

**EYNESHAM PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE –  
Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031  
Consultation**



**Feedback form**

**1a Volume 1 (Overall Policy) - Supporting Growth and Economic Vitality**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? - Mostly disagree

**1b Volume 1 Overall Policy - Supporting Growth and Economic Vitality**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

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'.

Eynsham Parish Council supports Policy 03. The Eynsham to Botley B4044 Community Path should be included in LTP4 and funds provided for its completion.

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.

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.

Eynsham Parish Council supports Policy 16. Notwithstanding the published Highways Asset Management Plan, OCC have chronically failed to maintain both the road and footway infrastructure. Particularly in areas of high use, such as the centre of Eynsham, the system appears to degrade to costly and inefficient 'worst first' pothole by pothole remedial work.

**2a Volume 1 (Overall Policy) - Cutting Carbon**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? - Mostly agree

**2b Volume 1 (Overall Policy) - Cutting Carbon**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

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.

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.

Policy 21 is supported to target safety improvements on walking and cycling routes to school. 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.

**3a Volume 1 (Overall Policy) - Improving Quality of Life**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? - Mostly agree

**3b Volume 1 (Overall Policy) - Improving Quality of Life**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

Eynsham Parish Council supports Policy 25 and the proposal to better manage flood risk (para 159). The failure of OCC to adequately maintain the ditches and drainage within its control over many years has caused considerable property and economic damage to rural areas such as Eynsham.

Policy 27 is supported but the Parish Council is disappointed at the failure to produce a rights of way strategy prior to submitting LTP4 for consultation.

Eynsham Parish Council supports Policy 32 and a reduction of the speed limit to 20mph (para 189) in villages such as Eynsham.

**4a Volume 2 section i (Oxford Transport Strategy) - Mass Transit**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? - Mostly agree

**4b Volume 2 section i (Oxford Transport Strategy) - Mass Transit**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

Eynsham Parish Council cannot support the proposed Oxford Bus Strategy and outer Park & Rides, particularly the proposal for an Eynsham Park & Ride. Without a positive and deliverable strategy for the A40, on which the Park & Ride is entirely dependent, this will provide no gain in infrastructure efficiency. As proposed, the outer Park & 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.

**5a Volume 2 section I (Oxford Transport Strategy) – Walking and Cycling**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? – Mostly agree

**5b Volume 2 section i (Oxford Transport Strategy) – Walking and Cycling**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

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.

**6a Volume 2 section i (Oxford Transport Strategy) – Managing Traffic and Travel Demand**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? – Mostly disagree

**6b Volume 2 section i (Oxford Transport Strategy) – Managing Traffic and Travel Demand**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain way.

Past Oxford transport strategies have had a negative impact on the City. They have raised barriers to those who wish to live, work, create businesses or shop in the centre of Oxford. They have resulted in Oxford having some of the worst air pollution in the country. They have also had a serious impact on the survival of independent local retailers, destroying much off Oxford's unique character. Any transport strategy should be better integrated with the major City Centre landlords, Oxford City, the University and the colleges to promote local commercial and retail development.

**Volume 2 section ii** – Eynsham Parish Council has no specific comments on the Science Vale, Bicester or Banbury Area Strategies.

**10a Volume 2 section ii (Area/Route Transport Strategies) – Witney**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? – Mostly agree

**10b Volume 2 section ii (Area/Route Transport Strategies) – Witney**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

Policy WIT6:

Any strategic transport network for Witney is entirely dependent on OCC developing a positive and deliverable strategy for the A40 between Witney and Oxford.

As major users of an outer Oxford Park & Ride on the A40 would be commuters from Witney, 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.

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.

**11a Volume 2 section ii (Area/Route Transport Strategies – Carterton**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? – Mostly agree

**11b Volume 2 section ii (Area/Route Transport Strategies – Carterton**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

The improvements to cycle routes in Policy CA3 and a link with Witney could be improved by providing a further link along the A40 with the Eynsham-Botley B4044 Community Path linking with the Botley-City Centre Super Cycle Route.

As for Policy CA5, any strategic transport network for Carterton is entirely dependent on OCC developing a positive and deliverable strategy for the A40 between Carterton and Oxford.

As 75% of commutes from Carterton to Oxford are made by car (para 3), any outer Park & Ride on the A40 should be placed in the Shores Green area of Witney. This would benefit both Carterton and Witney and reduce more car journeys than placing it half way along the A40 at Eynsham.

**12a Volume 2 section ii (Area/Route Transport Strategies – A420**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? – Mostly agree

**12b Volume 2 section 22 (Area/Route Transport Strategies) – A420**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

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.

**13a Volume 3 (Science Transit Strategy) – Our approach to delivering Science Transit**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? – Mostly agree

**13b Volume 3 (Science Transit Strategy) – Our approach to delivering Science Transit**

What would you add or change? If possible, explain why.

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. While well placed to benefit from the evolving Knowledge Spine, it has been consistently overlooked as a development and employment area for inclusion in the Knowledge Spine.

While admitting that the A40 at Eynsham suffers high levels of congestion and delay (at 2.21) there is no positive or deliverable strategy to improve this area of the A40.

While Carterton/Witney are included in the Strategy as commutervilles 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. It would make more sense to reduce these Carterton/Witney-Eynsham car journeys and place the Park & Ride in the area of Shores Green which is more convenient to both Witney and Carterton.

**14a Volume 4 (Mode Strategies) – Cycling**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? – Mostly agree

**14b Volume 4 (Mode Strategies) – Cycling**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

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.

**Volume 4 15a and 15b** – Eynsham Parish Council have no comments on the Science Vale Cycling Strategy.

**16a Volume 4 (Mode Strategies) – Freight**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? – Mostly agree

**16b Volume 4 (Mode Strategies) – Freight**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

Eynsham Parish Council supports the proposed Route Based Strategies for the 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.

The Parish Council supports measures to increase the use of rail freight where possible.

**17a Volume 4 (Mode Strategies) – Bus**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this section? – Mostly agree

**17b Volume (Mode Strategies) – Bus**

What would you add or change? If possible, please explain why.

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.

Eynsham Parish Council does not support the proposals for outer Park & Rides. The impact 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 & Ride on one of the most congested stretches of the A40 would mean 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.

This is expressly in aid of ‘reducing traffic growth and congestion in the Knowledge Spine area’ (para 80) while excluding Eynsham as a Knowledge Spine development and employment area

Saying (at para 93) that 'Oxfordshire's Real Time Information service is amongst the best-performing systems in the UK' is simply not true. The system, since its inception, has been plagued with problems and is very unreliable. The various attempts by OCC, through various contractors, to make it work are still unsuccessful. The lack of funds to roll out this system or provide consistent maintenance has only exacerbated this problem. A reliable RTI system would be a valuable asset for those in village communities reliant on public transport as (para 128) 'there is traffic congestion on several of the main radial roads approaching Oxford City, the A34 and A40' and 'buses have tended to become worse in many places leading to deterioration in bus journey time reliability'.

**18 Volume 5** – Eynsham Parish Council has no specific comments on the Strategic Environmental Assessment.

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

**19 Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031?**

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.

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.

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.