

Division(s):

CABINET – 15 MARCH 2011

LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3, 2011-2030

Report by Deputy Director of Environment & Economy Highways & Transport

Introduction

1. Oxfordshire County Council has a statutory requirement to produce a new LTP by April 2011. The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval for the Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2030 (LTP3) in order that it can be put before The County Council for formal adoption as Council Policy.
2. LTP3 will be a document that will help shape Oxfordshire for the long term, with a 20 year horizon rather than five years as in previous LTPs. This will bring it in line with the Sustainable Community Strategy, 'Oxfordshire 2030', and extend beyond the 2026 planning horizon that District Councils have been working to with their Local Development Frameworks and their infrastructure delivery plans, which it will complement. It therefore provides a framework for all transport development across the county.
3. The Plan has been developed against a fast changing background. It has to reflect the difficult current economic climate whilst not losing sight of the longer term aspirations for Oxfordshire. With uncertainty over the future of the planning process and the availability of funding, it will be important that the County Council has the clear policy framework LTP3 will provide, to help the Council and its partners plan, fund and deliver the infrastructure (including priority transport schemes) essential to enable development. While this LTP will not directly affect the amount of funding made available to the council, the overall quality and delivery of the Plan may be taken into account by the government in decisions on funding bids or major scheme applications.
4. In January 2011 the government published a White Paper, "*Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon - Making Sustainable Local Transport Happen*" which sets out its vision for delivering a transport system that is an engine for economic growth but is also greener and safer and improves quality of life. At the centre of this is a commitment to encouraging local sustainable transport choices which will be good for society as a whole.

Local Transport Plan Aims

5. Transport is important for each of the county's ambitions set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy. Congestion can act against economic prosperity; air quality and road safety affect local communities; traffic is a major local source of greenhouse gases; lack of access to education, jobs and

other services can re-enforce local deprivation; encouraging 'active' travel (walking and cycling) can help improve health. LTP3 has a major role in meeting these ambitions. The main aims of this Plan are that by 2030:

- The county has well designed and maintained transport networks that meet its growing needs;
 - Congestion levels are reduced and major hotspots have been tackled;
 - Road casualties are substantially lower than present numbers;
 - No-one is excluded from taking part in activities through lack of transport facilities;
 - New developments have been integrated into the county without causing traffic or environmental problems;
 - The contribution made by transport in the county to carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere is reduced;
 - The county's transport networks contribute to an improved environmental quality;
 - Use of public transport is increased both within and between the major towns and Oxford;
 - Walking and cycling levels across the county are increased.
6. There are some significant opportunities (as well as challenges) in developing and managing growth and infrastructure in Oxfordshire over the next two decades, which this Plan is positioned to meet, including the development of Science Vale UK, Eco Bicester and the regeneration of Oxford's West End. For this Plan to be successful it will be essential that all of those with a stake in the future of the county work closely together to make Oxfordshire better for existing residents and businesses, as well as for new development. We want local communities and businesses to work with us to find realistic solutions to help respond to transport related impacts.
7. The Oxfordshire City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), which has identified Science Vale, Bicester and Oxford as the key hubs for delivering economic growth, provides a forum to help guide the delivery of the Plan. The LTP also needs to reflect the development (and associated infrastructure and services) proposed through Local Development Frameworks and promote the priority strategic transport infrastructure schemes agreed in the Oxfordshire Local Investment Plan. Inclusion of these schemes in the LTP will be a crucial factor in the ability of the Council and our partners to progress these projects.

Public consultation

8. In September 2010, Cabinet approved a draft LTP3 for consultation. This public consultation took place between October 9, 2010 and January 4, 2011. It was mainly promoted through the council's online consultation portal as well as being advertised at the Oxford Park & Ride sites and at other locations across the county. Stakeholders identified through the LTP development process were invited personally to take part in the consultation. At the close of the consultation we had received 676 comments from 237 different respondents. In addition, comments were received from all District Councils.

The main issues raised in the consultation, together with the recommended responses to them, are shown in the table below

Comment	Recommended Response
Opposition to Cogges Link Road, Witney	OCC to maintain support as previously agreed, as the best scheme to reduce congestion and improve air quality in town centre
Impact of HGVs on rural roads and villages	Issue in each location to be considered in terms of its value for money in meeting LTP objectives. Context is countywide HGV routing map which provides principles. Further work is needed to agree and deliver priorities.
Park & Ride expansion (comments in favour and against)	OCC to look for opportunities to expand provision on the edge of Oxford and possibilities for remote sites. Expansion or new sites will form part of a wider strategy supporting growth in Oxfordshire.
A40 congestion issues	Still a top priority but withdrawal of funding for Access to Oxford means there is unlikely to be an early solution. Oxford LDF Core Strategy and the proposed "Northern Gateway" development site provide a potential for external funding for priority schemes. This will need to be a mixture of highway and sustainable travel solutions.
Cross boundary issues	Text has been added in final draft especially regarding Reading and Swindon
Need for new river crossing north of Didcot	Scheme would be highly expensive and currently no funding is available or is likely to be. The possibility is not included for delivery in LTP3, but would be a longer term aspiration beyond LTP3 period.
Need to deal with Bicester Village traffic	OCC will continue to work with Bicester Village and Cherwell District Council to develop solutions; some relief may come from other schemes planned for town (e.g. Bicester SW Link Road); the possibility of Park and Ride is being investigated
Lack of Implementation Programme	This will be included in final version following decisions of the Cabinet.
Support for A40 Lodge Hill slip roads	No strong technical justification or funding for this scheme. As a trunk road the decision lies with Highways Agency who tend to oppose proposals for additional accesses onto A34
Support for Grove & Wantage Station	It is in LTP3 as part of longer term strategy for rail development and transport in the Science Vale area.
Retain Kidlington Station proposal	It has been difficult to attract interest from the railway industry. The proposed station at Water Eaton would have good connections to Oxford and London. It is proposed to retain Kidlington Station as a longer term aspiration for beyond LTP3. Focus in LTP3 period will be on Water Eaton and investigating better connections to it from Kidlington

9. A report summarising all the comments received in the consultation (with an officer response and a recommended course of action) has been placed in the Members' Resource Centre. The responses from District Councils and other key stakeholders are summarised in Annexes 1 and 2. These documents will also be placed on the County Council website prior to the meeting.

LTP3 Implementation Plan

10. This has been developed to meet LTP aims and strategic objectives to deliver new housing, (including affordable homes), support economic growth, achieve regeneration and tackle deprivation and contribute to meeting strategic infrastructure needs. It reflects the proposals in the Local Investment Plan and will need to take account of supporting infrastructure requirements being identified through work on local development frameworks.
11. The proposed programme for the first five years of the Plan is shown in Annex 3(i). The Council has been given confirmed funding allocations by central Government for the first two years of the plan period and indicative allocations for the following two years. This programme takes account of the decisions made by Cabinet in the light of these allocations. For planning purposes it has been assumed the allocation for year 5 (where no indication has been given) is the same as year 4.
12. There is still considerable work to be undertaken to identify a full programme for this period, particularly with regard to minor schemes and developer funded schemes, and it is intended that further reports will be prepared later this year to update the programme when this work has concluded.
13. In Annex 3(ii) the major proposals for the remainder of the LTP3 period are set out. This includes the remaining schemes from the Local Investment Plan and transport schemes currently identified for delivery by other agencies. There are significant uncertainties in planning over this period, but it is important to set out the long term programme to allow for effective planning of major schemes, many of which would require a lead-in period of up to 10 years.
14. In the event that significant new development, beyond that currently proposed in local development frameworks, comes forward, the requirements of the strategic transport network will be reviewed, including the need for previously proposed longstanding or aspirational transport schemes that are currently not included in the Plan because the cost cannot currently be justified, or there is no realistic prospect of securing funding.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

15. A Strategic Environmental Assessment has been carried out on the proposed Plan. A copy of the Environmental Report is available in the Members' Resource Centre and is on the Council website. The SEA identified significant positive effects, principally improvements to health through better opportunities for walking and cycling, as well as overall accessibility and built environment improvements. The SEA did identify significant negative effects

attributable to new highway links proposed in Bicester, Science Vale and Witney which could give rise to some permanent and irreversible impacts upon landscape, soils and biodiversity. The SEA recommends that these projects be subject to detailed Environmental Impact Assessment. It also recommends that greater investment in demand management is considered for the larger towns, to promote a greater level of modal shift. An adoption statement will be published following the adoption of the LTP by the Council.

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

16. This has also been carried out on the Plan, to determine whether it would have any significant negative impact on areas of ecological, scientific or nature conservation importance or interest. A second stage Screening report has been carried out on the LTP programme. This report is available in the Members' resource Centre and on the County Council website. The HRA found that there were no likely significant effects predicted from the schemes currently included in the programme however there were potential impacts in the future from some schemes, for example the upgrading of Pear Tree and Water Eaton Park & Rides (and the Water Eaton rail station); improvements to Oxford northern approaches and Woodstock Road bus corridor improvements. The HRA recommends that project level HRAs are carried out on each of the identified projects before work commences. The HRA report has been submitted to Natural England and the Environment Agency for comment. Any received from these organisations will be reported orally at the meeting.

Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)

17. Equality Impact Assessment seeks to ensure that the impacts of plans and proposals do not unfairly favour or discriminate against any group in society. An EQIA has been carried out in parallel with the development of LTP3 with particular reference to the public consultation on policies. Focus groups were organised with membership balanced to reflect the demographic make up of Oxfordshire. During consultations, care was taken to ensure that equality issues were fully taken into account in the list of organisations consulted. Disability organisations, principally *Unlimited* expressed concern over a number of policies, the wording of which they felt did not adequately reflect the needs and interests of people with a wide range of disabilities. Officers worked closely with disability representatives and the policies were revised. Feedback from the final stage of consultation on the draft Plan showed that the revised policies are now much more appropriate. The LTP3 EQIA was approved by the E&E Equality Working Group in February 2011 and is available on the County Council website.

Financial and Staff Implications

18. The programme has been developed to reflect the current difficult financial environment for the first 5 years of the Plan. For the rest of the Plan the overall ambition is for a level of investment that is roughly similar to that which was available in the 1990-2010 period. To achieve this it will be important to make the best use of all available resources. Officers are currently reviewing

the developer funding accounts to maximise the use of this funding and the intention is that the funding in the Integrated Transport minor schemes programme will be used to top-up developer funds where there is insufficient capital available to carry out the most appropriate scheme.

19. Funding for the Access to Oxford major scheme was not forthcoming following the government's Comprehensive Spending Review. While some of the elements of the package have been incorporated in modified form in the LTP Implementation Plan, other parts of this project will need to be developed through partnership working with the rail industry, the Highways Agency, or as part of the Northern Gateway Area Action Plan.
20. There are funding opportunities to help deliver the Implementation Plan, for example from the Regional Growth Fund (RGF). A bid has been made by the Science Vale UK Partnership, supported by the LEP, to develop the design and planning work for the Science Vale transport package. If this is successful then this work should enable further funding to be secured from a combination of developer and public sector. A bid has also been made to support the East-West Rail project. The government has also launched the £560 million *Local Sustainable Transport Fund* (LTSF) to build on councils' plans to take forward packages of sustainable travel measures through their LTPs. Only one bid per local authority is allowed. For small projects (with a bid value of less than £5 million) bids for the first round of funds are due by 18 April, while for large projects (over £5 million) initial proposals are due by 6 June and full business cases by 20 December. Options for a bid are currently being developed, in consultation with the Cabinet members for Growth & Infrastructure and Transport.
21. To make the most of any funding opportunities over the next few years it is important that the Council has a sufficient number of developed, justified and costed schemes which can be delivered in the often limited timescales that these bid processes demand.

Risks

22. There is a risk of raising expectations of how much can be achieved through the LTP in terms of short/medium term capital schemes, particularly in the current economic climate. Transport infrastructure investment is being significantly hit by reduced funding levels, limiting the Council's ability to deliver against LTP priorities, at least in the short term. The long-term nature of this Plan will help to mitigate against this risk, as will (to a certain extent) the inclusion in the Plan of the 5-year programme outlined in this report.
23. On the other hand, if constraints on available funding are assumed throughout the Plan period then the lack of investment would put the county's economic prosperity at risk. It could also impact on journey time reliability and the choice available for communities to access goods, services and employment. For these reasons the assumptions about funding beyond the first five years reflect previously higher levels of investment.

RECOMMENDATION

24. The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) RECOMMEND the County Council to adopt the Local Transport Plan, subject to the inclusion of any consequential and editorial changes in the text as agreed by the Deputy Director of Environment & Economy Highways & Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Growth and Infrastructure and the Cabinet Member for Transport; and**

- (b) to delegate the authority for any interim changes to the Plan to be agreed by the Deputy Director of Environment & Economy Highways & Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Growth and Infrastructure and Transport, for proposed adoption as Policy as part of the annual review of the Plan.**

STEVE HOWELL

Deputy Director of Environment & Economy
Highways & Transport

Background papers:

- Guidance on Local Transport Plans Department for Transport July 2009
- Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2030 Cabinet draft March 2011
- Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2030 Summary of Consultation Responses March 2011
- Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2030 Strategic Environmental Assessment - Environmental Report
- Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2030 Habitats Regulations Assessment - Final Report

Annexes: Annex 1: Comments From City And District Councils

Annex 2: Comments From Key Stakeholders

Annex 3: Proposed Implementation Programme For Ltp3

Contact Officers: John Disley, Tel: 01865 810460
Roger O'Neill, Tel: 01865 815659

February 2011

COMMENTS FROM DISTRICT COUNCILS

The major points made by the five District Councils are as follows:

Cherwell District Council

- * Would wish to see Bicester identified as a priority for external funding in policy G4
- * Major new link roads are unlikely to be delivered before end of LTP but should be retained
- * OCC should continue to work with CDC to consider the opportunities created by major developments
- * LTP should acknowledge the contribution made by lorry movements to overall congestion in Banbury
- * Strategic transport schemes for Bicester should remain a priority
- * Walking and pedestrian environment strategy should investigate integration between the proposed Bicester eco-development and the existing town.
- * Bicester cycling strategy should mention the railway stations as key locations/destinations
- * Strategy for buses should include a rapid bus route between NW Bicester and town centre
- * The purpose of P&R facility should be clarified
- * The priority to be given to measures for Howes Lane and Lords Lane needs to be clarified
- * Prioritise high quality pedestrian, cycling and bus links to Water Eaton station, if that proceeds
- * OCC is asked to take a clear position on a rail station at Kidlington
- * Priority should be given to improving pedestrian connectivity within and to Kidlington village centre
- * LTP should acknowledge importance of providing footpath links within and between villages and to transport and employment areas
- * A good level of bus service should particularly be provided to those villages which offer employment and other opportunities

Oxford City Council

- * Policies do not consistently distinguish the responsibilities of various delivery stakeholders
- * Object to lack of baseline information against which the success of measures can be judged
- * Supports high priority of reducing congestion on the proviso that this should not be interpreted as a barrier to delivering viable development
- * Road safety section would benefit from explicit policy requiring the designing-in of street features that discourage speeds of above 20mph in urban areas
- * Accessibility policies should prioritise local accessibility improvements for socially excluded communities

- * Supporting development section should be redrafted so that it cannot be seen to unnecessarily duplicate local development frameworks
- * Section on contributions should be more flexibly worded to refer to seeking contributions from developments towards strategic transport developments in accordance with the relevant local development framework
- * Recommend adding commitment to investigate further ways in which delivery patterns can be further rationalised in Oxford city centre
- * Should include reference to Oxford City Centre Street Scene manual
- * Should explicitly include park and ride sites as public transport interchanges
- * Should include firm commitment to publish a strategy for the implementation of remote park and ride, including outlining how this would be funded
- * Should adopt street user hierarchy as set out in Manual for Streets
- * Need to have firm commitment to produce separate Cycling and Walking Strategy Documents
- * Object to revocation of dual cycle network in Oxford
- * Support the idea of high quality rapid transit serving eastern arc but make clear that this is a long term aspiration depending on feasibility and funding
- * Need to have explicit support for elements from Access to Oxford project
- * Should include improvements to Seacourt, Redbridge and Pear Tree park and ride sites
- * Should acknowledge opportunities presented by Northern Gateway strategic development
- * Should include new footbridge and cycle crossing at Oxpens
- * Should refer to City Council Low Emissions Strategy
- * Behavioural Change and Traffic Management sections need to be better integrated

South Oxfordshire District Council

- * Question why Chinnor is in smaller towns category
- * The link is made between transport and economic development but not carried through to solutions
- * Top priority should be given to investment in strategic highway schemes that will bring direct and immediate benefits to the Oxfordshire economy
- * Need map of bus hierarchy
- * Request investigation of formal park and ride facility at Lewknor
- * Science Vale UK Strategy should confirm the necessary infrastructure as county council's top priority including improvements to A338 and A417
- * Include traffic calming for Harwell and the Hagbournes in the programme
- * LTP should refer to creating a better bus interchange at the Orchard Centre
- * Need for joint review with SODC on parking strategy for Henley-on-Thames
- * Need legislative details for environmental monitoring
- * Amend text re air quality for Didcot, Henley, Wallingford and Watlington

Vale of White Horse District Council

- * Should include commitment to work with DC to investigate how the case for the completion of the A34 Lodge Hill junction
- * Add investigate Marcham Road/Colwell Drive/Drayton Road/Ock Street junction improvements
- * Supports Science Vale strategy which should confirm that necessary transport infrastructure should be OCC top priority
- * LTP should commit OCC to funding Harwell Strategic and Field Link Roads and Wantage Eastern Relief Road and complement these with highway improvements to A338 and A417
- * Wantage Western link Road should be included as a long term aspiration
- * Disappointed that there is no commitment for Marcham Bypass
- * Supports strategy for A420 traffic management

West Oxfordshire District Council

- * Should concentrate in short term upon delivery of schemes for which funding is already identified (priorities are Cogges Link Road and A40 Downs Road junction)
- * Need to review and improve existing facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport
- * Support strategies for Carterton, Chipping Norton and Long Hanborough station
- * Priority must be given to linking Carterton with strategic road network
- * Removal of conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians in Chipping Norton Horsefair must be given priority
- * On rural roads speed limits below the national limits should be introduced to improve safety and encourage use by pedestrians and cyclists

COMMENTS FROM KEY STAKEHOLDERS**Highways Agency**

- * Targeted infrastructure improvements need to consider the potential impacts on strategic road network (SRN), its users and to road safety
- * Strongly support policy G2
- * Fully support measures which will reduce dependence on private car by offering sustainable alternatives
- * Support principle of P&R but ask that OCC consider the impact of expansion plans on SRN
- * New infrastructure should only be considered as a last resort after first identifying alternative sustainable solutions
- * The key issues relate to worsening congestion and need for mitigation of transport impacts on the SRN of planned growth in Oxford, including Northern Gateway
- * Vital OCC work with LPAs to ensure that mitigation measures in one area do not impact on a neighbouring authority's ability to deliver their own development or mitigation measures

British Waterways

- * Feel the Oxford canal and its towpath can play a part here to make the Northern Gateway a true Green gateway
- * Feel the towpath and the redevelopment of canalside near Banbury can offer considerable opportunities for sustainable travel within Banbury and beyond

Reading Borough Council

- * Hopes we will consider the cross boundary movements of school children as well as commuters between Reading and Henley-upon-Thames as an opportunity to work together to encourage sustainable travel to school and work
- * Hopes we will consider how we can work together to provide integrated services and ticketing for public transport

West Berkshire District Council

- * Oxfordshire lorry route network will need to be consistent with West Berks freight network
- * Need to consider proximity of M4 J13 when considering access to Science Vale UK area
- * Particularly concerned that additional demand for travel arising from growth at Didcot and Wallingford will result in additional traffic on West Berkshire's local highway network, particularly when A34 is congested
- * Supportive of measures to make the Science Vale UK area more self-contained and to promote sustainable travel in the area

- * LTP3 should recognise cross boundary issues and need for continued partnership working

Cotswold Conservation Trust

- * Welcomes the intention to reduce speed limits on rural single carriageway roads to 50mph but considers that this should be a maximum and lower speed limits may be appropriate in some circumstances
- * Welcomes proposals to reduce the impact of light pollution
- * Would wish to have reference to the Guidelines for highway maintenance and management which have been agreed in the Chilterns and Cotswolds AONBs
- * Disappointed that there is no policy reference to reducing roadside clutter, particularly signage

North Wessex Downs AONB

- * Strongly recommends that before the County Council proceed further with the Plan that detailed landscape and visual impact assessment work is undertaken to fully assess the impact of new road building both within and within the immediate setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB

Chilterns Conservation Board

- * Consider that Policy PT6 (High Speed Rail) and paragraph 11.50 should be deleted because there are no benefits to the county from HS2
- * Would object to inclusion in programme of schemes for Park and Ride at Lewknor, remodelling southbound entry slip road at B4009, Watlington Bypass, restricting vehicles on Icknield Way Watlington, rationalising coach parking at Lewknor.

Chiltern Railways

- * Need to include promotion of rail as means of reducing congestion
- * Need to consider importance of the private car for access to the rail network
- * Car parking at Banbury station will be reduced with redevelopment of Tramway Industrial Estate
- * Chiltern Railways anticipate entering into a Bicester Stations Transport Partnership to optimise use of non-car modes to both the town's stations
- * Not sure why driving to a P&R site is considered desirable but driving to a train station is not
- * Improved rail services from Islip Station may not be possible without prejudicing timetable reliability and journey times for the overall Oxford-Bicester-London service

Oxford Radcliffe Hospitals NHS Trust

- * Further bus service improvements to hospitals would be welcomed
- * Need to recognise ORHT's travel plan initiatives
- * Changes of use at ORHT sites should not be taken as intensification with the implication of adverse transport implications

CA12

- * ORHT have more importance than simply as employer in Eastern Arc - need to recognise operational requirements
- * Some workplace parking is essential to the efficient delivery of public health services
- * Park & ride expansion to the south of the city should have high priority
- * Pricing mechanism for park & ride should be targeted and exemptions made for key workers
- * Particular attention should be given to management and regulation of the operation of Thornhill Park & Ride
- * Investigations into workplace parking should distinguish between local workers and providers of essential public health services

South Central Ambulance Service

- * This ever expanding town needs serious consideration when planning for its future travel requirements - development of a Southern entrance and exit junction on the M40 making it a new junction 10a would be considered a very appropriate use of taxpayer's money.
- * a good infrastructure of cycle paths are required on all new developments in and round Banbury and especially linking existing commercial developments such as Banbury Business Park, Adderbury where safety for cyclists reaching this estate needs improving.

ANNEX 3 - PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMME FOR LTP3

(i) Capital Programme 2011-2016

(* denotes a LIP scheme)	2011/12 £000s	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000s	2014/15 £000s	2015/16 £000s	Comments & Explanation
STRUCTURAL MAINTENANCE						
Carriageway schemes	3,439	3,340	3,580	3,605	3,590	
Footway schemes	1,696	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,300	
Surface treatments	3,800	3,900	3,850	3,900	3,900	
Street Lighting	500	500	500	500	500	
Drainage	1,200	1,100	1,100	950	950	
Bridges	1,105	1,400	1,060	1,015	930	
Iffley Road Oxford Structural Maintenance	1,340	1,010				
Ruscote Avenue Banbury Structural Maintenance	606					
Total Structural Maintenance	13,686	12,600	11,440	11,320	11,170	
INTEGRATED TRANSPORT (including allocation of IT block in 2011/12 & 2012/13 as previously proposed)						
Frideswide Square development & design, including rail station transfer deck	400					Conversion of traffic signals to roundabouts to ease flows, reduce congestion and enhance streetscape. Does not fund implementation, which would be funded from development or Government funding bid. Additional funding available from West End Partnership
Banbury North/South Route*	170	330				Junction realignments and capacity improvements on the A361 and A4260. £260,000 match funding available from development
Science Vale Transport Package - detailed design*	200	200				Design of transport network improvements, including new highway schemes. Construction not included. Also included in RGF Round 1 bid
Science Vale Strategic Cycle Network*	50	150				Start of construction of cycle network. Potential LSTF bid Also included in RGF Round 1 bid
Science Vale Strategic Public Transport Network	125					Improvements to Premium Bus Route facilities

(* denotes a LIP scheme)	2011/12 £000s	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000s	2014/15 £000s	2015/16 £000s	Comments & Explanation
Routes*						and information provision. Potential LSTF bid Also included in RGF Round 1 bid
Cogges Link Road Witney *	1,393	8,085	3,904	3,131		Inner relief road for Witney plus measures on Bridge Street to consolidate benefits. Costs shown include developer funding
Didcot Parkway Interchange *	1,321	2,661	214	587		Improved bus waiting and pedestrian facilities at rail station to supplement investment from First Great Western. Costs shown include developer and district council funding
Kennington Roundabout upgrade*	250	2,250				Roundabout improvements, previously elements of Access to Oxford project, to relieve severe congestion. Heyford Hill contribution supplements £2m developer scheme
Hinksey Hill Interchange upgrade *	10	240				
Heyford Hill Roundabout enhancement *	25	475				
Thornhill P&R extension project development*	85					Additional parking spaces plus parking management. Development and design only, implementation to be funded from development or government funding bid
A40/Downs Road Junction, Witney project development	50					New junction on A40 Witney Bypass in conjunction with North Curbridge development. Project development and design only, implementation to be developer funded.
Countywide Speed Limit Review	138					Completion of 2010/11 Project following release of capital in November
Minor schemes programme			965	900	900	OCC funded schemes to be identified. Principally these will be used to supplement developer funding
Developer funded/led schemes	300	285				Match funding for Developer funded schemes (work is ongoing to identify further schemes)
Small developer funded schemes already in the programme	1,058	68				

(* denotes a LIP scheme)	2011/12 £000s	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000s	2014/15 £000s	2015/16 £000s	Comments & Explanation
Total Integrated Transport	5,575	14,744	5,083	4,618	900	
Additional Allocation		1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	To be determined
TOTAL PROGRAMME	19,261	28,344	17,523	16,938	13,070	

Total Funding	2011/12 £000s	2012/13 £000s	2013/14 £000s	2014/15 £000s	2015/16 £000s	
OCC Capital Funding	17,011	18,165	15,067	14,521	13,070	
Developer Contributions	1,310	10,179	2,456	2,417	1,310	
Other External Contributions	940					

(ii) Additional schemes (*denotes Local Investment Plan Scheme)

The following additional strategic schemes have been identified for potential delivery during the Plan period. Because of the long lead times that are often involved in scheme development, work on some of these schemes may commence in the short term but implementation may not happen until later in the Plan period.

- Frideswide Square and approaches - remodelling
- Oxford Rail Station Transfer Deck*
- Thornhill Park & Ride expansion and parking management*
- A40/A44/A34 Oxford Northern Approaches *
- Science Vale Transport Package: Harwell Strategic Link Road / Harwell Field Link Road / Wantage Eastern Link Road / Rowstock junction upgrade / Rowstock Western Link / Featherbed Lane Improvement / Grove & Wantage Rail Station / Science Vale Strategic Public Transport and Cycle Networks *
- A41 park & ride & bus priority, Bicester *
- Oxford Eastern Arc improved access to employment, including public transport enhancement
- Increased park and ride capacity and infrastructure, including potential remote Park & Ride
- Bicester Eastern Perimeter Route Improvement
- Strategic Cycle Routes e.g. Witney-Carterton, Eynsham - Oxford
- A40/Downs Road junction
- Witney - Oxford improvement/bus priority

Details of the more local/smaller area strategy schemes needed to deliver the area strategies will be presented to Cabinet as a separate paper. Those schemes will then also be used to collect developer contributions towards the town strategy, and if justified be funded from the Integrated Transport block as yet unallocated in the capital programme. Other supporting measures which may be put forward for this funding include better travel information, network management and smart ticketing. It is also expected that significant progress would be made by other agencies on the following Local Investment Plan schemes by 2021:

- Chiltern Railways Evergreen 3
- East West Rail (western section)
- M40 Junction 9 Improvements
- South West Bicester Perimeter Road
- Didcot northern perimeter road Phase 3
- Cotswold Line re-doubling