

WITNEY TRANSPORT STRATEGY PHASE 1 - DUCKLINGTON LANE CORRIDOR TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS – PUBLIC CONSULTATION FEEDBACK & TRO OBJECTIONS JULY / AUGUST 2013

Comment No.	Comments	Response
Public consultation feedback		
001	<p>1. This road system will have to cope with greater capacity than is currently the case with new developments already agreed being a new hotel, housing at the old Buttercross site and new housing in Carterton and Downs Hill road. Witney is a prosperous town that continues with its free parking attracting HGVs and general traffic from a wide surrounding area.</p> <p>2. Heavy transport is already a problem and will continue to grow for the reasons above.</p> <p>3. Articulated lorries already cut the corners of the existing junctions as the corners are too tight.</p> <p>4. Traffic lights never seem to be the correct solution as they create queues and clog the flow of traffic.</p> <p>Proposed solution: Bearing in mind the above points would appear that a “root and branch” solution is required – not a patch that will not be capable of a more lasting solution.</p> <p>Consequently creating roundabouts – or better a single roundabout that brings together the Station Lane junction with the slip-road from the A40. This Will mean acquiring additional land whether 1 or 2 roundabouts are created but this is entirely possible it is thought.</p> <p>With the demise of the Cogges Link Road it is essential that</p>	<p>The proposals have been designed to cope with future traffic flows brought about by proposed developments, as included in West Oxfordshire District Council’s draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Initial design work did include the assessment of a roundabout instead of a signal controlled junction, however technical work indicates that an improved traffic signal controlled junction is the most appropriate solution. A roundabout design would not be able to accommodate the predicted future northbound traffic flows without requiring significant land beyond the highway boundary. Going beyond the current highway boundary would increase costs significantly above £2m allocated to this scheme.</p>

	<p>this development be carefully thought through if Witney is to continue to prosper and Ducklington village roads do not turn into a “rat run”.</p>	
002	<p>The plans may improve the Ducklington junction but the Shores Green option needs sorting out now to take the traffic out of Witney in the first place and then find out what needs to be done under new traffic condition</p>	<p>The A40 Shores Green Slip Roads are Phase 3 of the Witney Transport Strategy, as set out in the 19 March Cabinet Report (http://mycouncil.oxfordshire.gov.uk/documents/s20111/CA_MAR1913R23.pdf).</p> <p>Improvements to Ducklington Lane can be implemented before Shores Green or any measures to improve wider traffic flows are put in place. Shores Green Slips are also linked to any development coming forward in east Witney, which would be expected to fund these improvements.</p>
003	<p>First impressions are a well thought out scheme Traffic signals sequencing is vital to its success. Sequencing needs to be reviewed on a regular basis. Maybe install a temporary cctv monitoring system to assist with re-sequencing. Concerned that traffic entering the Ducklington roundabout with the intention of joining the A40 (w'bound) will still get blocked by traffic on roundabout. The Ducklington roundabout is big enough to accommodate a third inside lane for A40 access. Delighted to hear that your traffic flow figures for this junction review include the Shores Green slip road upgrade.</p>	<p>Linking the traffic signals at the Ducklington Lane/A40 Off-slip with signals at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction will help to better coordinate traffic through the whole corridor. This should not only reduce congestion at the junction but will also improve wider traffic movements by reducing the potential for traffic to block back to the Ducklington Lane/A415 roundabout.</p>

		Signal timings will be continually monitored and can be altered fairly quickly if feasible/necessary.
004	Need more than island refuge to access Focus as very difficult to cross road at moment. Improved crossing facilities as Ducklington Lane bus stop are welcome but would prefer bus stop at facility of McDonalds. Perfect time to provide bus layby. Very dangerous to cross A40 slip road as impossible to look both ways at once. Should provide path on both sides of Ducklington Lane.	We have significantly improved pedestrian crossing facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor.
005	The proposed pedestrian and cycle routes leading up to the A40 junction are great. As a cyclist and walker and not a car owner who lives up the hill from Lidl I often walk or cycle to B&Q and Countrywide so some provision for pedestrians and cyclists across Ducklington Lane and Thorney Leys to the informal gap in the hedge/ path into B&Q car park would be helpful for me and numerous people who live nearby as well as people who work in B&Q, Countrywide and the Thorney Leys industrial estate to encourage them to cycle or walk to facilities in Witney rather than drive.	Revised scheme proposals include upgrades to the footway along Thorney Leys (north) linking to the industrial area that includes B&Q, via a new pedestrian island.
006	In general a good plan, combined with Shores Green. Not enough facilities for pedestrians and cyclists access safely to Thorney leys industrial park from Ducklington Lane and Station Lane. I drive there because it is so unpleasant to cycle. Is there any plan to improve the cycle lane on Station Lane across the Emma Dyke Bridge (the suicidal bit where cyclists are forced out onto the road). I assume there is something in place as there is a major new housing development at that point.	Proposals significantly improve pedestrian crossing facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor. Wider pedestrian and cycle improvements, such as along Station Lane, will be considered as part of a longer term strategy.

007	<p>Good: Splitting of the on ramp to the A40 east with a pedestrian island will make crossing safer. A crossing into Thorney Leys business park will improve safety, but it seems a little out of the way for pedestrians. Improving cycle paths is good, but still unsafe for children cycling to school due to its disjointed design. Bad: Cycle access to B&Q is difficult. The paths and crossing are designed for pedestrian use only. The rat run through the service station will continue unless prevented by signs. Making the road system more difficult for cyclists will encourage more cars. Pedestrian/ cycleway is narrow, faces into headlight, leads only to a dangerous junction and then stops.</p>	<p>Revised scheme proposals include upgrades to provide a shared footway-cycleway along Thorney Leys (north) linking to the industrial area that includes B&Q, via a new island. This is considered to be within a reasonable walking distance of the junction.</p> <p>Proposals include a raised kerb on Station Lane to stop vehicles using the service station area as a 'rat-run'.</p>
008	<p>Station Lane from Sainsbury's direction towards Thorney Leys currently difficult. What is correct position for cyclist to travel. Ducklington Lane aiming for B&Q using current cycle lane. The footpath is not wide enough currently to accommodate cyclist and parent with pram. Actual turning is blind due to vegetation. Consider actual position of traffic light posts.</p>	<p>Areas of particular difficulty for cyclists will be examined where they fall within the scheme extent. The on footway segregated cycle lane on Station Lane in the direction towards Sainsburys is for two-way cyclist use. However at the bridge over Emmas Dyke, due to space constraint it becomes an on carriageway one – way cycle lane over the bridge.</p> <p>A controlled pedestrian crossing will be available on the Ducklington (north) arm of the crossroads, which will link to both the segregated facility along Station Lane and a shared use 2m wide cycleway/footway along Thorney Leys. Vegetation will be cut back at the Thorney Leys/Ducklington Lane north west corner to assist cyclists and people</p>

		pushing prams.
009	It might work! There is a cut through from B&Q will you consider this? I was surprised that a Premier Inn was allowed to go ahead causing more traffic!	<p>Revised scheme proposals include upgrades to provide a shared footway-cycleway along Thorney Leys (north) linking to the industrial area that includes B&Q, via a new pedestrian island.</p> <p>The proposals have been designed to cope with future traffic flows brought about by existing and potential developments.</p>
010	Please widen Station Lane eastwards to provide a middle lane designated for vehicles turning right into Avenue one industrial area. This will prevent such traffic blocking Station Lane eastwards while they wait for a gap in the traffic westwards.	This is beyond the scope of the existing scheme, but a survey could be undertaken to quantify the problem of right turning traffic blocking traffic on the through route. This will be examined as part of the final detailed design stage.
011	The three lanes at the traffic lights at junction of Thorney leys/ Station Lane has to be an improvement to the existing situation. It will improve the right turn onto Ducklington Lane providing the view of oncoming traffic. Existing Station Lane turning left onto Ducklington Lane is also improved.	Noted.
012	Definitely seems to be an improvement on what we have at present - the cycle track from Ducklington will be an improvement. Rather concerned about the traffic lights at the A40 slip road - need to be very much synchronised with main cross road. Good luck with it - it has been very bad for too long.	Noted.

	Expect criticism - roundabouts at Downs Road would be a big bonus - will await the result with anticipation - chaos when being done.	
013	Make sure lights are sequenced better and allow enough vehicles through at a time. Are the lanes big enough? A40 east drop off - will this really work?	The proposals have been designed to cope with future traffic flows brought about by existing and potential developments.
014	Not happy with lights on A415 slip road - too close to cross roads.	Linking the traffic signals at the Ducklington Lane/A40 Off-slip with signals at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction will help to better coordinate traffic through the whole corridor. This should not only reduce congestion at the junction but will also improve wider traffic movements by reducing the potential for traffic to block back to the Ducklington Lane/A415 roundabout.
015	Right turns to Tesco please remove. Why waste money making three lanes just put in a right filter. If Downs Road A40 access was sorted out sooner this should decrease the amount of traffic especially the heavy lorries using Thorney Leys Road. Therefore why do you need three lanes? With the development of Coral Springs being approved this is going to increase the amount of cars. noise and pollution and the ever continuous noise of the A40 bypass. So I would think the A40 Downs Road very important. Where it is 30 miles put in slow down signs (on Thorney Leys Road between the first turning and Deer Park roundabout) as cars and lorries do not slow down.	<p>The proposals have been designed to cope with future traffic flows brought about by existing and potential developments. This includes an assessment of the traffic expected to use Ducklington Lane once the west Witney development and the A40 Downs Road junction is in place.</p> <p>The Downs Road junction will be delivered as part of the west Witney</p>

		development.
016	Plans look good from a car users perspective and everyone will welcome relieving congestion in the area. I feel more could be done for cycle users where there is no real areas south of the road. Pedestrian refuges will not accommodate bikes and most users would not want to attempt to cycle such a busy road. I would have hoped for more cycleways so people can access B&Q etc.	Proposals significantly improve pedestrian crossing facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor. Revised scheme proposals include upgrades to provide a shared footway-cycleway along Thorney Leys (north) linking to the industrial area that includes B&Q, via a new pedestrian island.
017	I am curious why a roundabout appears not to be appropriate?	Initial design work did include the assessment of a roundabout instead of a signal controlled junction, however technical work indicates that an improved traffic signal controlled junction is the most appropriate solution. A roundabout design would not be able to accommodate the predicted future northbound traffic flows without requiring significant land beyond the highway boundary. Going beyond the current highway boundary would increase costs significantly above £2m allocated to this scheme.
018	I'm supportive. Anything you can do will be an improvement	Noted.
019	Want improved right turns at junction	All right-turn manoeuvres along

		Ducklington Lane (south) and at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction will be unopposed.
020	Obsession with traffic lights appears to be the policy at the county council when they have a problem. There are too many. Whilst I appreciate space would be used I would suggest a roundabout is the preferred option. It must cost less. It seems odd that the council want to spend £2million on this yet are attempting to save £340,000 on the school transport budget. Two million does not need to be spent here. Please be more inventive and at last try a temporary roundabout.	Initial design work did include the assessment of a roundabout instead of a signal controlled junction, however technical work indicates that an improved traffic signal controlled junction is the most appropriate solution. A roundabout design would not be able to accommodate the predicted future northbound traffic flows without requiring significant land beyond the highway boundary. Going beyond the current highway boundary would increase costs significantly above £2m allocated to this scheme.
021	Hurry and start. Witney needs better roads! East Witney should be the up most priority though.	Noted.
022	I live in Colwell Drive and my house is very close to Ducklington Lane. I am strongly opposed to narrowing the kerb and the pavement on the side of the road near the houses on Colwell Drive. A dual carriageway will reduce my quality of life and that of my neighbours due to increased noise and air pollution. My house will depreciate in value to the point where it will be difficult to sell and I am concerned about the increase in vibrations from passing lorries and the effect it will have on my house. A 2 metre pavement is insufficient for bicycles and	In light of comments received from residents of Colwell Drive, the Ducklington Lane northbound carriageway (which runs parallel to Colwell Drive) is proposed to remain a single lane highway, with a shortened merge lane located just to the north of the junction/adjacent to the Thames Water pumping station. The existing

	<p>pedestrians and needs to be reconsidered. I suggest you widen the road further on the other side of the road where it is not a residential area. I would like the council to consider mine and my neighbours' situation and ask yourselves if you would support a plan to build a dual carriageway two metres from your own houses.</p>	<p>footway and hedge separating Colwell Drive properties from Ducklington Lane will therefore be unaffected.</p>
023	<p>Are there are any plans to stop vehicles from turning right and entering the service station when approaching the traffic lights from town as this causes further hold ups ?</p>	<p>Yes. Kerbing will be used to stop this manoeuvre.</p>
024	<p>One of the worst current issues with the junction is not shown on the proposal, and ought to be added to ensure it is used to validate the eventual detailed design.</p> <p>The right turn from Thorney Leys to Ducklington Lane frequently has long tailbacks, requiring multiple light changes to traverse, and it is often quicker to use a 'rat run' involving taking the left-hand lane across the lights, U-turning at Avenue One, and returning to take a left turn onto Ducklington Lane. This problem has become worse over recent years due to increased industrial traffic from Range Road, and is likely to be exacerbated by the planned residential expansion between Deer Park Road and Curbridge Road, despite the new A40 link in that development.</p> <p>I realise that right filters are to be included on all sides of the new junction, but would like to see this issue stated explicitly in the plan to ensure that any traffic flows are suitably validated.</p>	<p>The proposed junction provides additional highway capacity and removes opposed right turns like the one from Thorney Leys to Ducklington Lane. Traffic modelling has shown that the proposed design reduces congestion and can cope with existing and future traffic flows.</p>
025	<p>An excellent piece of design. Welcomed the cycle route to complete the route from Ducklington Village to the south into the commercial area of Ducklington Lane and the signal control of traffic using the off slip from the A40 eastbound. As a</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>resident of Ducklington, the current congestion is a huge inconvenience for the motorist coming from the south. Much better for the cyclist as the current crossing of the on slip A40 East is a nightmare on a bicycle. No negative comment whatsoever.</p>	
026	<p>Although I objected strongly to OCC's Cogges Link Road proposal, equally I am very strongly in favour of this well thought out proposal for the Ducklington Lane/Station Lane/Thorney Leys/A40 junction system. This is a design which, contrary to earlier modelling, now addresses the entire system and which, through the use of intelligent MOVA-controlled signalling - including the Toucan crossings - should provide the best available solution for this area. Removal of the southern Beechgate access will not, in my opinion, inconvenience residents but will certainly enhance safety. This is an excellent plan - if there are awards available for traffic schemes, this should be given one! Very well done, OCC!</p>	Noted.
027	<p>B&Q are concerned about what disruption may occur during the course of the works and how this might impact upon trade and footfall. Please can every effort be made to minimise disruption and to ensure that access to the B&Q site is kept open during trading hours?</p> <p>Another point of concern is as follows, during such works temporary signals are often used. These often do not have the flexibility to respond to changing circumstances and very different traffic movement patterns say on weekends or Bank Holidays. In my experience the use of temporary signals without careful thought of the actual needs of a junction system can result in terrible congestion. Please can every effort be made to avoid this?</p>	<p>The junction will be open during road works, and although there will inevitably be some delay this will be kept to a minimum through appropriate traffic management and advance warning of any works.</p>

	Finally B&Q's key trading period is the spring and early summer. I accept that you have many competing demands to juggle but if the disruptive works near B&Q could be avoided during spring 2014 we would be grateful.	
028	Please can we have safe provision for cyclists. Lots of people will only use bicycles if the cycle paths are joined up and safe. Let's have Witney as a leader in safe cycling in market towns.	Proposals significantly improve pedestrian crossing facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor.
029	Make the proposed pedestrian crossing on Thorney Leys Road into a Zebra Crossing with the proposed refuge island. A Zebra Crossing will be safer for pedestrians than an unmarked crossing.	The provision of a zebra crossing could be examined but an uncontrolled facility is appropriate for the demand.
030	My first choice for the Ducklington Lane/Station Road junction would have been a large signal-controlled roundabout. Since lack of space makes that impossible, the traffic light system proposed looks practicable, provided the conflicts of priority at the present junction are avoided. I urge you to implement the phasing pattern in which traffic on three of the four roads is halted and all traffic from the fourth proceeds, whether it is going straight on or turning right or left. I have seen this work extremely well, and it completely eliminates any source of doubt or error.	Noted.
031	I am concerned that the Ducklington Lane proposals do not include enough provision for safe cycling along key routes. Currently the bike journey from my home in Cogges to B&Q is offputtingly scary and I don't see any evidence that the route will be any less frightening under the new proposals. It's great	Proposals significantly improve pedestrian crossing facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor.

	<p>to see a segregated cycleway along part of the route, but pockets of safety are not enough. Most people need to be guaranteed a safe route for the whole of their journey before they will consider leaving the car at home and cycling for that journey. It seems to me that you have prioritised speeding up car traffic without thinking of any incentives for people to leave the car at home and walk or cycle.</p> <p>Great to see improved pedestrian crossings but it's obvious you have prioritised the convenience of motorists over the convenience (and, more importantly, safety) of other road users. Please rethink with viable, safe cycling and walking routes in mind.</p>	
032	I support the proposal provided the traffic light phasing is in line with the traffic movements which are time of day dependant.	Noted.
033	There needs to be more consistent provision of access for bicycles. It's good to see some provision, but to encourage everyday cycling in Witney, cyclists need to be able to get all the way to where they're going safely. In these plans, access to Thorney Leys Business Park and Station Lane Avenue One is only by road or footpath. I think these proposals will make car drivers even less tolerant of cyclists using Thorney Leys Road, because there are more cycle paths - but that means that when the cycle path stops suddenly, as these do, the cyclists are tipped out into the road.	Proposals significantly improve pedestrian crossing facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor.
034	I use the Ducklington junction as a cyclist sometimes, to get to B&Q. It's a miserable experience; but these proposals are just guaranteed to make it more miserable. Not only is the council incorrect to suggest that no cyclists use the junction, but by these proposals they will worsen this	Proposals significantly improve pedestrian crossing facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor.

	<p>undesirable situation, by making it an even more miserable experience!</p> <p>How will I cycle to Thorney Leys Business Park (e.g. B&Q) safely and legally, with only a footpath?</p> <p>How will I cycle to Avenue One businesses (e.g. Screwfix), with only a footpath?</p> <p>Will crossings be toucan (bikes and pedestrians) and not just pelican?</p> <p>Why is there no joined-up cycle route?</p> <p>Currently, it feels like car drivers were considered the priority in this scheme, with cyclists bolted on afterwards. This seems like madness when cyclists are more beneficial both socially and economically to Witney, AND use the junction: it just move us from one unsustainable junction to another!</p> <p>Each cyclist lost is an extra car!</p>	<p>The revised scheme proposals include upgrades to provide a shared footway-cycleway along Thorney Leys (north) linking to the industrial area that includes B&Q, via a new pedestrian island.</p>
035	<p>As a cyclist who use's cycle path's in this area ,the change of use from a segregated/cycle lane to a share facility on the colwell drive side of ducklington lane is a silly idea as the trees and bushes are often left to grow over the path .there doesn't seem to be enough room in the area to fit all the new lanes proposed without make the footpaths really narrow. also the loss of the footpath on the b and q side of thorny leys road will mean that anybody wishing to get to thorny leys industrial park,coming from ducklington or station lane, will have to cross 3 roads, when at the moment they only have to cross 1.also there doesn't seem to be any improvement in the exit from Tesco/mcdonalds/lidl's, why don't these changes include the entrance to the new premier inn.</p>	<p>The existing segregated pedestrian-cycle lane on Ducklington Lane north will be retained.</p> <p>The revised scheme proposals include upgrades to provide a shared footway-cycleway along Thorney Leys (north) linking to the industrial area that includes B&Q, via a new pedestrian refuge island.</p>
036	<p>Generally, the proposals look sensible, although putting traffic lights at the A40 slip-road risks shifting the problem back to the</p>	<p>Linking the traffic signals at the Ducklington Lane/A40 Off-slip with</p>

	<p>Ducklington roundabout, which even now often has a queue around it in the morning rush hour. The key to success must be the phasing of the main lights. Just putting right turn lanes will not help unless right filters are included.</p> <p>One bad aspect is the proposal to narrow the eastbound A40 slip road to a single lane before joining the main carriageway. A common policy nationwide nowadays, this is a recipe for accidents. Many slow HGVs use this access, and they have frequently not reached 40MPH at the top. Forcing other road vehicles to sit behind them in a single lane will hugely reduce the speed they can reach at junction, meaning that more traffic will have to join the main road at well below the speed of the flow - and frustration leads to dangerous manoeuvring joining fast moving traffic.</p>	<p>signals at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction will help to better coordinate traffic through the whole corridor. This should not only reduce congestion at the junction but will also improve wider traffic movements by reducing the potential for traffic to block back to the Ducklington Lane/A415 roundabout.</p>
037	<p>I support the proposed improvements to the junctions at Ducklington Lane and the A40. Is it worth investigating if further traffic flow improvements can be made by having peak time signal control access on to the roundabout from the A415 linked to the traffic signals at the Ducklington Lane junction to create further gaps in the traffic or to allow traffic through the roundabout from the A415 quicker if there is little traffic coming onto the junction from the A40 either East or West bound.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The existing modelling shows that the proposed traffic signal arrangement will operate satisfactorily, but measures such as this can be looked at in future years prior to the design life of the proposals being reached.</p>
038	<p>It has been said that it is too expensive to build 4 slip roads onto the A40 Witney bypass at Downs road and that a roundabout is the cheaper option. It may be cheaper but it will cause chaos during the construction and when it is built. We will have a repeat of the Eynsham roundabout that causes delays every day. Nobody</p>	<p>Comments refer to the proposed Downs Road roundabout junction, which is outside the scope of the Ducklington Lane consultation.</p>

	<p>would dream of putting a roundabout on the A34 dual carriage way so why do it on the Witney bypass?</p> <p>There is a 3rd option that would be cheaper to construct and less disruptive when built. Build just 2 slip roads going to/ from Oxford. The bridge is already there. Traffic may go to & from Burford via the old A40 (B4047) the same as they currently do. I don't think that this has been publicised enough because everyone I have spoken to didn't have a clue about the proposal and are completely against it.</p> <p>The traffic queue that is from Oxford to Witney the majority of the time would be extended to the Downs Road.</p> <p>A roundabout is definitely the wrong decision.</p>	
039	<p>I feel the proposal makes things worse for cyclists and pedestrians and will not encourage more cyclists to cycle all the way around and through Witney. I do not own a car and go everywhere by bike and quite often go to the B&Q store and Countrywide, this is often a time consuming and frightening experience that is only going to get worse with the increased volume of traffic and the little infrastructure there is for cycling being scaled down. There is a proposal to have an island crossing near to the entrance to that industrial estate but I for one do not like the idea of standing in the middle of a busy road waiting for a spot to cross. I was told there wasn't much pedestrian and cycling over to B&Q but I dispute this as there is a well-worn path through the hedgerow on either side contradicting that statement. I was told also at the consultation that compromises need to be made but the only groups compromising are the most vulnerable road users and that is not acceptable.</p>	<p>Proposals significantly improve pedestrian and cycle facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor.</p>
040	<p>The proposal for improvements to the Ducklington/Station Lane</p>	<p>A balance must be struck for all users</p>

	<p>junction do not meet the objectives of OCC's Local Transport Plan for Witney. That's a worry. WitneyBUG put a lot of effort into contributing to the LTP which covers the same time period as the design brief for this part of the transport network. How was this project assessed against the LTP?</p> <p>OCC funds annually the Oxfordshire Travel Challenge targeting businesses and the commuting habits of employees in the county. Currently there are no legal, safe, convenient cycle routes to: Thorney Leys Business Park; Avenue One, Station Lane; Countrywide off the Ducklington Roundabout. Why is one part of OCC funding this initiative and another part ignoring a golden opportunity to make cycling a practical travel solution for employees on these sites?</p> <p>I have other specific issues, e.g. proposing a Pelican crossing on a cycle route instead of a Toucan, but only have 1000 characters to respond.</p> <p>Given the constraints, which I imagine I'll have no influence over at this stage, people working and shopping in this area who are being encouraged by OCC and WODC to switch to bikes will need the following as a minimum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shared use path and a suitable crossing from the northern arm of the DL/SL junction into Thorney Leys Business Park. I think you mentioned 2m was an achievable width. • A toucan crossing across the northern arm of the junction rather than a Pelican. No 'Cyclist Dismount' signs please. • A shared use path from the junction along the southern side of Station Lane to allow access to Avenue One. • A shared use path from one of the cycle paths around Ducklington roundabout to give access to Countrywide. 	<p>within the scope of this scheme. Proposals significantly improve pedestrian and cycle facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor – see revised scheme plan at Annex 5.</p> <p>The proposals are in line with the Local Transport Plan objectives for Witney.</p> <p>These suggestions are noted. Some are beyond the scope of the current scheme, some have been considered and ruled out already, and some will be examined as part of the final detailed design stage.</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dropped kerbs where appropriate. 	
041	<p>Why persist with traffic lights when a far more user friendly option is a roundabout. traffic lights slow down the movement of traffic considerably. how often have you been held up by traffic lights when there has been no traffic from opposing directions. the introduction of a second set of lights to allow vehicles to exit the A40 will further slow down traffic flow. if a roundabout was introduced at the junction and all traffic exiting the A40 was permitted to turn left only then use the roundabout, which is less than 50 metres away, to turn towards Ducklington. traffic lights permit traffic to cross paths which is an unnecessary hazard. this does not occur with roundabouts. why improve pedestrian crossing facilities on station lane and ducklington north. this access is required also on thorney leys and ducklington lane south. please consider pedestrian crossing at these points also.</p>	<p>Initial design work did include the assessment of a roundabout instead of a signal controlled junction, however technical work indicates that an improved traffic signal controlled junction is the most appropriate solution. A roundabout design would not be able to accommodate the predicted future northbound traffic flows without requiring significant land beyond the highway boundary. Going beyond the current highway boundary would increase costs significantly above £2m allocated to this scheme.</p>
042	<p>I agree with most of the proposals to improve this busy junction for the expected increase in traffic, except for one aspect. The north (off slip) leaving the A40 and joining Ducklington Lane should be closed and repositioned. The logical solution would be to move it further back to merge with Thorny Leighs where the road almost runs parallel to the A40. A roundabout could be made to allow traffic to enter Thorny Leighs in both directions and any traffic wishing to travel into Witney or turn right towards Standlake, can use the new improved junction at Ducklington Lane.</p> <p>Perhaps a simpler and more cost effective solution would be to build an off slip for Witney to merge with the Curbridge Road and use the existing roundabout to enter Thorney Leighs for Witney and Standlake.</p>	<p>This suggestion is beyond the scope of this scheme.</p>

	If traffic lights are installed to allow vehicles leaving the existing slip it will cause more tailbacks for traffic, negating improvements to the wider junction.	
043	<p>What is the fascination with traffic lights in OXON and particularly in Witney. The only queues formed in Witney are caused by the traffic lights, rarely any queues at any of the roundabouts. At the lower end of Deer Park Road there is a roundabout where I rarely have to queue, it is quite busy but the traffic moves freely. Less than half a mile up the road there are traffic lights at Range Road where I regularly queue just to let one vehicle out, its not very busy. The same is said at the top of Deer Park where this meets Burford Road, more traffic lights more queues. To the East of this where Burford Road has a mini-roundaout with Tower Hill, NO queues. The main roundabout at Ducklington Lane copes very well and has NO ongoing maintenance or cost once constructed. Please review your plans to include a roundabout for the westbound carriageway slip roads, there is a large area which can accommodate this. Also a large roundabout at Thorney Leys junction, once built no maintenance.</p>	<p>Initial design work did include the assessment of a roundabout instead of a signal controlled junction, however technical work indicates that an improved traffic signal controlled junction is the most appropriate solution. A roundabout design would not be able to accommodate the predicted future northbound traffic flows without requiring significant land beyond the highway boundary. Going beyond the current highway boundary would increase costs significantly above £2m allocated to this scheme.</p>
044	<p>What is the fascination with traffic lights in OXON and in particular Witney. Lower end of Deer Park Road has a roundabout, very busy, NO QUEUES. Further up at Range Road, traffic lights, regular queues, , Deer Park Road to Burford Road junction more traffic lights more queues. Burford Road to Tower Hill, miniroundaout, NO QUEUES. Once built a roundabout is vitally maintenance free. Traffic Lights need to be powered constantly and with regular maintenance. The is considerable room for a roundabout to serve both the westbound sliproads to the A40. There is also room , with</p>	<p>Initial design work did include the assessment of a roundabout instead of a signal controlled junction, however technical work indicates that an improved traffic signal controlled junction is the most appropriate solution. A roundabout design would not be able to accommodate the predicted future northbound traffic flows without requiring significant land beyond the highway</p>

	<p>imagination to for a roundabout at the Thorney Leys junction. Please start to think outside the confines of traffic lights solve everything, they do not. Let traffic flow, with suitable calming measures and it WILL move without the need for traffic lights.</p>	<p>boundary. Going beyond the current highway boundary would increase costs significantly above £2m allocated to this scheme.</p>
045	<p>As a resident directly affected by your plans to change the road set up in Ducklington Lane, Witney, please find my observations and objections set out below.</p> <p>Your plan to remove the screening at the rear of the resident's properties provided by natural vegetation bringing road traffic closer to our homes will cause the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stacking of traffic will only increase the "fume plume". 2. Increased noise from engines and radios. 3. Increased dust and rain spray. 4. Increased road "vibration" due to the road being moved closer to our homes. 5. Loss of privacy as people will be able to see over our fences. 6. Loss of natural habitat for wildlife which must be protected. 7. Safety issue caused by closer proximity of the road to local gardens which could result in serious injury if vehicles collide with our properties. This has happened previously when the verge was wider. <p>All of the above WILL occur if you continue with your plans to widen the highway AND remove the natural vegetation screen put up on the advice of Colin Carritt, former Area Engineer at OCC. This was agreed when planning permission was given to build the TESCO Express/petrol station and McDonalds opposite our homes some years ago.</p>	<p>The proposals have been designed to cope with future traffic flows brought about by existing and potential developments.</p> <p>In light of comments received from residents of Colwell Drive, the Ducklington Lane northbound carriageway (which runs parallel to Colwell Drive) is proposed to remain a single lane highway, with a shortened merge lane located just to the north of the junction/adjacent to the Thames Water pumping station. The existing footway and hedge separating Colwell Drive properties from Ducklington Lane will therefore be unaffected.</p>

	<p>It would appear that your plans will now remove that vital protection our community has had from the residue of the traffic to allow you to complete your work. As yet we have had no visits from any of your engineers to ascertain the impact on the community. We feel that our rights are being overlooked to allow you to achieve your plans which you appear determined to force upon the local community.</p> <p>The residents of this community see no benefit of putting an extra lane of traffic behind our homes towards Welch Way as there is never build-up of vehicles going in that direction.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that our homes will be blighted as a result of these “improvements”. The values will fall and as yet we have not been offered any compensation, whether this involves window replacement (to cut down on traffic noise), financial recompense or strengthening/heightening of the boundary fences to alleviate the problems we WILL now face.</p> <p>Following conversations with neighbours whose boundary adjacent to the road, there is a general consensus that these changes are not needed and if given the go ahead will be at the detriment of this community. Please accept this letter as a representative view of myself and that [of the] local community.</p>	
046	<p>Your proposals are a terrible idea. As a resident whose property backs on to Ducklington Lane & having resided in Witney for over 45 years I can speak with expert knowledge of this junction. This junction worked perfectly well when there was a roundabout there with no traffic signals. The problems with this junction are: 1) These lights are the most dangerous I have seen anywhere on my travels & I do extensive mileage. If</p>	<p>In light of comments received from residents of Colwell Drive, the Ducklington Lane northbound carriageway (which runs parallel to Colwell Drive) is proposed to remain a single lane highway, with a shortened merge lane located just to the north of</p>

	<p>you are turning right coming from Station Lane or turning right coming from Thorney Leys you are stuck in the middle of the road your view completely obstructed even worse when a large vehicle is waiting to turn you cannot see oncoming traffic which travels at a speed to get through the lights. As a result many head on accidents have occurred. I have also had the frightening experience of being stuck in the middle as an ambulance went though the lights on red & then the lights changed leaving me stranded.</p> <p>2) The air pollution & noise here for residents is intolerable the extra lanes of traffic you wish to create will make matter worse.</p> <p>3) The beet & most sensible solution to this junction would be to keep the traffic constantly moving by putting back a roundabout. There is a roundabout at the other end of Thorney Leys & at the Witney end of Ducklington Lane. There are never any hold ups there the main reason being there are no traffic lights. There is plenty of room for a roundabout to be constructed & it would be far cheaper than your proposal, perhaps you could consult B&Q to see if they would like an entrance from any proposed new roundabout here in which case some of their land adjacent to the junction could be utilised to make the junction bigger. As I previously stated there was a roundabout here before. It was much safer & kept traffic flowing. Your proposals mean same old traffic lights = same old queues, same dangerous blind turning. Extra lanes = more queuing traffic, more noise, from vehicles & drivers stereos. More air pollution created for the long suffering residents. On numerous occasions here when the traffic lights have not been working the traffic has flowed freely. A new roundabout without lights with a pelican crossing in Station Road adjacent to the TESCO garage is the only sensible option re safety & cost.</p>	<p>the junction/adjacent to the Thames Water pumping station. The existing footway and hedge separating Colwell Drive properties from Ducklington Lane will therefore be unaffected.</p> <p>Initial design work did include the assessment of a roundabout instead of a signal controlled junction, however technical work indicates that an improved traffic signal controlled junction is the most appropriate solution. A roundabout design would not be able to accommodate the predicted future northbound traffic flows without requiring significant land beyond the highway boundary. Going beyond the current highway boundary would increase costs significantly above £2m allocated to this scheme.</p>
--	--	--

047	<p>We act on behalf of the East Witney Consortium, who are promoting land at east Witney for residential development and related supporting community infrastructure. The draft Local Plan (October 2012) proposes about 300 new dwellings at east Witney, alongside upgrading of the A40 Shores Green junction.</p> <p>The East Witney Consortium is concerned about viability of the current Local Plan proposals, with the scale of development proposed by the Council at east Witney, unable to fund the A40 Shores Green junction upgrade and other on and off-site infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>It is our understanding that West Oxfordshire District Council is currently considering the advice of Aspinall Verdi on viability of the Local Plan proposals as a whole, as well as the viability of the strategic development areas. The District Council are also giving consideration to their approach to introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>It is in the above context that we welcome the form of the proposed improvements to Ducklington Lane. We note that the proposals no longer provide for a new roundabout, with proposals set out in the consultation material a lower cost solution than previously promoted by the County Council. We assume that the County Council has remodelled the traffic flows in the area following demise of the Cogges Link Road and have concluded that the three pieces of proposed infrastructure (Shores Green Slip Roads, Down;s Road Roundabout and Ducklington Lane signals)along with improvements to Bridge Street, will be capable of accommodating the planned new housing development in the town.</p> <p>Indeed, the works proposed to Ducklington Lane are very</p>	<p>The proposals have been designed to cope with future traffic flows brought about by existing and potential developments</p>
-----	--	--

	<p>similar to those put forward by th East Witney Lane Consortium at the CPO Inquiry on the Cogges Link Road (refer document MT2/1).</p> <p>The lower cost of the improvements to Ducklington Lane are supported by the East Witney Land Consortium, as they will help lower the overall cost of infrastructure delivery in Witney. All things being equal, this should assist with ensuring that the West Oxfordshire Local Plan is viable and deliverable, with the money that would have been spent on more costly improvements to Ducklington Lane – now being available for other transport infrastructure in the town.</p>	
048	<p>The creation of 2 lanes northbound on Ducklington Lane will encourage speeding in a 30mph zone, and the first thing to slow them will be the pedestrian crossing from Burwell Farm. This will make the crossing even more dangerous with drivers currently not concentrating due to mobile phones or looking elsewhere or ignoring the lights completely, but now the added hazard of driver speeding to pass those driving at the legal speed and missing the lights altogether.</p> <p>Also the 2 lanes converge whet ether entrance to the new Premier Inn is, creating yet another hazard for drivers turning right into the hotel.</p> <p>So why not converge the lanes closer to the cross road similar to Station Lane, or not have the 2 lanes at all.</p>	<p>The road will now merge closer to the Ducklington junction without the provision of the two lanes. This means the road will be less open in this vicinity and therefore traffic speeds are not likely to exceed the existing situation.</p>
049	<p>I warmly support the proposals. I am a frequent cyclist, driver and walker along Thorney Leys to Ducklington Lane, and onward in each of these directions.</p>	<p>Proposals significantly improve pedestrian and cycle facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane /</p>

	<p>The provision of filtered lights from Thorney Leys to Ducklington Lane south is important. At present drivers are tempted to cross late on an amber signal to keep the flow going.</p> <p>It would be good to provide officially a cycle track off road from Burwell Meadows to Ducklington Lane. At present many people cycle on what is legally, no doubt, a footpath, for they sense of safety. To provide a reserved cycle lane on this road would probably hinder traffic, and still be dangerous for cyclists, as it is very busy. A separate cycle track would then link up with the cycle/pedestrian lanes on Ducklington Lane going north.</p> <p>I warmly support the making of an island at the entrance to the A40 eastbound on Ducklington Lane. This will be made safer for pedestrians and cyclists as will, as they look out for traffic coming into that entrance from both directions.</p>	<p>Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor.</p> <p>A cycle track from Burwell to Ducklington is beyond the scope of this scheme, but the suggestion is noted.</p>
050	<p>I welcome and support the plans, not least because I use this route frequently, walking and cycling or in a car.</p> <p>I appreciate the proposed R-H turn from Thorney Leys into Ducklington Lane to reduce the potential of accidents, and encouraging drivers to keep the law.</p> <p>I welcome the proposal to make an island at the entrance: a) to the A40 Eastward on Ducklington Lane to help cyclists cross that junction, and vehicles to have clearer picture of what they can do; b) to make access from the A40 on the slip-road onto Ducklington Lane easier (traffic lights).</p> <p>As a cyclists it is uncomfortable now going down Thorney Leys to the traffic lights junction with Ducklington Lane; please can some provision be made to make it safer, as it is on</p>	<p>Proposals significantly improve pedestrian and cycle facilities at the Ducklington Lane / Station Lane / Thorney Leys junction and through the corridor.</p>

	<p>Ducklington Lane going towards the town centre (past McDonalds etc.). Thank you to those who gave up their time for the consultation, as well as preparing the relevant plans.</p> <p>P.s. what is happening to Station Lane, where new building is taking place, and cyclists have to ride against the traffic by Gordon Way, it can be hair-raising, unless you can use the pavement.</p>	
Responses to TRO consultation		
001	<p>The 27 signatory petition (copied at the end of this Annex) was submitted alongside this letter.</p> <p>I have been a resident at Beechgate for c. 15 years, and, for the past 2 years have provided a single Private Hire Taxi service.</p> <p>I probably use the exit(s) from Beechgate more than any other driver. Having studied your plans, I can honestly say they are seriously flawed.</p> <p>The current exit from Beechgate towards Witney town centre (turning right) can be very difficult during busy periods as you can sit there for several minutes having to rely on drivers on Ducklington Lane to let you in. Sometimes it is necessary to move out across the south facing carriageway, briefly, to take advantage of the short delay between traffic light changes at the Station Lane junction. At peak times, inexperienced drivers may sit at the exit for 5 to 10 minutes! The proposed yellow box will not help at all.</p>	<p>See revised scheme plan for changes to the Beechgate southern access. A new TRO will be consulted on before the end of the calendar year.</p>

	<p>This leads to the 2nd problem. There is insufficient room at the exit from Beechgate for two vehicles side-by-side and so any delays for those turning right will hold up anyone turning left towards the A40 even though there would be an opportunity at traffic light changes.</p> <p>Therefore, your plan to block off the “southern junction” is very, very ill thought out! That slip road can provide a way out at busy times.</p> <p>Some vehicles, who maybe have decided to change course, turn around before the traffic lights, and often will turn into the slip road by Beechgate and will use the slip road to exit at the southern end.</p> <p>Creating a signalised junction at the “A40 off-slip” will achieve minimal results to help traffic flow. Yes it will allow a few more vehicles to exit the A40 slip-road but it will seriously reduce flow from/to the existing traffic lights. Maybe during the weekday peak hours only it would let a few vehicles turn right? Or, perhaps, a slightly longer period before current traffic light changes would help? I assume that the black blobs on the map are “speed humps”? The only valid use for them would be from Ducklington roundabout towards Witney; some drivers speed which makes it more difficult for those existing the A40 slip. The many proposed speed bumps on southerly side are not a good idea.</p> <p>The real problem is at the existing traffic lights.</p> <p>The “extra” lanes, approaching that junction occur too late to help cope with peak time traffic. (it is a common theme in this area – Witan Way – and beyond e.g. Wolvercote roundabout from Eynsham).</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Turning right from Thorney Leys into Ducklington Lane can be dangerous for those who don't understand the system – probably the main cause of traffic incidents at the junction.</p> <p>Station Lane “ring road” is a joke! It is too narrow; there should be a Right Turn centre facility to ALL Avenues into the business areas not just ONE.</p> <p>With addition of traffic from the new Buttercross housing development added to the new Premier Inn Hotel in Ducklington Lane and traffic flow will be ever worsening.</p> <p>Bluntly speaking, it seems to me that the County Council should appoint a group of local professional drivers to sit in to meetings prior to plans for road layout changes being raised and issued.</p> <p>I am sure that many problems could be ironed out at an early stage.</p> <p>The original roundabout at Station Lane/Ducklington Lane junction was a disaster; too difficult for large delivery lorries to negotiate. Let's not make things worse again.</p>	
002	<p>We park at our property, a long wheel based Ford Transit & a 20 by 9 metre kebab bar. We operate this business in Oxford City under local govt. license – street trading consent consent 13/00651/street. If the southern exit to the A415 is closed we will <u>not</u> be able to get the van & trailer down the service road & around the corner, when rolling out into Ducklington Lane. The van at present needs to pull into the centre of the A415 road to get the trailer round via the south exit of the service road. This would not be possible at the north end of the service road, due to the north bound vehicles on the A415 waiting to turn right into Station Lane.</p>	<p>See revised scheme plan for changes to the Beechgate southern access. A new TRO will be consulted on before the end of the calendar year.</p>

	<p>There is not enough time currently between traffic light changes to get out either left or right, from the service road, and drivers currently have very little respect for current yellow cross hatching. This does generally feel to be a proposed improvement, in fact, being a generally retrograde step. With the southern exit closed, it will not be possible to park the vehicle on our property, as the total length makes it not possible to reverse into the drive – it currently turns into the south entrance and reverses along the service road.</p>	
003	<p>Having received your plan of improvements and visited the exhibition, we have the following objections to your proposals:</p> <p>Your proposed closure of the southern entrance into the service road, because you say it is used as a 'rat run' from the slip-road, (although having lived here for over 25 years we have never experienced this), will not be necessary if you are making the slip road a signalised junction.</p> <p>This proposed closure will disadvantage the nine properties that use this junction on a regular basis for entry and exit onto Ducklington Lane. We cannot see how we will be able to turn right towards Witney, out of Beechgate junction. We will be forced to turn left and go round the Ducklington roundabout to go back into Witney.</p> <p>The properties, April Cottage and Willow Lodge have large vehicles using the southern Beechgate junction several times a day and due to the proposed configuration of the service road, they would find it extremely difficult to negotiate the entrance and exit at the northern Beechgate junction.</p>	<p>See revised scheme plan for changes to the Beechgate southern access. A new TRO will be consulted on before the end of the calendar year.</p>

	<p>Another neighbour in Anmar Lodge has a kebab van and trailer; he also would find it difficult to negotiate this entrance and exit. This is his business and he has regular deliveries to his property using this southern entrance.</p> <p>Surely if you abandon the proposed closure of our service road it will save you money and not disadvantage the people who live in the nine properties affected.</p> <p>Finally, we were promised the report of the survey that 'proved' our service road was a 'rat run'. To this data we have not received it.</p>	
004	<p>Covering letter received sent to Beechgate residents:</p> <p>Dear neighbour, We refer to OCC letter dated 3 July 2013, which we assume you have received? Apparently, this plan was approved by OCC (WODC?) on 20 March 2013. To the best of our knowledge, no approach has ever been made to affected residents, prior to approval. Our initial thoughts would be the increased traffic from past the top of the lane serving April Cottage and Willow Lodge, which have high dependency residents, and rely on speedy access for ambulances and other emergency vehicles. The collection of waste by WODC contractors will also be severely impacted, as there will no longer be space for the occupants of the lane to put out their dozen or so bins and large dumpsters. Exiting the lane via the roundabout at Beechgate; already quite difficult, as the filter traffic lights at Station Lane currently barely allow a space in the traffic to exit the service road now; will deteriorate greatly, with only one service road exit.</p>	<p>See revised scheme plan for changes to the Beechgate southern access. A new TRO will be consulted on before the end of the calendar year.</p>

	You may also wish to ensure that your line management at the Camden Society and Ridgeway Partnership are fully appraised, in view of OCC deadline of 9 August.	
005 Thames Valley Police	<p>Documents with plans have been supplied. The proposal will improve safer access to the development away from the A40 slip road. The yellow box feature is noted across the road access on the north side which will be a low priority for enforcement. I have visited the site and noted reasonably good passive compliance with other features and the layout in that vicinity.</p> <p>Thames Valley Police have no further comment or objections to the closure order.</p>	Noted.

Continued overleaf...

Petition with signatures received alongside response 001 to the TRO consultation:

I wish to concur with Mr Gibbon's objections to the proposed plans:
Traffic/AMG/Ducklington

NAME	PLAT NO.	SIGNATURE
MR + MRS P. DEAN	39 BEECHGATE	P. Dean
Mr + Dr M. GRAY	43 BEECHGATE	M. Gray
Mr Mrs V. I. HALIZ	14 BEECHGATE	V. I. Haliz
RACHEL WHEELER	6 STONEGABLES	R. Wheeler
DAVID THOMAS	26 BEECHGATE	D. Thomas
DAVID MACFARLANE	32 BEECHGATE	D. MacFarlane
MRS W. PRICE	33 BEECHGATE	W. Price
Mr + Mrs MORRIS	31 BEECHGATE	Morris
Mr Worthy	34 Beechgate	Worthy
MISS Sophie Rabson	3 Stonegables	Sophie Rabson
JASON TUNNICLIFFE	8 STONEGABLES	J. Tunnicliffe
IAN DEWAR	3 Beechgate	I. Dewar
Ann-marie Quarterman	8 Beechgate	A. Quarterman
Kirsten Curry	4 Beechgate	K. Curry
CELIA CASSIDY	19 BEECHGATE	C. Cassidy
Lristia Bowers-Reading	27 Beechgate	L. Bowers-Reading
MR. N. DRAKE	28 BEECHGATE	N. Drake
M. R. Low-Jack	14A Beechgate	M. R. Low-Jack
E. machinwong, 30	29 Beechgate	E. Machinwong
A O'Meara	23 BEECHGATE	A. O'Meara
A BELLO	30 Beechgate	A. Bello
Mr - Mrs Bento	18 Beechgate	Bento
M. WOJNOWSKI	37 Beechgate	M. Wojnowski
P. Covel	41 BEECHGATE	P. Covel
LUISA VARRIALE	44 BEECHGATES	L. Varriale
Traffic/AMG/Ducklington		

Page 3 of 5.

NAME	FLAT NO	SIGNATURE
ERT BURNS	40 BEECHGATE	CT
MACIEJ KOZLOWSKI	22 BEECHGATE	Maciej Kozlowski
TRAFFIC/AMC/Ducklington		