

## Consultation summary

Stakeholders and local organisations were asked which of the two options they preferred and for detailed comments on the designs.

The following organisations were consulted:

City of Oxford Licensed Taxi Association (COLTA)	Christ Church
English Heritage	Cyclox (representing cyclists)
West End Partnership	City Sightseeing
Guide Dogs for the Blind	Oxford Inspires
Oxfordshire Association for the Blind	West End Community Group
Oxford University	Association of British Drivers
Oxford Pedestrians' Association	South Central Ambulance Service
Parish Transport Representatives	My Life My Choice (representing people with learning difficulties)
Oxford Preservation Trust	Environment Agency
First Great Western	Stagecoach in Oxfordshire
	Oxford Brookes University
Oxford City Centre Manager	Saïd Business School
Rescue Oxford (representing city centre businesses)	Network Rail
Nuffield College	Arriva
Oxfordshire Unlimited (representing people with disabilities)	Sustrans
Bus Users UK	Oxford Bus Company
Cyclists' Touring Club (representing cyclists)	Oxford City Council
West Oxford Matters	Oxfordshire County Council local members
Oxfordshire Fire & Rescue Service	West Oxford Community Association
Oxford Nightsafe	Rewley Park Management
Thames Valley Police	Freight Transport Association
Science Oxford	Oxford Civic Society

Of the 45 organisations consulted, 31 responded, of which 21 expressed a clear preference for one option: 14 (67%) preferred the Boulevard and 7 (33%) preferred the Oval. Oxford City Council preferred the Boulevard. The responses are summarised below. Copies of all responses received are available in background document B.

Organisation	Preferred option	Reasons for preference	Detailed design comments
Fire & Rescue Service	Oval	Oval may have slight advantage for Fire & Rescue Service as carriageway leading to Botley Road appears longer, providing more opportunity for vehicles to pull over to allow emergency vehicles to pass.	Critical to keep traffic flowing. Keep Rewley Road exit clear of stopped traffic / make pavement overrunable. Could use red flashing beacons and signage and hatched box to indicated presence of fire station. Ensure that widening of footway in Hythe Bridge Street should not restrict ability of emergency service vehicles to pass. Make Becket Street roundabout overrunable to make it obvious to drivers they can use these areas to yield to emergency service vehicles.
Association of British Drivers	Oval	Traffic movements are not concentrated in the centre of the square and the curved carriageways create a less regimented arrangement. There is also a central focus on pedestrian movement and public space.	
Sustrans	Boulevard	Maximises the space available for use by pedestrians and cyclists on the principal desire lines to and from the rail station.	
Oxfordshire Association for the Blind	Boulevard	Straighter lines would make navigation easier for visually impaired people.	Lack of Light Controlled crossing points for pedestrians is a serious impediment for visually impaired people, which introduces considerable risk. Crossing points A, B and C are necessary now and should be located closer to the square detours. Lack of kerb will disadvantage guide dog users.

Arriva	Boulevard	<p>Straight design for the vehicle path, will mean buses will be able to pull in parallel with the kerb with ease, without obstructing traffic. Concentrates pedestrian and cycle movements that come into conflict with moving vehicles, meaning those more vulnerable will be more aware of traffic. Better to concentrate pedestrian movement than spread it out. Easier for bus users to see where alternative bus stops are located and easier for drivers to direct passengers to stops.</p>	
Oxford Pedestrians' Association	Boulevard	<p>Centre of Oval could become isolated, 'dead' space surrounded by traffic. Boulevard means pedestrians can cross easily and efficiently. Wide pavements on both sides. on desire lines possible.</p>	<p>Level crossings and islands make crossing easy. Wide pavements. Concerns that there will not be low traffic speeds at night. Suggest wiring put in place for traffic signals if needed in future. Not clear where cyclists will go when road is congested; concern they will use pavement. Traffic will not travel at uniform speed; vehicles will accelerate in gaps between junctions which may have implications for safety of pedestrians and cyclists. A timescale for review of the scheme should be set. Huge improvement on existing.</p>
Nightsafe (crime prevention)	Boulevard	<p>Large grassed areas make people linger which attracts those looking for opportunities to commit crime. Open areas could attract street drinkers and rough sleepers etc.</p>	<p>No CCTV in this area and no funding to install this. Limit trees to enable visibility for Said Business School camera.</p>
My Life My Choice (representing people with learning)	No preference	<p>Both options look great. Our views were listened to in early stages.</p>	

difficulties)			
St Ebbe's New Development Residents' Association	Boulevard	Traffic flow pattern is simpler and less constrained. Crossing the square of foot will be easier. Pavements will be reasonably free from traffic fumes. Only minority support Oval: presents an elegant, welcoming entrance to the city. Charming piazza en route to station and ideal meeting point. Oxford lack public spaces. Could be fitted with street furniture, map of colleges, restaurants and other attractions.	Relief that associated works on and under Botley Bridge will mean proper provision of adequate cycle paths. New layout is an improvement and roundabouts and shared space appears to be an effective system. Removal of traffic lights eagerly anticipated. Suggest turning Becket Street into a two-way street and adding mini-roundabout at its Oxpens Rd junction to improve city centre traffic flow.
Gerald Eve on behalf of Christ Church	Boulevard	Creates more-usable and accessible public space. Public space accessible without having to cross a lane of traffic. Better use of space that allows activity from buildings to flow out. The Oval creates a traffic island that will be unattractive to pedestrians and similar to current layout, detract from sense of place, roads will be a barrier to the central space. Oval is more confusing for pedestrians accessing city centre via Park End Street and creates more obstructions to visibility across the square.	

English Heritage	Boulevard	The public open space created is more in tune with the character of the centre of Oxford and space would be more usable and relate better to the buildings fronting the square. Sufficient separation from the traffic to create an improved pedestrian environment.	Oval would read as an alien feature in Oxford's townscape. Central space may be unattractive because of the hazard of crossing the road and being surrounded by traffic. High quality materials will be crucial to securing a scheme that will make a positive contribution to the streetscape and gateway to the city. Use the advice set out in the Street Scene Manual. Phase implementation of the details if funding is not available to undertake a high quality scheme at this stage.
Unlimited (representing people with disabilities)	Boulevard	Design is of type used in European and UK towns and is readily understood. More open and friendly for pedestrians. Clearer sightlines for pedestrians crossing and less conflict with buses compared to Oval. Less impact from traffic fumes. Superior design of the two for physically handicapped people because the pedestrian crossing route is more direct with fewer trip hazards. Park End Street bus stops - have loading and parking been considered?	Need to consider visually impaired people - tactile paving, crossing points and audible indications of crossings. Concern about lack of continuity of roundabouts being not over-runnable and over-runnable. How will traffic speed be enforced? Should install crossings A, B and C from the start. Footbridge over Botley Rd should be signed. Pedestrian crossings should be raised to slow vehicles. The Oval design has a loading bay located to block pedestrian route and sight lines. Grassed areas block desire lines and is unlikely to be used.
Cyclists' Touring Club (representing cyclists)	Neither	Object to both. Major concerns for safe passage of cyclists. Left turning, large vehicles create a danger to cyclists. Will create real and perceived danger for cyclists, resulting in them using the pedestrian areas. 3.1m carriageway is too narrow. Over-runnable roundabouts will permit fast vehicles to cut across these junctions when traffic flows are low.	Locations of crossings A, B and C are poorly located and off the desire line of pedestrians. Informal crossings work at times of low traffic but are not suitable at peak times when traffic queues bumper to bumper. Support the widening of footways in Park End Street and Hythe Bridge Street. Potential for junctions to be blocked by queuing traffic at peak times causing the whole area to seize up.

<p>Cyclists' Touring Club (representing cyclists)</p>	<p>No preference</p>	<p>Oval delivers least space next to buildings; perhaps needs a building but this could be problematic; boulevard delivers more space for frontagers; but Said Business School is relatively inactive; space on south side is reduced</p>	<p>Support change at Frideswide Square; shared space approach was plausible but current drawings appear to be traditional highways; tree planting is weak; grass unusable; landscape designs poorly conceived; haven't seen traffic modelling - where is evidence for reduced delays; how has modelling accommodated cyclists; some ped crossings are on desire lines, but mostly not; bus stops are assigned with explanation; crossings outside the square at points A, B and C are illogically located; 3.1 m dimension for carriageways may make cyclists feel safer, but widths flare out at points which may not work; many cyclists will use the pavements areas; design is only partly shared space, likely to be treated as traditional carriageway and footway; not place for comfortable and convenient cycling; need to allocated clear alternative cycling routes across the footway area subtly but perceptibly; carriageway cycle lanes are required on all the approaches; design fails to provide a desirable environment for cycling.</p>
<p>Cyclox (representing cyclists)</p>	<p>Neither</p>	<p>Neither is suitable for an area with a high number of cyclists. Both schemes will at worst cause significant danger to cyclists and at best put them in confrontation with pedestrians and motorists.</p>	<p>No separate cycle lanes and carriageway of 3.1m are narrow. This would not be a problem if it could be guaranteed that motorists remain patiently behind cyclists. Danger that drivers will overtake. Best practice schemes have cycle lanes leading up to shared space. Attempts in London to use cyclists to slow traffic are unpopular. Pedestrians will step out in front of moving cyclists. Danger to cyclists from left turning vehicles. Roundabouts create potential for drivers to ignore or not notice cyclists. Roundabouts and number of accesses to the square will be confusing and difficult to navigate. Flared entries will encourage dangerous over-taking of cyclists. Bus drivers will waive each other out of junction</p>

			<p>causing confusion and danger to cyclists. Cyclists will use pedestrian areas because of perceived danger - roundabouts are difficult for inexperienced / less confident cyclists. Lack of clear pedestrian crossings and often inconveniently set back from desire line. Courtesy crossing only work in low traffic volume / speed areas and there is no evidence that these conditions will apply. Scheme will be a deterrent to cycling and a missed opportunity to create a world class entry to the city. Will result in unacceptable conflict between road users, and will almost certainly lead to injury and death to cyclists.</p>
Rewley Park Management	Boulevard	<p>More pedestrian friendly with large pavements. More space for bus passengers waiting. Keep traffic fumes in a contained area. Design incorporates more trees.</p>	<p>Marked cycled lanes should be provided to avoid pavement cycling. Insufficient provision for buses to stop. Should include a statue for the City's patron saint. Concern how the Rewley Road and Hythe Bridge Street junction will work for right turning traffic heading south or west. Proposal does not improved the existing difficult arrangement of poor traffic light phasing and blocked exit for vehicles exiting Rewley Road. Crossing A would not be used as it is set too far north for pedestrian flow. Existing pedestrian situation at this junction is dangerous as they ignore the traffic / ped signals. Landscaping should be included in Rewley Road to soften its appearance.</p>

First Group (First Great Western)	Oval	Better cosmetic appearance.	Need to discuss proposals in detail to ensure there is no conflict with proposals to redevelop the station forecourt. Clarification required on how the access and egress from station forecourt will work for vehicles using kiss and ride, short stay, staff parking, buses and taxis - proposals must not make things worse. Bus/rail interchange should not be made more difficult - rearrangement of bus stops must not result in pedestrians having to walk further to catch a bus than at present.
Oxford Bus Company	Oval	Disperses pedestrians crossing the road compared to the boulevard option, and will create natural desire lines. Only one bus stop and shelter for each direction of travel which causes confusion for bus passengers and drivers. Is there sufficient space for vehicles to pass if a vehicle breaks down in the running lane?	Need for bus interchange is met by Park End Street proposals. Need to consider layout carefully in terms of taxi rank. Westbound passengers going to the square but not the station would have to alight earlier and walk further to get to a common stop where they can board any bus. Park End Street should be wide enough for two buses in opposite stops and a passing bus. Raised crossing gradient should be mindful of standing-passengers on board buses. Need careful design for parking and loading and enforcement of these. Concern that roundabout junctions will be congested / blocked and cause delays - no bus priority.
Oxford City Council	Boulevard	Strong preference. The space is informal and has developed organically. Buildings provide historic context and sense of place. The square is an important meeting point of two historic routes into the city.	Keep materials, palette and landscaping simple. High quality materials are important and the scheme could be delivered in phases to allow higher quality finishes to be added at a later stage. Breaking up larger spaces adds cost and unnecessary complexity. Efforts should be made to integrate features such as bus shelters into the hard and soft landscaping to reduce the intrusion of functional items.



City of Oxford Licensed Taxi Association (COLTA)	No preference	Colta members and are in favour of minimum disruption to pedestrians and keeping the traffic flowing freely	
Guide Dogs for the Blind	Boulevard	Easier for visually impaired pedestrians to get from one side of the road to the other to access the bus stops as opposed to the oval design which they would have to negotiate the wide open space to get to the other side of the road/ bus stop. The Oval plan would lead to disorientation with anyone with more limiting sight.	Kerb height should be 60mm, if not, at least it must not be a level surface; The raised crossings must have tactile paving on the edge of the pavement where the pavement meets the carriageway to inform blind and partially sighted people that this is a level crossing point; The edge of the bus stop also needs tactile or textured surface to demarcate the edge of the pavement and bus stop as they are both level; without demarcation
Oxfordshire County Councillor for West Central Oxford	No preference	Could support Oval if it had lots of trees; but unsure what the central space is for and what it would look and feel like	Concerned about cyclists. Unconfident cyclists don't like roundabouts. Traffic speeds must be low. Concerned that cyclists will use the footway areas; does this sort of scheme work well for cyclists elsewhere? Crossing points A, B and C too far from desire line. Very important to widen footways and add eastbound cycle lane under rail bridge if possible
Network Rail	No preference		

<p>Bus Users UK</p>	<p>Oval</p>	<p>The Boulevard carriageways through the square are shorter than those of the Oval draft design, which leaves less room for bus stops. The Boulevard also lacks the delivery bay on the south side of the square shown in the Oval design. This side of the square has several takeaway food outlets, and we are concerned that if no delivery bay is available the bus stops could be misused by either customers stopping to buy takeaways or delivery drivers working for the takeaways themselves</p>	<p>Capacity for future increases in buses and bus passengers should be provided (space for 3 buses in each direction). Buses serving the forecourt should be allowed to serve the square. In the Oval design some of the turns seem very tight for buses - could these be made less tight? Oppose low kerbs; all kerbs except at crossings should be 100 - 140 mm high; formal marked crossings should be included at each end of the square; seats should be provided at intervals of 30m; shelter provision appears inadequate, shelters should give good protection from the elements; do not oppose principle of combining two separate stops for each direction into one stop for each direction; support more tall trees; need to take steps to design out pavement cycling;</p>
<p>Oxford Civic Society</p>	<p>Neither</p>	<p>Least prefer oval because harder to adjust. Neither option offers improvement of existing situation.</p>	<p>Concerned about cyclists; not enough bus stop capacity; pedestrian desire lines not properly catered for; encourage more pedestrians to use Park End Street; promote route over footbridge; approaches to the square need to be designed now rather than later; including junctions at Roger Dudman Way and Cripsey Road; suggest moving rail station to Oxpens; could something simpler be tried at Frideswide instead of major changes?</p>

<p>Stagecoach in Oxfordshire</p>	<p>No preference</p>	<p>Possible preference for Boulevard as Oval could make it harder for buses to dock properly at the kerbside</p>	<p>Support bus lay-bys for buses in both directions, each capable of accommodating two buses simultaneously with each bus able to enter and leave independently of the other. Need two stops and two shelters on either side of square, even with no station services stopping. Strongly oppose proposal to restrict the use of the stops to services which do not enter the station forecourt. The layout must be able to cope with 15m long vehicles. Kerbs at bus boarding points should be 120mm. Care must be taken over raised surfaces at crossing points. These could cause a hazard with passengers standing in buses waiting to get off and from and would need to be of very robust construction, given the volume of traffic. Clear, enforceable marking of bus stops essential. Not having Frideswide Square as a timing point undermines your high level project objective of promoting sustainable transport. Routes passing the station should show include times at Frideswide Square in the timetables. This does not necessarily mean that buses should "wait for time" at this location and we can organise things so that this does not happen. Is it possible to have an out-bound bus lane from Park End Street/Hollybush Row roundabout to the bus stop to prevent delays on the roundabout with Hythe Bridge Street? Can this be achieved without compromising the design aspirations? Has the future growth of bus services been taken into account</p>
<p>Oxford Preservation Trust</p>	<p>Boulevard</p>	<p>Simpler design</p>	<p>Suggest a phased approach, with basic layout followed in future years by upgrade of materials. Flexibility critical to allow for future changes in the West End and further afield.</p>

ROX (Rescue Oxford - representing city centre businesses)	Oval	More impressive western approach	Suggest reserve lanes are created to be used in the event of breakdowns, accidents etc. Suggest increasing bus space to allow for three buses; third bay could be shared with loading; approaches to bus bays should be made less steep; loading space is needed for businesses on south side and for Royal Oxford Hotel.
Said Business School	Oval	More pleasant crossing experience; opportunity to create a "gallery" or sculpture park; opportunity to create a world class attraction for the city	Maximising green space is critical.
Oxford University Building and Estate's Sub-Committee	Boulevard	More aesthetically pleasing; makes better use of the space available; not clear how the central part of the Oval would be used effectively; requires less land to be released by the university	Concerned that neither option caters properly for cyclists and vulnerable pedestrians.
West Oxford Matters	No preference	Officers attended a public meeting at which the two options were discussed. Detailed feedback was received (see right). There was no overall clear preference for one option.	<p><b>Positive comments</b></p> <p>Both schemes have merits and improve the introduction to the city. Some suggested asymmetrical version of Boulevard with more space on Said Business School side; others felt Oval was better for pedestrians – provides sunnier space and split pedestrian crossings; continuous flow is good idea; plans should reduce delays; temporary roundabout before current layout worked well; wide pavements could allow cycle lanes on pavements; current Becket St crossing works well because it is raised – will proposed crossing be raised? Support 2 way Becket Street; support extra people space; more civic/green space supported; more trees supported.</p>

			<p><b>Negative comments</b></p> <p>Need to take full consideration of wider West End changes and future traffic; Discouraging traffic is bad for small businesses; neither plan addresses volume of traffic – this needs to be reduced; don't want more traffic, want slower traffic; improving flow will attract more traffic; both layouts too fussy; Botley Rd rail bridge must be improved for cyclists; need cycle lanes throughout scheme; poor emergency access; bad idea to eliminate the option to travel east-west in the left lane without having to pass through a junction; Beaumont St to Oxpens means going through two roundabouts; removing controlled junctions means tactile paving will disappear; pedestrians will stop the traffic too much in rush hour; who will sit in the middle of the Oval?; stone paving expensive and often not maintained; street lighting needs to be addressed;</p> <p><b>Suggested additions</b></p> <p>Need clear speed limits and speed cameras - esp at night. Oval could be improved with statue or fountain, e.g. Ox sculpture; put West oxford Health Centre on south side of square; move bus stops from square to station; add cycle lane on pavement; suggest one-way system between Hythe Bridge St and Park End St; need provision for trade vehicles and loading.</p>
--	--	--	---