



EYNESHAM PARISH COUNCIL

CLERK: KATHERINE DOUGHTY,
91 BRIZE NORTON ROAD, MINSTER LOVELL, WITNEY, OXON. OX29 0SG

Telephone: 07956 901622 Email: epc.clerk@eynsham-pc.gov.uk Web: www.eynsham-pc.gov.uk

The Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP
Secretary of State
Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government
House of Commons
LONDON
SW1A 0AA

Sent by email - robert.jenrick.mp@parliament.uk

1 March 2021

Dear Rt Hon Jenrick

Direction Request - To consider planning application under s.77 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

Applicant	Oxfordshire County Council (OCC)
Application No.	R3.0057/19
Proposal	Construction of a park & ride (P&R) car park providing 850 car parking spaces, cycle spaces, motorcycle spaces, electric vehicle charging points, bus shelters, landscaping, external lighting, public open space, toilets, seating, fencing, habitat creation, drainage features, new access from Cuckoo Lane, new roundabout with access onto A40, an eastbound bus lane approximately 6.5km in length from the park & ride site to the A40 bridge over the Dukes Cut canal, two sections of westbound bus lane (each approximately 500m in length), new shared use footway/cycleway, widening of Cassington New Bridge, junction improvements, new crossings, new footbridge alongside Cassington Halt Bridge, and associated works.
Location	Land West of Cuckoo lane and adjacent to the A40, Eynsham, West Oxfordshire, OX29 4PU
Determining Authority	Oxfordshire County Council (OCC)

Eynsham Parish Council (EPC) formally request that you determine the above planning application.

The Council consider this project a short term operational sticking plaster that does not fix the strategic problem of the A40 traffic flow (or lack of flow) at this pinch point on the network.

The genesis of this project was the potential availability of Central Government funds to improve public transport provision, however the scheme has been designed purely to make use of such funding rather than investigate the best transport solution for the A40 from first principles.

OCC realised that by utilising some land within their ownership, this money from Government/Growth Board could be acquired. To date OCC have spent more than £3 million of Local Council Tax generated money on a 'punt' with no guarantees of success.

Whilst the Council agree with the petition raised by Robert Courts MP (Hansard report <https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2018-01-22/debates/18012211000042/CongestionOnTheA40BetweenWitneyAndOxford> refers), the proposals contained in this planning application will not resolve the congestion problems.

It is in our view and that of many others, a short term, poorly designed project that appears to ignore all of the surrounding impacts and challenges facing West Oxfordshire and the operation of the A40, going both East to Oxford, the M40 and beyond and West to the M5. The project does not demonstrate joined-up thinking in terms of local and regional transport policy.

OCC's Biodiversity Assessment shows it is unable to achieve its aim of a 5% net gain in biodiversity (currently stated at -7.69 habitat units and -7.95 hedgerow units) when both Government and OCC have declared a climate emergency should be enough to call this project into question. To pay Trust for Oxfordshire's Environment to offset this loss anywhere other than Cassington and Eynsham is unacceptable.

The permanent loss of 2.07ha semi-improved grassland, 0.58ha broadleaved plantation, 0.61ha dense scrub, up to 114 mature and semi-mature trees, 1.9km species-poor hedgerow and 320m linear length trees is catastrophic. The vegetation loss associated with this development will have a significant adverse effect in landscape character and views at a local level in the short and medium-term. The P&R proposal will further negatively impact air quality being located close to the A40 that is often close to being illegal in terms of exceeding existing air quality regulation standards.

We believe that the current determination process provides opportunities for OCC to operate with a potential bias and incompetency as is highlighted by the number of concerns from within OCC itself. Additionally, over £35 million of taxpayers' money would be spent on 850 car parking spaces for a road carrying 32,000 cars a day is NOT a good use of Government funds. In short, OCC application R3.0057/19 for a P&R and other roadworks is not fit for purpose.

We are requesting that, the Secretary of State 'call in' this application for determination. We believe that close inspection of the many, highly detailed and highly technical comments by consultees and others will be convincing evidence that a refusal is the correct and only conclusion.

Why this project will not improve the A40

This is not a parochial issue. The A40 is a road of huge strategic and tactical significance. It carries traffic that is traversing the country from Herefordshire, Gloucestershire, Wales and beyond in addition to traffic generated within Oxfordshire.

The vast majority of this traffic is NOT heading for Oxford City. They are heading to the A34 North at Oxford and access the M40. They are looping around Oxford on the A40 to get to the Oxford Hospitals (Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust has 11,000 employees), Oxford University Press (6000 employees) and the BMW MINI Plant (4500 employees). Other traffic is heading for the A34 South to head to the M4, Swindon, Reading, Southampton area.

Employees using the A40 into Oxford City include Oxfordshire County Council, Newsquest Oxford, Oxford University; all with employees/contractors in their thousands. In short 850 parking spaces and a bus lane (part) will not have a significant effect on the A40 which already operates over its design capacity.

The reason the Eynsham area is the pinch point and location of the major problem of congestion is clear. Travelling East from Cheltenham to Eynsham there are NO traffic lights. Traffic is joining the A40 constantly as the morning traffic heads East, from Cheltenham, Gloucester, Burford, Carterton and Witney.

This traffic slows and queues form when the dual carriageway merges into single carriageway at Barnard Gate; traffic trickles to the traffic lights and roundabout at Eynsham then completely backs up at the Cassington traffic lights. In addition, HGVs slow on the rise towards the traffic lights at Eynsham. The result is daily queues and congestion from Barnard Gate to Wolvercote on the western edge of Oxford where a major roundabout with traffic lights presents yet another obstacle.

To this mix the P&R project intends to add one, possibly two more roundabouts and three additional sets of traffic lights between West Eynsham and the Wolvercote roundabout. Some 32,000 cars pass Barnard Gate, West of Eynsham daily. The West Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan calls for 15,500 new homes by 2031 (3200 of them in Eynsham), around 10,000 of those will directly access the A40.

At this point, it is impossible to support a project that, at best, will remove 850 cars from this mix, save those drivers 9 minutes to Oxford City Centre (OCC data) and yet cost around £37 million in total.

To summarise, the application does not support social, economic or environmental objectives that constitute sustainable development. It is therefore contrary the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and policies of West Oxfordshire District Council 2031 and Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan.

We look forward to receiving confirmation that your department will be determining this planning application. Supporting documents are contained in the attached appendices.

Yours sincerely



Mrs Katherine Doughty
Clerk to the Council

Copies to:-

- 1) Rt Hon Grant Shapps MP, Secretary of State for Transport - shappsg@parliament.uk
- 2) Robert Courts MP, Witney & West Oxfordshire - robert@robertcourts.co.uk

Responses from Organisations and agencies (from initial consultation)

A number of objections and comments were received by OCC during the public consultation phase of the Application. The following are short quotes from what are, in many cases, extremely long and detailed technical objections. The full text of the submissions can be seen here:

<https://tinyurl.com/OCCPark-Rideapplicationrespons>

Environment Agency

Objection

“We have reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment (AECOM, Rev:00, May 2019) submitted in support of the proposed development and in the absence of an acceptable FRA we object to the application and recommend refusal of planning permission on this basis.”

“The bus lane scheme will therefore cause a loss of floodplain storage due to the widening of the existing carriageway into the floodplain.”

CPRE Oxfordshire Response

Objection

“We remain unconvinced about the logic of a Park & Ride at this location. If a Park & Ride is required, we would suggest that Witney might be a more appropriate location, intercepting traffic at an earlier point. “

“Unfortunately, growth from the new Eynsham suburb is not provided for. Firstly, it must be assumed that the desired destinations of the new residents will mirror that of existing users in the corridor, almost half of whom do NOT enter Oxford city “

Natural England

Advise

“Whilst the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites, it is apparent that there may be impacts on Local Wildlife Sites, and that overall the scheme currently results in a net loss in biodiversity. “

“We note that the submitted scheme delivers a net loss in biodiversity (-12.33 units using the TVERC calculator). Much of this is loss of hedgerows, grassland and verge habitats...”

Berkshire Bedfordshire Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust

Objection

“BBOWT objects to this application in its current form on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development raises serious concerns about:

- a) potential negative impact on Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits LWS, and on priority species of birds, contrary to the NPPF and West Oxfordshire Local Plan;
- b) potential negative impact on Cassington to Yarnton Pits East Extension LWS, contrary to the NPPF and West Oxfordshire Local Plan;
- c) potential negative impact on Oxford Meadows SAC, contrary to the NPPF and West Oxfordshire Local Plan;
- d) potential negative impact on wild bird habitat, contrary to the requirements of paragraph 9A of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 as amended in the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) 2012 Regulations), contrary to the NPPF and West Oxfordshire Local Plan;
- e) potential negative impact on priority habitats, contrary to the NPPF and West Oxfordshire Local Plan;

f) potential negative impact on ecological networks, the Oxford Meadows and Farmoor CTA, contrary to the NPPF and West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2 2.

The application is not currently demonstrating a net gain in biodiversity, contrary to the NPPF and West Oxfordshire Local Plan.”

Objections from within OCC - OCC Officers

A number of Officers from departments within Oxfordshire County Council have raised objections. These objections are summarised in the Reg 25 request for further information, 15th August from Ms. M Hudson, OCC Planning written to the OCC/Aecom project team, this letter is appended to this document as Appendix B.

OCC Landscape

Objection – See also Reg 25 Letter from Ms. M Hudson Appendix B.

“I have a number of questions and observations which require further information and/or clarification. I have some landscape and visual concerns with regard to the P&R site, the impact of which I find difficult to fully judge without further information. I also find it difficult to judge the impact of the A40 widening as I have not been able to find information on whether and how much vegetation needs to be removed to accommodate this.”

OCC Transport Development control

Objection – See also Reg 25 Letter from Ms. M Hudson Appendix B.

“The Transport chapter of the Environmental Statement does not provide sufficient information or follow required guidance and therefore an objection is raised pending further information. “

OCC Ecology

Objection – See also Reg 25 Letter from Ms. M Hudson Appendix B.

“The metric shows an overall loss of biodiversity due to the scheme, which goes against all relevant national and local policies.”

“How much vegetation removal is required alongside the A40, in particular alongside the Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits Local Wildlife Site. The loss of screening vegetation here could have an adverse effect on the breeding birds within the site.”

OCC Drainage Officer

Objection – See also Reg 25 Letter from Ms. M Hudson Appendix B.

“Lack of key documentation to enable a full technical audit of drainage/flooding/SuDS for the proposal.

The standards being proposed within Appendix 5/1. These are not in line with local and national standards which are explained in detail within the Oxfordshire guidance document.

Information needs to be provided to ensure that the cumulative impact of the development will not cause flood risk elsewhere in the catchment and that the watercourses have capacity to take the run-off/volume.”

Local authorities raised a number of comments and objections.

West Oxfordshire District Council – The Local Planning Authority for the site.

WODC Raised concerns including;

“...the current proposal fails to provide opportunities to provide further vehicular access to the OCGV. It is also important for the scheme to facilitate convenient and legible pedestrian and cycle links to the OCGV. Flexibility should also be allowed for bus services to extend from the Park and Ride into the OCGV. In terms of West Eynsham SDA, the proposal fails to consider the need for an integrated access strategy for both motorised and all other users including pedestrians and cyclists.”

Cherwell District Council

CDC Raised concerns including;

“...It is also noted that overall the scheme currently results in a net loss in biodiversity and converting this to a net gain through appropriate off-site enhancements is encouraged. The County Council should also establish and carefully consider the extent of any tree/hedgerow removal needed and secure appropriate mitigation to minimise any adverse visual impact where necessary.”

Eynsham Parish Council

Objection – EPC raised a number of objections to the application. The full text of the EPC response is appended as Appendix D.

The objections by EPC included;

Eynsham Parish Council considers this application is contrary to one of the 3 key policies of sustainable development (NPPF 8 c) as it does not contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

In consideration of the fact that in West Oxfordshire District Council’s Local Plan (WOLP) 2031, the Witney sub-area has a housing allocation of 4702, Burford-Charlbury sub-area has 774 and Carterton sub-area has 2,680, the Park & Ride (P&R) is in the wrong location to meet the impact of these planned developments.

Freeland Parish Council

Objection with a number of Local Policy objections including;

“The Council are, however, extremely concerned about the Park and Ride elements of these planning applications, which have ignored the points raised at the consultation stage, resulting in landscape, visual, traffic and lighting impacts which are wholly unacceptable to the local community.”

Objections from local pressure groups

EPIC – Eynsham Planning Improvement Campaign

Objection

“EPIC and our many partners agree that the only solution to a problem on this scale is for a light railway or tram from Carterton which then runs parallel to the A40 from Witney to Oxford to link with other mass transit options.

In addition to the existing crisis, we now face huge house building plans all along the A40 west of Oxford ... many of them already agreed in the Local Plan and on beyond west of West Oxfordshire. The current proposals give no recognition of the huge additional pressure on the road. The regular traffic will increase exponentially as the various developments come online."

CYCLOX

"Cyclox objects to the application, in particular the cycling design aspect of the application. The junctions and roundabout proposals. These latter are inadequate, almost without exception. More than inadequate in the case of Eynsham roundabout where the provisions are certainly lethal. "

...I refer you to "Yeltkin vs Newham 2010, EWCA Civ 776", you are required to accommodate vulnerable users safely."

Even developers have raised significant strategic concerns

Barton Willmore on behalf of Jansens Property

Objection

"Strong objection is raised to the proposed design of the Park & Ride Roundabout which is contrary to the Development Plan;

The roundabout fails to consider the need for an integrated access strategy for both motorised and non-motorised users from the West Eynsham SDA as the design prejudices the future ability to create a southern fourth arm to access the West Eynsham SDA;

The roundabout design does not optimise the use of the Park & Ride facility in the provision of direct and seamless bus routes from the West Eynsham SDA and beyond. As a result, the current roundabout design is not supported by Stagecoach (the operator);

The application, as submitted, has no regard or explanation for adopting a design which prevents a southern arm in the future. It is fundamentally different from that presented in the final consultation event prior to submission and fails to reflect the position understood as part of the previous consultation discussions;

The Environmental Statement is not fit for purpose, it fails to assess the impact of the scheme on the freight layby and neighbouring land uses to the south.

The Transport Assessment is deficient. It contains unsubstantiated data on traffic, patronage and bus services; and

For infrastructure planning to ignore plan led development located to take advantage of accessibility to Oxford is bad planning."

Berkley Strategic

Commented that...

"Berkeley had previously raised the point about providing a considered solution to pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities on the A40. The current design proposals still do not address this issue."

"In our view, greater consideration should have been given to the increase in foot traffic to and from the park and ride facility from the proposed strategic allocations to encourage greater use of the improved bus services and journey times into Oxford."

"...whether a footbridge or other means of crossing the A40 should be incorporated into the wider A40 strategy to help integrate the West Eynsham SDA with the Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village and Park and Ride."

Residents and local groups

There were more than 50 responses from local residents and interested groups. Those resident comments are not posted to the OCC Application page as, unlike the Local Planning Authority WODC, OCC do not upload these to the planning website for public access/viewing. After a request from EPC to OCC the responses were sent to us albeit in redacted form. The redacted versions of the comments from members of the public are appended as Appendix C to this document.

A small selection of comments from residents.

"I see absolutely no improvement here from previous A40 consultations. These changes are still totally inadequate to deal with the traffic problems of today"

"It is madness to chase a small sum of funding for an old thinking idea that will only exacerbate congestion and put a cork in bottle-necks along the A40. As well as not being joined up with CURRENT developments, let alone those of the future, your ineffective scheme is also a massive waste of public money because it is an isolationist, piece meal and unimaginative response to our Climate Emergency. "

"Many residents have commented on the flaws in this project. It seems as if OCC was always going to press on regardless without any changes. The Park & Ride is in the wrong place."

"...proposal for biodiversity offsetting to CTAs elsewhere is vague, unmeasurable and an abdication of responsibility, leaving the Eynsham and Cassington environment greatly impoverished while 'benefiting' areas that are already catered for."

"A bus lane alone will not get traffic off the road. The time spent parking, waiting for a bus when that has limited priority three miles up the road and so re-joins a traffic jam at Dukes Cut Bridge is a completely inadequate incentive to get people out of their cars."

"The air pollution levels on A40 and at Wolvercote roundabout already regularly exceed safe legal limits. It would be illegal to create a development that added to this breach."

"These proposals represent old thinking when new solutions are urgently required, and they should be rejected as unfit for purpose."

"The plans are so obviously unfit for purpose as to be laughable if the situation wasn't so serious."

"This planned Park and Ride will be expensive, ineffective in resolving the issues around our car obsession and worst of all will be environmentally damaging and will see a loss in biodiversity, which is inexcusable."

"there is no evidence that it will improve general traffic flow or bus use. The impact for neighbouring residential properties in Eynsham and Cassington during construction – visual, noise, air quality – is assessed as being 'major adverse (significant)' (15.4.3). "



Date: 15th August 2019

Our ref: R3.0057/19

Sue Halliwell
Director for Planning & Place
County Hall New Road Oxford
OX1 1ND

Mr Matthew Stopforth
AECOM

Sent by email

Dear Matthew,

Proposed new park and ride and A40 bus lanes, Eynsham

Further information required to support planning application and under Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

The consultation period on the above planning application has ended and we have received comments from a range of consultees. Copies of these have already been provided to you and they are available to view on our website. We require further information in respect of the Environmental Statement before we can assess the impacts of the proposals and determine this application. This letter sets out the information which is required.

Further Information Required:

Landscape and Visual Assessment

- The photographs from the representative viewpoints do not show the extent to which the scheme would be visible in the view. In line with the Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3, as a minimum, the extent of the site should be indicated in the photographs together with some explanation of how this view would be impacted upon
- Photomontages or wireframe images from selected key viewpoints are required. It is suggested that viewpoints 6 and 7 are used and ideally also 3, 5, 9 and 12A.

Park and Ride Design and Landscaping

- An illustration of the proposed park and ride is required
- A Landscape Plan should be provided showing all relevant information on a single plan. This should include site context, vegetation to be removed, new vegetation proposed, structure, hard surfacing materials and means of enclosure.
- Details of the future management and maintenance of landscaping to demonstrate that the landscape measures proposed would achieve the desired objectives

Ecological Impacts

- Details of the extent of vegetation removal along the A40, and replacement planting, must be provided. The impacts of the proposed vegetation removal, including on the Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits Local Wildlife Site, priority species of birds and habitats, must be assessed.
- Further information is required on the scope for biodiversity gain within the site. If this is not possible information should be provided on proposals for offsetting, including the identification of suitable local site(s).
- An assessment of alternative locations for site compound 9 should be provided to demonstrate whether the loss of grassland and impacts on the Cassington to Yarnton Pits Local Wildlife Site East Extension in the proposed location is justified.
- A detailed hydrological report is required to demonstrate that the proposals would not have an impact on the Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation through impacts on water levels or quality.
- Further information should be provided on proposed positive measures within the Conservation Target Area.
- Please provide a copy of the biodiversity metric spreadsheet so that the calculations can be checked. We need to verify that the final value is accurate, as the cost of any biodiversity offsetting required will be based on this figure.

Lighting

- A detailed lighting plan for the park and ride site should be provided including details of the location, height, design, sensors and luminance of proposed external lighting. This is required in relation to ecological impacts to assess impacts on sensitive species including bats and breeding birds, and also in relation to landscape and visual impacts.
- Information should be provided assessing the impact of the proposed lighting and details to illustrate the appearance and spread of external lighting.
- Details of alternative lighting options which have been explored should be provided to demonstrate the reasons why the proposed scheme has been put forward.
- Clarification must be provided on any proposed new lighting along the A40.

Transport

The transport chapter as submitted does not follow Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines. This chapter should be resubmitted to contain an assessment which does meet these guidelines. It must cover both the construction phase and operational phase. The assessment undertaken must be presented in a way which provides clarity on the relationship between significance of effects and their severity.

Further details of the requirements can be found in the consultation response from Oxfordshire County Council's transport development control team.

Flood Risk Assessment

An updated Flood Risk Assessment is required to address the deficiencies raised in the consultation response from the Environment Agency. The submitted FRA fails to:

- provide an appropriate assessment of the potential increased flood risk that the proposed development would cause;
- demonstrate that the loss of floodplain storage within the 1% AEP flood extent with an appropriate allowance for climate change caused by the proposed development can be mitigated for; or
- provide details on main river crossings and the potential impact on flood risk.

The updated FRA must address these concerns and comply with the requirements set out in the online Planning Practice Guidance.

Please refer to the Environment Agency consultation response dated 14th August 2019 for further detail about why the submitted FRA is not considered to be acceptable.

Drainage

Oxfordshire County Council's drainage and Lead Local Flood Authority team have provided detailed comments on further information that is required and deficiencies in the submitted documents in their consultation response. Further information should be provided, and any necessary amendments made to address their concerns, which are summarised below.

- The standards proposed within Appendix 5/1 are not in line with local and national standards.
- Swale widths - The side slopes of the swales are proposed to be 1 in 3 which is the recommended minimum however, it may be difficult to achieve an adequate profile with 1 in 3 within the proposed widths which are 1.5m max.
- Combined Kerb drainage is being proposed where it isn't possible to provide swales. These are very difficult to maintain and normally need to be cleaned during a lane closure. Further consideration should be given to whether this is a suitable solution for the A40, as a major route.
- Section 5.7.3 states brownfield rates are to be applied. Greenfield rates are expected for all relevant return periods including 40% Climate Change allowance. This section is not consistent with Section 5 and 3.2 of the Surface Water document.
- FEH (Qmed) should be applied to a catchment of this size.
- WFD is mentioned in detail but little explanation is given for how water quality will be improved.
- Micro Drainage calculations should be re-run using FEH data and recommended Cv

values of 0.9 for roof areas and 0.9 for hardstanding, as the default Cv values are not reflective of the site conditions. If this is not to be provided, full written justification should be provided.

- FEH has been used to calculate storage but FSR for flow. Further information should be submitted to explain this.
- Discharge consent evidence from both the EA and LPA for ordinary watercourses should be provided.
- Further detail is required on how the proposed compensatory flood plain storage would be achieved (please also refer to the Environment Agency's comments on the Flood Risk Assessment).
- A topographical plan should be provided to show Pre and Post development surface water flow paths.
- Information should be provided to demonstrate that the cumulative impact of the development will not cause flood risk elsewhere in the catchment and that the watercourses have capacity to take the run-off/volume.

- Written justification is required as to how the noted surface water flood risk to the south west corner of the Park and Ride area and the eastern edge of the site adjacent to Cuckoo Lane is to be managed.
- Drawing 60551821-ACM-HDG-A40_SW_ZZ_ZZ-RP-CD-0001 indicates uncontrolled discharge to ditches and culverts. This needs to be further explained.
- Freeboard for swales and flow rate down swales needs to be demonstrated and explained.
- A written statement should be provided detailing whether any surcharging of the system is to be expected.
- An exceedance routing plan should be provided in case of failure/blockage.
- A plan detailing all points of discharge, rate and flow control should be provided
- Culverting of ditches should be avoided. If this cannot be achieved, written justification must be provided.
- A catchment plan required detailing flow, volume and discharge rate for each sub- catchment should be provided.
- Drawing number 60551821-ACM-HDG-A40_SW_ZZ_ZZ-DR-CD-1006 needs to be amended to demonstrate invert levels.
- Plans should show that all footpaths are of permeable construction.
- Build outs in roads and the new roundabout should be considered as opportunities for SuDS.
- Silt traps shown in the swale drawing cross sections require explanation. Careful design should ensure there is no silt ingress into the outlet pipe or ditch line.
- Confirmation as to whether the parking area is to be constructed of permeable surface should be provided.
- A phasing plan and explanation as to how surface water will be managed during construction should be provided.
- A Full standalone Detailed Design and Surface Water Management Strategy should be provided.

Other comments made by consultees

I recommend that you carefully consider the comments which have been made by consultees, including suggestions for improvements to the proposals. You are encouraged to make amendments to the proposals to address any concerns which have been raised. Amended plans and details can be submitted alongside the further information requested above. If you are amending plans, please set out clearly in a covering letter which previously submitted plans have been superseded.

The consultation responses received include requests for further details to be required by condition. For example, the Environmental Health Officer at WODC has requested a mitigation scheme for noise protection and sound insulation. If you are able to provide further information at this stage to address the details that consultees have confirmed that they will require, this could avoid the need for some of the proposed pre-commencement planning conditions, should planning permission be granted for this development. Therefore, you are encouraged to submit as much information as you can at this stage, as this could avoid delays at a later stage.

Following submission of this further information we will hold a further public consultation period and there would also be a lead-in period to get a report finalised and the item on the agenda for a Planning and Regulation committee. Forthcoming Planning and Regulation committee dates are:

21st October 2019 2.00 pm

9th December 2019 2.00 pm

27th January 2020 2.00 pm

Please note that in order to take a report to committee on 21st October all the further information requested would need to be submitted by Wednesday 28th August at the latest. This would be necessary to allow sufficient time for the further information to be advertised in a newspaper and for a 30-day consultation to take place before the report would need to be completed on 7th October. Given the various requests for further information, it therefore seems unlikely that it will be possible for this application to be considered by committee on 21st October. However, if you do wish to submit information before 28th August please liaise with David Periam (david.periam@oxfordshire.gov.uk 07824 545378) as I will be on leave until 3rd September.

I hope this is helpful, but please let me know if you require any clarification.

Yours sincerely

M Hudson

Mary Hudson
Principal Planning Officer

Direct line: 07393 001 257

Email: mary.hudson@oxfordshire.gov.uk

www.oxfordshire.gov.uk

Eynsham Park and Ride – Representations**Rep 1**

I see absolutely no improvement here from previous A40 consultations. These changes are still totally inadequate to deal with the traffic problems of today. Let alone in the context of Climate Emergency. I support Nigel Pearce's response 100%.

Second response from same person:

This is my second response informed by the Question & Answer meeting with Cllr Yvonne Constance in Eynsham on July 12th. I would have added it to the first response but online responses to this consultation are not loaded onto your site.

At the A40 Consultation Meeting called by Eynsham Parish Council, Eynsham Planning Improvement Campaign and Eynsham Society, I asked Cllr Yvonne Constance the following question:

You are likely to be aware that the Centre for Research into Energy Demand Solutions (CREDS, University of Oxford) has just published its report, *Shifting the focus: energy demand in a net-zero carbon UK*. Their recommendations for surface passenger travel are targeted at local, as well as, national policy makers. Particularly relevant to OCC in relation to the A40 and the Oxfordshire Transport Network generally are three policy recommendations for influencing and providing more energy-conserving life-styles:

1. Avoiding travel demand and car ownership, eg,
 - a. Developing local support for car clubs
 - b. Incentivising co-ordination of transport and planning objectives to reduce the need for travel
2. Shifting travel to the most sustainable modes, eg,
 - a. Systematic support for the very lowest energy modes of transport i.e. walking, cycling, e-bikes, e-scooters and electric
 - b. New approaches to transport pricing
3. Improving efficiency of vehicles in use, particularly through increased occupancy using carrot approaches (e.g., dedicated parking, charging and signage for car club vehicles) and stick approaches (e.g., parking charges and restrictions for private vehicles).

I know you are trying to lessen car use with your A40 plan, but it is based on old thinking. i.e., (1) reducing traffic congestion and (2) focussing on reducing carbon emissions. When you began with this plan, it was not common knowledge that we were heading so rapidly to a climate emergency and only have a decade to massively change the way we live and move. So, we require new thinking NOW about transport that is founded on mass transit with zero carbon emission. So, could you reassure us, Cllr Constance, that OCC will be looking seriously at these and other 'new thinking' recommendations that are founded on rigorous social and technological research? Especially, in the context of our recent national, county (including your own) and district Climate Emergency (including WODC) declarations.

Having heard Cllr Constance's responses to my and others questions, I remain unassured that she or the Council have fully comprehended the CREDS recommendations. If I had heard some shift in the plan, such as the following, then I would have seen some evidence of a pro-active response to Climate Emergency through a move towards 'influencing and providing more energy-conserving life-style:

- incentivising the formation and running of Car Clubs
- re-naming the Park & Ride as a Mass Transit Hub with PV panels on the roof (as culture is carried in our language, this re-naming emphasises the norm of home to destination public transport)
- providing a rapidly expanding percentage of the car parking for electric Car Club vehicles for a small fee, say £1 (with cameras to ensure that each car had more than one person in it) and private electric vehicles for a higher fee
- charging fossil fuels private vehicles a substantial parking fee
- introducing congestion charges for all cars and HGV vehicles using the A40 between Witney and Oxford
- re-thinking the rigid, ideological bias for privately-run public transport by either Council-run small buses from surrounding villages feeding into the transit hub or re-incentivise private rural buses.

It is madness to chase a small sum of funding for an old thinking idea that will only exacerbate congestion and put a cork in bottle-necks along the A40. As well as not being joined up with CURRENT developments, let alone those of the future, your ineffective scheme is also a massive waste of public money because it is an isolationist, piece meal and unimaginative response to our Climate Emergency.

The plan is being promoted as merely the first stage of a bigger development. So where is the masterplan? Where is the evidence that the overall development is based on ambitious 21st century thinking and experience of mass transit systems in other countries, as well as on the recommendations of Climate Change scientists? And do not say, there is no money. We are the fifth richest country in the world. You have a duty to demand that our national Government meets its Climate Change Emergency obligations with funding a national transport system that enables us to meet our Paris Agreement targets and on beyond.

PLEASE, do not waste our money with this mealie-mouthed plan that will contribute to the release of carbon emissions in its construction and then in its modification when a better, holistic plan is created. Do not put A40 users through another year of road works and resultant misery and stress, for a scheme that will be redundant in several years.

PLEASE wait, go back to the drawing board, approach the design intelligently, using an innovative design process and not relying on the old thinking of companies like AECOM to do the work for you.

Rep 2

Wrong location for park and ride. It needs to be a mile before Barnard Gate where the worst of the traffic congestion is. By Cuckoo Lane the traffic is moving. No one will use it .

Rep 3

Many residents have commented on the flaws in this project. It seems as if OCC was always going to press on regardless without any changes. The Park & Ride is in the wrong place. I attach comments on AECOM's Environmental Statement: Non-Technical Summary. (document attached and saved elsewhere)

Rep 4

I am not objecting to the Park & Ride as I believe it is signed and sealed and will be delivered; however, I have major concerns over its impact on where I live.

The problem is the footway/cycleway going westwards past my, and my neighbours' houses. I live in **17 Hanborough Close, Eynsham, OX29 4NR**, at the end of a terrace of houses which ends with No. 26. As the proposed development will bring the road a lot closer to our houses, I wish to remind you of the water culvert at the bottom of our rear gardens, backing onto the A40, that is supposed to take run-off water away from the A40. This culvert has been blocked for countless years with rubbish thrown into it from the present cycle track and also from trees that have grown up in it, a couple of which are now 20 feet high.

Three years ago, I asked Eynsham Parish Council and Oxfordshire County Council to look at it. Apart from a letter to residents, reminding them to keep it clear of *their* rubbish, NOTHING was done to clear this culvert. Over the years, many times, we have had flooding in our gardens from this and, at least twice, this has risen almost up to our houses which are 30 metres away.

On your plans, it seems that the cycleway/footpath will come right up to this ditch, if not over it. When you cut down the hedgerows and trees which now border the A40, we will be subject to having members of the public only feet away from our gardens looking down from the cycleway/footpath directly into our houses and gardens.

The problem is that my house is in the worst position as this culvert, and our gardens, are approximately two metres lower than the A40 and the existing cycleway and footpath but our privacy is maintained by the present hedgerows and trees

I am asking for a high fence to be erected along the length of our rear gardens, between us and the A40, from Nos 17 to 26, to give us some privacy and to dampen noise. If you do not erect a strong barrier, then people on bicycles could easily fall into this culvert. I cannot see how you can plant any trees along there as you will not have room to do so.

I would welcome someone from your Council to come to my house (No. 17) and into my rear garden in order to see how low our homes and gardens lie. Walking along the A40, it is not possible to see how low we are.

If you have no plans to put up a fence or address the noise and pollution from the bus lane and dualled A40 (presently screened by the tall trees) then I wish to object. By not doing so, you risk someone on a bicycle having to swerve in order to avoid a collision with walkers (as it is a shared footway/ cycleway) and somebody being injured by falling into the culvert. I strongly request that this culvert be cleared of rubbish and the trees that are growing in it, allowing run-off water to flow again.

I wish to comment on the bus lane and the A40 road: The bus lane is 3.50 metres wide, yet the road is only 3.25metres wide. WHY? The lorries that are using the A40 are the same width as a bus, which are 2.55 metres wide, not including the wing mirrors. Therefore, on the A40, at 3.25 metres wide less 2.55 metres for a lorry, and allowing 300 mm for two wing mirrors, it leaves a width of less than 200 mm either side of the lorry. Let us hope that one does not swerve! This is the same for both sides of the A40, but the culvert is on my side of the road. If a lorry, or even a car, were to break down in this area, there would be major traffic disruption as it would not even be possible to pull the vehicle to the side and enable other traffic to pass it safely. I broke down between the Woodstock Road roundabout and the Banbury Road roundabout, a couple of years ago, and it took two-and-a-half hours to remove my car, so I know, first-hand, the traffic disruption it can cause!

Rep 5

Your proposal for biodiversity offsetting to CTAs elsewhere is vague, unmeasurable and an abdication of responsibility, leaving the Eynsham and Cassington environment greatly impoverished while 'benefiting' areas that are already catered for.

Comment on AECOM's ES Vol II Chapter 6 Biodiversity

Paragraph 6.6.62 of this document says that "it is expected that there will be an overall reduction in Annual Average Daily Traffic" (a statement repeated elsewhere, eg in paragraph 6.6.55).

This is at odds with what AECOM says in its Environmental Statement – Non-Technical Summary: "Once operational, the change in traffic flow along the A40 and wider study area is not identified to result in a significant increase in traffic flows (paragraph 7.10.5)." Ie, there will be an increase, albeit not a significant one, apparently.

So which of these two statements is correct?

Rep 6

I wish to object to the planning application for the Park and Ride and changes to the A40 past Eynsham into Oxford.

The proposals for a bus route part of the way into Oxford drawn up to deal with the existing stresses on the road are totally inadequate. The A40 is already at gridlock at key times and these delays have knock on effects in terms of loss of working time, hidden costs to businesses and the economy, air pollution and health, personal stress and mental health. A much more radical solution is needed. These proposals will give very little relief, not least because at least a third of the traffic (according to your figures) does not go into Oxford, and if one adds on to that those who want to go into Oxford but not to the City Centre your solution becomes even less feasible. A bus lane alone will not get traffic off the road. The time spent parking, waiting for a bus when that has limited priority three miles up the road and so rejoins a traffic jam at Dukes Cut Bridge is a completely inadequate incentive to get people out of their cars.

Part of a better solution would be the reinstating of the proposed A44 Link that would take pressure off that bottleneck at the Oxford end of this part of the A40.

Then there ought to be more imaginative plans such as a light railway or tram from Witney or even from Carterton for the traffic into Oxford

In addition, we now face huge house building plans all along the A40 west of Oxford ... many of them already agreed in the Local Plan and on beyond west of West Oxfordshire. The current proposals give no recognition to the huge additional pressure on the road. Regular traffic is going to increase exponentially as the various developments come online.

The current proposals also totally ignore the plans for 2,200 houses in the Garden Village to the north of Eynsham which will require a number of crossing points between the new development and the existing village as well as access on to the A40. They also fail to recognise the impact of 1,000 houses to the west of Eynsham which will need similar access, whilst the road around the west of Eynsham proposed there, to prevent the traffic going through the village or on to the A40, will only put more pressure on the Toll bridge, which itself cannot cope with more volume.

A proper proposal should include a look at the full picture rather than something as limited as this.

Rep 7

The air pollution levels on A40 and at Wolvercote roundabout already regularly exceed safe legal limits. It would be illegal to create a development that added to this breach.

Rep 8

Response to OCC consultation on the Park and Ride and A40 planning Application

I agree with the EPIC (Eynsham Planning Improvement Campaign) objection to the planning application for the Park and Ride and changes to the A40 past Eynsham into Oxford.

EPIC have consulted with their members and with Eynsham residents more widely and suggest that these changes are totally inadequate to deal with the traffic problems of today. Let alone in the future. I agree with these sentiments.

The proposals for a bus route part of the way into Oxford were drawn up to deal with the existing stresses on the road as acknowledged in your proposal. The A40 is already at gridlock at key times and these delays have knock on effects in terms of loss of working time, hidden costs to businesses and the economy, air pollution and health, personal stress and mental health. A radical solution is needed to restore sanity to our local journeys and these paltry solutions go nowhere near enough. A bus lane alone will not get traffic off the road. The time spent parking, waiting for a bus which has limited priority three miles up the road and rejoins a traffic jam is a completely inadequate incentive to get people out of their cars.

We are faced with a massive challenge which requires a massive and imaginative response. The current proposals merely tinker with the existing infrastructure. We need to be looking for long term solutions, harnessing the opportunities of new technologies. For example the predicted move towards driverless cars in place of individually owned cars may well make the Park and Ride redundant within a decade. EPIC think that the only solution to a problem on this scale is for a light railway or tram from Carterton which then runs parallel to the A40 from Witney to Oxford to link with other mass transit options.

In addition to the existing crisis, we now face huge house building plans all along the A40 west of Oxford ... many of them already agreed in the Local Plan and on beyond west of West Oxfordshire. The current proposals give no recognition of the huge additional pressure on the road. The regular traffic will increase as the various developments come online.

The current proposals totally ignore the plans for 2,200 houses in a Garden Village to the north of Eynsham which will require a number of crossing points between the new development and the existing village. It also fails to recognise the impact of 1,000 houses to the west of Eynsham which will need access to the A40, and a road around the west of Eynsham to prevent the traffic going through the village to the toll bridge, which itself cannot cope with more volume.

There is no recognition of the access off the A40 to cope with the massive building of the Garden Village.

As you will be aware, the local opposition to the Garden Village understandably focuses largely around fears about the road and the quality of life for anyone who works in Oxford or beyond. It is one of the key principles of a Garden Village that there should be good transport infrastructure.

That principle has already been ignored and the Garden Village should not go ahead without properly addressing the problems of the A40. These proposals do not do that.

These proposals represent old thinking when new solutions are urgently required and they should be rejected as unfit for purpose.

Rep 9

I have lived in Eynsham for nearly 30 years and travel into Oxford down the A40 by bus or bicycle to work. It beggars belief that anyone cannot see that the proposals are totally inadequate to deal with the traffic problems of today. Let alone in the future.

The A40 is already at gridlock at key times, add the 2000+ planned new builds and the gridlock will be permanent. In these circumstances what is the point of a bus lane that goes only towards Oxford and stops to merge with the gridlock before the A34 flyover? The most effective mode of transport would be the bicycle, except these plans make the remaining cycle lane inadequate and dangerous - obviously "planned" by someone who has never tried to cycle along the A40 on a dark winter night.

The plans are so obviously unfit for purpose as to be laughable if the situation wasn't so serious. This is people's lives and livelihoods you are destroying with your incompetence. Stop trying to be seen to do something without spending money and implement a solution that may actually have a chance of alleviating the problems now and in the future.

Rep 10

We are faced with a massive challenge which requires a massive and imaginative response. The current proposals merely tinker with the existing infrastructure. We need to be looking for long term solutions, harnessing the opportunities of new technologies. For example the predicted move towards driverless cars in place of individually owned cars may well make the Park and Ride redundant within a decade. EPIC and our many partners agree that the only solution to a problem on this scale is for a light railway or tram from Carterton which then runs parallel to the A40 from Witney to Oxford to link with other mass transit options.

In addition to the existing crisis, we now face huge house building plans all along the A40 west of Oxford ... many of them already agreed in the Local Plan and on beyond west of West Oxfordshire. The current proposals give no recognition of the huge additional pressure on the road. The regular traffic will increase exponentially as the various developments come online.

The current proposals totally ignore the plans for 2,200 houses in a Garden Village to the north of Eynsham which will require a number of crossing points between the new development and the existing village. It also fails to recognise the impact of 1,000 houses to the west of Eynsham which will need access to the A40, and a road around the west of Eynsham to prevent the traffic going through the village to the toll bridge, which itself cannot cope with more volume.

There is no recognition of the access off the A40 to cope with the massive building of the Garden Village. As you will be aware, the local opposition to the Garden Village understandably focuses largely around fears about the road and the quality of life for anyone who works in Oxford or beyond. It is one of the key principles of a Garden Village that there should be good transport infrastructure. That principle has already been ignored and the Garden Village should not go ahead without properly addressing the problems of the A40. These proposals do not do that. These proposals represent old thinking when new solutions are urgently required and they should be rejected as unfit for purpose.

The proposals for a bus route part of the way into Oxford were drawn up to deal with the existing stresses on the road as acknowledged in your proposal. The A40 is already at gridlock at key times and these delays have knock on effects in terms of loss of working time, hidden costs to businesses and the economy, air pollution and health, personal stress and mental health. A radical solution is needed to restore sanity to our local journeys and these paltry solutions go nowhere near enough. A bus lane alone will not get traffic off the road. The time spent parking, waiting for a bus when that has limited priority three miles up the road and rejoins a traffic jam is a completely inadequate incentive to get people out of their cars.

Rep 11

This planned Park and Ride will be expensive, ineffective in resolving the issues around our car obsession and worst of all will be environmentally damaging and will see a loss in biodiversity, which is inexcusable.

Rep 12

I wholeheartedly concur with the comments and objections raised in the "EPIC Response to OCC Consultation on the Park and Ride and A40 Planning Application", which I attempted to submit as an attachment. Yours faithfully, S. Carter

Rep 13

The proposals for a bus route part of the way into Oxford were drawn up to deal with the existing stresses on the road – stresses you have acknowledged in your proposal. The A40 is already gridlocked at key times and these delays have serious knock-on effects in terms of loss of working time, hidden costs to businesses and the economy, air pollution and health, personal stress and mental health. A very radical and different solution is needed to restore sanity to our local journeys and these paltry proposals go nowhere near enough. A bus lane alone will not get traffic off the road. The time spent parking, waiting for a bus when that has limited priority three miles up the road and rejoins a traffic jam is a completely inadequate incentive to get people out of their cars.

We are faced with a massive challenge, which requires a massive and imaginative response. The current proposals merely tinker with the existing infrastructure. We need to be looking for long-term solutions, harnessing the opportunities of new technologies. For example the predicted move towards driverless cars in place of individually owned cars may well make the Park and Ride redundant within a decade. The only real solution to a problem on this scale is for a light railway or tram from Carterton which then runs parallel to the A40 from Witney to Oxford to link with other mass transit options. Only this will stand a chance of getting cars off the road and it is only a reduction in the volume of traffic that will ease the congestion.

In addition to the existing crisis, we now face huge house building plans all along the A40 west of Oxford - many of them already agreed in the Local Plan and these go on beyond west of West Oxfordshire. The current proposals fail to recognise the huge additional pressure that will be placed on the A40 road. The regular traffic will increase exponentially as the various developments come online.

The current proposals totally ignore the plans for 2,200 houses in a Garden Village to the north of Eynsham which will require a number of crossing points between the new development and the existing village. It also fails to recognise the impact of 1,000 houses to the west of Eynsham which will need access to the A40, and a road around the west of Eynsham to prevent the traffic going through the village to the toll bridge, which itself cannot really cope with the current level of traffic – let alone more volume.

There is simply no recognition of the access needed off the A40 to cope with the massive scale of building the Garden Village will bring.

As you will be aware, the local opposition to the Garden Village understandably focuses largely around fears about the road and the quality of life for anyone who works in Oxford or beyond. It is one of the key principles of a Garden Village that there should be good transport infrastructure. That principle has already been ignored and the Garden Village should not go ahead without properly addressing the problems of the A40. These proposals do not do that.

These proposals represent old thinking when new and imaginative solutions are urgently required. These proposals should be rejected as unfit for purpose.

Rep 14

Dear Sir,

I am writing with reference to the planning application for a Park and Ride at Eynsham, and associated work on the A40.

I have sent my comments on the application to WODC, believing that they were the authority to whom the application had been made, but now I am unsure where I should send my response. I am therefore attaching a copy of the letter I sent on 1 July to WODC herewith, for your attention. The WODC reference number is 19/01725/CC3REG. I also sent a hard copy of my comments to WODC's offices. I would be grateful to know whether comments on this application should be made to WODC or OCC, and also to have acknowledgement of receipt of the attached letter. Thank you.

I wish to object to the planning application for a Park and Ride at Eynsham, and associated changes to the A40.

This is not a plan for the future and the long term. It is a short-term fudge that is incompatible with national targets to alleviate the climate emergency and improve air quality, as it seeks to accommodate and cater for more petrol and diesel polluting vehicles on the A40 and the surrounding infrastructure.

The proposed scheme is aimed at alleviating congestion on the A40 and addressing the needs of public transport. However, there is little evidence that this will be achieved by the current plan. Furthermore it cannot be effectively judged unless the other developments along the A40 corridor that are included in the Local Plan are taken into consideration at the same time. The P&R scheme ignores the intention to build the Oxford Cotswold Garden Village next to it, and an extension to West Eynsham of 1000 houses on the other side of the A40, and the possible dualling of the A40 between Witney and Eynsham. All these developments will put additional strain on the infrastructure and lead to a considerable increase in car use, congestion, and emissions and require additional junctions around Eynsham on to the A40. How, therefore, can a reliable assessment be made of the impact of the P&R without detailed plans being available for these other schemes?

There are many details relating to the A40 in the current scheme that remain 'tbc'. The documents make the assumption that the OCGV and West Eynsham will be accessible via a new roundabout junction located on the A40 to the west of the proposed development but the effect of this on traffic flow cannot, and has not, been included in the assessment of the scheme's effectiveness.

Most damning, for a scheme whose main aim is bus priority, bus passenger data for existing and forecast bus patronage 'has not been available to inform the assessment'. Despite the improved bus journey time reliability and improved accessibility that the proposals aim for, because they do not 'provide a continuous bus lane in both directions for the full extent of the bus routes' the planning assessment states that 'the proposals are considered to result in a low beneficial magnitude of effect. Therefore for public transport users, the significance of effect is minor beneficial' (14.6.37). In other words, the scheme will provide minimal benefits for bus travel.

For these reasons, the planning application should be refused. There is no justification for blighting the landscape with a massive car park that will be of no benefit to the residents of Eynsham or the future residents of the Garden Village when there is no evidence that it will improve general traffic flow or bus use. The impact for neighbouring residential properties in Eynsham and Cassington during construction – visual, noise, air quality – is assessed as being 'major adverse (significant)' (15.4.3). There is very little detail about the mitigating solutions that will be put in place to protect residents from noise, dust, air pollution, and vibration during construction, let alone what long-term barriers will protect them from increased noise and traffic from the P&R and new junctions on the A40. There will be additional light pollution from the P&R site overnight and the roundabout that provides access: how will that be addressed?

The applicant (OCC) makes assumptions about increases to bus service between now and 2031 that it cannot control. The bus service provider decides how many buses to run, and their frequency. If the P&R charges for parking there is little incentive for commuters who use Eynsham as a free car park for Oxford to change their habits.

The proposal is not compatible with the need to improve air quality and reduce emissions. The proposed number of crossings and junctions along the A40 at Eynsham is likely to result in traffic slowing and accelerating more frequently, producing greater pollution. If, in addition, the A40 is subsequently dualled between Witney and Eynsham, that is likely to result in increased traffic, not least from Witney residents who choose to drive their cars to the Eynsham P&R and pick up a bus there. It is ironic that there are intended to be only 45 electric vehicle charging points in a car park for 850 vehicles, when there will be far more electric cars than petrol and diesel polluting vehicles in the future.

The scheme should be scrapped. A continuous bus lane from Witney to Oxford, and additional sections of westbound lane where possible would be a far greater incentive for commuters to switch from car to bus than an Eynsham P&R. Better still would be the reinstatement of a light rail link; and the re-routing of the A40 to the north of the OCGV at Eynsham should be given fresh consideration. Above all we need a new approach that recognizes the changes that will have to be made in our use of fossil fuels if we are to improve our environment; that means enabling a swift transition to electric vehicles and a more comprehensive investment in public transport infrastructure.

Finally, it is indicative of the disregard this application has for local residents, and the lack of joined-up thinking in relation to other developments in Eynsham, that it can state that 'improved access to healthcare services... facilitated by the proposed development is assessed to positively impact the human health of residents in the area' (12.6.33). The human health of Eynsham residents would be much more positively impacted if the pressure on the Eynsham Medical Centre was not so great: but instead the pressure will get considerably worse thanks to the enormous expansion of Eynsham dictated by the Local Plan.

Rep 15

Good morning Raymond

I am following up on my Email of last week .I have left a message on your Mobile this morning.

I understand that you are the principal contact on this project so I am hoping you, or may be your Consultant, will be able to come back to me soon on the points of clarification on the TA (prepared by Aecom) as outlined below:

In Section 3.6 the results of the baseline junction capacity modelling is presented; were the models calibrated against observed queues or delays?

I have had problems downloading Appendix B : could you forward a copy of this please?

In Section 4 Future Year Base

In paras. 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 it refers to the inclusion of the traffic growth forecasts for the West Eynsham and OCGV developments and an assumption that a 4 arm roundabout will serve both developments to the west of the P & R scheme (which concurs with our understanding)

So that we are clear, has the modelling for the Future Year assumed the traffic generation from both of the SDAs (which seeks out the A40) will connect to the A40 at this single point ?

Can you please advise what assumptions have been made to derive the trip generation for the SDAs and indicate the numbers input into the modelling? There is reference to data in Appendix D; could I please ask for a copy of this as again I have had problems downloading from the Web link.

Inspecting Tables 4-1 and 4-2 , could it be explained why ,for example at the A40/Cuckoo Lane junction the 2031 flows for the A40 West are lower than the corresponding flows for 2021?

Inspecting Table 7-2 and comparing with Table 4-2 , ie the 2031 scenarios without scheme and with scheme and again looking at the A40 west at the A40 Cuckoo lane jct (DS); could it be explained why the A40 west eastbound flows are similar 1114 /1112? Can one presume that it reflects the interception of movements to the P &R offsetting the effects of all of the future growth on the AM eastbound lane at this location?

All of the above is relevant to our understanding of the assumptions and modelling ,undertaken on behalf of OCC, so that one can take a consistent approach when preparing the TA for West Eynsham.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this Email and an indication of when I might receive a response.

Rep 16

Having looked at the online information on the A40 Eynsham Park and Ride, the presentation seems essentially as if this is a stand alone part of a larger plan that involves a separate provision for a west bound bus lane without which,being incorporated, it is difficult to approve the East bound section. Were this second shoe not to drop, we would be left with a provision that served the interests of Oxford City (getting people to work) while ignoring the needs of west Oxfordshire (getting them home in good time) Beyond this a one way partial mass transit priority system is little incentive to move from cars to public transport.

A second consideration is that traffic does not start at Eynsham but Witney and, if a real reduction in private car use is intended, the mass transit priority system must start at the major population center, which implies a large P and R at Witney, although given duelling to Eynsham from the west, no bus lane as such.

The idea that this mass transit system is driven by the new housing fails properly to recognise the existing traffic load, which calls for amelioration now and might well call for a staged mitigation along with new housing.

Fourthly, the problem simultaneously calls for attention to the Toll Bridge and the road to Botley and this takes two forms: increasing potential vehicle usage and creating a bike path providing safety for cyclists. More radical solutions involve passing an Act of Parliament to remove the Toll, paying a fee from public funds to the owner to remove the Toll itself and building another parallel bridge to create more road space,

The essential issue, if we are to be a part of the Knowledge Spine as I feel we inevitably are, is to retain and enhance the lifestyle that inward investment demands. We have a good school with a very high profile, an improving cultural life, a magnificent hinterland of intense pastoral beauty and we need an integral infrastructural and transportation plan. It is to be hoped that Mr Courts can bring us good news on this front for his advocacy, already notable, might soon become very influential indeed.

Given the lack of present commitment, it might be better to delay implementation of this partial scheme until the fuller infrastructural funding is guaranteed. It is notable that both potential Conservative leaders are talking infrastructure funding for the Oxford-Cambridge-London triangle (and the Kerslake Report seems to accept this too as well as advocating a Northern version) so that more comprehensive planning may become possible.

As you know, as a retired Professor of Business and as a former member of the Stanford School of Business, the intellectual source and beneficiary of so much of the digital revolution, I am keen on economic development and treat the transportation as necessary to it rather than seeing its lack as a ground for its rejection. For my part I want to encourage humane development for the prosperity of our future residents, in the national interest and above all for reasons of maintaining humane standards for ease of transport and especially for those who will work and live here to enjoy a pleasant lifestyle necessary both for us and those we hope to attract to live and work here

May I suggest you publish this and other submissions on the Parish online website where it can be read by those interested and where it might favourably affect the minds of the other authorities we are trying to reach. It is also important, I feel, for the historic record of our community.

Were I to catch your Chairman's eye, I would be happy to contribute to the Debate on the 12th.

Rep 17

Why do you ask people to comment if you have already made your decision, like every time. A dual carriageway all the way is the only answer, not that you will listen to 80% of people

Rep 18

Please consider the effect of a parking charge at the proposed park-and-ride. I am concerned that people will travel from out of town to park for free outside local village businesses.

Rep 19

How can a 1000 car park and rigde can solve the issue of a single cartridge way carrying circa 36000 cars a day with the plan to build a further 18500 house in West Oxon this figure could double. Please can you reconsider better long term options.

Rep 20

My objection as follows to R3.0057/19

I object to this application. As a local tradesmen / electrician I spend a lot of time on the A40 . This application will make my time spent in my van so onerous that I will be forced to move to another area. OCC are effectively being anti-business

The real truth of it is this application is designed to set the path clear for the building of the proposed new build of thousands of houses to the north of Eynsham.

What it is not is a scheme specifically designed for 'modal transport shift ', let's be clear about that. The term Modal Transport shift is a patronising and disingenuous term to con people into accepting it.

This new build development , which this park and ride goes hand in hand with, will encourage unsaid and huge numbers of traffic movements onto the surrounding areas and into Oxford . This is unaccounted for in this application but is implicit . It is the only reason the park and ride application is going in at this time.

Underpinning everything is a well accepted fact that Vans and HGV electric / hybrid vehicles are the last to be electrified due to the inefficiencies of batteries weight to load carrying capacity and will /may not be seen commonly and affordably until 2030's and later, if at all. By DEFRA's own admission emission targets will not be met as predicted, intact far from it.

ClientEarth to sue Government over 'flawed' air pollution plan for third time | The Independent

Furthermore this application relies on the premise that people will be forced into using buses because driving in car and the consequential delays will be intolerable.

This is insane thinking.

Large numbers of the targeted people will not have the option to swap their journey to the bus e.g those who have site specific journeys places where there is no bus service.

Journeys where a car has to be used - to carry materials.

How will tradesmen get around for example, on public transport ? The entire notion is ludicrous .

Meanwhile in the background that spectre of the misnamed "garden village' looms adding countless other movements into the system.

Where in the documents is the data that identifies where these calculations have been done ? I looked and was unable to find them.

All this development will do is add strain and stress to an already difficult set of conditions, and waste a lot of public finance.

Dependency on the private sector to take the risk of providing public transport - who is to guarantee that this will be picked up by the private sector and that sufficient money can be made by them to make it worthwhile ?

It also incentivises that scheme to as punitive as possible to the car user to force people into buses. How do we introduce some sanity into this process and protect ourselves from a County Council trying to save itself from its own ill-informed decisions ?

- Traffic movements to the Park and ride

This development will draw traffic from the surrounding areas that may wish to use it thereby increasing traffic in areas that is not designed to have the increase in traffic.

The so called modal shift will have unintended consequences of creating traffic problems in areas that doesn't currently have traffic issues

In the figures provided I couldn't see this data

- Traffic bottleneck at Dukes Cut

The bottle neck of traffic at Dukes Cut where this scheme literally runs out of road will cause increased levels of pollutants at this point. This has not been accounted for and needs to be. Static traffic and acceleration zones away from it as the bus lane is given free rein will create zones of pollution for cars' occupants.

Impact on Oxford Meadows SAC and SSSI's - the run off from the increased hard standing and roads' surface will have an effect on the surrounding flood plain which all feeds into the Oxford SAC meadows made special by the Oxford Clays . The very impermeability of the clays which make the meadows so special not only holds the pollutants from the run off but also creates conditions for increased flooding.

What would make more sense is not to build the new development of houses that is intended on the north side of the A40 and associated ribbon development . This area of Oxfordshire is constrained by Flood Zone 1,2 and 3 i.e. lots of rivers.

There's a reason that there are fewer house here. It's because it floods.

If it were to be about 'modal transport shift' a far better spend would be to do an in-depth survey of transport use in the area, bring back public transport for kids to schools and stop building large dumps of houses on farmland.

And while we're about it get tax and third second homes to free up some housing.

Rep 21

I wish to comment on this application.

1. I believe that this application is precipitate as it does not take into consideration the extra traffic that will be generated from the development already taking place in the west of Eynsham which will be greatly augmented when the Garden Village starts to be built in the near future. As the many of these houses are to meet Oxford City need for more houses it is presumed that the new residents will be travelling into the city. For this reason alone this application should be delayed.
2. The application does seem to be confined to short term measures to alleviate the present situation of congestion at morning rush hour when we all know that congestion also occurs at other times. A bus lane that can be changed to "ebb and flow" in response to traffic congestion, at least east bound in the morning and west bound in the evening does work elsewhere, I have seen it work in California and am told it works in Manchester.
3. Car pools can work given sufficient incentives to make it attractive.
4. Traffic using the A40 does not necessarily turn down Woodstock into Oxford. Much traffic turns left towards the A34. A slip road has been talked about for years and the implementation of such a road would greatly decrease the congestion at the Woodstock road roundabout.
5. It is hoped that any augmentation of the buses will take passengers to where they want to go, Oxford Parkway station, the Headington hospitals, Cowley, Brooks university, etcetera.

6. As Oxford City is a heritage site of national, and even international, importance is it inconceivable that perhaps priority can be given to gaining national funding to use this as an example of what can be achieved with what your representatives called "blue sky thinking". New methods of travelling into and around cities are used elsewhere why not here?

Rep 22

I wish to object to the planning application for a Park and Ride at Eynsham, and associated changes to the A40.

My objections are as follows:

1. The scheme does not take account of planned developments in the immediate vicinity (Garden Village and West Eynsham)
2. The P&R site would be better sited closer to Witney

The design of the P&R site is not future-proofed

1. The scheme aims to enable a shift of (mainly commuter) traffic between West Oxfordshire and Oxford City from car to public transport. The scheme is presented as a stand-alone solution to the A40 problem. But it ignores the major developments that are immediately adjacent, the Garden Village and West Eynsham. These will double the size of Eynsham and need more radical solutions (such as a light rail link) to discourage car use than a partial bus lane scheme. Specifically, criticism has been made of the design of the roundabout and access to the P&R site in relation to these developments in the submission by Stagecoach, with which I agree.¹ These design aspects criticised by Stagecoach, and the lack of an assessment of the developments of traffic flow, demonstrate that it is not being considered as part of a holistic approach to traffic problems, but a 'too little too late' fix.
2. While bus lanes on the A40 are undoubtedly part of the solution, there appears to be no clear argument for siting the P&R at Eynsham rather than Witney. Locating the P&R at Witney would remove the future need to dual-carriage the A40 from Witney Shores Green interchange to Eynsham P&R (adding bus lanes would be cheaper than dualling).
3. The design of the P&R site itself is problematic because it is not designed to function as a transport hub or interchange. It is not adequately designed for access on foot or by bicycle. These points are every well made by the submission from Stagecoach with which I agree. Nor is the currently planned provision for electric vehicles adequate given the need for a rapid shift to EVs.

Rep 23

As I have been unable to go directly on to the weblink and closing time for comments is midnight. I would just like to state that after attending the open meeting in Eynsham I feel that the A40 plan is ludicrous. A park and ride is not going to help the traffic as few of the people traveling are going to Oxford City.

Money should be spent on either dual carriage way or moving it completely.

We were constantly told at the meeting that there was a limited pot of money, with so much new housing not just in Eynsham but west Oxfordshire in general, this obviously needs to be increased. I found the meeting both patronising and a waste of 2 hours of my life!!

Rep 24

Dear Oxfordshire Planners,

I object most strongly to the proposed Park and Ride at Eynsham. This is the wrong place for it. It should be nearer Witney. As planned it will only draw traffic to the area, no one who lives in Eynsham (or the proposed developments north and west of it) will use it, they just need a bus stop! It will increase the flow of traffic through Eynsham (e.g. from Stanton Harcourt, Standlake, etc), the central streets of which are a medieval width and constantly chocked with traffic as things are now let alone when people from south of the village try to get to a Park and Ride on the north of it. It will increase the flow of traffic through the villages to the north of it (Freeland, Hanborough, etc.). This is a thoroughly bad scheme, presumably only chosen because the Council own the land.

Rep 25

Dear WODC / Planning Officers

At the PR event (you might prefer to call it a consultation) staged by WODC at Eynsham Village Hall on 12th July, the underpinning assumption was that our community should be pathetically grateful to you for securing funding for works on the A40. The corollary of this was that we must therefore accept any scheme, however flawed and damaging, in order not to lose this money. What a spurious argument ! A Park and Ride at Eynsham would do irrevocable harm and offer no benefit whatsoever. It would be an unjustifiable and unforgivable waste of public money. My reasons for objection are as follows:

- This application is clearly intended to pave the way for the building of thousands of new houses north of Eynsham. However, there is no guarantee that new residents would be limited in their vehicle usage, or that they would commute into Oxford. So the development would certainly generate a huge increase in local traffic movements but it cannot be assumed that it would generate demand for a Park and Ride.

Oxford City Ring Road is designated as an AQMA. We already know that Wolvercote roundabout is a pollution blackspot, where legal emission limits are regularly breached. Any development that knowingly adds to this situation would therefore break the law. This means that the Eynsham North development could not be built without provoking a legal challenge on air pollution grounds. Even if the Eynsham North proposal were to be abandoned, the Park and Ride application proposes additional pedestrian crossings and a new roundabout which would add to congestion and extend the pollution corridor.

- The Park and Ride would not be used because there would be no demand for it. Due to the geography and sheer cost of undertaking works at Duke's Cut, the east bound bus lane would be forced to end well short of Wolvercote Roundabout. Buses would then join the bottle neck of traffic.

On the west bound journey, buses would simply sit in the congestion along with all the other vehicles. In either direction, there would be no gain in time or convenience so no incentive to use the service.

- WODC assume that the Park and Ride would ease congestion because they wrongly imagine that traffic clogging the A40 between Eynsham and Wovlercote is travelling to and from the City Centre. This is not the case. By far the longest queues are always on the through lanes, either towards the A34 or the A40. The A40 is a trunk road between West London and Wales, it would serve no purpose to fiddle around with a few kilometres of bus lane when the overwhelming majority of congesting traffic is generated outside of the locale.

- There is no guarantee from any bus company that it would run buses on the proposed route. This is probably because professional transport providers realise there would be little demand for this service. Particularly, if the Eynsham North development went ahead and made an already heavily congested road, even worse. The business case for this bus lane isn't there.

- There are a great many people for whom using a bus or a bicycle may not always be an option. For example; trades people who need to carry equipment and materials, delivery drivers, disabled people, those doing a weekly shop or going to destinations for which there are no, or infrequent, linking onward options.

- In the unlikely event that there was uptake for the Park and Ride, it would generate just as many car journeys as currently occur, if not more. People would be driving across the county to leave their cars at Eynsham. Possibly, instead of taking a bus from their home village or town. Eynsham would become a rat run and our streets would struggle to cope with an influx of commuter vehicles. There would be congestion and pollution in residential areas and accident hotspots could well arise as the sheer volume of traffic overwhelmed local people going about their business.

- Building a bus lane would increase run off from road surfaces. This would have a damaging effect on adjacent flood plains which are vital feeds for the Oxford Meadows (SAC). The meadows are a significant and protected ecosystem due to conditions created by the impermeability of Oxford Clays. Unfortunately, the clays can also hold damaging pollutants from run off. Furthermore, if the meadow area is decreased by building this could increase flooding to harmful levels. This area of Oxfordshire is constrained by Flood Zone 1,2 and 3. It floods !

This Park and Ride proposal represents the same old short term, profit driven thinking that has led our planet to the brink of climate catastrophe. The scheme would be a disaster. You are proposing to build a bus lane to a bottle neck. There is no evidenced demand for the service and there isn't a company that wants to run the service. Insanity.

We really need to spend public money far more imaginatively and responsibly than this.

Rep 26

Please find attached a submission jointly prepared by the three District Councillors representing Eynsham, Cassington and South Leigh. We strongly object to the scheme.

Response to Oxfordshire County Council, from Cllrs James, Rylett and Levy.

As District Councillors for Eynsham and Cassington, we are writing to object to the scheme, both as a whole, and to individual features proposed.

We have been in frequent conversation with our constituents about the proposed Park & Ride and changes to the A40. Local public opinion on the proposals has been almost unanimously antagonistic, primarily on the grounds that they are unlikely to be effective, are a “waste of money” and a missed opportunity to take a better approach, such as building a light railway or rerouting the A40, as well as concerns about covering more local green space with tarmac.

It is universally considered that the A40 between Witney and Oxford has suffered from decades of under-investment. The daily traffic jams at Eynsham and Cassington significantly degrade the quality of life of residents and commuters alike, poisoning them with car fumes. In addition congestion is choking the local economy. Instead of the proposed tweaks put forward in this application, an overall strategy for the region is vital. First to co-ordinate all local proposed developments and secondly, because of the enhanced potential for economic growth and enhanced welfare if planned properly and with adequate investment.

Yet there is no coherent overall strategy for the area, and no clear vision articulated for the future. There needs to be more joined up thinking, bearing in mind in particular the proposed Garden Village and West of Eynsham developments, growing awareness of Climate Change, an ever shrinking local bus network and local imbalance between where people live and work.

The nature of the A40 is nothing less than fundamental to the success of the Garden Village and West Eynsham. How is the conflict to be resolved between the needs of people who need to travel from Witney, Gloucestershire and beyond towards Oxford and further afield, with the need of local residents to cross the A40 from north to south Eynsham, e.g. grade or possible bridge crossings? This proposal does not begin to answer that question, and is important because as the design of the Garden Village plans are beginning to take shape, one thing becoming clear is the importance of the links across the A40, for e.g. shared medical and educational facilities.

Why has the option of redirecting the A40 northwards, which could address these issues, never been assessed? There is no mention of it in the options described in Planning Statement May 2019.pdf Section 3.4.6

Will the road have to be dug up again when the Garden Village starts to be built, then again when the West of Eynsham starts and then again when more funding is found for a long-term solution?

This application has been driven and shaped not according to a set of requirements for what the area needs but by the vagaries of government funding mechanisms. In spite of the scale of the problems and the great potential benefits from appropriate improvements, funding has been pitifully inadequate, insufficient to solve the current issues, let alone deal with the proposed new housing.

Perception has not been helped by a lack of a public exhibition on the final application. We are aware that there were exhibitions in earlier phases of the project, but it is very disappointing that residents have not been given full opportunity to view the significant changes included in the final draft, especially since many of the documents are best viewed printed on A3 or larger, rather than on a computer screen. Nor were paper copies made available to local councillors.

Eynsham Parish Council felt compelled to take it upon themselves to print out selected documents from the application and display them in the village library.

And how is it possible to respond fully when not all the information is available? Most notably, the Business Case promised for many months is still not forthcoming. This suggests to us that that it has not been easy to justify the proposals on business grounds. The public have the right to see this document which outlines the 'why' of the scheme and to have the opportunity to respond and hold it to scrutiny. In addition, plans for several sections of the A40 appear to still be in draft status, such as the one just south of the Park and Ride, bordering the north-western edge of Eynsham (e.g. HIGHWAYS PRELIMINARY DESIGN GENERAL ARRANGEMENT drawing no.0101, Section 5 describes existing bus stop at the end of old Witney Road to be removed). When and how will the final details be made available to the public to view and have the opportunity to correct any errors?

Among residents' doubts to the success of the scheme are:

1. The closure of Horspath Lane in Cassington is currently under review. Until a decision is made on this aspect, then we cannot assess that portion of the scheme; another example of lack of co-ordination
2. The proposed bus lane reaches only as far as Dukes Cut, and hence does not give a "clear run" to Oxford. The improvements in bus punctuality are likely to be minimal, and hence the incentive to switch from car to bus lower than predicted.
3. The scheme has only small sections of bus lane heading westbound, and hence does little for the very bad traffic (including buses) heading west in the evenings.
4. The scheme fails to recognise that a high percentage of traffic on the A40 is through-traffic heading for the M40, A44 or A34.
5. There are numerous shortcomings in the design of the bus and bike lane between the Park and Ride and Dukes Cut, including not prioritising bicycle traffic at junctions, including the BP garage, Cuckoo Lane, and the roundabout with the B4044. This means that the scheme is not compliant with LTP4, is unsafe and fails to encourage active travel. We draw OCC's attention to the many observations on this feature from cyclist groups such as Cyclox. Many of our constituents in Eynsham cycle to Oxford and Headington, and their safety and convenience is compromised.
6. The proposals will only increase bus usage if there are increased numbers of buses, including services to locations other than Central Oxford, e.g. to Oxford Parkway station. Such bus routes are an aspiration but not certain. Indeed the number of bus routes via Eynsham has been decreasing recently.

Cycling

We would like cycling and walking encouraged into the Park and Ride, including from the east, site of the Garden Village. Specifically, we propose a cycle path starting at the vehicle access junction from Cuckoo Lane, running east-west directly south of the row of parking spaces marked 'B-B' and connecting with the central section of the Park and Ride (Planning Statement May 2019, Figure 5.1 Proposed P&R Layout).

There should also be charging docks for e-bikes, and links sought with local cycle hire companies in Oxford to try and find a way of allowing people to hire bikes, including e-bikes, at the site.

Alternatives

Why is the Park and Ride not located closer to Witney where there is suitable space at Shores Green? Unless the Park and Ride is adjacent to a larger population centre and comfortably reachable by residents by foot or bicycle it will only encourage more cars on the road.

Worse than that from a public transport perspective, the scheme risks making less likely what is surely the best long-term solution from an environmental point of view; some form of rapid transport system between Witney and Oxford, especially given the rapid growth of housing along the A40 in recent years and into the future. There have recently been new light railways introduced elsewhere in the country. We need more imagination about the opportunities and potential benefits of rail.

Biodiversity

We are very disappointed at the net loss of biodiversity, which seems completely unnecessary. The NPPF 2018 advises net biodiversity gains for new developments and we see no reason why this can't be achieved here, if not directly on the site then nearby, for example some imaginative thinking about a green corridor which links up with neighbouring wildlife sites such as Osney Mead Lake and Wytham Woods. Instead, the scheme offers only the bare minimum that can be got away with.

Light Pollution and Visual Impact

The Environmental Statement (Volume I)- Landscape and Visual describes several locations, including from Eynsham, which will suffer a 'major adverse (significant) effect' of light pollution or visual impact. In spite of this, mitigation proposals are unclear so should be tightened up, e.g. more clarity on dimming of lights at night, and direction of light.

The Environmental Statement (Volume I)- Landscape and Visual, Section 10.6.30 states that trees will take 15 years to grow to full height. How will the trees which screen the site be maintained? What happens if they fail to grow? Are they evergreen so as to maintain the screen in wintertime? The Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan states that any Park and Ride should "include full screening from all sides with trees and hedgerows typical of its location"

Flooding

We are concerned about potential flooding south-east of the site. The Environmental Statement (Volume I)- Road Drainage and the Water Environment states:

"The channel [on the eastern edge of the site adjacent to Cuckoo Lane] exhibits patches of high flood risk amongst the low to medium overall risk, with flows passing around an electricity substation outside the north-east border of the site, flowing through the site, before spilling over a localised low spot on the A40, potentially flooding property at the end of Old Witney Road, then entering an existing ditch to the south."

All necessary measures must be taken to reduce the risk of flooding to neighbouring properties, when taking into consideration the SuDS in the south-east corner of the site. Responsibility must be clarified at the earliest date for overseeing maintenance of all SuDS components to ensure that they continue to function effectively.

Finally, it seems bizarre that the County Council is able to make the decision on its own application. Any proposal, especially as significant as this one, surely requires independent assessment, scrutiny and review. It would therefore be more appropriate for the affected District Councils to have the powers to approve or reject the scheme, to make amendments or to apply conditions as they see fit. We are specifically concerned that the scheme is being assessed without the assumption that the developments planned for Eynsham, which are included in the WODC local plan, will go ahead, when these in reality will have an enormous impact on the use of the A40, the junctions required and the crossings which will need to be built and which must impact on bus and car movements. This is a fundamental flaw in the process.

Rep 27

Proposals will not solve present traffic flow problems

Use money to do K & M link roads as in your A40 summer2018 update

Rep 28

Total waste of money without solving the main problem. The only stretch of A40 from burford to London that is not dualled & the plans make the bottleneck even worse.

Think again & take into account all factors

The A40 is a major route from London to Gloucester & Wales & is used by heavy goods vehicles as well as trades vans in conducting their business. The only stretch between Burford & London, that is not dual carriageway, is this stretch under consultation. This factor is the main cause of a bottleneck & the many hold-ups that occur.

Your 'solution' is concentrated on adding to the volume of vehicles using this stretch – namely putting a park & ride here with its roundabout – thus slowing progress even more. Surely, any Park & Ride scheme should be nearer to Witney encouraging the cars from Witney, Burford, Carterton & outlying villages off the road.

Most vehicles do not go into Oxford, but to places further afield – Headington, Cowley etc. None of the present bus routes would give anyone a way of getting to those destinations. Most able-bodied people, in Eynsham, use the bus services already.

I am one of the 23/24 care drivers in this area. None of the clients I drive can use your suggested facilities. Care drivers go to several sites in Witney, Oxford & into the county. Some of these sites are not a bus route of any sort. Most of these people cannot walk to a bus-stop; they have wheelchairs etc and/or cannot see well enough to get around easily.

Your 7km solution is only going to exacerbate the problems that exist, without solving anything, only adding extra time to our journeys. Extra traffic (mostly buses), narrowing of an already narrow road & causing an even worse bottle-neck at Duke's Cut.

This scheme is a total waste of meagre resources & solves no problems or improves the environment.

Rep 29

park and ride service too far from Oxford

Another roundabout

Queue to Eynsham to park to wait for a bus

Scale too big

Piecemeal solutions without a complete end game. Stop wasting our money. Solutions instead of moving cars from one place to another

Rep 30

I emphatically object to this planning application. I realise the planners have done a lot of work on this project, but their energy and expertise has been wasted on a poorly thought out project. I have attended public meetings and listened to County Councillors and Planning Officers try desperately to justify this plan. I have been involved in much larger and more expensive projects in my working life and I have found it is much cheaper to tear up the drawings for an ill conceived scheme than to try and correct the mistakes later when the plan has been built. It seems pointless to go into detail of the pitfalls of the plans here, the councillors have heard them over and over again. Unfortunately the planners seem to consider that the public do not understand or are not able to grasp the details of the plans and they, the councillors and planners, know better. You do not need to be an expert to see the flaws in this project and there were many flaws pointed out the meeting at Eynsham on Friday 12th July. It is time to withdraw this application, go back the drawing board and come up with a comprehensive plan for the A40. You may not have the money to implement it completely at present, but we must have a long term plan to aim for. This piecemeal development wastes time and money and solves nothing.

Rep 31

Poorly planned with no thought for numbers/termination of bus lane! Let's do it properly!

Rep 32

Radical action on climate change is being urged upon us from all sides, so it is a major mistake to prioritise investment in traffic flow over environmental concerns.

Rep 33

I believe that it has been noted that the majority of east bound A40 traffic proceeds past the Wlovercote roundabout to the east side of Oxford and beyond.

Rep 34

A40 PARK AND RIDE BUS SCHEME R3.0057/19

I would like to comment as follows.

While it is certainly the case that some improvement to the A40 traffic scheme is needed, it seems extraordinary that OCC and WODC are not working in alignment to deliver the scheme in association with the plans to build a new village to the north of the A40 at Eynsham and additional housing to the west of Eynsham which will deliver c. 2,750 houses, and thus increase substantially the traffic on this route.

This is particularly the case given that many of the houses are to satisfy the 'unmet' housing need of Oxford city. It is vital that any plans for the A40 take on board such future needs. It should be noted that Stagecoach also comments on the fact that consideration is given to these extension plans at the outset.

It is also the case that the future dualling of the A40 must be taken into account so as not to waste taxpayers' money on a temporary fix that will then be relatively soon demolished and reworked.

In addition:

- a) The eastbound bus lane to Duke's Cut and the addition of 4 traffic light crossings mean that at peak times there will remain – and possibly increase – a build-up of queueing traffic.
- b) While Stagecoach is in broadly in favour of the scheme, there is no commitment to 18 buses per hour until 2031 and this is dependent on efficient entry and exit to the P&R and ensuring that the P&R is implemented as part of the Garden Village plans.
- c) There is no effort to address car traffic. Many vehicles are not travelling to Oxford itself, but are using the A40 as a through route from the west to London and points east. It is critical that any traffic improvement scheme address these needs as these vehicles will not be shifting to bus travel.
- d) Commercial vehicles will not be making a 'modal shift' to bus travel. It is essential that a survey of the number of commercial vehicles travelling along the A40 at peak times be made and consultation of their needs be made so that they can be addressed.
- e) Bus journey into Oxford is relatively expensive for those who do not have a bus pass. If more than one person is travelling, it is cheaper by car. OCC/WODC must give some thought to the cost of bus travel so that there is a real incentive to move to bus travel rather than use cars.
- f) Bus travel is not going to replace commuter travel to the major sites to the east of the city, including the JR and Churchill hospitals, Headington, and Oxford Brookes University. They need a direct route from the west, not into the city centre from where they would have to make an additional journey. An alternative bus journey of over an hour is not an attractive proposition for such commuters.
- g) Positioning of the Park & Ride at Eynsham – now for only 850 cars – does not make sense, as it will mean that those from Witney and Carterton will be travelling to Eynsham to take a bus, increasing car traffic. It is already the case that some commuters park in the village to get the bus to Oxford. It would be far better to have a Park & Ride either only at Witney, with an Eynsham bus pick-up stop, or to have Park & Rides at both Witney and Eynsham.
- h) There is no provision of cycle lane entry to the Park & Ride, and this must be incorporated, along with cycle parking.
- i) It is essential that the additional buses travel through the village, otherwise those in the village itself will be making additional journeys to the Park & Ride (there must be a commitment to continuing the S1 service which is well used and serves the central village and schoolchildren and commuters).
- j) Given that commuters from outlying villages already park in Eynsham and pick up buses there, might consideration be given to bus services that connect these villages direct to Oxford city, thereby obviating these unnecessary journeys by private vehicle?
- k) There must also be access to the Park & Ride from the south at the roundabout (as also noted by Stagecoach).

- l) The cycleway needs to be sufficiently broad so that those who are deigned to consider a shift to cycling feel safe and also are not subject to fumes from commuter vehicle traffic, which would be an unhealthy option. A budget must be allocated for maintenance of the cycleway including surfacing, cutting back trees/shrubs, etc.
- m) Why has the BikeSafe cycle lane to Oxford via Farmoor which would likely be very well used by those from Eynsham, Farmoor and other points to south not been included as part of the plans? This would alleviate private vehicle use, and remove some overuse of the A40.
- n) The eastbound link road to Peartree P&R is not included, and so traffic must still go to Wolvercote and then queue at that roundabout to turn left to Peartree.
- o) Consideration and inclusion of links to Long Hanborough station must be included from the outset.

Rep 35

Comments on Planning Application Ref: R3.0057/19: Construction of a Park & Ride at Eynsham and A40 Road Alterations and Improvements to form Bus Lanes, Cycle Lane, etc between Eynsham and Dukes Cut Canal

1. The public consultation period for this application is totally inadequate and unfair for such a huge planning application as this one. It is impossible to comment on such a massive amount of documents so my personal comments will only touch on what I believe are some of the more significant failings of the application.
2. Although I understand that the Council has asked its consultants to design a scheme within the potential budget available, and I commend the attempts that have been made for such a complex scheme. However I believe it makes a folly of sensible strategic planning for the future when trying to resolve the problems of the whole A40 route between Witney and Oxford by 'tinkering with the bit in the middle' between Eynsham and Dukes Cut canal. This piecemeal approach cannot succeed until such time as a comprehensive scheme for the whole of the Witney to Oxford route is accepted as being the only logical solution.
3. It is important to acknowledge that the majority of the current traffic travelling towards the Wolvercote roundabout is not heading into Oxford but is either turning left towards Peartree or going straight on towards London, with a significant proportion turning off at the Marston flyover to the hospitals and Oxford Brookes or continuing towards Cowley. The Park & Ride into Oxford from Eynsham will therefore only have a small effect on the thousands of vehicles that pass along that stretch of road every day, and there cannot be any more than a reduction of 850 vehicles even if the proposed P & R is full to capacity.
4. I understand that the County Council's adopted Local Transport Plan sets out the underlying rationale to effectively intercept traffic from outlying areas well before they reach congested highways approaching the Oxford Ring Road in order that as many car-borne journeys are transferred onto high capacity 'rapid transit' public transport. This makes a mockery of the proposed Eynsham P & R when heavy congestion begins towards the eastern end of the Witney bypass. A Park & Ride close to the south-east of Witney would therefore be a much more logical step to reduce the traffic load on the already congested stretch of the A40 from Witney to Eynsham which will become more and more congested by further housing developments in Witney and beyond.

5. It is of great concern to me that the stretch of road between the Witney bypass and the proposed Eynsham P & R could remain as it is for possibly tens of years or more before additional funding is available. Also the so-called dualling of the eastbound A40 from Eynsham to Dukes Cut will still be a single carriageway for thousands of queuing vehicles whilst at least a few hundred individuals who have used the Eynsham P & R have the luxury of sailing past on the buses – until they get to Dukes Cut. The

length of road between there and the Wolvercote roundabout has to be a massive priority otherwise there will be no point in much of the work on the A40 from Eynsham. Unless I've misunderstood something, I presume the P & R buses will have to queue with all the other queuing vehicles trying to get to the Wolvercote roundabout.

6. It can clearly be seen at more-or-less any time of day or night that the inside lane leading up to the Wolvercote roundabout always has the longest queues because it needs to turn left towards Peartree to travel north and south. A lot of that traffic comprises heavy lorries that can be quite slow moving forward and negotiating the corner. This exacerbates the problems further back where the road is reduced to a single carriageway over the Dukes Cut bridge and under the A34 Western Bypass. So the P & R buses are going to be substantially held up negotiating that relatively short bottleneck.

7. I understand that any work in improving that situation cannot be funded in the immediate future which is a great worry because following years of construction chaos on the A40 upgrading a few years ago we are going to have to endure years of more upgrading, and yet there will still be this bottleneck leading up to the Wolvercote roundabout. It is obviously imperative that the potential spur heading northwards from the A40 to lead onto the existing dual carriageway that links the Wolvercote roundabout with Peartree is planned and funded as a major priority, otherwise the Eynsham to Duke's Cut construction chaos that we will all have to endure will appear to have been a complete waste of time, money and frustration to thousands of road users.

8. The western bound journey from Wolvercote Roundabout to Eynsham and further west is also a very significant problem which has to be endured every weekday from early/mid-afternoon onwards into the evening. I seriously believe that the short lengths of bus lane before Cassington and before Eynsham will have a relatively minor improvement to the total travel times along that section of road.

9. Finally, more local to Eynsham, there appears to have been no consideration for the proposed spine road through the West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (SDA) and how this would link into the A40. This large unwelcome addition of 1,000(?) houses will increase enormously the traffic through Eynsham's often narrow roads from the north, south and east. It is illogical for this to be ignored when the first phase of the development is already under way and has caused endless and severe disturbance to existing residents on that edge of the village .

Surely this access must be an essential part of the infrastructure for the SDA and there should be no further housing construction than the current phase until that road is in place?

Rep 36

Eynsham residents bus to Oxford via the toll bridge. 90% of A40 traffic goes north or east when it reaches Dukes Cut. The proposed bus lanes will be underused and slow traffic flow. The P&R should be before the dual carriageway ends.

Rep 37

As consideration been made with respect to the extension of Old Witney Road into the Nursery housing development, especially with regard to the proposed pedestrian crossing ?

Rep 38

The Society is broadly supportive of the construction of an eastbound bus lane towards Oxford, but does not believe that the measures in the present application will do anything to reduce congestion, or even to reduce bus journey times significantly. Details follow below.

The Society is cautiously supportive of the partial westbound bus lane, but is sceptical that two short stretches will achieve anything significant. There is also concern that they may adversely affect the south-side cycle path.

The Society strongly opposes the construction of a Park & Ride at Eynsham, on the ground that it make no sense to site it there. Details follow below.

The Society is sceptical that the proposals in the application will encourage significant modal shift to cycling as a means of commuting to Oxford. Details follow below.

The Society regrets that the application does not include the proposed eastbound spur from the A40 to Peartree junction, which would be the single most effective means of reducing congestion by removing most through traffic from the Wolvercote roundabout approach. In our opinion this should be the first measure implemented.

It is particularly unsatisfactory that so little time has been allowed for comment on the application, given the vast amount of accompanying documentation and the absence of any summaries. These comments are necessarily based on the "Planning Statement", the "Design and Access Statement", and some hitherto-unpublicised facts which came to light at the Public Meeting in Eynsham on 12th July. **We formally request that the deadline for comment be extended until at least the end of July so that we can examine the material in greater detail.**

The Eastbound Bus Lane

We welcome measures which will improve bus journey times to Oxford and encourage modal shift away from commuting by private car. However:

- Most commuter car traffic is not going to the city centre, where the City Council's policy is to make parking difficult and expensive. Evidence for this is the very short queue at the Wolvercote roundabout (even in peak hours) in the right-hand lane to turn down the Woodstock Road. In contrast, the other two lanes (left to Peartree and the northbound M40, and possibly to Peartree P&R), and straight on (via Northway to the southbound M40 and the major employment sites in Headington and Cowley) are long at all hours of the day but particularly during the morning peak. This is exacerbated by the excessively long red period and short green period of the eastbound traffic lights at the roundabout.

- It is unfortunate that no adequate or credible breakdown of the traffic figures has ever been published – simply treating as “Oxford” the flows to the city centre, Headington and Cowley provides no evidence on which to base a solution. With the eastbound bus lane, the city centre could be well served by S2 buses along the A40 and down Woodstock Road, subject to the constraints of merging back into general traffic at Duke’s Cut, waiting to turn right at the roundabout, and the peak-hour congestion in Woodstock Road itself. This would probably be a more attractive route than the S1 via Farmoor and the Botley Road, certainly for Cassington and Hanborough commuters.
- However, without an ongoing bus lane round the Ring Road to Headington (hospitals, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford University Old Road Medical Campus) and Cowley, (BMW), it is unclear that bus journey times to these major employment destinations would be short enough or predictable enough to encourage people away from car use – buses would simply get stuck in the congested traffic heading for the southbound M40. Current bus journey times from Eynsham to Headington (S1 via Farmoor and 4 from city centre) are often in excess of 80 minutes and need halving to encourage modal shift.
- We understand that there is an intention to provide an extended bus lane at some point in the future when funds may be available, though this does not appear to be stated in the application and can at best be speculative. Without a commitment to this, the bus lane will achieve negligible reduction of A40 congestion and probably little reduction in bus journey times.
- It is deeply unsatisfactory that the application appears to provide no details of the bus routes and frequencies which are envisaged – figures ranging from 6 to 18 buses per hour along the bus lane itself have been quoted elsewhere at various times. We appreciate that this depends on commercial operators such as Stagecoach, but there must have been discussions and modelling. **The success of the bus lane in achieving modal shift is crucially dependent on providing a frequent, reliable service from near commuters’ homes to their work or shopping destinations**, but it is impossible to tell from this application whether that can be achieved.
- There is no indication that the plan takes into account the large amount of extra A40 commuter traffic that will be generated by new housing in Eynsham (3,200 houses, of which 2,750 are specifically for Oxford’s unmet housing need and will therefore generate up to twice that many commuters) and some 8,000 further west in Oxfordshire (figures from West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 policy H1). As a result A40 congestion will be considerably worse than at present, and it is impossible to believe that the limited measures in this application will provide even a reduction back to present levels.

The Westbound Bus Lane

This has previously been mooted as a future project, and we are surprised to find it included here. The two short stretches proposed are clearly intended to get buses quickly past the queue at the Cassington traffic lights, which since they were installed have always caused major tailbacks disproportionate to the small amount of traffic entering or leaving Cassington. A separate solution to this issue is long overdue. We do not object to these sections of bus lane provided that they do not adversely affect the south-side cycle path (not a “footpath” as it was frequently described by an OCC representative at the 12th July meeting – there are signs instructing cyclists to use it), which (though woefully substandard) is the one preferred by cyclists as it avoids two unnecessary and difficult crossings of the A40 and is less affected by oncoming headlights on winter evenings.

We would oppose any future extension of a westbound bus lane past the Eynsham eastern bypass if it brought traffic nearer to houses in north Eynsham.

The Park & Ride at Eynsham

We strongly oppose the siting of the proposed Park & Ride at Eynsham, for a number of reasons:

- It makes no sense to site a Park & Ride at a major population centre halfway between Witney (where much of the traffic originates) and Oxford. Eynsham is currently the fourth-largest settlement in West Oxfordshire (West Oxon. Local Plan Examination Matter 6, April 2017) and is set to more than double in size if the so-called “Garden Village” is built. The argument in para. 3.4.10 of the Design and Access Statement may justify building P&R sites further from Oxford, but does **not** justify building one at Eynsham.
- Commuters from Witney will have to endure 6 miles of congested traffic before reaching the P&R, and may well be reluctant to switch modes at that point. Even if the dual carriageway were extended as is proposed (though not in this application), there would still be congestion to negotiate. A much better solution would be to site the P&R further west and start the bus lane there. Possible locations are the outskirts of Witney, or near the existing end of the dual carriageway. Either would avoid the massive waste of taxpayers’ money (£42 million has been quoted) which the proposed dual carriageway extension would engender, and would improve journey times by using the dedicated bus lane for as much as possible of the journey.
- Commuters from Eynsham (including the so-called “Garden Village – actually by definition a dormitory for Oxford commuters) would be unlikely to use the P&R if they have easy access to a good A40 bus service – this should be built into the “Garden Village” from the outset, though it is more problematic for the existing Eynsham village where streets are narrow and some houses are nearly a mile south of the A40.
- In either case, **it is highly undesirable for Eynsham commuters to have to drive to the P&R to catch a bus**. This sort of short journey should be discouraged at all costs as it clogs the narrow village streets and (until electric cars are universal) causes disproportionate levels of pollution from cold engines. It also makes a mockery of the concept of modal shift if commuting by bus starts or finishes with a car journey (and this is a general criticism of Park & Ride schemes, which should be seen as a temporary step on the way towards integrated transport rather than a long-term solution).
- The solution for Eynsham commuters is either to divert some of the A40 buses through the village or to run a (preferably electric) shuttle service through the village to/from the A40 bus stops, with through ticketing available. This could also extend to the villages north of get A40 and south of Eynsham, eliminating congestion still further. **Again, it is vital to know what bus services are envisaged**. Interestingly, **the latter solution entirely eliminates any justification for a Park & Ride at Eynsham** – instead, all that would be needed is a small bus interchange hub just off the A40, or possibly one on each side. It is also a much better long-term solution in terms of emissions and congestion. A shuttle to the outlying villages would probably require subsidy, but that should not be seen as an insuperable problem. It might in any case be made sustainable by allowing proportionate amounts of future housing in these villages once transport is available, rather than concentrating it in Witney and Eynsham.

Cycling

Some comment on the cycling provisions is in order – the author has first-hand experience of cycle commuting to Oxford from 1977 to 1986 and from 2003 to 2005, and to Headington from 2005 to 2017. During the first of these periods the A40 cycle paths were unsuitable for any wheeled traffic. By 2003 they were usable, but have remained substandard ever since.

Modal shift to cycling on these routes should be encouraged, but in practice the opportunity for significant shift is strictly limited unless considerable care is taken.

- Few cyclists are prepared to take on the distance (Witney to Oxford centre ~12 miles, Eynsham to Headington 10), or indeed the time required, though the latter journey can be done in 50 minutes by a moderately fit cyclist. This may improve as electrically-assisted cycles (e-bikes) become cheaper and more popular, though higher speeds may raise safety issues.
- Few cyclists are prepared to commute in very wet or cold weather, however good the facilities.
- The cycle paths must be of high quality (a much better surface is required than for motor vehicles), well-drained **and gritted in winter**. Overhanging vegetation is a particular problem as water dripping from in cold weather creates black ice. This is likely to be a particular problem in the current plans, where shoe-horning in a bus lane apparently requires the cycle path to be within 0.5m of the hedge. Another problem with this proximity is eye-level brambles which grow out horizontally at 3 inches per day.
- Cyclists have made the point many times that **they want the main cycle path to be on the south side**, not the north side. This avoids two unnecessary and difficult crossings of the A40 on the way from Eynsham to anywhere in Oxford, and also reduces glare from oncoming headlights when travelling west on winter evenings. It is disappointing that this input from cyclists has been consistently ignored.
- Crossings at junctions and side roads need to be well designed – those at the remodelled Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts are an object lesson on how **not** to design a cycle crossing. Wherever possible, cyclists should have priority (though cameras may be needed to enforce this as some motorists ignore even signalised crossings).
- Pedestrians may prefer a grade-level crossing to a bridge, but this is not the case for cyclists, who would rather take on the ascent and descent than wait at traffic lights. Both should be provided at appropriate points.
- Mixed use of paths by cyclists and pedestrians is undesirable and even dangerous, as the speed differential can be more than 6 to 1 – far more than between cycles and cars.

We strongly urge that local cycling groups such as Cyclox be actively involved in the detailed design.

Rep 39

The A40 Park & Ride + Bus Lane scheme aims to get more people using buses. To do this the Park & Ride element isn't necessary and funds could be diverted to making a bus lane from Witney.

Rep 40

I have tried to read online the application and get some sort of perspective of the plans, but as they are all in black and white it

is impossible - why no colour showing the areas concerned?

You quote peak hours on the A40 of 8 to 9 in the morning and 5 to 6 in the evening. Sorry but its more like 7 to 9:30 in the morning

and 16:30 and 18:30 in the evening and various other times during the day. I think you do not use this A40 at all!

I live in Eynsham (since 1983) and before that Witney from 1975 to 1983, so I know a bit about the local traffic.

The A40 is totally inadequate for the current volume of traffic that use it and has been for 30 years. A dual carriage way should have been built in 1992 when plans were agreed on the blue route only for funding to be withdrawn. It sill desperately needs this road to be made into a duel carriageway - then for dukes cut to have a feeder road to the A34. This is the only way to improve the traffic flow on the A40 - then for OCC to work out how to deal with the traffic in north Oxford.

I say this as you will now add to the congestion that will occur by building this park and ride and a partial bus lane. First you slow down traffic with the new roundabout at the Curbridge for access to West Witney. Then you will increase the number of cars heading to the new P&R to catch a bus. You then assume these people will use this facility - or walk or bus as they are going to Oxford - this is a false assumption, only a small percentage of travellers will do this and are going to Oxford.

Following on from the meeting in Eynsham last Thursday 11th July. The main reason for building the P&R and a partial bus lane is to increase the flow of traffic. How on earth will this be done if you build a new roundabout at the junction of Cuckoo Lane, then construct 4 controlled crossings across the A40 !!!!! This will completely and utterly slow down the traffic around Eynsham i.e. it will increase the congestion further!

PLEASE GET THE MONEY TO BUILD THE CORRECT ROAD FOR THE CORRECT AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC i.e. A DUEL CARRIAGEWAY FROM THE WITNEY BYPASS TO OXFORD AND BEYOND.

Rep 41

Introduction

I support the Park and Ride concept to help relieve pressure on the A40, but I object to planning application R3.0057/19 and in particular to the proposed Aecom design ref impact on Residents / users of the A40 Lay-By located opposite the proposed Eynsham Park & Ride roundabout.

I believe design modifications are needed to improve the safety for Lay-By users, as this scheme leaves both residents and the general public with a very dangerous access / egress driving situation.

Background

Our house, Derrymerrye Farm, entrance and exit uses the Old Witney Rd A40 lay-by. We are situated nearly opposite to the proposed Park & Ride Roundabout. We have lived here for 26 years.

There are 2 other properties here, one other residential, 'The Long Barn' and a Business premises, 'Control Developments', located next door to us. All vehicles from these Properties turn directly East or West onto the A40. We have 4 adults living here with a car each and the Long Barn residents have 2 cars. 'Control Developments' regularly has multiple cars including the owners, staff, visitors plus regular delivery / collection trucks etc.

This long high capacity Lay-By is well used and has a regular weekday Burger Van. The Lay-by is very popular with Car drivers for journey 'breaks', Truckers who also use it for overnight stops, Van drivers and miscellaneous other members of the Public.. (Note: there are no proper Toilet facilities provided along the Lay-By, which means people utilise hedges and grass verges as necessary, which is not pleasant for residents or other lay-by users.)

A) Road Safety Concerns explained:

I have raised Road Safety concerns for Lay-By users at various OCC Bus Lane Public Consultations in Eynsham over the past 30 months or so with Odele Parsons & Lydia Herbert both in emails and Raymond Cheung and Odele at the Consultations and on OCC /WODC Feedback Forms. At the last Consultation he attended, I personally offered to drive Mr. Cheung into and out of the Lay-By to demonstrate the problem after the Consultation, which he declined. (Please could I suggest, Ms Hudson, that you try some turns into and out of the is Lay-By to experience these issues I have raised.)

AECOM / OCC Highways, seem to have completely forgotten about Residents / Users of the Lay-By in this Roundabout design, as I cannot see any reference to a full assessment of the Lay-By included in this Planning Application.

i) Eastern Lay-By exit to Oxford:

a) The design is deficient and unsafe, as for some obscure reason, it does not allow lorries to turn left or right out of the Eastern end of the existing lay-by. If Lorries /Artics & Vehicles with trailers / horse trailers / caravans take the proposed sharp left turn, they will then (i) obstruct the Lay-By exit to vehicles from Oxford direction turning into the Lay-By and (ii) straddle both west bound lanes approaching the roundabout, again, potentially obstructing A40 traffic. This will be a dangerous manoeuvre particularly at peak times

b) Missed Turns: Vehicles, particularly Artics / Lorries travelling to Oxford having missed, the Western end Lay-By entrance currently use the Eastern entrance, turning across 2 lanes of traffic, to enter the lay-by. This is a tight turn now and I have seen Artics reversing back into the A40 traffic flow when they can't make this turn in one go, which is very dangerous. (See e.g. above attachments (1) Shows an artic turning in, which also reversed back into the A40 and (2) Various Artic / Lorry tyre marks on the road surface clearly shown entering or exiting the Lay-By at acute angles. This manoeuvre will be impossible with the proposed design, but drivers will likely try it. This lane crossing manoeuvre happens at both the Eastern and Western ends.

c) Elms Place: The design shows a cross hatched centre lane after the proposed Elms Place filter lane, currently this crosshatched area does not stop overtaking which is a regular occurrence in both directions when exiting our Lay-By. Could Traffic Islands be designed into the centre lane?

My family have all seen near misses with motorbikes/vehicles turning into and out of the lay-by or just overtaking slower moving traffic by using the centre turning lane. Sometimes, when turning right, drivers will slow to let you cross in front of them, only to find a car or motorbike overtakes them to meet you in the centre lane. For this reason, we do not readily accept an offer to drive out, preferring a clear view east and west along the road prior to exit.

d) Vehicles leaving the Elms Place Office road exit will still be likely turn 90 degrees right over the cross hatched centre lane, as they do now with the existing layout, rather than the long way round by turning left to use the roundabout. If they turn left, it will mean Lay-By users chances of turning out will take even e longer and more difficult.

ii) Western Lay-By exit to Witney

a) Now it is obviously safer turning left out of the Western end of the Lay-By to travel to Witney, which remains the same with this design. However, the right turn from Witney direction into and out of the Lay-By in the Oxford direction offer the opportunity for safety improvements by including an additional centre turning lane. This could also be extended for vehicles/lorries turning right out of the Lay-By towards Oxford and then merge with the LH lane? Currently, drivers have to be very careful when turning into the Lay-By, as the traffic rapidly backs up behind and on occasions a motorbike will try to ride along the RHS as drivers turn right. Cars occasionally undertake you as well using the grass verge, which could be resolved by a new middle lane.

iii) Rat Runs: The Lay-By will potentially provide a very convenient 'Rat Run' for West bound drivers to avoid delays at the Park and Ride Roundabout. Other than 'Road Humps' which would make residents lives a misery, could 15 mph speed restrictions / Limited use signs be added at the entrance? Cars and Lorries tend not to slow down as they enter the Western end of the Lay-By from the A40. I have followed cars in as I slow down, who are exceeding 50MPH. This is hazardous for other parked drivers exiting their own vehicles. There is a short footpath near the entrance, but Lorries regularly Park on it or obstruct it. Thus Pedestrians / Cyclists / Horse riders, children, Pushchairs etc. are forced to walk in the road on the outside of the Lorries, again very dangerous as oncoming traffic turns into the Lay-By.

B) Other Concerns

a) Crossing Point: The Proposed West of Eynsham SDA. The proposed Park and Ride crossing point near Cuckoo lane ignores future new residents from the Eynsham SDA safely and easily accessing the site. The proposed Pedestrian / cycle crossing near Cuckoo lane is too far along the A40 to encourage new SDA residents to access the Park and Ride on foot / bicycle. Logically relocating this crossing nearer to the proposed roundabout would seem to me to be a better proposal.

Otherwise SDA residents will likely dangerously short cut across the A40 near the roundabout entrance anyway. I suggest a design provision should be included for a new crossing* now. The logical crossing point for all Eynsham village /SDA users must surely be near the entrance to the roundabout?

b) Toilet / other Facilities. The Crossing suggested in a* above, could also be utilised for Lorry Drivers /other users to access the Washroom and other facilities at the Park and Ride?

c) Expansion? Is there space for the Park and Ride to be expanded in the Future? This was needed due to popularity at Thornhill, Oxford P&Ride?

d) OGV: Why is there no direct access road from the Oxford Garden Village into the P&Ride, thus avoiding the A40? A small entrance is shown from Cuckoo Lane, but no exit. This will force the Cuckoo Lane Long Hanborough traffic exiting the P&Ride to use and congest the A40?

e) The Entrance to the A40 Nursery site : next to the Elms Place exit as shown is incorrect as this has been already had Planning Permission approved for the Nursery site exit to be routed along the Eynsham Village Old Witney Rd., NOT directly onto the A40?

f) Cuckoo Lane: Vehicles turning right turn out towards Witney direction. How do vehicles exiting Cuckoo lane avoid driving over the proposed central lane cross hatchings? No clear central lane is provided for this manoeuvre.

In Summary, the AECOM design and the planning application generally ignores the existing A40 Old Witney Rd. Lay-By, which is directly affected and made more unsafe by the proposed scheme. For these reasons, I object to the planning application in the strongest terms.

Rep 42

As a resident of the village I wish to register my objection to this scheme on the basis that it is poorly thought out, does not reflect best practice, will increase congestion, does not take account of the planned changes to Eynsham village, lacks vision and is a misuse of public funds. I am content this response is made public.

It is **poorly thought out** for a number of reasons, key ones include:

- the introduction of two further pedestrian crossings between the lights at Witney Road in the west and the current Eynsham roundabout which will increase congestion and slow traffic in both directions. There will be three lights controlled crossings in less than 0.8mile with at least one of them spanning both carriageways so needing to stop traffic for longer than the other two and mean that both directions will have to be stopped unlike the other two. It is unclear why these are needed since if it relates to existing bridle ways they could continue to use the crossing at the junction with Witney Road and if it is about new development to the north runs counter to what has been said that these plans do not take account of future development.
- the siting of the park and ride at the top of the rise coming from Witney before the turning into Cuckoo Lane is at the slowest part of the A40 around Eynsham as HGVs slow up. Introducing the entrance to the Park and Ride at this point will lead to a further slowing of traffic prior to it then stopping for the existing lights.

It **does not reflect best practice** as Councillor Constance herself stated at the public meeting on 12 July where she said far more effective would be provision of a series of smaller park and ride sites along the A40 so that people can access the parking as near as possible to their start points e.g. Carterton and Witney as well as a small Eynsham provision.

It **will increase congestion** since the increase in bus traffic along the A40 by the S2 and S7 and its free movement will be limited by the ability of traffic to flow west on the return journeys. Since there is limited west direction 'bus only' capacity in these plans the slow traffic we see now can only be compounded and as on any normal day the queues run back eastwards to beyond Cassington and often much further then nothing is gained, indeed bus passengers along with everyone else will take even longer than now to come back.

To say as Councillor Constance did that changes to the westward direction are planned in some future, as yet unknown project, ably demonstrates how poorly thought through this scheme is currently. This is wasting money in the here and now.

It **takes no account of planned housing development** west and north of Eynsham and the development that is already happening at Thornbury Road in Eynsham, at Witney and at Cassington. These are adding to the volume of traffic daily which the plans fail to acknowledge. The plans also ignore the planned growth which is within less than five years and so to go ahead with these plans represents misuse of public funds. These funds are not some gift they are taxes that we, the public, have paid and do not want to see wasted on short term, poorly thought through plans.

That the **plans lack vision** in terms of considering the environmental, human and social costs. This poorly constructed scheme will take presumably 12-18 months to complete during which time all traffic will be subject to substantial delays, loss of productivity as a result and increased pollution from static traffic (as the recent disastrous resurfacing of the A40 between Eynsham and Witney demonstrated where delays were up to an hour) and buses will be less effective than normal! Once complete it will be fit for purpose for a very limited time before the new housing at Eynsham starts to impact and the need for safe crossings for children going to schools with access roads to and from the new developments are needed. Again demonstrably a misuse of public funds.

The plans give no consideration to **additional and alternative options** such as:

- changing traffic routes, such as reopening the old road from Cassington to Eynsham;
- initiatives such as developing car sharing schemes, imposing tariffs on cars coming into Oxford city itself and incentivising buses for independent schools in the city;
- taking forward thinking for a railway based solution;
- or even transferring the A40 back to Highways England by redefining the road as the trunk road that it is in all but name;

For all these reasons it is clear that the planned scheme reflects a limited vision and a misuse of public funds.

Oxfordshire County Council need to withdraw these plans – accepting that the possible funds will be lost – and do a thorough Oxfordshire wide review of the A40 from Carterton to Oxford.

Rep 43

The money set aside for the P&R should be spent on extending the bus lane to Witney instead, where many commutes into Oxford begin. Siting a P&R at Eynsham will, I believe, turn out to be a short-sighted mistake.

Rep 44

In view of the climate emergency, as well as the looming biodiversity catastrophe worldwide, highlighted in March the UN, government at every level is being urged to embark on 'transformative change'. By 'transformative change' the UN means 'fundamental, system-wide reorganization across technological, economic and social factors, including paradigms, goals and values.'

Economic growth as a sole measure of progress is now recognised both by the UN and the World Economic Forum as being largely to blame for the environmental and social problems of today's world.

The A40 meeting in Eynsham on July 12th, indicates that Oxfordshire County Council has failed to understand the new realities of the world we live in. The expenditure of £38m for a scheme that is recognised:

- not to relieve congestion until more funding is found
- will condemn local people to several years of road works for not beneficial outcome.
- unrealistically hopes to encourage people onto buses, since in the above scenario the waiting time will make it not worth it.
- unrealistically anticipates the provision of a bus every 4 minutes from a private bus company with no subsidy. This will mean that buses at certain times of day will travel half empty and will be uneconomical.
- does nothing to reduce the non-local traffic and commercial traffic
- fails to address the massive population growth for West Oxfordshire

I urge the County Council not to waste £38m of tax payers money on this scheme even though it is available. And reassess the infrastructure needs from a local, regional, and national perspective, taking into account the projected growth and the fact that Oxford can take no more cars. Some sort of train/ guided tram can be the only solution in the long term and according to sensible planning reasoning the most cost effective.

Rep 45

I do not support this proposal for the following reasons:

It lacks any of the statistical underpinning would required for any due diligence. Simply stating the number of vehicles that use the A40 every day fails to address the key questions of who is intended to use this P&R, where to they come from, how many, how often, etc, There is complete silence on how the planned new villages along the A40 will impact the number of cars (see 'modal shift' below) Thus the (many) positive claims being made are at best 'aspirational'.

This is presented only a 'first step', but in committing to this programme you are already effectively committing taxpayers to fund a future scheme in which they have had no say.

The future costs of implementing the scheme must be compared with alternatives, like the light rail, which received strong support. There is an unresolved problem of the bottleneck created at Dukes Cut: the costs of resolving this must be included when comparing with other schemes.

AECOM's claim is that the P&R will create 'modal shift'. Modal shift is intended to reduce congestion. If the P&R works as intended it will create more space for more cars – effectively having the same effect as the dual lane option that was firmly rejected because it would bring more cars on the road.

The increase in signalled crossings, together with unsignalled crossing and the bottleneck at Dukes Cut, seems guaranteed to ensure that there are more traffic jams. Where is the evidence or even an argument that it will not?

At the public meeting of 12 July in Eynsham, Councillor Constance announced that the number of buses would rise from 14 buses per hour to 18 buses per hour leaving the park and ride. But she also informed the meeting that Stagecoach – the effective bus monopoly - have not signed up to this, so again this frequency is 'aspirational'.

The density of housing in the vicinity of Eynsham is planned to rise significantly, yet a safe cycle track for the B4044 is put in the back burner. This is a hugely popular proposal and would serve a wide community. Why is this not top of the to-do list?

The DAS states clearly and in several places that the P&R site will need to be 'well-lit' for security and safety. This is not achievable without significant light spill, so the claim that this will have 'No significant effectsin relation to ecology' is not true.

'Sustainability' is not a description cannot be applied to the construction or use. The hope that sustainability will be achieved through 'modal shift' is flawed for reasons given above.

Rep 46

(received via WODC)

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Councillor

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Affect local ecology
- Design and layout
- Highways
- Landscape
- Policy / Principle

Comment:I have severe reservations over the construction of the Park and Ride, and A40 plan in general. Having looked at the plans, I do not believe that the P&R will make much difference to the

A40. We need a proper consultation, and ask members of the public their views - what they believe is the best way to solve the A40 problem.

The Park and Ride is designed to get people out of their cars at Eynsham. Will they? It is highly unlikely that people who commute to Seacourt and Pear Tree and going to stop at Eynsham.

The project does not promote active travel, it does not take into consideration construction of the "Garden Village" and it does not take into account the amount of housing which is under construction/going to be constructed in West Oxfordshire.

The lack of vision from Oxfordshire County Council and West Oxfordshire District Council is why the

issue of the A40 will be around for decades to come. These plans do not differ much to the plans which were drawn up nearly two decades ago.

We need a clear vision, a clear plan and an innovative project.

This is a project for the past, not the future - will it make a difference? Yes, a little bit - but People are still going to get caught up in traffic.

The A40 issue is here to stay for the next 50 years if OCC and WODC go ahead with this plan.

Rep 47 (via WODC)

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Affect local ecology
- Highways
- Landscape
- Other - give details
- Policy / Principle

Comment:

What might appear to be a 'good idea' in terms of transport improvements and the reductions in carbon emissions needs to be rethought so that both objectives are actually met. OCC should be encouraged by the progressive attitude shown by the well attended public meeting in that the well informed local people also see the lack of ambition in the current proposals in these respects.

The proposals should be reconsidered on the following issues. Transport:

1. The increase in bus services should go ahead without the P&R that is heavy on carbon, harmful to the landscape/biodiversity and is essentially a facility for car drivers.
2. Any P&R should be limited strictly to EVs owned by car clubs so that it is part of the transition to net zero carbon.

3. A transport proposal on any scale should not precede developing an understanding of the impacts of both electrification (including bikes and scooters) and automation. All public investments must then be part of the transition (ie avoiding traffic congestion of individually owned EVs or autonomous vehicles)

4. Improvements to the A40 corridor should be one more reason for WODC and OCC to strongly oppose

the OxCam Expressway to which it would become a feeder road.

5. If there is any parking facility, it should be under housing with PV on the roofs.

6. The modelling does not and cannot show that any reduction in congestion would not give rise to more car traffic taking advantage of the capacity created by those shifting to the bus. The proposals make no sense without effective demand management measures; workplace parking levy, managing or charging for the school-run, or road pricing.

7. Are there any proposals to make the A40 'tidal flow' so that morning and evening peaks could be accommodated - if the demand were first reduced as above.

8. OCC are making this proposal because it can be funded and not because it yet makes sense in the wider scheme of things. It may be setting the wrong path could be closing off others.

Carbon and biodiversity

9. The 'climate and ecological emergency' should mean that major proposals are reconsidered to ensure that they are consistent with a route to net zero carbon. A very limited modal shift from car to bus might appear to have carbon benefits until put in a context where travel modes and patterns are subject to systemic changes where investments of different kinds might be needed.

10. OCC should not rely on the rhetoric building around net biodiversity gain based on the potential for off-setting losses. The loss of biodiversity should be avoided without there being very exceptional circumstances that are not apparent from these proposals.

The problem of A40 congestion might appear to be 'exceptional' but the effectiveness of OCC response (a P&R car park for car drivers) is very uncertain.

11. The construction of the P&R car park and the roads improvements will create carbon emissions in the immediate future (ie the next decade) when reductions are most needed. Reductions from modal shift (if they occur) will be in the more distant future when the damage will have been done.

OCC should understand that there will need to be significant changes to the transport system (the sector where carbon emissions are still growing) that may or may not include some facilities for commuting by car and then bus in peak hours. In these circumstances all public investments in the transport should be part of a coherent programme that will result in carbon emissions from transport reaching zero in the next ten years or so. The fact that money might be available for what is currently seen as only one part of a whole route improvement is no justification for a major public investment. OCC should be looking at the whole network in the context of the new transport and carbon agendas through the Local Transport Plan and Strategic land use plan to 2050.

Not only can new infrastructure prove to be ineffective but also counter - productive at a time when we cannot afford to take any false steps.

Rep 48 (via WODC)

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Affect local ecology
- Design and layout
- Highways
- Neighbourliness
- Policy / Principle

Comment: My objections to the proposal are

- No obvious and clearly defined guaranteed benefit from the proposed scheme
- It lacks a clearly defined business case, its primary purpose appears to be the use of non-recurring funds, without proper consideration to delivery of true benefit and value for money.
- No recognition to future housing growth plans. Many parts of the scheme (crossing areas for example) may not be suited to existing development plans already in the pipeline.
- The proposal is based on wishful thinking rather than meaningful data, which is either not available or has been withheld. There is no serious data showing existing travel patterns on the A40, both existing bus and car journeys and their ultimate destination. The scheme will benefit only those destined for Oxford city centre and there is no data to indicate that this is a significant proportion of A40 journeys.
- The hoped for saving in bus travel times seems insignificant in relation to the few people it will benefit and the overall cost. What is the cost per minute saved per person? The economic benefit is overstated.

- There is nothing in the scheme that would provide significant motivation to persuade people to use the bus rather than the car.

- The proposed bus travel time saving will be eaten by the time lost at the additional crossing points and the traffic growth already predicted from current house building.

- One extra roundabout, extra crossings and 830 additional cars coming to the Park and Ride will mean greater delays not a reduced travel time for the vast majority of A40 users. These changes plus additional traffic growth and the Garden Village will turn Eynsham into a pollution corridor, more stop/starts (particularly HGVs) causes more pollution.

- From where will the 830 proposed users of the park and ride come? Will they be existing A40 users or those already using bus services, but find Eynsham a more convenient place to dump their cars?

Will they be local villagers whose bus services have been cut? There is no data or hard evidence to support the Park and Ride just wishful thinking.

- No data available from bus companies and no commitment from bus companies to run extra buses why then are OCC relying on factors and funding that will likely not occur.

- Little or no consideration has been given to alternatives for example more use of LongHandborough rail station, subsidising local bus services to remove cars from the road.

- No attempt to address the overall problem of the majority of A40 users who are not destined for Oxford City, it is predominately through traffic with a heavy presence of HGVs, the implementation of a Bus lane, Park and Ride and additional crossing points/roundabout will only delay the majority of road users and worsen the congestion, particularly through Eynsham and Dukes Cut Wolvercote, there will be a long term pollution cost for residents in these areas. OCC has chosen the wrong scheme in order to use central government funding and has failed to produce a viable business plan to support it. OCC is spending money without proper consideration to the big picture and known future development plans. OCC should do the right thing and lobby for the transformational planning, produce a clear strategy for the next 25 years and identify the key developmental steps needed

Rep 49 (via WODC)

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Highways

Comment: The proposed Park and Ride facility has not been properly thought out. It takes no account of the bigger picture which is to improved traffic flows for all road users, not just car drivers and cyclists. In this respect I refer to HGV's and pantechnicons.

The traffic jams which occur each morning of the working week from 7am onwards along the Shores Green to Eynsham Section of the A40 is caused solely by HGV's who struggle to maintain momentum when coming up the gradient towards Cuckoo lane and after that up to the bus stop and traffic lights at the Eynsham turn.

Time is money and impeding the progress of HGV's and other commercial traffic by placing a roundabout in the worst possible location will ultimately have a negative effect on the regional/national economy which is not what local business leaders in West Oxfordshire would want to see.

The County Council have not taken any of this into account they only thinking about ways and means of keeping cars out of Oxford city centre.
The Park and Ride Scheme needs further thought.

Rep 50

This planning application has exceptionally fine design upon the village model which has clearly taken much time and trouble. I had much looked forward to their implementation.

1. The proposals have of course to take into account the passage of time and other planning decisions already or likely to be taken in the near future. In effect a new demographic unit will have been created at Eynsham, Oxfordshire straddled across the existing A40 highway. The proposed new build and other recent permissions within the existing settlement have to be included within the 10000 total envisaged for the A40 corridor as a whole.

2. The 2011 census gave Eynsham's population as 4648.

Within 15 years of that date the enlarged locality is likely to be double. Ancillary demands beyond housing have to be taken into account too. Were this site to have been greenfield, national standards would doubtless have required the provision of a four lane highway.

3. Substantial further demands upon town planning beyond housing.

Park and Ride to Oxford upon the western fringe of the garden village will certainly provide equal attractions for surrounding districts too. On the other hand much needed access to Park and Ride from parts of the existing settlement nearby will be across the A40 itself. " Smart" or not, three pedestrian crossings will certainly challenge the smooth passage of traffic east and west even as now let alone to come.

4. Environmental issues incompletely or even competently addressed.

The risk of flooding to the existing settlement recently foreseen during climate change has been substantially enhanced locally by potential fallout from the execution of new works without detailed prescription. The potential of renewed quarrying nearby remains. Here policy now favours decentralising national operations in favour of national traffic reduction and of environmental benefits elsewhere. There has been neither reliance upon nor co-ordination with the green energy provision of a new planning proposal nearby. The atmospheric repercussions of current planning plans may not have been met.

5. Future provision of medical, educational and retail services for a population doubled over clear time have not been identifiably put into place.

6. Series of serious and expensive modifications to the A40

These remain piecemeal and constitute a disproportionately high contribution to the total cost for what is a free market project therefore now likely to be expensive. Government funding required is presently stringent and even so incomplete. This development, now presumed to take place either side of the A40's existing width, will preclude even soon the necessary widening and integral reconstruction any future generation or other party might wisely require.

7. The manner in what could have been a worthwhile project has been conducted unfortunately dissipated local goodwill. A higher plan instead ought first to cover this area of the county overall and its relation with the City of Oxford. Had environmental issues and the interests of utilities and other essential stakeholders been conjointly addressed we should all have been saved anguish and anxiety. The outstanding concern however has to remain transport. On this Eynsham had not been publicly updated until last Friday evening.

Rep 51

Comments from Grosvenor – saved elsewhere

Rep 52

Comments from Pandora Properties – saved elsewhere

Rep 53

First this must be approached holistically. A piecemeal approach will not work and will waste vast quantities of public money.

Will the planners please go back to the drawing board and plan for the effect of thousands more houses on the A40 catchment area and for the effect of future transport modes.

The need for a Park&Ride is questionable and will cover good land with concrete to no good effect. If we have to have something of that ilk it should be closer to Witney to prevent build up of traffic west of Eynsham. Also it would work better as a general transport hub, housing bus and tram junctions.

The emphasis must NOT be on improving conditions for cars, which will encourage more cars and cause more carbon emissions and pollution. It should instead be on all forms of public transport, including a railway if possible, and certainly on good one-way cycle paths and good CONTINUOUS bus lanes on BOTH sides of the A40 from Witney at least as far as Wolvercote roundabout.

Traffic flow could be much improved by creating a junction of the A40 with the A34 Oxford bypass, relieving the road of much traffic before Wolvercote roundabout.

Rep 54

I apologise for the delay in submitting my comments on the Planning meeting which took place in the Eynsham village hall on 12th July 2019 but I have been away from the village since this date.

At the meeting I found the two members in attendance from the West Oxfordshire District Council extremely condescending and rude towards the local village people in attendance.

The proposed developments will hugely increase the volume of traffic on the A40 towards Wolvercote roundabout and thereafter onto the A34 and A40 towards London. There is currently a development being built in Wolvercote which will need to feed into this same roundabout.

One of the gentleman on the panel stated that he knew all about the Northern Gateway and Wolvercote developments and regardless of any traffic problems this may cause it would simply go ahead and he wasn't prepared to elaborate as he stated he didn't feel the audience were capable of understanding the concepts of this.

The female member of the panel stated that the residents of West Oxfordshire should be grateful for the money being spent on the proposed changes to the A40 because the A420 was equally as bad for congestion and no such improvements had been made. I would be very interested to see statistics in support of this comment.

Although I would be in favour of the proposed developments on the A40 ie Bus lane Park and Ride Cycle tracks this would be totally insufficient for the additional houses being built in West Oxfordshire.

Rep 55

I am writing as a member of Transition Eynsham Area and convenor of our energy group, to oppose the current plans.

The government, County and District Councils have declared a climate emergency, which is welcome - but this needs to be followed up with swift action, while policy lags behind. All plans need to be reviewed in the light of the climate and ecological emergency. Oxfordshire is building an enviable reputation for innovation in the transformation of the energy supply, but its record on transport is woeful.

The Committee on Climate Change (CCC) report *Reducing UK emissions 2019 Progress Report to Parliament* published this Wednesday (10 July) states that policy is well behind the binding net zero carbon target and highlights transport as in need of major change- and we know from the CREDS report *Shifting the focus: energy demand in a net-zero carbon* (published 6 July 2019) that electric vehicles will not fix all the pollution and will do nothing for congestion. The reports urge demand reduction, a move away from car travel and schemes to support walking, cycling, car sharing and public transport.

The CREDS report prioritises:

- Avoiding travel demand and car ownership
- Developing local support for car clubs

- Incentivising co-ordination of transport and planning objectives to reduce the need for travel
- Shifting travel to the most sustainable modes
- Improving efficiency of vehicles in use, particularly through increased occupancy using carrot and stick approaches.

The CCC report states:

- Surface transport is the largest-emitting sector in the UK, accounting for 23% of UK emissions.
- Progress in deploying measures to reduce emissions is off-track across transport, buildings, agriculture and land use. In these areas, progress to date is behind virtually every indicator we track, often by a wide margin.

While one of the stated, and welcome, aims of this project is to encourage a modal shift to bus and cycling, we remain unconvinced that this scheme has the vision to achieve this: the bus lanes will be incomplete with marginal benefit, the park and ride is in the wrong place and the cycle routes are unpleasant, fragmented and unlikely to create the shift we need; this was compounded by the decision to remove the B4044 community path from the HIF bid. It is essentially a piecemeal road-based approach where the vast majority of journeys will continue to be by private vehicle. The park and ride sets out to attract cars to Eynsham but does not (in this phase) have sufficient infrastructure, nor provide the incentive, to power the expected and necessary scale of electric cars, cycles and buses with renewable energy. Moreover, The construction process of the park and ride car park and the road improvements will create damaging carbon emissions in the immediate future.

The scheme only attempts to improve the current chronic congestion, while adopted planning policy will exacerbate the problem by locating significantly more housing in West Oxfordshire. It is a short term scheme which takes no account of planned housing development: indeed parts of the scheme would soon need to be redesigned, which is inherently unsustainable. Further, if the park and ride succeeds in removing 8500 cars from the A40, road space would be released which in turn will attract more traffic to the A40 unless there is radical reduction in the demand for car travel.

Many of us have responded at length at each stage of the development of this outdated scheme. We have suggested spending money on a longer bus lane in place of the park and ride and completing a more extensive cycle network which could be used immediately (and would not need to be redesigned, unlike the road works) and providing EV infrastructure with renewable energy: but we have not been heard. We repeat that we need demand management, efficient, innovative and attractive public transport and cycling provision to get people out of their cars and off the road. Setting us on the path to an inadequate road-based solution is not an answer to the current crisis.

The fact that money might be available for what is currently seen as only one part of a whole route improvement is no justification for pursuing a flawed scheme. If government policy is the issue, as we are told, we would expect our council to fight with us to achieve the revolution in transport planning that the climate emergency demands. Oxfordshire needs to show the vision to begin the transformation of transport in the way it is beginning to do for energy generation.

Rep 56

I live in Yarnton and saw the application for park and ride at cuckoo lane. This is in West Oxfordshire so what has this to do with Cherwell. I do see that Yarnton CP is involved but why.

Mary Hudson
Principal Planning Officer
Communities
Oxfordshire County Council
County Hall
New Road
Oxford OX1 1ND

July 2019

Sent by email – mary.hudson@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Dear Ms Hudson

Application No.	R3.0057/19
Proposal	Construction of a park & ride car park providing 850 car parking spaces, cycle spaces, motorcycle spaces, electric vehicle charging points, bus shelters, landscaping, external lighting, public open space, toilets, seating, fencing, habitat creation, drainage features, new access from Cuckoo Lane, new roundabout with access onto A40, an eastbound bus lane approximately 6.5km in length from the park & ride site to the A40 bridge over the Dukes Cut canal, two sections of westbound bus lane (each approximately 500m in length), new shared use footway/cycleway, widening of Cassington New Bridge, junction improvements, new crossings, new footbridge alongside Cassington Halt Bridge, and associated works.
Location	Land West of Cuckoo lane and adjacent to the A40, Eynsham, West Oxfordshire, OX29 4PU
EPC Response	Strongly Object

Eynsham Parish Council strongly object to the application as follows:-

Location – Promoting Sustainable Transport

In consideration of the fact that in West Oxfordshire District Council's Local Plan (WOLP) 2031, the Witney sub-area has a housing allocation of 4702, Burford-Charlbury sub-area has 774 and Carterton sub-area has 2,680, the Park & Ride (P&R) is in the wrong location to meet the impact of these planned developments.

Whilst it is felt a P&R would help to alleviate traffic congestion by potentially taking 850 cars off the A40, it should be located further west at Shores Green, Witney so that existing and new residents will need to spend less time travelling to the P&R on already-congested roads.

The application is therefore considered contrary to NPPF 103 - "Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes." The application is not in alignment with WOLP 2031 EW1 where it states 1000 car parking spaces are to be provided, not 850.

Air Quality

It is not understood how anyone without a degree in chemistry, biology and/or physics can legitimately scrutinise the accuracy or understanding of the Air Quality Report. Common sense says the air quality will be compromised with the twice-daily movement of 850 vehicles in addition to the dust and pollutants from HGV's/machinery whilst creating the P&R.

Air Quality Management Area - It is felt that calculating the 'in combination' Nitrogen Levels reducing from 'critical' to within '5-10% of critical level' (and therefore being considered acceptable) based solely on the P&R and A40 projects being successful as there will be a reduction in Annual Average Daily Traffic, is based on wishful thinking only. There is no proof that the application will actually remove the maximum 850 cars from the A40 – its location (and cost of parking) is key to whether it will be considered successful.

The air quality monitoring and mitigation methods proposed during and post construction are unacceptable and will not outweigh the significant negative impacts that residents and biodiversity will experience. The natural and local environment will be put at unacceptable risk from, and will be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of dust and air pollution. The application is therefore considered contrary to policy EH8 of WOLP 2031 and NPPF 103, 170 e) and 181.

Biodiversity

The output of the biodiversity impact assessment calculator suggests that the scheme will result in an overall deficit in biodiversity units of approximately -12.33 biodiversity units. This represents approximately a 22% reduction on the baseline. It is unacceptable for OCC to obtain approval for the application while there are no agreed options for improving on the outputs in order to create a net biodiversity gain.

Significant effects of the application include: the removal of 990m of hedgerow (vs 565m of new hedgerow to be planted). All hedgerows should be retained and the P&R redesigned to work with the existing constraints of the site where it is feasible to do so. The application will effect a loss of 0.82ha of semi-improved grassland and 0.82ha of species rich grassland; a loss of 150m² habitat of the 'protected' newt; and will permanently effect bats due to light pollution. These are just the significant adverse effects.

The application is contrary to OCC's LTP4 Policy 24 which seeks to avoid negative environmental impacts of transport and where possible will provide environmental improvements, particularly in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Conservation Areas and other areas of high environmental importance.

The proposed mitigation measures are disproportionate to the level of harm that will be incurred and the application is therefore unacceptable. The natural environment will not be conserved or enhanced.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats' site. The application is therefore considered contrary to NPPF 170, 174 b), 175 and 177. It is contrary to WOLP 2031 policies EH2, EH3, EH4 and EH8. It is also contrary to various sections of The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, The Protection of Badgers Act 1992, The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

Landscape and Visual

The proposed development would result in significant adverse effects at a local level during the construction phase, specifically to the P&R site, along the A40 and to Eynsham.

At year 1 of operation, the change in land use at the P&R site would result in a significant adverse effect through the extent of hardstanding and parked vehicles. It will take 15 years for the planting within the P&R site to reduce the adverse visual impact of the change in land use. The Council does not agree that there would not be any significant adverse effects to the landscape character areas as detailed in the report.

Green Belt – departure from plan

Contrary to WODC LP Policy EW10 – Protection of the Oxford Green Belt and conservation and enhancement of the Cotswolds AONB. NPPF 143 inappropriate development of the green belt.

For the reasons set out above, Eynsham Parish Council considers this application is contrary to one of the 3 key policies of sustainable development (NPPF 8 c) as it does not contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Katherine Doughty
Clerk to the Council

Press release from Eynsham Parish Council



PRESS RELEASE – 19 AUGUST 2019

Parish Council calls time on County Council project

Eynsham Parish Council request the Secretary of State ‘call in’ this application.

‘Flawed, a waste of taxpayers’ money and an assault on the environment and resident’s air quality’ is how Eynsham Parish Council (EPC) consider Oxfordshire County Council’s (OCC) recent planning application for a proposed Eynsham Park & Ride and associated Bus Lane work.

This so far speculative proposal by OCC for a £35 million plus project remains completely unfunded¹ other than by Council Tax revenue of which more than £3 million has already been spent by OCC. Not only unfunded but the published highway designs do not accommodate the Eynsham Northern Development² (2200 homes) or the West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (1000 homes) meaning the highway design and implementation work will have to be re-done when these developments commence.

The Parish Council is requesting a ‘call in’ so that the Secretary of State will determine the application under current planning law³, this will prevent Oxfordshire County Council considering its own submission as it proposes to do.

This project will have wide ranging effects, the A40 is a major East/West route carrying traffic from Wales and the West of England, as well as Gloucestershire and Herefordshire, East towards the Oxford hospitals and beyond towards London. More than 32,000 cars a day pass the site of the Park & Ride project at Eynsham.

The proposed Park & Ride caters for only 850 cars and cannot be expanded as it will be surrounded by other development, particularly the proposed Northern Development at Eynsham of some 2200 houses.

The Parish Council ask, ‘How can £35 million for a car park for 850 cars represent good value?’

Notable objectors to the proposal include OCC Highways, the Environment Agency, Berkshire Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) along with many local residents and resident pressure groups.

The Parish Council's concerns, based on effectiveness of the project to reduce congestion on the A40, geography of the site and environmental damage, have been ignored.

The Parish Council action to call in the application is driven by the conviction that this is in the interests of residents of the Lower Windrush and West Oxfordshire, as well as those of Oxfordshire and further afield.

In the view of EPC there is no commercial case for the present plans; and far more efficient use of taxpayers' money can be better served by much needed changes to the existing road network, greater improvement to the efficiency of the buses or by establishing a rail based alternative.

[Ends.]

Further information

Cllr Gordon Beach (Chairman) gordon.beach@eynsham-pc.gov.uk 07704 449054

Katherine Doughty (Clerk to the Council) epc.clerk@eynsham-pc.gov.uk 07956 901622

Notes for Editors

¹ This is currently a completely UNFUNDED project. OCC has suggested that Department of Transport (DoT) funds have been acquired; true they have been allocated by DoT, but delivery of this funding is totally dependent on an acceptable Business Case being approved by DoT. That Business case is now more than 2 years overdue and has NOT been agreed by DoT. This means that the only funding so far for the project has been from OCC revenues, Council Tax payments from which has come a speculative £3 million+ spend by OCC.

² Northern Development of Eynsham otherwise known as the Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village (OCGV).

³ The Secretary of State can determine the application under Regulation 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

The first formal consultation resulted in OCC Highways presenting objections to their own scheme as well as objections from the Environment Agency and the Berkshire Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust questioning the inadequate flood prevention and the unacceptable impact on the environment and local wildlife and birds. In addition, many, many objections were raised by local residents during this consultation.

The application document R3.0057/19 ran to some 95 separate documents totalling, according to an OCC Officer working on the project, around 1200 pages.

Despite the huge size of this application, Councillors from Eynsham Parish Council (EPC) studied the documentation closely and, in addition to this research incorporated as many of the comments raised at the 'Future of the A40' Public Meeting in Eynsham Village Hall on Friday 12th July as was possible. That meeting was attended by Cllr. Constance, OCC Cabinet member for Environment supported by Raymond Cheung, Senior Officer from the Project Team and by Charles Mathew, County Councillor representing Eynsham. The packed meeting was chaired by Gordon Beach, Chair of Eynsham Parish Council and ran to more than two hours as questions were put to the panel. The meeting was described as 'lively' by residents who attended.

The response from Eynsham Parish Council to the application runs to some seven pages of A4 as the Parish Council outline the areas where the scheme contravenes planning policies and considers unsatisfactory issues. Here is a sample of the points raised:-

- Air quality will be compromised with the twice-daily movement of 850 vehicles in addition to the dust and pollutants from HGVs/machinery whilst creating the P&R.
- According to OCC research this scheme will result in an overall deficit in biodiversity units by approximately 22% reduction on the baseline.
- The application is contrary to WOLP Policy EW10 – Protection of the Oxford Green Belt and NPPF 143 and is inappropriate development of the green belt.
- The Park & Ride (P&R) is in the wrong location to meet the impact of the planned developments within West Oxfordshire.
- There are 2 substantial omissions in the list of proposed completed developments by 2021. These are (1) Northern Development (2200 homes) and (2) West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (1000 homes).
- Traffic is able to 'short cut' the proposed roundabout and access the layby when traffic is heavy.
- Considering the continually changing details and scale of this application, insufficient public consultation has been undertaken.

- EPC believe that all hedgerows should be retained, and the P&R redesigned to work with the existing constraints of the site.
- The proposed development would result in significant adverse effects at a local level during the construction phase, along the A40 and to Eynsham.
- Lower lighting columns should be considered which may benefit neighbouring residents and bats/ecology.

Some other useful references for Editors;

INVESTING IN THE A40 CONSULTATION November 2015

https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/A40_investment_response.pdf

A40 EYNHAM PARK & RIDE AND BUS LANE SCHEME CONSULTATION January 2017

https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/A40_P&R_response.pdf

CONNECTING OXFORDSHIRE - IMPROVING TRANSPORT ALONG THE A40 CORRIDOR January 2019

https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/OCC_A40_PRConsultationResponse_Jan2019.pdf

A40 PARK & RIDE - RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION July 2019

https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/R3_0057_19%20P&R%20A40_Final.pdf

Details of the planning application can be found on [Oxfordshire County Council's website](#).

<http://myeplanning.oxfordshire.gov.uk/swifftlg/apas/run/WPHAPPDETAIL.DisplayUrl?theApnID=R3.0057/19&theTabNo=3&backURL=%3ca>

Eynsham Parish Council's full response to the application is available on [Eynsham Online](#) and here;

<http://myeplanning.oxfordshire.gov.uk/swifftlg/MediaTemp/206070-56219.pdf>

Find out more about Eynsham here;

www.eynsham-pc.gov.uk

Useful Links

INVESTING IN THE A40 CONSULTATION November 2015

https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/A40_investment_response.pdf

A40 EYNSHAM PARK & RIDE AND BUS LANE SCHEME CONSULTATION January 2017

https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/A40_P&R_response.pdf

CONNECTING OXFORDSHIRE - IMPROVING TRANSPORT ALONG THE A40 CORRIDOR

January 2019

[https://eynsham-](https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/OCC_A40_PRConsultationResponse_Jan2019.pdf)

[pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/OCC_A40_PRConsultationResponse_Jan2019.pdf](https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/OCC_A40_PRConsultationResponse_Jan2019.pdf)

A40 PARK & RIDE - RESPONSE TO PLANNING application July 2019

[https://eynsham-](https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/R3_0057_19%20P&R%20A40_Final.pdf)

[pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/R3_0057_19%20P&R%20A40_Final.pdf](https://eynsham-pc.gov.uk/variable/organisation/37/attachments/R3_0057_19%20P&R%20A40_Final.pdf)

Details of the planning application can be found on [Oxfordshire County Council's website](http://myeplanning.oxfordshire.gov.uk/swiftlg/apas/run/WPHAPPDETAIL.DisplayUrl?theApnID=R3.0057/19&theTabNo=3&backURL=%3ca).

<http://myeplanning.oxfordshire.gov.uk/swiftlg/apas/run/WPHAPPDETAIL.DisplayUrl?theApnID=R3.0057/19&theTabNo=3&backURL=%3ca>

Eynsham Parish Council's full response to the application is available on [Eynsham Online](#) and here;

<http://myeplanning.oxfordshire.gov.uk/swiftlg/MediaTemp/206070-56219.pdf>

Find out more about Eynsham here;

www.eynsham-pc.gov.uk