

## RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

Table 1 – The Plain:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Sustrans	Support the changes in the interest of cyclist and pedestrian safety and amenity and would also support raising the loading bays to footway level	Noted
Member of public	<p>Objects to proposals on the grounds that the consultation on the proposed amendments to waiting restrictions is premature as this will restrict flexibility for amendments to the detailed design, including the scope for segregated cycle routes</p> <p>More specific concerns were also expressed on:</p> <p>a) Layby on north side of roundabout: - there is inadequate space left for cyclists inside of loading trucks in this (Sainsbury's) location. Being inside of a loading bay is likely to be more convenient than passing a loading truck and potentially having to move outwards if trucks are not perfectly placed within the bay and up to a kerb; since lorries loading here present an overtaking hazard, cyclists safety and convenience has not been considered adequately.</p> <p>b) Layby on east side of roundabout - queries if adequate consultations or surveys of current use and therefore little accurate consideration can be given to impacts on retail and entertainment in the area. I note added restrictions in St Clements area by other reductions in off-street parking space.</p>	<p>Officers are seeking approval for a design which includes loading bays in specific locations. The timescale of the project is such that the TRO consultation cannot take place after the design is approved. Department for Transport funding must be spent by 31 March 2015 – detailed design must start in April in order for a start on site in September/October. This wouldn't be possible if TRO consultation takes place after the date of the committee considering these TROs.</p> <p>Officers do not believe that there is scope to provide any meaningful segregated cycle facilities around the roundabout. This is considered at Annex 6 to this report.</p> <p>Officers do not believe that providing for cyclists inside of the Sainsbury's loading bay is a sensible or safe proposition. There is insufficient space and this design solution would produce conflicts with the large volume of pedestrians moving along there.</p>

		<p>Cyclist safety is being considered as part of the safety audit process being applied to the scheme design.</p> <p>The proposals should help local businesses by improving the availability of loading opportunities and should have minimal impact on customer parking, given that there is currently no parking outside Sainsbury's and observations suggest that at the layby on the east side of the roundabout, the majority of the parking is longer stay and not related to businesses.</p>
Oxford Brookes University	<p>No objection to proposals for layby and supportive in principle of the scheme although concerned about the potential for increased delays to all traffic and in particular buses.</p> <p>Also concerned that the planned construction period is the worst time for our students and the bus service. It is understand this is unavoidable.</p>	Noted
Thames Valley Police	No objections to the proposals.	Noted
Oxford Transport and Access Group (OXTRAG)	No objections to the proposals	Noted
Oxford Pedestrians Association	Support aims of project and welcome the carriageway being substantially narrowed and the additional crossing place for pedestrians across the St Clements junction. While OxPA has a preference for zebras across each of the junctions, acknowledging the need to reduce traffic queuing at this very busy roundabout & hope that dropped kerbs and a colour indicator will offer a viable alternative.	Noted.

	<p>However, have significant regret that the plans do not now reduce the Magdalen Bridge entry to one lane and are concerned that the crossing from fountain to Sainsbury's will become more difficult with 2 lanes + 2 cycle lanes to be negotiated. OxPA notes the possibility of a dog-leg route from the end of the bridge, before the extra lanes begin, to the central refuge, then along it to the fountain: this should be useful for Magdalen School boys - and others, when they get to know the layout, will also benefit.</p> <p>We note that as the proposal has been developed space for pedestrians has been reduced in some places. So far this does not present a problem but are keeping an eye on this aspect of modifications to the scheme.</p>	
<p>Ballroom Emporium respect proposals layby on east side of the roundabout) (in of for east the)</p>	<p>Concerned over the loss of parking, particularly given the recent re-development of St Clements car park which already has had a severe impact on local businesses and reduced employment and the general vitality of the area. Parking provision in the area has been eroded to an unacceptable extent and if the three spaces in this layby are removed, they need to be replaced in the scheme by other parking nearby. Also concerned about the noise problems arising from the taxi rank for local residents.</p> <p>More generally has reservations as to whether the proposals will result in the intended benefits.</p>	<p>Although no formal surveys of the use of the layby have been carried out, observations suggest that they are primarily used as longer term non customer parking rather than for customers themselves.</p> <p>The proposals will facilitate the ease of loading/unloading by the businesses.</p> <p>The concerns on the general level of parking in the area are acknowledged but the proposals do not materially affect this and similarly, as there is an existing taxi rank, the proposals will not lead to a change in the potential for noise disturbance. The comments on the wider impact of the scheme are noted.</p>

**Table 2 – A420 High Street junction with Longwall Street (Original proposal):**

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Magdalen College	Supports the proposal to remove the left turn for cyclists from the High into Longwall Street if it will change the pedestrian crossing times as indicated. Recommends the centre broken white line be continued from the High into Longwall Street to reduce the frequent infringement of the centre line by traffic in both directions. Minor accidents occur through a lack of spatial awareness.	Noted
Oxford Pedestrians Association	Support this proposal, providing the proposed changes do not make it easier for vehicles to make illegal left turns. The greatest benefit for eastbound cyclists would be a 5 second headstart ahead of buses. The present situation is very dangerous with cyclists hemmed into a narrow cycle lane between nose-to-tail buses and an often very crowded pavement from which people sometimes step out into the cycle lane. The existing wait-time at these lights is excessive, presenting an incentive for light-jumping. The cycle lane white line is very worn and almost invisible in places between the Longwall corner and Magdalen lodge, at a place where it should be prominent to give cyclists maximum protection.	The proposals will not make it easier for vehicles to turn left into Longwall Street.
City Cllr Dick Wolff	No objections.	Noted
Thames Valley Police	Objects to proposal on grounds that there will be high levels of contravention placing considerable demands for police enforcement and dangers for pedestrians crossing Longwall Street.	Amended proposals for the junction will allow the few cyclists who do want to turn left into Longwall Street to continue to do so by using the newly created small section of shared use footway/cycleway (see amended proposals).
Member of Public	Objects on grounds of cyclist amenity and on the understanding that the 90 degree corner to stop dangerous left turns by motor vehicles	As above; the 90 degree corner is being retained to continue to discourage vehicles

	would be removed.	from making the left turn.
Cllr Coates	Sam Objects on grounds of cyclist amenity	Amended proposals for the junction will allow the few cyclists who do want to turn left into Longwall Street to continue to do so by using the newly created small section of shared use footway/cycleway (see amended proposals).
Member Public	of Objects on grounds that there would be no safety benefits and that cyclists would not comply with proposed prohibition	As previous response
Member Public	of Objects on grounds that there would be no safety benefits and that cyclists would not comply with proposed prohibition	As previous response
Member Public	of Objects on grounds that the proposal is unnecessary, unlikely to be obeyed and likely to increase danger for all people there, including pedestrians. Also concerned that by reducing delays, may encourage additional motor vehicle traffic	As previous response. Although the concerns that the proposal will result in increased traffic are noted. Buses, cyclists and pedestrians will be the main beneficiaries of the reduced delays.
CTC	Query if the benefits outweigh the dis-benefits to cyclists affected by the amendment, but would be open to the proposal if a strong case could be made. Also suggests consideration of alternative signalling arrangements for cyclists, including re-siting the signal heads on Longwall Street to effectively increase space for cyclists and other vehicles on the narrow part of the road	Amended proposals for the junction will allow the few cyclists who do want to turn left into Longwall Street to continue to do so by using the newly created small section of shared use footway/cycleway (see amended proposals). An application to DfT for an early start for cyclists on the eastbound High Street approach is to be made, but currently no other changes to the signals are considered a priority
OBIS (Oxford Brookes University)	Objects on grounds of reduced amenity for cyclists and pedestrians and requests consideration of alternative signalled layout	As above

Member of the public	Objects on grounds of reduced safety for cyclists	As above
Member of the public	Objects on grounds of reduced safety for cyclists	As above
Member of Public	Objects on grounds that the proposal is unnecessary, unlikely to be obeyed and likely to increase danger for all people there, including pedestrians	See above
Oxford Brookes – Sustainability Team	Concerned that it is not realistic to expect cyclists to dismount	See above
CTC Councillor (SE region ) Oxonian Cycle Club - council liaison officer)	Objects to proposals on the grounds of reduced cyclist amenity and requests a shared use cycletrack to allow left turning cyclists to bypass the signals.	As above.

**Table 3 – A420 High Street junction with Longwall Street (Amended proposal):**

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
Oxford Pedestrians Association	<p>No objections given the very small number of left turning cyclists will be unlikely to impair the safety/convenience of pedestrians and the increased pavement space would be available for pedestrians at a very crowded junction.</p> <p>Suggest the use of a pedestrian symbol marking (in addition to a cycle symbol) to make it clearer (in particular to cyclists) that the space is to be shared by cyclists with pedestrians.</p> <p>Also request that if approved the operation of the layout should be reappraised after 3 or 6 months to make sure the changes have not created unexpected problems.</p>	<p>Noted. However there is currently (under national signing regulations) no approved pedestrian symbol, and so it would not be possible to use these marking here.</p> <p>The scheme will be closely monitored if the proposal is approved.</p>
City Cllr Dick Wolff	<p>No objections but suggests that the alignment of the proposed shared use track is altered to help ensure that the speed of cyclists using the proposed facility is as low as possible</p>	<p>Noted. The suggested amendment to the alignment of the proposed shared use cycle track will be reviewed although the scope for change is likely to be limited.</p>
Thames Valley Police	<p>No objections on basis that the provision (including signing and markings) if approved fully complies with national regulations</p>	<p>Noted. Officers understand the proposed signing and markings are in accordance with national regulations.</p>
Member of Public	<p>No objections to amended proposals</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Sustrans	<p>No objections to amended proposals</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Cllr Sam Coates	<p>No objections to amended proposals (subject to cycling groups also expressing no objection)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Oxford Transport and Access Group (OXTRAG)	<p>Concern that cyclists making the left turn would on entering Longwall Street be concentrating on checking for traffic and may be unaware of the need to give way to pedestrians, with disabled pedestrians and wheelchair users being particularly vulnerable.</p>	<p>Noted -</p>

		To reduce risks, suggest a realignment of the kerb and that cyclists be required to give way to pedestrians at the edge of the tactile paving.	
Oxford Brookes Sustainability Team	–	Supports as providing reasonable compromise	Noted



CMDE5