

## Rebekah Morgan

---

**From:** Peart, Timothy - Communities <Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 October 2020 12:16  
**To:** Rebekah Morgan  
**Cc:** Nick Jones-Hill; Manku, Amrik - Communities; White, Joy - Communities  
**Subject:** FW: A41 Roundabout - Response to OCC  
**Attachments:** WIE11386-145-03-001-A41 Pioneer Rbt General Arrangement - A03-A1.pdf

Good afternoon Rebekah,

I can confirm that the attached drawing (ref: WIE A41 03 001 A03) addresses the concerns raised in Joy White's consultation response dated 3 September 2020 and the points raised below.

The county council has no objection to the general arrangement as shown in the attached plan. The detailed design will be subject to a full technical audit and approval process at the S278 stage.

Please let me know if you require anything more from me.

Kind regards,

***Tim Peart***

Interim Principal Transport Planner – Cherwell & West Oxfordshire  
Communities  
County Hall  
New Road  
Oxford  
OX1 1ND  
Email: [timothy.peart@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:timothy.peart@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

---

**From:** White, Joy - Communities  
**Sent:** 01 October 2020 17:47  
**To:** Rebekah Morgan <[rebekah.morgan@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:rebekah.morgan@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)>; Nick Jones-Hill <[nick.jones-hill@watermangroup.com](mailto:nick.jones-hill@watermangroup.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: A41 Roundabout - Response to OCC

Hi Rebekah and Nick

I have reviewed the revised drawing with my colleagues, including a member of our Traffic Signals team.

We welcome the segregation of the cycle and footway around the roundabout. It is unfortunate that the additional width required has reduced the verge width, but I assume that is because of the restriction of the red line boundary of this planning application - the red line is adjacent to the back of the cycleway. It may be possible to increase the verge width on the northern side immediately adjacent the roundabout - this is a detail that could be agreed at S278 submission stage.

We also welcome the efforts to avoid the staggered crossing. However, the segregated cycle and pedestrian crossing on the western arm does give us cause for concern. We recognise that this form of crossing is set out in LTN 1/20 but is more suited to crossings at signalised junctions, and it removes the stagger for cyclists. At a standalone crossing (which this is, because it is not linked

to signalised operation of the roundabout) there is more scope for driver confusion over the two separate crossings. Pedestrians would also be likely to use the cycle crossing if it allowed a crossing in one operation as opposed to the staggered pedestrian crossing next to it. We have concerns about the length of time that traffic would be stopped on a red signal to allow a safe pedestrian crossing of all lanes in one movement, which would likely cause traffic to back up to the roundabout at busy times. At a signalised junction, this time can be better accommodated in the phasing of the lights.

There is scope for a shared pedestrian/cycle crossing not to be staggered and still have to be crossed in two stages. However, the Traffic Signs Manual recommends a wider refuge. I do not consider the proposed refuge would be wide enough to avoid the possibility of a pedestrian mistakenly thinking they can cross in one stage, which would be a safety risk. However, if it is not possible to widen the refuge, it may be possible to reduce the stagger shown to a slight offset.

Because this is a standalone crossing, the time taken to cross in two stages can be significantly reduced by the technique of 'forward calling'. Pressing the button causes the second crossing to be automatically called before the user arrives at the second button to press it, minimising the delay. This technique is already in operation at some other crossings in Oxfordshire. It is worth noting that a standalone crossing would delay pedestrians and cyclists significantly less than crossings at a signalised junction, such as Rodney House Roundabout.

In summary, whilst we have concerns with the design of the crossing on the western arm as shown, there may be scope to find a solution at the detailed design stage, which reduces the stagger of the crossing in line with updated LTN 1/20 guidance. However, given our concern over the separate cycle crossing at this location, we would prefer the amended plan not to be approved. Our preference would be for a plan which shows the segregated cycle path, but the crossing as per the original plan.

Kind regards

Joy

Joy White  
Transport Development Control Lead - Cherwell, West Oxfordshire and Oxford  
Communities  
Oxfordshire County Council  
Mobile 07554103522  
Email: [joy.white@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:joy.white@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

This email, including attachments, may contain confidential information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender by reply and delete it immediately. Views expressed by the sender may not be those of Oxfordshire County Council. Council emails are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000. [email disclaimer](#). For information about how Oxfordshire County Council manages your personal information please see our [Privacy Notice](#).