

Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel

Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel's responses to the LTCP5 topic paper questions

CoHSAT's general principles

Our overarching aim is that: No journey will require a private car, as there is always an alternative.

To achieve this, the following are needed:

1. No car-dependent new developments (housing, retail or industrial) should be permitted and in existing developments car-dependency should be reduced.
2. In all villages, towns and in Oxford, the development of local services so that everyone can walk or cycle to meet their everyday needs: the "20-minute neighbourhood".
3. Expansion of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in urban areas, to make walking, cycling and scooting the natural choice for short journeys.
4. The school journey is transformed, so children can walk, cycle and scoot in safety and with confidence.
5. Rapid expansion of a Strategic Active Travel Network, of the highest quality.
6. Provision of a comprehensive system of conventional and demand-responsive zero-emission public transport services, particularly in rural areas.
7. Widespread easy access to low-carbon shared mobility services, including pooled electric vehicles, e-bikes and e-cargo bikes.
8. A clear strategy to reduce private car trips in urban areas.
9. A clear strategy on how to reduce lorry and van freight journeys throughout the county.

Responses to specific questions in LTCP5 topic papers

1. Active & Healthy Travel: Cycle Streets

Q: 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?

A: We support the concept of cycle streets- they are a great idea, but need to be part of a wider package of cycling confirming that motorists give priority to cyclists everywhere, both legally and psychologically. For more people to cycle in Oxfordshire, the cycle routes have to be a lot safer than at present and separate (in space and, sometimes, in time) from cars, buses, vans. This will continue to be true when the number of vehicles has been reduced by 40%. It is likely to take a long time - and new legislation - for motorists to accept that people cycling have priority, even after the experience of the present lockdown.

It is not sufficient for cycle streets to be signed only. In the Netherlands and Denmark they are effectively normal streets, giving cyclists priority. Otherwise, they must be combined with properly segregated space and modal filters that create Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and restrict motor traffic. Two examples are: Jack Straws Lane in Oxford should be closed to through traffic to make it a genuine cycle street. Cowley Road cannot be described as anything close to a cycle street! It can only work with a modal filter, giving legal priority for cycling and no legal overtaking of people cycling.

The Homezone is a similar concept for carefully selected streets as part of a joined up urban network, giving cyclists priority. Marlborough Road, Oxford or East St Helen's St, Abingdon may be good examples.

For there to be more people cycling, there also needs to be better information on multi-modal journey planners (apps and public interactive display screens) that include cycling. And good quality, plentiful cycle parking at all modal intersections.

2. Active & Healthy Travel: Greenways

Q: 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?

A: Greenways are an excellent idea, provided they are 'green'. This means new routes, away from roads, that go through an attractive, leafy environment and are designed for safety (lit, wide, good surfaces). CoHSAT believes that the design criteria are crucial and would like to be included in a thorough debate about the objectives for the Greenways. For instance, are they mainly to link outlying villages to Oxford (as in Cambridge); have they a primary function of enabling children to get to school, without relying on the parental car; are they focusing also on filling in the gaps in the present network, for instance from Charlbury to Chipping Norton. CoHSAT expects there to be both radial routes into Oxford and with orbital 'necklaces' joining up the radial routes to form a strong network of car-free, cycling and pedestrian routes.

The proposals to use public rights of way and disused railway lines are excellent. The use of minor public roads is only sensible if they are closed to through traffic (cars and vehicles). Otherwise they remain too narrow and dangerous for cyclists, particularly children.

The Greenways should be part of a complete network of traffic-free routes that connect places people want to go: homes, workplaces, shops, schools, etc.

3. Active and Healthy Travel: LCWIP

Q: 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?

A: We are in wholehearted support of the Oxford LCWIP and believe that there is an imperative on implementing it immediately.

All Oxfordshire towns should have LCWIPs and the principles applied to all settlements large and small. Walking and cycling should be separate from cars and other fossil-fuelled vehicles, both for health, noise and public amenity reasons. Which means there should be 5m between their exhausts and the cyclist and the walker.

The full suite of LCWIPs together form the backbone of the transformation to active travel in urban areas, so they are needed urgently. There needs to be a clear implementation plan and resource allocated to manage the change. Work can start on a small scale without needing massive investment, such as modal filters to create Low Traffic Neighbourhoods thereby increasing walking and cycling for short local trips. This is particularly important now, in response to the Coronavirus epidemic and as requested by the Secretary of State for Transport.

We want to see Greenways integrated into a comprehensive network of cycle routes so that there is no disconnect between the quick and quiet routes defined by the LCWIPs and the Greenways and other long-distance cycle routes. Then, the cycling and walking opportunities are continuous, comprehensive, logical and reflect the travel-desire lines that meet the needs of all.

The LCWIP approach to coherent network design is strongly supported and should be extended to every town in Oxfordshire. All routes must be designed to be inclusive, to be used by all abilities - otherwise the mass of people who are not yet cycling will be excluded from some of the best routes.

4. Active & Healthy Travel: Low Traffic Neighbourhoods

Q: 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?

A: We are strong supporters of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and are delighted at the support they are being given by the councils, for instance in the Oxford LCWIP. Our third suggestion is for the:

Expansion of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in urban areas, to make walking, cycling and scooting the natural choice for short journeys.

Rapid progress with the transformation of Florence Park will mean that residents, retailers and drivers in other areas can see that the benefits (greater footfall and safer, cleaner, quieter streets) really do outweigh any short-term inconvenience. In Jericho, we support the latest proposal by Don't Choke Jericho. This would convert a section of Walton Street to mixed ped/cycle use and allow expanded frontages for traders. The template here is Orford Road in Walthamstow, London. The busgate on Worcester Street under Connecting Oxford will alleviate rat-running pressures, and the use of central Walton Street as the "point closure" will address the current all-south vs all-north entry/exit problem.

LTNs are great and their benefits have been proven over long experience in the Netherlands and more recently in Waltham Forest, as noted in the Topic Paper. Several communities in Oxford are ready and eager to get started. The key campaigners in each community understand that any such proposal will be challenging for some people. Equally, there is a growing recognition that the voices against LTNs are louder than those in favour -- but are unlikely to be more numerous. They are best introduced based on strong neighbourhood desire. This open engagement is essential. Shops may be concerned, but data from Waltham Forest and other places (see Living Streets' Pedestrian Pound analysis) shows retailers often overestimate the purchases of those arriving by car and underestimate those by foot and cycle. Other objections may come forward based on mis-understandings of impact or benefits and the process should be ready to engage with these early.

The engagement process should begin with localities being asked to decide *where* the street architecture is installed, not *whether* it is installed. This will build local ownership and local champions. Then, at consultation stage, the process must be paper-based and one per household. Online platforms such as Commonplace have been shown to be vulnerable to misuse.

5. SHIFT

Q: 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?

A: We support SHIFT and endorse the principles behind it and the need for improved facilities to facilitate inter-modal switching, for instance, better, secure cycle storage near bus stops. This has to be done quickly and comprehensively. The highest priority locations should be where there are no safe cycling routes in the public transport corridor. Oxfordshire has a good track record of providing cycle parking at rural bus stops.

Measures should include better signage, journey-planning information, marketing and

improvement of routes between bus stops and origins/destinations (e.g. new cycle/walking routes, surfacing, vegetation clearance). Get local volunteer 'rangers' to look after the routes (Drawing on Sustrans experience). This will work best on established bus corridors with frequent services, and where many houses or key locations are close to the stop. A review of the county or individual routes could be conducted - see the OCN/Oxford Bus/Stagecoach paper on potential Mini P&R locations as many of these are suitable for SHIFT. Also be aware of distances, SHIFT will be best for walking or cycling within 5-10 minutes of fixed bus stops. The impact could be tested by careful measurement of a single route or a few bus stops.

The links between SHIFT and demand-responsive mobility services requires some very careful planning.

6. Active and Healthy Travel: Parklets

Q: 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?

A: Parklets are brilliant and have been shown to increase community cohesion and reclaim the street for people. The future must be one in which privately owned and driven cars simply make a smaller impression on our public realm and in our transport network. Parklets are a key part of this future, which we need to bring into the present "at pace".

The provision of more public spaces with attractive seating and planting is an excellent idea and we support these, for instance in Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, Broad Street and St Giles. The 'parklets' could provide mobile-phone charging points, powered by photovoltaic panels <https://strawberrye.com/>.

Local ownership is important, so that parklets are maintained and valued by local residents. This has worked well in Beechcroft Road.

7. Active & Healthy Travel: Strategic Active Travel Network

Q: 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?

Q: We strongly support the provision of a Strategic Active Travel Network, provided it includes both walking and cycling, as our objectives state: **The rapid expansion of a Strategic Active Travel Network, of the highest quality.**

The network should enable active travel from any town to any other on a safe route. Most journeys would be shorter, but such a network would:

- Enable essentially any journey in the county to be made in comfort by active travel (walking, cycle or e-bike), bolstering all active travel as credible modes;
- Provide a backbone network so other locations (eg schools) and new developments can be 'plugged in';
- Provide an excellent and marketable tourism resource.

One of our main objectives are that:

The school journey is transformed, so children can walk, cycle and scoot in safety and with confidence.

In developing the SATN, one approach should be to start with the location of the schools and ensure that the vast majority of pupils can get there via a Cycle Street, a School Street or dedicated cycle route. There should be no requirement for the pupil to be driven to school, because of the absence of safe, active travel opportunities. We believe this could be a transformative approach and help to reverse the need for many parents to get into a car.

Our view is that every transport decision should prioritise active travel over other modes of transport, not the other way round. The overarching, strategic active travel network needs to be developed as soon as possible, so that it is clear that separate developments (for instance the first 8 miles of Greenways around Oxford) fit into the whole proposal. Piecemeal development of the network, in the absence of the overall strategy, will undoubtedly be sub-optimal.

It is good that other topics are being drawn together under the SATN, such as Greenways, LWCIPs and School Streets.

8. Equestrians

Q: Do you think that horse riders and equestrian issues need consideration in OCC strategy, policies and practice? How do you think equestrian use of the highway network could be made safer?

A: The number one preference for equestrians is a softer surface than tarmac, which can also get slippery. But as an alternative route to riding on busy roads, then horse riders would prefer to use the off-road, hard surfaced option, such as a Greenway. If it is wide enough then the Greenway could have a grass verge for horse-riders, or a surface such as 'Flexipave' which is non-slip, porous and uses recycled tyres. Equestrians should not be excluded from Greenways and forced to ride on dangerous roads. Highway and greenway design should be made aware of equestrians. There are places where equestrian traffic is significant on roads

and changes would help them to cross, visibility could be improved or speeds reduced.

9. Bus Strategy

Q: 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?

A: There is a short-term problem, because of social distancing. In the longer-term, high quality buses on frequent, reliable routes throughout Oxfordshire are essential if people are to switch out of cars. These services should be 7 days a week and continue late into the evening. We wish to see reregulation of buses to allow:

- Cheaper fares, which are essential when we want to persuade people out of cars;
- Remove competitive ticketing, including at night;
- Better use of subsidies on less economically viable routes.

The bus network will undoubtedly consist of excellent services along the main routes and connecting services, for instance with demand-responsive buses and taxis, to rural villages. This demonstrates the need for an integrated approach to transport planning.

Most people commuting on buses are those with lower or middle incomes. Energy justice requires a stronger focus on buses than railways.

Private cars have received numerous economic advantages over public transport in recent years and this needs to be reversed. There are some critical roles that OCC can fulfil to help this and the development of bus services: we need to start investing in public transport and only rarely subsidise the private car in future.

For non-Oxford buses, the important thing is to understand the journey needs - you need a Origin/Destination journey survey. For example some routes might justify a direct non-stop premium service at peak-hour (e.g. a Wantage to Harwell 'space shuttle' or a 'Witney to Oxford Tube') - While these are commercial opportunities, it may be public use of data that identifies them.

Further, OCC should coordinate a project to see how far a rural bus corridor can be developed using the complete 'toolkit' that has been identified. This could include: SHIFT, Mini P&Rs, Demand Responsive Transport, Promotion, signage, real-time info/app, route improvement/priority etc.

Bus transport will be one of the main beneficiaries of Connecting Oxford. In addition to the five busgates/ traffic filters in the October 2019 document, we need two more bus gates: at the

bottom and top ends of Morrell Avenue in East Oxford. This would allow a much faster and more reliable bus-service between the rail station / city-centre on the one hand and Marston, Headington and East Oxford on the other hand. This slightly expanded version of Connecting Oxford is the natural extension of the council's already ambitious and commendable vision.

Within Oxford we are expecting such a significant reduction in motor vehicle numbers that buses can travel at a reasonable speed along arterial and connector roads. Elsewhere buses should be given priority over other motor vehicles through comprehensive bus lanes and bus gates. In urban areas, bus speeds should be limited to 20mph, for the safety of cycle users.

10. Rail Corridor Study

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

A: The more stations that can be opened and new lines re-opened or developed, the better. The developments in the OCRS are all welcome. The link to Cambridge is essential, so that the expressway is made redundant. Electrification of all lines should be a priority, particularly using locally-generated electricity, for instance from photovoltaic installations over station car parks. The success of Oxford Parkway demonstrates the potential for new rail connections. However, most people commuting by rail are in relatively better-off income groups. We strongly support the reopening of the Cowley branch line for passenger trains. New stations at Grove and Begbroke are also supported, with good quality walking and cycling connections essential.

On using rail more, a key issue is connection to rail stations. 2 examples:

- Abingdon, a major town, has 3 issues for increasing rail use of which connectivity is the first: (1) the station is 2 miles away and the cycle route is fairly poor, there is a bus every 20 minutes, or you have to drive; (2) Train frequency is very low 1-2 an hour - so the improved frequency in ORCS helps this; (3) For Oxford, the X3 bus is very frequent and cheaper. For London, train is the most practical option but the question is 'Radley or Didcot' - frequency and a better cycle route would save a drive to Didcot.
- Oxford Parkway, 2 miles from Kidlington and Summertown. But when it was opened the opportunity was missed to establish safe cycling routes between them, or even to clear vegetation and improve signage on the existing substandard cycling routes.

11. Park and Ride

Q: 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?

A: In the immediate future, because of the pandemic, the P&R should become 'Park and Pedal', so there is no need to get on a bus. The surplus orange bikes in the centre of Oxford could be relocated to the P&R for hire.

Eventually, the role of Park and Ride is in inverse proportion to that of public transport: the better the public transport, the less need there is for more Park and Rides. So, P&R is a transitional solution whilst an integrated public and active travel network is under development. Park-and-rides should be gradually reconstituted as bus interchanges, along with a greatly expanded county-wide bus network, to unlock a host of benefits in the Oxford public transportation system. Among other things, a bus-interchange would: (A) Reduce the overwhelming bus impression on the city centre; and (B) Allow the benefits of Connecting Oxford to be enjoyed by people not living in Oxford and not wishing to use a private car to reach a park-and-ride. The transition of park-and-rides to bus interchanges is consistent with the necessary diminution of the privately owned and privately driven car in our transport system and our public realm.

Another role for the P&R in future is as a charging hub for electric vehicles and the trans-shipment of freight from large vans and lorries to cargo-bikes, lockers for self-collection, and electric vans.

P&R has a role to play in routes where it is currently unfeasible to provide public transport from end-to-end. These are likely to be 'Mini P&R' with parking and bus services remote from Oxford and where the 'ride' is most of the journey. These will not be sufficient to support dedicated P&R bus services so would be on existing bus services (or help to justify new bus services). They typically would have 10-100 parking spaces plus cycle parking, and placed to have walking, cycling and driving catchments from nearby towns and villages. Because these can be on existing routes, they may serve other towns or work locations with central parking or congestion problems, for example Abingdon, Banbury, Bicester, Didcot (& station), Milton Park.

12. Climate Emergency and Transport

Q: 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?

A: We strongly support the need for urgent action and hope that the County Council will prioritise decarbonising transport in LTCP5, as requested by the Secretary of State.

The best support the Council can give is to be brave, firm, decisive and act to limit cars and other vehicles in Oxford and Oxfordshire. It will be inconvenient to be stopped from driving across Oxford, but that is what has to happen and we all have to get used to it. Half-hearted measures and a prolonged timetable will just extend the period of pain and adaptation.

Electric vehicles will contribute to a low carbon future, but they can't replace fossil-fuelled cars one on one. Electric vehicles are not the answer to congestion, severance and social justice.

Much more clarity is required by the County Council on how life can continue (and improve) without private cars dominating public spaces. We strongly endorse the Climate Action plan to “reprioritise road space for low-carbon travel”, provided that walking, cycling and public transport have a much higher priority than electric vehicles.

The lack of integration with the planning system we have seen over the last several years has led to some appalling results. New developments MUST have a zero carbon transport plan from the OUTSET. There should be no new housing development without good bus, cycle and walking route connections. Car parking should be minimised to encourage active travel, public transport and shared car use. This will require working with the District Councils to ensure planning for active and public transport connectivity is built in BEFORE a development is permitted to progress and is in place before the new residents take up occupancy. Otherwise, people will get accustomed to the wrong travel patterns while waiting for the new development to be connected. A major element of this planning should be to ensure that children can get to school safely, by active travel means.

This reflects our main aim and first principle:

Our overarching aim is that: No journey will require a private car, as there is always an alternative.

To achieve this, the following are needed:

- 1. No car-dependent new developments (housing, retail or industrial) should be permitted and in existing developments car-dependency should be reduced.**

13. Air Quality

Q: 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?

A: Air pollution is a blight on our towns and city, and has to be reduced rapidly in compliance with WHO standards. This requires a big modal shift out of private cars (including EVs which pollute through braking and tyre wear). This will only be achieved by disincentivising cars from our towns. Each town needs Traffic Restriction, Parking reductions (and/or WPL). A quick intervention would be to remove the subsidy of free parking, for instance in Witney.

There should be a public information alert to warn people not to visit a specific area when pollution levels are high, in particular for children and people with health problems.

We are disturbed by the proposal in the Red Zone of the ZEZ that polluting vehicles can buy their way into a pollution-free zone during the day and have free access between 7pm-7am. It must be made clear by the Councils that this is a temporary situation to allow residents and businesses a bit of time to buy EV or adapt through using cargo bikes or other non-polluting modes.

The 59% improvement in air quality in Oxford during lockdown is one piece of good news to come from the Coronavirus epidemic. It demonstrates the real health benefits for all those in Oxford if polluting cars are removed. We hope and request that the County Council introduces policies that maintain this level of clean air, or better. Otherwise, "Every day someone in Oxfordshire dies from air pollution" will continue to be true.

14. Green Infrastructure

Q: Your views on how best to incorporate green infrastructure into the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan would be welcomed. For example:

What do you like most / least about the existing transport and connectivity GI in the county?

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?

The Greenways and the Green Infrastructure should be two parts of the same policy and developed together, to link with the existing excellent green infrastructure, both 'big' (AONB, Ridgeway, Thames Path) and small (many parks, footpaths etc). There should be clear maps and signage (outdoors and on the internet) to identify the locations and promote their benefits. Every town should have an equivalent of the 'Bicester Blue Lines' (a blue health trail painted on the roads) and short bike and walking routes.

There may be some elements of the Green Infrastructure that are for walking only, but it is assumed that in most cases they will combine with cycle routes. A strong strategic approach to GI would be very welcome, for instance making sure there are good quality, long-distance, uninterrupted paths and areas beside the Thames, the canal and other waterways.

The Green Infrastructure could be designed to provide corridors for biodiversity. And the Thames Path should be opened up to cycling throughout Oxfordshire (and beyond), with improved access for disabled people by removing restrictive barriers.

15. School Streets

Q: 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?

A: School Streets are a brilliant and important concept and should be a priority for all schools, whether primary, secondary or independent. We are in full support of the approach.

However, there should be a more comprehensive approach to school travel. This requires positive links with the development of Greenways and active travel paths generally, so that it is realistic to expect the children to cycle, walk or scoot to school in safety. Each school should have a healthy travel plan that is agreed with the parents and well publicised. The first thing would be for each school to map how the pupils get to school and how many are in practical walking/cycling distance? The school and the County Council can then discuss how to improve the situation, quickly.

When the Coronavirus has been minimised, additional school buses are probably needed as well, particularly for primary school children. In Oxford, one possibility is the development of school bus services that pick up children (particularly for the independent schools) from the Park and Rides and take them to the various schools within the ring road, eg some children go to the High School, some to the Dragon, but on the same bus. This would provide safety for the children and peace of mind for the parents. The Oxford Schools Bus Partnership is, at present, for independent schools only. It should be opened out for all school pupils.

There are obvious links with cycle streets, the need to combine with modal filters and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods for an area-wide approach to school travel.

16. Did you comment on the Connecting Oxford proposals?

Q: Yes/No. Please enter any additional comments

Yes, CoHSAT commented and would just reiterate that the Councils need to have the courage to take decisive, bold action and bring in coherent, consistent, tough policies together, probably overnight. We are disappointed at the delay announced in progressing with the detailed Connecting Oxford plan.

We want to reiterate that we believe the workplace parking levy should apply to the whole City. On its own, this may not deter sufficient motorists and other measures will be needed. We are not in favour of any pricing mechanism, such as road charging, as this is regressive: it is easier for the better-off to pay than those on lower incomes.

We endorse the Connecting Oxford Plus (developed by Oxfordshire Liveable Streets) which includes two extra busgates (Warneford Lane and St Clements), to stop rat runs across the east of the City and ensure that travel in Oxford is in sectors: travel to the centre is in and out of the same sector, not across them. Connecting Oxford as consulted in October 2019 leaves open St Clements (and Warneford Lane) as conduits of traffic between the South and Headington. St Clements is already the city's highest-polluted corridor. As bold as Connecting Oxford is (and much deserving of commendation), it risks exacerbating this problem -- while also missing out on significant connectivity benefits that would accrue to all bus routes flowing through St Clements (and along Iffley and Cowley roads). The solution is parsimonious: two additional bus gates, located on the main roads either end of Morrell Avenue. Please google "Connecting Oxford Plus" in the OLS "Statement on Connecting Oxford" for more details.

CoHSAT believes that, as soon as possible, Oxford City centre should be car-free. While there are a large number of public and private parking spaces this cannot happen. Similar exclusions are needed for freight transport.

17. Area Transport Strategies

Q: 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?

A: Area strategies are a sensible approach, but they need to further the objectives and outcomes of LTCP5, particularly the need to deliver substantial modal shifts. Thus they must include plans for a significant and immediate shift away from private cars and towards:

- Public transport (buses, supported by mobility hubs)
- Active transport (cycle routes that join up origins and destinations and around towns, walkable spaces)
- Facilities for EV charging (including for autonomous EVs)
- Infrastructure to facilitate and encourage shared autonomous cars instead of private autonomous cars.

This needs to start with data on journeys - origins and destinations, not just flows on roads.

18. Transport Corridor Connectivity

Q: 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?

It is not sufficiently clear to CoHSAT how the County Council intends to reduce car use and road freight transport in Oxfordshire, but they have to be reduced. Hence, the proposals for these major corridors have to focus immediately and strongly on alternative forms of transport through a significant shift away from private cars and towards:

- Public transport (buses, trains, supported by suitable interchanges (e.g. mobility hubs, Mini P&R) and onward connections (local walking and cycling connections, local buses/DRT). Need to achieve regularity, affordability, reliability (which is generally as good as a car but needs better communication), credibility/acceptability (so a well-tuned promotion campaign, or maybe some improvements to the actual proposition are required). Start with some focus groups and see what the issues are. Test potential solutions on a 'Living Lab' corridor.
- Active Transport. Many town-to-town journeys in Oxfordshire are ~5 miles and so under 30 minutes by cycle or e-bike. So a Strategic Active Travel Network is a credible and valuable investment.

19. Regional Transport Network

Q: 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?

A: A Regional point of view is good for sharing best practices (and avoiding repetition of mistakes), and for connecting public and active transport networks. In particular, Oxfordshire's routes should be connected to Reading, Swindon and Thame & Haddenham Parkway Station. CoHSAT considers the development of the electric rail network between Oxford and Cambridge to be of real importance, primarily because it enables both cities to link to routes to the north via Milton Keynes and Bedford.

We agree with OCC's position on the Expressway. Road capacity increases - obviously including but not limited to the Ox-Cam Expressway - are strictly incompatible with responding to the climate emergency. Even a 100% EV fleet with 100% renewable energy would be incompatible with a climate emergency, due to the embedded carbon required to produce EVs. Any major new road project should be viewed as worse than a white elephant, because it is not just irrelevant, it actively takes us in the wrong strategic direction.

Oxfordshire will achieve immense kudos by reversing the role of the car and thus improving the quality of life for its residents. The County will be an exemplar on the future of transport.

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

Q: Yes/No/Maybe. Please enter any additional comments

Yes. The interactions between the ZEZ and Connecting Oxford appear to us to be in need of careful thought, with the overarching direction clearly explained to the people in Oxford. The ZEZ is more focused on switching to EV, whereas CO is designed to restrict motor vehicle traffic. These need better alignment.

Motor traffic restrictions and parking restrictions should be the priority rather than ZEZ. Similar traffic restrictions, parking reductions and ZEZs should be rolled out to other congested and polluted towns in the county.

21. Local Community Action on Transport

Q: 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?

A: We completely believe in the importance of local community activity, providing this is set in a framework of much more extensive action by the County Council to remove the need to get into a car. Particularly, the provision of inter-connecting transport modes, for instance demand-responsive options in small villages to enable people to get to the nearest bus service, which may be some distance away. As stated in our overarching principles, there needs to be the

Provision of a comprehensive system of conventional and demand-responsive zero-emission public transport services, particularly in rural areas.

These include pooled electric vehicles, e-bikes, e-cargo bikes and community transport options for the less mobile.

We expect the County Council to provide the framework within which local communities can flourish and have the appropriate mobility. This builds on all our earlier comments, so that the future of all travel is low carbon, active and healthy. As with low traffic neighbourhoods, even where there is a strong community-led activity, there is still the need for council funding and support.

Funding is critical and the Council holds the purse strings. A Community Action Fund should be established to enable local initiatives and minor works to go ahead on local streets e.g. parklets, bike hangers and community planning events.

The interactive system envisaged will require careful and innovative planning so that the different components can fit together well and form part of the SATN.

22. Digital infrastructure strategy

Q: How could you be better connected? How would easier access to information, services and transport be good for you? Would it reduce your need to travel?

A: CoHSAT is supportive of connecting the whole county, including rural areas, to a superfast fibre broadband. Satellite is an under-used way to achieve this, for a slight delay time which affects certain applications (real-time gaming and to some extent conferencing). Perhaps OCC or OxLEP could provide a guide to the best video/audio conferencing services, plus rural broadband options, updated once or twice a year, provided (and sponsored) by a local tech firm.

It has to be recognized that the energy-saving benefits of working at home and reducing travel can be more than offset by the increased need to heat homes during the day in order to keep the home worker warm: the savings only come if the central office is reduced in size.

23. Network Management and Coordination

Q: 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?

A: CoHSAT agrees that Network Management should play a far greater role in influencing travel choices, promoting modal shift and reducing the impact of car traffic on the environment. Its primary objective should be to ensure that it is never necessary to get into a car as there is always an alternative form of transport available.

Network Management should balance the needs of all users, with particular attention to the disadvantaged. It should encourage the use of modes of transport that are space and carbon efficient - so today active and public transport, and in future adding shared cars. For example, cycling could specifically be promoted with messages like '8 minutes to the centre by bike' around Seacourt P&R.

We recognise that medium and long distance journeys are the most difficult to address, but simply replacing the vehicle fleet with electric vehicles does nothing for congestion, severance and social justice. Use of private cars must be reduced.

24. Highways Asset Management Plan

Q: 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?

A: Highways Asset Management should be renamed Sustainable Travel Management and be based on an 'asset' management system that values all forms of travel infrastructure, including pavements, cycle tracks, Greenways. It should also include a measure that reflects the reduction in the need to travel. As an example, in rural parts of the County, for those that are vulnerable and on a low-income, there should be an emphasis on getting facilities to the village, not getting the villagers (via a rare and expensive bus) to the facilities. So, a mobile bank, doctor, dentist, hairdresser, vet could all provide their services to the village. At the moment, people may be having to get the bus to an ATM, partly in order to have the cash to get home again. So the proportion of the County's population that lives in a "20 minute neighbourhood" would form part of HAMP and should be increasing annually (see our principles at the start).

The future is not about the primacy of the car and the road, but is focused strongly on the needs of people, why (and whether) they need to travel, how they would like to get there, what is the least polluting, most pleasant method of achieving those aims. It will be difficult to bring about this radical shift in the County as Highway Authority, but it has to happen. And a redefinition of HAMP appears to be an important part of that process.

25. Freight Strategy

Q: 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?

A: Last mile delivery services, such as cargo bikes, are a fantastic initiative in city and urban centres. There should be a clear plan for most freight to be trans-shipped from heavy goods vehicles at consolidation centres, such as Park and Rides, and to then be delivered by cargo-bikes or small electric vans. Freight creates some difficult choices and we look forward to seeing a good strategy up to 2050.

The growth in local delivery traffic could be much reduced if consolidation was incentivised or required for each town or area of the county. Consolidation centres would be required, perhaps based at the P&Rs. A charging system could be devised to incentivise its use: e.g. if each van entering the city pays £100, 8 operators with a van each would soon understand that it is better to consolidate to 2 vans between them.

Our objectives require that there is:

A clear strategy on how to reduce lorry and van freight journeys throughout the county.

Apart from consolidation, another component is to encourage more local production, that is

consumed locally (especially food), no more out-of-town retail parks, more repair, re-use and recycling would all help.

26. A Smart County

Q: 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?

A: CoHSAT hopes that on-line information is in real-time and relevant to helping people make the choice to go by public transport, rather than get in the car, or even not to travel if pollution levels are high in urban areas. Another important role is information that facilitates multi-modal journeys, by highlighting connections and problems, see Q1.

27. Living Labs

Q: 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?

A: We support the 'Living Lab' approach to testing new solutions in a real-world situation where they can be closely monitored, evaluated and adjusted. This is a great opportunity for Oxfordshire to combine expertise across sectors and disciplines to be at the forefront of new transport systems.

We suggest a rural corridor as the Living Lab (e.g. the A420 corridor or the A4074 corridor). This would enable testing several concepts in public transport, active transport, infrastructure, technology, community action and behaviour change interventions - all in combination - to see what impact could be achieved on a difficult challenge that is relevant across Oxfordshire and across the UK.

One of our major principles is that:

In all villages, towns and in Oxford, the development of local services so that everyone can walk or cycle to meet their everyday needs: the "20-minute neighbourhood".

This requires a focus on the provision of local services rather than just on mobility to get to the services provided elsewhere. The Covid 19 epidemic has re-empathised the local community, the opportunities to purchase food from local organic farms and suppliers. But underlining this approach to the "20 minute neighbourhood" is our recognition that travel can be expensive, that not everyone enjoys the same mobility (either as walkers or cyclists) and that for too many people access to services is limited if you live in a rural area. The services (medical, dentist, hairdresser, bank, vet) need to be taken to the people rather than try to provide the

transport for all to get to urban centres. Several “20 minute neighbourhoods” should form Living Labs.

28. Motorcycles

Q: 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?

A: We expect E-bikes to be a major part of the future transport mix and there has been no mention of them, nor E-scooters. People riding motorcycles, like all other road users should have their safety needs considered in road design. However, data shows that incidents rise if they are allowed to share lanes with cyclists, so this should not be permitted. (This usually applies to bus lanes - and combined bus/cycle lanes are not a good solution in any case.) Motorcycles, like cars, can be fossil-fueled or electric - currently most are fossil fuelled, so they should not receive special advantages on this basis.

29. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about improving transport and travel?
How could you contribute to making Oxfordshire a thriving county?

CoHSAT would like to see an explicit and overarching statement in LTCP5 that "Oxfordshire will reduce the prevalence of the privately owned and privately driven car wherever feasible in our county."

Missing Topics:

- Cars and Traffic - Q: How do we reduce the impact of traffic: congestion, pollution and the use of space? A: Traffic restrictions, parking reductions, ZEZs, other regulation and taxation (WPL), plus improved active and public transport (and shared cars)
- Car clubs, ride-shares and shared cars today and future - covering everything from ZipCar and Uber to shared autonomous cars. What do the people of Oxfordshire think about them? We believe they are important because they provide long-range mobility for less-travelled routes and in rural areas without needing a private car.
- Planning for Transport - Q: How do we get the Planning System to deliver the transport system we need in the future? A: It probably involves the new Residential Roads Design Guide, District Councils, and actually standing up to developers and saying 'no, this is inadequate'.
- Micromobility: rental bikes, e-bikes and scooters
- Transport and Health. A paper that is more explicit about the health impacts of the current and future transport mix, both from air pollution and physical inactivity. In addition to the effects we knew before, we now know that both of these make people more susceptible to COVID-19, so active travel is an important part of building resilience against the resurgence of COVID-19 and to future respiratory diseases and pandemics.

This set of topic papers does not provide a clear set of objectives and aims. CoHSAT's primary aim for this consultation is that **no-one has to get into a private car as there is always an alternative travel choice**. Our main objectives were given at the beginning of this document and underline all our comments. There are insufficient policies mentioned that will demote the role of the motor-vehicle in future. Car travel has to decline.

About CoHSAT

The Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel (CoHSAT) is a group of voluntary and campaigning organisations working across Oxfordshire to create attractive, accessible and people-friendly streets. We will do this by encouraging efficient, active, low carbon and sustainable travel, which will reduce traffic, air pollution and noise, and enable healthy and thriving communities. More details can be seen at <http://www.cohsat.org.uk>.

The 10 CoHSAT members are: Low Carbon Oxford North, Low Carbon West Oxford, Pedal and Post, Oxford Friends of the Earth, Oxford Pedestrians Association, Oxford Civic Society, Cyclox, Rose Hill and Iffley Low Carbon, Oxfordshire Liveable Streets and Oxfordshire Cycling Network.



