

# Connecting Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4

## Consultation Issues Raised

CONNECTING  
OXFORDSHIRE



OXFORDSHIRE  
COUNTY COUNCIL

**Contents**

Member Working Group .....	3
Comments on the overall strategy and policy approach .....	5
Oxford Transport Strategy comments .....	7
South and Vale comments (including Science Vale) .....	9
Banbury Area and surrounding villages comments .....	18
Bicester and area comments .....	38
Chipping Norton – Summary of comments received .....	55
Witney and Carterton (including the A40 and Eynsham) comments.....	60
A40 .....	66
A420 strategy comments .....	84
Freight strategy comments .....	89
Cycling strategy comments .....	91
Bus strategy comments.....	94

*Comments on the Strategic Environmental Assessment are located within Appendix A of that document.*

### Member Working Group

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
More attention should be given to Abingdon	Abingdon is covered by mode strategy and policy document in terms of transport input.	Make it clearer that the mode strategies and policy document direct transport in areas not covered by an area transport strategy.
Any roll-out of a workplace parking levy should be accompanied by much more consultation.	Noted	No action
Two tiers of P&R is the right solution, in the medium term at least. P&R sites should also be used/marketed as Park & Cycle and Park & Walk	We are commencing a study into park and ride options later this year.	Clarify wording in OTS.
Enough detail should be in the report(s) to ensure that no development happens in the county without making a Section 106 contribution for transport. LTP4 should make clear that we will be getting developers to contribute S106 money for transport in the most generous way where possible	We agree that transport should receive an appropriate contribution. However, we are not the planning authority and we need to work with the districts and the City Council on this.	Expand the section on transport and development in the policy document.
Concern over the maintenance of electric car charging points, given problems maintaining other infrastructure through lack of funding	Noted	No action

**ANNEX 2**

Suggestion that we approach Highways England to get a bus lane along the A34 at Lodge Hill, to make bus access into west Oxford more reliable. Alternatively, A4183 could be made bus and cycle (and local traffic/freight?) only and buses could use this route.	Noted	Incorporate into work on the Oxford – Cambridge Expressway.
Concern over Didcot and the loss of buses in central Didcot, especially through the development plans	We agree with this, which is why we have concerns about the plans for Didcot town centre	We shall work with the District Council to find a solution
Mention Crossrail in the Cross-Boundary section	Crossrail should be mentioned but in the rail section	Add Crossrail to the rail section
Cowley rail branch should be electrified	Noted	Incorporate into future discussions on Cowley branch
Improve maintenance of existing cycle routes	Noted	No action
Cycle routes suggested around Science Vale and along rivers.	We are developing area-based cycling strategies	Pass to the teams developing the area cycling strategies

## Comments on the overall strategy and policy approach

We received a number of comments about the overall approach to the LTP4 policy document, its structure and focus:

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
LTP4 and the Strategic Economic Plan seem very reliant on the provision of new capacity on the A34, which is currently at capacity.	Our Science Transit strategy sets out how we plan to provide sufficient capacity through a combination of increased, faster rail and bus services, increased agile working, lift sharing and other measures developed as part of the initiative.	Set out how we are working with Gov't/ Highways England on short/long-term measures for the A34, development of the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway, and with rail industry partners to enhance the parallel rail route, to take freight and passenger journeys off the road.
The study takes little or no account of cross-boundary movements nor access to Heathrow and Gatwick, nor does it make any proposals in respect of these.	Recent developments on Tri-Counties to be included, plus access to Heathrow and Gatwick	Add sections about cross-boundary links, in particularly access to Heathrow, access to Northamptonshire and Warwickshire, and to Berkshire via a third river crossing at Reading
OCC needs to be better at taking advantage of S106 and CIL opportunities.	To work with District Council to get the best outcome in new developments, both in terms of finance and design.	Use LTP4 to clearly articulate our priorities in seeking contributions and in giving comments on applications.
LTP4 needs to consider the requirements of disabled and the growing number of elderly travellers in its policy and strategies. This should include more satellite parking throughout the city for blue badge holders and ensuring that public transport is accessible for the visually impaired, mobility impaired, those with learning difficulties and others.	Oxfordshire County Council will ensure that the transport infrastructure for which we are responsible meets the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and we will work with our partners to assist them in meeting the legal requirements.	We will review the policy document and ensure that we articulate our commitment to equality clearly.
There should be more area strategies, as there were in LTP3, for example Chipping Norton and Henley. These are needed to guide responses	We are prioritising area strategies in locations that will provide the most housing and employment growth in line	The executive summary will explain in detail how the LTP as a whole provides guidance for development across

## ANNEX 2

<p>to local plans and developer applications and to provide momentum behind measures such as reducing the number of HGVs in the town. Insufficient attention is given to residents and businesses in rural areas of the county, in particular the south-east.</p>	<p>with the Strategic Economic Plan. The County Council's position towards development in locations without an area strategy should be based on the Policy Document and mode strategies and future route strategies</p>	<p>Oxfordshire. The Policy document and Freight documents will be strengthened and clearer in their relevance and influence for land use planning and better articulate how rural areas can benefit from LTP4.</p>
---	---	--

## Oxford Transport Strategy comments

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
<b>Park &amp; Ride</b> – general support for outer sites but also a view that inner sites have a continued role to play (e.g. park & cycle, premium parking etc)	We consider that more flexibility is needed in the OTS on P&R with regard to continued use of the existing sites.	Text updated to reflect possible continued role for P&R at inner sites, with appropriate pricing mechanisms. Expansion now not ruled out in short term, but clear that additional capacity should be temporary.
<b>Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</b> – general support but people feel trams shouldn't be ruled out. Scepticism over deliverability/effectiveness of priority on BRT routes. Concern about BRT route through Lye Valley.	We consider more flexibility is needed and that trams could play a role in future if growth is sufficient to support them, and that specific rapid transit links away from the main road network should not be included in the OTS at this stage.	Updated to include possible long term role for trams on the busiest corridors, if development levels justify it. Also recommendation to remove "Bus" from title so that it is now Rapid Transit  Changes made to maps and text to remove references to BRT routes away from existing roads. Text updated to reflect need to consider alternative access to Churchill site as part of site master planning but with no options specifically identified.
<b>Cycling</b> – some feel this isn't ambitious enough and we should be aiming for more segregation	The document already aims for a high level of segregation but recognises this isn't physically possible everywhere, especially given the need to achieve other objectives such as BRT	None
<b>Walking</b> – some calls for a wider walking strategy;	Walking is already central to the document, in particular in the city centre element.	None
<b>Workplace Parking Levy</b> – objections from	Workplace parking levy must be fully	None

ANNEX 2

some, support from others. Some think it should be fast-tracked.	considered and consulted on and time is allowed for this. Start of roll out from 2019 is already ambitious, but considered to be realistic.	
<b>City centre</b> – scepticism about tunnels. Some alternatives based on re-routeing suggested (e.g. terminating buses from the east at The Plain), though some question whether there is any need to separate buses and pedestrians further in the city centre, particularly if BRT/trams are introduced	No major changes recommended. Terminating services from the east at The Plain considered in 2008 and ruled out. Trams/BRT will not resolve conflicts between different modes in the busiest streets.	None
<b>Evidence base</b> – criticism that evidence is insufficient to support proposals. In most cases a level of detail is sought that will come in future stages of the strategy development.	Most aspects of the strategy require considerable further study which will take several years; OTS provides strategic framework and direction for this further work.	None
<b>Zero emission zone</b> – supported but some caution over timescales	Timescales are deliberately challenging. The zone may start small - e.g. one or two streets.	Text changes made to clarify phased nature of ZEZ roll out – <i>starting</i> from 2020.
<b>Rail</b> – a view that more should be made of the strategic rail opportunities, in particular as a solution to the very high levels of growth planned	Agree – updates recommended.	Rail section updated to reflect ambition for four-tracking between Oxford and Didcot.
<b>Phasing</b> – a view that demand management measures such as workplace parking levy , access restrictions etc should be programmed sooner, and ring road improvements pushed back as they may prove to be unnecessary	All timescales are indicative so there will be some movement as further studies progress, including the option to deliver schemes earlier if possible.	Timescales for access restrictions brought forward to reflect possibility of earlier implementation.

**South and Vale comments (including Science Vale)**

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTR4 ANNEX 2
<p>Would like further reference to the linkages between employment growth and transport infrastructure investment in Science Vale, backed by relevant evidence to support funding priorities.</p> <p>There should be a greater focus on the importance of the Enterprise Zone and the need to invest in infrastructure to support its continued success in delivery of high value jobs growth.</p>	<p>We recognise that there is an important links between transport infrastructure investment and employment growth. Transport modelling work has been undertaken to assess the impact future developments have on the Science Vale transport network. With the quantum of growth proposed a number of schemes are required, working as a package, to collectively mitigate the cumulative impact of that growth and support the continued success in delivery of high value jobs growth within the Enterprise Zone.</p>	<p>We shall look for opportunities to emphasize this in the SVAP and in dealing with the district councils in future development planning and spatial policymaking. We hope to work with SODC and VWHDC to ensure land use planning for employment and dwellings is complementary in future.</p>
<p>Further evidence needs to be presented on options to address the fact that a longer-term solution is needed to alleviate congestion on the A34, including their relative benefits and viability of deliverability.</p>	<p>We are working with Highways England on improvements to the A34, both as short-term projects to 2019 and as part of the new Oxford – Cambridge Expressway project</p>	<p>Added 'Science Vale' to point in the policy document which highlights the need for an Oxford – Cambridge Expressway</p>
<p>There should be area strategies for the market towns of Thame, Henley, Wallingford, Abingdon and Faringdon. These areas have planned employment and housing growth, and have particular issues related to transport that need addressing.</p> <p>There should be a statement that outlines how communities that are developing NDPs should use the documents' contents and can best support the policy aspirations. Neighbourhood Planning should not be overlooked as an important component in</p>	<p>These areas should work with the public transport, cycling and freight mode plans, alongside their Neighbourhood Plans</p>	<p>Added explanation into policy document together with a diagram</p>

**ANNEX 2**

<p>the delivery of the various strategies – especially for public transport patronage and the development and use of pedestrian and cycle routes.</p>		
<p>The A4074 (Oxford-Wallingford-Reading) corridor has seen strong patronage growth, but congestion is problematic. Much development is proposed along this corridor in the South Oxfordshire Local Plan. This route will also be important to Science Vale. What is proposed to support this growth?</p>	<p>Route strategies will developed alongside Neighbourhood Plans and mode strategies, as explained in the policy document before policy 2</p>	<p>We shall consider route strategies over coming years, including looking at the A4074</p>
<p>In Science Vale capital schemes, the emphasis is on highway improvements. Bus services are somewhat neglected; bus priority measures should be incorporated more.</p>	<p>Capital schemes will include bus priority where needed but such investment is dependent on commercial operators operating services on the infrastructure on a long-term basis</p>	<p>We shall work with developers, local and district councils and bus operators to identify places where infrastructure will benefit and boost bus operations. This will include working with councils and developers to ensure new development is located and built in a way to make frequent, reliable bus services commercially viable</p>
<p>For the Science Vale transport strategy to be delivered successfully, the station interchange, town centre, and major east-west radial roads all need to be joined up with as direct, logical and seamless a bus route as possible. Buses must be seen as playing a key role at the centre of the town, rather than a supplementary role on the margins. This needs to be considered when allowing for the expansion of the town centre and</p>	<p>We agree with this, which is why we have concerns about the plans for Didcot town centre</p>	<p>We shall work with the District Council to find a solution</p>

**ANNEX 2**

other developments.		
Poor links to Heathrow deterring high-value investment and concern at perceived lack of focus on this in the strategy.	Our policy document acknowledges the importance of improving access to Heathrow (and other airports). We are working to improve access and appreciate support from other local stakeholders in articulating this to Government.	We are working with local partners to promote and increase the speed of delivery of the Western Rail Access to Heathrow project. We are pressing for direct rail links from Oxford and Didcot to Heathrow to be established as a result of this.
Better bus links are needed between Swindon and Harwell	This falls within work leading from the A420 route strategy	We shall consider this in developing bus routes as part of route strategy work around links to Swindon
Demand for action on the A34, especially management of overtaking lorries - request lorries are kept to the inside lane.	This has been raised with the DfT by Oxfordshire County Council	We shall work with Highways England on ways of addressing this problem during our forthcoming work on A34 infrastructure around Oxford
Objections to the locations of the proposed Lodge Hill, Sandford, and Cumnor P&Rs in terms of their impact on nearby villages through traffic and noise, and their location in the green belt. Additionally, some doubt over the principle/efficacy of remote P&Rs. Objection to diamond junction scheme at Lodge Hill and concern over potential lorry driver rest area.	<p><i>Lorry park/driver rest-area &amp; P&amp;R</i></p> <p>The possibility of locating a P&amp;R at Lodge Hill is part of longer term possibilities to support increased numbers travelling to Oxford. We are commencing a study into long-term options for P&amp;R later this year, which will look at the options for retaining existing P&amp;Rs as well as new, outer P&amp;Rs.</p> <p>Provision of a lorry park/driver rest area would be designed to provide better facilities for those travelling on the A34, and reduce the impact of lorries using the currently substandard laybys, which cause congestion and safety risks as drivers slow down to park and then pull out of laybys</p>	These concerns will be considered within the relevant project study.

	<p>into fast-running roads). Similarly alternative locations will be considered for this.</p> <p>Furthermore, the mention of a proposal in the Local Transport Plan 4 does not preclude a scheme being subject to the normal process of consultation as it is drawn up in more detail.</p> <p><i>Lodge Hill junction</i></p> <p>The County Council has now undertaken modelling based on future housing and employment numbers proposed for the area, which includes Science Vale and Oxford, as well as that for Abingdon itself. This modelling demonstrates the increased pressure on Abingdon's local roads with the increase in trips. It shows the subsequent improvement if A34 traffic is permitted to access from all directions at Lodge Hill. Further evidence to this effect will be available at the Examination In Public. Modelling and subsequent discussions with Highways England (HE) also show that this proposal is in principle acceptable to HE as the online flow on the A34 is not significantly impacted.</p> <p>The Evidence of Transport Impact report</p>	
--	--	--

	on the Vale of White Horse Local Plan proposals (which is available on their website) sets out the strategic need for new infrastructure including the Lodge Hill interchange, as part of a package of measures to deal with the increase in trips from the growth in housing and employment in the area.	
Attention to cross-boundary traffic to/from Reading and the potential impact of a third river crossing is insufficient.	- <u>We will continue to work with Berkshire councils on the potential for additional river crossing capacity at Reading, taking into account the potential for impacts on the local road network from the increased traffic flow across the river. We also need to understand expectations for population growth in Berkshire and the impact this would have on future demand across any potential bridge.</u>	Included this statement in the policy document
Action on AQMAs appears to have been delegated to SODC. This indicates a lack of joined up thinking, where environmental concerns and transport concerns are dealt with by separate authorities.	When an area is declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) because of exceedance of particular pollutants, the district council is required to develop an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP). Where transport is a contributory factor, we shall work with SODC to consider possible solutions.	We recognise our responsibility with AQMAs and will work with the district councils to consider possible solutions, taking into account our overall transport strategy.
A general feeling that the south-east corner of the county has been neglected in terms of any thought towards strategic infrastructure provision, especially the	We have developed a freight strategy taking into consideration the problems caused by HGVs on the local road network.	We are keen to work with SODC, residents and businesses in the development of Neighbourhood Plans and any route strategies, considering

**Formatted:** Space After: 10 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style, No bullets or numbering, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers, Position: Horizontal: Left, Relative to: Margin, Vertical: -1.48 cm, Relative to: Paragraph, Horizontal: 0.32 cm, Wrap Around

**ANNEX 2**

<p>traffic impact of the M40 on the local road network and problems caused by HGVs.</p>		<p>possible solutions to problems taking into account our overall transport strategy</p>
<p>The proposed new bridge over the Thames with a road link to the M40 south of the Baldons will create an outer ring road on the south side of the city which, together with the Sandford Park and Ride site, will create an area of land in between and in the Green Belt. This will put even more pressure on development and for expansion of the city boundary.</p>	<p>We shall consider what measures to take to ensure our county's economy grows, balancing possible measures against environmental concerns.</p>	<p>The development of any road link would have future consultation before implemented</p>
<p>Based upon experience in European countries the biggest take up of cycling is for journeys less than 5km and therefore more emphasis should be placed on shorter journeys. A lot of emphasis is being placed on commuting cyclists, especially in Science Vale, who only represent a very small proportion of all cycle journeys.</p>	<p>The Government has announced hundreds of millions of pounds of investment in science based industries in Science Vale, which is attracting multi-national companies to consider locating in the area. These companies are looking to locate where infrastructure is good, and this includes cycling infrastructure. It's essential we take the opportunity to ensure our cycling infrastructure meets the expectations of these companies so that they choose to locate in Science Vale, this will in turn support our aims to increase levels of cycling in Oxfordshire.</p>	<p>We shall work with partners in the Oxfordshire Cycling Network in developing our cycling plans and take advice on what best enables short distance and leisure cycling as part of our wider strategy. We are developing an Oxfordshire Cycling Strategy and will consider implementing measures as and when there is funding and an appropriate scheme</p>
<p>As part of the development of route strategies for the A417 and A338, cycle routes along these corridors should be provided. These strategies (and the proposals therein) should be completed in the near future, rather than be considered long-term aspirations.</p>	<p>We are developing a strategy for these roads which includes investigating provision for cyclists</p>	

**ANNEX 2**

<p>Given the growth in housing and employment proposed in Wantage and Grove; proposals for new perimeter roads and improvements to the existing network are insufficient.</p>	<p>We shall be considering the problems around Wantage and Grove as part of our work on the A417</p>	<p>We shall continue work on improving public transport links to the towns in collaboration with operators and stakeholders</p>
<p>There should be better cycling provision for people travelling from Berinsfield to Oxford, Science Vale, and other nearby settlements.</p>	<p>We have developed a strategy for cycling in Science Vale which includes investigating future requirements as they gain priority</p>	<p>We shall consider how to improve cycling provision for these areas as our strategy is implemented and reviewed</p>
<p>The current proposals for cycling in the Science Vale area are inadequate, the design and routing of new infrastructure needs careful consideration and committed investment.</p>	<p>A cycling strategy for Science Vale has now been developed. Additionally, a best practice guide will be produced to provide standards for the design of infrastructure across the county.</p>	<p>The cycling strategy looks to introduce new infrastructure across the Science Vale area. We will work with our cycling partners in Oxfordshire to develop a best practice guide for cycling, including agreed best practice for cycle lanes and junctions. It will consider lessons from other successful cycling cities and regions, while making the document relevant to the specific transport demands of our county, our ability to influence developers and taking into account the likely budget we shall have available for schemes over the coming years.</p>



### Banbury Area and surrounding villages comments

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
The reliance on 'modal shift', although laudable on paper, is totally impractical in supporting the infrastructure that Banbury has and will need to develop to support the economy of a growing town such and its rural hinterland.	The Banbury Area transport strategy will reflect a balanced approach to both highway and sustainable travel modes.	None.
Traffic calming along A361 the South Bar Street/ Horsefair corridor – opposition to the need for introducing traffic calming methods, as traffic generally flows freely through this corridor. Concern that introducing traffic calming methods in this area will further increase the starting/stopping of vehicles' engines which, in turn, will cause an increase in air pollution.	We mean 'traffic calming' in a general sense, with the aim to reduce the attractiveness of this route to through traffic in order to improve the air quality.	Revise text to improve explanation of the need for physical measures to improve air quality by reducing traffic on the A361 the South Bar Street/ Horsefair corridor.
General support for the use of Bankside and the removal of traffic calming measures along this corridor. There are concerns that promoting this road will inevitably cause more congestion on Swan Close Road and Windsor Street/Cherwell Street unless traffic is diverted to a reopened Tramway for access to the railway station and the road bridge over train tracks to connect with Higham Way and the new link to the Central M40 site.	We will undertake work to understand the consequences of opening Tramway for access to the Rail Station and a road bridge over the tracks to Higham Way with a new road linking to Central M40 site.	Revise text to show commitment to study.
Support for the improvements at the	The strategy is imprecise due to the	Consider revising text to include

ANNEX 2

<p>Cherwell Street/Bridge Street junction, which is known for its congestion issues. There are, however, concerns in the use of the word 'improvements', as this is imprecise and there is a feeling that this should be strengthened into a definitive strategy. Support for major improvements to this junction, which could include the provision of a roundabout. With a potential redevelopment of this area we feel that the County Council should look at a pedestrian walkway over this junction, which would make the provision of a roundabout viable.</p>	<p>opportunities, and also uncertainties, of the Canalside redevelopment, and to a lesser, extent rail electrification.</p>	<p>context.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bloxham Road (A361)/ South Bar Street improvements</li> <li>• Increasing the capacity of junctions along Warwick Road (B4100)</li> <li>• Hennef Way/ Southam Road improvements</li> <li>• Hennef Way/ Concord Avenue improvements</li> <li>• Hennef Way/ Ermont Way improvements</li> <li>• Ermont Way/ Middleton Road improvements</li> </ul> <p>Support for any improvements which would increase capacity and traffic flows, but questions how this could be achieved as no detail has been provided</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Revise text to demonstrate how this will be achieved.</p>
<p>Provision of a link road from Higham Way to the Central M40 site. – Strong support for the provision of additional road</p>	<p>We will undertake work to understand the consequences of opening Tramway for access to the Rail Station and a road</p>	<p>Revise text to show commitment to study.</p>

**ANNEX 2**

<p>infrastructure, including a link road from Higham Way to the Central M40 site. The delivery of this link road will need to be part of a range of road infrastructure provision and there is a request for a South East Relief Road and Tramway/Higham Way bridge over the rail lines. There will need to be a 7.5ton limit along the residential parts of this new road. This was supported by the Inspector at the Cherwell Local Plan Inquiry and OCC were asked to investigate the potential for this crossing.</p>	<p>bridge over the tracks to Higham Way with a new road linking to Central M40 site.</p>	
<p>Provision of A361 Bloxham Road to A4260 Oxford Road Link Road. – This is supported. If OCC were to consider a South East Relief Road (joining the Central M40 site to Bankside), then there would be a tangible link all the way to the roundabout at the end of Sycamore Drive, in affect making a ring road (Bloxham Road &gt; Oxford Road &gt; Bankside &gt; South East Relief Road &gt; Higham Way/Central M40 link road &gt; Ermont Way, Hennef Way, Ruscote Avenue, and Warwick Road).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Revise text to 'spine road'. Revise text to show commitment to study.</p>
<p>Provision of a link road east of M40 Junction 11 (Overthorpe Road to A422), if required. – This is supported.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Potential link road crossing from Tramway to Higham Way. – This is strongly supported by and we would like to see the inclusion of this road as part of an overall attempt to get traffic from the East of the railway to the</p>	<p>We have been cautious about the need for a road bridge from Tramway to Higham Way as traffic modelling and engineering feasibility work, to generate inform the way forward, is yet to be conducted.</p>	<p>Revise text to show commitment to study to determine the way forward.</p>

**ANNEX 2**

<p>West. There is a strong feeling that the wording of paragraph 12 (of the Banbury Area Strategy) should be changed from “may also be required” to explicitly include the Tramway to Higham Way crossing in the LTP4 plan. There is also a feeling that the phasing of this road needs to be brought forward to before 2024 and it should not be an ‘either/or’ situation when considering a potential South East Relief Road.</p>		
<p>Reviewing the highway signage on routes into the town centre to sign north-south through-traffic away from sensitive areas of the town centre and promote appropriate route choices at key decision making junctions, especially on Oxford Road A4260. This is generally supported. The current traffic lights and traffic calming on the Oxford Road needs to be reviewed as it is often causing rat-running through the residential estates that run parallel to this main North/South arterial route.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Car park review and improvements, and provision of car park matrix signs. – This is generally supported.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Support for the infrastructure provision to support an increased use of buses in Banbury. There are a number of concerns on the overall feasibility of modal shift in the Town.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>The notion of modal shift toward public transport will only be effective if the service</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>

ANNEX 2

provision, and the 'pro's' of public transport outweigh those associated with private car use.		
If Oxfordshire County Council is reliant on modal shift then the service provision, cost and ease of access all need to be improved. If there are to be future cuts in service provision, then modal shift cannot be used as a method to deal with congestion issues in the town.	The Banbury Bus Strategy aims to create a network of commercial bus services providing high quality and attractive bus routes across Banbury. Bus travel is essential as a town the size of Banbury cannot rely on travel by walking and car alone.	Revise Banbury Bus Strategy to make the aims and methods of delivery clearer.
The provision of new bus routes needs to take into account that central Banbury is mainly pedestrianised and that for any modal shift away from the private car to the bus for access to employment to work it would need to coincide with the shift patterns of the major employers. We do not believe that this is economically feasible and so reliance on the private motor car will continue.	The Bus Strategy will examine town centre access by bus. The initial phases of the bus strategy will be focussed on providing high quality bus services connecting homes to work places the AM and PM peaks when congestion is at its worst. Success in the early phases will be built upon to widen key services to support shift workers at less traditional times of day.	Revise Banbury Bus Strategy to make the aims and methods of delivery clearer.
The need for a Bus Station in Banbury - would be reviewed with the possibility of relocating the existing Bus Station to a site in George Street. While this site would provide a good link to the town centre, There is a question over the need for a Service Bus Station altogether as drop off/pick up bus stops that provide shelter to bus users are more effective in a heavily congested area.	Noted	Revise Banbury Bus Strategy to indicate the need for a bus station will be reviewed including coach operations.
However, there needs to be provision for intercity coaches to drop off and pick up	Noted.	None

passengers. This could be at an integrated transport hub at Banbury Railway Station thereby providing trains/coach/buses/taxis at a single location. The reopening of Tramway would be integral to this transport hub working properly and to take traffic off Bridge Street.		
Support for the development of Banbury Train station as an important 'entrance' to Banbury and would welcome any improvements at this site. It does, however, seem as though the strategies contained in policy BAN3 are mainly landscaping issues and the promotion of walking, cycling and public transport.	OCC will work with Train Operating Companies and Network Rail to support their vision for Banbury Station. OCC (and other Local Authorities) can add most value to the areas around the station building rather than the building itself.	Review text to ensure partnership working with Train Operating Companies and Network Rail is clear.
Support for the provision of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, but considers this policy to be putting too much emphasis on the provision of walking, cycling and public transport provision. There are major concerns that the topography of the land and the inclination of residents to use cars as a mode of transport could hinder Oxfordshire County Council's reliance on overall modal shift.	Noted.	None
Would therefore urge OCC to consider road improvements as a more effective way to cure Banbury's traffic congestion issues. Paragraph 14 of the Banbury Area Strategy states that only 6% of journeys are made by bicycle, despite funding being put towards cycle ways over the last 20 years.	The Banbury Area Strategy pursues a number of road schemes within Policy BAN1.	None.

**ANNEX 2**

Therefore, would urge OCC to stop using funding for more cycle ways as this approach has been ineffective in the past.		
General support for policy BAN5 and the inclusion of travel plans on all new developments that meet OCC's thresholds.	Noted.	None.
Would like to see developer funding put toward the development of a South East Relief Road, as previously requested under policy BAN1. There is a considerable amount of housing development taking place in the town, with an additional 7,000 houses expected by 2031. Seen as a missed opportunity in terms of funding for a South East Relief Road.	The Council seeks developer funding and other types of funding towards adopted schemes.	None.
There is a need for a South East Relief Road. The population of Banbury will no doubt benefit from a 'south-to-east' link road and this is something that should be mentioned in the LTP4 documentation. OCC's provision of junction improvements (at Bridge Street/Cherwell Street), a potential link from Higham Way to Tramway, and the improvements at Hennef Way are unlikely to resolve the congestion issues which are currently blighting the town.	We will continue to review the need for a South East Relief Road, based on Local Plan growth.	None.

**ANNEX 2**

<p>Awareness of the impending electrification of the railway along the 'Oxford Corridor'. This will force Bridge Street to be closed to allow for the bridge to be raised. This will further impede traffic trying to cross from the east of Banbury to the west, as the only available route will be along Hennef Way and along Concorde Avenue. As well as the electrification of the 'Oxford Corridor', developments on HS2, although it does not directly go through Banbury, will have a significant impact on lorry and vehicle movements accessing Junction 11 of the M40. This is likely to have a significant effect on the west-to-east movements.</p>	<p>We will work with Network Rail and Train Operating Companies on projects in the Banbury area.</p>	<p>Revise text to include partnership working on rail projects.</p>
<p>Disappointment expressed in the LTP4 documentation being overly Oxford centric. There is vast provision of transport infrastructure given in the Science Vale Area Strategy, including the provision of a number of link roads. Banbury is a major economic hub for Oxfordshire and the surrounding Counties and as a result more provision should be allocated to it in the LTP4 documentation.</p>	<p>As a large Oxfordshire Town Banbury has a dedicated Area Strategy and Bus Strategy within LTP4.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>New homes developments tend to be divorced from employment areas, the railway station and the motorway. A future transport strategy must provide new links east to west if the town is to avoid complete gridlock.</p>	<p>The A361-A4260 spine road and bus strategy will seek to improve connections east to west.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>House prices in Oxford and more recently in</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

## ANNEX 2

the Witney area are likely to drive increasing numbers of buyers towards Banbury from where they will commute to work.		
A future transport interchange close to Banbury Station is essential.	Noted	None
Cherwell Street 'Eastern Corridor is not a realistic aim – it will only add to the existing congestion. Another bridge across the Canal for vehicles to connect with railway parking is needed urgently. Chiltern Railways parks off Higham Way have only served to add to the congestion and impede traffic movements through Grimsbury.	Point raised previously.	Point raised previously.
I would support a new link road from Higham Way to the existing Thorpe Way industrial areas if possible linked to the proposed road from A361 to A4260.	Point raised previously.	Point raised previously.
Bankside: I strongly support the promotion of Bankside. The road must be widened and traffic calming effects removed to take some pressure off the Oxford Road.	Point raised previously.	Point raised previously.
South Bar/Bloxham Road: I support the Bloxham Road/South Bar improvements. The new housing areas for 500 houses on the western fringe will generate many more car journeys on a road that is already at capacity.	Noted.	None
I strongly support the proposed Bloxham Road (A361) to Oxford Road (A4260) link road and would urge the revival of the option of a second motorway junction. Given the number of schoolchildren using	Noted.	None

**ANNEX 2**

the road to get to and from Banbury Academy, Blessed George Napier, and the Warriner Schools plus Queensway Primary, Harriers Ground and Bloxham Primary Schools thought needs to be given to further pedestrian crossings and safe cycle routes.		
Bus Station: I strongly support the need for a new bus station. The current bus station is already at capacity and will not serve as an interchange. Thought needs to be given to a new location. Bolton Road might be a possibility with a link to the railway station.	Point raised previously.	Point raised previously.
Bus routes: I strongly support working with public transport operators to develop the town's bus network and to provide extra services. Any improvements in infrastructure would also be most welcome. Bus services at present are completely inadequate – on most routes there is no evening or Sunday service – and are likely to be further reduced with declining subsidies.	Noted.	None.
The large crossroads at Southam Rd/Castle Street is ALWAYS congested and pumping filthy fumes into the air, as lorries idle, waiting for the lights. I am an expert witness - it is right outside the windows of the flat I live in.	Noted.	Revise text to confirm Southam Rd/Castle Street is included in the area strategy.
Bridge Street/Concorde Way/station intersection is a blight on the appearance of Banbury and totally without practicality.	Point raised previously.	Point raised previously.
I support the Banbury Civic Society	Noted.	None.

**ANNEX 2**

comments and suggested plan completely.		
With only two east-west crossing points, Hennef Way and Bridge Street, Banbury already has a congested and unreliable highway network. Many key roads are already at, or beyond capacity.	Noted.	None.
Hennef Way is at full capacity, as is Ermont Way, with particular problems on the Ermont Way roundabout and at Jct 11. Oxford Road is also at full capacity at peak times.	Noted.	None.
Traffic levels on the Southam Road between the Hennef Way roundabout and the Warwick Road crossroads result in serious delays at the Warwick Road crossroads with long tail-backs.	Noted.	None.
Traffic congestion on the Middleton Road is frankly a disgrace for a residential street, with air-quality levels that demand a solution. Traffic backing up over the railway bridge is seriously impacting the ability of motorists, taxis and busses to reach the railway station and its car parks, resulting in low use of the station car parks and unacceptable levels of on-street parking in residential areas.	Cherwell District Council continues to monitor air quality at Middleton Road, as yet an air quality management area has not been declared in Middleton Road as the threshold has not been met.	None.
The Inner Relief Road (Upper Windsor Street / Cherwell Street / Concorde Avenue) was an out-of-date concept when it was built in the early 1990s. It divides the town in half, separating it from both the railway station and from Grimsbury. The physical	Noted.	Revise text to explain the aims of Cherwell Street Corridor.

**ANNEX 2**

<p>dislocation caused by heavy traffic at the Bridge Street crossroads is completely unacceptable, whilst the road-width and lack of pedestrian crossing points on Cherwell Street is a serious impediment to the regeneration of the Canalside area.</p>		
<p>Often the town comes to a virtual standstill because of congestion caused by the volume of traffic. This is particularly prevalent when incidents occur on the M40.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>With all of the new housing sites being allocated on the western side of Banbury and all new employment sites, the station car park and the M40 connection being located to the east, the site allocations in the draft Cherwell Local Plan 2031 looks set to impose significant further traffic loads on the existing local road network, particularly between predominantly residential west side and the predominantly industrial east side, with its M40 connection.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>There will be an intolerable burden on the two existing connections between the town's eastern and western halves; the modern Hennef Way to the town's north and the historic and congested station bridge in the town centre, connecting Middleton Road to the Bridge Street crossroads.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>The desire line between the M40 and the town's north and east quadrants is reasonably well provided for by the current infrastructure, in that this traffic may avoid</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p>the town centre by using the modern Hennes Way, with its northern rail / river / canal crossing.</p>		
<p>The previously proposed south-to-east link road should now be re-examined in detail and an estimate of costs prepared in anticipation of such a project being seen as essential to support the town's planned growth. The preferred route start from Jct 11 on OCC / CDC's proposed link between Jct 11 and Overthorpe Road, using the existing bridge over the M40, and then following Chalker Way through the allocated Central M40 industrial site (Banbury 6 in the Cherwell Local Plan). It would then follow a sweeping crescent south-westward across railway, river and canal to join with an upgraded Bankside through an allocated open area at the heart of the consented Bankside development. Via Bankside, it would connect to the Oxford Road (A 4022) at the Bodicote Flyover. OCC / CDC's proposed Higham Way spine road provided as part of the allocated Higham Way and Central M40 developments (Banbury 19 and Banbury 6) would connect the route to the recently built multi-storey station car park.</p>	<p>We will undertake work to understand the consequences of opening Tramway for access to the Rail Station and a road bridge over the tracks to Higham Way with a new road linking to Central M40 site.</p>	<p>Point raised above.</p>
<p>Connectivity would be further enhanced by a 150metre link round the underused Spittle Farm allotments, connecting Higham Way (Banbury 19) to the existing Thorpe Way industrial area.</p>	<p>This suggestion will be included in the study work to understand the consequences of opening Tramway for access to the Rail Station and a road bridge over the tracks to Higham Way with</p>	<p>Revise text to show commitment to study to determine the way forward.</p>

**ANNEX 2**

	a new road linking to Central M40 site.	
If the south-to-east link road is considered impractical within the plan period, a second M40 junction on the south side of Banbury will be required.	Point Raised above.	Point Raised above.
The air quality on the Cherwell Street corridor is much worse and it would be inappropriate to reduce traffic flows on the South Bar / Horsefair corridor if this would result in more traffic on the Cherwell Street 'Eastern Corridor'.	Cherwell District Council monitors air quality and OCC will continue to work with them on air quality actions plans.	None
Developing the Cherwell Street 'Eastern Corridor' as the preferred north-south route through the town - This proposal is viewed with horror by Banbury residents and businesses alike. The existing Banbury Inner Relief Road (BIRR or Cherwell Street 'Eastern Corridor' is based on an outdated model that sought to relieve town-centre congestion by driving a new arterial route through the existing urban core. Like all such roads, it already has substantial adverse effects on the urban fabric and on air quality. It cuts the town in half, separating the town centre from the station and is a major impediment to pedestrian traffic. It is also the cause of chronic congestion, particularly on the station access, the Bridge Street crossroads and on Middleton Road.	Noted.	Revised text to ensure that "enlargement" is not used and make clear the aims of the Cherwell Street corridor study.
Any further enlargement of the Cherwell Street 'Eastern Corridor' (BIRR), or further	Noted.	None

intensification of its use, would exacerbate the existing problems and bring to naught the recent efforts to encourage commercial and business enterprises to locate to the town. Such a proposal would also do nothing for west-to-east and south-to-east traffic flows that will only intensify due to the decision to locate most new homes on the west side of Banbury and to centre employment and the station car park on the eastern side of the town. The enlarge BIRR would also further separate the town centre from the railway station and make it almost impossible to integrate the allocated Canalside development site with the existing town centre.		
A361 Bloxham Road to A4260 Oxford Road Link Road - it greatly benefit residents of Springfield Avenue / Timms estate, whose residential streets are used as rat-runs.	Noted.	None.
Reviewing the highway signage on routes into the town centre to sign north-south through-traffic away from sensitive areas of the town centre and promote appropriate route choices at key decision making junctions, especially on Oxford Road A4260 - Not if this means more traffic over the Bridge Street crossroads.	Noted.	None
(We believe that LTP4 needs to be specific about the clear need for schemes that re-open the link from Tramway to Station Approach (taxis and buses) and from the	Noted.	Review text to confirm the aspirations for the station forecourt and access to the station.

**ANNEX 2**

station forecourt and the canal towpath).		
The document makes no reference to the villages in the North of the County and their connectivity:- this is a particular concern for villages in the north of the County that have had to accept an excessive amount of un-planned development, with no improvement to the Highway Infrastructure ( notably the Highways, Cycle Paths or Bus Services).	Our policy document, freight, public transport and route strategies (where relevant) should be used to direct transport in Neighbourhood Plans and other local matters countywide.	Increased the emphasis on this in chapter 8 (policy 32) of LTP4 policy document.
We understand that one of the key inhibitors for OCC in making a plan for the A361, particularly for lorry routing, is an almost total lack of data on the source and destination of lorry traffic and the routes taken through the county.	Where resources allow a study into the A361 will be conducted through the LTP4 Freight Strategy.	None.
There has been no assessment of the Air Quality of this route through the villages especially in Bloxham. Due to the restrictions of the highway within the village, often vehicles are standing waiting for the traffic flow to recommence. This results in a concentration of emissions that are known to be harmful.	Cherwell District Council is responsible for monitoring air quality.	None.
The mini Roundabout in Bloxham is at capacity at Peak times now, yet no reference is made to any strategy for its improvements, despite this being a specific factor in the granting of several planning permissions in Bloxham.	This is a local, rather than strategic issue, and too localised for detailed inclusion. The funding secured will be utilised to improve the roundabout through the planning process.	None.
This Transport Plan (LTP4) does not appear to address the need for, or provision of, Highway or Transport improvements in	All areas of the County are covered by the general LTP4 policies.	None.

Bloxham. In consequence, we assume that all future proposed housing developments in the village will not be supported by OCC Officers as there is no mention of how such developments would be accommodated within this Transport Plan.		
In our opinion the Consultation document does not apply in Rural Areas for the reasons cited above, specifically it does not :- 1. support the Growth and Economic Vitality of the whole of Oxfordshire, 2. cut carbon 3. improve Quality of life	Noted.	None.
Officers welcome the reference in BAN 1 to a potential link road crossing from Tramway to Higham Way but this falls short of the wording agreed at the Local Plan examination in which options would be consulted upon through the LTP review process.	Noted.	Revise text to make clear the study/assessment, engagement/consultation methods.
It is acknowledged that some Banbury potential schemes may be less advanced to take forward to consultation at this moment in time than those at Bicester. If this is the case, it should be acknowledged in LTP4 with a commitment to assessment and consultation in the Policy, and timescales set out in an implementation plan or other document.	Noted.	Revise text to make clear the study/assessment, engagement/consultation methods and timeframes.
Certainty on transport initiatives with land-use implications will be required for the	Noted.	None.

**ANNEX 2**

preparation of Local Plan Part 2 and other land-use plans set out in the Local Development Scheme.		
Policy BAN 2 - This is a similar scenario as the potential link road in which no programme for the assessment of the options or how the final approach will be reached. There is a need for a commitment to assessment of the options, consultation in the Policy and timescales set out in an implementation plan or other document. Certainty on transport initiatives with land-use implications will be required for the preparation of Local Plan Part 2 and other land-use plans set out in the Local Development Scheme.	Noted.	Ensure bus strategy has a clear option assessment, engagement, and delivery path.
The Area Strategy recognises that the current cycle network at Banbury 'is fragmented and does not encourage people to consider cycling'. Policy BAN 4 commits the County Council to work with others to fill in gaps in walking and cycling but does not detail areas for intervention or how the policy would be taken forward. Without a framework at Banbury and no further direction in Policy BAN4, it is difficult to see how the aims of the policy can be delivered.	Noted.	Revise text to say how the policy will be taken forward.
Banbury's Area Strategy would benefit from a review of key county road links out of Banbury, including those that cross the county boundary. It would also benefit from further support from an overarching section	Note.	None.

**ANNEX 2**

<p>in the Policy Document, Volume 1 setting the links between county link road initiatives and those undertaken by other Local Highways Authorities and National programmes.</p>		
<p>Policies BAN5 and BAN6 - Relies on private sector funding to deliver transport initiatives. An implementation plan will be crucial to understand how this will work within a framework that limits the pooling of S106s to 5; to any given infrastructure scheme and a CIL system which is only intended to provide for gap funding. CDC and OCC officers will work together as part of the Cherwell Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Local Plan Annual Monitoring Framework but the approach to implementation of LTP4 initiatives needs to be set out in the LTP4. This will help ensure that Banbury schemes are incorporated within bids for the Local Growth Fund through the Local Enterprise Partnership and with other sources of funding.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Revise text to include timeframes, where possible.</p>
<p>The LTP4 seems southern centric (apart from the Banbury Area Strategy), more could be done within LTP4 Volume 1 to reflect corridors and economic priorities in the northern part of Cherwell and connections outside the County boundaries.</p>	<p>Point raised previously.</p>	<p>Point raised previously.</p>
<p>The LTP4 approach to transport options does not clearly set out how the County Council intends to assess the specific</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

**ANNEX 2**

options proposed and their social, economic and environmental impacts.		
Without a clear program to finalise options and an implementation plan, it is unclear how the policy objectives for sustainable transport and specific transport initiatives will be delivered and how this is going to inform Cherwell's local plan process.	Noted	Revise text to include timeframes, where possible.

### Bicester and area comments

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
Concerns were expressed that the improvements to M40 Junction 9 will be short lived as the traffic growth rapidly outstrips the increased capacity. Highways England comment that the current improvements will facilitate planned economic growth in the vicinity of Bicester, but that work to consider the long term impact of growth on the SRN is being undertaken.	The wording in BIC1 states that OCC will be, "Continuing to work with the Highways Agency to improve connectivity to the strategic highway, including future proposals for the A34, Junctions 9 and 10 of the M40."	No further amendment made. Current work programmes with Highways England will be continued.
There were some general comments about the peripheral routes policy and some about specific links. From a general point of view, it was felt that a ring road, rather than containing development within it, will only serve to encourage development on the outer edge.	A ring road should not be seen as a limitation to development. The level of growth being planned could not be accommodated within the ring road.	No amendment necessary.
Comment was received that there had been no mention made of the Howes Lane Realignment. Others commented that this realignment is fundamentally flawed as it will be useless for traffic wishing to bypass Bicester to the west – especially HGVs. Should consider widening Howes Lane instead.	Some form of realignment of the road is required in order to accommodate the necessary new tunnel under the railway. The wording should therefore include this link to make this clearer. The details around the design of this corridor are yet to be approved and are not necessary here.	Amend the second bullet point under the western corridor to read, "Realigning A4095 Howes Lane, as part of improving the strategic western peripheral route for Bicester."

<p>It was felt that the reference to a junction with the rail line as part of the Western peripheral road is unclear.</p>		
<p>There was concern that the impact of large scale residential and commercial development at Skimmingdish Lane has not been assessed or addressed. Others wanted the roundabouts around Charbridge Lane and Launton Road to be rationalised.</p>	<p>The impact of development proposed in the emerging Cherwell Local Plan on Skimmingdish Lane has been assessed and the increased capacity in the LTP consultation document is now identified as needing to be dual carriageway. This work will include reassessing the junctions along the corridor.</p>	<p>Update the second bullet point to include to specifically say, "Upgrade link to dual carriageway on the A4421 between the Buckingham Road and Gavray Drive"</p>
<p>The proposal for a new link through the South East Bicester development site caused considerable concern because of any impact on the Upper Ray Conservation Target Area, the Gavray Meadows wildlife site and the Local Green Space. This would degrade important habitat. There are also concerns that the road would be within the setting of the Alchester Roman Site Scheduled Ancient Monument. The Historic Environment Record and the County Council Archaeologist should be consulted and Historic England would also welcome being consulted. It was suggested the road should exit at Peregrine Way roundabout, with this current dangerous northern exit from Peregrine Way needing assessment anyway. It was also felt that LTP4 should use consistent terminology when referring to</p>	<p>The routeing of the road through this development site will need to take into account all of the constraints in the area, hence the "indicative" nature of the route on the map. However, this is a crucial link to achieve, both to lessen the impact on the highway network, but also to maximise on the connectivity of this site, particularly for buses.</p>	<p>No amendments to the wording proposed, but the significant concerns voiced are noted and ecology and archaeology interests will be consulted as any detailed proposals are brought forward.</p>

<p>the potential new and improved roads within Bicester and this link in particular to be consistent with the Local Plan.</p>		
<p>It was felt that there was a shortage of information in the plan around details of the improvements planned for Boundary Way.</p>	<p>This could be clearer.</p>	<p>The first bullet point for the southern corridor makes it clear that there are committed junction improvements at each of Boundary Way that are due to be delivered by developments. It is then the link capacity issues that require further consideration.</p>
<p>There were concerns over the two route options for the South East Perimeter Road – concern that the more southerly alignment would cut through the protected buffer zone, would box Wendlebury in between various pieces of transport infrastructure, and open up the land for infill development; concern that the more northerly alignment cuts across Bicester Wetland Reserve Local Wildlife Site. There was a call for LTP4 to commit to reviewing the requirement for this new road and the link through the south east Bicester development site. Request for OCC officers to visit Bicester Town Council to discuss Bicester South East Link Road proposals.</p> <p>The need for certainty through the Cherwell Local Plan Part 2 has been identified and that consultation on options should inform the final LTP4. It was also stated that an</p>	<p>The concerns expressed about Wendlebury and understood and part of the considerations. The route shown are only indicative and a high level ecology study will be undertaken to understand the constraints across the whole area.</p> <p>The need for an answer to the Boundary Way issues is not questioned within the strategy, but the Garden Town proposal for a new motorway junction may impact on the need for a perimeter road – see below.</p> <p>Happy to engage with the Town Council over this and the wider LTP4 implications.</p> <p>The aim is to provide certainty through the Local Plan Part 2 process. Further work on ecological and archaeological advice and technical engineering issues will be undertaken for the two route options for a South East Perimeter Road and the outcome will feed in Part 2 and a revised</p>	<p>The wording within BIC1 aims to make matters clearer. It confirms that the area strategy will be updated following consultation and approval of a preferred route.</p>

<p>implementation plan illustrating further work to implement its proposals with timescales will provide a greater element of certainty to help community engagement and integration of transport initiatives within land-use plans. Questions were also raised about how the County Council will assess the specific options proposed within BIC1 – when will route options be finalised.</p>	<p>area transport strategy.</p>	
<p>The Garden Town announcement and possible new M40 junction were picked up in several responses. It was observed that a new motorway junction would have an effect on the opportunities for traffic mitigation in and around the area and could therefore change the need for a South East Perimeter Road.</p> <p>Others felt this would be a waste of money and that instead there should be money for a longer term solution at Junction 9 or for an Oxford Cambridge Expressway.</p>	<p>The County Council is directly involved with the assessment of transport options within the Garden Town work. It is acknowledged that this <i>could</i> have an impact on the need for a South East Perimeter Road, but until options have been tested and the impacts and benefits are fully understood the options remain open.</p> <p>The County Council is also working with Highways England and the Department for Transport on proposals for an Oxford Cambridge Expressway and will clearly take this into account as plans for infrastructure around Bicester evolve.</p>	<p>A new bullet point within BIC1 is proposed on the new motorway junction to reflect the Garden Town announcement.</p>
<p>Concern was voiced that a number of the proposed schemes would appear to be likely to affect designated heritage assets, either directly or by virtue of being within the setting of a designated heritage asset. The Historic Environment Record and the County Council Archaeologist should be consulted on potential archaeological</p>	<p>Constraints and impacts of any scheme will be considered as they are developed.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No amendment necessary.</p>

ANNEX 2

remains as the design of these schemes progress. When further details of a proposed route or works are known, Historic England also would welcome being consulted.		
It was suggested that a 50mph road around the outside of the North West development should be considered, both to give it a sound boundary and to facilitate the inevitable growth in commercial traffic. However, comment was received that this should only be prioritised if set within a wider assessment of all reasonable options when the time comes.	Traffic modelling of a peripheral road around the edge of the NW Bicester development did not show a clear benefit under the current plan horizon however the need to reassess this within any longer term growth discussions is acknowledged hence the wording in the area strategy. It is accepted that all reasonable alternatives would need to be considered – WebTAG guidance.	No amendment necessary.
Responses felt there was a shortage of information around solutions for Charbridge Lane and London Road – the latter in particular coming up as a concern (and similarly a lack of information for the South East Perimeter Road – see above for proposed changes to this wording).	Work is on-going with Network Rail and the East West Rail project to find solutions to both level crossings. The design of a road bridge over the railway at Charbridge Lane will commence, to include proposals for dualling that part of the highway network. Options appraisals and scheme feasibility for solutions to the London Road level crossing are currently being undertaken.	The proposal is to change the Charbridge Lane bullet point to state that this needs to allow for a dual carriageway link. The wording on the London Road level crossing is slightly amended to give more certainty over the fact that a solution <i>will be</i> agreed.
Encourage the development of a single train station for Bicester instead of the current two stations.	It is not a consideration under the current Local Transport Plan planning horizon.	No amendment necessary.
A 'Parkway' type station at Ardley should be considered as it would accommodate commuter traffic from points west and particularly Heyford Park and would obviate the need for travel through Middleton	Although a station at Ardley is not considered necessary or viable during this plan period, it is an option that would be investigated further in the future.	No amendment necessary.

Stoney village to Bicester.		
<p>There was support for the Park &amp; Ride at Vendee Drive as long as this would make use of the bus service between Oxford and Bicester town centre. This facility will help with a wide range of dispersed journey-to-work origins.</p> <p>However, there was concern that this facility will barely replace the current 'overflow' parking that Bicester Village uses at Graven Hill.</p>	<p>It is intended that services between Oxford and Bicester town centre will be able to make use of the Park and Ride facility. Oxfordshire County Council will work closely with Bicester Village to ensure their parking and local highway network are managed effectively. Although the Park and Ride to an extent will mitigate the reduction in overflow spaces at Bicester Village, it is not intended as a direct replacement.</p>	<p>No amendment necessary.</p>
<p>Comment was received that key cross county roads, such as those to Buckingham, Aylesbury and Upper Heyford need to be upgraded to cope with Bicester's growth.</p> <p>In particular, it was felt that there is a lack of strategic thinking about improvements for the A41 to supplement Bicester's commercial operations while offering opportunities to tackle congestion.</p>	<p>This is covered in the Bicester Area Strategy within BIC1 by the last bullet point, "Reviewing key county road links out of Bicester, including those that cross the county boundary. A review of whether the B4100 between Bicester and A43 is still fit for purpose will be undertaken including whether an upgrade is required from its 'B' road status. Similarly a review of A41 to Aylesbury and A4421 to Buckingham will also be undertaken. The interrelationship of development at Upper Heyford with that of Bicester, connected by the B4030, will be considered carefully."</p>	<p>No amendment necessary.</p>
<p>Total assurance was sought that the Buckingham /Banbury Road Chicanes review would not allow HGV's through the town except for access.</p>	<p>HGV through traffic movements will be deterred and the peripheral route for these movements promoted. However, there have been a number of calls to reconsider the Banbury and Buckingham Road chicanes and it may be that they are no</p>	<p>No amendment necessary.</p>

**ANNEX 2**

	longer providing the function they were intended for.	
Bicester Town railway station has been renamed by Chiltern Railways to Bicester Village.	Agreed.	Change name of Bicester Town Station in LTP4 to Bicester Village Station
Access to the stations was raised as an issue.	Connectivity with the Railway Stations is covered by “Enhancing pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to the Bicester Village Station and Bicester North Station and key employment sites” in BIC2.	No amendment necessary.
Concern has been raised about the perceived unfeasibility of the local bus network, which makes it difficult to see how an effective commercial network of bus feeder services will materialise as the rail stations are not sited close to the town centre and are not on major arterial bus corridors. A full consultation was requested as some of the proposed bus routes are not workable. Others felt that BIC1 was all about new roads with fewer measures to develop bus travel.	The county council will continue to liaise with operators, and also bus users, to make new or improved services as attractive as possible to ensure they have the best chance of commercial success. BIC2 sets out a number of measures for buses including, “Improving Bicester’s bus services along key routes”. The aim is to balance proposed highway capacity improvements with improvements enabling sustainable modes of transport. The buses will benefit from a functioning highway network. A comprehensive bus strategy has been developed for LTP4 in parallel to the area strategies.	No amendment necessary.
Concerns were raised about the bus corridor along Bucknell Road. There was also concern that the prioritisation of bus lanes could inconvenience other road users.	The challenges for this corridor are acknowledged. BIC2 states that “in particular there is the need to find a solution to issues at the Bucknell Road / Field Street junction which is proposed to become an important bus route as North West Bicester	No amendment necessary.

	builds out.”	
There is no mention of bus routes to local hospitals, i.e. The Horton in Banbury and the John Radcliffe etc. in Oxford.	The wording in the strategy is broader than this but leaves the hooks there to look into the detail. If specific proposals emerge from discussions with operators this can be included in future amendments to the strategy.	No amendment necessary.
The bus stopping arrangements for the new shopping centre were a concern as it was felt they represent a major detour for westbound buses. Bus stop facilities are needed on the west side of Manorsfield Road, opposite the current stops, to accommodate these services.	There is an aspiration to provide westbound stops, particularly as the NW Bicester development develops out. However, this level of detail is considered too ‘fine grain’ for LTP4.	No amendment necessary.
It was questioned whether a real answer can be found to the access to Bicester Village issues, which particularly impact local people at weekends and on Bank Holidays. Another entry into the retail park was suggested.	This is covered in the Bicester Area Strategy by “Improving access to Bicester Village. An essential element of mitigating Bicester Village’s impact is to improve connectivity with the local area through walking and cycling route improvements to key destinations. This in combination with Highway and Public Transport Infrastructure improvements will reduce the local impact in the area. Specifically a new Park and Ride service in close proximity to Bicester Village will be provided in 2015, improving its connections with Oxford and Bicester town centre.”  Level differences and the capacity of the A41 have made it difficult to find a feasible solution to providing a second access to	No amendment necessary.

	Bicester Village.	
There were questions raised about crossing the A41 and Wretchwick Way – extremely busy roads for residents of new developments to cross.	Crossing of the A41 is included in the Bicester Village Phase 4 access improvements and will be discussed with developers in terms of Wretchwick Way. BIC2 includes, “Improved pedestrian connections to Graven Hill including A41 crossing options to reduce severance and increase the accessibility of this site”.	No amendment necessary.
<p>Comment was received that the strategic aim should be to provide dedicated cycling lanes, separate to the roads, and pedestrians. Where the footway is wide enough both cycling and pedestrians could use the route but there needs to be a clear delineation down the surface to identify the pedestrian and the cycling surfaces. It is not acceptable for both cycling and pedestrians to try and use a footpath for both! The laws on cycling on footpaths are very clear and need to be reinforced as many cyclists now seem to think they can ride anywhere and put pedestrians in danger!</p> <p>Others felt the cycling improvements were piecemeal and that a strategic cycling vision and map should be developed (like the Science Vale one).</p> <p>Others questioned the idea of promoting of cycling to the extent that it would prevent</p>	<p>Cycling improvements will be designed within the constraints of each location. The first aim in the Cycling Strategy within LTP4 is to deliver segregated cycle facilities on road. In terms of shared use facilities between pedestrians and cyclists, these are only considered appropriate where they have a relatively low footfall compared to a busy urban area to avoid conflict. The preference is generally not to delineate between cyclists and pedestrians as this is often ignored or not acknowledged, leading to conflict between the users.</p> <p>Legal enforcement of cycling on footways is not the responsibility of the county council. A more detailed strategy for cycling in Bicester is being developed through the Bicester Sustainable Transport Strategy commissioned by Cherwell District Council. The aim is for a balanced strategy whereby any redistribution of traffic resulting from</p>	No amendment necessary.

**ANNEX 2**

cars from accessing the usual routes within the town.	sustainable measures in the town centre will be met by the peripheral route improvements. However, access to the centre by all modes will be maintained.	
Detailed comments on the specific pedestrian/cycle routes listed– (i)&(ii) need to include the Middleton Stoney Road, (iii) this suggestion will be firmly opposed locally, as all vehicle access to the town centre is essential. (iv) needs to be under the A41. (V) - hope you mean 'from' the Town Park (The Garth) so as not to further encroach on this town treasure!(vii) any bridge needs to be simple and not a complicated eyesore(Tubbs Crossing).	All these points will be considered as these schemes are developed. The merit of any scheme and its impact on other modes will be carefully considered and consulted upon.	'through the town park' reworded as 'from the town park'.
Market Square - Bicester County Councillors have long pressed for this to be consulted on ONLY once the London Road crossing issue is resolved!	Market Square improvements will complement the major investment in the town centre redevelopment and will be progressed once other developments impacting on the Market Square are completed.	No amendment necessary.
It was felt that a radical approach to facilitating mode shift to buses is required.	Within the town the Bicester One-Shared Vision has identified a shift to cycling as the best opportunity for mode shift. However, with an expanding town bus will become more important for cross-town trips and will continue to be a key mode for trips to and from external connections. The strategy includes Smarter Choices and Travel Plans to help to achieve this shift.	No amendment necessary.
Concern regarding HGV traffic in Middleton Stoney. Routing arrangements should be	Issues around HGV movements are covered by the Freight Strategy within	No amendment necessary.

put in place to ensure HGV traffic does not use the B4030.	LTP4.	
HGV routing agreements are sometimes abused on the B430. Through traffic is using the B430 but should be using the strategic network. A 7.5 tonne weight limit should be applied to B430 with the exception for local access for those vehicles which need to use it for access to local business purposes.	The County Council is working with Highways England to improve the strategic corridors and their junctions to encourage long-distance trips onto appropriate roads. The Freight Strategy within LTP4 includes a section on new weight limits. The B430 can be included within these considerations, although progress will be dependent on funding.	No amendment necessary.
There were some questions over the map: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it doesn't show any of the proposed road amendments or routes of new roads</li> <li>- it could be entirely changed after the government inspector has reported</li> <li>- the "Extension to perimeter road (indicative)" that is shown as a red dotted line must not go from the A41 to the Gavray Drive roundabout.</li> <li>- the peripheral corridor improvements indicated with a blue dotted line mean what?</li> </ul>	Until new road alignments are approved they cannot be shown on the map. Indicative arrows are used instead. This is a live document. The area strategy will be coming back for an update later this year. Constraints will need to be established with the developer and interested parties. These are only indicative at this stage.  They indicate the peripheral corridors where measures will be undertaken to maintain the capacity of these routes. The necessary improvements vary.	No amendment necessary.  The wording of the eastern peripheral corridor bullet point under BIC1 now states that the improvement on this corridor will be the delivery of a dual carriageway.
Disappointing to note that the B4030 is now considered a strategic link route between the new settlement at Heyford Park and Bicester. Disbelief that modelled measures can be implemented effectively for Middleton Stoney.	The B4030 runs from across county from Enstone to Bicester and is a rural 'B' road to connect county areas together. It does not have the strategic role of an 'A' road or motorway, but localised growth will increase the traffic flow. A bypass has been modelled to the North	No amendment necessary.

ANNEX 2

<p>Traffic impact on B4030 should be reduced by a bypass north of Middleton Stoney Village.</p>	<p>East of the junction at Middleton Stoney but initial investigations showed limited benefit for a scheme of this scale with the level of development proposed.</p>	
<p>Disappointing to note that the B4030 is now considered a strategic link route between the new settlement at Heyford Park and Bicester. Disbelief that modelled measures can be implemented effectively for Middleton Stoney. Traffic impact on B4030 should be reduced by a bypass north of Middleton Stoney Village.</p>	<p>The B4030 runs from across county from Enstone to Bicester and is a rural 'B' road to connect county areas together. It does not have the strategic role of an 'A' road or motorway, but localised growth will increase the traffic flow. A bypass has been modelled to the North East of the junction at Middleton Stoney but initial investigations showed limited benefit for a scheme of this scale with the level of development proposed.</p>	<p>No amendment necessary.</p>
<p>A request was received to ban road humps, in particular those planned for Middleton Stoney Road. Instead the planned pedestrian controlled traffic lights should be used as a speed control measure that won't damage vehicles.</p>	<p>The approved Middleton Stoney Road scheme comprises road cushions which should minimise any potential damage to vehicles when compared with road humps.</p>	<p>No amendment necessary.</p>
<p>There was a call to include motorcycle in more than just the road casualty statistics - a congestion reducing mode and one that requires fewer parking spaces and is more economic than the private car. It was felt there was a blurring of technology – promotion of cycling and electric cars, but no mention of electric bicycles or electric motorbikes. Roads and parking facilities need to be designed to accommodate motorcycles in</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No amendment necessary.</p>

either internal combustion or electric forms.		
<p>Changes are necessary to ensure the draft LTP4 is consistent with the Community Infrastructure Levy (as amended)</p> <p>The LTP4 should include a commitment to consider any potential requirements for strategic transport infrastructure and strategic public transport service contributions in the context of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (as amended) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)</p> <p>The LTP4 should include a commitment to set any requirements for strategic transport and public transport service contributions against the provision of land for any strategic transport infrastructure to avoid any 'double counting'.</p>	<p>The Community Infrastructure Levy is yet to be adopted by Cherwell. The LTP4 Bicester Area Strategy and The Cherwell Local Plan Modifications will form the basis for understanding what infrastructure should be included on the CIL list for Bicester.</p> <p>Potential requirements for strategic transport infrastructure and strategic public transport service contributions are considered in the context of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (as amended) and National Planning Policy Guidance.</p> <p>Each development will be assessed on its own merits. Land is taken into account in assessing contributions.</p>	No amendment necessary.
<p>The LTP4 should include a commitment from OCC to engage with the developers on the transport infrastructure requirements for their sites and timing for delivery of any transport infrastructure requirements identified and the requirement for a possible south-east relief road within Bicester and a potential new link road through the South East Bicester development site.</p>	<p>Transport requirements are discussed in any pre-application discussions and during the scoping of a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Where third party land is required for a transport scheme, engagement with interested parties will take place early on in the process once a scheme becomes a live project.</p>	No amendment necessary.
<p>Bicester is an Eco Town, soon to have Garden Town status, but this plan seems to erode at the already depleting green space in and around the town.</p>	<p>Transport schemes requiring green fields are only considered as a last resort after assessment has shown that improvements to existing routes would not be the answer</p>	No amendment necessary.

ANNEX 2

	and measures to improve sustainable transport modes are not sufficient on their own to address the issues.	
OCC to consider extending the consultation period until after the Cherwell Local Plan Inspectors report has been issued	LTP4 is a live document and will be updated as appropriate points.	Extension of consultation period not considered necessary.
LTP4 does not go nearly far enough to address the forthcoming traffic growth.	The LTP4 area strategy has been developed alongside the evidence for the Cherwell Local Plan and, pending confirmation over certain schemes in Part 2 of the Local Plan, addresses the impacts of the planned growth.	No amendment necessary.
The Draft LTP4 is not consistent with the Main Modifications to the Cherwell Submission Local Plan (October 2014). To be consistent there needs to be commitment to undertake regular monitoring reviews alongside the Local Plan Annual Monitoring Reviews. Need to measures the delivery of transport infrastructure against the delivery of development and the requirements set out in planning documents.	Every effort has been made to ensure that LTP4 is consistent with the Cherwell Local Plan Main modifications. The County Council will be involved in the Annual Monitoring Review including reviewing the IDP. LTP4 will be a live document and the area strategy will be updated later this year if the work undertaken to inform Local Plan Part 2 provides further clarity over the routeing / design / phasing of schemes.	BIC1 has been amended to confirm that the area strategy will be updated following consultation on the south east link road options.
The forthcoming Bicester Masterplan should be in place before the compilation of this LTP.	LTP4 is a live document and any impact on the area strategy can be picked up in the review following on from the Garden Town work.	No amendment necessary.
There is insufficient evidence presented within the LTP4 to inform the transport strategy for Bicester.	The area strategy for Bicester in LTP4 is based on a comprehensive evidence base of movement studies and modelling carried out over a number of years.	No amendment necessary.
The Bicester Area Strategy is different in	LTP4 is a live document and the area	No amendment necessary at this

the level of detail, format and content to the Oxford Transport Strategy and Science Transit Strategy.	strategies reflect the current position in that area. Any amendments as a result of the Garden Town work, or any other significant pieces of work such as that undertaken in connection with Local Plan Part 2, will be taken account of in a review.	stage.
The approach to implementation of LTP4 initiatives needs to be set out in the LTP4.	Further work on the phasing will be undertaken in the review of the area strategy.	No amendment necessary.
Since being purchased by Bicester Heritage Former RAF Bicester is now a thriving industrial and sporting facility with a possible future for heritage tourism. The sport of gliding needs to be recognised.	This is not a matter for the LTP4 area strategy, but it is noted that the uses at this site should be accurately reflected in any wording.	No amendment necessary.

### Positive Feedback - No Action Required

It is pleasing that the plan recognises that traffic in Bicester is increasing.
CDC officers welcome Policy BIC 1 emphasis on further assessment and consultation on the element of the South east perimeter road connecting Graven Hill with the A41, and the acknowledgement of Garden Town initiatives.
Supports for the development of Graven Hill as a freight interchange.
I fully approve your paragraph at the top of page 9 regarding getting freight off the roads and onto the rail network.
The study to remove the chicanes on the Banbury and Buckingham Roads is welcomed.
I note your use of the correct name of Bicester TOWN station. Please insist on this remaining the name of the station as it defines the town and not a shopping outlet!
Bicester Town Station pedestrian and cycle access – fully support, but the rail crossing needs to be simple and accessible.
Green links – Fully support. Suggest engagement with Bicester Rambler and other interest groups.
Work is already in had on the parking strategy – we now need some real joint working with CDC and the Police to action a co-ordinated policy for the town.
I fully support your statement on the top bullet point on page 24 that “the south east quadrant of Bicester is viewed to be the most appropriate area for B8 employment uses given the strategic road and rail access.”

## ANNEX 2

I approve of 20 mph speed limits in residential areas as well as more “Home Zones” that you identify on page 11 of volume 2.
I fully approve of your support for air travel from our local airport at London Oxford.
Support for measures in BIC 4 to secure developer contributions for capital and revenue support for bus services.
Design the P&R sites such that the quickest possible access and egress is achievable for each bus movement. We note and commend the design for Bicester Park and Ride in this regard.
Stagecoach in particular believes that the creation of new Park and Ride facilities at Eynsham and Bicester, both of which are on land controlled by the County Council, offer clear short-term potential to assist in consolidating demand from a wide range of dispersed journey-to-work origins, that will help allow for the early provision of enhanced direct commuter services to the Headington/JRH area, and in time, the remainder of the Oxford Eastern Arc, subject to bus priority and reliable peak journey times being achievable.... location and design of the new sites needs to have regard to taking advantage of the frequency and range of existing services as far as possible. Eynsham and Bicester are exceptionally well-located in this regard, with at least 6 buses per hour available at each today.



### Chipping Norton – Summary of comments received

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
Disappointed and concerned that the Chipping Norton Area Strategy section included in the County's LTP3 (revised Oct 2012) has been entirely omitted from the draft LTP4.	Understand these concerns. Area Strategies have been limited to the areas receiving the greatest volume of growth. The general LTP4 policies and strategies will apply to all areas of the County, and Chipping Norton will have specific chapters in the WODC Local Plan, as well as having a Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan. These other policy documents provide significant opportunities for Chipping Norton without having a Transport Area Strategy.	None.
Underlying needs for the A44 depriming and HGV compulsory weight limits in Horsefair, Chipping Norton remain unchanged.	Noted.	Strengthen the LTP4 Freight Strategy to include A44 reclassification scheme.
No section or strategy about Chipping Norton to deal with the Air Quality Management Area issues	WODC have an Air Quality Action Plan to address the Chipping Norton Air Quality Management Area. LTP4 Volume one has an Improving Air Quality section which highlights the Chipping Norton Air Quality Management Area.	None.
When will the feasibility study for the implementation of the lorry management measures be available and what weight will it be given?	Officers plan to conduct a study toward the end of 2015/16 financial year depending on available budget and resources.	None.

**ANNEX 2**

Anger and dismay at the virtual complete lack of mention of Chipping Norton in LTP4.	Noted.	None.
It will be extremely difficult to meet the housing target without an extreme rethink of traffic – more specifically the movement of the huge HGVs.	In combination LTP4, WODC Local Plan and Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan will address the impact of growth.	None.
<p>Following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HGV diversion route around the Rollright Stones</li> <li>• Priority system through Horsefair</li> <li>• One way system using Albion Street and A44</li> <li>• New second tier in the New Street Car Park</li> <li>• Charging the parking limits, especially along Topside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HGV diversion route around the Rollright Stones</li> <li>• Priority system through Horsefair</li> <li>• One way system using Albion Street and A44</li> </ul> <p>These proposals were explored in the OCC 2007 report “Chipping Norton AQMA Feasibility Study” which concluded none of these were suitable to take forward, which was when the A44 primary route status declassification scheme was included in LTP3.</p>	None.
New developments will result in the increase of HGVs, pollution and congestions, and increased traffic / problematic car parking	Noted.	None.
The Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan focuses several pages on issues such as transport and movement, and the Town Centre (including parking).	Noted.	None.
Lack of a commitment to de-priming the A44 through Chipping Norton in the local transport plan.	Noted.	Strengthen the LTP4 Freight Strategy to include A44 reclassification scheme.
Should commit to working with West Oxfordshire District Council to reroute large lorries from Chipping Norton as soon as	Noted.	Strengthen the LTP4 Freight Strategy to include A44 reclassification scheme.

**ANNEX 2**

possible.		
As well as the high levels of nitrous oxide, which have been measured for around a decade, lorries using the A44 at Horsefair represent a significant danger to pedestrian safety.	Noted.	Strengthen the LTP4 Freight Strategy to include A44 reclassification scheme.
Dismayed that there are no plans or strategy within the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan – LTP4 to deal with the problem of HGV traffic passing directly through Chipping Norton.	Noted.	Strengthen the LTP4 Freight Strategy to include A44 reclassification scheme.
There has allegedly been a ‘black box’ in place on Topside for the past ten years that has consistently detected illegal levels of Nitrogen Dioxide which clearly represents a danger to the health and safety and general well-being of residents and visitors to Chipping Norton. Surely this warrants urgent action to deal with this health hazard.	WODC have an Air Quality Action Plan to address the Chipping Norton Air Quality Management Area. LTP4 Volume one has an Improving Air Quality section which highlights the Chipping Norton Air Quality Management Area.	None.
There have been a number of pedestrian fatalities in Chipping Norton involving HGV traffic, further and compelling evidence that action is required to find an alternative route for HGV traffic to avoid them using Chipping Norton as part of their route.	Noted.	Strengthen the LTP4 Freight Strategy to include A44 reclassification scheme.
Shelved the HGV Diversion Plan.	Noted.	Included in LTP4 Freight Strategy.
The High Street (outside of the Blue Boar) is a dangerous, narrow stretch of road.	Noted.	None.
We is encouraged that the need to re-route heavy goods vehicles in Chipping Norton is highlighted in relation to delivering potential air quality improvements in the town. This is	Noted.	None.

<p>a key issue for Chipping Norton and the the preparation of the feasibility study that has been commissioned to further consider potential lorry management measures is welcomed.</p>		
<p>It is understood that a number of potential measures have previously been considered including the use of weight restrictions, the re-routing of HGV traffic via the A40 through 'de-priming' of the A44 and signage modification as well as a bypass for the town. Whilst we accept that environmental sensitivities and lack of funding may render a bypass potentially unachievable, it is essential that the feasibility study considers all options including for example the potential to encourage improved HGV movements through the construction of short spur roads in appropriate locations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HGV diversion route around the Rollright Stones</li> <li>• Priority system through Horsefair</li> <li>• One way system using Albion Street and A44</li> </ul> <p>These proposals were explored in the OCC 2007 report "Chipping Norton AQMA Feasibility Study" which concluded none of these were suitable to take forward, which was when the A44 primary route status declassification scheme was included in LTP3. This remains the preferred scheme.</p>	None.
<p>Improving air quality in Chipping Norton has long been an aspiration (an Air Quality Action Plan was approved in October 2008) but there has been slow progress in identifying and implementing measures to improve air quality.</p>	Noted.	None.
<p>The impacts of this additional growth on the air quality management area should be assessed as part of the feasibility study and any opportunities to fund improvements from development and other funding streams should be examined. In addition to Chipping Norton, the impacts of HGV</p>	Individual development sites will be asked to assess their impact on the air quality management areas in the district.	None.

<p>movements in other towns such as Burford and Woodstock should also be assessed and potential solutions considered, as HGVs cause congestion and noise which impacts on local residents and tourists. We are pleased that this is acknowledged in the Cycle, Freight and Bus Strategies paper but clear actions should be identified to address the situation.</p>		
--	--	--

### Witney and Carterton (including the A40 and Eynsham) comments

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
<p>We agree that the restricted movement junction at Shores Green, coupled with only one river crossing at Bridge Street results in considerable congestion and journey time delay. In addition, we are pleased that the County Council recognise the constraint of the river combined with the level of demand for vehicular travel which results in severe congestion, delays to buses and air pollution - deterring cyclists and pedestrians from using this route.</p>	Noted	None
<p>We support Policy WIT1 which seeks to improve access to the strategic transport network and manage through traffic by securing the all-movement at-grade junction on the A40 at Downs Road, west-facing slip roads at A40 Shores Green junction, improvements to the Oxford Hill junction with Jubilee Way and the West End Link Road 2. In addition, the Council supports Policies WIT2 and WIT3; including the protection of the line of the Shores Green Slip Roads and safeguarding land for the proposed West End Link stage 2.</p>	Noted	None
<p>We consider that the West End Link 2 has a</p>	Note	None

<p>key role to play in tackling congestion as part of a package of strategic transport measures at Witney and has allocated land to the north of the town for the provision of 1,000 homes in order to help fund and deliver the scheme together with a new northern distributor road.</p>		
<p>In relation to Policy WIT4, we agree with the objectives set but wishes to raise concerns regarding the funding sources available to improve the frequency of the bus services. We have identified an aggregate funding gap between the infrastructure necessary to support growth to 2031 and the predicted income generated from CIL to be between £62.6 - £71.5m1, therefore developer funding through Section 106 Agreements and CIL (once adopted) is extremely unlikely to be able to fund the necessary bus improvements alone. In addition, we consider that the policy should reflect the need for bus services to be better aligned with rail departures and arrivals at Hanborough Station which will require collaborative working with First Great Western.</p>	<p>Developer funding will be sought to pump prime buses to serve new developments whilst they are being built in order to provide bus services before they become commercially viable.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Considering Policy WIT6, we are broadly supportive of this policy, although given the substantial funding which has been provisionally awarded to investigate the options for major integrated transport enhancements to the A40 between Witney</p>	<p>The along with the Witney &amp; Carterton area strategies the A40 Strategy has been updated to reflect the importance of Park and Ride at Eynsham .</p>	<p>Revise text to strengthen commitment to Eynsham park and ride.</p>

<p>and Oxford/ the Northern Gateway, we would have expected more recognition of the role of a Park &amp; Ride. We consider this to be a vital part of the package of achieving modal shift and reducing congestion on the approaches to Oxford and the Northern Gateway. In addition, it is important that there is certainty as the implementation of the future Park &amp; Ride sites such as at Eynsham will impact on the wider transport strategy, including the retention of existing Park &amp; Rides sites such as Peartree.</p>		
<p>Finally, in regard to the funding for transport measures in the Witney area (Policies WIT7 and 8), as expressed above, developer funding alone (either through legal agreements or CIL, or both) is unlikely to be sufficient to fund the measures detailed and therefore other potential funding mechanisms should be identified.</p>	Noted.	Revise text to explain funding limitations and seek external funding opportunities.
<p>Turning to the Carterton Area Strategy, we are supportive of all the various enhancements proposed and are pleased that the County recognise that Carterton, as second largest town in the District, currently suffers from relatively poor access to the principal road network. Providing improved access will help to unlock economic growth potential in the town and better connect existing employment sites which will encourage inward investment linked to the activities at RAF Brize Norton. As such, the</p>	Noted	None.

ANNEX 2

District strongly supports the necessary improvements to the B4477 between Carterton and the A40 at Minster Lovell, along with the upgrade from B-classification to A-classification and west facing slip roads at the A40/B4477 Minster Lovell junction.		
As above, with regard to the funding for transport measures in the Carterton area, developer funding alone is unlikely to be sufficient to fund the measures detailed and therefore other potential funding mechanisms should be identified.	Noted	Revise text to explain funding limitations and seek external funding opportunities.
We do not think the above transport plan deals with the significant increase in volume of cars and car journeys that must result from the increase in house building in the area – not just Witney, but Long Hanborough and Woodstock as well. In other words the ‘solutions’ proposed are not commensurate with the scale of the problem.	Further measures will be sought from developments through the Planning Process.	None.
With regard to an integrated public transport system we would also favour more attention being given to linking bus services with trains and the railway system. i.e. regular bus services from Witney to Long Hanborough and Charlbury stations.	This is included in the Bus Strategy.	None.
WIT1 - The Parish Council welcomes the planned all-movement junction on the A40 at Downs Road and the planned upgrade of the A40/B4022 Shores Green junction to an all-movement junction.	Noted	None

**ANNEX 2**

<p>We also welcome the much needed feasibility and viability assessment of West End Link Road 2 (WEL2), a new road bridge crossing the River Windrush. We have previously made representations to OCC on this proposal and repeat those at the end of this document.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Additionally we have explored WODC's background documents relating to WEL2 and have concluded that there is a substantial non-viability issue associated with the North Witney proposals (of which WEL2 is a part).</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>A notable exclusion from OCC's POLICY WIT1 is the Northern Relief (or Distributor) Road (contained in the WODC Draft Local Plan - North Witney proposal) which runs from the Woodstock Road across the New Yatt Road to the Hailey Road). Cost details for the Northern Relief Road are contained in the WODC Background Paper 6 - Appendix CIL and Local Plan Viability Appendices compressed. Geoffrey Arnold, Senior Engineer &amp; Transport Planner, OCC responded to a West Oxfordshire development proposal (Application no: 14/01671/OUT) for Phase 1 of the North Witney development. Proposal – The Northern Relief Road should be included in the Witney Transport strategy if it is to be consistent with the WODC Draft Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Revise text to make it clear Northern Relief (or Distributor) Road is to be delivered by North Witney.</p>
<p>The Viability results of the both scenarios in</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p>the model for North Witney FAIL THE VIABILITY TEST as in both cases the Relative Land Value is less than the Threshold Land Value. The RLV is only 65-67% of Threshold Land Value. NORTH WITNEY IS THEREFORE NOT VIABLE. When these previously unidentified costs are inserted into the Aspinall Verdi financial model for North Witney the RLV is not only below the TLV but in both scenarios modelled, the RLV is negative. The cost of the flood barrier and mains sewers have not been identified and are not included in the viability appraisal but would worsen the financial case. When these additional factors are taken into account the mitigation measures required to overcome the non-viability of North Witney become unachievable.</p>		
<p>The scheme to build a cycle path along the B4044 from Eynsham and Farmoor to Botley and hence to Oxford City would generate many more new cyclists along this road. Few cyclists use this route as it is intimidating for all but the most experienced cyclists. The route twists with many buses and HGVs using the road, with little opportunity to overtake cyclists. A path along the wide verge on the North side would allow cyclists, walkers and runners to use this road in safety. The County's Environmental Centre at Hill End is only</p>	<p>We are not opposed to this in principle but we consider that this would be an expensive project to undertake and that there are likely to be other projects to carry out that would benefit cyclists more than this link is likely to.</p>	<p>We shall continue to hold this as a potential future project in the event of funding becoming available.</p>

<p>accessible by car or minibus because it is too dangerous for buses to stop near Hill End and it is too difficult to walk on the present verge. A multipurpose path along the north verge would solve these problems, and cost no more than is being spent of the Plain roundabout, but would have much greater benefits. In addition the payback just in terms of improved health is only 10 years, according to a nationally accepted calculation method.</p> <p>With so many supporters of a B4044 path and the amount of money already raised, the County would only need to part-fund this path. But this project would generate immense support and health benefits. It would also go some way in closing the gap in the cycle routes around Oxford. This should be the next cycling scheme supported by the County.</p>		
--	--	--

## A40

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
Pleased that there is recognition within this document that the A40 is critical for linking West Oxfordshire with Oxford/ the	Noted	None

**ANNEX 2**

Knowledge Spine and currently experiences severe congestion throughout the day.		
The congestion levels on the A40 deter businesses from locating in West Oxfordshire and therefore detrimentally impacts the local economy which in turn impacts on the growth potential of Oxfordshire as a whole.	Noted	None
Whilst there is reference to the need for 'major integrated transport enhancements' to the A40 between Oxford and Witney, the possible enhancements are not set out within the text of this document. We recognise that the County Council are still developing a strategy for improving the A40 corridor; however the broad options which include a Park & Ride at Eynsham and bus priority measures along with A40 corridor have been investigated in some detail and should be referred to within this document.	Updated to include A40 strategy.	Updated to include A40 strategy.
Congestion on the A40 also displaces vehicles onto other routes creating localised congestion such as along the A4095, particularly between Witney and Woodstock. This should be considered as part of the overall strategy so that traffic is diverted back to the A40 as the principal route to Oxford.	The A40 Strategy will address this.	Updated to include A40 strategy.
Currently congestion on the A4095 and other local roads detrimentally impacts local residents along these routes and creates	The A40 Strategy will address this.	Updated to include A40 strategy.

**ANNEX 2**

<p>safety hazards. Therefore major enhancements along with A40 should aim to significantly reduce the current levels of 'rat-running' along secondary routes and additional capacity should also be built-in to the scheme to create resilience as the population in West Oxfordshire increases and demand rises.</p>		
<p>We are also concerned that there is no reference to the A40 cycle corridor and the potential for improvements to Oxford/ the Northern Gateway which could be achieved as part of the major enhancements to the A40. This should be incorporated into Part 2 of the Science Vale Cycling Strategy as this is a key linkage to the Northern Gateway.</p>	<p>The Science Vale cycling strategy focuses on the Science Vale area. The A40 corridor is being investigated currently.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Whilst the we agree that lorries and through traffic should be encouraged to stay on strategic routes, the strategy for the A40 should ensure that if freight is directed onto this route, there is sufficient capacity for this and other vehicles alongside the bus priority measures.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>We are encouraged that the A40 from Oxford to Witney is designated as a 'Rapid Transit Route' where investment will be concentrated and we support the provision of facilities such as pre-paid ticket machines, real time service information and secure cycle parking. We are however concerned that Eynsham is not listed alongside the other major hub locations at</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>The list on paragraph 41 is for major projects which are still being planned and/or funding for which has not been fully identified.</p>

ANNEX 2

<p>paragraph 41, although we note that this is referred to on page 71 of this paper.</p>		
<p>Whilst Witney and Carterton currently benefit from a 'premium' bus service, the attractiveness of the services is degraded considerably by the journey time which is in excess of 50 minutes from Witney to Oxford at peak times and also the inconsistency in journey time due to congestion of the A40 approach to Oxford and on the Swinford Toll Bridge. Therefore, we strongly support measures such as the bus priority enhancements and Park &amp; Ride to improve connectivity into Oxford and the Northern Gateway.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>We are wholeheartedly disappointed with the draft transport plan. It expresses a number of woolly hopes/aspirations without providing any concrete facts about how much things will cost, where the money would come from and what the quantified effect would be of the measures proposed and is therefore considered a feeble attempt at resolving desperate transport problems. Some meaningful financial data needs to be included in the plan.</p>	<p>Note the criticism of a lack of detail. This reflects the current stage of work. Future revisions to LTP will add greater level of detail.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>At point 30 (vol 1), it is indicated that West Oxfordshire (in particular Witney) is the largest commuter town to Oxford in the County. When combined with point 32 (vol1) indicating the 'through traffic' from outside the County and the A40 showing 2 areas</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>The A40 section in the policy document is being revised</p>

<p>that are at 95% capacity, the road is clearly 'full'. What the plan seemingly fails to consider is that not only is the A40 already at full capacity, West Oxfordshire District Council is planning to build 10,500 new homes between now and 2031 which will add further pressure to the highway network.</p>		
<p>The draft plan does not provide any realistic solutions to the problems being experienced now or in the future regarding the A40. Installing a Park &amp; Ride at Eynsham will be ineffective with only 1000 spaces and Witney commuters will still have to find a method of transport to get to Eynsham.</p>	Noted.	None
<p>Minster Lovell's bus service has been dramatically reduced by Stagecoach Oxfordshire due to the fact that congestion on the A40 means they cannot support timetables and with Carterton/Witney being 'growth areas', Minster Lovell's 'viable' public transport has been effectively withdrawn to ensure those areas receive a service. Investment into subsidised services for Witney's rural areas should be made a priority.</p>	Noted.	None
<p>A Bus Rapid Transit Route from Witney to Oxford is proposed to resolve the A40 problems. It is 'pie-in-the-sky' unless congestion into and around Oxford is significantly reduced. Bearing in mind the semi-rural nature of Witney,</p>	Noted	None

ANNEX 2

<p>potential passengers would have to drive to Witney, park and gain access to the bus. Who wants to pay for an expensive ticket to sit in a crowded bus, in a traffic jam when they could be sitting in the comfort of their own car and meeting their door to door transport needs?</p>		
<p>Stagecoach is unable to provide enough buses to support existing services so how can Stagecoach or other bus companies provide enough vehicles to meet the growing demands of West Oxfordshire? Providing extra dedicated buses and a park and ride facility at Eynsham will not resolve the A40 congestion problems.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Employees need to access transport, day and night and this is emphasised by those working at BMW Cowley who employ 4500 people, two-thirds of those work on shifts. Will the Bus Rapid Transit Route provide a service from Witney to that part of Oxford between the early hours of the day to midnight?</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>To be considered as part of coming Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project work.</p>
<p>HGV's using the B4477 through Minster Lovell is an increasing concern to the Parish Council as the road is not wide enough to allow to two large vehicles to pass without mounting the kerb. This is extremely hazardous to residents (including primary and secondary school children) using the footpath. It is hoped that by installing west-facing slip roads at the A40/Minster Lovell</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Environmental weight restrictions within the Freight Strategy.</p>

<p>junction, the problem will be alleviated and this policy (including CA1 and WIT1) is therefore supported. At point 16 (vol 4) reference is made to environmental weight restrictions being reviewed - Minster Lovell wish to be included in the focus as it does not have any restrictions in force.</p>		
<p>The A40/Downs Road junction is also supported by the Council (WIT1 policy). It is considered that a broader review of HGV transport routes into and out of the County is considered to ensure that the most effective routes are used (and enforced) when considering carbon footprints, local economies, environments and the impact on those communities.</p>	Noted	None
<p>As part of policy CA1, the upgrading of the B4477 road to an 'A' classification should ensure that a safe and viable cycle route is incorporated. National Cycle Network route 57 runs through Minster Lovell and local funds have been previously sourced to maintain this part of the route. More investment needs to be secured in order to maintain existing routes, to ensure they continue to be used as well as establishing new routes.</p>	Noted	Revised text to make it clear the B4477 includes cycle provision.
<p>Since the adoption of LTP3, a map showing the future cycle network in Witney - linking people with schools, shops, services and employment, indicating which future developments could fund which sections,</p>	Noted	Revised text to show commitment to developing the cycle network in Witney.

towards a joined up, comprehensive, safe network of routes - has not been created. Until OCC generate this map, the opportunities that arise as pockets of development occur in and around Witney will continue to be missed.		
We acknowledge the considerable effort OCC are putting into LTP4 and welcome it in the hope that within a year of its adoption a map of the future Witney cycle network is created to help developers and planners grasp any and all opportunities that will present themselves in the coming years.	Noted	None
In 2014 we asked our members, and the people in and around Witney who would like to cycle but don't, what they wanted from OCC. They said, 'We want space for cycling.'	Noted.	We have developed a Cycling Strategy for increasing cycling in Oxfordshire with input from consultees across the county
LTP4 demonstrates a very poor understanding of the reality of living in the rural districts of Oxfordshire. The public transport network between West Oxfordshire (Witney and its surroundings in particular) does not provide the transport solution that most people need. In the absence of a railway line between Witney and Oxford, residents in our locality have to travel by car to Long Hanborough or Charlbury rail stations. These stations provide a limited service, the parking is often full (despite both stations having had their parking provision recently extended),	Noted.	We note the possibility of improving access to local stations in our section on rail strategy in the policy document. This will be expanded upon in our updated rail strategy. Options for improved public transport between Witney and Oxford will be addressed in consultation later this year.

**ANNEX 2**

and the carriages are overcrowded during the rush hour.		
The bus service between Witney and Oxford is also itself significantly detrimentally impacted by the slow journey times on the A40 caused by its congestion. For the people living in the villages, like our residents, there are very limited bus services to anywhere. If our residents want to take advantage of the bus service between Witney and Oxford, they need to be able to park within Witney.	Noted suggestion of park and ride at Witney.	The Park & Ride proposed for Eynsham will offer parking for those in the area travelling to Oxford. The updated A40 Strategy elaborates on this.
The inadequacy of long-term parking in Witney is well known, and prevents workers from being able to choose to drive to Witney, leave their car for the day, and catch the bus into Oxford. Cycling or walking to work is not a realistic option for people living over 10 miles from Oxford.	Noted.	None.
The consultation document acknowledges that a significant majority of people living outside of Oxford have to travel to work. This is certainly the case in West Oxfordshire. This situation will only be exacerbated by the imbalance between housing and employment growth incorporated within the SHMA and the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan – the vast majority of occupants of the new housing which will be built in West Oxfordshire over the period of the Local Plan will not be working within 10 miles of	Noted.	None.

**ANNEX 2**

their homes, as there is not a matching expectation for significant employment growth within our area over the same time frame		
Section 78 of Volume 1 says that the County Council will be involved in strategic planning so that additional housing is located close to jobs where people can walk or cycle to work or where people can access high quality public transport to get to work. There is, however, no indication of how this will or could actually be achieved.	Noted	None
It is our opinion that the improvements featured in figure 20 on page 42 are insufficient and too vague to achieve any significant improvement over the life of the plan. The improvements referred to are either uncertain or are referred to as “longer term.” The residents of West Oxfordshire need to see major improvements to this essential road network in the near future. The delays caused by the congestion on the A40 act as a direct inhibitor to economic growth in Oxfordshire, and blight the lives of West Oxfordshire residents daily.	Noted.	We are revising the A40 section in the policy document
The new junctions and sliproads proposed for the A40 around Witney (the Shores Green and Downs Road junctions) will only mean that drivers will access the A40 more quickly, to join the long and slow traffic queues.	Noted.	None.
With the collapse of the plans to build the	Noted.	None

<p>Cogges Link Road, the LTP still contains no firm plans to build a second river crossing in Witney, merely stating that there will be a “feasibility and viability assessment” of the possible West End Link Road 2, which would seem to suggest that any hope of a second river crossing is still a long way off in the future.</p>		
<p>At the same time Policy WIT2 says that there will be an implementation of “schemes to deter through traffic from using Bridge Street and the Woodstock Road.” For residents of Witney south of the river, the only way to access north Witney is by using Bridge Street. The County Council cannot justify making it harder for commuters to get through Witney until the second bridge crossing is built.</p>	Noted	Consider revision of text to ensure context is clear.
<p>It is naïve to expect that making improvements to the public transport network and routes for walking and cycling will achieve what our residents in West Oxfordshire need.</p>	Noted.	None
<p>We are too far from the major employment areas in the county and beyond for people to walk or cycle, the buses only use the already over-congested roads, and there is not an effective rail network able to serve West Oxfordshire. The reality is that whilst we continue to build housing away from the employment areas, the employees the county’s businesses need will remain</p>	Noted.	None

dependent on the private motor car, and we will continue to look to the County Council to make concrete improvements to the road network to increase its capacity and improve journey times.		
The proposals in this section are generally inadequate to achieve the stated objectives. The failure to produce a strategy for the A40 to accompany this consultation is just one example. Figure 20 shows proposals for both ends of the Witney-Oxford section of the A40 but nothing in the Eynsham-Cassington area, while Figures 9 and 10 show this area with 95+% peak time capacity and it is admitted (at p41) 'it currently experiences severe congestion throughout the day'.	Noted these comments refer to LTP4 Volume 1 Overall Policy - Supporting Growth and Economic Vitality	We shall be consulting on future proposals for the A40 later this year.
Eynsham Parish Council supports Policy 03. The Eynsham to Botley B4044 Community Path should be included in LTP4 and funds provided for its completion.	We are not opposed to this in principle but we consider that this would be an expensive project to undertake and that there are likely to be other projects to carry out that would benefit cyclists more than this link is likely to.	We shall continue to hold this as a potential future project in the event of funding becoming available.
Policy 04 is supported to classify routes for direct through traffic along the A40 and local access routes. These must be combined with measures such as village centre weight limits to protect areas such as Eynsham from not only the environmental damage but the traffic congestion HGV lorries cause. There must also be adequate provision for enforcement of these limits.	Noted	We are considering options for a freight strategy for Oxfordshire taking into account the significant funding restrictions the County Council has.

**ANNEX 2**

Eynsham Parish Council supports Policy 06 and the initiative to increase the proportion of freight carried by rail.		
The concentration on developing the 'Knowledge Spine' consistently overlooks the opportunity to include Eynsham as a development and employment area, while, on the edge of the Science Vale-Oxford-Bicester corridor it is given the burden of an outer Park & Ride and Bus Rapid Transit route (Figure 22) to support the Science Transit Network.	Noted.	None.
To date, there has been inadequate co-ordination between OCC and the district councils of land use and transport infrastructure. The pressure to deliver more housing has been at the expense of employment and been hampered by inadequate development of the transport infrastructure. One example being the lack of an A40 strategy to deal with the WODC draft Local Plan development for Witney and Carterton.	Noted.	None.
Eynsham has chronic traffic problems on Witney Road in the vicinity of Bartholomew School and the pedestrian footway access to Eynsham Primary is inadequate, particularly with the increase in pedestrian traffic from the Swinford Green development which was allowed to proceed with inadequate infrastructure provision.	Noted.	None.
Eynsham Parish Council cannot support the	Noted.	We shall be consulting on A40

**ANNEX 2**

<p>proposed Oxford Bus Strategy and outer Park &amp; Rides, particularly the proposal for an Eynsham Park &amp; Ride. Without a positive and deliverable strategy for the A40, on which the Park &amp; Ride is entirely dependent, this will provide no gain in infrastructure efficiency. As proposed, the outer Park &amp; Rides will simply export the traffic problems, including the associated traffic, noise and light pollution out of the City, with little significant compensating benefit to the hosting communities.</p>		<p>strategies later this year.</p>
<p>Eynsham Parish Council supports Policy 18. The Oxford City Centre to Botley Cycle Super Route should be connected to the proposed B4044 Community Path to provide a dedicated cycle route from Oxford to Eynsham. A Cycle Super Route from the City Centre dead-ending in Botley makes little sense on its own. This is an opportunity to create an integrated cycle network beyond the City by joining this up with the Eynsham-Botley B4044 Community Path. This would not only create a joined up route from Eynsham to Oxford but, with improved cycle paths in Eynsham, would also connect with the Witney-Eynsham A40 cycle path and create an alternative route to the current Witney-Eynsham-Oxford route along the A40.</p>	<p>We are not opposed to this in principle but we consider that this would be an expensive project to undertake and that there are likely to be other projects to carry out that would benefit cyclists more than this link is likely to.</p>	<p>We shall continue to hold this as a potential future project in the event of funding becoming available.</p>
<p>Any strategic transport network for Witney and Carterton is entirely dependent on OCC</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>

**ANNEX 2**

developing a positive and deliverable strategy for the A40 between Carterton, Witney and Oxford.		
As major users of an outer Oxford Park & Ride on the A40 would be commuters from Witney and Carterton, any new Park & Ride on the A40 should be placed in the Shores Green area of Witney. This would reduce more car journeys than placing it half way along the A40 at Eynsham.	Noted.	We shall be consulting on A40 strategies later this year.
Eynsham Parish Council supports the cycling initiatives. By developing the Eynsham-Botley B4044 Community Path with the proposals included in Policy WIT5, an integrated cycle network could be created from Carterton to Oxford.	Noted.	None
Eynsham Parish Council supports any positive and deliverable improvements to traffic management on the A420. Overcrowding and delays during peak times and blockages in the A420/Botley interchange area can quickly have a knock-on effect to the B4044 reaching back to Farmoor and Eynsham, having a further impact on the B4449 and A40 at Eynsham Roundabout.	Noted.	None
Eynsham Parish Council is disappointed that while Eynsham seems to have a disproportionate burden of this Transit Strategy, it would receive few of the advantages.	Noted.	None
While admitting that the A40 at Eynsham	Noted.	We shall be consulting on A40

**ANNEX 2**

suffers high levels of congestion and delay (at 2.21) there is no positive or deliverable strategy to improve this area of the A40.		strategies later this year.
While Carterton/Witney are included in the Strategy as commuters for the Knowledge Spine, to be connected by the Bus Rapid Transit 3 system, it is proposed to site an outer Oxford Park & Ride at Eynsham, half way to Oxford and in one of the most congested A40 areas. While being overlooked as a destination employment site itself, Eynsham is expected to be burdened with the increase in car and bus traffic using the Park & Ride, as well as suffering the inevitable increased air, noise and light pollution that this proposed 1000 car interchange would generate.	Noted	We shall be consulting on A40 strategies later this year.
LTP4 should focus on creating integrated countywide cycle networks rather than concentrating on area strategies. In Oxford, a Super Cycle Route is proposed from the City Centre network to dead end in Botley. It should be connected to the Eynsham-Botley B4044 Community Path, with improved cycle routes through Eynsham to the A40, combined with the Carterton and Witney area strategies for a cycle path between the two. This would create a dedicated, safe, longer distance cycle route stretching from Carterton to most areas of Oxford.	Noted.	None
Eynsham Parish Council supports the proposed Route Based Strategies for the	Noted.	None.

**ANNEX 2**

<p>A34, A40 and A420. However, traffic management measures should also take into consideration safeguarding the communities adjacent to the Routes. This should extend beyond imposing weight restrictions and expecting these to be self-policing. As an example, the A40 in the Eynsham-Cassington area suffers frequent accidents and blockages because of traffic overcapacity. When this occurs, Thames Valley Police divert the HGV traffic through the centre of Eynsham without warning, causing gridlock in the whole village.</p>		
<p>The Parish Council supports measures to increase the use of rail freight where possible.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Support for public transport in rural areas should be a priority. Funding for subsidised routes which can integrate with other public transport should be maintained rather relying on volunteer and community transport schemes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Eynsham Parish Council does not support the proposals for outer Park &amp; Rides. The impacts on the hosting sites have not been taken into consideration. This would result in exporting traffic problems to outlying communities without providing them with adequate justifying benefits. The siting of the proposed Eynsham Park &amp; Ride on one of the most congested stretches of the A40 would mean</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We shall be consulting on A40 strategies later this year.</p>

<p>commuters from Carterton and Witney would have to cover half their journey to Oxford by car to benefit. Meanwhile, Eynsham would suffer the increased car and bus traffic and suffer from the air, noise and light pollution that a 1000 car full-service interchange would generate.</p>		
<p>Overall, this is a disappointing collection of documents. The proposals are generally inadequate to achieve the stated objectives. LTP4 seems long on platitudes and short on detail. Vital strategies, which would impact on the whole Plan, such as an A40 strategy, are missing.</p> <p>OCC policy is heavily dependent on things not in its control, such as direct Government or Highways Agency funding, rail authorities and private bus operators.</p> <p>There is little that is proactive. It depends on the co-operation of other authorities, companies or agencies with their own regulations and agendas or simply reacting as consultees to planning applications, infrastructure proposals or neighbourhood plans.</p>	Noted.	None

### A420 strategy comments

Issue Raised	County Council Position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
Difficult to access A420 from south of it at both the Little Coxwell and Longcot (Kings Lane) junctions. (2)	<u>Proposal 2</u> - Maintain suitable access from settlements along the A420	These junctions will be investigated
The Little Coxwell turn / Fernham Road needs to be a roundabout or have protected right turn (2)	<u>Proposal 2</u> - Maintain suitable access from settlements along the A420	This junction will be investigated
Major upgrade needed, not just piecemeal (6)	A major upgrade of the A420 corridor is not proposed for the current LTP period. Any significant scheme (such as further dualling of all or part of the route) would attract more traffic and be likely to encourage further sites on this corridor to be identified for development.	None
NMU crossing at Little Coxwell	Keen to improve NMU crossings	Investigate opportunities for provision
Need a roundabout at Faringdon / Great Coxwell (2)	<u>Proposal 2</u> - Maintain suitable access from settlements along the A420	This junction will be investigated
A415 roundabout requires improvement (2)	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road	This junction will be investigated
dog leg junction at the a420 hinton/longworth/southmoor exit is dangerous and needs improving – roundabout will slow people (Pinewoods road / Charney Road) (5)	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road	This junction will be investigated
A420/Park Road junction evaluation should include an option for a segregated layout.	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road	This junction will be investigated
If the A420 remains mainly single carriageway then the speed limit should be 50mph for the whole length, except for the dual carriageway	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road	Investigate speed limit changes

## ANNEX 2

sections.		
Turning right a challenge (3)	<u>Proposal 2</u> - Maintain suitable access from settlements along the A420	Investigate junction improvements
Dual the route	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road	Investigate carriageway dualling
Monitor traffic levels along a420	Agreed – various sources of data available	Monitor traffic
Monitor traffic levels using Fernham Road junction during peak periods, once the new quarry is in operation.	Important to understand implications of new developments	Investigate traffic monitoring options for this junction
Make improvements to how people can travel to bus stops	Agreed	Investigate improvement opportunities
Cycle parking at bus stops (2)	Agreed that this would be beneficial in some locations	Investigate cycle parking provision opportunities
A420/Townsend Road at Shrivenham has to be a roundabout to cause gaps in the traffic long enough for those entering at other junctions to join.	Further discussions have taken place with strategic site developers since LTP4 was published: current thinking is to create an access nearer the site, further north of Townsend Road	Continue discussions with developer
Include pedestrian bridges/crossings for safety (6)	Agreed	Investigate areas with highest need and where funding will allow
The B4508/A420 roundabout needs a major overhaul as incomplete slip road is misjudged as a continuation of A420 resulting in near misses and shunts daily.	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road	Investigate safety improvements of this junction which may include improved signage of slip road 'give way'
Enforce 50mph speed limits better	Agreed	Investigate speeding issues and discuss with Police
Bypass around residential areas	A major upgrade of the A420 corridor is not proposed for the current LTP period	Investigate options to improve capacity without increasing rat running

**ANNEX 2**

Roundabout should be built North of the Shrivenham site, close to the bridge on the Highworth Road. The junction at Townsend Road should remain the same as gaps in the traffic would be provided (5)	The County's preference is to locate a new junction in the vicinity of Highworth Road.	Continue discussions with developer
Larger villages need a cycle link to their neighbours. Namely :- 1. Fyfield - Kingston Bagpuize (current "crossing" of A420 currently totally inadequate with risk of cars running on hatched centre of road, needs traffic island). 2. Littleworth - Faringdon, Better signing of existing bridleway under pass between Tubney - Fyfield. 3. Cycle track link between Shrivenham and Swindon.	<u>Proposal 2</u> - Maintain suitable access from settlements along the A420	Investigate cycle route opportunities
Cycle crossing at Buckland cross roads - really needs a traffic island to make crossing of A 420 safer/easier.	There is currently a central refuge at this junction	Investigate opportunities to improve NMU provisions here
The 420 should not be widened, straightened or duelled any more. Wide = fast. Fast = dangerous. More roundabouts, traffic calming, obstructions, speed limits, cameras please.	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road.  Any changes to the A420 should not increase the likelihood of drivers rat running	Find a balance between vehicle volumes and safety
Maintain ability to ride horses	The effect of highway changes on horses will be considered.	
Support for measures on B4508, B4000, B4507	Agreed	
Acorn Bridge floods – improve	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road	Investigate opportunities to reduce flooding
Faringdon is a hub and should have its own plan	Area strategies are not possible in all	Noted

**ANNEX 2**

	locations. Neighbourhood Plans work with the mode strategies and policy document.	
As well as junction improvements already referred to in the A420 strategy, we see that short sections of realignment, widening and even dualling may be appropriate, not least to improve safety; and that this can be expected to assist significant improvements in bus journey times and reliability.	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road	Investigate suggestions to realign, widen or dual the route considering funding opportunities
Ensure new developments are able to access bus routes on A420	<u>Proposal 2</u> - Maintain suitable access from settlements along the A420	Investigate the provisions of NMU facilities to bus stops on the A420
Bike racks on buses?	Keen to increase sustainable transport usage	Investigate if there would be sufficient demand
Buses are severely delayed by congestion	Noted	Implement A420 strategy
Build a right turn lane and / or vehicle activated sign at Barcote Park Access	These improvements could help improve safety at this site, unfortunately there are currently no funds available to make safety improvements here	As developments are brought forward in the surrounding area safety improvements may be able to be made using funding from developer contributions
Reopen Grove and Shrivenham rail stations	Further work would have to be undertaken to assess whether the impact of opening these stations would help reduce vehicle flows, considering neither are in town centres so would likely attract people to drive to them. Also, buy-in from the rail industry would be required.	Noted
No bus laybys – buses are held up	<u>Proposal 1</u> - Ensure the A420 continues to perform a strategic function operating as a principal road	Investigate the provision of bus cages, half lay-bys and full lay-bys along the route
Restrict lorries unless local deliveries (4)	We have developed a freight strategy	Noted

**ANNEX 2**

P&R facilities should be sited further out in the county towns at the start points of journeys and not, as proposed, at interception points immediately outside the city	Undertaking a P&R study	Noted
Support for park and ride	Noted	None
Cumnor P&R should be placed near A338 to service A420, A338, A415	Undertaking a P&R study	Noted
No Cumnor park & ride as encourage rat running through village and in Green Belt (4)	P&R study	Noted
Plan must incorporate provision for maintenance of the road surface including white-lining and of lighting and signage	Noted	None
Bus service on A420 does not serve Longcot, there are no footpaths	Longcot does not create enough demand to support a bus service	A420 strategy

### Freight strategy comments

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
Environmental weight limits sought in towns/villages not mentioned in LTP4	Although a few towns are named this does not preclude other towns and villages from consideration for weight limits, subject to resources	None
HGV routing agreement sought for NW Bicester to protect Middleton Stoney	Not an LTP matter	Referred to OCC Development Control
OCC should work with RHA and FTA to promote use of lorry specific satnav	Our participation in Freight Gateway will support RHA/FTA work to promote use of National Freight Journey Planner and lorry specific satnav	None
Need weight limit signs on M40 for side roads	Not an OCC responsibility	OCC to liaise with Highways Agency
Need ANPR enforcement of weight limits	OCC Trading Standards will determine appropriate technology to use, and Freight gateway's lorry watch facility will help identify potential offenders	None
Need HGV O&D survey on A361	Strategy includes plans for surveys	None
Oxford University keen partner on delivery and servicing plans, freight consolidation and low emission deliveries	OCC is keen to work in partnership with Oxford University and others	
Should be peak restrictions on freight movements in Oxford	Not currently planned, although loading and unloading is restricted in the city centre, but this could be considered in any future freight study work as part of the Oxford Transport Strategy	None

**ANNEX 2**

City Council wants focus on freight and delivery vehicles to cut emissions	This could be considered in any future freight study work as part of the Oxford Transport Strategy	None
Lodge Hill unsuitable for freight facility, no analysis of this v. other locations	This is mentioned as a potential location but if this project were to go ahead a scoping study looking at various sites would be appropriate	None
Reduce size of Watlington weight restriction zone	Strategy mentions review of weight limits which would include this	None
Cuxham doesn't want Watlington HGVs diverted via Cuxham	Strategy mentions review of weight limits which would include this	None
South and Vale want more detail on spatial impacts of goods vehicles	Strategy includes plans for surveys	None
Chipping Norton needs A44 de-priming and HGV diversion route	Strategy revised to include this	None
West Oxon wants limited road building as an option in Chipping Norton to reduce impact of lorries	It is difficult to see how short new road links could effectively relieve the town centre, as opposed to a full bypass which could but would be prohibitively expensive	None
West Oxon wants additional capacity on A40 to support its role as preferred lorry route	Work on an A40 strategy will take account of this routes significant role in lorry movements	None
Woodstock wants rail freight to reduce lorries on A44	The Cotswold Line is unlikely to have either the demand or capacity for rail freight compared with the Oxford-Banbury and Oxford-Bicester routes	None
OCC shouldn't have weakened commitment to minimise gravel miles in Minerals and Waste Plan	Not an LTP matter	Referred to OCC Minerals and Waste

## Cycling strategy comments

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
The document should mention the cost to England from the lack of physical exercise - estimated to be £11 billion – and reference the economic benefits of active travel.	We do mention the benefits to health in the cycling strategy, cross-referencing the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy. However, the cycling strategy is intended to focus on how we can increase the level of cycling in the county, not to review arguments in favour of cycling.	Ensure that the health benefits of cycling are made clearer in the policy document as a reason to promote cycling, cross-referencing the cycling strategy.
OCC needs to increase its investment in cycling substantially if it is to meet its aim of trebling the level of cycling to work by 2031	It is important to recognise that local authority budgets have been and are likely to continue to be cut and there are not unused sums of money that can be allocated. However, where there is a clear justification and outcome, we will commit to applying for grant and other funding opportunities announced for cycling and related schemes.	Work with OCN and other partners in developing proposals and applying for grants and other sources of funding for cycling improvements.
OCC should not just seek to ensure that new developments encourage cycling and walking, it should insist on it	The cycling strategy refers to the OCC motion passed in September 2013 that included requiring cycling-friendly measures to be incorporated into all new road schemes and housing developments.	Emphasise the motion and that we require new developments to encourage cycling.
Cycling's value in promoting social inclusion should be included in the policy document: it is a low cost form of transport which helps people on low incomes to travel and different designs of cycle make cycling possible for many	We do not refer to this currently.	Cover this point in the Increasing Cycling section of the policy document, mentioning the low cost of cycling and inclusion schemes such as Wheels for All

mobility-impaired people.		
Develop Area Strategies for the whole county, based on a north-west, south-west etc format. Do not develop route strategies as these are too motor-vehicle centric.	We are prioritising area strategies in locations that will provide the most housing and employment growth in line with the Strategic Economic Plan. The County Council's position towards development in locations without an area strategy should be based on the Policy document and mode strategies and future route strategies.	Ensure that route strategies do not focus on motor vehicles but on improving all journeys made in the vicinity of the route under review.
Park & Cycle should be incorporated into Park & Ride locations. Park & Ride locations earmarked for closure should become Park & Cycle locations.	We have commissioned a study into Park & Ride for Oxford and the role of cycling will be included in this.	Include cycling in the forthcoming P&R study.
Ensure that mass transit/Bus Rapid Transit does not impact negatively on cycling and works in conjunction with it	We aim for BRT and cycling to be complementary as possible	Ensure that cycling integration is in the BRT development brief
OCC should appoint a Cycling Champion on the Council and appoint a dedicated cycling development team. There should be a Cycling/Active Travel Delivery Board at senior level to oversee the delivery of cycling outcomes and to promote soft measures.	We have a number of skilled and experienced people working on cycling within the Council. We currently have a high-level political champion in Cllr David Nimmo-Smith, the Cabinet Member for Transport, who is an enthusiastic cyclist and has supported many successful schemes, including the Oxonbike cycle hire project which is currently expanding.	OCC will work together with the Oxfordshire Cycling Network to develop and oversee new, innovative and cost-effective ways of improving cycling provision, based on relevant international best practice.
OCC should build a cycle path from the B4044 toll bridge to Botley	We are not opposed to this in principle but we consider that this would be an expensive project to undertake and that there are likely to be other projects to carry out that would benefit cyclists more than this link is likely to.	Continue to hold this as a potential future project in the event of funding becoming available.

## ANNEX 2

<p>Prepare clear numeric annual targets for increasing cycling rates across the County in the next 5, 10 and 15 years</p>	<p>We have set an ambitious target to treble the level of cycling to work in Oxfordshire by the end of the LTP4. We shall monitor our progress by means of the Census results.</p>	<p>Invite the Oxfordshire Cycling Network to develop an interim means of monitoring cycling to work using new data collection methods, in line with the principles of Science Transit.</p>
<p>Develop a network of bike-rail and bike-bus interchange points, with secure cycle storage and easy connection to key public transport routes.</p>	<p>We will work with transport operators and infrastructure owners to implement a network of quality bike-rail and bike-bus interchanges.</p>	<p>Highlight this objective in our cycle, bus and rail strategies.</p>

## Bus strategy comments

Issue raised	County Council's position	Proposed action / change in LTP4
Lack of clarity over the future of rural bus services and concern there are no plans for improving subsidised services into rural areas.	<p>Work is underway to analyse the levels of need catered for by existing subsidised bus services. The needs analysis will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does the route serve unmet needs?</li> <li>- Does the route provide value for money?</li> <li>- Who does the route cater for (e.g. the vulnerable, peak travel)?</li> <li>- Does the route fulfil other statutory needs, e.g. home to school transport?</li> </ul>	Once the analysis work is complete, proposed changes to the subsidised bus network would be issued for public consultation. This consultation would seek to determine the public's view on how the council should prioritise these services and its opinion on proposed changes to bus services.
Operators are unclear about how to introduce zero-emissions fuels into their fleets. Other respondents have suggested use of other fuels in buses in Oxfordshire, such as biomethane.	Oxford city is proposed to be a zero-emission zone. Bus operators will be able to develop and select the technology they use in meeting this target in the city.	We shall work with bus operators and vehicle manufacturers in developing and trialling new vehicle technology as part of Science Transit, for example 'virtual electric' systems, which would allow vehicles to operate under different technology in and out of the city
Concern that the bus strategy neither provides a delivery plan for the improvements it proposes, nor mentions which agency would deliver it. Bus operators seek clearer phasing of bus strategy and mode shift targets.	The bus strategy will broadly be implemented alongside other area or route schemes, via developments or with operators. LTP4 does not use hard targets in terms of mode shift.	We shall make this clearer in our policy document and bus strategy.

ANNEX 2

<p>Public support for integrated ticketing for multimodal journeys. Bus operators are introducing contactless debit-card payment technology and mobile-phone m-ticketing, which they expect to have lower back-office costs than smartcards.</p>	<p>We want to develop an advanced, integrated ticketless travel and cashless payment for the county. This development of this advanced system is in our Science Transit strategy.</p>	<p>We shall make the link to Science Transit clearer in our bus strategy and better highlight how the development of such an advanced system in Oxfordshire can benefit present and future operators.</p>
<p>Bus operators wish to retain existing level of access to Oxford city centre and re-open Cornmarket.</p>	<p>Accessibility to Oxford city centre for buses and bus passengers remains a high priority, although we have no plans to re-open Cornmarket.</p>	<p>We shall consider the requirements of bus operators and passengers when plans for the city centre get to a development stage.</p>
<p>Concern over the suitability of articulated buses in Oxford city centre with the introduction of BRT</p>	<p>The BRT network will require operation by multi-door vehicles with easy access and exit to minimise the time spent at stops. BRT services can be operated by double-deck or articulated buses</p>	<p>We shall describe BRT buses in terms of the operation specification/design outcome, rather than illustrating a specific design..</p>
<p>Blewbury requests that improved bus services between Didcot and Harwell loop around villages to maintain the village public transport links.</p>	<p>We aim to maintain a good level of public transport across the county. We need to balance providing a service to villages with providing fast connections from Harwell to the town and railway at Didcot.</p>	<p>We shall work with the bus operators and other partners to provide links to the villages while ensuring that the bus connections between Didcot and Harwell are sufficiently fast and direct to attract people away from car transport.</p>
<p>Increase the level of east-west bus services in Science Vale.</p>	<p>We aim to improve the level of bus links around the county subject to the existence of demand and commercial viability. Plans exist for improved links in Science Vale, but implementation is linked to delivery of housing developments and receipt of section 106 funding in the Wantage/Grove area.</p>	<p>We shall make this clearer in our area strategy and bus strategy.</p>
<p>Banbury is a larger town with many self-contained journey destinations. It will see significant growth, which offers the</p>	<p>We are working with bus operators and Cherwell DC to develop the bus network in Banbury. A detailed strategy is being</p>	<p>We shall make this clearer in our area strategy and bus strategy.</p>

potential to create a critical mass of new demand on bus corridors that today are very ill-developed in terms of journey time and frequency.	worked up for the area, linked to new housing and commercial developments, which will result in new bus routes and more frequent routes.	
Bus services do not suit the needs of people working irregular shifts and the strategy does not address this.	Our transport policy and strategy aims to increase the level of usage of public transport and in doing so, make operating off-peak services more viable. Where new and enhanced services are funded from developments, then increased frequencies can be specified across the day, with the aim of establishing a market for off-peak services, including from people newly arriving in the area. However, the provision of additional capacity at peak times is fundamental, in providing a credible alternative to the car, and thus tackling road congestion.	Increasing the viability of services off-peak will result in more services running, so encouraging people working on irregular shifts to travel by bus.
Bus operators should contribute more to the development of highway design guidance.	Ensuring that larger developments have suitable spine roads for bus operation is understood, and discussions are held with operators as proposals come forward.	Noted.
Bus services should be at the centre of land use development planning guidance and practice. Operators urge that we strengthen our support for this, by articulating the requirements and principles needed to maximise the delivery of high quality bus services to	We agree that sustainable transport – including bus services - needs to be core of the design of new developments in the county, alongside Section 106 pump-priming for services. We shall continue to represent this to our partners in the district councils, who are the local	We shall make this clearer in our policy document and area strategy.

**ANNEX 2**

<p>and through new developments much more explicitly.</p>	<p>planning authorities. It is necessary to articulate these principles to developers at a very early stage.</p>	
<p>Bus operators wish to adopt an improved Quality Bus Partnership to facilitate the implementation of the LTP.</p>	<p>We are working well with bus operators and are pleased with the progress in attracting customers. We would like this to continue and grow countywide.</p>	<p>Our strategy will include building on our existing partnering arrangements to improve bus services and integrated ticketing across the county, including partnerships with new market entrants where appropriate.</p>