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**SUBMISSION**

Concerning: Engagement activity: Local Transport and Connectivity Plan: <https://consultations.oxfordshire.gov.uk/consult.ti/ltcp.engagement/consultationHome>

The Cowley Area Transport Group (CATG) is a loose network of individuals interested in transport issues, covering the council wards of Cowley and Lye Valley plus Temple Cowley, in Oxford. It has already been responsible for the *Cowley Area Transport Strategy* – 2nd edition 2018,[[1]](#footnote-1) based on consultations with residents.

Whilst CATG is interested in local transport improvements in its main area of coverage, it also has wider concerns about transport which it will raise in reports on specific topics periodically. The first of these, on Electronic Road Pricing for Oxford,[[2]](#footnote-2) was sent to key County Councillors on 15th November 2018 and can also be made available to City Council officers or councillors who want to read it. CATG has also responded to public consultations periodically.

This submission responds to an engagement stage of a prospective new Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan. Answers given below to specific consultation questions are as presented in the online questionnaire. However, given the exceptionally limited scope of both the questions and the topics raised in subject papers for this consultation, additional material is necessary because of serious omissions that need addressing:

**SECTION ONE: MISSING LINKS**

**(SECTION 2: RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION QUESTIONS p.8 onwards)**

There are many serious omissions in the papers associated with this consultation, each carrying implications for not reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Oxfordshire concerning transport, and other transport emission sources including through international linkages which are also part of Oxfordshire’s total greenhouse gas emissions from the entire transport sector. These include:

**A date for a carbon free County, no later than 2030**: Government policy is tied to a 2050 carbon neutral country objective, too far into the future to be adequate in relation to the needs of the Planet. It is also beyond the period of service of many elected representatives, encouraging complacency. Whilst commitments to be carbon neutral by 2030 in their own activities, such as those by Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council, are welcome, target dates for reductions in emissions from transport in the County or caused by activities and demands which add to Oxfordshire’s transport emissions in practice need to be set.

Reasons for a much earlier carbon neutral date for Oxfordshire, and other local council complete areas, include:

1. **There has been NO progress in reducing global carbon dioxide emissions**: The increase in global carbon dioxide emissions 1990-2018 was 67%, meaning that ideas of meeting targets by specific countries have not impacted upon the global trend towards a far hotter planet.[[3]](#footnote-3) In consequence, radical cuts in greenhouse gas emissions in all willing States are needed now, with targets for carbon neutral societies no later than 2030, to compensate for States failing to implement rigorous targets. This means Oxfordshire needs to be a carbon neutral County no later than 2030, to make a contribution to this process.
2. **The capacity of the Oceans to absorb carbon dioxide may have been significantly over-estimated**:[[4]](#footnote-4) However, new research suggests heating might occur at earlier dates and more severely than expected if carbon dioxide absorption by the Oceans is less than believed, or reaches a point at which absorption is no longer occurring.[[5]](#footnote-5)
3. **Countries seem generally unwilling to improve upon their inadequate Paris Agreement targets:** The UN has warned that the Paris Agreement country targets would lead to an absolute minimum of 3 degrees C of warming, and has urged States to improve their goals significantly.[[6]](#footnote-6) However: so far, only 7 countries have submitted improved Climate goals in response to this pressure, and only a total of 34 are planning currently to do so.[[7]](#footnote-7) The Paris Agreement State by State goals promised us a 3 degree C warmer world by 2100 as a minimum. The UK has not improved its minimalist 2050 carbon neutral target. But aviation, shipping and import-related emissions must be included in each country's emissions to identify the full extent of their emissions.[[8]](#footnote-8) If the difference between inadequate counting and reality takes UK emissions from about 2% each year of the global total to more like 12%,[[9]](#footnote-9) then clearly very deep cuts in emissions need to occur year on year. If the world can take revolutionary steps to counter the Coronavirus, then the Climate Emergency must be reflected in equally radical sector by sector transformations as the virus recedes - starting in the UK and council by council if the Government is too slow.[[10]](#footnote-10)
4. **The catastrophic end of warm waters from the Caribbean reaching northern Europe is coming nearer to reality**: As more freshwater from melting onshore ice reaches the Oceans, ocean currents can be influenced and even changed. The Gulf Stream plays a large role in water temperatures and weather in north West Europe. But it is susceptible to slowing.[[11]](#footnote-11)
5. **Heatwaves are occurring above the Poles**: For example, in Antarctica, once deemed to be proof against global warming until after 2100[[12]](#footnote-12), and in the loss of 2 billion tonnes of ice from Greenland.[[13]](#footnote-13) In addition, about a quarter of the ice of the Himalayas has already melted, over a 40 year period.[[14]](#footnote-14) In short, areas of ice cover around the world that reflected heat and kept the Planet cooler are disappearing at unexpected speed, justifying far more radical efforts to achieve year on year deep cuts in greenhouse gas emissions, consistent with a goal of a carbon neutral Planet no later than 2030. For the UK, this might mean making cuts of 10-15% p.a. The UN suggested, in 2019, cuts in global carbon emissions of 7.6% per year just to meet the 1.5 degree C ceiling on global temperature rise.[[15]](#footnote-15) [[16]](#footnote-16)
6. **The Coronavirus recession is unlikely to have long-term effects on greenhouse gas emissions, without radical changes of policy**: A full year of lockdowns globally might lead to a 10% overall reduction in carbon dioxide emissions, but this is not enough to make much impact on the long-term warming trend and does not prevent resurgence in pollution if the post-crisis emergency reconstruction is not planned to be sustainable and resilient.[[17]](#footnote-17)
7. **Coal production has not stopped, and new coal mines are possible**: China continues to exploit and import coal;[[18]](#footnote-18) Australia is exporting coal particularly to Japan, China and South Korea;[[19]](#footnote-19) Poland continues to produce and to import coal from Russia, even under adverse price conditions.[[20]](#footnote-20) Without a general effort to cut coal production to zero in a few years, any realistic hope of making radical cuts in greenhouse gas emissions seems unreasonable optimism. Even in the UK, there are plans to open new coal mines.[[21]](#footnote-21)
8. **Fossil fuel industry subsidies have not been stopped:** UK fossil fuel industries receive over £10bn per year in subsidies; about £2bn of UK funding is also supporting fossil fuel industry projects abroad.[[22]](#footnote-22) [[23]](#footnote-23) In short, it is impossible to envisage reaching targets likely to achieve the preferred UN goal of only 1.5 degree C of warming whilst countries are committed to heating the Planet through such subsidies.
9. **Carbon Capture and storage**: It is not possible to use untried, costly and possibly ineffective technology to sequester carbon indefinitely on a global scale. Such technology would mean achieving guaranteed no leakage into the environment *forever.* Generalising a reliable form of such technology could take decades, if it is actually possible, by which time a runaway greenhouse gas emissions event could be in progress and adaptation to global warming could have overtaken other policy options.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Other areas of concern relevant to Oxfordshire’s overall role in transport-related greenhouse gas emissions include:

**Aviation**: The total volume of passenger and freight-only flights made to and from the UK with point of transport mode origin in Oxfordshire or destination in Oxfordshire are part of the greenhouse gas emissions of both Oxfordshire and the UK. Defence aviation has been estimated at about an additional 10% on top of other aviation emissions globally and Oxfordshire has a share of those too. Before the Coronavirus crisis, there was already accumulating evidence that people had begun cutting passenger flights.[[25]](#footnote-25) However, the growth rate in aviation emissions has, up to now, reached about 5.7% p.a. Also, the UK is 3rd in the world for aviation emissions at 4% of the global total, after the US (24%) and China (13%).[[26]](#footnote-26) In consequence of these considerations, local authorities in Oxfordshire should all campaign for voluntary cuts in flying and access to the continent, and especially to the rest of the mainland UK, to be more often accomplished by rail. This needs to be emphasised in the final version of the new Local Transport Plan. Similarly, councils should oppose any attempt to add to scheduled flights from any airport in Oxfordshire. Offsetting is not to be a preferred option if serious and rapid attempts are being made to cut emissions:

“Greenpeace describes it [offsetting] as paying lip service to action, saying: “When compared to ideas like frequent fliers paying more and more heavily for trips abroad, [carbon offsetting transport falls very short](https://www.greenpeace.org.uk/press-releases/greenpeace-reaction-spring-statement/).” In 2016, the Institute for Applied Ecology also called the practice’s effectiveness into question when it analysed the Clean Development Mechanism. That’s the platform that made it possible for [green projects in developing countries to earn carbon credits](https://cdm.unfccc.int/about/index.html), each equivalent to one tonne of CO2, which could be traded and used by industrialized nations to help meet their emissions reduction targets. Its findings make for gloomy reading. “Overall, our results suggest that 85% of the projects covered in this analysis and 73% of the potential 2013-2020 Certified Emissions Reduction (CER) supply have [a low likelihood that emission reductions are additional](https://ec.europa.eu/clima/sites/clima/files/ets/docs/clean_dev_mechanism_en.pdf) and are not over-estimated,” the Institute says. “Only 2% of the projects and 7% of potential CER supply have a high likelihood of ensuring that emission reductions are additional and are not over-estimated.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

**Shipping:** Emissions from shipping, like aviation, are not counted as part of the UK’s greenhouse gas emissions in terms of international targets such as those included in the Paris Agreement. Shipping emissions, which are growing, are about 2.5% of global greenhouse gas emissions but are likely to increase by an absolute minimum of 50% by 2050, with 250% being possible.[[28]](#footnote-28) Consequently, campaigns by councils to significantly increase re-use and recycling must be stepped up to help reduce imports of physical goods which end up serving Oxfordshire. The excellent example of re-use offered through charity shops can be promoted, such as the Library of Things in Oxford;[[29]](#footnote-29) businesses offering repair are to be supported also; councils can consider how they improve their offer of recycling services to increase recycling of things which may not readily be re-used. Advice to households on how to use some things in compost is valuable: egg shells can be dried and crushed into compost; plain cardboard can be allowed to soak in rain and then can be ripped up for adding to compost heaps, etc. An effect of the Coronavirus has been to increase cultivation of food by households, so this needs council recognition and support throughout the County.

**Import substitution and local employment**: Reducing the distances physical goods travel is an essential feature of reducing impacts on transport infrastructure and cutting traffic movements and resulting emissions. Energy and land use issues are critical areas for increasing localisation, and both have transport implications.[[30]](#footnote-30) Successful reduction of physical imports is also desirable to help create new employment throughout Oxfordshire. Some examples, consistent with improved Climate goals, include: increasing forest cover to include commercially valuable species for construction, furniture etc; allocation of land to production of more organically grown fruit, vegetables and flowers in the County – all of which are being imported in large quantities at present.

**Road user hierarchy reflection in spending priorities**: Spending priorities are not made clear in documentation for this exercise. If a road user hierarchy is accepted as the documentation in this Engagement consultation suggests, and the physical vulnerability of both pedestrians and cyclists is properly recognised, then clear commitments about giving much higher priority in spending to pedestrians and cyclists need to be made abundantly clear. Documents stating the importance of active travel are nullified by continuing spending on new trunk roads, a known source of more journeys of longer distance.[[31]](#footnote-31)

**Trunk Road building**: A country that has a 14 year (minimum) backlog in road repairs cannot built any new trunk roads.[[32]](#footnote-32) The rate of repair is subject to unpredictable road damage done by very cold winters and very hot summers. In terms of reducing transport emissions as the largest UK sector for emissions, not encouraging more traffic movements is essential. This will involve abandoning the fantastically expensive Cambridge-Oxford Expressway and undertaking specific actions to reduce traffic on roads with a high burden of traffic such as the A34. In practical terms, this means research on road user groups to establish which ones may be amenable to reduction eg school run traffic becomes electric school bus transport; delivery vehicles become cargo bikes through formal adoption of more transhipment points; cars disappear as home working and flexitime are promoted and implemented; less vehicles moving waste because of more success in household and enterprise re-use of materials, etc. Alternatives for such roads should also include: restoring bus subsidies and securing additional funds to support other reasonable bus and coach services; more bus lanes; re-opening disused rail lines.

**Comprehensive expansion of pedestrianised areas**: Reduction in air pollution must include the suppression of PM 2.5s arising from: brake pad erosion, road surface abrasion, wear of tyres, dispersal of toxic dust from the road surface. But this can only be achieved where pedestrianised areas, with through cycling access, are expanded in urban centres. Since it has often been demonstrated that pedestrianised areas benefit commercial outlets, economic objections can be set aside. Special pleading by some transport users or groups for continuations of heavily trafficked polluted and congested areas in urban centres need to be countered by progress with pedestrianisation in some locations that needs replication in Oxfordshire – examples include Norwich and York. Active travel for health promotion must be stressed as an alternative to short distance car, bus and taxi use. Retail regeneration and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods would benefit by this approach; notorious ‘rat runs’ could be closed, or access to them could be reduced to single-lane.

**Moving utility access points out of roads to pavements**: Road works blight all forms of surface transport movement. This is partly because of poor coordination between privatised utilities; partly because roads are not uniformly well-repaired leading to damage to utility infrastructure underneath, and to greater frequency of repairs being needed; partly due to issues arising from poor attention to drainage; and above all to excessive levels of traffic. This is going to be a very long-term programme, requiring a continuous effort over decades, but it should be emphasised as a goal which those involved in road repair must address every time they engage in works. Given very poor standards of road repair, councils need to ensure better service from contractors/utilities. In addition, the tests of whether a road needs repairing should be based upon the impacts experienced by cyclists and pedestrians crossing such roads. In other words, smaller scale defects should mean earlier optimum repair. This will serve all road users by providing far better average surfaces for all uses.

**Car hire not ownership**: The total volume of vehicles continues to increase. Council by council encouragement of vehicle hire, and car clubs, rather than ownership should be a shared effort. Only electric vehicles should be supported in this way, to assist the decline of more polluting vehicles.

**Re-opening disused rail lines**: The available network of disused rail lines should be re-opened, with electrification, to give people more choice of transport modes on more routes.[[33]](#footnote-33) This long-term process should be planned carefully, so that – for example – communities with significant brownfield site population increase should obtain new rail services, including stations where desirable, to prevent new major sites of car commuting adding to traffic burdens.

**Implement the Gilligan report**: The Gilligan Report which promised £150m to improving cycling-friendly infrastructure in Oxford should be promoted strongly for implementation.[[34]](#footnote-34)

**Electronic Road Pricing**: Funding transport in areas of very high transport movements requires a more sophisticated and selective approach than congestion charging or ‘Connecting Oxford.’ CATG has prepared *Electronic Road Pricing for Oxford,* an outline for such a trial scheme in the Oxford City Region, to forward this idea – in use in Singapore since 1998.

**Locality specific complete transport strategies**: CATG is unconvinced by transport strategies or overall policies which lack a lot of locally-specific policy innovations. Our development of the *Cowley Area Transport Strategy*, in cooperation with a loose network of people in a part of East Oxford, is an example of what we mean. It seems likely, judging by the Headington Neighbourhood Plan, that some communities have already made significant steps towards their own local transport strategies. How might these types of strategies be funded? Firstly, by the abandonment of the Major Roads Network category that the Government has created which will divert more money spent on transport infrastructure away from the specific needs of small localities.

**Encouragement to home-based working and use of flexitime by all employers:** This can be encouraged, and practiced, by local councils but they should campaign for national legislation on this as well.

**Waterways as a more important transport mode:** None of the documents for this Engagement consultation deal with waterways as transport networks, leisure routes or the site of an increasing number of very low cost housing units in the form of canal barges and similar vessels. A growing waterway population needs some specific facilities to make their lives easier. Freight movements by water also need to be considered and (re)introduced as part of relieving impacts upon the road infrastructure, where possible. Whilst the draft Oxford City Plan does envisage a small increase in moorings, we favour a County-wide approach to increase secure moorings and the facilities needed to sustain them. This will require research, investment and implementation over a period of years. It should include fully engaging with the Electric Boat Association which can offer advice in this area.[[35]](#footnote-35)

**SECTION 2: RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION QUESTIONS:**

# Question 1

**Active & Healthy Travel: Cycle Streets - What do you think?**

Can we make cycling safer through cycle street ideas? What else could we do to make cycling more attractive to everyone across the county? What might make you cycle more often, and for different types of journey?

Street design features omit the very poor maintenance of cycle markings on roads, and on all cycle routes throughout the County. Cycling needs to be made safer, as the Gilligan Report suggests, by improving junctions and roundabouts for cyclists, particularly to reduce accidents. Poor cycle marking appears to encourage walking on cycle routes, which is observable periodically: on the north side of the Cowley Road, Oxford, from Magdalen Road to Bartlemas Close; on the eastern by pass on its eastern side from Horspath Driftway to the Green Road roundabout. Achieving much lower levels of traffic requires appreciable investment in constraints upon through traffic. This should mean extending pavements across half the road width in residential areas, with space to allow cyclists through them, specifically on all ‘rat runs’ through residential areas. Buses and utility vehicles could pass but those wanting to drive above 20mph will be severely discouraged from doing so. This section refers to Cowley Road being designed to encourage cyclists to take ‘priority position.’ However, this is the most dangerous road in the County for cyclists in terms of accidents. Re-direction of some bus services to the Iffley Road is clearly needed; delivery hours should be more restricted along the whole road and Oxford Road also; a study of how the specific types of users of this road might be deterred from using it by car should be undertaken. Cycle routes in Oxford are frequently blocked by parked vehicles due to the absence of double-yellow lines. This happens all the time at the north end of Hollow Way, on the eastern side, and very frequently on Barns Road, south side. There are blocking problems and pavement parking problems every day along the Slade’s cycle routes. So, cycle streets, whilst forming parts of a network of improved cycle routes, are very welcome, but cyclists still have to access areas which are problematic in their terms and still need major attention to improve safety and journeys. Additionally: Green Travel Plans are not being applied enough to school staff and parents; reducing City Centre parking and converting it to housing would reduce traffic, and other car parks could be decked elsewhere.[[36]](#footnote-36) The Gilligan Report which promised £150m to improving cycling-friendly infrastructure in Oxford should be promoted strongly for implementation.[[37]](#footnote-37)

**Question 2 Active & Healthy Travel: Greenways - What do you think?**

Do Greenways sound like a good idea? Would you or people you know, use them? Could they help mitigate the effects of private car ownership upon the environment, congestion and people’s health?

Very much agree with the improvement of Greenways for pedestrian and cyclist use. The goal must be seamless networks not disconnected sections of routes. The potential for reducing car use is clear. However, no disused rail line should be used in this way as all of these lines should be re-opened as part of giving people better choices than the car. Cuckoo Lane should be cycle friendly from end to end.

**Question 3**

**Active and Healthy Travel: LCWIPs - What do you think?**

Where else should have an LCWIP? What improvements would you like to see to your cycling or walking network? How can cycling and walking be made safer and more attractive for all?

The objectives for LCWIPs are very modest indeed, in relation to public health and the need to address the Climate Emergency. Each person needs to do ever more exercise each year beyond the age of 40 to remain healthy, or there will continue to be consequences in terms of impacts upon the NHS as well as their own longevity. The Climate Emergency is currently not being addressed effectively on a global basis, with a 67% increase in carbon dioxide emissions 1990-2018. So, as part of an integrated approach, LCWIPs need more ambitious targets and a much larger geographical coverage throughout the County. Each community with a population above 10,000 should be served by an LCWIP zone by 2030 at the latest. A core cycle network in each community is to be welcomed, provided it attracts levels of investment normally used on new trunk road building. Cycling can be made safer by separation from vehicles and from pedestrians as far as is practically possible. Reduction in air pollution must include the suppression of PM 2.5s arising from: brake pad erosion, road surface abrasion, wear of tyres, dispersal of toxic dust from the road surface. But this can only be achieved where pedestrianised areas, with through cycling access, are expanded in urban centres. Since it has often been demonstrated that pedestrianised areas benefit commercial outlets, economic objections can be set aside. Special pleading by some transport users or groups for continuations of heavily trafficked polluted and congested areas in urban centres need to be countered by progress with pedestrianisation in some locations that needs replication in Oxfordshire – examples include Norwich and York. Active travel for health promotion must be stressed as an alternative to short distance car, bus and taxi use. Retail regeneration and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods would benefit by this approach; notorious ‘rat runs’ could be closed, or access to them could be reduced to single-lane.

# Question 4

**Active & Healthy Travel: Low Traffic Neighbourhoods - What do you think?**

What do you think the benefits of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods could be for your community? How do you think they could be best introduced? What objections do you think there might be, and how could they be mitigated?

Low Traffic Neighbourhood development has worked well in Waltham Forest, which we have visited in the company of Cyclox supporters. Speed of introduction can be enhanced by making use of the findings of their impacts and particularly how they can favour the expansion of local businesses. Traffic diversion assumptions, meaning such Neighbourhoods move traffic elsewhere, need to be countered by the experience in Waltham Forest of ‘traffic evaporation’ – the actual disappearance of journeys. Clearly, enhanced local shopping areas as in the Waltham Forest case do attract more footfall from their own locality and may be preventing car journeys since the ‘local offer’ has positively changed. Pedestrianisation will rebuild local communities if given the chance eg: <https://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk/sites/cycling-embassy.org.uk/files/documents/2185491.pdf> Spending priorities are not made clear in documentation for this exercise. If a road user hierarchy is accepted as the documentation in this Engagement consultation suggests, and the physical vulnerability of both pedestrians and cyclists is properly recognised, then clear commitments about giving much higher priority in spending to pedestrians and cyclists need to be made abundantly clear. Documents stating the importance of active travel are nullified by continuing spending on new trunk roads, a known source of more journeys of longer distance. CATG is unconvinced by transport strategies or overall policies which lack a lot of locally-specific policy innovations. Our development of the *Cowley Area Transport Strategy*, in cooperation with a loose network of people in a part of East Oxford, is an example of what we mean. It seems likely, judging by the Headington Neighbourhood Plan, that some communities have already made significant steps towards their own local transport strategies. How might these types of strategies be funded? Firstly, by the abandonment of the Major Roads Network category that the Government has created which will divert more money spent on transport infrastructure away from the specific needs of small localities. Florence park has its own LTN design already and has consulted residents. Headington Quarry is demanding an LTN too.

# Question 5

**SHIFT - What do you think?**

Do you agree with our approach to progressing the SHIFT proposal? What types of measures do you think would help you to combine walking, cycling and public transport to make your daily journeys? Which locations should be a priority for any SHIFT network investment?

The SHIFT proposal must incorporate reductions in emissions from all transport serving Oxfordshire. This means aviation, shipping and imports must be accounted for. (See separate document submitted to this consultation on serious omissions in the Engagement consultation documentation). This means prioritising these areas for public spending, stopping new trunk road building and ensuring links to rail stations (existing and new) are included in this process. Priorities for the SHIFT proposal’s implementation should include ‘travel to shop’ as well as ‘travel to work’ areas. In our area of particular concern, this would mean improving links to the Cowley Centre and to Headington shops in particular, and considering means of discouraging and decreasing avoidable traffic movements in these vicinities. More cycle parking is needed at Headington shops as existing cycle racks are often full. Cycle priority is needed at all four points of the crossroads. City Centre cycle parking is poor, and should be restored to its original level in Queen Street. Two level (storey) cycle parking should be considered in the Carfax area in particular; the Rail station; Broad Street to help reduce car parking present there; and in St.Giles.

# Question 6

**Active and Healthy Travel: Parklets - What do you think?**

How do you think parklets could be implemented?

What kind of places across the county do you think they could work well? As part of our commitment to tackling the climate emergency how do you think they could contribute to supporting an increase in active and healthy travel (i.e. cycling and walking)? What kind of things would you have in a parklet if you were given free rein to design your own?

Parklets, and other green spaces not rendered lifeless by planning decisions, should have robust, drought resistant evergreen species predominantly and some areas of native flowering species appropriate to the soil conditions. Herbs and scented plants like Lavender and Rosemary are worth including.

# Question 7

**Active & Healthy Travel: Strategic Active Travel Network - What do you think?**

What do you think should be considered and included in developing the Strategic Active Travel Network? What else could be done to promote active travel? What uses could it have, once developed?

Existing and new developments should be planned to further reduce car parking allocation and in consequence encourage active travel and public transport use. Conversations with local residents in our area of interest suggest car ownership is a result of space available for parking. And car-free developments are too few. Whilst the principle of a Strategic Active Travel Network is a good one, the problem that will need addressing is how to ensure good continuity of network across, over or under roads, railways or other obstacles that need to be dealt with. One innovation we would suggest is that each Parish or Town Council should have a Green Travel Plan to cover both its residents and its visitors including deliveries. It should be borne in mind that the scope of cargo bike delivery will increase if this Strategic network is made effective, with advantageous reductions in delivery vehicles, noise and pollution.

# Question 9

**Bus Strategy: What do you think?**

Could you do more of your journeys by bus if something changed? If so, what?

Are there other areas that would help to make the bus network better for you, given our current constraints? What else could our bus strategy consider?

Most bus routes go in and out of Oxford; would you use the buses to go to other places, instead of Oxford, if it were possible/easier?

Many bus journeys being made within Oxford could be either walking or cycling journeys for a lot more people if good networks for each of these transport modes existed. Promotion of active travel therefore fits into the road user hierarchy as a health promotion measure, above supporting more use of buses as in this documentation. We also want to see more parents walking and cycling with children to schools, although convenient bus services are better than car use in terms of congestion. Rush hour buses are stuck in traffic jams on routes into Oxford and major routes within Oxford, emphasising the general need to reduce traffic. Since buses are at peak capacity on some routes eg on the High Street in Oxford in rush hour, other ways of serving transport needs are wanted and walking and cycling are the lowest cost options and the best for public health. Where buses are more important is to serve rural communities and reduce commuter/school run/shopping car journeys, where no rail option exists and no disused rail line could be put into service. This includes supporting short distance day visits by people coming out of Oxford to visit a variety of facilities and by doing so supporting the bus services. Whether bus services are commercially sustainable is not a primary consideration. Social solidarity between urban and rural areas should mean better bus services for the latter, including meeting needs for rural to rural journeys. This section has many points about bus services we agree with, but an integrated transport system means integration with the social need of health promotion, meaning stronger emphasis on walking and cycling. Reducing loading times by using flat fares and more emphasis on contactless payment should both be considered.

# Question 10

**Rail Corridor Study - What do you think?**

If capacity and connectivity were improved, how much more could you use the rail network in Oxfordshire?

We are in favour of encouraging more ‘stay-cations’, where Oxfordshire residents make full use of the enormous range of facilities within our County in place of overseas holidays. Building stronger local economies depends in part upon achieving better use of what we have available locally. Re-opening all disused rail lines with full electrification must be planned for and delivered as part of this process. Rebuilding Oxford rail station should be brought forward. The Cowley branch line should be linked to existing rail lines near Wheatley, the Marylebone line, and be extended to Witney and Carterton to relieve road traffic pressures. This will serve the goal of cutting car traffic and meeting the demand for rail passenger services. We note the need to re-nationalise the railways and to bring rail fares down from being the highest in Europe as part of that process. The available network of disused rail lines should be re-opened, with electrification, to give people more choice of transport modes on more routes.[[38]](#footnote-38) This long-term process should be planned carefully, so that – for example – communities with significant brownfield site population increase should obtain new rail services, including stations where desirable, to prevent new major sites of car commuting adding to traffic burdens.

# Question 11

**Park and Ride - What do you think?**

What role do you think Park and Ride should have in our future transport strategy development? How do you think Park and Ride could be developed or changed to contribute to reducing carbon emissions and improving health and well-being? What else should future Park and Ride strategy consider?

Our experience of Park and Ride is conditioned by lengthy periods of living in Canterbury, where very short distance Park and Ride created areas of significant traffic movements and pollution upon the periphery of a small City.[[39]](#footnote-39) Oxford’s plans to engage in urban sprawl rather than significantly increasing the urban population of the City mean that Park and Rides which are not always entirely peripheral to the City now, will become integral parts of the Oxford City Region if unimaginative housing sprawl continues. We want to see a strong emphasis on Park and Cycle, instead of just P&R buses. In terms of constraining traffic movements, the County and City should seek the designation of all major car parks as potential areas for high density housing over, above or around each site; similarly, the density of use of each industrial or science park should be considered with allocations of land to housing instead of employment. In order to reduce workplace parking spaces and car parking in Oxford which creates traffic movements and discourages use of least impact transport modes, existing Park and Rides should be decked for multi-level parking, have space for transhipment to increase cargo bike activity, and an area allocated to regular users who are running electric vehicles should be introduced and increased in steps to 100%, no later than 2030. We do not support more Park and Ride sites anywhere, favouring re-opening disused rail lines and a supported-subsidised network of bus services serving a larger part of the County than at present.

# Question 12

**Climate Emergency and Transport: What do you think?**

We know that doing nothing is not an option. What could you do, and the Council realistically support you to do, to help you make a long-term change to a much less polluting/carbon emitting mode of transport?

Net zero carbon emissions from the UK by 2050 is far too late, and does not yet include how this is to be achieved in sectors like aviation, shipping and imports. The supplementary submission on omissions from this consultation indicates briefly why 2050 is far too late a date. This means that the 45% proportion of emissions in the County coming from transport must be reduced to zero by 2030 at the latest.[[40]](#footnote-40) This 45% higher than the one fifth of emissions from transport noted by Government up to 2017 as a UK figure. It is also alarming that transport emissions in the UK increased 6% 1990-2017.[[41]](#footnote-41) If a 60% reduction in Oxfordshire’s transport emissions by 2030 is possible, according to this documentation, then more is possible with the commitment of political will. Many of our comments throughout this submission are about achieving earlier impacts upon greenhouse gas emissions from the transport sector in particular. We note that Oxford City Council is not offering a Zero Emission Zone, since polluting vehicles may still enter the area, but only an Ultra-Low Emissions Zone comparable to the one in London. The questioning here places emphasis upon the individual to take action, neglecting larger pollution sources than households such as employers both public and private. This is wrong. First, the greatest obligation must be placed upon the major sources of greenhouse gas emissions amongst employers which will include their transport impacts. Oxford University would have considerable expansion space for the long-term if it, and the Colleges, removed their long-stay car parking completely, apart from disabled provision. And other major employers must be named and shamed to follow suit, including BMW and Unipart.

# Question 13

**Air Quality - What do you think?**

What more could you do about air pollution where you live or work? In what ways could we get the message across more strongly, when pollution is an invisible issue and easily ignored?

The primary responsibility for dealing with air pollution lies with the Government and its agencies, and local government, not with individuals. Research shows premature deaths from air pollution globally are double previous estimates at about 8.8 million deaths per year, including 800,000 a year in Europe.[[42]](#footnote-42) The UK share of this is not 28-36,000 as the consultation document suggests, but 64,000 air pollution-caused deaths per year.[[43]](#footnote-43) The document correctly shows concern about PM 2.5s, but only pedestrianised areas where vehicle movement is minimised offer protection against virtually all forms of air pollutants. So, each Council in the County, beginning with its most polluted areas, must consider how pedestrianisation can be extended in its localities, whilst retaining through access for cycling. A Workplace Parking Levy in Oxford that covers only half of the 18,000 workplace parking spaces in the City is manifestly unfair and wholly inadequate to the problem of dealing with the real level of deaths from air pollution. And we now know that air pollution seems to be related to more deaths from the Coronavirus as well.[[44]](#footnote-44) So all of this creates an imperative for pedestrianisation, for low traffic neighbourhoods, far less urban car parking spaces, for more home-working and flexitime and emphasis on hiring electric vehicles instead of owning a polluting one.

Question 14

**Green Infrastructure - What do you think?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| • | What sorts of green infrastructure benefits would you particularly like to see and where? |
| • | Are there any particularly important routes that you think could be identified as strategic green routes for additional investment?  There is an abject failure to fund walking and cycling as part of assistance to make Green Infrastructure and the countryside in general more accessible. There should be a complete stop on Green Belt and greenfield site development to both preserve Green infrastructure and to retain land for a wide variety of other purposes including biodiversity restoration. Despite the colossal expense of new trunk road building, it remains a throwback to the 1950s in areas of Government policy. A sustainable and more resilient transport system means funding walking and cycling first, and then other low impact modes of transport and reducing tendencies to further encourage car journeys. The UK would benefit from more people holidaying here, and visiting here, but Governments and local councils need to behave as if this is what they wanted to achieve. This means spending money in the right places and ensuring that council officers, including planning officers, know what is required of them. In practice, more bridges over roads and under-passes under them will help; more rail lines to access the countryside can be created from disused lines; and countryside restoration needs to match sustainable transport initiatives, meaning closing down the Oxfordshire LEP in favour of funding local government, Natural England and the Environment Agency to ensure Green Infrastructure can fully play a part in recreation, tourism and employment, air quality improvement, biodiversity restoration and enhancement, nature-linked schooling activities etc, etc. Green Infrastructure needs careful maintenance within urban areas as well, given the propensity of planning committees to neglect the environment or wreck it. This could start with ensuring Tree Preservation Orders on far more trees than at present, and by ensuring greenfield sites are sacrosanct. Tree planning along bypasses should be instigated as a long-term programme. A Special Planning Guidance for the Lye Valley water catchment should include ensuring better drainage suitable for the Lye Valley SSSIs including proper road maintenance and including roadside drainage that is often poor and problem to cyclists and pedestrians. |

# Question 15

**School Streets - What do you think?**

How do you think School Streets could work in your community? Given climate emergency, air quality problems and public health issues, how important a priority should School Streets be for all Councils and Local Communities? What do you think needs to change to make School Streets happen?

What else could schools and parents change to help tackle climate emergency, and improve air quality?

There are traffic issues around each primary school in our area of main concern. Steps such as increasing double yellow lines, such as near the Tyndale Community School in William Morris Close, Oxford, do not prevent dropping off and parking issues at school run times and especially where this overlaps with normal rush hour traffic. St Christopher’s C of E School in Temple Road has had police interventions to guide gridlocked traffic out of the area because of too many cars present at school run times. In Bartholomew Road, Oxford, the Church Cowley St. James school, there are too many cars at school run times causing serious congestion making it dangerous to cross the road to the school – feeding a culture of car use to transport children safely to school. So individual schools will need their own traffic reduction planning, and enforcement is clearly needed in some areas. If children are to be supported walking and cycling to school, then overall reductions in school run traffic must occur. In some places, substantial extensions to double yellow lines and signage against drop offs is going to have to be backed up by daily enforcement. Probably the best way to tackle this is to have Green Travel Plans for each school in which each parent is deemed to have a role in reducing car use. School buses may be useful for some schools too. ‘School cycle buses’ or ‘Cycling bus’ arrangements as at Windmill School in Headington should be adopted generally, with the incentive of annual awards for the biggest schemes and most improved ones also.

# Question 16

**Did you comment on the Connecting Oxford proposals?**

**☐ Yes**

☐ No

These proposals need major improvement, particularly to ensuring Workplace Parking levies apply to all workplace parking spaces in Oxford, not half of them. We also want to see a realistic study of potential traffic diversion effects of Bus Gate locations. How, for example, would such a diversion of traffic be prevented if a Bus Gate is placed at the northern end of Hollow Way? Diversion of traffic through Dene Road and Bulan Road would be likely. This is just one example of where local residents need to be consulted directly. We support more CPZs, and an extended Ultra Low Emissions Zone to cover the whole City no later than 2030.

# Question 17

**Area Transport Strategies - What do you think?**

This paper has used Science Vale as an example. Your area will also need a transport strategy.

What are your views on a strategy for your area? What would make it easier for you to choose more sustainable and active modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport for some journeys instead of opting for your car?

The Cowley Area Transport Group has already prepared a local transport strategy for our area. The 3rd edition of the Cowley Area Transport Strategy will appear later in 2020. The main public needs we have found in the area are for reductions in through traffic movements, reductions in traffic around schools, and improved and safer walking and cycling arrangements – for example in Between Towns Road and at the Oxford Road-Between Towns Road-Garsington Road-Hollow Way staggered junction. We support proposals for a Low Traffic Neighbourhood in Florence Park, and want similar arrangements to apply in neighbouring areas. Our conversations in our locality suggest parents are loath to let children walk or cycle to school on some routes because of adverse traffic conditions and a lack of good walking and cycling networks. The presumption in the final question above is that all households have access to a car. In Oxford, about a third of households do not have access to a car and this is something which should be encouraged as a contribution to our local environment by our councils. Hire of an electric car should be strongly encouraged in place of car ownership.

# Question 18

**Transport Corridor Connectivity - What do you think?**

What approaches to managing transport and movement should be developed on major corridors such as the A420? What changes do you think would be realistic and effective? What would encourage you to switch to using the bus on the major routes through the county - A40, A44, A420, A4074? If you live near or on a major transport corridor what would you like to see changed?

Enhancement of long-distance coach arrangements, and more express buses are desirable. The authors of this submission are both coach users and occasional rail users. Studies should be used to identify which types of functions are being represented by different transport users in order to reduce vehicles in each category year on year. Initiatives to do this could include: Electronic Road Pricing; school buses in place of cars; more cargo bikes; progressive long-term transfer of some freight to water borne transport and rail; Green Travel Plans by all employers to cut vehicle movements. No new trunk roads, junctions or road-widening measures should occur. Resources should achieve lower levels of use of roads.

# Question 19

**Regional Transport Network - What do you think?**

How do you think Oxfordshire should ensure it remains a significant authority across the region? How might the schemes above play a role in mitigating climate emergency, improving air quality or supporting healthy place shaping? How beneficial do you think it might be for Oxfordshire to be better linked to Cambridge by new transport links?

There is no such thing as the Oxford-Cambridge Arc as a region. The TTW data indicates concentrated traffic movements to work in Oxford, Milton Keynes and Cambridge and very little movement across the Arc. So, it cannot be considered a region in transport terms. Anything which encourages more vehicle movement across the Region, such as the unwanted Cambridge-Oxford Expressway idea, should be abandoned as unacceptable use of public resources in relation to both the Climate Emergency and the various ecological crises including loss of biodiversity in the UK.[[45]](#footnote-45) As HS2 is intended to carve through over 100 ancient woodlands, then Oxfordshire becoming a ‘significant authority; would imply a new holistic approach linking biodiversity, the Climate Emergency, eco-tourism, localisation of production and exchange, sustainable transport modes and an end to bodies which take money from local government like the Oxfordshire LEP and England’s Economic Heartland. Grandiose projects are not needed, especially when obviously meeting public opposition. There is support for East West Rail, and for its full electrification, and for opening disused rail lines. Support for enhancing some routes for water borne transport for leisure, freight and boats as homes need considering. There is no appreciable support anywhere for the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway. The idea of extra funds to a Major Roads Network should be abandoned, and the resources other than those needed for road repair should go to cycling and walking networks.

# Question 20

**Will you be responding to the forthcoming consultation on the Zero Emission Zone?**

☐ **Yes**

☐ No

☐ Maybe

Please enter any additional comments

There is no Zero Emissions Zone planned, only an Ultra-Low Emissions Zone. It is not helpful to give false impressions of what councils are doing. CATG supports an Ultra-Low Emissions Zone for the entire area of Oxford and such parts of the Oxford City Region as may be sources of major traffic movements in and out of Oxford. The easiest way to do this would be through Electronic Road Pricing, to make using polluting vehicles prohibitive, in stages up to a full scheme by 2030, using the Singapore model. Additional steps could include closing off some roads to deter car use and rat-running as part of this process.

|  |
| --- |
| Question 21  **Local Community Action on Transport - What do you think?** |

What can you do for your community to make it a better/nicer/safer place to live? What type of small interventions would you see as a priority for funding? How might other organisations support you?

What would you find useful? Can we frame the issue in a way that will help you as a resident to engage and come up with your own sustainable solutions for your community?

Are there current schemes that need help expanding to benefit more of the community?

The Cowley Area Transport Strategy we have prepared with the assistance of many people needs the kind of funding lavished upon road schemes in the past. This is both community and place making and can create an agenda of projects to improve transport conditions year on year. Clearly, the Low Traffic Neighbourhood proposed for Florence Park needs general expansion: every residential area needs to be a Low Traffic Neighbourhood in the County as a long-term goal. Subject to the constraints of not preventing Emergency Vehicle movements, public utility vehicles and residential traffic, road space needs attenuating to discourage rat running, illicit movements of heavy goods vehicles and decreasing enthusiasm for using cars in the school run. Above all, we see this as part of localising public spending and giving people more power in their own areas. As part of this, the restriction than Neighbourhood Plans must be in ‘lockstep’ with the Plans of their district or unitary council needs to be challenged. Whilst the Council concerned may be considered a ‘strategic’ level of decision-making, local communities should have the power to challenge traffic management or planning decisions which make traffic and environmental conditions in their area worse.

# Question 23

**Network Management and Coordination - What do you think?**

How do you think Network Management should balance the transport needs of the county as whole (and indeed the wider region) with those of local communities?

What do you like about these proposals or think needs to change?

The goal of network management must be road traffic reduction. Economic activity in a country with far more home working and flexitime could be a lot more household-centred. This is a potential lesson the Coronavirus crisis is teaching us. Similarly, there is the issue of remote access to some leisure and educational activities having potential traffic reduction effects.

# Question 24

**Highways Asset Management Plan - What do you think?**

Does Oxfordshire’s Asset Management approach sound like a good idea to you? Do you think it could be a good solution to ensuring the transport network is maintained? What else might you want to know about HAMP?

The main issue here is that Government believes in adding new trunk roads whilst the backlog of road repairs is not effectively addressed. Our views are that no new trunk roads should be created, that repairs should be to higher standards on all roads, and that road traffic reduction measures of all types should receive funding previously wasted on creating new roads. Asset Management is best served by reducing impacts on road infrastructure and ensuring more durable road repairs.

Question 25

**Freight Strategy - What do you think?**

Do you have any ideas about how to better move and manage freight through and within Oxfordshire? How do you think improvements could be made?

The expansion of online sales is increasing freight goods movements, especially by light goods vehicles.[[46]](#footnote-46) This may require more taxation to reduce numbers of vehicles in use and to keep emissions down.[[47]](#footnote-47) Resources to support increases in the use of cargo bikes, waterways and rail for freight, and to encourage localisation of production and better re-use and recycling can all contribute to cutting the volume of freight vehicle movements. Electronic Road Pricing can also be used to deter movements of heavier goods vehicles on some routes, in addition to extending prohibitions as part of encouraging other means of freight movement, including especially cargo bikes.

**Question 26: A Smart County - What do you think?**

What are your views on Smart Cities and a Smart County? What advantages do you think connectivity could bring? What else should or could be put in place through a Smart County approach?

To reduce road traffic, no new trunk roads should be built. Housing developments need to take place upon urban brownfield sites in order to radically restrict potential traffic growth. Didcot-Bicester-Oxford should be linked by continuous and safe cycle routes with no road widening at all, and rail links should be enhanced. Culham-Harwell-Milton Park already have the Science shuttle. The cycle routes should be improved and be made continuous and safe. The cycle route from Oxford to Blenheim Palace should be made continuous and safe. Safe in all these cases involves properly planned safe junctions and roundabouts for cyclists. The Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal should be revised with lower housing targets to reflect ONS figures.

# **Question 27**

**Living Labs - What do you think?**

How do you think new technologies can best be employed? How do you feel about Oxfordshire being at the forefront of improvement? Would you like to be more involved in Living Labs?

Not unlike the Smart County section, this is more than a little vague. There are unstated questions here related to feasibility of roll-out of autonomous travel, timescales, actual investment and precisely who the real target audience might be.

# Question 28

**Motorcycles - What do you think?**

Should the approach to motorbikes and motorbike riders in the new Local Transport and Connectivity Plan be reviewed? How could any approach affect active and healthy travel opportunities?

Could there be better and clearer parking, as distinct from cycle parking and car parking?

Could road safety campaigns on motorcycles be extended? What angle/s should this cover?

It would have been more appropriate to consider motorcycles together with scooters, electric bicycles and powered small scale electric scooters. The latter two technologies appear to be more in evidence than electric motorbikes at present. What is perhaps needed here is a Charging strategy accommodating to these different technologies and then allocations within specified parking areas to provide for these needs. We agree that even electric motorcycles make a noise and that an overall sustainable transport strategy means quieter modes of transport need to be favoured. The issue of motorcycle accidents is particularly concerning since a contact who works with head injuries and associated neurological damage has emphasised to us the frequency of brain damage, and of deaths, and the impacts upon the family of the deceased. Electric bicycles, although not offering the same range as a motorbike, have the huge advantage of what should continue to be an enlarging cycle network which provides increased protection for cyclists.
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