

Rachel Tibbetts

From: Danny Yee <danny@oxlivsts.org.uk>
Sent: 01 November 2023 10:05
To: Planning
Cc: Catherine Hickman; White, Joy - Oxfordshire County Council; JacquiCox (OCC); damian.haywood@oxfordshire.gov.uk; Thomas Webster; Councillor Daniel Sames; calum.miller; Cllr Andrew Gant; Robin Tucker; Paul Troop; Eden, Oliver - Oxfordshire County Council; Zuhura Plummer
Subject: Re: 23/01080/OUT and 23/02399/REM (NEW)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Oxfordshire Liveable Streets objects to this design too.

Requiring four staggered stages for someone walking to make a single crossing of the development entry is positively anti-pedestrian and needs to be rethought completely. We suggest aligning the pedestrian crossing with the cycle crossing (and possibly on the inside rather than the outside of it). That will avoid confusion for drivers who will not expect to have to stop twice in quick succession for crossings. It would also allow the crossing to be reduced to two pedestrian stages.


And cycling must be buffered from motor traffic with 40mph speeds. Table 6-2 in "Cycle Infrastructure Design" (LTN 1/20) requires 0.5 metres at "an absolute minimum" - and recommends 1 metre.

Danny Yee, for Oxfordshire Liveable Streets.

On Mon, 30 Oct 2023 at 18:14, Paul Troop <pault@gclaw.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Oliver

I hope you are well. We have reviewed the revised arrangement for this junction (image below) and I am afraid we have some very serious concerns. I would add that we were not involved in the development of the design, otherwise we would have raised these earlier.



The design is a modest improvement over the initial concept in that the pedestrian and cycle crossings have been decoupled. However:

1. The frontage of the site is a 40mph road. LTN1/20 requires a buffer of at least 0.5m, and advises at least 1m. At present the applicant is proposing zero buffer.
2. The Bicester LCWIP specifies that both frontages (A41/Oxford Road & Lakeview Drive) should be segregated paths. The OCC CDS also require segregated paths alongside spine roads such as the A41. At present the applicant is proposing shared.
3. Though we do not have a mandate for pedestrian provision, the pedestrian crossings are truly awful and will effectively prevent anybody from walking along the A41. There are 4 separate crossings, no doubt with long waits at each crossing, each are staggered in a way that is unlikely to comply with the Equality Act as they will be almost impossible to navigate in a wheelchair, and the islands are way too narrow. Surely we could do better here, even if it was to reduce the angle offset to below 90°? Ideally the number of pedestrian crossings would also be reduced to 2 or at least 3 - with bigger islands.

4. The standard arrangement of a junction is always to have the cyclists closer to the motor vehicle traffic and the pedestrians further away. This design reverses this logic and will inevitably cause conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. A better arrangement must be possible.

I would add, just for completeness, that we do not accept that OCC cannot insist on the junction complying with standards and policy because a previous design was approved (and built) here prior to LTN1/20 and the Bicester LCWIP. This application is obviously a new application and proposes a new arrangement.

Could we request an urgent meeting to work through how the junction could work better please?

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Best regards, Paul

Secretary, Bicester Bike Users' Group

From: Paul Troop <pault@gclaw.co.uk>
Date: Monday, 30 October 2023 at 11:15
To: Thomas Webster <Thomas.Webster@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>, Eden, Oliver - Oxfordshire County Council <Oliver.Eden@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>, Planning <Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Cc: Catherine Hickman <catherine@bicesterbug.org>, White, Joy - Communities <Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>, Cox, Jacqui - Communities <Jacqui.Cox@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>, damian.haywood@oxfordshire.gov.uk <damian.haywood@oxfordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: 23/01080/OUT and 23/02399/REM (NEW)

Dear Tom

Thank you very much for the telephone call of last week letting us know that there is a revised design for this crossing. I was away for half term last week, but will try and have a look at the revised design later today.

Warm regards, Paul

From: Paul Troop <pault@gclaw.co.uk>
Date: Tuesday, 24 October 2023 at 16:31
To: Thomas Webster <Thomas.Webster@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>, Eden, Oliver - Oxfordshire County Council <Oliver.Eden@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>, Planning <Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Cc: Catherine Hickman <catherine@bicesterbug.org>, White, Joy - Communities <Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>, Cox, Jacqui - Communities <Jacqui.Cox@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>, damian.haywood@oxfordshire.gov.uk <damian.haywood@oxfordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: 23/01080/OUT and 23/02399/REM (NEW)

Dear Thomas and Oliver

I note with some concern that I have not received an acknowledgement or a substantive reply to my request below, contrary to both CDC and OCC service standards. 23/01080/OUT is a particularly crucial connection to Bicester and I would be grateful if you would revert to me as a matter of urgency as to how you are progressing with the applicant concerning the active travel crossings over Lakeview Drive.

I have taken the liberty of copying in the OCC Cycling Champion Councillor Damien Haywood as I think this failure by OCC to respond to a key stakeholder in a timely manner regarding an absolutely crucial piece of infrastructure is something that he may wish to be aware of to ensure that it does not happen again.

In addition, I also note there is a very poor application 23/02399/REM that has recently been submitted. As far as we can see there is no LTN1/20 compliant cycling or walking provision at all which is very concerning. You will be aware that Lakeview Drive forms part of the Bicester walking and cycling network route BR18. The Bicester Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) 2023 update specifies that this must be delivered as segregated off-road walking and cycling paths. We would also expect to see LTN1/20 compliant crossings over the minor roads such as parallel crossings. Note also that BR18 is envisaged to continue to connect to Graven Hill via a bridge over the railway.

Could you please confirm that this application, and the LCWIP standards that relates to it, is on your radar please?

I look forward to hearing from you both with a substantive update as a matter of urgency.

Yours sincerely

Paul Troop

Paul Troop, Barrister
Garden Court Chambers
57-60 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, WC2A 3LJ
DX: 34 London Chancery Lane
Twitter: @GardenCourtLaw @GardenCtPublic @GCC Housing @GCC Civillib
Switchboard: 020 7993 7600 | Direct Tel: 020 7993 7867
My Profile: <https://www.gardencourtchambers.co.uk/barristers/paul-troop>



Regulated by the Bar Standards Board

This electronic mail message is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information which is privileged and confidential. Any disclosure of the same is prohibited by law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, please note that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error can you please notify the sender immediately. Thank you for your co-operation and please contact us on +44 (0) 20 7993 7600 or email info@gclaw.co.uk

From: Paul Troop <pault@gclaw.co.uk>
Date: Tuesday, 3 October 2023 at 07:03
To: Thomas Webster <Thomas.Webster@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>, Eden, Oliver - Oxfordshire County Council <Oliver.Eden@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Catherine Hickman <catherine@bicesterbug.org>
Subject: 23/01080/OUT

Dear Thomas and Oliver

I hope you are both well. I'm just wondering where we are on this application? We'd be very keen to see the draft design with the direct cycling crossing previously discussed while it is still being discussed.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Best regards, Paul