

Divisions affected: *Kennington & Radley*

**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT
23 FEBRUARY 2023**

**RADLEY: KENNINGTON ROAD & WHITES LANE – PROPOSED
PEDESTRIAN & CYCLE CROSSINGS AND SHARED USE FOOTWAY
/ CYCLETRACK**

Report by Corporate Director, Environment and Place

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Cabinet Member for Highway Management is **RECOMMENDED** to approve the following measures as advertised:
 - a. a new zebra crossing on Kennington Road
 - b. a new raised parallel crossing on Kennington Road
 - c. a new non-raised parallel crossing on Whites Lane,
 - d. a new Shared-use footway/cycle track (to be approx. 3 metres wide) on the east side of Kennington Road, and the west side of Whites Lane.

Executive summary

2. This report presents responses to a consultation on a proposal to introduce a number of pedestrian and pedal cycle improvements in Kennington Road and Whites Lane, Radley in order to provide safe and convenient facilities for pedestrians and cyclists; while the measures are being funded by the developers of housing on adjacent land with a particular focus of encouraging active travel by occupants of this development, the measures will also benefit the many existing pedestrian and cyclists, including through the provision of a convenient link through the development to the Sustrans Route 5 linking Abingdon and Oxford.
3. Specifically, the proposals as shown in **Annexes 1 to 4** will comprise of the following measures a) a new zebra crossing on Kennington Road, b) a new raised parallel crossing on Kennington Road, which will be sited on a new flat top road hump approx. 7m wide and 75mm high, with a ramp gradient of between 1:15 and 1:20, c) a new non-raised parallel crossing on Whites Lane, (both of which comprise of separate adjacent crossing facilities for pedestrians & pedal cyclists), and d) a new Shared-use footway/cycle track (to be approx. 3 metres wide) on the east side of Kennington Road, and the west side of Whites Lane.

Financial Implications

4. Funding for the proposals, including consultation will be met from the developers of adjacent land.

Equality and Inclusion Implications

5. No implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of the proposals.

Sustainability Implications

6. The proposals would help facilitate walking and pedal cyclists, and improve road safety in the vicinity.

Formal consultation

7. The Formal consultation was carried out between 01 December to 30 December 2022. A notice was published in the Oxford Times newspaper, and an email sent to statutory consultees, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, local bus operators, countywide transport, access & disabled peoples user groups, Vale of White Horse District Council, the local District Cllrs, Radley Parish Council and the local County Councillor representing the Kennington and Radley division. Additionally, letters were sent directly to approximately 55 adjacent premises in the immediate vicinity.
8. 42 responses were received via the online survey during the course of the formal consultation, and these are summarised in the table below:

Proposal	Object	Concerns	Support	No opinion / objection	Total
zebra crossing Kennington Road	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	31 (74%)	3	42
raised parallel crossing Kennington Road	1 (2%)	6 (14%)	31 (74%)	4	42
non-raised parallel crossing Whites Lane	-	7 (17%)	31 (74%)	4	42
Shared-use footway/cycle track	12 (29%)	10 (24%)	19 (45%)	1	42

9. Additionally, 11 emails were received, comprising of four objections, two raising concerns, four in support, and one submitting a non-objection.

10. The full responses are shown at **Annex 5**, and copies of the original submissions are also available for inspection by County Councillors.

Officer response to objections/concerns

11. Thames Valley Police expressed no objection providing the necessary speed monitoring had taken place with the results supporting this, and that the proposals fully meet all necessary design criteria.

12. The Local member, Oxford bus Company and Radley C of E Primary School all expressed support for the proposals.

13. Radley Parish Council expressed support for the proposals, although also sought reassurance that the project meets the County Council's commitment to biodiversity net gain, and also asked that resident concerns at the size and location of the new layby which replaces parking at the front of 98 to 102 Kennington Road are considered.

14. Two responses were received from Cyclox (full response shown at **Annex 6**) and Cycling UK; these included an objection in respect of the detailing of the cycle track where it crosses the access to the Sports Centre in respect of cycle priority and kerb radii etc. Their detailed response raises also many other comments and observations, and these will be considered by the designers; notwithstanding these important matters of detail, their overall response is very supportive noting that the proposals address a current 'missing link' for cyclists travelling between Abingdon and Oxford.

15. Several responses – including that of Radley Parish Council above, and the affected residents – expressed objections and concerns over the impact of the of the scheme on parking by residents of 98 to 102 Kennington Road. Unfortunately, there is no scope to retain the current parking provision directly outside these properties. The new parking is provided approx. 35m south (this measurement has been taken from the centre of the existing parking provision to the centre of the new parking layby). It is noted that the property furthest south has on-plot parking, and this access will be retained.

16. Several objections were also received to the proposed shared use cycle track on the grounds that the scheme should focus on the improvement of the existing shared use track on the west side between Radley village and Sugworth Lane. However, although the latter will be retained, the proposed cycle track on the east side provides a much better connection for cyclists and pedestrians between Radley and Kennington including also a convenient cycle link through the residential development to the Sustrans route 5 continuing to Oxford.

17. In respect of other comments received, the following points are noted:

- It is a standard arrangement to have private driveway accesses adjoining shared cycleway/footways, due care and attention should always be

taken when emerging from driveways as users of the footway/ cycleway have priority as per the Highway code.

- The verges on the eastern side will be removed to facilitate the cycleway/footway. The hedges will not be lost, but there are two Highway trees that will need to be removed to facilitate the works.
- The new cycleway links into the Redrow Homes development in Kennington, this connection to Redrow's cycleway is on the eastern side of the carriageway, therefore if the cycleway was on the opposite side of the road cyclist would need to cross the carriageway twice, this would make the route less attractive to users and increase costs to provide formal crossing points.
- An environmental impact assessment was carried out at the planning stage and all information can be viewed on the District Council's website.

Bill Cotton
Corporate Director, Environment and Place

Annexes	Annexes 1- 4: Consultation Plans Annex 5: Consultation responses Annex 6: Consultation response from Cyclox
---------	---

Contact Officers: Ryan Moore 07557 082568

February 2023

ANNEX 5

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	No objection – In principle the Police have no objection providing the necessary speed monitoring has taken place and current speeds support these proposals, and that these proposals meet all current design standards.
(2) Local County Cllr, (Kennington & Radley division)	Support – Quite happy with the proposals, this is a culmination of a process which has been going on for many years!
(3) Interim Managing Director, (Oxford Bus Company)	Support – Oxford Bus Company is supportive of these proposals.
(4) Radley CE Primary School	<p>Support – on behalf of the Governors, staff, children and parents of Radley Primary School to support the proposed construction of a zebra crossing for pedestrian use across Kennington Road north of the junction with Church Road, as this will enable the children that attend our school from Radley College to safely cross this busy road. In our travel plan, we have permission to use the Sports Centre car park for parents who drive their children to school and walk the last part.</p> <p>We are also very keen for the children attending our school to travel to school by bike, scooter or foot, and the proposals of the cycle lane and crossings will not only ensure the safety of our children, but also the children from Radley once they have left us to attend secondary school in Abingdon and travel by foot or bicycle.</p> <p>With our expansion due to finish in the near future and doubling the size of our school, the need for these will only increase.</p>
(5) Local group/organisation, (Cyclox)	Object – see full response in Annex 6
(6) Local group/organisation, (Cyclox)	Support – Thank you for posting the consultation on Kennington Road & Whites Lane proposed pedestrian & pedal cycle improvements. We are very supportive of this scheme, and will provide constructive comments.

	<p>One question. The original plans agreed with Pye Homes included cycle tracks on the rest of Whites Lane, improvements to the junction with Radley Road/Thrupp Lane, and improvements to the cycle tracks on Radley Road inside and outside the Abingdon ring road. Are these coming forward in a separate consultation?</p>
(7) Radley Parish Council	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>Radley Parish Council welcomes pedestrian and cycling improvements which will be brought by this project, but asks to be reassured that the project meets the County Council's commitment to biodiversity net gain. It asks that resident concerns at the size and location of the new layby which replaces parking at the front of 98 to 102 Kennington Road are considered.</p>
(8) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Kennington Road)	<p>Object – I don't know how you can possibly expect my two families with very young children to manage with a layby 30yards down the road! Which presumably anybody can use.let alone leave their cars there overnight.</p> <p>Historically the layby is there to service just those cottages. Of course deliveries and septic tank empties also.</p>
(9) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Kennington Road)	<p>Object – I am resident and owner of Oakwood Cottage, 98 Kennington Road, Radley and object to the cycle track proposed along the east side of Kennington Road. As do my neighbours who are residents at no 100 and 102 Kennington Road, you will perhaps also hear from them separately along with the owner of 100 and 102 Kennington Road.</p> <p>As a cyclist, I support improvement of cycle routes to connect the new development. The originally proposed route as part of the Neighbourhood plan; along the railway track seemed an ideal solution but I understand the required land could not be purchased to facilitate this. I therefore understand that the next solution is to follow the road, of which I have no issue with. However, I (& others listed above) strongly feel it would be far better to improve and widen the existing cycle track and pavement on the other side of the road rather than destroy the grass verge, drainage ditch and existing habitats on the east side to create a completely new cycle track.</p>

The current scheme negatively impacts our row of three houses and I object on the following basis...

- Safety, the proposed cycle track will be extremely dangerous to emerge onto from my driveway. The current opening beyond my boundary (what will become the cycle track) is what I have to pull out onto to be able to see both up and down Kennington Road before pulling out. As you may be aware there is also a bend in the road to the right of my property, so even when pulling out of my driveway into the existing opening (before emerging into the road) it can be risky if a car is coming around the bend quickly. The only option should the cycle track on the east side go ahead would be to pull out of my driveway blindly onto the cycle track, blocking this entirely to be able to see the road. This would leave me blocking the cycle track posing quite a danger to cyclists who may find it difficult to see my vehicle side on.

To illustrate this point, please find at the bottom of this email a series of photos;

- IMG_3170 - Illustrates the significant drop of my driveway from the road, with the removal of the space between my driveway opening and the road, meaning I need to pull directly out (blindly) into a cycle track this makes a difficult bit of car clutch control required here posing a greater danger to cyclists

- IMG_3176 - Shows the view sat in a car emerging from my driveway (front of car in line with boundary), looking south. As shown, you cannot see at all before emerging onto what will be a cycle track

- IMG_3178 - Shows the view sat in a car emerging from my driveway (front of car in line with boundary), looking north. As shown, you cannot see at all before emerging onto what will be a cycle track

- IMG_3182 - Shows the view sat in the car in the opening to my driveway (front of car 2ft from the road edge), looking south, what would be blocking the new cycle track. As shown, I would have to entirely block the cycle track to see sufficiently to pull out

- IMG_3183 - Shows the view sat in the car in the opening to my driveway (front of car 2ft from the road edge), looking north, what would be blocking the new cycle track. As shown, I would have to entirely block the cycle track to see sufficiently to pull out

The loss of the lay-by outside no 100 and no 102 is also quite an issue and poses a different safety concern. Both these properties have no driveways and their only parking is in this lay-by. Therefore moving this lay-by further up the road poses a safety risk for both these families as they would have to park further down the road and navigate a cycle track and pavement next to a 40mph road with very young children. It's a danger for these children parking in a lay-by

	<p>directly outside their houses let alone having to park further away and walk down the cycle track / road with children, shopping etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity, destroying the grass verges and drainage ditches on the East side of the road and removing habitats for various wildlife makes no sense given there is already a fairly wide pavement and cycle track on the opposite side of the road. This surely could be improved and widened to provide the same effect on the side of the road where there is an existing pavement and cycle track where the area next to the road (pavement and grass verges) is particularly wide in most places already. Given the councils adoption of Bio-Diversity Net Gain objectives in planning from 2023 onwards, this certainly does not align with this policy. - Security, introducing cyclists and pedestrians onto the side of the road where our properties are poses security issues which we haven't faced previously. All 3 of our properties are very close to the road and open at the front. 2 of the 3 properties do not have driveways, my property does and so has a wide opening which would encourage unwelcome visitors. I feel with the cycle track immediately outside my boundary it would be difficult to have a gate, as I would need to pull into the cycle track and leave my vehicle blocking this whilst opening / closing the gate. Dangerous for both the residents but also the cyclists using the new cycle track.
<p>(10) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Kennington Road)</p>	<p>Object – I am resident and owner of Oakwood Cottage, 98 Kennington Road, Radley, and object to the cycle track proposed along the east side of Kennington Road. As do my neighbours who are residents at no 100 and 102 Kennington Road, you will perhaps also hear from them separately along with the owner of 100 and 102 Kennington Road.</p> <p>As a cyclist, I support improvement of cycle routes to connect the new development. The originally proposed route as part of the Neighbourhood plan; along the railway track seemed an ideal solution but I understand the required land could not be purchased to facilitate this. I therefore understand that the next solution is to follow the road, of which I have no issue with. However, I (& others listed above) strongly feel it would be far better to improve and widen the existing cycle track and pavement on the other side of the road rather than destroy the grass verge, drainage ditch and existing habitats on the east side to create a completely new cycle track.</p> <p>The current scheme negatively impacts our row of three houses and I object on the following basis...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safety, the proposed cycle track will be extremely dangerous to emerge onto from my driveway. The current opening beyond my boundary (what will become the cycle track) is what I have to pull out onto to be able to see both up and down Kennington Road before pulling out. As you may be aware there is also a bend in the road to the right of my

property, so even when pulling out of my driveway into the existing opening (before emerging into the road) it can be risky if a car is coming around the bend quickly. The only option should the cycle track on the east side go ahead would be to pull out of my driveway blindly onto the cycle track, blocking this entirely to be able to see the road. This would leave me blocking the cycle track posing quite a danger to cyclists and pedestrians who may find it difficult to see my vehicle side on.

To illustrate this point, please find at the bottom of this email a series of photos;

- IMG_3170 - Illustrates the significant drop of my driveway from the road, with the removal of the space between my driveway opening and the road, meaning I need to pull directly out (blindly) into a cycle track this makes a difficult bit of car clutch control required here posing a greater danger to cyclists

- IMG_3176 - Shows the view sat in a car emerging from my driveway (front of car in line with boundary), looking south. As shown, you cannot see at all before emerging onto what will be a cycle track

- IMG_3178 - Shows the view sat in a car emerging from my driveway (front of car in line with boundary), looking north. As shown, you cannot see at all before emerging onto what will be a cycle track

- IMG_3182 - Shows the view sat in the car in the opening to my driveway (front of car 2ft from the road edge), looking south, what would be blocking the new cycle track. As shown, I would have to entirely block the cycle track to see sufficiently to pull out

- IMG_3183 - Shows the view sat in the car in the opening to my driveway (front of car 2ft from the road edge), looking north, what would be blocking the new cycle track. As shown, I would have to entirely block the cycle track to see sufficiently to pull out

The loss of the lay-by outside no 100 and no 102 is also quite an issue and poses a different safety concern. Both these properties have no driveways and their only parking is in this lay-by. Therefore moving this lay-by further up the road poses a safety risk for both these families as they would have to park further down the road and navigate a cycle track and pavement next to a 40mph road with very young children. It's a danger for these children parking in a lay-by directly outside their houses let alone having to park further away and walk down the cycle track / road with children, shopping etc.

- Biodiversity, destroying the grass verges and drainage ditches on the East side of the road and removing habitats for various wildlife makes no sense given there is already a fairly wide pavement and cycle track on the opposite side of

	<p>the road. This surely could be improved and widened to provide the same effect on the side of the road where there is an existing pavement and cycle track where the area next to the road (pavement and grass verges) is particularly wide in most places already. Given the councils adoption of Bio-Diversity Net Gain objectives in planning from 2023 onwards, this certainly does not align with this policy.</p> <p>- Security, introducing cyclists and pedestrians onto the side of the road where our properties are poses security issues which we haven't faced previously. All 3 of our properties are very close to the road and open at the front. 2 of the 3 properties do not have driveways, my property does and so has a wide opening which would encourage unwelcome visitors. I feel with the cycle track immediately outside my boundary it would be difficult to have a gate, as I would need to pull into the cycle track and leave my vehicle blocking this whilst opening / closing the gate. Dangerous for both the residents but also the cyclists using the new cycle track.</p>
<p>(11) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley Road)</p>	<p>Concerns – I would like to draw your attention to a problem on the existing pedestrian walkway/cycle path between Radley College and Sugworth Lane.</p> <p>Because of the decision to cut the grass verge only once a year and not carry out routine maintenance, the path naturally becomes narrower (image attached showing how much the verge has overgrown due to NO maintenance). In the height of summer when the grass and weeds are at their highest the path is as little as 2 or 3 feet wide in places. This causes a safety issue as bicycles are trying to squeeze past pedestrians - sometime at speed - on such a narrow path. It would make for more sense to tarmac the entire width of the track to allow safer use for both pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Another issue is the path between Sugworth Lane and the bus stop at Sugworth Crescent which is now a disgrace. Despite me speaking directly to a Redrow representative, they decided just to throw mud and stones on the path verge after they had finished digging it up. After just a few weeks weeds germinated and by mid summer they were 3 or 4 feet high and encroaching the footpath. Also every time it rains the road and footpath now become flooded (image attached). This combination makes access for the elderly and disabled virtually impossible. Quite a contrast to the manicured turf and block paving that they laid on their shiny new housing estate.</p> <p>In short, any new shared-use footway/cycle track laid needs to be wide enough for both AND regularly maintained to avoid accidents and allow safe use for all.</p>
<p>(12) Local Resident/Member of</p>	

<p>public, (Kennington, Bagley Wood Road)</p>	<p>Concerns – I understand the need for improvements to the current cycle route from Oxford through to Abingdon, in particular the section between Kennington and Radley. My concern is about the environment. The housing developments are gradually eroding space for wildlife and I would hope that there should be some environmental gain from this new plan.</p> <p>Our road verges are increasingly important as havens for wildlife, including vital pollinators and wild flowers. If we lose the verges on the East side of the road then consideration needs to be given to what can be gained on the West side, perhaps even extending the field verge into the field a short distance. It is now generally accepted that our road verges are vital resources and I hope we can enhance them wherever possible.</p>
<p>(13) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, College Close)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>The plans are not obvious. There is little suggestion where things are. An overview of the entire extend of work with references to the individual plans would have been useful. A bike lane is vital, but who is going to maintain it? There is already a combined footpath/cycle path on the opposite side of the road which the Parish Council (with the help of Radley College) maintains if possible. Can the existing bike/footpath not be adjusted widened? Where is the Zebra crossing going to be? Still in Radley? Is it to connect the Oxford-bound Radley College bus stop with the opposite side of the Road?</p> <p>The main crossing near Church Road seems to be on the wrong side and as such only caters for traffic from Kennington Road to Whites Lane. Could it be closer to the entrance to the Radley Sports Centre to also include footfall from the village (from Church Road) to the sports centre)? I wonder if pedestrians (people with push chairs) would people turn right around the church, cross and then turn left again towards the sports centre entrance?</p>
<p>(14) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, College close)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p>

	No comments.
(15) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Ferny Close)	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>Pro walking and cycling measures - we need alternatives which enable people to switch from motorised vehicles.</p>
(16) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Foxborough Road)	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Object, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>The proposal does not recognize that we are facing a climate and biodiversity emergency. The almost total loss of the verge on the east side of Kennington Road is indefensible. Use of the verge on the west side of Whites Lane is, alas, the only way of providing a safe pedestrian and cycle route along it. But the surface must be specified to remain porous. The proposed layout at the cottages is utterly impractical: the proposed cycle path is squeezed up against the valuable (private, I assume, hedge) , with a notable, and sudden change of level compared to the front gardens, and car parking in a dangerous, and narrow, island between the cycle path and the carriageway. The proposed arrangements at the Radley College bus stop are similarly unacceptable.</p> <p>The solution is to move away from the assumption that cars must have plenty of space to go as fast as possible, while humans and all other life forms must adapt to cars' demands. Fortunately, this stretch of Kennington Road is lightly used. It should be seen as only for local vehicular traffic between Kennington, North Radley, Sugworth, and Central Radley, and for up to 3 (or maybe in future 4) buses an hour in each direction. For longer journeys, the car-dependent should be nudged to use the A34. The (certainly, desirable) southbound cycle lane should be laid out on the east side of the existing paved carriageway, with wands as necessary at the bends, crossing to the west side, as proposed, just north of the church. There might need to be, say, 3 places where the space for vehicles is slightly widened to allow large vehicles going in opposite directions to pass each other. However, the car-dependent should, in my view, accept that they may, sometimes, have to take turns, and not expect a 3.5 m wide desert everywhere they want to go.</p>

<p>(17) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Foxborough Road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>I am very pleased at the proposal to have a dedicated cycle path between Abingdon and Oxford (this is part of it) as I regularly cycle between Radley and Oxford or Abingdon and I know that many other people do too. Due to the Climate Crisis, we all need to rethink transport and this feels like a step in the right direction ie making a good cycle and pedestrian route.</p> <p>I am generally in favour of the proposal and pleased that there will ultimately be a cycle path between Abingdon and Oxford. Other points I'd like to make are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will result in loss of biodiversity and damage to wildlife as verges and hedging is removed. Is the plan to fill in the ditch? If so, what environmental impact will this have? I would like there to be an environmental impact assessment on the proposals and mitigation put in place. • Alternatively, could part of the Kennington Road be allocated to become a cycle track rather than building a new cycle path? Some passing spaces could be provided. This would naturally slow down vehicular traffic making it safer and encouraging people to consider alternatives to driving a car. Combined with the provision of a good cycle path this would be a significant behavioural nudge towards cycling. • Where the cycle and footpath crosses the junction to Radley Sports Centre this must be clearly marked as priority for pedestrians and cyclists. Ideally with the path being level all the way.
<p>(18) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Further Wore)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>Regularly cycle between kennington and Abingdon</p>

<p>(19) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Gooseacre)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>There is already an underused cycle path on the west side of Kennington Road - widening that could be more cost effective and less damaging to the local biodiversity. As a regular biker, I strongly support more bike routes but in this case there is already an existing cycle path and I'm concerned how this fits in with the local authority's commitment to biodiversity net gain. There is a healthy hedge bordering the proposed new cycle path which the Radley Environment Group recently surveyed, and I'd like to know how this would impact the hedge. I also can't see on the plans what happens to the South of the new development on White's Lane and surely there needs to be a path all the way to the bike path at the bottom of White's Lane?</p>
<p>(20) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Kennington Rd)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>I write to oppose in part the introduction of a cycle path along the Kennington Road. In particular to its location as it runs from Sugworth Lane to Radley College. As a resident at 102 Kennington Rd, the Park Farm Cottages. As our access is shared with the entrance to the farm field we use the entrance daily. The proposal wishes to ignore the existing stretch of shared cycle/footpath already in place on the far side of the road that could easily be improved. When existing the entrance there is a blind corner to your right. On many occasions there have been near misses. The driver's view is obscured by the hedge row and drop on the road elevation. The addition of a cycle lane/path on the cottage side would be dangerous to all those that use it. In addition there is a proposal to move the current parking/lane further down the road. This is the parking for visitors and neighbors and often ourselves. With three children one of whom is an infant we feel that having a heavily used cycle path with fast moving riders is a danger. It would be far more sensible to extend the already existing pathway.</p>
<p>(21) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Kennington Rd)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support,</p>

	<p>Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>I am a regular cyclist and would like better facilities</p>
<p>(22) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Kennington road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>I live in Oakwood Cottage, 98 Kennington road and this would join my boundary, this causes various concerns for me and my two neighbours. It makes no sense to ruin the natural habitats on this side of the road, not to mention the affects on our properties, security risk etc. When there's a perfectly good pavement including existing cycle path on the opposite side of the road. This simply could be widened to increase safety for cyclists and pedestrians at a fraction of the financial cost as well as having very little impact on the environment and natural habitats. This is a completely ridiculous idea and there are two much simpler solutions; the cycle track following the railway as proposed in the neighbourhood plan or simply widen the existing pavement and cycle track on the other side of the road</p>
<p>(23) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Kennington Road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>There is already an existing foot/cycle path on the west side of Kennington Road (south of Sugworth Lane). I also have safety concerns regarding exiting our driveway (98 Kennington Road, Radley) as we are already on a blind corner and will have to straddle the proposed cycle path before we are able to see on coming traffic.</p>
<p>(24) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Kennington road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p>

	<p>There is already a cycle path on the opposite side of road. If this was properly maintained(verge cut more than once a summer) and widen in the ample available space there is no need for a cycle path to be built on the other side. Also as per the plans, the parking that is available or my property will be moved a good distance further down the road and with two children under the age of 2 this, is far from ideal.</p> <p>I simply do not see why the existing cycle/footpath cannot be improved. Surely would also be a cheaper option too.</p>
<p>(25) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Norfolk Close)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Concerns, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>I'm supportive of the proposed cycle path from Redrow Homes, through to Radley Village (Church Road).</p> <p>My concern is when the path crosses the road, to the side of Radley College:</p> <p>The exit from Radley Sports centre takes priority over the cycle lane. This is a large disincentive to switch side to use this stretch of cycle lane. In particular when classes finish, there will be queued traffic blocking the cycle lane.</p> <p>Many users of this stretch will be commuting cyclists. It takes less than a minute to cycle from the proposed Radley Church crossing, to "Access to Main Development" / Whites Line Crossing. Given the sports centre entrance this means that someone commuting is expected to take three extra crossings / start / stops to keep on the cycle route.</p> <p>Given the extra crossings, and effort required to stay on the proposed cycle lane I expect few people will cross over at Church Road.</p> <p>Giving priority to cyclists at the Sports Centre will make this stretch less inconvenient.</p> <p>Given the likelihood of people avoiding using this stretch of cycle track, I recommend that the design allows an easy transaction from cycle track to road at the Kennington Lane / Church Road junction.</p>
<p>(26) Local Resident/Member of</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - No opinion, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - No opinion,</p>

<p>public, (Radley, Norfolk Close)</p>	<p>Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - No opinion, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - No opinion</p> <p>Please forgive me, this is a subsequent submission with the following as an afterthought. I wanted to flag a problem the feeder route to the start (Kennington end) of this proposed stretch. Specifically, the Sandford Lane / Kennington Road stretch of cycle lane that has yet to be opened.</p> <p>At both entrances to this alleged cycle lane are signs with the instruction "Cyclists Dismount". Needless to say, if people are instructed not to cycle on a cycle lane, people will avoid using the cycle lane, or there will be likely be conflict with people who cycle on the cycle lane. If it's not suitable to cycle on the cycle lane, then it's status of a cycle lane should be removed. Not being able to cycle onto this proposed stretch may have an impact of the design of this new stretch.</p> <p>Better would be to fix the problem, and / or to change the signs of this feeder route to "Share with care", or "Pedestrian Priority".</p>
<p>(27) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Pebble hill)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Concerns, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>The proposed position of this is not on the best side of the road it just need the original path in the other side of the road widening or better still continuing the cycle track along the side of the river extending to Abingdon</p>
<p>(28) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley, Stonhouse Crescent)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Concerns, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>There is already a cycle path for most of the route on the other side of the road, and I cycle it regularly. If it were made a little wider and the greenery cut back it would be fine, it is a waste of time and money to carry out the proposed plan. Please reconsider.</p>

<p>(29) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley , Gooseacre)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>Additional footpath and cycle ways to connect Radley are badly needed</p>
<p>(30) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley , Kennington Road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>Better and more effective use of funds to upgrade current cycle path on west side of Kennington Road</p>
<p>(31) Local Resident/Member of public, (Radley , Pebble hill)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>We need a safe walking route around the village with new house coming in.</p>
<p>(32) Local Resident/Member of public, (Kennington , Poplar Grove)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>There's no cycle lane or footpath on White's Lane. The existing path between Radley and Kennington is nowhere near wide enough nor in an acceptable state. Joining it and coming off it is dangerous and ill thought through.</p>
<p>(33) Local Resident/Member of</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support,</p>

<p>public, (Kennington, Meadow View Road)</p>	<p>Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>The shared-use path should really be wide enough that cyclists and pedestrians don't get into conflict for space. Looking forward to this improvement, but would be great to extend something like it through Kennington itself.</p>
<p>(34) Local Resident/Member of public, (Kennington, Old Nursery View)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - No opinion, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - No opinion, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - No opinion, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>This is not an appropriate location for cycle track as it will pass 3 houses between the end of Kennington and the start of Radley on the left, by the fields. it will impact on their access to their drives and isn't safe for cyclists who will be cycling fast while drivers cross their track to and from the houses. The track will be better located on the opposite side of the road. This is v important.</p>
<p>(35) Local Resident/Member of public, (Kennington, River View)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Concerns, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>I support the proposals in general, with the following concerns: the whites lane parallel crossing is to a short length of cycle path likely only used by those most vulnerable, so it would make sense to have this as a raised crossing also to protect those children by forcing speed reduction (the 30 limit on whites lane is not well observed as it looks like a 'country road'). The driveway openings in the main path look like smooth gradients, but it would be safer to show priority by keeping a flat path with a steeper kerb stone and also act as a speed reduction device. For similar reasons the drives should have good sight lines along the path. Please also consider adding more regular dropped kerb access where there are no driveways so people can escape from the road onto the path if they see a hazard. Thanks for the new facilities in general, it will be great when they start linking up with some of the plans in the Abingdon LCWIP.</p>

<p>(36) Local Resident/Member of public, (Kennington, The avenue)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - No opinion, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - No opinion, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>Current cycle lane could be improved at less cost and less damage to environment</p>
<p>(37) Local Resident/Member of public, (Kennington, Woodcroft)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>Creating a new cycle path on the East side will lead to considerable loss of verge and hedge both of which are essential habitats for many creatures. I support a cycle path but would like there to be a plan to ensure there is not a net loss of biodiversity and habitats. This could be by reinstating new mixed hedges alongside the new path and by natural improvements to the West verge. Biodiversity net gain is vital both in terms of the short term and our long term survival.</p>
<p>(38) Local Resident/Member of public, (Kennington , Fairways)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>Parking and general driver intolerance on Kennington Rd / The Avenue create a dangerous environment for cyclists and pedestrians. We need to make the roads safer for vulnerable road users to encourage cycling and walking. I'm not 100% behind shared use paths however as my experiences in north Oxford and Botley Rd have not always been positive. The safest solution I've found in Oxford is on Donnington Bridge where cyclists, pedestrians, and cars are kept separate.</p>
<p>(39) Local Resident/Member of</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support,</p>

<p>public, (Kennington , Meadow View road)</p>	<p>Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>There's certainly a need for a proper off-road cycle path through Radley</p>
<p>(40) Local Resident/Member of public, (Kennington , Playfield Road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Object, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>The cycle track will be dangerous for both cyclists and residents living in the cottages at 98 -102 Kennington road Radley as their access will be compromised and the loss of the lay-by outside their houses is disadvantageous to the young family who will have to park at a distance to their house. If the cycle path was on the west side of the road it would not be dangerous for residents to use their existing driveways. Also an alternative route for the cycle path was identified by the approved Radley neighbourhood plan alongside the railway which would link to Sustrans path 5 at Sandford lane which would be safer and pleasanter for cyclists. At night the Kennington road is dark at this point as no street lights are present this will make access to the houses even more dangerous for cyclists. Loss of biodiversity in current grass verges and ancient hedgerows will likely be disturbed by the work. The road floods in places as there is no mains drainage so cycle track may also be affected by flooding . I object to the route because there are alternatives that are safer for both cyclists and residents. The sight</p> <p>Line is poor due to a bend into Kennington making emerging from 102 and 98 Kennington Road more difficult, plus the added possibility of having to block the cycle path in order to get out of their drives. The pathway on the west side of the road could easily be widened with none of the disadvantages of the route on the east side.</p> <p>I am not happy about the route as there are great potential dangers for cyclists to clash with residents who will need to emerge in their cars crossing first the proposed cycle track, and then onto a fast main road (limited at 40mph, but rarely adhered to) from their driveways?</p> <p>The scheme particularly negatively affects the residents in the white cottages at 98 to 102 Kennington Road as their vehicular access will be compromised by the cycle track. Also the loss of the lay-by immediately outside their homes is a great disadvantage especially to the young family currently living at 100 Kennington Road.</p>

Please can you tell me if the present wide grass verges and established hedgerows will also be lost to this scheme, if it goes ahead? There is no mention of potential loss of biodiversity in the notes on the plans?

We can't understand why the planned cycle track route is for the east side of the main Kennington road, yet there is already a path regularly used by cyclists on the west side which could simply be widened and improved for both walkers and cyclists? This would be less costly and less disruptive for residents.

On your point about cars crossing over the cycle track needing to give priority to cyclists, what is not evident from the plans is the change in levels between two of the cottage's drives and the proposed cycle track level. There is several feet difference at 98 Kennington road, which means a car emerging onto the cycle track will not be able to see cyclists coming along the track to their right prior to mounting the track, this is dangerous for cyclists especially at night and relies very much on a drivers clutch control to balance just at the very edge of the track before emerging onto the track and stopping ! If priority is given to a cyclist and the road is not then clear to emerge, it is quite likely another cyclist could be stopped and delayed on the track whilst a car driver is checking for traffic on both sides of the road which currently has a 40 mph speed limit and a bend into Kennington to the right at that point! I have been driving for four decades but I could not negotiate both crossing the cycle track and emerging onto the road without checking again for road traffic and potentially blocking the track to a cyclist who could easily crash into the side of a car in the dark or bad weather.

This situation particularly applies to cottage at 98 Kennington Road.

Removal of the lay-by to the south of existing lay-by, will create a problem for the occupants of 100 Kennington road as they have no side access to their house being a mid terrace. They will have to park at a distance from the front of their house forcing them to manage young children and a baby buggy, plus shopping walking along the cycle track and potentially conflicting with cyclists travelling at a fast pace. This will be dangerous for both cyclist and pedestrians. I am also concerned about delivery drivers ignoring the new lay-by and parking their vans on the cycle track to gain access to the three cottages, forcing cyclists out into the road. Whereas if the cycle track was on the west side of the road as existing, this would not happen.

Loss of the wide verges for the whole length of the cycle track is a considerable loss to wildlife and biodiversity. I cannot find the environmental impact statement you referred to at the "planning stage" on the Vale's website? Does this mean a planning application has already been submitted to the Vale district council? Can you send me the link to the environmental impact statement please? Or a reference number so we can check the planning application? Surely the consultation period with the public open until 30th December should happen before any decisions have been made by the district council about the proposed track?

	<p>Your point about cyclists having to cross the road twice makes no sense to me, as the plans show that the cyclists do have to cross back to the west side of the main road when they reach Radley, so why not simply improve the existing pavement/cycle track that people already use on the west side of the road from the point at Sugworth lane all the way into Radley, they will then only have to cross once onto the pavement that already exists and there is a narrow grass verge which can easily be widened without any great loss of the wider grass verges on the east side? I suspect that there will be much damage done to the adjacent hedgerows as the work for the track will potentially affect the roots of the hedge? Will the two trees that are lost be replaced?</p> <p>Much damage has already been done by Redrow homes on the east side of the Kennington road in front of their new development by the removal of some trees and hedges due to drainage and utilities companies frequently digging up the road!</p> <p>Surely the point of public consultation is that it is effective for the public to participate and is not just a box ticking exercise for the Council.</p> <p>I would refer you to Sherry Arnsteins ladder of participation which demonstrates that much “consultation “ is designed to actually frustrate and discourage public participation in the planning process, rather than facilitate effective participation and enable ordinary people to get their voices heard.</p> <p>As I have written two dissertations on this very topic whilst I was studying as a town planner, I get a quick sense of when there is “tokenism” happening rather than genuine participation. I am also aware of the criticisms made by opponents to recent other traffic management matters in the way in which voices of the public have been consistently ignored on occasions.</p> <p>I can reassure you that my son is a keen cyclist and as a family we all enjoy walking, so it is the safety of cyclists and pedestrians using the proposed track that is uppermost here. The cycle track needs to be on the WEST side of the road NOT the east side and there are good reasons for maintaining that route which already exists and has adequate space to improve the existing infrastructure and the use already made by cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>!we need to understand therefore why the east side has been chosen over the West side of the road? Please ask the relevant officer to explain the rationale of their decision?</p>
(41) Local Resident/Member of	Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support,

<p>public, (Abingdon, Bostock Road)</p>	<p>Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>My main concern is that will not be a continuous cyclepath on both sides of Kennington Rd + White's Lane. The cycle path should have priority over traffic at the sports centre entrance and driveways, with coloured tarmac and yield markings indicated for car driver cross the cycle path. As a cyclist, if we have to give way at all the driveways and entrances we'll very likely stay on the road (which is how we currently travel along this stretch).</p> <p>It is implied that cyclists travelling south will cross over before Church Rd using the zebra crossing., whereas in practice those traveling on to Abingdon will just rejoin the road at this point, unless the cycle path is given priority over Church Rd. Unfortunately I can imagine getting abuse from some drivers at this point if they wait at the zebra crossing, and then we rejoin the road and don't cross.</p> <p>My partner and I frequently commute between Abingdon and Oxford despite these comments, we're generally glad to see this linking up with the cyclepath around the back of the Redrow development. We look forward to when we might actually have a full cycle path linking Abingdon to Oxford.</p>
<p>(42) As part of a group/organisation, (Abingdon, Bostock Road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>* This route will enable a traffic-free link from Abingdon to Oxford, the first significant inter-town link in the county. It is a route that is already cycled by many people (based on observations at commuting time), despite road sections as it is about 7 miles centre-to-centre, but a full traffic-free option will increase its attractiveness substantially.</p> <p>* The basic design of the route, a 3m shared path seems appropriate. There is some, but limited walking traffic, and we judge it will fit well withing the LTN 1/20 guidance of under 300 pedestrians and 300 cyclists per hour.</p> <p>* It is disappointing that the route swaps sides for 160m, and we note that it sometimes falls slightly below 3m and required buffers, but we accept that this is where required due to width and reasonable budget constraints.</p> <p>* One design point that should be improved is the crossing of the sports centre junction. This should reflect the priority</p>

	<p>given to pedestrian and cycling movements by Highway Code Rule H2, and the OCC transport hierarchy. The walking/cycling route on the road should have priority over this driveway, this should be clearly marked, and the path here should be level, raised if possible perhaps using 'Dutch Entrance Kerbs' to emphasise priority and speed reduction for traffic turning in or out.</p> <p>* The complete scheme should continue to Thrupp Lane with a redesigned junction, and to about 100m west of Audlett Drive. We hope and expect that plans and consultation for this part of the scheme will follow in coming months.</p>
<p>(43) Local Resident/Member of public, (Abingdon, Darrell Way)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>The proposals will go part-way to providing a safe segregated cycle/walking route between Abingdon and Oxford. I strongly support schemes that promote active travel, for environmental and health reasons.</p>
<p>(44) Local or County Cllr, (Abingdon, Hanson Road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>All proposals will help link the NCN Route 5 with the pre-existing cycle routes in Abingdon. As a regular user myself this continuous section provision from Abingdon to Oxford will fill in the gaps and encourage other, less confident cyclists to join in and contribute to modal shift (good for the environment, health, and congestion).</p> <p>Ideally the crossing of the sports centre junction should be looked at, with the walking/cycling route having priority over this junction, and it being clearly marked.</p>
<p>(45) Local Resident/Member of public, (Abingdon, Victoria Road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support,</p>

	<p>Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>All looks fantastic. The shared use pathway should be as wide as possible, with pedestrian and cyclist priority at the junctions, as they do in The Netherlands. It should continue up Whites Lane and Radley Road, all the way to Abingdon. This would really encourage cycle commuting.</p>
<p>(464) Local Resident/Member of public, (Long Wittenham, Westfield Road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Object, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Concerns, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>I am writing to you to object to the Kennington Road and Whites Lane proposed pedestrian and pedal cycle improvements.</p> <p>I am writing as a cyclist who spent three years commuting along that stretch of road, as a professional ecologist, and as a scientist involved in investigating how our society can achieve net zero carbonemissions.</p> <p>I object to these plans for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. UNACCEPATABLE COST TO BIODIVERSITY through ecological damage to habitats and loss of ecological connectivity.</p> <p>There is a roughly 350m continuous stretch of hedgerow running along the east side of the Kennington road from the Redrow homes development south to the Kennington Road Cottages. After the Kennington Road Cottages, there is a further stretch of ~350m hedgerow running on southwards, also along the east side of the Kennington road. These hedgerows are legally protected due to their length and location.</p> <p>These hedgerows are currently in good condition, accompanied by a ditch along part of their length and currently protected from the road by a wide (>2m) margin. This complex of three habitats (hedgerow, ditch, margin) is extremely ecologically valuable. It provides multiple ecological functions that are not provided for elsewhere in the vicinity. It is providing habitat for farmland birds and north-south connectivity for woodland birds, small mammals, invertebrates and amphibians.</p> <p>a. According to the plans, the proposed cycle way will involve removal of hedgerows, hedgerow trees and scrubby</p>

growth at the north end of the scheme (plus other locations). Since the trees and scrub are ecologically part of the hedgerow, this is illegal, and it will cause loss of connectivity for woodland dependent species. This hedgerow is a vital link from the semi-natural ancient woodland of Radley Large Wood, south to North Close Copse and beyond. The Redrow development has already severely degraded the northerly parts of this hedgerow (through gapping and 'urbanising' it) and further damage to this hedgerow represents an unacceptable loss of ecological connectivity.

b. According to the plans, the ditch that accompanies the hedgerows will be completely obliterated. This is the sole movement route for amphibians, water vole and freshwater invertebrate species from the pond at Radley primary school north to Radley Large Wood and the boundary stream. Along with the wet ditch and hedgerows along White's Lane, these ditches form a key north-south movement/dispersal route that links Radley Lakes to the wet habitats within Radley Large Wood and along Sandford Lane. Destruction of any of the ditches along this route is completely unacceptable: it shows a complete disregard for the needs of biodiversity and is counter to the objectives of Oxfordshire's Nature Recovery Network.

c. According to the plans, the proposed development will result in complete loss of the grassy margins that currently lie between the eastern hedgerows and Kennington road. It is proposed that the new hard surface cycle/footway will immediately but up against the hedgerows. This will severely degrade the ecological quality of these hedgerows (e.g. by increasing the fraction of run-off/pollution they receive from the adjacent road). The hedgerows are currently used by breeding whitethroat (amber listed species) and yellowhammer (red listed species of highest conservation concern). Both of these birds use the vegetation at the base of hedgerows, i.e. the rough margins adjacent to the hedgerow is as valuable to them for food and nesting protection as the hedgerow itself. It is likely the roadside margin is more insect rich than the margin on the arable side of the hedge (due to the hedge protecting it from agricultural spray drift) so the fact the grassy margins on the field side of the hedge will remain is not sufficient compensation. Loss of the rough grassy margins along the east side of Kennington Road is an unacceptable loss of habitat that will result in a decrease in biodiversity in this area.

d. The residents of Kennington have been trying to increase biodiversity within their village by reducing mowing of road verges. This is being done to support pollinators and other insects as well as grassland plants. Loss and reduction of the grassy margins along Kennington Road, as a result of the proposed plans, will severely undermine their efforts to support biodiversity and increase nature connectedness within their community. The (currently wide) grassy verges along Kennington Road, which are threatened by the cycle way plans, are the primary means for grassland species to travel northwards and colonise the new wildflower verges within Kennington. Other ecological access routes into Kennington are either wooded, heavily managed (e.g. Radley College) or blocked by urbanisation (e.g. Cow Lane/Redbridge). The verges running into Kennington from the Radley direction are the only movement corridors left for grassland species and the proposed plans will cut this last route off and cause severe loss of vital

connective habitat.

2. INSUFFICIENT BENEFIT TO CYCLISTS

From the proposed plans, it appears that a cyclist travelling southwards from Oxford to Abingdon on cycle route 5 would be expected to come out of the Redrow development and join the proposed cycle path running eastwards down the Kennington Road, cross Kennington Road at the proposed formal crossing outside Radley College, then cross the access road to Radley Sports centre and then recross Kennington Road to enter the new development off Whites Lane. It is plausible that a family with children out on a Sunday bike ride might do this. Most daily commuter cyclists (whose priority is continuous cycling) would not do this: this involves stopping for two crossings of the main road and crossing an access road (before taking a presumably circuitous route through the Whites Lane development). Furthermore, the access road they are required to cross is a Sports Centre with significant exit/entry traffic both early morning and early evening during peak cycle commuting time.

There is already a perfectly functional pavement along the west side of Kennington Road which runs south from Sugworth Lane to Church Lane. It would be infinitely preferable if a crossing was instead installed immediately to the north of Sugworth Lane (where the footpath connection to the Redrow site is) to enable cyclists to safely join the existing west-side footway (which has already been made wide enough at that point to act as a shared cycle/footway), with another crossing across Sugworth Lane so that cyclists could then safely join the exiting west-side footway. This option simply involves relocating two of the proposed crossings, still provides a safe cycle route, does not require construction of a new cycle path and would not involve degrading the quality of 700m of priority habitat.

3. CARBON EMISSIONS

The hedgerows, verges and ditches are currently capturing carbon from the atmosphere and locking it away. They contribute towards the country's efforts to reach net zero and minimise climate change. They are a carbon sink.

The proposed plans will concrete/tarmac much of this carbon sink. This construction process will release huge amounts of carbon through the vehicles and materials involved. It will be a carbon emitting process.

No calculations have been provided for the carbon cost of this development. No statistics have been offered on the number of cyclists who currently use this route. No roadside survey seems to have been conducted to establish *how* cyclists currently use this route (i.e. if most are already using the existing footway, constructing an extra one on the

other side of the road is clearly of no benefit) No projections have been presented on how many more cyclists might use this route if the plans are implemented. If this scheme does not result in a reduction of cars travelling this route, then there will be no carbon saving and this proposal will actually result in net carbon emissions to the atmosphere.

The council must provide thorough, realistic and convincing statistics on the expected carbon budget of this scheme, given that it is due to result in loss of carbon-absorbing semi-natural habitats.

Furthermore, some residents have been told that Kennington Road will be shifted westwards, in order to fit the proposed cycle route in between the road and the existing hedges. It is not clear from the plans that this will happen. If this is what is proposed, the carbon cost of this scheme will be greater still.

Just because this plan involves creating a cycle path, does not automatically mean that this is a 'green' or 'eco-friendly' scheme. The carbon cost of this scheme must be declared, given the minimal benefit to cyclists and the significant negative ecological impacts. If this proposed scheme is not projected to be on-site carbon neutral (i.e. without offsite mitigation), then it should be refused.

4. URBANISATION

The proposed scheme is another step towards the urbanisation of the green belt between Oxford and Abingdon.

One field remains between the bottom of the Abingdon Road in Oxford and Kennington village - this is currently occupied by Kendall Copse and, if the flood relief scheme goes ahead, this will be lost to a concrete lined channel.

The Redrow development has extended the urban area of Kennington as far south as Sugworth Lane and the White's Lane development has extended Radley Village.

Only three arable fields now remain between Oxford and Abingdon: the two fields either side of Kennington Road and the field between Twelve Acre Drive and White's Lane. If this proposed scheme goes ahead, a third of the arable roadside verges along the Oxford-Abingdon route will be lost.

5. LOSS OF ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

	<p>The proposed scheme will result in loss of ecosystem services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - carbon capture will be reduced through loss of semi-natural habitats - water quality/flood alleviation will be reduced through loss of the ditches - pollination services and biodiversity will be reduced through loss of semi-natural habitat and reduced connectivity - cultural services will be impacted through the roadscape's conversion from a rural to an urbanised appearance. <p>It is difficult to see how such loss of ecosystem services could be considered in the public benefit.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>The proposed scheme offers minimal benefit to cyclists, given that an off-road option already exists alongside Kennington Road. Further reductions to the speed limit and relocating the proposed crossings *without constructing the extra cycle path east of Kennington Road* could all offer more cost-effective and carbon-effective ways of improving safety for cyclists in this location.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will cause significant ecological damage to, and degradation of, priority habitats. It will reduce connectivity for multiple species, contribute to habitat fragmentation and as such is counter to the goals of Oxfordshire's Nature Recovery Network. The loss of habitat and connectivity for biodiversity appears to far outweigh any minimal gains in connectivity cyclists might receive.</p> <p>The carbon costs/benefits of this scheme are unclear.</p> <p>As such, my view is that this will not help Oxfordshire achieve Net Zero Plus goals and the money could be better spent in other ways that offer greater benefits to the community and are less damaging to local biodiversity.</p>
<p>(47) Local Resident/Member of public, (Moulsford, Ferry lane)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Concerns, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>Your plan is entitled "pedestrian and pedal cycle improvements".</p> <p>That is clearly misleading, as the plan requires pedestrians to share space with vehicular traffic. Pedal cycles are</p>

	<p>vehicular traffic. Mixing of pedestrians and such vehicular traffic is not necessarily dangerous, but makes walking less attractive and hence runs counter to environmental aims of pollution-free local transport (by foot).</p> <p>You may want to rename your plan as “pedal cycle improvements at the expense of pedestrian comfort”.</p>
<p>(48) Local Resident/Member of public, (Oxford, Church Cowley Road)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Concerns, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Concerns, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>Shared use footway/cycleways bring pedestrians and cyclists into conflict, especially in places where the cyclists are expected to go at speed. A 3m wide one is a welcome improvement, but doesn't eliminate the problem entirely, as neither group will know which unmarked "side" to use to avoid each other.</p> <p>The northmost end only makes sense if the old path from the railway bridge, behind the new development, is reopened; at the moment, everyone is expected to go along Sandford Lane and double back up Kennington Road. The southmost stretch of the shared path, where it swaps to the west of the road, is useful for pedestrians and less confident riders accessing the new Radley development, but is not welcoming to riders going between Kennington and Abingdon. Crossing over means slowing nearly to a halt for the sharp change of direction, and also using a cycle lane that's marked in the mouth of a side-road. Drivers are likely to ignore cyclist and pedestrian priority at these places, despite the road markings.</p> <p>Because of all of these factors, I am likely to be forced into using the carriageway for some stretches beside this path, and worried that its existence means some drivers will be angered by my doing so.</p>
<p>(49) Local Resident/Member of public, (oxford, hollybush row)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>As a cyclist and pedestrian this would improve my experience. Kennington road is also on the cycle route from Oxford to Abingdon and so should be made better for cyclists.</p>

<p>(50) Local Resident/Member of public, (Oxford, Howard Street)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Concerns</p> <p>Why do some sections of the path have a 0.5m buffer to the carriageway, but others not (even when the carriageway is >7m)? There should be a 0.5m buffer everywhere, unless that would drop the carriageway below 6.4m width.</p> <p>No vertical cross-sections are provided with the plans. Please make sure that the shared path remains entirely flat across vehicular crossovers, with entrance kerbs used so the rise is at the carriageway edge. (Slopes should minimise inconvenience to thousands of people walking and cycling, not for a few vehicle movements a day.)</p> <p>The entry to the sports centre has excessively high radius corners, encouraging vehicles to turn in at speed. These should be tightened.</p>
<p>(51) Local Resident/Member of public, (Oxford)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - No opinion, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - No opinion, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - No opinion, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Object</p> <p>I strongly object as there is already a Cycle path on the other side of the road, total waste of money</p>
<p>(52) Local Resident/Member of public, (Oxford , Walton well)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>As a commuting cyclist this section of road is currently v intimidating- a dedicated cycle lane and crossing points will v much improve safety. Not clear from plans how side entryway into fields/properties will work but strongly encourage you to make these raised curb so that the cycle way v clearly has priority and is a continuous surface</p>

<p>(53) Local Resident/Member of public, (Stanford in the Vale, Spencers Close)</p>	<p>Zebra crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Raised Parallel crossing (Kennington Road) - Support, Parallel crossing (Whites Lane) - Support, Shared-use Footway/Cycle path (Kennington Road/Whites Lane) - Support</p> <p>Improved environment for cycling and support for active travel</p>
---	---



I am responding to the **Radley: Kennington Road & Whites Lane - proposed pedestrian & pedal cycle improvements** consultation on behalf of CycloX and Cycling UK Oxford.

Summary points

Formal objection - Sports Centre entry treatment

The design of the cycle track cross the Sports Centre entrance is not compliant with guidance. The design must reflect the priority given to pedestrian and cycling movements by Highway Code Rule H2, and the OCC transport hierarchy.

The walking/cycling route must have priority over this driveway, and this priority should be clearly marked. The path here should be level (so raised entry for motor vehicles to enter).

The kerb radii need to be reduced to make a tighter turning. This is to slow turning drivers down, so reducing the chance of "left hook" collisions, which are a common cause of cyclist fatalities.

Options for cycle tracks crossing side roads/entries are given in chapter 10 of LTN 1/20, including figure 10.13: "Priority crossings of cycle tracks at side roads.

Other general points:

General/link

This scheme will fill in an important missing link in the cycle network. Once completed, almost all the route from Abingdon - Oxford can be cycled segregated from traffic. Indeed, most of Sutton Courtney - Woodstock can be done segregated from motor traffic.

Widths,

The basic design of the route, a 3m shared path, seems acceptable subject to effective/regular vegetation cutting/clearance. There is some, but limited walking traffic, and we judge it will fit well withing the LTN 1/20 guidance of under 300 pedestrians and 300 cyclists per hour.

White lining.

No white lines on the cycle track are shown. Driveways should have give way lines where they meet the cycle track.

Quality of the drawings for a consultation.

As someone familiar with highway drawings, these drawings are very hard to read.

Detailed points:

This is only half the scheme. The complete scheme should continue to Thrupp Lane with a redesigned junction, and to about 100m west of Audlett Drive. We hope and expect that plans and consultation for this part of the scheme will follow.

Quality of the drawings for a consultation.

As someone familiar with highway drawings, these drawings are very hard to read to read, too many similarish markings for different types of kerbs is an example.

General/link

This route will enable a traffic-free link from Abingdon to Oxford, the first significant inter-town link in the county. It is a route that is already cycled by many people (based on observations at commuting time), despite road sections as it is about 7 miles centre-to-centre, but a full traffic-free option will increase its attractiveness substantially.

This scheme will fill in an important missing link in the cycle network. Once completed, almost all the route from Abingdon - Oxford can be done segregated from traffic. Indeed, most of Sutton Courtney - Woodstock can be done segregated from motor traffic.

Widths

- The basic design of the route, a 3m shared path, seems appropriate. There is some, but limited walking traffic, and we judge it will fit well with the LTN 1/20 guidance of under 300 pedestrians and 300 cyclists per hour.
- The route sometimes falls slightly below 3m and required buffers, but we accept that this is where required due to width and reasonable budget constraints.
- There are parts where there is no 0.5m margin between the cycle track and the road (verge space/ditch again). These stretches need white lining (see below for further comment on this).
- The north-bound footway between the sports centre entry and the main school entrance is about 1m above the road (which affects possible work arounds for the narrow 2.5m wide shared width on the opposite side of the road (mentioned below)).

LTN 1/20 Table 6-1: Minimum recommended horizontal separation between carriageway and cycle tracks: -

Speed limit 40 - Desirable minimum horizontal separation (m) 1.0 - Absolute minimum horizontal separation (m) 0.5

The absolute minimum has been achieved, in some places only.

LTN 1/20 Table 6-3: Recommended minimum widths for shared use routes carrying up to 300 pedestrians per hour

Up to 300 cyclists per hour 3.0m.

This has mostly been achieved.

Sports centre entry treatment

Formal objection.

There needs to be clear cycle/pedestrian priority over the sports centre access.

This should reflect the priority given to pedestrian and cycling movements by Highway Code Rule H2, and the OCC transport hierarchy.

The walking/cycling route on the road should have priority over this driveway, this should be clearly marked, and the path here should be level, raised to emphasise cycle/pedestrian priority and speed reduction for traffic turning in or out.

Radley School sports centre entrance needs tighter kerb radii/raised entry/"elephants feet markings" across to slow turning drivers.

Design options for cycle tracks crossing side roads/entries are given in chapter 10 of LTN 1/20 including Figure 10.13: "Priority crossings of cycle tracks at side roads*."

At all driveways/side entries/side turnings, any lowered/flush kerbs **MUST** extend across the **full width of the cycleable track**. There must be no points where a cycle user might ride into a not fully lowered angled kerb.

White lining.

The drawing shows no white lines proposed for the shared use track. There should be: -

- A white line by the kerb where there is no 0.5m grass margin, to help determine where the edge is when riding in the dark. Kerbs/cycle track edges can be hard to see when being dazzled by oncoming car headlights after dark. Night time commuting lasts over 4 months of the year.
- Give way lines for private driveways where they meet the cycle track (Radley entrances are mentioned separately below).
- Some pedestrian/cycle markings at ends/periodically to show shared use.
- Some lines (or signs) to show where cycling **is no longer permitted**, ie where it changes from shared use to pedestrian use only. "Cyclist Dismount" signs **MUST** not be used, they are counter to current guidance.



Some specific points.

190 - 250m points

There is an issue with width north of Radley Church, 190 - 250m points: -

Church - Gore House, 2.5m abutting fence/hedge - deduct 0.5m for a vertical edge, leaves 2m width - not wide enough - no more land available (unless purchase front gardens, unlikely/not a desirable course of action). Narrower when vegetation left untrimmed (as it will be...).

An alternative suggestion up to approx Radley School main entrance, 1 way (for cycles) shared use each side of the road, then change the pedestrian crossing near Radley School main entrance into a pedestrian/cycle parallel crossing.

The 1 way (for cycles) shared path on the west side could also continue (with widening) to the north end of Radley, to tie in with the existing shared cycle track to Kennington.

Allowing for with (motor) traffic cycle flow on both sides of the road helps cycle users deal with the issue of oncoming car headlight dazzle (dipped beam points to the left).

This would still need a cycle crossing near Radley School main entrance, as this is a much safer place to cross the road than near Sugworth Crescent (south end of Kennington) which is an uncontrolled crossing with very poor sight lines.

On paper, keeping the shared 3m cycle on the west side of the road between Radley Schools sports centre and main entrance looks good, but in reality this is not an option/has complications due to the height difference (1m?) between the existing footway and the road.

Approx 1000 - 1010m point

Tree roots outside Halfway Cottages. Approx 1000 - 1010m point, the house holder has planted some trees just inside/outside the garden fence. What are the construction solutions offered here to protect the tree roots?

The tree variety suggest they have been planted by the house owner, so needs consideration.

Relocated car parking bay. This is probably 1 car space less than the current layby. The new lay by must allow for at least the same number of cars to help prevent parking on the cycle track. What remedy is proposed to prevent parking encroachment on the cycle track?

If bollards, it needs 1. Reflective coating (car parking and cycling in the dark) and 2. Local widening* of track to accommodate the bollard (*probably the section that kinks in/out from the highway boundary, so no need to encroach into the ditch or road).

530m point.

Outside Field House/Grangefield House - the plan at the 530m point says the service provider will relocate the "overhead cable pole". "The pole" is in fact 2 poles (one vertical, one an angled triangulating pole). Has it been checked that relocating the pole is a simple moving a pole, or does the triangulating aspect complicate the issue?

As always, the devil is in the details.

1391m point

South (Abingdon) bound bus stop near Redrow homes suggests an issue, but the drawing has the bus stop in its old position. It has been relocated north to about 1391m point (so missing cycle users who will turn off to Redrow at about 1388m point. So this should not be an issue.

Yours Sincerely,

Cyclox.

Poplar Grove
Kennington,