</p>	<p>Text to be corrected</p>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	<p>It should also be noted that the contribution for LSTF was £5million for the key component bid and £25 million for the main bid.</p>	<p>Text to be emended as appropriate</p>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	<p>SYPTE question if the funding from the Local Growth Plan Process is predominantly transport based?</p>	<p>Text modified to reflect latest understanding</p>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	<p>Page 65. It is likely that a consolidated devolved transport budget will be allocated to the 'single pot' but no necessarily into a 'transport fund'</p>	<p>Text modified to reflect latest understanding</p>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	<p>Is it important to note that all the LSTF money benefits South Yorkshire as a whole.</p>	<p>The strategy looks at how funding has affected Rotherham within the context of SY</p>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	<p>It is considered that much of the text in the document is outputs not outcomes and as such difficult to measure and understand when they have achieved their objectives/outcomes?</p>	<p>Much of the strategy is geared to outputs that are easily measured. Outcomes are often difficult to measure in specific terms and will often require comparison of census/ cordon count data over a long timescale.</p>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	<p>SYPTE would welcome more measurable quantitative targets.</p>	<p>Targets will be developed over time as it becomes apparent how much funding will be available</p>
 <p><b>SOUTH YORKSHIRE PASSENGER TRANSPORT</b> <b>E X E C U T I V E</b></p>	<p>In summary SYPTE welcome this forward thinking strategy based around sustainable transport and acknowledges the opportunities for co-operation it presents.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support</b>, no action required</p>

Responder	Issue	Action
	<p>Fundamentally, the proposed Strategy sets out a positive approach to transport connectivity, sustainability, efficiency and safety and this is supported by SCR. We recognise that the document pulls together previously separate information and articulating what this means at the local level.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support</b>, no action required</p>
	<p>Although the overarching SCR Transport Strategy is referenced within the document, strategic alignment is not as apparent as it should be. The Rotherham Transport Strategy should set the SCR Transport Strategy and associated policies out as the primary regional transport strategy, with clear reference to its role and demonstration of clear policy linkages throughout the document. Ideally, the Strategy should be structured around how the policies of the SCR Transport Strategy will be delivered at the local level.</p>	<p>The alignment of the Rotherham strategy to the SCR strategy is implicit in the document and the latter informs Rotherham's Strategy throughout. Constant cross referencing of policy linkages was felt likely to detract from the readability of the document and diminish its local emphasis, which seeks to address Rotherham's own priorities that are somewhat diluted by the SCR strategy.</p>
	<p>It should be noted that the SCR Transport Strategy is subject to a refresh and that this will be undertaken in early 2016.</p>	<p>Noted, reference to be made in text</p>
	<p>The Rotherham Transport Strategy should also better reflect the Strategic Economic Plan objectives and the overall approach to future transport infrastructure through the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan (SCR IIP). The SCR IIP is not currently mentioned within the document.</p>	<p>Reference to be made to SCR IIP in the text.</p>
	<p>Good to see reference to devolution. The content does not reflect the outcome of the latest devolution deal and should be updated to reflect how devolution could facilitate the delivery of the plan.</p>	<p>As the Devolution deal has not yet been ratified it may be premature to add too much detail. Future updates may be the most appropriate means of reflecting the progress of the deal.</p>
	<p>References to funding and delivery need to be set within the context of devolution and the SCR assurance framework. It is felt that this does not currently come through clearly enough within the document.</p>	<p>At present this is by no means settled and should probably be dealt with by means of an update.</p>
	<p>The Rotherham Strategy does emphasise the importance of the Local Authority in ensuring that policies are actively delivered on the ground. For example integrating transport and land use (i.e. Policy I of the SCR Transport Strategy) forms a key Rotherham priority. This will be driven by the Local Plan process and the Local Authority Development Management approach.</p>	<p><b>Positive comment in support</b>, no action required</p>
<p><b>S Hewitson (private individual)</b></p>	<p>Recent discussions of transport strategies such as "Health on the Move", the Sustran's report on "Transport Poverty" and ongoing campaigns by groups like the Leonard Cheshire Trust have highlighted the impact transport policies and strategies can have on older people, people with disabilities and other groups on low income. Transport Poverty is more extensive than "Fuel Poverty" and the</p>	<p>Health and transport poverty are reflected in all aspects of the Strategy</p>

	consequent experience of loneliness and isolation, particularly for older people, impacts on the health and well-being of an increasing number of people and it is important any long term transport strategy reflects these issues and offers some vision of how they may be addressed during the 10 year period covered by this strategy document	
Responder	Issue	Action
<b>S Hewitson (private individual)</b>	Local Community Transport makes a much more significant contribution than is identified in the strategy document particularly in supporting people with health and social care needs as well as disadvantaged families and children with disabilities. The strategy could be strengthened by including a commitment to building stronger partnerships with the local voluntary and community sector. The implications of the introduction of personalised budgets for health, social care and education also need to be addressed	Whilst the strategy acknowledges the role of community transport in supporting some groups, its operation is not solely controlled by RMBC.
<b>Kathleen McDermott (private individual)</b>	Regarding public transport for Woodsetts. For 80+ years there was a bus to Sheffield which originally ran via the A57 and later came through our village but several years ago this was discontinued and we have to get the 19a to Dinnington and transfer to the X5 to Sheffield resulting in a much longer journey time. The 19A service is provided by Stagecoach Worksop and the times do not fit with the times of the bus to Sheffield. Returning from Sheffield the X5 arrives at Dinnington Interchange at 10 and 50 mins past the hour but the 19A to Woodsetts is scheduled to leave at 48 mins past the hour. Going to Sheffield the 19A arrives at Dinnington Interchange on the hour whereas the X5 to Sheffield leaves the interchange at 38 and 58 mins. Also the 19A and the 19 (to Worksop but via the A57) alternate so the bus through Woodsetts can be badly affected if there is a problem on the A57. Could some improvements to our bus service be made in the forthcoming strategy. Also, in view of the inevitable population increase in Dinnington and Anston it would be an improvement if the faster bus to Sheffield (the old X4) were reintroduced. This would encourage more people to use public transport rather than cars.	Although the issues are of concern the mechanics of running bus services are in the remit of the Rotherham Bus Partnership. At a strategic level it is important that people's transport requirements are looked at in more general terms. It is clear that links from settlements remain an issue and will be referred to the RBP..
<b>Todwick Parish Council</b>	Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the draft strategy. It's clear that a lot of thought and work has gone into producing it. We welcome and would endorse much of the content. The strategy refers to the Rotherham Improvement Plan (2015) and the desired outcomes. We too, fully support the outcome that Rotherham should be a child-centred borough and held this particular objective in mind in when considering the strategy.	<b>Positive comment in support, no action required</b>
<b>Todwick Parish Council</b>	The vast majority of schools throughout the borough experience issues relating to transport – most often parking around the school at drop off and pick up times, difficulty crossing the roads around the school and speeding vehicles close to the school. We would like to see a commitment from RMBC that all schools across the borough are to be considered for a 20 mph speed restriction and the start and end of the school day. A commitment should also be made to re-assess the need for school crossing patrols and a pro-active recruitment drive made a priority.	Pilot trials are in progress of school 20mph limits and parking / school crossing patrols are the subject of continuing attention.

Responder	Issue	Action
<b>Todwick Parish Council</b>	All the objectives related to public transport are fully endorsed. However, we feel in Todwick that the village has been excluded from any of the objectives as changes made over recent years have had the opposite effect. The loss of the bus service linking Todwick directly with Dinnington, Kiveton Park and Crystal Peaks has had a significant adverse impact on people, their well-being, and has also lead to the increase in private car use. The bus service to and from Sheffield was said to have been 'strengthened' however it's unclear in what way, given the service is no longer as quick or efficient as it was previously. As your own information indicates, a significant percentage of people in this area identify more closely with Sheffield than Rotherham and commute daily for work. The lack of an effective bus service has meant people have had to resort to using their car when they would, in the past, have used the bus.	Needs to be referred to the bus partnership to deal with the detail of people's desired travel direction within the obvious funding constraints that exist.
<b>Todwick Parish Council</b>	Kiveton Park train station is identified as a 'park and ride' area but the very limited number of parking spaces prohibits people using this as a viable alternative. As the buses do not effectively link Todwick and Sheffield for people who work (many can get to work but not home again) they would as a second option use the park and ride if there were sufficient parking spaces. We suggest serious consideration is given to increasing the parking capacity around the train station.	The issue of park and ride is touched upon in the strategy, however the expansion of P&R is likely to be driven by the PTE. Current levels of crowding on trains on the Lincoln Line would probably not support additional peak hour passengers. Additional park and ride locations should perhaps be considered for the Strategy. We will suggest that this is reviewed by SYPTE
<b>Todwick Parish Council</b>	Traffic congestion to and from Sheffield, Rotherham, Crystal Peaks and Dinnington is steadily getting worse but how bad must the public transport system be for people to prefer to sit in their cars in a traffic jams? A serious re-think must be made about how public transport can be made more user friendly if there is to be any reverse of the decline in patronage. Smaller, more economical vehicles would be more appropriate in outlying areas. It may also be worthwhile considering reducing the number of 'bus stops' in some rural areas and having 'request stops' instead. This may be of particular benefit for older and less mobile people who could access/exit a bus anywhere along a given route.	Hail and ride services are possible, however the economics of some rural services are not conducive to operation of a regular service. Part of the issue can be resolved by community transport and use of new taxi regulations allowing shared journeys.
<b>MAG-UK (Voluntary Organisation)</b>	The overall strategy seems positive, if somewhat familiar for those who were involved in the consultation process for the SCR as a whole. Unfortunately, it has the same limitations that the city region plan was missing, in that it completely ignores the possibilities offered by powered two-wheeled transport options (motorcycles and scooters).	Where issues specific to PTWs are evident these are dealt with in the strategy
<b>MAG-UK (Voluntary Organisation)</b>	I'm glad to see the Wheels 2 Work scheme which was pioneered here receiving a mention. I'd like to see assistance available to allow some of the people who've taken advantage of this scheme to take the next step towards a low-carbon, low fuel consumption future on two wheels.	There would be no strategic objection to that, other than the availability of funding
<b>MAG-UK (Voluntary Organisation)</b>	Hopefully, the themes mentioned in this section can find a budget. It can't have escaped anyone's attention that parts of the road network in Rotherham is in need of significant improvement. Theme 19 is one of particular interest, as it provides an opening for the two-wheeled option to step in until the more expensive road engineering options can be scheduled.	Unclear what this would mean in practice
<b>MAG-UK (Voluntary Organisation)</b>	Good to see motorcycling getting a mention finally, although it's the same old negative story about working on road safety. Interestingly, the BikeSafe motorcycling scheme, which enables riders to get professional advice from police riders, was pioneered in South Yorkshire. Unfortunately, it would appear to be suffering from the budget cuts affecting a lot of services operated by	Unfortunately it is necessary to aim programmes at PTW riders as they are a disproportionately high percentage of total KSIs of which in recent years they form 20% of the total, even though PTW trips are only about 1% of the total.

Responder	Issue	Action
	police and local government.	
<b>MAG-UK (Voluntary Organisation)</b>	Implementing the strategy: It looks like stakeholders have been chosen and assigned tasks within their core competencies.	<b>Positive comment in support</b> , no action required
<b>MAG-UK (Voluntary Organisation)</b>	Funding: I suspect this will be the biggest struggle for the council and other stakeholders.	<b>Positive comment in support</b> , no action required
<b>MAG-UK (Voluntary Organisation)</b>	Breaking the elements into themes looks like a good idea, as setting measurable goals for them becomes a lot easier.	<b>Positive comment in support</b> , no action required
<b>MAG-UK (Voluntary Organisation)</b>	As I've mentioned earlier, I'm disappointed in the strategy as a whole missing out a transport option which could offer an alternative at lower cost and help the stakeholders achieve their green goals.	The fuel consumption of some of the larger bikes is worse than small cars and therefore not very "green". The economics of PTWs are by no means clear cut.
	From a Safer Roads perspective we would support the strategy, it looks as if much of this, including the targets, is taken from the broader South Yorkshire Safer Roads strategy. As part of the review of the Safer Roads Partnership strategy which we are currently embarking on, we shall be looking to assess whether these indicators are still valid, whether we need to be more ambitious (especially around the target for reducing slight casualties) and whether second tier indicators related to specific road user groups would be beneficial.	<b>Positive comment in support.</b> As and when the new indicators are adopted these will be incorporated into the strategy.
	Your focus on active travel is welcomed and we recognise the work that needs to be undertaken to improve the safety, and perception of safety, for these road users in order to encourage a modal shift away from motorised travel. Pedestrians and cyclists are two of our priority road user groups and we shall continue our range of activities to encourage safer walking and cycling. One of my major concerns is whether current roads maintenance strategies will assist the promotion of walking and cycling (and motorcycle riding too). I am concerned that the current state of the roads will be a big deterrent to use of more active and sustainable modes of travel	<b>Positive comment in support.</b> The HAMP should address these issues
	P58 – the list of Safer Roads partners should include Highways England now, not Highways Agency. You could also add the University of Sheffield.	Noted, changes made to text
	P60 – in the third paragraph you make reference to the South Yorkshire Road Safety Education Plan. This should be the Safer Roads Education, Training and Publicity Action Plan.	Noted, changes to text made
	P60 – haven't the Police Safer Neighbourhoods Teams become the Local Policing Teams? P60 – does the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership still exist?	Noted changes to text made