

**Project name:** A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor  
**Project number:** 332110202  
**Date:** 18 June 2021  
**Prepared By:** Francesca Rowson and Gemma Care  
**Subject:** **A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor Online Public Engagement Summary Note (v7)**

---

## 1. Overview of online public engagement process

- 1.1. The A40 Programme team undertook an online public engagement exercise for the A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor ('A40 HIF2') project between 10 May and 7 June 2021 (inclusive) which ran in parallel with the Access to Witney engagement exercise. Both schemes form part of the A40 Improvements programme.
- 1.2. The table below summarises the key engagement activities and publicity undertaken to support the A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor project.

**Table 1: A40 HIF2 Online public engagement timeline**

Date	Activity
5 May 2021	A40 Improvement web pages go-live date
10 May 2021	Online exhibition go-live date
10 May 2021	OCC consultation portal for submitting feedback go-live date
12 May 2021	A40 HIF2 online public engagement email update sent to over 400 contacts
12 May 2021	Meeting to run through online exhibition with Cassington Parish Council
13 May 2021	Online public engagement publicised in 'YourOxfordshire' resident's newsletter
13 May 2021	Meeting to run through online exhibition with Eynsham Parish Council
14 May 2021	Paper copies of exhibition boards delivered to four local libraries for public display (Eynsham, Burford, Carterton and Witney)
17 May 2021	Live webinar event no. 1 (including Q&A)
15 & 19 May 2021	Outdoor advertising displayed in Kidlington, Witney and Cheltenham
22 May 2021	Live webinar event no. 2 (including Q&A)
27 May 2021	Decision to extend the deadline for comments to 7 June 2021
27 May 2021	Online public engagement publicised in 'YourOxfordshire' resident's newsletter
3 June 2021	Extended deadline for comments publicised on Eynsham Parish Council website
7 June 2021	OCC consultation portal for submitting feedback closes

- 1.3. The project team established a new 'A40 Improvements' webpage which provided an overview of the six A40 Improvement schemes and access to a dedicated A40 HIF2 webpage, virtual exhibition and frequently asked questions webpage.
- 1.4. The virtual exhibition provided the opportunity for participants to complete a feedback form online via the OCC consultation portal. A dedicated email address was also set up to provide the opportunity for comments and questions to be submitted to the project team.

- 1.5. The project team also held two live webinar events hosted via Microsoft Teams to give participants the opportunity to ask questions to members of the team directly. This aimed to recreate as far as possible a traditional 'in-person' public exhibition while complying with the Government's Covid-19 guidelines.
- 1.6. The following measures were put in place to ensure that participants without access to the internet or those who reported issues accessing the materials online had the opportunity to view and comment on the proposals:
  - The public engagement was advertised in print (Oxford Mail).
  - The advertisement included a telephone number to request printed copies of the online exhibition boards and feedback form.
  - Paper copies of the online exhibition materials were displayed in four local libraries (Eynsham, Burford, Carterton and Witney).
  - A Word copy of the online feedback form was sent out to stakeholders on request for completion offline.
  - A PDF copy of the online exhibition boards was emailed out to stakeholders on request to print the information at home.

## 2. Overview of participation

- 2.1. Key statistics on the level of participation in the online public engagement between 10 May and 7 June (inclusive) are summarised below:
  - 6,321 visits to the A40 Improvements webpages were viewed at least 6,321 times\*.
  - Visitors spent over 2 minutes on the A40 Improvements webpages on average which indicates that visitors are engaging with the content.
  - Visitors viewed 2 or more webpages per session on average which again indicates that visitors are engaging with the content.
  - 420 individuals clicked through to the A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor online exhibition\*.
  - 109 responses received on the A40 HF2 online public engagement.
  - 25 attendees at the live webinar events held on 17 and 22 May 2021.
- 2.2. It is important to note that the actual number of visits to the A40 Improvement webpages and the online exhibition is likely to be significantly higher than the reported results\*. This is because the figures recorded by Google Analytics only represent those visitors who accepted cookies on entering the site; typically, only 10-20% of visitors accept cookies.
- 2.3. The social media activity records indicate that the actual number of visitors to the A40 Improvements webpages was higher than the Google Analytics data suggests:
  - Facebook adverts generated 10,000 clicks throughs to the A40 Improvements landing webpage.
  - Facebook adverts were viewed by at least 100,000 users and adverts were targeted to areas that use the A40.
  - The Next Door post generated just under 6,700 'impressions'. Next Door is a local social channel that allows posts to be targeted at the local level (street/parish level).
  - YourOxfordshire messages generated 807 click throughs to the A40 Improvements landing webpage.
  - Email notification about the online exhibition generated 50 clicks throughs to the A40 Improvements landing webpage.

## 3. Summary of responses

- 3.1. Responses on the proposals were received via two channels:
  - 102 feedback form responses submitted via the OCC consultation portal or email.
  - 7 other written responses submitted via email.

### Key stakeholder responses

3.2. 11 responses were received from key stakeholders identified as such at the outset of the project (including landowner responses). A high-level summary of responses from key stakeholders (excluding landowner responses) is provided below:

- West Oxfordshire District Council – Supports the Dual Carriageway Extension, Integrated Bus Lanes and Duke’s Cut schemes and welcomes the construction start date (late 2022) given the importance of addressing congestion on the A40. The A40 HIF2 scheme is generally consistent and supportive of the Salt Cross AAP proposals.
- Eynsham Parish Council – Supports the proposed cycleway/footway improvements, location of the underpass and the Integrated Bus Lanes in principle but considers that the bus lanes should be extended to Witney. The Park and Ride should be relocated to Shores Green, or a second Park and Ride should also be provided at Shores Green.
- District Councillor Rylett (Eynsham and Cassington) - Recommends alternative schemes to address congestion including: a railway between Eynsham and Oxford (long-term) and diverting the A40 north around Eynsham (short-term) which would also facilitate a bridge between Salt Cross and Eynsham and a reduced 30 mph speed limit past Eynsham.
- Bike Safe – Recommends that a second grade separated crossing at the Eynsham roundabout should be included in the A40 Improvement scheme to facilitate north south active travel movements between Lower Road, the proposed A40 shared paths and B4044 path.
- Eynsham Society – Supports the Integrated Bus Lanes and the cycleway / footway improvements in principle. Opposes the proposed underpass due to safety and flood risk concerns and considers that a ramped bridge or at-grade controlled crossing would be preferable for cyclists/pedestrians. Requests that existing distances between the A40 and homes should not be reduced, and mitigation is provided (resurfacing) to reduce existing noise impacts from traffic.
- Witney Oxford Transport Group – Prefer that the funding is allocated towards a rail link between Oxford and Eynsham. Recommends that the A40 Improvements should safeguard land for a railway route between Eynsham and Oxford.
- British Horse Society – Objects to the Dual Carriageway Extension in principle but recognises that the new Barnard Gate roundabout could improve road safety by reducing traffic accidents. Recommends that Pegasus crossings should be provided at Eynsham instead of proposed Toucan crossings.
- Oxfordshire Transport & Access Group – Supports the Dual Carriageway Extension, the Integrated Bus Lanes up to Eynsham Roundabout and the cycleways / footways. An A40/A44 link road would be a more effective solution to relieve congestion at the Wolvercote Roundabout.
- Bus Users Oxford – Objects to the Dual Carriageway Extension in principle and recommends that the funding is reallocated to creating bus lanes between Shores Green and Eynsham and a westbound bus lane at Duke’s Cut instead.

### Online feedback form results

#### Views on A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor schemes

3.3. The online feedback form contained six questions which asked participants for their views on specific elements of the Project (no. 8, 9, 10, 11 12, 13). A qualitative and quantitative summary of the responses received to the six ‘project-specific’ questions is provided below.

**Q8. What is your view on our proposal to upgrade the A40 between East of Witney to the Eynsham Park and Ride site into a dual carriageway?**

Strongly support	26%
Support	21%
Neutral	4%
Minor concerns	6%
Significant concerns	44%
Don't know	0%

*Note: Percentages may not sum due to rounding.*

The table below shows the top 5 comments provided in response to this question.

Theme	Count
Impacts - redistributes congestion	21
Few benefits	15
Impacts - encourages car use	12
Supports the principle	12
Alternative approach - reinstate or build railway line	11

**Q9. What is your view on our proposal to replace the existing Barnard Gate / South Leigh junction with a new roundabout?**

Strongly support	20%
Support	23%
Neutral	18%
Minor concerns	11%
Significant concerns	27%
Don't know	2%

*Note: Percentages may not sum due to rounding.*

The table below shows the top 5 comments provided in response to this question.

Theme	Count
Supports the principle	19
Impacts - improve safety	14
Impacts - increase journey times	12
Impacts - increase congestion	8
Impacts - redistributes congestion	5

**Q10. What is your view on our proposal to construct eastbound and westbound bus lanes along the A40 between Eynsham Park and Ride running towards Duke's Cut?**

Strongly support	20%
Support	21%
Neutral	10%
Minor concerns	9%
Significant concerns	40%
Don't know	1%

*Note: Percentages may not sum due to rounding.*

The table below shows the top 5 comments provided in response to this question.

Theme	Count
Supports the principle	14
Alternative approach - new link to the A34	11
Alternative approach - extend dual carriageway further east	10
Alternative approach - reinstate or build railway line	10
Majority of traffic is not going to Oxford	10

**Q11. What is your view on our proposal to construct a new eastbound bus lane over the bridges at Duke’s Cut?**

Strongly support	20%
Support	21%
Neutral	16%
Minor concerns	5%
Significant concerns	38%
Don't know	2%

*Note: Percentages may not sum due to rounding.*

The table below shows the top 5 comments provided in response to this question.

Theme	Count
Supports the principle	14
Alternative approach - extend dual carriageway further east	8
Alternative approach - new link to the A34	7
Objects to the principle	6
Alternative approach - reinstate or build railway line	5

**Q12. What is your view on our proposal to provide a cycle path to connect the A40 to the Oxford Canal tow path which is part of National Cycle Route 5?**

Strongly support	40%
Support	27%
Neutral	16%
Minor concerns	4%
Significant concerns	11%
Don't know	3%

*Note: Percentages may not sum due to rounding.*

The table below shows the top 5 comments provided in response to this question.

Theme	Count
Supports the principle	37
Alternative approach - improve existing active travel routes	5
Design change	4
Design - unsafe for cyclists	3
Alternative approach - new link to the A34	2

**Q13. What is your view on the cycling and pedestrian facilities proposed along the full length of the HIF2 A40 Smart Corridor project (between East of Witney and Duke’s Cut)?**

Strongly support	24%
Support	20%
Neutral	22%
Minor concerns	6%
Significant concerns	23%
Don't know	3%

*Note: Percentages may not sum due to rounding.*

The table below shows the top 5 comments provided in response to this question.

Theme	Count
Supports the principle	30
Alternative approach - segregated cycle lanes	7
Design - unsafe for cyclists	6
Few benefits	6
Cycle - too close to traffic	5

Views on alternatives to the A40 Improvement schemes

3.4. Participants suggested alternative approaches to address the current issues experienced by users of the A40. These suggestions included redirecting funding to alternative schemes, major changes to the current A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor scheme and measures in addition to the A40 Improvement schemes. The most popular alternatives suggested by participants are as follows.

- Extend the proposed dual carriageway further east, either to the Wolvercote Roundabout or into Oxford.
- Construct an Oxford to Eynsham railway line either instead of, or in addition to the A40 Improvement schemes.
- Construct an A40/M40 link road to reduce queuing at Wolvercote Roundabout and provide a benefit to road users travelling beyond Oxford.
- Construct an A40/A34 link road to reduce queuing at Wolvercote Roundabout and provide a benefit to road users travelling beyond Oxford.
- Construct an A40/A44 Loop Farm Link Rd to reduce queuing at Wolvercote Roundabout and provide a benefit to road users travelling beyond Oxford.
- Provide segregated cycle lanes instead of shared use paths.
- Extend the westbound bus lane over Duke’s Cut to Oxford.
- Construct on/off slip roads instead of the proposed Barnard Gate Roundabout.
- Construct an overbridge instead of the proposed Eynsham underpass.

**4. Summary of scheme changes**

4.1. The table below shows the changes to the scheme which have been proposed in response to the feedback received during early stakeholder engagement and the recent public engagement exercise.

DESIGN CHANGE/ UPDATE	STATUS	STAKEHOLDER
<b>SHARED PATH / ACTIVE TRAVEL</b>		
<b>All Corridor</b>		
1. All uncontrolled crossings will be raised, coloured / surface differentiated, with warning markings for road users (this applies to all whether priority for shared path or for road users).	Confirmed subsequent of stakeholder engagement*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholders</li> <li>Eynsham Society</li> </ul>
2. Consideration to be given to shared path surfacing throughout. Stakeholder feedback on asphalt being very slippery/dangerous under tree canopy. Leaves, drops, black ice (stays in shade).	To be taken forward in detailed design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eynsham Society</li> </ul>
3. Cycle storage at Bus Stops.	To be taken forward in detailed design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel S/h</li> <li>Eynsham PC</li> <li>Stagecoach</li> </ul>
<b>Barnard Gate to Park and Ride</b>		
4. A40 north side pathway E-W crossing of Barnard Gate Road – road alignment amended for slower vehicle approach to uncontrolled crossing point. Safety improvement.	Design work continuing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholder</li> </ul>
5. N-S Toucan controlled crossing added on eastern arm of Barnard Gate roundabout with pathway link to road to South Leigh.	Design is incorporating. Directly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel S/h</li> <li>Eynsham PC</li> <li>South Leigh PC</li> </ul>
6. Ensure a pathway link from A40 path onto access road at Barnard Gate Farm.	Confirmed as a result of engagement*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholder</li> </ul>
7. PROW link to Barnard Gate road. Unsurfaced connection to be included.	Design to incorporate	OCC PROW team
<b>Park and Ride Junction</b>		
8. Controlled crossings on west and north arms re-aligned to be in-line for easier crossing by cyclists.	Incorporated into GA designs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholder</li> <li>HIF1 team liaison</li> </ul>
<b>Park and Ride bus only eastbound exit</b>		
9. Proposed layout for crossing point now has priority for peds/cycles. Shared use, uncontrolled.	Confirmed subsequent to stakeholder engagement*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholder</li> </ul>
<b>Evenlode Pub</b>		
10. Amend bend out of crossing to ensure max. set back from A40 entrance, without encroaching on Evenlode land.	Confirmed subsequent to stakeholder engagement*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholder</li> </ul>
<b>Witney Road to Lower Road</b>		
11. South side path width to be extended to 3.5m (from previously proposed 3m) to align with OCC active travel standards (Patrick Lingwood) for bus shared path section.	Confirmed subsequent to stakeholder engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OCC Active Travel Lead</li> <li>Active Travel Stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>Various laybys and Public Fuel Station access</b>		
12. Motor traffic has priority on exit from A40, when speeds are higher on mainline. Peds/cycles to have priority on entries to A40, when motor traffic can wait offline.	Confirmed following stakeholder engagement*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>Hanborough Rd</b>		

<b>DESIGN CHANGE/ UPDATE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>STAKEHOLDER</b>
13. Hanborough Rd toucan crossing. Possibility of altering to single stage crossing currently under review.	Under consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholders</li> </ul>
14. Second grade separated crossing at Eynsham (Hanborough Rd -Lower Road area) request to be investigated. Not for HIF2 design.	HIF2 team support any motivation. No action for HIF2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholders</li> <li>Eynsham PC</li> <li>WODC members</li> </ul>
<b>Lower Road Roundabout</b>		
15. Request to re-look at roundabout design yet slow vehicle exit speeds to increase crossing safety.	Design under review with to not drop roundabout capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholders</li> </ul>
16. North side and south side in-line toucan crossings.	Incorporated into GA designs*	
17. A40 west side N-S crossing. Stakeholder request for controlled crossing here.	Design review indicated not feasible. Signage and design to focus on best linking B4449 and Lower Rd at Hanborough Rd crossing point. Separate note to be prepared on this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>BP PFS east of Lower Road</b>		
18. Peds/cycles have priority over motor traffic entering A40 (i.e. vehicles exiting BP)	Confirmed following stakeholder engagement*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active Travel Stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>Apollo Layby</b>		
19. Motor traffic to have priority when exiting A40 (due to speed of traffic) but peds/cycles have priority on entries, as motor vehicles wait offline.	Confirmed	
20. Potential safety issue of right turns to/from A40; not currently banned. Decision needed on whether to ban turning movements	Under review	
<b>Horsemere Lane w/b bus stop and N/S A40 crossing;</b>		
21. New Controlled crossing design in progress.	Design in progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cassington PC</li> <li>Active Travel S/h</li> <li>Stagecoach</li> </ul>
<b>PUBLIC TRANSPORT &amp; GENERAL</b>		
<b>Cassington</b>		
22. Call for local area village traffic calming measures to be taken up within OCC.	HIF2 team support motivation. No immediate action for HIF2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cassington PC</li> </ul>
23. Additional bus stop at Horsemere Lane westbound.	Design in Progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stagecoach</li> <li>OCC Public Transport</li> <li>Cassington PC</li> </ul>

\*Note: These updates/changes were a continuing design effort to improve priority for active travel within the scheme that were progressing within OCC & AECOM prior to latest round of engagement. Recent engagement has supported these changes (Active Travel Stakeholder Group maintain a push for further priority for shared path users within the scheme).