



Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Environment (including Transport) Thursday, 21 January 2021

ADDENDA

Annex 4 – Analysis by External Consultants of the Email/Free Text Responses – Attached.

Amendment to paragraph 38 (bold Italics)

38.A number of respondents in Don Bosco Close expressed the preference that they would prefer to exit via Temple Road rather than Crescent Road, by moving the filter in Junction Road from just north of Temple Road to just north of ~~Salesian House entry~~ **Temple Cloisters**. This does not affect any other roads. It was considered that this would be an advantage for two reasons. The filter would no longer be on a steep hill removing the potential for cyclists crashing into the filter and secondly it would provide the opportunity for a traffic-free parklet between Crescent Road and Salesian House. It is therefore recommended that the Temple Cowley LTN design is altered to accommodate these requests.

Amended Recommendation (Bold Italics)

The Cabinet Member for Environment is RECOMMENDED to

- a. note the responses received to the preliminary consultation on the Cowley Low Traffic Neighbourhoods
- b. approve proposals as consulted on for the introduction of traffic management measures in the Church Cowley, Temple Cowley and Florence Park areas in Oxford to create Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, including the introduction of Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders giving effect to the proposed modal filters within the LTNs, and associated waiting restrictions.
- c. approve minor changes from the consultation proposals in the light of consultation responses, namely:
 - i.* To relocate the filter in Junction Road from south of Don Bosco Close to north of ~~Salesian Gardens entry~~ **Temple Cloisters**
 - ii.* To permit taxis and private hire vehicles through the traffic filters which permit buses in Cornwallis Road and Bartholomew Road




This page is intentionally left blank

Prepared for:



Consultation Report:

Low traffic Neighbourhoods
(LTNs) in Cowley.



January 2021

Alasdair Gleed, Research Director
agleed@djsresearch.com

Head office: 3 Pavilion Lane, Strines,
Stockport, Cheshire, SK6 7GH

Leeds office: 2 St. David's Court,
David Street, Leeds, LS11 5QA

+44 (0)1663 767 857
djsresearch.co.uk








Contents

Executive summary	3
Introduction	7
Views on priorities for local area or street	14
Support for LTN trial proposals	26
Current travel behaviour and potential effect of LTN trial on walking and cycling behaviour	48
Social media and correspondence	59



Executive summary





Here we summarise the findings from a consultation to gather feedback from residents and stakeholders on three proposed Low traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) in Cowley.

Background to the survey

Oxfordshire County Council have recently run a public consultation to gather views on three proposed Low traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) in Cowley. The proposals include traffic filters which prohibit all motor vehicles, plus two which allow access for buses.

A low traffic neighbourhood is an area where through traffic is prevented so that residents can enjoy a quieter neighbourhood and feel safer when they walk, cycle or go by wheelchair. For that reason, it is also known as a liveable neighbourhood.

If approved, the LTNs would be implemented using experimental traffic regulation orders. More information is available [here](#).

The council encouraged feedback on the proposals through an online survey which was accessible on the Oxfordshire County Council website from 23 November to 18 December 2020. In addition, the Council received feedback in the form of letters, emails and comments on social media which have been analysed separately to the survey.

DJS Research, an independent market research company, was commissioned by the Council to provide an independent analysis of the consultation findings and produce this report.

Priorities for local area or street

Overall, the highest priorities for respondents are to 'reduce traffic speeds on residential roads', to 'reduce air pollution' and 'to make it easier and safer to cycle', with around two-thirds (60%, 59% and 59% respectively) selecting these as 'very important' benefits. In addition, to 'making it safer for children to travel and play' (55%) and 'remove or reduce through traffic' (55%) are also seen to be very important priorities for more than half of all respondents.

The priorities given the lowest ratings relative to the others presented to respondents are to 'make bus services quicker and more reliable', with only 23% of respondents selecting this as a very important benefit, and 'keep local roads open so car trips are easy and convenient' (25% selecting this as a very important benefit).

Residents living in Florence Park often place higher importance on several of the priority areas presented to them compared to residents in Church Cowley and Temple Cowley.

Respondents completing the survey on behalf of a business, group or organisation generally seemed less concerned about almost all of the priorities for local areas or streets than residents.



Support for LTN trial proposals

Overall, approaching two-fifths of all residents fully supported the LTN trial proposals in each of the three areas. However, for each proposed LTN trial, around a quarter of all residents did not support each one.

The highest level of support is seen for the Florence Park trial LTN, with 60% fully supporting the LTN trial in this area and a further 7% supporting it but with reservations.

More than two-thirds (67%) of all residents support the Florence Park LTN trial to some extent (either 'fully support' or 'support with reservations') – however, just over a quarter (26%) say they 'do not support' the Florence Park LTN trial. Residents in Florence Park itself are much more likely than residents in other areas to support the Florence Park LTN trial to some extent; 79% of Florence Park residents indicate their support, compared with 65% of Temple Cowley residents and 59% of Church Cowley residents.

Almost two-thirds (65%) of all residents support the Temple Cowley LTN trial to some extent (either 'fully support' or 'support with reservations') – however, a quarter (25%) say they 'do not support' the Temple Cowley LTN trial. Residents in Temple Cowley itself, as well as Florence Park residents, are more likely than residents in other areas to support the Temple Cowley LTN trial to some extent (71% and 71% respectively), with only 55% of Church Cowley residents expressing their support for the Temple Cowley LTN trial.

A similar proportion (64%) of all residents support the Church Cowley LTN trial to some extent (either 'fully support' or 'support with reservations') - however, more than a quarter (27%) say they 'do not support' the Church Cowley LTN trial. Residents in Church Cowley itself are more likely than residents in other areas to express less positive views about the Church Cowley LTN trial, with 38% indicating that they do not support it.

For each of the three LTN trial areas, respondents completing the survey on behalf of a business, group or organisation express lower levels of support (only 27% fully support the Church Cowley LTN trial, 26% fully support the Temple Cowley LTN trial and 24% fully support the Florence Park LTN trial).

For each of the three LTN trial areas, support is generally slightly stronger amongst younger and middle-age groups compared to older respondents, and is also more strongly supported by white residents compared to BAME residents and also by those without a long-standing disability, illness or infirmity compared to those who have such issues.

Current travel behaviour

Overall, the most-used form of travelling amongst respondents is walking, with just under half (48%) using walking as their normal way to travel and nearly all respondents answering using walking to travel at least sometimes.

Just under four-fifths (78%) of respondents either sometimes or normally use car driving as their mode of travel, while more than seven-tenths (72%) cycle at least sometimes.

Nearly seven-tenths (68%) of respondents use the bus to some extent, although only 8% use buses as their main mode of travel.



The least-used methods of transport are mobility scooters, motorbikes or mopeds (72% never use) and car clubs (62% never use).

Potential effect of LTN trial on walking and cycling behaviour

Encouragingly, more than half of respondents say they would definitely consider walking more than they currently do during the LTN trial, with a further 16% saying that they would maybe consider doing so.

Equally encouragingly, almost half (49%) of respondents indicate that they would definitely consider cycling more, with a further 13% saying that they would maybe consider cycling more.




However, around a sixth (16%) of respondents say they would definitely not consider walking more during the LTN trial, with approaching a quarter (23%) feeling they would definitely not consider cycling more during the LTN trial.

For both walking and cycling:

- Younger age groups are more likely to express an intention to walk and cycle more during the LTN trial than older residents.
- White residents are more likely to express an intention to walk and cycle more during the LTN trial than BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to indicate that they would definitely consider walking and cycling more during the LTN trial.



Introduction





In this section we provide details of the background, objectives and methodology used in the consultation.

Background to the consultation

Oxfordshire County Council is proposing to trial Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) across Oxford city. Initial proposals are to pilot 3 LTNs within the Cowley area. This means the introduction of traffic filters at specific points across Church Cowley, Temple Cowley and Florence Park.

A low traffic neighbourhood is an area where through traffic is prevented so that residents can enjoy a quieter neighbourhood and feel safer when they walk, cycle or go by wheelchair. For that reason, it is also known as a liveable neighbourhood.

The LTN will prevent people from outside the area driving through the neighbourhood by the use of “traffic filters” which can be either planters or bollards. Where there is a bus route, camera enforcement filters will permit buses through, but prevent all other motorised vehicles. All streets will continue to be accessible to residents, visitors and deliveries by car or van, but drivers may need to choose a different route.

Temple Cowley, Church Cowley and Florence Park have been chosen as a priority for two main reasons. Firstly, the neighbourhoods suffer because many drivers from outside the area take shortcuts along the residential streets. Many residents have complained to the Council about the problems of short-cutting traffic including noise, danger and nuisance. Secondly, there are cycle routes running through the neighbourhoods which serve both the local areas and areas further out. Traffic makes cycling along these routes unattractive. The Council aims to make these cycle routes more pleasant in support of wider policies to support active travel, reduce air pollution and tackle climate change.

The Council are introducing the LTN via a legal process called an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO). ETROs are used when it is very difficult to assess the impacts of the scheme in terms of traffic or public support, but the cost of implementation and removal is relatively low cost.

In an ETRO, the Council introduces the scheme first and there is then a six-month period after the scheme is introduced when the public can submit objections or letters of support. At the end of the six-month period, the Council assesses the objections and decides whether to confirm, cancel or extend the ETRO for up to 12 months longer to allow further consultation and monitoring. More information is available [here](#).

About the consultation approach

The councils encouraged feedback on the proposals through an online survey which was accessible on the Oxfordshire County Council website from 23 November to 18 December 2020.



There has been a high level of interest in this exercise and good response to the survey, with a total of 1,454 responses. A full profile (by respondent type and demographics) of who responded to the survey is provided overleaf.

In addition, the Council received feedback in the form of letters, emails and comments on social media which have been analysed separately to the survey.

About this report

DJS Research, an independent market research company, was commissioned by the councils to provide an independent analysis of the survey findings.

The survey introduced the proposals then asked respondents a series of questions including closed ('tick-box') questions, and open questions where respondents could type in comments.

In addition to analysing the closed questions, DJS Research carried out thematic analysis of the open comments from the online survey on a question-by-question basis, coding them into themes so that these could be quantified.

This document summarises the findings from the independent analysis.



Respondent profile

In total, 1,454 responses to the survey were received. A profile of the respondents to the survey is provided below (tables 1 to 6).

Table 1: Please say whether you are responding as...?

OVERALL RESULTS (all responses: n=1,454).

Respondent type	No. responses	% responses
Florence Park resident	340	23%
Church Cowley resident	322	22%
Temple Cowley resident	307	21%
Resident of another part of Oxford	381	26%
Resident outside Oxford	40	3%
Local business, group or organisation in the Cowley area	39	3%
On behalf of an interest group	25	2%

The vast majority of respondents are Oxford residents – living in fairly equal proportions in each of the three proposed LTN areas (21%-23%) and in other parts of Oxford (26%) – with a small proportion of individuals living outside of Oxford (3%). The remainder of responses are made up of people responding completing the survey as a local business, group or organisation in the Cowley area (3%) or on behalf of an interest group (2%).

*Those classifying themselves as not living in the Cowley area (i.e. living outside of Church Cowley, Florence Park and Temple Cowley) were asked to indicate the reason why they were responding to the survey – Table 2 overleaf summarises the responses given by non-Cowley residents.



Table 2: Please say whether you are responding as...?

OVERALL RESULTS (all not residing in the Cowley area: n=461, 496).

Respondent type	No. responses	% responses
'I travel through the Cowley area on my way to somewhere else'		
Yes, most days	269	58%
Yes, sometimes	192	42%
'I travel to the Cowley area for work, education, social or recreation purposes'		
Yes, most days	300	60%
Yes, sometimes	196	40%

Table 3: What is your age group? OVERALL RESULTS (all responses: n=1,454).

Respondent type	No. responses	% responses
Under 18	16	1%
19-24	22	2%
25-34	227	16%
35-44	425	29%
45-54	303	21%
55-64	229	16%
65-74	172	12%
75-84	54	4%
85+	6	0%

Most age groups were well represented, although only 3% were aged under 25.



Table 4: What is your gender? OVERALL RESULTS (all responses: n=1,454).

Respondent type	No. responses	% responses
Female/woman	693	48%
Male/man	685	47%
Other	4	0%
Prefer not to say	72	5%

Table 5: What is your ethnic group? OVERALL RESULTS (all responses: n=1,454).

Respondent type	No. responses	% responses
White (i.e. British, Irish, any other white background)	1,172	81%
Asian or Asian British (i.e. Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, any other Asian background)	69	5%
Black or Black British (i.e. Caribbean, African, or any other Black background)	9	1%
Mixed (i.e. White & Black Caribbean, White & Black African, White & Asian and any other Mixed background)	37	3%
Other	15	1%
Prefer not to say	152	10%






Table 6: Do you have a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity?
OVERALL RESULTS (all responses: n=1,454).

Respondent type	No. responses	% responses
No	1163	80%
Yes – mobility issues	79	5%
Yes – sight issues	21	1%
Yes – hearing issues	18	1%
Yes – general health issues	131	9%
Prefer not to say	89	6%

In the remainder of this report, where appropriate we have analysed how views differ by the different respondent types and demographic groups outlined above.



Views on priorities for local area or street






Those responding to the survey were presented with a list of eleven benefits and were asked to indicate their priorities for their local area or street by providing a score for at least three of them (although respondents could provide a score for up to eleven if they so wished).

Headline findings

Results for all respondents for this question are summarised in figure 1, below.

Figure 1: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities. For each row, please put in a figure from 0 to 3 (0 = 'no benefit', 1 = 'minor benefit', 2 = 'important benefit', 3 = 'very important benefit'). You must select an option in at least three rows, or you can answer every row. You can also add another option in the 'other priority' box. RESULTS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS (n=1,454).





Overall, the highest priorities for respondents are to 'reduce traffic speeds on residential roads', to 'reduce air pollution' and 'to make it easier and safer to cycle', with around two-thirds (60%, 59% and 59% respectively) selecting these as 'very important' benefits. In addition, to 'making it safer for children to travel and play' (55%) and 'remove or reduce through traffic' (55%) are also seen to be very important priorities for more than half of all respondents.

The priorities given the lowest ratings relative to the others presented to respondents are to 'make bus services quicker and more reliable', with only 23% of respondents selecting this as a very important benefit, and 'keep local roads open so car trips are easy and convenient' (25% selecting this as a very important benefit).


Results by Resident type

Figures 2-12 (below and overleaf) show how responses to this question varied for different types of respondent for each of the priority issues presented to respondents and are shown in order of the level of importance that respondents attach to them at an overall level.

It should be noted that the base sizes for those answering on behalf of a local business, group or organisation, and also for those answering on behalf of an interest group, are both relatively low – although comment has been made on the findings from these respondents where appropriate, the findings for these groups should be treated as indicative rather than statistically significant.

Further analysis of feedback from residents also highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors (such as age and gender). Where applicable, these differences are detailed under figures 2-12 (below and overleaf):

Figure 2: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Reduce traffic speeds on residential roads'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living in Florence Park are more likely than residents in other areas to select 'reduce traffic speeds on residential roads' as a very important benefit; more than two-thirds (68%) of Florence Park residents selected this as a very important




benefit, compared to 55% of Church Cowley residents and 60% of Temple Cowley residents.

Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations are much less likely than residents to select 'reduce traffic speeds on residential roads' as a very important benefit, with less than three-tenths (28%) doing so – this compares to 56% of respondents answering on behalf of an interest group.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Female residents are slightly more likely than males to select 'reduce traffic speeds on residential roads' as a very important benefit; 62% of females stated this, compared with 58% of males.
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to select 'reduce traffic speeds on residential roads' as a very important benefit; 64% of white residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared with 46% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to select 'reduce traffic speeds on residential roads' as a very important benefit (49%, compared to 63% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).

Figure 3: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Reduce air pollution'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living in Florence Park are more likely than residents in Church Cowley to select 'reduce air pollution' as either an important or a very important benefit; nearly seven-tenths (69%) of Florence Park residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared to 52% of Church Cowley residents and 57% of Temple Cowley residents.


Those answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations are again less likely than residents and interest groups to select 'reduce air pollution' as a very important benefit - only 36% see this as a very important benefit, compared to 64% of those answering on behalf of an interest group.



Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights one difference in opinion by demographic factors:

- Female residents are slightly more likely than males to select 'reduce air pollution' as a very important benefit; 64% of females stated this, compared with 55% of males.
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to select 'reduce air pollution' as a very important benefit; 63% of white residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared with 50% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to select 'reduce air pollution' as either an important or a very important benefit (62%, compared to 63% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).

Figure 4: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Make it easier and safer to cycle'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living in Florence Park are much more likely than residents in other areas to select 'make it easier and safer to cycle' as a very important benefit; 69% of Florence Park residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared to 48% of Church Cowley residents and 58% of Temple Cowley residents.

Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations, appear to express less positive sentiments about the benefit of 'make it easier and safer to cycle' compared to residents, with only 36% viewing this as a very important benefit.


Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups are less likely than White residents to select 'make it easier and safer to cycle' as a very important benefit; 48% of BAME residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared with 65% of White residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to select 'make it easier and safer to cycle' as either an



important or a very important benefit (42%, compared to 64% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).

Figure 5: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Make it safer for children to travel and play'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living in Florence Park are more likely than residents in Church Cowley, Temple Cowley and those living elsewhere in Oxford to select 'make it safer for children to travel and play' as a very important benefit; approaching two-thirds (64%) of Florence Park residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared to 43% of Church Cowley residents, 54% of Temple Cowley residents and 55% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.


Those answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations are much less likely than residents to select 'make it safer for children to travel and play' as a very important benefit, with only 38% thinking this is a very important benefit, compared to 72% of those answering on behalf of an interest group.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to select 'make it safer for children to travel and play' as a very important benefit; 60% of white residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared with 44% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to select 'make it safer for children to travel and play' as a very important benefit (37%, compared to 60% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Figure 6: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Remove or reduce through traffic'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living elsewhere in Church Cowley are less likely than residents living in the other two LTN trial areas to select 'remove or reduce through traffic' as a very important benefit; less than half (47%) of residents living in Church Cowley selected this as a very important benefit, compared to 64% of Florence Park residents and 60% of Temple Cowley residents.


Those answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations are again less likely than residents and interest groups to select 'remove or reduce through traffic' as being an important benefit – only around a fifth (21%) see this as a very important benefit, compared to 56% of those answering on behalf of an interest group.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to select 'remove or reduce through traffic' as a very important benefit; 60% of white residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared with 41% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to select 'remove or reduce through traffic' as a very important benefit (42%, compared to 59% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Figure 7: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Make it easier to cross roads on foot'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living in Florence Park are slightly more likely than residents in other areas to select 'make it easier to cross roads on foot' as a very important benefit; three quarters (48%) of Florence Park residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared to 36% of Church Cowley residents, 42% of Temple Cowley residents and 45% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.


Those answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations are much less likely than residents to select 'make it easier to cross roads on foot' as a very important benefit, with less than three-tenths (28%) doing so – this compares to 52% of respondents answering on behalf of an interest group.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Female residents are slightly more likely than males to select 'make it easier to cross roads on foot' as a very important benefit; 48% of females stated this, compared with 39% of males.
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to select 'make it easier to cross roads on foot' as a very important benefit; 46% of white residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared with 37% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to select 'make it easier to cross roads on foot' as a very important benefit (35%, compared to 46% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Figure 8: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Enhance the area with more trees and planting'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).




There are no significant differences between residents of the three LTN areas in relation to opinions on the priority to 'enhance the area with more trees and planting' as being a very important benefit, with between a third and two-fifths of residents in all areas feeling that this is a very important benefit.

Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations once again place relatively low importance on this aspect compared to residents and interest groups – less than a quarter (23%) see 'enhance the area with more trees and planting' as a very important benefit, compared to 56% of those answering on behalf of an interest group.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights only one difference in opinion by demographic factors:

- Female residents are slightly more likely than males to select 'enhance the area with more trees and planting' as a very important benefit; 37% of females stated this, compared with 32% of males.

Figure 9: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Reduce traffic congestion on nearby main roads'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



There are no significant differences between residents of the three LTN areas in relation to opinions on the priority to 'reduce traffic congestion on nearby roads' as




being a very important benefit, with between a quarter and three-tenths of residents in all areas feeling that this is a very important benefit.

Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations are less likely than residents to select 'reduce traffic congestion on nearby main roads' as either an important or a very important benefit – less than a fifth (18%) see this as either an important or a very important benefit, compared to 28% of those answering on behalf of an interest group.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights only one difference in opinion by demographic factors:

- Female residents are more likely than males to select 'reduce traffic congestion on nearby main roads' as a very important benefit; 34% of females stated this, compared with 25% of males.

Figure 10: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Create pleasant areas where you can meet up'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living in Florence Park are slightly more likely than residents in the other two LTN trial areas to select 'create pleasant areas where you can meet up' as a very important benefit; a third (33%) of Florence Park residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared to 27% of Church Cowley residents, 27% of Temple Cowley residents and 32% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.


Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations are much less likely than residents to select 'create pleasant areas where you can meet up' as a very important benefit – less than a fifth (18%) see this as a very important benefit, compared to 44% of those answering on behalf of an interest group.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to select 'create pleasant areas where you can meet up' as a very important benefit (21%, compared to 32% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Figure 11: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Keep local roads open so car trips are easy and convenient'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living in Florence Park are less likely than residents in other areas to select 'keep local roads open so car trips are easy and convenient' as a very important benefit; only a sixth (16%) of Florence Park residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared to 33% of Church Cowley residents, 26% of Temple Cowley residents and 23% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.


Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations may be slightly more likely than residents to select 'keep local roads open so car trips are easy and convenient' as a very important benefit - two-fifths (41%) see this as a very important benefit, compared to 32% of those answering on behalf of an interest group.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- White residents are less likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to select 'keep local roads open so car trips are easy and convenient' as a very important benefit; 20% of white residents selected this as a very important benefit, compared with 38% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are more likely than those without a disability to select 'keep local roads open so car trips are easy and convenient' as a very important benefit (37%, compared to 21% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Figure 12: Thinking of your local area or street, we would like to understand your priorities: 'Make bus services quicker and more reliable'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living elsewhere in Oxford (i.e. outside the three proposed LTN trial areas) are more likely than residents in other areas to select 'make bus services quicker and more reliable' as a very important benefit; a third (33%) of residents living elsewhere in Oxford selected this as a very important benefit, compared to 18% of Church Cowley residents, 19% of Temple Cowley residents and 19% of Florence Park residents. Interestingly, only 11% of Florence Park residents and 10% of residents elsewhere in Oxford see no benefit of making bus services quicker and more reliable, compared to 25% of Temple Cowley residents and 25% of Church Cowley residents.




Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations are again much less likely than residents and interest groups to select 'make bus services quicker and more reliable' as a very important benefit – just under a sixth (15%) think this is a very important benefit, compared to 40% of those answering on behalf of an interest group.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Female residents are more likely than males to select 'make bus services quicker and more reliable' as a very important benefit; 26% of females stated this, compared with 21% of males.
- Those aged 75+ are slightly more likely to select 'make bus services quicker and more reliable' as a very important benefit, with 33% of those aged 75+ stating this, compared with only 19% of 45-54s.



Support for LTN trial proposals






Those responding to the survey were asked to indicate their levels of support for the proposed LTN trials in the Church Cowley, Temple Cowley and Florence Park areas.

Headline findings

Results for all respondents for this question are summarised in figure 13, below.

Figure 13: Please look at the detailed proposals before answering this question. Do you support the LTN proposals as a trial for the following areas? Select the most applicable option in each row. RESULTS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS (all responses: n=1,362-1,367).



Overall, approaching two-fifths of all residents fully supported the LTN trial proposals in each of the three areas. The highest level of support is seen for the Florence Park trial LTN, with 60% fully supporting the LTN trial in this area and a further 7% supporting it but with reservations.

However, for each proposed LTN trial, around a quarter of all residents did not support each one.

Results by Resident type


Figures 14-16 (overleaf) show how responses to this question varied for different types of respondent for each of the three proposed trial LTN areas.

It should be noted that the base sizes for those answering on behalf of a local business, group or organisation, and also for those answering on behalf of an interest group, are both relatively low – although comment has been made on the findings from these respondents where appropriate, the findings for these groups should be treated as indicative rather than statistically significant.

Further analysis of feedback from residents also highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors (such as age and gender). Where applicable, these differences are detailed under figures 14-16:



Figure 14: Do you support the LTN proposals as a trial for the following area? 'Church Cowley LTN'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,367).



Nearly two-thirds (64%) of all residents support the Church Cowley LTN trial to some extent (either 'fully support' or 'support with reservations') - however, more than a quarter (27%) say they 'do not support' the Church Cowley LTN trial. Residents in Church Cowley itself are more likely than residents in other areas to express less positive views about the Church Cowley LTN trial, with 38% indicating that they do not support it.


Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations also express less positive views about the Church Cowley LTN trial – only 35% support it to some extent (either 'fully support' or 'support with reservations'), with more than half (54%) indicating that they do not support it. Respondents answering on behalf of an interest group tend to be more positive than businesses about the Church Cowley LTN trial, with 55% supporting it to some extent, although 33% say that they do not support it.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Full support of the Church Cowley LTN trial is generally stronger amongst younger and middle-age groups; 61% of 35-44s, 58% of 25-34s and 54% of 45-54s fully support it, compared with 49% of 55-64s, 53% of 65-74s and 44% of those aged 75+.
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to fully support the Church Cowley LTN trial; 62% of white residents fully support it, compared with only 44% of BAME residents, while 43% of BAME residents 'do not support' it.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to 'fully support' the Church Cowley LTN trial (37% and 61% respectively), while 47% of those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity say they 'do not support' it, compared with 23% of those without a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity.



Figure 15: Do you support the LTN proposals as a trial for the following area? 'Temple Cowley LTN'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,370).



Almost two-thirds (65%) of all residents support the Temple Cowley LTN trial to some extent (either 'fully support' or 'support with reservations') – however, a quarter (25%) say they 'do not support' the Temple Cowley LTN trial. Residents in Temple Cowley itself, as well as Florence Park residents, are more likely than residents in other areas to support the Temple Cowley LTN trial to some extent (71% and 71% respectively), with only 55% of Church Cowley residents expressing their support for the Temple Cowley LTN trial.


Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations also express less positive views about the Temple Cowley LTN trial – only 32% support it to some extent (either 'fully support' or 'support with reservations'), with more than half (54%) indicating that they do not support it. Respondents answering on behalf of an interest group appear to be more positive than businesses about the Temple Cowley LTN trial, with 56% supporting it to some extent, although 40% of interest groups say that they do not support it.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Full support of the Temple Cowley LTN trial is generally strongest amongst under 25s (71%) and 35-44s (61%) and slightly lower amongst older age groups (52% of 65-74s and 55% of 75+ residents expressing full support).
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to fully support the Temple Cowley LTN trial; 62% of white residents fully support it, compared with only 45% of BAME residents, while 43% of BAME residents 'do not support' it.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to 'fully support' the Temple Cowley LTN trial (40% and 61% respectively), while 39% of those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity say they 'do not support' it, compared with 21% of those without a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity.



Figure 16: Do you support the LTN proposals as a trial for the following area? 'Florence Park LTN'. RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,362).



More than two-thirds (67%) of all residents support the Florence Park LTN trial to some extent (either 'fully support' or 'support with reservations') – however, just over a quarter (26%) say they 'do not support' the Florence Park LTN trial. Residents in Florence Park itself are much more likely than residents in other areas to support the Florence Park LTN trial to some extent; 79% of Florence Park residents indicate their support, compared with 65% of Temple Cowley residents and 59% of Church Cowley residents.

Again, respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations express less positive views about the Florence Park LTN trial – only 30% support it to some extent (either 'fully support' or 'support with reservations'), with more than half (56%) indicating that they do not support it. Respondents answering on behalf of an interest group appear to be more positive than businesses about the Florence Park LTN trial, with 56% supporting it to some extent, although 43% of interest groups say that they do not support it.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Full support of the Florence Park LTN trial generally decreases with age; it is strongest amongst under 25s (71%), 25-34s (62%) and 35-44s (64%) and decreases to 51% for 55-64s and 54% for residents aged over 75.
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to fully support the Florence Park LTN trial; 66% of white residents fully support it, compared with only 46% of BAME residents, while 39% of BAME residents 'do not support' it (compared to 20% of white residents).
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to 'fully support' the Florence Park LTN trial (39% and 65% respectively), while 43% of those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity say they 'do not support' it, compared with 21% of those without a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity.



Those responding to the survey were asked to indicate whether there was ONE filter that they strongly SUPPORTED – if there were none, respondents were asked to leave this question blank.

Headline findings

Results for all respondents for this question are summarised in table 7, overleaf.



Table 7: Looking at the plans, is there ONE filter that you strongly SUPPORT? (otherwise please leave blank). RESULTS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS (all responses: n=1,454).

Filter	No. responses	% responses
Church Cowley LTN trial:		
CC1 Church Hill Road	50	4%
CC2 Beauchamp Lane	19	1%
CC3 Littlemore Road	24	2%
CC4 Mayfair Road	15	1%
CC5 Liddell Road	2	0%
CC6 Bartholomew Road	27	2%
Church Cowley (all filters equally)	1	0%
Florence Park LTN trial:		
FP1 Cornwallis Road	58	4%
FP2 Rymers Lane	84	6%
FP3 Littlehay Road	57	4%
FP4 Clive Road	9	1%
Florence Park (all filters equally)	15	1%
Temple Cowley LTN trial:		
TC1 Crescent Road	75	5%
TC2 Junction Road	10	1%
TC3 Salegate Lane	8	1%
TC4 Temple Road	20	1%
Temple Cowley (all filters equally)	1	0%
'I support all filters in all areas'	6	0%
No strong support indicated for any one filter	950	65%

In total, there were 489 mentions of specific filters or broad filter areas that respondents expressed strong support for (they were allowed to indicate more than one if necessary).



(NB: It should be noted that 15 respondents typed something into the box provided for this question but what they typed could not be deciphered into either a specific filter or attributable comment).

Overall, the strongest support for specific filters in any one area is for filters in the Florence Park LTN trial area, where 223 respondents singled out a specific Florence Park LTN trial filter for strong support. This is particularly the case for the FP2 (Rymers Lane) filter, with 84 respondents indicating that they strongly supported this filter.

However, 146 respondents specified their strong support for specific filters in the Church Cowley LTN trial area, with the CC1 Church Hill Road filter receiving the strongest level of support for any one filter in this LTN trial area.

Meanwhile, 114 respondents specified their strong support for specific filters in the Temple Cowley LTN trial area, with the TC1 Crescent Road filter receiving the strongest level of support for any one filter in this LTN trial area.



Those responding to the survey were asked to indicate whether there was ONE filter that they strongly OPPOSED – if there were none, respondents were asked to leave this question blank.

Headline findings

Results for all respondents for this question are summarised in table 8, overleaf.



Table 8: Looking at the plans, is there ONE filter that you strongly OPPOSE? (otherwise please leave blank). RESULTS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS (all responses: n=1,454).

Filter	No. responses	% responses
Church Cowley Proposed LTN Filters		
CC1 Church Hill Road	18	1%
CC2 Beauchamp Lane	5	0%
CC3 Littlemore Road	57	4%
CC4 Mayfair Road	41	3%
CC5 Liddell Road	3	0%
CC6 Bartholomew Road	32	2%
Church Cowley (oppose all filters equally)	9	1%
Florence Park Proposed LTN Filters		
FP1 Cornwallis Road	25	2%
FP2 Rymers Lane	19	1%
FP3 Littlehay Road	20	1%
FP4 Clive Road	2	0%
Florence Park (oppose all filters equally)	14	1%
Temple Cowley Proposed LTN Filters		
TC1 Crescent Road	26	2%
TC2 Junction Road	13	1%
TC3 Salegate Lane	4	0%
TC4 Temple Road	33	2%
Temple Cowley (oppose all filters equally)	11	1%
'I oppose all filters in all areas'	41	3%
No strong opposition indicated for any one filter	1,087	75%

In total, there were 373 mentions of specific filters or broad filter areas that respondents expressed strong opposition to (they were allowed to indicate more than one if necessary).

Overall, the strongest opposition for specific filters in any one area is for filters in the Church Cowley LTN trial area, where 165 respondents singled out a specific



Church Cowley LTN trial filter that they were strongly opposed to. This is particularly the case for the CC3 (Littlemore Road) filter, with 57 respondents saying that they strongly opposed this filter.

However, 87 respondents specified their strong opposition to specific filters in the Temple Cowley LTN trial area, with the TC4 (Temple Road) filter receiving the strongest level of opposition for any one filter in this LTN trial area.

Meanwhile, 80 respondents specified their strong opposition to specific filters in the Florence Park LTN trial area, with the FP1 (Cornwallis Road) filter receiving the strongest level of opposition for any one filter in this LTN trial area.




Those responding to the survey were asked to say briefly in an open-ended question (in fewer than 50 words) what they thought about the proposed LTNs.

Headline findings

This was an open-ended question where respondents could expand on their reasons for giving their viewpoints detailed in the previous section; DJS Research has analysed the comments and coded them into themes to provide a quantified sense of the themes and sentiment.

Overall results for this question are summarised in figure 17, below.

Figure 17: Please say briefly what you think about the proposed LTNs. RESULTS FOR RESPONDENTS WHO MADE COMMENTS (all responses: n=1,320).





In total, 1,320 respondents made a comment. **Example comments** illustrating some of the resident sentiments about the proposed LTNs are provided below and overleaf.

Example comments (where residents express positive sentiments about the proposed LTNs)

"It's wonderful. Please bring them on asap. We cannot live with the current level of traffic in the area and this would solve all our problems. So please do this as soon as possible. I hope that there are no more delays in doing this."

"Strongly support. Rymers Lane and Cornwallis have become rat runs with constant speeding and no enforcement. Dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists, especially schoolchildren. The current situation is unsustainable."

"I support the concept of LTNs for residents and other road users, making it easier and safer to travel through or from the area on foot or by bike. LTNs should reduce vehicle turning movements at side road junctions making travelling by any mode along arterial routes easier and safer."

"Very much in favour of the Florence Park one which is so busy and dangerous at rush hour/school drop off/pick up that I moved from cycling to taking the bus, or cycle via Iffley Road instead which is slower and longer. Ridiculous that the actual cycle routes are scarier than main roads!"

"I am strongly supportive of this. My concern is that there is a loud minority that gets catered to while most residents are actually in favour even if they don't voice their opinions as loudly. LTN are a step towards addressing the climate emergency and make our neighbourhoods more liveable."

"This is terrific and we applaud the local authority for pushing ahead. We also urge the local authority to persevere in the face of a possibly vocal minority against the plans."

"Absolutely thrilled. These are politically difficult - possibly the most difficult thing a local authority can do. But they also have the biggest 'bang' for the buck in terms of health and social payoffs."

"Overdue and brilliant. The council has taken advantage of all the cyclists already reducing traffic and this would be a tangible step to be supportive of change. My kids would cycle to school if I wasn't concerned they would be hit by a car."

"Fantastic proposal to reduce traffic in what are at essence residential areas, making it easier and safer to cycle and walk, therefore encouraging more short and convenient trips out of vehicles. The trial period hopefully allaying fears of traffic dispersment and proving instead traffic evaporation."

"I want this so badly for our neighbourhood! The speed of through-traffic makes our road dangerous, loud, & polluted - the speed of cars is genuinely unbelievable at times through this residential area. I'm afraid to cycle with my daughter even though that would be my preferred mode of transport."

"My overwhelming reason for supporting the LTN is to create a safer cycling environment for our family."

"I'm really looking forward to my two daughters being able to bike/walk to the park/school safely, without fear and without being exposed to the levels of pollution they are at the moment."



Example comments (where residents express positive sentiments about the proposed LTNs)

"I think they are a fantastic idea and I fully support their roll out across Oxfordshire. We need to trial more innovative ways to reduce carbon and air pollution, improve biodiversity and community cohesion."

"I strongly support the Bartholomew Road filter as it is used as a cut-through with disregard to the speed limit."

"Strongly welcome these proposals - we need safer, cleaner streets! At present I don't feel it's safe for my children to walk to school - this could change that, please make it happen!"

"I really want this to be trialled. In my section of Cornwallis Road we get large numbers of vehicles travelling at really high speeds - not just boy racers but in the past council vehicles and police cars (without lights flashing so not sure if even on a car)."

"A great idea, good for safety, congestion and the environment. We live on Cornwallis Road and do not like it being used as a through-road stop. Speeding is very common and it feels dangerous at times. It's also noisy and brings unnecessary pollution."

"I strongly support LTNs throughout residential and particularly family areas of Oxford. Especially to reduce car journeys with a knock on effect on lowering pollution levels and fossil fuel use and to make cycling easier, safer and a better option for travel in and around Oxford."

"A positive step towards a greener and healthier future promoting active travel and liveability. Think of the benefits to all including those that have to drive if those that don't feel safer walking and cycling. Hopefully a route to a reduction in traffic fatalities and possibly even Vision Zero?"

"Excellent & vital. I've almost been hit by a car speeding down Rhymer's lane & see cars speeding through Florence Park all the time. It gives me a safe route from St Mary's to my work at Unipart."

"I think it will be good for children to play out more. Most of my barriers to cycling are because of difficulty with the Cowley Rd/Iffley Rd to get into the city centre so I am not sure it will encourage me to cycle more."

"As a local health provider, we are strongly supportive of LTNs - we need safer, cleaner neighbourhoods to keep people healthy, and also for more patients and staff to feel safe walking and cycling to local health facilities when needed."

"In principle I support the plans, traffic and congestion are getting out of control and something needs to be tried. The Florence Park filters FP3 and FP4 might actually help traffic flow on Oxford Road as it will stop traffic backing up waiting to turn right into Littlehay Road if you can't cut through."

"Many of these streets are made very dangerous by the through traffic. Speeding and oversized vehicles kill pets and smash parked cars. Reckless drivers ignore cyclists and mount curbs to get through narrow parts. Turning on to these streets from main roads also backs up traffic on the main roads."

"I strongly support the LTN's to create a safer and healthier community. I live on Rymers Lane and the traffic is fast and constant (despite a 20mph speed limit). My child has had two hospital admissions for wheeziness and I am concerned that the air pollution on this road is impacting on his health."



Example comments (where residents express negative sentiments or concerns about the proposed LTNs)

"Has a major effect for surrounding traffic and additional pollution travelling a greater distance to my property. At school times the traffic will be a very difficult situation as the road will be blocked vehicles going up and down the road to drop off children, also may cause more accidents turning."

"In principle good idea but our side of Westbury Crescent will have ALL traffic from the entire estate coming past. This will significantly increase traffic past our house which is just unacceptable. The site of the Mayfair Road filter needs more thought please."

"I think it will block all surrounding roads and prevent people working. I can't get to work any other way, why allow so many business parks in Cowley when you're stopping people driving."

"Local residents' life will be made more difficult than before because you want to stop outsiders driving through the areas. Install traffic enforcement cameras instead."

"It will make people lives very inconvenient. Why should people that live outside the city making decisions on local roads that they have never lived on or driven down."

"Good in theory but poorly thought through. Not enough consultation. Impact on neighbouring areas not properly considered. The suck-it-and-see approach is regrettable. The record of Walton Street and the City Centre bus gates suggests the County Council will not actually deliver the LTNs."

"Ridiculous - it is simply moving traffic from one area to another. Makes it inaccessible to residents with only one way in and out of the residential area that will no doubly build up with traffic especially at rush hour."

"I think the Mayfair Road CC4 will increase traffic through Westbury Cr. Can it be put at Churchill / Kelburne Road junction by Queens Court instead to separate the 2 estates?"

"Whatever is planned, it is vital that Oxford's Hackney carriage (black cab) trade is given unrestricted access. We provide a door to door service, not leave passengers stranded on streets, especially if they're vulnerable. Also, passengers want to be picked up without delays because of closures."

"The problem with closing "ratruns" is it forces traffic on the "main" roads, the main roads are constantly congested already and are not adequate to take the extra traffic currently using the "ratruns". This will not make people leave their cars at home it will just make them late for everything."

"Where is the impact assessment of these proposals on B Leys R Hill etc.? How do these proposals fit into a wider strategic plan to reduce cars in Oxford? Buses take a long time to get to town from B Leys for 9am - will this improve? Will B Leys residents become prisoners in B Leys?"

"Too limiting in Church Cowley, pushing all locals into dangerous and slow ring road traffic. No way for Sandford or Littlemore residents to easily get to food shops or libraries. Massive blow to already isolated communities and the elderly. Would be up for slower speeds, but blocking cars is unkind."

"Do not agree with the proposal as impact on local residents with LTN will be significant with cons outweighing the pros. Increased traffic congestion will result on Oxford Road, Cowley Road and Eastern By Pass with delays and increased pollution."



Example comments (where residents express negative sentiments or concerns about the proposed LTNs)

"Church Cowley rat-run is best managed by locating the filter between Kelbourne and Church Hill Road. That way, residents of both Mayfair/Fairlie/Hillsborough and Westbury/Wykeham/Church Hill all have equal distances to exits, rather than making it disproportionately long for residents of the former."

"A knee-jerk reaction that will lead to VERY serious congestion in Temple Road at school drop off/pickup times, my only vehicular route under these proposals."

"The CC3 will cut off my access to visit my sister, dad and my route to work. I always walk when I can but it's too far to walk to work. The cycle track is not safe and too dark to use as an alternative option. I don't want to be forced to use an already busy ring road and I can't afford buses every time."

"I support the idea of the LTN but with CC1 and CC4 the south side of Westbury Crescent will experience a much greater volume of traffic than it currently does the if CC4 was moved to Kelbourne Road, this would allow some cars from this area to exit via Mayfair Road. We do not want increased traffic!"

"Coming from Wheatley it is two hours by two buses to this area. It is 15 minutes by car. I will stop using businesses in this area as a result. Also this proposal will push more traffic onto the ring road which is already at capacity."

"It will push traffic onto main roads creating congestion and pollution."

"I oppose the Littlemore Road filter as it blocks the main road through the area, and would drastically increase traffic at the dangerous Newman Road/Rose Hill junction, which should be made 'no right turn onto Rose Hill'."

"I am fully in favour so long as delivery drivers and other commercial vehicles aren't unduly inconvenienced. We all benefit from them and should therefore assist them."

"TC2 forces the residents of DonBosco sometimes having to make a right turn into Hollow Way. This is a dangerous turn into a busy road. Put TC2 at the top of Station road near TC1. We could then exit via Temple Road - a much safer option."

"I think the council is naive saying that traffic will not become worse on major roads. I have to drive for work and I don't see why I should be punished and have longer journeys because of LTNs and some inconsiderate drivers who give everyone a bad name. Surely pollution increases when more cars are in queues?"

"There are too many, too close together. While I appreciate the benefits of cycling, it's physically impossible for some of us so we'll be forced to walk (if we can) as we won't be able to use cars nor, currently, public transport. In reality, we won't spend time or money locally."

"This is not the way to reduce traffic, it merely reroutes and lengthens journeys, adversely affecting pollution and convenience. Better public transport is needed, especially for Littlemore."



Those responding to the survey were also asked to highlight (in an open-ended question) any specific issues that they thought needed investigation.

Headline findings

This was an open-ended question where respondents could expand on their reasons for giving their viewpoints detailed in the previous section; DJS Research have analysed the comments and coded them into themes to provide a quantified sense of the themes and sentiment. Overall results for this question are summarised in table 9, below and overleaf.

Table 9: Please use this space only to highlight any specific issues that need investigation. RESULTS FOR RESPONDENTS WHO MADE COMMENTS (all responses: n=644).

Theme of comment	No. responses	% responses
Concerns for/will increase congestion	209	32%
Parking issues need to be addressed/concerns about parking	77	12%
Concerns for/need to stop rat runs/speeding	74	11%
Concerns for school run/accessing school	54	8%
Concerns for resident access/safety	51	8%
Concerns for/will increase pollution	49	8%
Need/lack of surveying/data/monitoring/information	42	7%
Concerned about specific road/location: Church Cowley	36	6%
Concerned it will make travelling harder/longer	33	5%
Need/lack of safe/separate cycle lanes	32	5%
Fast moving traffic/difficult to cross roads/dangerous	32	5%
Concerns for cars turning/reversing	31	5%
Concerned about specific road/location: Westbury Crescent	29	5%
Concerned about specific road/location: Hollow way	27	4%
Concerned about specific road/location: Newman Road	26	4%
Concerns for emergency services/healthcare worker access	24	4%
Concerned about specific road/location: Littlemore	23	4%
Concerns for the elderly/disabled	23	4%



Table 9 (continued): Please use this space only to highlight any specific issues that need investigation. RESULTS FOR RESPONDENTS WHO MADE COMMENTS (all responses: n=644).

Theme of comment	No. responses	% responses
Concerned about specific road/location: Crescent Road	23	4%
Concerned about specific road/location: Cowley Road	22	3%
Improve roads/pavements/infrastructure	22	3%
Introduce speed reducing measures (e.g. speed bumps, cameras etc.)	21	3%
Concerned about specific road/location: Florence Park	21	3%
Concerned about specific road/location: Rymers Lane	21	3%
Concerned about specific road/location: Oxford Road	20	3%
Concerned about specific road/location: Temple Road	19	3%
Concerned about specific road/location: Marsh Road	19	3%
Need to reduce traffic/pollution	18	3%
Alternative/better/cheaper transport needed	18	3%
Concerned about specific road/location: Rose Hill	18	3%
Concerned about specific road/location: Cornwallis	17	3%
Concerns for deliveries	16	2%
Concerned about specific road/location: Temple Cowley	13	2%
Signage/markings needed	13	2%
Concerned about specific road/location: Iffley Road	12	2%
One way system would be better	11	2%
Concerned about specific road/location: Little Hay	10	2%
Concerned about specific road/location: Bartholomew Road	9	1%
Suggest specific location to include: Kelburn Road	8	1%
Suggest specific location to include: Church Hill Road	6	1%
More/move traffic lights to help with traffic	8	1%
Concerns for/want to use planters	7	1%
TC1/TC2 unnecessary/problematic/needs moving	6	1%



In total, 644 respondents made a comment. **Example comments** illustrating some of the specific issues that respondents thought needed investigation are provided below and overleaf.

Example comments (for some specific issues requiring investigation)

"Filters and LTNs represent a 'stick' to encourage travel behaviour changes; some 'carrots' are needed e.g. better bus services."

"The number of tradesmen, aged, carers, HMOs in Mayfair precinct requiring vehicles."

"Look at Hollow Way (Swan to Horspath Road). It can't cope with any more traffic, and footpath is dangerous to walk on these days (bikes and electric scooters use it as it is safer than the road)."

"I am concerned that elderly/disabled library users will find coming to the library more difficult if they are unable to drive. There are already issues with parking around the library."

"Monitoring traffic increases on bypass will be vital. There are schools and residential houses very close to the bypass that could suffer from increased air pollution. Plus assessment of impact on Cowley resident time to get to hospital. Signage will be hugely important to prevent blocked roads."

"Temple Road leading to Owens Way - the parking is a nightmare as it is and causes issues with being able to enter Owens Way and due to the council depot workers parking anywhere and everywhere. If this road becomes blocked you will end up with stand-offs and cars not being able to turn round."

"Many drivers use Satnav so you need to liaise with the data providers to make sure drivers do not continue to attempt to use these old rat-runs."

"Noise pollution; Car speeds; Amount of traffic; Air pollution; Safety of residents; Car damage; Parking by people not local to the area; Noise disruption at night."

"Just today the news is on - more residential parking. Does the person realise this is in direct contradiction with electric cars? In areas with residential parking, one cannot put a home charger even though the parking spot is right outside your house. These are things you should be addressing."

"CC3. Blocking Littlemore Road means that I, nor my neighbours, can travel this way to and from work (in my EV), forcing us to use the Newman Road/Rose Hill junction. This is already a pinch-point for traffic with inconsiderate drivers & often breaks out in cases of road rage unfortunately."

"What will the impact be on to neighbourhoods next to these areas? We live off the other side of Hollow Way. These roads (Between Cranmer Road and Fern Hill Road) are also used as rat-runs to bypass Hollow Way. I fear this would get worse as traffic on Hollow Way will get worse."

"If introduced, what will be done to improve traffic surrounding the shopping centre area, in particular illegal parking hampering traffic especially? As I will now need to go via this road for every child pick-up and drop-off, plus work routes."



Example comments (for some specific issues requiring investigation)

"Vulnerable elderly people during the pandemic will be affected. Residents on major roads unfairly affected since their homes fall in between the proposed areas."

"Parking restrictions are being brought in as well and it's not clear whether these two teams are talking to each other. Will parking restrictions be necessary in Church Cowley considering people will be using cars less with the LTN?"

"Coming from Hollow Way, those of us living in St Christopher's Place would be prevented from accessing our street by car. The main traffic issues are related to the dangerous parking by parents near the school at 8.30am and 3.00pm. Why not target these people specifically? The rest of the time it's fine."

"The cut-through that causes most congestion/pollution and delays for Iffley Road buses most days is Howard Street, for traffic from Cowley Road to Donnington Bridge. This is not addressed in the trials."

"If you implement all gates in Temple Cowley as proposed, virtually the whole residential area will be funnelled to a single junction: Marsh Road - Cowley Road. I would only support your measures if a traffic light is placed there, otherwise waiting times to leave our residential area would be immense."

"Access for residents - can we drive through filters to get home?"

"The benefits need to be better highlighted, perhaps from people in other parts of the country who have already got them, particularly those who were cynical to start with (!)."

"Please consult economists and city planners before enacting such a one-sided measure to effectively gate-off neighbourhoods. This will lead to even higher rents and more congested main roads. The solution Oxford needs is more new infrastructure, not restricting access to already existing ones."

"Any new traffic scheme in Temple Cowley should wait until the new development is complete so that the new traffic situation can stabilise before nearby roads are closed."

"I'm worried that the LTN will increase the number of people parking on my street without a controlled parking zone to stop commuters parking here. The school drop-off congestion on Temple Road will be shifted but to where? I am not seeing commitment to improve footpaths like Boundary Brook to encourage walking."

"Line painting on Between Towns Road outside shared driveway of Trinity Court apartments and Cowley Workers Club. It is very busy and hard to exit the driveway safely to get into the far lane as there are always lines of traffic waiting at the traffic lights onto Oxford Road."

"Is CC4 in the right place? It'll increase traffic on Westbury (south) prompting complaints. If it was at the Church Hill Road/Kelbourne Road junction it'd have the same effect but share the load."

"The bend in Clive Road near where the proposed barrier will be sited may make turning or reversing difficult for vehicles."



Those responding to the survey as a business, group or organisation were asked to indicate what they thought the impact of the LTNs would be on their business or organisation.

Headline findings

Results for business respondents for this question are summarised in table 10, below.

Table 10: What do you think will be the impact (of the LTNs) on your business or organisation? RESULTS FOR ALL BUSINESSES AND ORGANISATIONS (all responses: n=39).



Filter	No. responses	% responses
Impact on...my customers or members	38	
Positive	9	24%
Neutral	2	5%
Negative	27	71%
Impact on...my staff or volunteers	36	
Positive	8	22%
Neutral	1	3%
Negative	27	75%
Impact on...my deliveries	35	
Positive	4	11%
Neutral	4	11%
Negative	27	77%
Impact on...my overall business	37	
Positive	10	27%
Neutral	0	0%
Negative	27	73%



Respondents answering on behalf of local businesses, groups and organisations, largely appear to express fairly negative opinions about the impacts of the LTNs on all aspects of their business. The area where businesses think that they will feel the greatest detrimental impact is on their deliveries, with only 4 out of the 35 businesses/groups/organisations answering thinking that the LTNs will have a positive effect.



Current travel behaviour and potential effect of LTN trial on walking and cycling behaviour






Those responding to the survey were asked to indicate how they typically travelled and the frequency with which they used that mode of transport.

Headline findings

Results for all respondents for this question are summarised in figure 18, below.

Figure 18: Please tell us about how you typically travel. RESULTS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS (n=1,454).



Overall, the most-used form of travelling amongst respondents is walking, with just under half (48%) using walking as their normal way to travel and nearly all respondents answering using walking to travel at least sometimes. Just under four-fifth (78%) of respondents either sometimes or normally use car driving as their mode of travel, while more than seven-tenths (72%) cycle at least sometimes. Nearly seven-tenths (68%) of respondents use the bus to some extent, although only 8% use buses as their main mode of travel.

The least-used methods of transport are mobility scooters, motorbikes or mopeds (72% never use) and car clubs (62% never use).




Results by Resident type

Figures 19-25 (below and overleaf) show how responses to this question varied for different types of respondent.

Please note: Of the very small proportions of respondents saying that they use **motorbikes or mopeds**, or **mobility scooters**, as a means of transport, there are no demographic differences in either case so illustrations for these two modes of transport are not shown.

Figure 19: Please tell us about how you typically travel. 'Walking' RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living in Florence Park are more likely than residents in other areas to typically travel by walking; nearly three-fifths (58%) of Florence Park residents use walking as their typical way of travelling, compared to 42% of Church Cowley residents, 49% of Temple Cowley residents and 49% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.

Those answering on behalf of a business/group/organisation, as well as those doing so on behalf of interest groups, are less likely than average to use walking as a means of travel.


Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Females are slightly more likely than males to use walking as their typical way of travelling; 51% of females say this is their typical means of travel, compared to 45% of males.
- Younger age groups are more likely than older residents to use walking as their typical way of travelling; 61% of under 25s, 50% of 25-34s and 49% of 35-44s say this is their typical means of travel, compared with 40% of 55-64s.
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to use walking as their typical way of travelling; 51% of white residents typically use this means of travel, compared with 38% of BAME residents.



- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to use walking as their typical means of travel (29%, compared to 51% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).

Figure 20: Please tell us about how you typically travel. 'Cycling' RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (n=1,454).



Residents living in Florence Park are more likely than residents in other areas to typically travel by cycling; more than half (56%) of Florence Park residents cycle for travel regularly, compared to only 34% of Church Cowley residents and 41% of Temple Cowley residents.


Those answering on behalf of a business/group/organisation may be slightly less likely than average to use cycling as a means of travel.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Males are more likely than females to use cycling as their typical way of travelling; 48% of males say this is their typical means of travel, compared with 42% of females.
- Younger age groups are more likely than older residents to use cycling as their typical way of travelling; 58% of under 25s, 53% of 25-34s and 48% of 35-44s say this is their typical means of travel, compared with 30% of 65-74s.
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to use cycling as their typical way of travelling; 49% of white residents typically use this means of travel, compared with 35% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to use cycling as their typical means of travel (24%, compared to 50% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Figure 21: Please tell us about how you typically travel. 'Car driver'
RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,454).



Residents living in Church Cowley are more likely than residents in other areas to typically travel by driving a car; more than two-fifths (42%) of Church Cowley residents drive a car as their typical way of travelling, compared to 26% of Florence Park residents, 36% of Temple Cowley residents and only 25% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.


Those answering on behalf of a business/group/organisation may be slightly more likely than average to drive a car as a means of travel (92% doing so at least sometimes, with 56% using it as their typical means of travel).

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Males are slightly more likely than females to drive a car as their typical way of travelling (37% and 29% respectively).
- White residents are less likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to drive a car as their typical way of travelling; 30% of white residents typically use this means of travel, compared with 40% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are more likely than those without a disability to drive a car as their typical means of travel (40%, compared to 31% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Figure 22: Please tell us about how you typically travel. 'By bus' RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,454).



Residents living in Temple Cowley are slightly more likely than residents in other areas to travel by bus at least sometimes; just over three-quarters (76%) of Temple Cowley residents travel by bus at least sometimes, compared with 72% of Florence Park residents, 64% of Church Cowley residents and 76% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.


Those answering on behalf of a business/group/organisation are less likely than average to use the bus as a means of travel (41% doing so at least sometimes).

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Bus usage tends to increase with age amongst residents; only 5% of under 45s use the bus as their typical means of travel, compared with 24% of those aged 65-74 and 18% of those aged 75+.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are more likely than those without a disability to use the bus at least sometimes (73%, compared to 68% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Figure 23: Please tell us about how you typically travel. 'Car passenger' RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,454).




Residents living in Temple Cowley are less likely than residents in the other LTN trial areas to typically travel by being a car passenger at least sometimes; just under half (49%) of Temple Cowley residents travel as a car passenger at least sometimes, compared with 59% of Florence Park residents and 55% of Church Cowley residents. Also, 55% of residents elsewhere in Oxford say that they typically travel as a car passenger at least sometimes.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity may be slightly more likely than those without a disability to travel as a car passenger at least sometimes (59%, compared to 54% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).

Figure 24: Please tell us about how you typically travel. 'Taxi' RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,454).



Residents living in Temple Cowley and Florence Park are slightly more likely than residents in Church Cowley to travel by taxi at least sometimes; more than two-fifths (46%) of Temple Cowley residents and 45% of Florence Park residents travel




by taxi at least sometimes, compared to 36% of Church Cowley residents and 37% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.

Those answering on behalf of an interest group may be slightly more likely than average to use taxis as a means of travel (60% doing so at least sometimes, with 28% using it as their typical means of travel).

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Those in middle age groups are slightly more likely than older residents to use taxis at least sometimes (47% of 35-44s and 46% of 45-54s, compared to 27% of 65-74s).
- White residents are slightly more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to use taxis at least sometimes as a form of travel; 41% of white residents typically use this means of travel, compared with 33% of BAME residents.

Figure 25: Please tell us about how you typically travel. 'Car club' RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,454).



Although very few residents use car clubs as their normal way to travel, Florence Park residents and residents elsewhere in Oxford may be slightly more likely than those in Church Cowley and Temple Cowley to use car clubs sometimes.

Those answering on behalf of an interest groups may be slightly more likely than average to use a car club as a means of travel (24% doing so at least sometimes, although none use a car club as their typical means of travel).

Further analysis of feedback from residents shows that there are no differences by demographic factors.




Those responding to the survey were asked to indicate whether they would consider cycling or walking more during the LTN trial – and if they don't currently cycle, would they consider trying to cycle.

Headline findings

Results for all respondents for this question are summarised in figure 26, below.

Figure 26: During the LTN trial, would you consider cycling or walking more? If you don't currently cycle, would you consider trying to cycle? RESULTS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS (all responses: n=1,384-1,387).



Encouragingly, more than half of respondents say they would definitely consider walking more during the LTN trial, with a further 16% saying that they would maybe consider doing so. Equally encouragingly, almost half (49%) of respondents indicate that they would definitely consider cycling more, with a further 13% saying that they would maybe consider cycling more.


However, around a sixth (16%) of respondents say they would definitely not consider walking more during the LTN trial, with approaching a quarter (23%) feeling they would definitely not consider cycling more during the LTN trial.

Results by Resident type

Figures 27 and 28 (overleaf) show how responses to this question varied for different types of respondent.



Figure 27: During the LTN trial, would you consider walking more?
RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,384).



Residents living in Florence Park are more likely than residents in other areas to definitely consider walking more during the LTN trial; two-thirds (66%) of Florence Park residents would definitely consider walking more, compared to only 40% of Church Cowley residents, 55% of Temple Cowley residents and 52% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.


Those answering on behalf of a business/group/organisation appear less likely than average to say that they would definitely walk more during the LTN trial, with only 16% saying they definitely would and 13% feeling that they maybe would.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Females are slightly more likely than males to express an intention to walk more during the LTN trial; 56% of females say they would definitely consider walking more during the LTN trial, compared with 50% of males.
- Younger age groups are more likely than older residents to express an intention to walk more during the LTN trial; 62% of under 25s, 54% of 25-34s and 55% of 35-44s and 54% of 45-54s say they would definitely consider walking more during the LTN trial, compared with 44% of 55-64s, 53% of 65-74s and 36% of those aged over 75.
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to indicate that they would definitely consider walking more during the LTN trial; 56% of white residents express this view, compared with 45% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to indicate that they would definitely consider walking more during the LTN trial (33%, compared to 57% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Figure 28: During the LTN trial, would you consider cycling more?
RESULTS BY RESPONDENT TYPE (all responses: n=1,387).



Residents living in Florence Park are more likely than residents in other areas to definitely consider cycling more (or try to start cycling) during the LTN trial; three-fifths (60%) of Florence Park residents would definitely consider cycling more, compared to only 37% of Church Cowley residents, 49% of Temple Cowley residents and 53% of residents elsewhere in Oxford.




Those answering on behalf of a business/group/organisation appear less likely than average to say that they would definitely cycle more (or try to start cycling) during the LTN trial, with only 18% saying they definitely would and 8% feeling that they maybe would.

Further analysis of feedback from residents highlights some differences in opinion by demographic factors:

- Younger age groups are more likely than older residents to express an intention to cycle more during the LTN trial; 62% of under 25s, 55% of 25-34s and 52% of 35-44s and 53% of 45-54s say they would definitely consider cycling more during the LTN trial, compared with 39% of 55-64s, 41% of 65-74s and 35% of those aged over 75.
- White residents are more likely than those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups to indicate that they would definitely consider cycling more during the LTN trial; 54% of white residents express this view, compared with 42% of BAME residents.
- Those with a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity are less likely than those without a disability to indicate that they would definitely consider cycling more during the LTN trial (27%, compared to 55% of those without an illness/disability/infirmity).



Social media and correspondence





In addition to analysing the survey results, we have reviewed the themes/sentiment of social media comments and written correspondence regarding the proposed LTNs.

There were less than twenty relevant comments made overall across all of the various Facebook and Twitter posts that Oxfordshire County Council released about the Cowley LTN trial.

The majority of the comments made on social media are more likely to relate to issues or concerns rather than focusing on more positive potential effects or benefits.

The main concern raised by the small number of residents making comments is that the proposed LTN trial will only divert or displace traffic onto other roads and make them more congested.

Another concern mentioned by one resident of Florence Park is that the LTN may lead to residents in that area feeling more isolated generally without the flow-through of vehicle traffic as it is currently.

However, there is some support for the proposed LTN trial in relation to it bringing back the notion of 'active travel' to the local area and reducing the amount of traffic and pollution in conjunction with this.

There is also some liking for 'anything that gives pedestrians and cyclists safe priority being a step forward'.

Finally, the potential benefit of less pollution and fewer vehicles on the streets in the LTN trial areas is mentioned as a positive by one resident.

The Council also received 22 pieces of correspondence (20 emails and a couple of letters) regarding the consultation.

Half of these were from residents, with the remainder coming from councillors (5) and representatives of organisations which included community, schooling, transport and policing groups.

Sentiment was mixed, with a couple of letters/emails expressing support for the proposals (1 resident and 1 councillor), 8 mainly opposing them (7 residents and one councillor) and 12 that were broadly supportive but expressed specific concerns/caveats (4 residents, 3 councillors, 5 organisations).

The main concerns raised were as follows:




- Access for emergency vehicles (4 residents, 2 organisations).
- Access to healthcare services, e.g. GPs, hospitals (3 residents).
- Access to schools (one resident, 2 organisations).
- Access to shops and other services, e.g. banks (3 residents).
- Rushed proposals without proper consultation (3 residents).
- Will create congestion in other areas (3 residents).



-
- Access for deliveries (2 residents).
 - Specific concerns about Temple Road (2 councillors).
 - Longer journey times leading to more emissions (2 residents).

For more information

Alasdair Gleed, Research Director
agleed@djsresearch.com



Head office: 3 Pavilion Lane, Strines,
Stockport, Cheshire, SK6 7GH

Leeds office: 2 St. David's Court,
David Street, Leeds, LS11 5QA

+44 (0)1663 767 857
djsresearch.co.uk



Follow us on LinkedIn...

For free market research findings and our latest news and developments:
[linkedin.com/company/djs-research-ltd](https://www.linkedin.com/company/djs-research-ltd)

For regularly updated market research findings from your sector, please
have a look at our complimentary insights: djsresearch.co.uk/blog/articles