

Draft Local Transport Plan 2011-2030

Summary of comments received

The following are the different points raised in the responses to the draft Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2030. The order of any comment within the list for each chapter should not be taken to denote either its merit or the strength with which that comment was expressed; neither should it be taken that inclusion in this list connotes the acceptance of any comment as being valid by OCC. A full list of the comments, complete with officer response and recommendation, will be published prior to the March 2011 Cabinet Meeting.

General comments

Generally overall for the Plan's strategy but concern that the Plan:

- * is aspirational and doesn't include a realistic action plan;
- * does not consider interests of non-car users fully;
- * should include more proposals for remote park and ride
- * needs to put more emphasis on reducing carbon emissions
- * should address enforcement issue
- * needs to set out mechanisms for local councils to contribute to strategy development and implementation
- * needs to include more on partnership working

Chapter 1 - Our Ambitions

Need more clarity on role of Science Vale in LTP and where it sits with regard to settlement types and preferred scenarios

Chapter 2 - The Challenges

No major issues but support for greater promotion of walking for health and for the environmental impact of actions to be a major determinant of programming.

Chapter 3 - Transport in Oxfordshire

Support for need to make substantive efforts to reduce car use and switch to public transport, active travel, walking and cycling, and the needs of disabled people. Feeling that the aims and objectives of schemes should be clearly set out ahead of implementation; that OCC need to liaise better with neighbouring authorities and support for delegation of some service provision to local communities.

Chapter 4 - Maintenance

There were calls for better management of weather related issues, especially snow clearing and gritting; the move to a whole-life approach to maintenance was supported, albeit that there was some scepticism that this would actually change much in practice. The need for better consultation in the planning of maintenance schemes was highlighted, as was the need to ensure that cyclist and pedestrians were taken into account in the design and execution of schemes. There was support for switching of street lights to reduce light pollution and carbon emissions, provided this did not compromise road safety, and for developing community led schemes programmes.

Chapter 5 - Tackling Congestion

There was a call for major improvements to encourage more people to walk, cycle or use public transport, especially for journeys into Oxford. This includes improvements to these

modes but also discouragement of driving: examples being priority being taken from general traffic at signals, extending controlled parking to include all Oxford inside Ring Road and removal of parking from problem locations such as Abingdon Road. Problems of congestion on A40 and A34 were highlighted but large scale solutions generally not supported. Lorries on minor roads and through villages was also identified as a major problem.

Chapter 6 - Road Safety

Generally a mixed picture with both calls for extensions of 20mph speed limits and removal of Oxford scheme and both support and opposition for moving toward 50mph speed limit on rural roads. No comments were received either way on the acceptability or otherwise of road safety improvements but support was expressed for increased education and publicity. There were also calls for motorcyclists, horse riders and cyclists to be considered more strongly in scheme design and policy.

Chapter 7 - Delivering Accessibility

A wide variety of comments with emphasis on need to take other factors (such as local views or possible safety impact) into account when decisions on bus subsidy are made. There was some doubt expressed as to the ability of the voluntary sector to fill any gaps left by service withdrawals but support for ways to better integrate health, education and social services transport. There was strong opposition to allowing pavement parking to reduce the available footway to less than a minimum amount.

Chapter 8 - Development

There was support for a policy of opposing developments where there was insufficient capacity to accommodate. There were calls for the process of programming developer funded schemes to be more transparent while affordability in negotiations was also mentioned (by a developer). There was a call for us to consider traffic free developments and to look through the whole planning system at how we could meet a long term aim of enabling people to live and work in the same area.

Chapter 9 - Carbon Reduction

There was general support for what we were saying in the draft but a feeling from some quarters that we were not going far enough and that the text needed to be strengthened, particularly with regard to promoting alternatives to the car - although the recognition that the car is likely to remain the major mode was welcomed. Some respondents suggested that the problem may resolve itself in the future with a move toward on-line internet commuting. Strong feeling that we needed to set out how we intended to measure carbon emission and to set out a target for reduction.

Chapter 10 - Reducing Environmental Impacts

There were no major issues raised with this chapter but there was a feeling that the policy needed to be worded more strongly. The impact of traffic and major schemes may have on the AONBs was expressed as was a desire to remove heavy vehicles from unsuitable routes. Support for schemes both to reduce air quality and noise reduction.

Chapter 11 - Public Transport

This section received more comments than any other policy chapter. There was a general feeling that we need to protect the services that we have at the moment and extend them where this is possible. There was a desire to have bus and rail services better integrated and for improved, simpler through ticketing. General support for rail improvements in the county (especially on approaches to main stations) although some concerns with new station at Water Eaton and strongly expressed opposition to HS2. Tram/rail proposals were suggested for Oxford-Witney-Carterton and in Science Vale UK area.

Chapter 12 - Cycling & Walking

Generally provision of additional facilities for cyclists and pedestrians was supported but almost unanimous opposition to shared facilities. There were calls to also give better consideration to equestrian needs and to ensure that all traffic calming was cyclist friendly. There was opposition to the dropping of the dual tier cycle network in Oxford and for cycle networks to be developed and implemented in all the county's towns. Better links to rights of way networks and conversion to "greenways" open to all users were supported.

Chapter 13 - Oxford

Unopposed support for the Eastern Arc proposals including "rapid transit" system though a number of respondents point out that workplace parking reductions can only take place after public transport improvements; a lightweight tram system was also suggested should be investigated for the city centre. There is support for both the expansion of the existing park and ride and the development of further and remote sites together with the development of better public transport into Oxford from the country towns. There were strong calls to set out and implement a coherent cycle strategy for the city although there is less certainty about what this should entail. A cycle hire scheme and a cycle hub were also suggested along with a desire to resolve the problems at the Botley Road railway bridge. There was both support and opposition to schemes in Frideswide Square and at Northern Gateway. Cautious support was given by a few respondents to the idea of road pricing or congestion charging and some others supported introduction of measures to reduce motor traffic across the city.

Chapter 14 - Abingdon

The major issue in Abingdon is support for the opening up of the Lodge Hill junction. There was support for better connections to Radley Station and its promotion as a railhead for the town. A new foot/cycle bridge west of Abingdon Bridge was put forward to help connect with Culham.

Chapter 15 - Banbury

New road links are seen as a priority in Banbury - either the SE Link Roads put forward in the draft or the development of a new motorway junction. Better traffic management in the town was also identified as being required. There was support for developing cycling and walking networks. There were calls for the approaches to the rail station to be improved, along with better bus integration and increased parking. Some comments expressed concerns about parking generally in the town.

Chapter 16 - Bicester

The need for infrastructure to be in place as development came on line was strongly expressed. The other main issues that were brought forward were that ways to deal with Bicester Village traffic needed to be developed; uncertainty over the impact of SW Bicester and eco-town developments; and desire to see a new network of footways and cycleways. Views on a park and ride were mixed, although there was some support expressed for this if it was part of the solution for Bicester Village traffic.

Chapter 17 - Science Vale UK

There was agreement that success of SVUK depended on the correct infrastructure being in place. Little opposition stated to the road schemes put forward but additional suggestions for improvements to A4130/B4016 Abingdon road, the A338 to Frilford lights and A417 through the Hagbournes. There was general support for proposals to provide network of off-road cycle routes and Grove station; mixed views on Milton Height rail

station. There is concern about river crossing capacity north of Didcot with the suggestion of a new bridge to resolve this.

Chapter 18 - Witney

Both support and opposition were expressed to Cogges Link Road, West End link Road 2 and traffic calming in Bridge Street. Some calls for rail reinstatement or light rail connection to Oxford; also support for park and ride at Witney as opposed to Eynsham. The issue of A40 was also commented upon with both dualling and bus lane solutions proposed.

Chapter 19 - Carterton

Support cycle route between Witney and Carterton; review road markings in town centre.

Chapter 20 - Chinnor

Traffic signing was seen as the main issue with a desire that M40-Thame traffic was not signed through village.

Chapter 21 - Chipping Norton

The removal of hgv's from the town is major issue along with the need for additional town centre car parking.

Chapter 22 - Faringdon

Parking issues were raised, along with ability of town to cope with buses and need for investment in cycle facilities.

Chapter 23 - Henley

The need for cycling and better pedestrian facilities was supported; there were also calls for restrictions on hgv movement and delivery in town centre.

Chapter 24 - Kidlington

Some support was put forward for the use of A44/A4095 to bypass village together with call to turn A44 south of Yarnton into a dual carriageway. There was strong opinion expressed that if the new Water Eaton rail station went ahead then this needed to be brought into the bus and cycle network for Kidlington but that this should not mean abandonment of previous Kidlington station proposal.

Chapter 25 - Thame

Support for cycle routes to connect Thame to Wheatley and Haddenham. Car parking is an issue with calls for the introduction of a residents' parking scheme for the town.

Chapter 26 - Wallingford

The need to implement improvements to cycle and pedestrian environment was the main issue raised. Others include cycleways to South Stoke/Goring and Oxford and issues of rat-running and residential parking.

Chapter 27 - Rural Areas

The most commonly expressed view was concerning heavy traffic, usually hgv, on unsuitable roads and through villages - this was mentioned for Woodstock, Burford, The Bartons, Watlington, Wheatley, Islip and Standlake. Pedestrian improvements were suggested at Bablock Hythe and Burford Bridge. The other main issues were the need to protect bus services into the major towns from rural area and improve bus infrastructure outside the towns. There was support for a number of rural cycle schemes including Eynsham-Oxford, Faringdon-Swindon and Woodstock-Hanborough. A number of respondents suggested that improved access to rural rail stations was wanted while there was some support for setting up a number of smaller remote park and rides on main

GI10

routes (Woodstock and Kingston Bagpuize were suggested). There was also support for reducing rural speed limits to 50mph and for 20mph speed limits in villages, with more local control over what is the appropriate limit in an area.