

Division(s) affected: *Didcot Ladygrove*

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT

16 JULY 2026

DIDCOT: A4130 ABINGDON ROAD & HADDEN HILL – PROPOSED 30MPH SPEED LIMIT & TRAFFIC/HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Report by Director of Environment and Highways

RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet Member is **RECOMMENDED** to:

Approve the following traffic/highway improvements in Didcot, as advertised:

- (a) **A4130 Hadden Hill:**
 - i. **Extend the existing 30mph speed limit eastwards for approximately 130 metres,**
 - ii. **Two new Toucan crossings (a signal-controlled crossing for use by pedestrians and cyclists) either side of the roundabout junction with the access to the ‘Hadden Hill’ retail park,**
 - iii. **Four new bus stop clearways, with ‘No stopping except local buses’ restrictions,**
 - iv. **New sections of segregated foot/cycleway (5 metres wide) on the North side,**
 - v. **New section of shared foot/cycleway (3 metres wide) on the south side.**

- (b) **A4130 Abingdon Road:**
 - i. **Two new Toucan crossings (a signal-controlled crossing for use by pedestrians and cyclists) either side of the junction with Tamar Way,**
 - ii. **Two new bus stop clearways, with ‘No stopping except local buses’ restrictions,**
 - iii. **New section of segregated foot/cycleway (5 metres wide) on the East side, and**
 - iv. **New section of shared foot/cycleway (3 metres wide) on the west side, south of Tamar Way.**

Executive Summary

2. This report presents comments received to a statutory consultation – and the subsequent response to objections from County Council Officers – on proposals

to introduce various highway & traffic improvements on the A4130 Hadden Hill & Abingdon Road in Didcot – as shown in **Annexes 1 & 2**.

3. The proposals have been put forward as a result of the development of adjacent land for residential purposes, which are required in the immediate vicinity related to the associated supporting infrastructure, and are in accordance with the approved S.106 agreement/planning obligations
4. The development will see additions & improvements to the pedestrian, pedal-cycle, and motor vehicular access infrastructure to the new residential development – from both the A4130/Hadden Hill retail park roundabout, and Abingdon Road. The subsequent proposals will see an extension of the existing 30mph speed limit on the A4130 Hadden Hill, and also the provision of new toucan crossings (signal-controlled crossings for use by both pedestrians and pedal cyclists), new bus stop facilities with clearway restrictions, & the widening of existing sections of footway to create both segregated & shared cycleway/footways.

Corporate Policies and Priorities

5. Of the three priorities identified within the newly adopted 'Oxfordshire Strategic Plan 2025-2028' which are listed below, these proposals actively support priority nos.1 & 3:
 - (1) Greener Oxfordshire – *“We want our communities to enjoy clean air, access to green space, and safe and sustainable ways to move around. This means reducing traffic congestion and investing in public transport, cycling and walking; protecting our natural environment; and helping Oxfordshire respond and adapt to a changing climate.”*
 - (2) Fairer Oxfordshire – *“We want all our residents to benefit from the advantages our county has to offer. This means supporting a local economy that benefits everyone; assisting people who face challenges in finding work; making our services as easy to access as possible; and helping communities in need.”*
 - (3) Healthier Oxfordshire – *“We want all our residents to be happy, healthy and safe. This means helping children get the best start in life; creating opportunities for young people to reach their full potential; supporting older people to age well and stay independent for as long as possible; and encouraging everyone to make healthy choices.”*

Financial Implications

6. Funding for consultation on the proposals has been received directly from the developer, with the relevant agreements in place for them to also fund implementation if approved.

7. Finance has completed a high-level review of this report. As no financial figures or costings were included, this sign off is limited to confirming that the narrative is reasonable based on the information provided. Service area Officers therefore take responsibility for confirming the funding arrangements and validating the financial position & underlying data independently from Finance.

Comments checked by:

Andrew Price – Interim Business Partnering Accountant

Andrew.Price@Oxfordshire.gov.uk

Legal Implications

8. The consultation that has been undertaken complies with the consultation requirements for the various elements as required by law including under the Highways Act 1980, the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and any other relevant legislation.
9. The scheme has been promoted by Oxfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority and Traffic Authority under the Highways Act 1980, and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Comments checked by:

Jennifer Crouch – Principal Solicitor (Regulatory)

Jennifer.Crouch@Oxfordshire.gov.uk

Staff Implications

8. There are no negative staff implications – with the appraisal of the proposals, as well as the consultation process having been undertaken by Officers from the 'Highway Agreements (South)', and 'TRO & Schemes' teams as part of their regular day-to-day duties, with no additional or negative impact on capacity expected.

Equality & Inclusion Implications

10. No negative implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of the proposals.

Sustainability Implications

11. The measures are aimed at increasing safety and convenience for vehicles as, well as improved facilities for buses, pedestrians and cycles, and with the segregation of the more vulnerable highway users, which will encourage more confident use of alternative means of transport.

Risk Management

12. No potential significant health and safety or service provision risks have been identified in these proposals.

Formal Consultation

13. Formal consultation was carried out between 20 May and 19 June 2026. A notice was published in the Oxfordshire Herald Series newspaper. An email was sent to statutory consultees & key-stakeholders, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Bus operators, countywide transport/access & disabled peoples user groups, Cherwell District Council, South Oxfordshire District Council, relevant local District Councillors, Didcot Town Council, and the local County Councillors representing the Didcot Ladygrove, Didcot South, Didcot West, and Cholsey & The Hagbournes divisions.
14. During the course of the formal consultation, 11 responses were received via the online survey, and these are summarised in the tables below:

table1. A4130 Hadden Hill:

Proposal	Support	Partially support / concerns	Object	No objection / No opinion
30mph speed limit	9	1	1	-
Toucan crossings	10	1	-	-
Bus stop clearways	10	1	-	-
Segregated foot/cycleway	10	-	1	-
Shared foot/cycleway	10	-	1	-

table2. A4130 Abingdon Road:

Proposal	Support	Partially support / concerns	Object	No objection / No opinion
Toucan crossings	10	1	-	-
Bus stop clearways	11	-	-	-
Segregated foot/cycleway	10	-	1	-
Shared foot/cycleway	9	-	2	-

15. Additionally, a further four emails were received directly – with Thames Valley Police not objecting, although raising some concerns about the proximity of the bus stops to the crossing facilities. Thames Travel (local bus operator) submitting their support – in light of the approval from the Local Planning

Authority for the residential development at Ladygrove East. The Oxfordshire Cycling Network submitted an objection to the proposed Abingdon Road shared foot & cycleway, and the local County Cllr representing the Didcot Ladygrove division offered partial support, outlining disappointment regarding the lack of wider route-based improvements for the Abingdon Road.

16. The full responses are shown in **Annex 3**, and copies of the original responses are available for inspection by County Councillors. Any comments received that Officers identify as containing personal abuse and/or other personal information will be redacted as appropriate.

Officer response to objections/concerns

17. The responses to these objections/concerns have been contributed to by a combination of both Highway Agreements and Transport Development Management Engineers/Officers
18. With reference to response e1, it has been checked and confirmed that pedestrian visibility splays will not be obscured by a stationary bus.
19. Referring to the objections raised in responses e3 & o3 – when developments come forward, they all must be considered on their individual merits and any mitigation that is sought must meet the Regulation 122 CIL tests (necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind).
20. Highway Officers must ensure the development will mitigate its own impact, however, this sometimes means that we are not able to justify seeking larger or more wider mitigations, given their scale or the impact the developer has evidenced in their transport assessment.
21. The proposals provide the necessary mitigation for the site, to ensure residents of the site can access existing walking and cycling infrastructure, as well as public transport and local facilities. It was not justified to seek further works heading north along Abingdon Road, given the connections that could be made to existing links through Ladygrove and the provision along Hadden Hill up towards the Broadway roundabout provide these connections.
22. Specifically, with respect to response o3 - the proposals are also set to provide safe links to the existing cycling infrastructure for the future residents of the development, and these proposals are fully funded by the developer at no cost to the County Council.
23. In response to the various concerns raised in response e4:
 - 1) The space constraints of the highway cross section in this location meant that a wider than 2m footway could not be achieved. Providing a wider shared use path along this section was OCC's preference, however, this relied upon using land outside of the developer's

control. Consideration was given to reducing the carriageway width to achieve the 3m shared use path, however, given the gradients to the east of the highway, more width would have been required to provide the necessary buffer widths/safety mitigations. The Abingdon Road is also a bus route and therefore, this limits the width you can take from the carriageway to provide the adequate width for any shared use path.

2) There are two 'strategic' cycle routes - one further north and one that runs along the southern boundary linking to NPR3 - being provided as part of the site, which will provide an east-west segregated connection for cyclists to the Abingdon Road. It is acknowledged that 3m is adequate for the facility to be shared use, however, it will not be possible to enforce against cyclists who choose to use this route to reach the Abingdon Road.

3) I acknowledge the concerns raised here, however, LTN 1/20 Table 6.1 states that a 0.5m buffer is desirable for 30mph roads, however, absolute minimum horizontal separation of 0m. We would not support narrowing of the carriageway to achieve this and the land beyond this point is not within the developer's control, therefore, whilst I acknowledge this point, it complies with LTN 1/20.

4) – It would not be safe to have a continuous raised priority crossing across Tamar Way without reducing the width, by tightening the radius of the junction. This is one of the main access points into the Ladygrove estate and therefore, tightening the radius is not favourable, given the traffic volumes. This is also outside of the scope of the developers works obligations and this consultation. We have managed to secure tactile paving across this junction (Tamar Way) which is a betterment on the existing arrangement, however, no further works to this junction will be undertaken.

5) The Marsh Bridge roundabout works proposed were costed up and have been provided as part of a contribution towards the Didcot Central Corridor scheme, given the roundabout makes up part of that scheme area. The Tesco roundabout walking and cycling provision has been improved, especially on the northern side at the site access and the splitter islands have been upgraded.

24. Officers agree that response 01 makes a valid point, however, the confirmed S106 stated that

“improvement works along the eastern side of the Abingdon Road to provide a minimum of 2m footway linking the northern pedestrian site access to the Abingdon Road/Hadden Hill Roundabout. A shared facility must be provided where possible in accordance with LTN/120”.

25. During the technical approval stage, considerable efforts were made to get the entire length of proposed footway on the eastern side of the Abingdon Road

upgraded to a shared facility (minimum of 3m). However, this could not be achieved as the land beyond this section falls outside of the developer's control, and is owned by South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC). Meetings were held with SODC, and they were put in contact with the developer to explore a potential solution, however, the developer did not wish to pursue this option. Due to the wording in the S106 agreement Officers could not make them upgrade this route, as the provision of a 2m footway in this location satisfies the developer's obligations.

26. It is envisaged that cyclists would use the toucan crossing from either direction to access the existing cycle facilities to the west or use the proposed cycling facility to the east, before reaching the 2m footway to the south of the toucan crossing on the eastern side. Appropriate signage will be provided advising cyclists to dismount, and should they wish to use this footway, they may do so by walking their bicycle.
27. With regards to the objection raised to the extension of the 30mph speed limit in response o2 – the relocation of the speed limit terminal signs was recommended by the Council's Traffic & Road Safety Department and the Road Safety Audit Team, to position them further from the proposed crossing point. Therefore, it has suitably been relocated. It is proposed to extend the 30mph speed limit by approximately 130m out of Didcot to ensure that all associated works fall within a consistent speed limit, avoiding a transition between 30mph and 40mph limits in close proximity to the toucan crossing, which could otherwise distract or confuse approaching drivers.
28. Finally, in response to o4 – extending the speed limit further east cannot be justified and is outside the scope of these works. The location of the crossings is in accordance with what was approved at planning and form key elements of infrastructure required to enable residents of the future development to access the wider walking and cycling network.
29. The siting of the crossings and bus stops has been subject to a technical review and independently assessed through a Road Safety Audit, which raised no safety concerns in relation to the proposed arrangement.

Paul Fermer
Director of Environment and Highways

Annex(es): Annexes 1-2: Consultation plans
 Annex 3: Consultation responses

Background papers: n/a
Other Documents: n/a

Contact Officer(s):

Aaron Morton (Senior Engineer – Highway Agreements South)
Ryan Moore (Technical Lead Engineer – Highway Agreements South)

July 2026

A. Email responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(e1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	<p>No objection – In principle the Police do not object, however raise concern about the positioning of the two Bus Stops shown in the drawing, specifically the inbound stop.</p> <p>I appreciate they are outside of the controlled area of the crossing, but feel they may still obscure visibility of pedestrian when the Bus stops.</p>
(e2) Head of Built Environment and Infrastructure, (Thames Travel)	<p>Support – We write to offer formal support for the proposals under consultation. In doing so, we recognise that this should be considered a formality, as the measures concerned arise from the consent duly made by the Local Planning Authority for residential development at Ladygrove East, (LPA Reference P19/S0720/O et alia.) now being lawfully implemented.</p> <p>This site is a formal allocation in the Statutory Development Plan being the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035. However, it bears recalling that the principle of residential development on this site, of the kind broadly now consented, has been in successive adopted development plans since 1983. Not only that but the current consent and these specific elements within it, have been the subject of exhaustive due process through the planning and highways consenting regimes. This has included copious public consultation. It is appropriate for us to signal our view that it is in all ways appropriate for the technical details to progress without delay.</p> <p>The proposals consist of the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extension of the existing 30mph speed limit on the A4130 Hadden Hill, • the provision of new toucan crossings (signal-controlled crossings for use by both pedestrians and pedal cyclists), • new bus stop facilities with clearway restrictions, and • the widening of existing sections of footway to create both segregated & shared cycleway/footways. <p>Naturally these all will facilitate safe and convenient access from the development site to bus services on both Hadden Hill and on Abingdon Road, as well as wider provision for active travel modes. This site represents an</p>

	<p>extremely compact form of development and as such walking and cycling will present a highly relevant choice with the implementation of these measures.</p> <p>Without them, the fundamental locational benefits of this site would not be realised; neither, the achievement of Local Plan Policy CP33, and much less so, the County Council's own transport and development management policies.</p> <p>We also wish to strongly emphasise the positive benefits that arise for existing parts of Ladygrove, west of Abingdon Road. Development commenced here in 1987, and most of these homes have been occupied, with very limited public transport, ever since about 1989. More recently, despite the presence of the X36 service running every 30 minutes, there are no bus stops anywhere on the road. The current situation therefore has a long history but now, appears to be quite intolerable in the light of ambitious County Council policies to radically increase bus use, not just from new development but from existing neighbourhoods. We have been urging the County Council for some time to accelerate as far as possible the delivery of such stops, whether through the progression of agreed measures under s278 of the Highways Act 1980 such as this, or on its own account. We also confirm that we previously have been approached by officers to consider these proposals in more technical detail.</p> <p>We trust that the foregoing is of assistance and that these legalities can be swiftly confirmed. Notwithstanding, as ever, officers should not hesitate to contact me if they have any question to raise.</p>
<p>(e3) Local County Cllr, (Didcot Ladygrove division)</p>	<p>Partially support – Firstly I want the road crossings delivered as soon as possible. There are a number of residents who need to cross the roads - one person has already suffered a broken femur when doing so in recent weeks.</p> <p>Proper cycling provision is essential. I support the comments made by Liveable Streets and Cohsat, with the exception of the comment about Tamar Way. This is a very busy junction, and side road treatment is not appropriate at all.</p> <p>And finally, it is disappointing that a study has been produced for a very small part of my division, rather than looking holistically at the whole route through on the Abingdon Road.</p>
<p>(e4) Local group/organisation,</p>	<p>Concerns – These plans should come with an explanation of how the measures proposed fit into the broader walking and cycling network. As often happens, these schemes seem only partially integrated into that, which we</p>

<p>(Oxfordshire Liveable Streets)</p>	<p>recognise is an unfortunate result of the way the development planning process is connected to strategic transport planning.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The southernmost toucan crossing on Abingdon Rd appears to connect on its eastern end with a 2m wide footway with no cycling provision. The cycle route further north needs to be extended (30m?) to connect to this crossing (as shown in orange on the plan below). If space constraints make separate foot and cycle provision here impossible, space for a three metre wide shared path should be found by taking a metre and a half off the carriageway. Abingdon Rd is a primary cycling route in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.2) The entry to the development marked as "Proposed 3.0m footway connection to development" (in light green on the plan above) should provide for cycle access, if necessary as a shared path (which a good quality three metre wide path will support). This is likely be used for cycling, regardless of designation, especially as this will be on the desire line from the development to the southern toucan crossing (and via that to the off-road path along the railway line).3) The cycle track along Abingdon Rd should have a buffer to the carriageway OR the speed limit on Abingdon Rd should be reduced to 20mph. (See <u>Cycle Infrastructure Design</u> LTN 1/20, Table 6-1.) Any kind of physical barrier - even a 0.2m raised kerb - would hugely enhance comfort and perceived safety for people cycling. Space for this could be obtained by reducing the carriageway width.4) The Tamar Way entry should be tightened up and, if traffic volumes are low enough, provided with a continuous footway (Side Road Entry Treatment). Otherwise a zebra crossing as close as possible to the desire line as is allowed (5 metres) from the junction.5) The provision at neither of the Hadden Hill roundabouts is really satisfactory for either walking or cycling. We realise these were outside the development boundaries, but feel this was a missed opportunity to upgrade at least one of these.
---------------------------------------	---

B. Online responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS		
<p>(o1) Local group/organisation, (Oxfordshire Cycling Network)</p>	<p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p>		
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="551 427 1308 491">30mph speed limit – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1308 427 2045 491">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table>	30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support
	30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="551 491 1308 555">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1308 491 2045 555">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table>	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support
	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="551 555 1308 619">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1308 555 2045 619"></td> </tr> </table>	Bus stop clearways – Support	
	Bus stop clearways – Support		
	<p>A4130 Abindon Road proposals:</p>		
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="551 715 1308 778">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1308 715 2045 778">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table>	Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support
	Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	
<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="551 778 1308 842">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1308 778 2045 842">Shared foot/cycleway – Object</td> </tr> </table>	Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Object	
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Object		
<p>We support almost all aspects of this scheme, which will facilitate walking, wheeling and cycling along these two sections of road. However, there is one section we object to strongly.</p>			
<p>We object to the footway only section on the east side of the south end of Abingdon Road A4130. This is a breach of OCC's policy and national guidance, and your Didcot LCWIP requires a better solution.</p>			
<p>This should be 5.0m segregated footway/cycleway, the same as sections to the north and the east on the A4130. There are no pre-existing physical constraints because the land was not previously developed, just an agricultural field, so this should be possible at minimal cost.</p>			
<p>This route is a key part of the Didcot LCWIP Network - Route 14 - published in 2023.</p>			
<p>If the current delivery intervention does not deliver it, it will be constrained by development and it is likely to be impossible to deliver. This will create a link that is forever broken into the cycling network, breaching the core design principle of 'coherence' of both national guidance (LTN 1/20) and Oxfordshire's own Active Travel Strategy (p18).</p>			

	<p>In practice it gives anyone cycling a dilemma: cycle on a road that fails to meet safe standards, or cycle illegally on the pavement. You would in practice be asking cyclists to break the law to risk their lives.</p> <p>The very purpose of LCWIPs is to develop plans to avoid problems like this. So it is essential that this route is safeguarded now, and constructing it to the standard of the surrounding routes would avoid the incremental costs of safeguarding the land and widening the route later.</p> <p>There are other problems on this route and development, highlighted in the response by Oxfordshire Liveable Streets - we agree with those points. This is the one that we considered required a firm Objection.</p>											
<p>(o2) Local resident, (Didcot, Regent Gardens)</p>	<p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 651 2029 837"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 651 1310 715">30mph speed limit – Object</td> <td data-bbox="1310 651 2029 715">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 715 1310 778">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 715 2029 778">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 778 1310 837">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 778 2029 837"></td> </tr> </table> <p>A4130 Abindon Road proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 941 2029 1066"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 941 1310 1005">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 941 2029 1005">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1005 1310 1066">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1005 2029 1066">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table> <p>OCC blindly apply speed reductions across the county with no enforcement. No one will pay attention to this speed limit just as they don't on the A4130 to Wallingford. It'll lead to more dangerous driving such as road rage, tailgating and overtaking. The road is wide enough with enough visibility to maintain 40mph safely.</p>		30mph speed limit – Object	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support		Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support
30mph speed limit – Object	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support											
Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support											
Bus stop clearways – Support												
Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support											
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support											
<p>(o3) Local resident, (Harwell, Reading Road)</p>	<p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 1340 2029 1396"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1340 1310 1396">30mph speed limit – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1340 2029 1396">Segregated foot/cycleway – Object</td> </tr> </table>		30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Object								
30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Object											

Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Object
Bus stop clearways – Support	

A4130 Abindon Road proposals:

Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Object
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Object

1. What is the point of the proposed 5m segregated footway/cycle way opposite entrance to Tamar Way? Are you actually expecting anyone cycling on the Abingdon road to use it? Similarly, upgrading the footpath to 3m North bound; you go from footpath, brief shared path, footpath again.

How does this aid any cyclist along the Abingdon road? Another extremely poor piece of infrastructure that appears from no where and disappears again and doesn't help any cyclist get around. for this short stretch do planners really think that cyclist should leave the road and then a few meters along join the carriageway again? You don't even have priority for the Tamar Way turning. Do the planners ever try to use the infrastructure they are proposing for their day-to-day activities. Completely pointless.

Similar issues with Hadden road. On the southside of the road there will be s short stretch of cycle way before being left stranded again at the roundabout where you lose priority. How does that help a cyclist? Who are you expecting to use this?

On the North side, what is the point of the short 5m shared footway/cycleway up to the bus stop? who are you expecting to use this? Where are these cyclists coming from that they will use it given you're just dumped onto the road again (and have to give way!) a short distance away?

Who are the planners expecting to park their bike at the bus stop on hadden hill? Some decent cycle parking at the stores opposite would be much more beneficial (there isn't any currently for halfords/b&m/pet store)

I'm very much in favour of cycle lanes but not when they are so poorly thought through like here. There is zero benefit that I can see. It does not aid any cyclist in getting around this area - so a complete waste of money. Please stop providing such piecemeal cycling infrastructure that appears and then disappears again. Another

example of a proposal from planners who never use the infrastructure they design. They should be embarrassed by these cycling proposals.

A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:

30mph speed limit – Partially support/concerns	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support
Toucan crossings – Partially support/concerns	Shared foot/cycleway – Support
Bus stop clearways – Partially support/concerns	

A4130 Abindon Road proposals:

Toucan crossings – Partially support/concerns	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support

(o4) Local resident,
(Harwell, The Poplars)

30mph speed limit location change - should be further east to cover the junction with the road to South Moreton - limit would need to extend on this road as well.

A4130 Hadden Hill - Crossings: Two crossings in such close proximity to each other and round about seems high in number, concerns around traffic flow / sequencing of lights with two crossings and the roundabout. - Should an alternate scheme where one crossing is installed as part of the island arrangements for the roundabout be considered. - Also the eastern crossing prevents staggering of the bus stop clearways.

A4130 Hadden Hill - Bus Stops / Clearways: Two eastern sites would be better staggered - although cannot be achieved with the proposed crossing arrangements.

A4130 Abingdon Road - Crossings: Again seems an excessive number in close proximity to each other. They are going to be within 100 meters of each other, with a junction being the only separation. Would propose a revision to a single crossing at the southern end, aligned to the proposed access to the new housing development indicated - would also suggest that is amended to be the 5m access vice 3m. As this provides the most direct link to travel and local services options.

<p>(o5) County Cllr, (Oxford, New Road)</p>	<p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 276 2027 462"> <tr> <td>30mph speed limit – Support</td> <td>Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td>Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>A4130 Abindon Road proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 566 2027 689"> <tr> <td>Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td>Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td>Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table> <p>Aligns with County goals around LTCP targets and also Vision Zero by improving walking and cycling and bus priority. Thank-you!</p>	30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support		Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support
30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support										
Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support										
Bus stop clearways – Support											
Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support										
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support										
<p>(o6) Local resident, (Didcot, Ben More)</p>	<p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 930 2027 1117"> <tr> <td>30mph speed limit – Support</td> <td>Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td>Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>A4130 Abindon Road proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 1220 2027 1343"> <tr> <td>Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td>Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td>Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table>	30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support		Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support
30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support										
Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support										
Bus stop clearways – Support											
Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support										
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support										

	<p>People that live on the Furlong roads on Ladygrove are not able to cross the road very easily and there is no pavement on that side of the road.</p>											
<p>(o7) Local resident, (Didcot, Collingwood Avenue)</p>	<p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 391 2029 579"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 391 1310 454">30mph speed limit – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 391 2029 454">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 454 1310 518">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 454 2029 518">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 518 1310 579">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 518 2029 579"></td> </tr> </table> <p>A4130 Abindon Road proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 681 2029 805"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 681 1310 745">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 681 2029 745">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 745 1310 805">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 745 2029 805">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table> <p>It should assist in better connectivity between east Didcot and the town centre, increase bus patronage (potentially) and provide a much better active travel connection into the town.</p>		30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support		Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support
30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support											
Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support											
Bus stop clearways – Support												
Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support											
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support											
<p>(o8) Local resident, (Didcot, North Bush Furlong)</p>	<p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 1045 2029 1233"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1045 1310 1109">30mph speed limit – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1045 2029 1109">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1109 1310 1173">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1109 2029 1173">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1173 1310 1233">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1173 2029 1233"></td> </tr> </table> <p>A4130 Abindon Road proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 1335 2029 1394"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1335 1310 1394">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1335 2029 1394">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table>		30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support		Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support		
30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support											
Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support											
Bus stop clearways – Support												
Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support											

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="555 180 1299 228">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 180 2020 228">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table>	Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1323 180 2020 228">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table>	Shared foot/cycleway – Support							
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support											
Shared foot/cycleway – Support												
(o9) Local resident, (Didcot, Torride Drive)	<p>RE: the more northerly of the two proposed new toucan crossings on the Abingdon Road. The installation of this crossing and the extension of the existing footway to provide pedestrian access from North Bush Furlong have been desperately needed by North Bush Furlong residents for years. Crossing the Abingdon Rd is difficult and dangerous especially for schoolchildren and people with prams/pushchairs/wheelchairs/dogs on lead. Under present conditions it is getting busier and more dangerous with the passage of time. We can't wait for this work to be undertaken.</p> <p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="555 611 1299 675">30mph speed limit – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 611 2020 675">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="555 675 1299 738">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 675 2020 738">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="555 738 1299 802">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 738 2020 802"></td> </tr> </table> <p>A4130 Abindon Road proposals:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="555 898 1299 962">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 898 2020 962">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="555 962 1299 1026">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 962 2020 1026">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table> <p>I live on the Ladygrove Estate, less than a mile from the Tesco store at Hadden Hill. In the 10 months since moving into my current home, I have been to that store 3 times, and instead have my shopping delivered. I do not drive, so my only way to get there is walk or cycle, or take two bus journeys. Neither walking nor cycling feels safe because most of the pavements feel narrow or require multiple road crossings, and from the Hadden Hill roundabout to Tesco, drivers are mainly concerned with how fast they can go regardless of the speed limit. If I do take the bus from Didcot, crossing to Tesco is not protected and I have never felt particularly safe crossing there.</p> <p>I am fully for all of the proposed improvements.</p>		30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support		Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support
30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support											
Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support											
Bus stop clearways – Support												
Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support											
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support											

<p>(o10) Local resident, (Didcot, Medina Close)</p>	<p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 276 2027 461"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 276 1310 336">30mph speed limit – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 276 2027 336">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 336 1310 399">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 336 2027 399">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 399 1310 461">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 399 2027 461"></td> </tr> </table> <p>A4130 Abindon Road proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 564 2027 687"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 564 1310 627">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 564 2027 627">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 627 1310 687">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 627 2027 687">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table> <p>I generally support this application. With respect to the southern most toucan crossing on Abingdon road does not join up to any cycling infrastructure on the east side of the road. Ideally there would be a link as this is the quickest way to the station or town centre from much of the new houses. I would like the existing barriers removed as they prevent the free flow of people on bikes. In addition, there is no protected cycling infrastructure between this crossing and the proposed supermarket where the former gas works was. This would be beneficial.</p>	30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support		Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support
30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support										
Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support										
Bus stop clearways – Support											
Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support										
Bus stop clearways – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support										
<p>(o11) Local resident, (Wallingford, Wantage Road)</p>	<p>A4130 Hadden Hill proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 1031 2027 1216"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1031 1310 1093">30mph speed limit – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1031 2027 1093">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1093 1310 1155">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1093 2027 1155">Shared foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1155 1310 1216">Bus stop clearways – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1155 2027 1216"></td> </tr> </table> <p>A4130 Abindon Road proposals:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="560 1319 2027 1378"> <tr> <td data-bbox="560 1319 1310 1378">Toucan crossings – Support</td> <td data-bbox="1310 1319 2027 1378">Segregated foot/cycleway – Support</td> </tr> </table>	30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support	Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support	Bus stop clearways – Support		Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support		
30mph speed limit – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support										
Toucan crossings – Support	Shared foot/cycleway – Support										
Bus stop clearways – Support											
Toucan crossings – Support	Segregated foot/cycleway – Support										

Bus stop clearways – **Support**

Shared foot/cycleway – **Support**

Good proposals to improve bus user experience and active travel. However lack of pedestrian and cycle priority at road junctions is poor. With the bypass being extended this route should be quieter and suitable for a more non-car dominated design.

The cycleway should have priority over the northern arm of the tesco roundabout - which is essentially an access road whilst the cycleway is a strategic route. Put a parallel crossing in here. Similarly the cycle way continue across the Hadden Hill road at the railway roundabout not giving up to prioritise motor traffic.

Opportunity should also be taken to tightening corner radii at Tamar Way to improve safety. This road is 20mph now and doesn't need slip road entrances, this just encourages the rampant speeding along Tamar Way.