



Response to the Bicester and Mid-Cherwell Movement and Place Plan Consultation – November 2025

CoHSAT, the Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel in Oxfordshire is a group of 25 voluntary and campaigning organisations working across Oxfordshire to create attractive, accessible and people-friendly streets.

We do this by encouraging efficient, active, low carbon and sustainable travel, which will reduce traffic, air pollution and noise, and enable healthy and thriving communities.

Summary response

The Movement and Place Plans are 'Part 2 of the LTCP' – as such they are the plans that must deliver each local area's part of the LTCP targets.

Overall we support the direction – there is much that is good within the plans. We support the direction and are mostly concerned that the plans are not ambitious enough or specific enough at this point to achieve the targets.

Major developments in this area: housing growth, EWR, Heyford Park, Ardley station and possibly rail freight terminal provide an opportunity to deliver these targets or put them out of reach. Achieving them will require making the right decisions on the London Road level crossing, and ensuring that policies for connecting new developments are adhered to in practice.

In detail

We appreciate the introduction, and the clear setting out of 'movement' and 'place' as the components of the plan.

Movement

The timescale of the MAP Plans is 15 years, and so the relevant targets are in the medium-term are:

By 2030:

- Replace or remove 1 out of every 4 current car trips in Oxfordshire
- Reduce car vehicle miles driven in Oxfordshire by 20%

- Increase the number of cycle trips in Oxfordshire from 600,000 to 1 million cycle trips per week
- Reduce road fatalities or serious injuries by 50%

By 2040:

- Deliver a net-zero transport network By 2050 our targets are to:
- Replace or remove an additional 1 out of 3 car trips in Oxfordshire

The Bicester MAP Plan has to deliver Bicester (and Mid-Cherwell)'s part of this. In the absence of a wider plan allocating targets to areas, this means it must reduce car miles in Bicester by 20%, increase cycling in Bicester by 67%, and reduce road fatalities and serious injuries in Bicester by 50% - all by 2030.

Of the 19 specific plans and 11 area-wide schemes shown on the map, none of them reduce private car journeys (with the possible exception of unspecific 'bus priority measures'. Several improve active travel or public transport, but there is good research¹ (and the examples of Stevenage² and Milton Keynes) to show that good provision of alternatives is not enough to shift people away from damaging private car transport.

There is description of 'Demand Management' on p33. But it is not at all specific, and there are only 5 years to the 2030 target. For context, it has been 10 years from the announcement of the plan for Oxford to have Traffic Filters, a Zero Emissions Zone and Workplace Parking Levy (Cabinet, 27 January 2015) to reach our current state of a tiny ZEZ and Temporary Congestion Charge). And meanwhile, plans like the A41, Vendee Drivee and large-scale housing growth will add capacity traffic, leading to greater traffic and congestion working against the targets of the LTCP. So, specific plans for car traffic reduction are needed – whether this is achieved through local congestion charges, road pricing, traffic filters, parking measures or some other means.

This is why the best option for replacing the level crossing on London Road is an active travel-only underpass. It is the only option that makes walking, wheeling and cycling *more easy*, while making private car use *slightly more difficult, but not being obstructive for those who need it* – thus making progress towards LTCP goals.

The same logic applies to the cycling schemes and the road casualty reduction schemes to be delivered by 2030. They need to be large-scale and targeted on the areas where they can make enough difference to change the numbers by sufficient magnitude. It's a big task and there is no indication that the plans are big enough and specific enough to be delivered in time and generate enough change to deliver the targets.

¹ [Reducing traffic with "carrots": A review of the evidence - ScienceDirect](#)

² [Build it and they will come? Why Britain's 1960s cycling revolution flopped | The Guardian](#)

Place

We support the healthy place-shaping objective (BIC1). In addition we propose two related ones, consistent with the LTCP. These would need to be delivered in conjunction with the District Council (until unitarisation) and Town/Parish Councils.

- **Increasing local density** – which can be both housing and mixed development. This is essential to reducing the need for motorised transport.
- **Developing liveable neighbourhoods** – Liveable neighbourhoods, are a features of the LTCP and improve access to services while reducing the need for travel. The MAP Plan should develop them in towns by identifying local centres for enhancement, plans for enhancing them, and gaps where they are missing.

Large new and extension developments in particular should build in these features. Create Streets' report on a development in Cippenham 'Stepping off the road to nowhere'³ provides an excellent example.

Broader aspects

Other aspects of the plan would also benefit from being developed in specificity. For example where it describes 'Explore options to promote place shaping' or 'Work with partners to deliver the walking, wheeling and cycling schemes contained within adopted documents'. These are good concepts and we support them, but they should be more specific and prioritised for the next few years at least.

We understand that there will be questions about funding and other uncertainties, but the LTCP is set down, and these are the 2nd level of plans that aim to deliver it, the MAP Plans should be providing confidence in delivery.

Robin Tucker
Chair, CoHSAT

³ [New report: Stepping off the Road to Nowhere - Create Streets](#)