

## Online Comments on traffic - Consultation 3

### Reference

### Plan Comment

- 651 The realignment of the B4009 as an urban realignment, not a bypass. By-passes encourage traffic and speed. An alternative route through Watlington is a very good idea and embedding this in the development a good idea (using the proposed wide verges etc). I would however encourage greater levels of implicit calming (through roundabouts - making better use of the B480 roundabout for example - perceived narrowing etc) is preferred to explicit attempts to calm (bumps etc). In addition, it would be great to see a 'part-pedestrianised' High Street - perhaps from the Butchers to D G Homecare - if traffic flows could be made to work. This would be perhaps for weekday or a Sunday market if permanent pedestrianisation was not possible. This would further discourage 'rat running' and promote trade in the high street if it could be made to work.
- 652 "An alternative route around Watlington will reduce the curse of congestion in the centre of the town, making it a far more pleasant environment for residents and shoppers." Having spoken to a few shop keepers, they do not share the parish council's view that traffic is wholly a misfortune. A shopkeeper with a very good view of the Town Hall crossroads says there is no congestion apart from at peak times, the rest of the time the traffic flows freely, and this is my observation too. Some shop keepers say that their livelihoods depend on passing traffic, which adds to shoppers. I have checked the many reviews online by visitors to Watlington and traffic is not mentioned as a problem, or reason not to visit Watlington. There is no evidence that visitors say Watlington is an unpleasant place, the opposite is true. If the parish council is referring to congestion at the T Junction, this is caused by on-street parking on Couching Street and to solve it removal of parking was recommended. Consultation 2 gave a negative response to the high street being pedestrianised. The range of views of the community, and especially those of shop keepers, as well as visitors, is not evident in the council's wholly negative opinion of traffic.
- 654 . Please see my comments on question 1 above. The traffic management plans must be "written in stone" and implemented as a pre-condition to the start of the development

655 1. The realigned B4009 is essential and must be completed before any housing construction begins. This will obviously be of benefit for access to the construction sites for the developers. 2. The route of the new road is from the Pyrton crossroads to the Britwell Road, but, that will then send traffic heading for Henley, back into town and into Brook Street. The reality is that a lot of this traffic will be unlikely to use the relief road and head into town as usual. In addition, traffic coming from Howe Road, heading towards the M40, will also head up Couching St rather than using the relief road. So, consideration must be given to building another relief road to connect Shirburn Road and Howe Hill. There should be some land belonging to Beechwood Estates which could be allocated for a further small housing development to pay for the relief road construction. As you say in the draft plan, "the number (of new homes) is bound to grow further". 3. To ensure that the problem of non-local traffic continuing to come into the town centre (point 2), as well as a 20 mph speed limit, there should be additional traffic calming measures need to be put in place. Chicanes at the bottom of Couching St and top of Shirburn St perhaps, additional on-street parking too would help. How about a fixed speed camera at last?

659 2a) Road changes often lead to unintended consequences, for example the unmarked road through Christmas Common has become a short cut for commuter traffic from the M40 to Reading; which was probably not anticipated when the M40 was built. The re-alignment of the B4009 needs to be reviewed not only for the expected outcome of diverting Watlington through traffic but also the unintended consequences, in particular whether it may lead to drivers taking short-cuts through local hamlets. 2c) Junction changes at the top of Hill Road were agreed at a Parish Meeting in Christmas Common. These should be included in the traffic management plans.

660 2a. A bypass around the town is the best idea. 2b. There is already illegal traffic going through the town that is not controlled, and it's already having a 'severe impact on traffic pressures and air quality'. How are you proposing to control/stop it in the future if you can't manage it now? 2c. Ditto above. And what percentage of developers' profits will be allocated via contributions, and who will ensure this actually happens?

661 2a. The route should be built before the houses otherwise traffic volumes will increase. 2b. Air quality in Watlington at the moment does not meet legal standards and traffic is severely congested at peak times. My understanding was that development should have a beneficial effect on traffic pressures and air quality. The wording 'does not have a severe adverse impact' is totally unacceptable. The council should not contemplate any development, or stage of development, that will have any adverse effect whatsoever. If the building of new housing between Pyrton Lane and the Pyrton crossroads does not take place, the route for the new road will not be available. How is the council going to ensure this does not happen? The paragraph sub-titled 'Why doesn't the route use Willow Close and the spur to the Industrial Estate?' , bullet point 4, states that the new route 'will provide a better edge ..... and will limit further development.' Why? The plans show building beyond this road which sets the precedent for further housing. Thame, Oxford and Didcot all have current, new housing developments beyond their ring roads demonstrating that a ring road is no impediment to development. Wording in the paragraph sub-titled 'What can be done to improve the town centre?' gives me no confidence in the ability of the council to ensure proposals will come to fruition. 1. Can the parish council impose and enforce the 20mph limit? When and how? 2. Surely any consultation should be carried out before plans are put into place. Haven't there been several consultations carried out over the years - have these actually been implemented and what has been the impact? 3. Traffic will be reduced 'WHEN' through traffic can use the new road - until then it will presumably increase. A date has to be given before this is acceptable. 4. 'HGV's ..... will be able to.....'! Surely this should be 'HGV's will only be able to .... as a result of traffic calming or width restrictions'. 5. Bullet points 5 and 6 are dependent on the preceding points and are resulting benefits, not actions that can be undertaken.

667 A by-pass of the scale envisaged will require between 400-700 houses to be built and will create a huge amount of increased traffic, pollution and hazards to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Instead, a modest relief road should be built to keep unnecessary traffic from the centre of town as previously envisaged via Willow close and the industrial estate.

688 Although Buses must have access to the school from the new road

689 Although I have always had reservations about building a new road because new roads tend to increase traffic I now support this as it's accompanied by proposals to do more and improve the town centre overall. A 20 mph limit in town will help for a start especially along with greater enforcement of the HGV limit.

691 Although traffic is an issue, I am not sure listing one choice as the best choice. And the thought of putting a bypass main road right through the middle of a housing estate full of family homes is ridiculous. Are there no other options?

692 Although we broadly agree with most of the draft plan proposals, and in particular support the principle that any significant development should be located to the north and/or west of the town and should be supported by a new alternative road route around the town, we are very disappointed that the Church Hall site is not explicitly protected as a green space. Other areas explicitly identified as green spaces to be protected are not as well used or as threatened as this area. With further development of the town likely, all the existing significant and valuable green spaces should be strongly protected. If significant development is allowed to the west of the town, the church hall site will be invaluable as a green space. We also feel that the proposal that 40% of developments should be affordable homes may result in unintended consequences. There is clearly a need for more affordable housing in and around the town, but specifying that such a large proportion of major developments is allocated to cheaper housing may lower the overall quality of housing and/or discourage potential developers. We believe that a more flexible strategy would be appropriate. We believe that the realignment of the B4009 needs to be in place before any major development takes place, to avoid the very significant adverse impact on traffic arising from further development, but more importantly to ensure that the town does not ultimately find itself in the position of having large new developments in place but there being no funds to effect the realignment. In our view, it is absolutely essential that a solution to the traffic issues throughout the town is found and effected sooner than later. It would be a disaster to allow any significant further development without solving the existing, and worsening, problems.

694 Am fully supportive of new road plan. Bt, in addition to the proposed 20mph limit along Couching St B4009, there needs to be more done on the existing B4009 near the Coop to ensure safety of pedestrians, the approach from the south towards the zebra crossing is very narrow and not wide enough for 2 cars, consider traffic lights/pelican crossing, this may encourage traffic to re-route around the town. Recommend making the road between B4009 Coop Couching St and Brook Street junction a no parking zone. Need to make available more parking in centre of Watlington if we are to encourage commercial/business. Recommend creating clearly marked parking spaces along the High St with a 1 hour max waiting. Could Couching St be residents access only. The road to the school Love Lane, is VERY POORLY maintained - once the number of children and therefore traffic to the school & college increases this road will suffer greatly, PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE invest in Love Lane and other school access roads to smarten up the grass verges, limit the on street parking and paint proper road markings and maintain a road without potholes. Put in a crossing where the access to the recreation ground emerges.

700 As a Cuxham resident I fear the Watlington "by pass" may increase traffic through Cuxham heading for Oxford.

701 As a Cuxham resident the main village concern is that of traffic. We have to accept the increase in housing which in turn generates more traffic.

- 702 As a family of 4 living in Watlington (for 5 years) we are renting in a buy-to-let property and are unable to afford a property in the town at present due to low housing stock and high prices. Although we think it is important that the community feel of Watlington is preserved, we also recognise the undeniable need for more housing in this town that "normal" people can afford. We both work in frontline public sector roles and unfortunately don't fit into the category for "affordable housing" but neither do we have half a million in the bank!!! We really approve of these plans and only hope they can include a variety of housing stock at reasonable prices. I also wonder if there is an option for self-build project within this? Agree wholeheartedly with the pressing need to improve traffic through the town, the 20mph speed limit and the need for pedestrians to feel safer, especially along Couching and Shirburn Streets.
- 704 As a resident of Britwell Road, I understand the need for more housing and don't in principal have any objections to houses on sites A, B and C but don't understand why the new junction will start outside our house when it could easily be moved to the beginning of the town. This cannot be a plan for all of Watlington if it doesn't consider the wellbeing of all of Watlington, it feels like we are being sacrificed for the good of everyone else. There will be more noise, more pollution, more light outside our house. We will have to reverse out onto a extremely busy road.
- 711 As long as: 1. Road infrastructure is built at the beginning 2. There are significant levels 40% and higher of affordable housing WE are not building on AONB or greenbelt.
- 713 As the strategy to realign the B4009 is likely to attract a significant increase in vehicular movements from Reading/Henley and that very commercial sector of the Thames Valley, via Nettlebed to M40 J6, part of the strategy should be to extend the realignment to link with the B480 somewhere to the southeast of Watlington. Not to do so will inevitably lead to increased pollution and misery to that part of the town near Howe Rd/Brook St/Cuxham Rd which will continue to suffer high, probably much higher volumes of through traffic, particularly when Chalgrove New Town comes on stream.
- 714 As well as a bypass, Watlington is in desperate need of a pedestrian crossing on Brook street. It is impossible to cross safely (I take 2 young children to school that way every day). Also, large vehicles often mount the curb on Brook St to get through making it very dangerous for pedestrians.
- 715 Be aware that our solutions may cause additional traffic problems for nearby villages.

717 Broadly I support the rerouted proposed B4009, I think it's an excellent idea to take pressure off the town centre and reduce pollution. However, I have some questions/ concerns / comments as follows: - It is mentioned in the plan that improvement of traffic could include widening of pavements. I heartily agree with this, as a mum with a baby and a toddler it is intimidating currently to have such narrow pavements. One particularly dangerous corner is the junction of The Goggs with Britwell Road, that definitely could benefit from widening the pavement or some other route to make it safer to access britwell road as a pedestrian. - At one place in the plan it mentions the idea of ANPR to enforce the HGV limit, and also that the HGV limit would remain in place with the new proposed road. I completely agree with using ANPR, this seems to be the only way that we can enforce the 7.5T restrictions that are currently completely flouted. Please prioritise funds for ANPR. - Having a 20mph limit in the town may be helpful but I believe should be less of a priority as most vehicles don't get up to 20mph anyway due to the limitations of the road with parked cars etc. - I think a major improvement the WNDP could do is to improve access to the school sites from the West side of the town. For example, for families living in Ash Close (and in future in the new developments) they have to walk a long route round the town via the church to get to the primary school. This may be putting families off walking, and increasing the traffic through the town. Please could the WNDP look to get some walking footpaths from the school sites towards housing areas and proposed areas on the west side of town? Thanks. - Another very important point I would like to make is a proposal for a bicycle route between lewknor Bus stops and watlington. Currently this road is not very safe to cycle on, which leads to increased need for parking at Lewknor and traffic through watlington. If there was a safe cycle path I believe it would be heavily used. - I agree there will need to be an expansion of parking for the town with the proposed increase in houses in WNDP and also in chalgrove. This I would like to see more information on as I didn't see in any of the reports of WNDP any formal proposal for increased parking. - For the proposed new road, what speed limit would it be? If 60mph then I think this wouldn't be safe with the nature of having housing sites either side. And how could pedestrians and cyclists cross the road in the middle of the housing estates? If by pelican crossing will this disrupt the flow of traffic and lead to people again using Pyrton lane or Watlington town centre? I think the crossings over / under the new proposed road is really important to have a clear plan for to maximise benefit to pedestrians and cycles and traffic flow.

723 Can the majority of new homes be within the new road so that the road essentially (for the moment at least) serves as a boundary to prevent further sprawl out into the countryside? Can it be ensured that the school buses get easy access to and from the new road to reduce the number that need to use the center of town? Can due respect be shown to the people of Pyrton such that a good solution is found for as many people as possible? Are they in general agreement with the proposed route of the new road?

736 Efficient traffic management is essential for this plan to be implemented successfully. The proposed bypass will ensure that the centre of Watlington is not overwhelmed by additional traffic, whilst ensuring that the new development(s) are similarly protected. This would vastly improve both the ambient and air quality in Watlington, and will also protect vulnerable older buildings which are currently suffering from vibration damage due to the high numbers of heavy vehicles passing through the town.

- 737 Enforce current weight and speed limits
- 738 Enforce requirement for road borders / verges to be sustainably planted to provide visual and acoustic screening and enhance natural habitats. Essential to provide investment to manage traffic to avoid town centre rat runs - especially on Couching street, Shirburn street.
- 745 Existing Pyrton Lane residents should not be compromised by new development but have their life styles enhanced. Willow Close was originally built to take HGV traffic to/from Industrial Estate. Why is a new road needed? HGV size/weight hasn't increased significantly.
- 753 Generally supportive bar the traffic measures for the relief road.
- 765 I agree that the town center traffic flow must be improved! At this time it doesn't feel safe walking through the town with young children because the paths are so close to the roads and people drive too fast at times. The zebra crossing sometimes feels unsafe because people just fail to stop.
- 767 I agree there should be 20mph limit, BUT ONLY for the very centre of the town e.g. High St, Gorwell, Coiching st, but not for Cuxham Road, Britwell Rd, where there should be more emphasis on keeping traffic to current limit of 30, Please no one way system for Britwell and Cuxham Rds, as locals,will,have further to drive and hence more pollution. many resident in Watlington do not,use their cars anyway when just going to the centre.
- 776 I am long standing resident of the area, and wholeheartedly support the ambition to preserve the natural and historic environment. The draft Neighbourhood plan fails this objective in the "re-aligned 4009" or bypass. There are three reasons for this: firstly the bypass would require a much larger number of houses to be built than is required under the 2033 guidelines, which in turn means that this objective is in contradiction of the main objectives of the Watlington plan. Secondly, there is clear evidence that the bypass will result in a gigantic growth in traffic along the B4009. The bypass can only be funded if several hundred houses are built in Watlington and several thousand in Chalgrove. This alone will more than double the existing traffic from 10,000 to 20,000 to 25,000 cars a day. The bypass will also attract traffic from the surrounding area (a repeatedly proven phenomenon) and will become anther alternative to the traffic on the A34 heading to the Midlands, and avoiding the traffic jams around Oxford. The small potential decrease in pollution through the centre of Watlington will be offset by a huge increase in pollution to the whole area. It is ludicrous to suggest that the 700 to 1000 houses required to fund the bypass, the light, air and noise pollution from the bypass will not affect the historic views of Watlington from all sides.

- 778 I am not totally against a road to the North and West of Watlington however the only traffic problems in Watlington are the 'only for access over 7.5t' lorries. Why would they not be encouraged to use the bypass, i.e no limit - leaving the high street free for general traffic - especially for passing trade for the high street. The recent closure of the High Street has proved to traders that a reduction in passing trade will crucify the retail outlets in Watlington. As a retailer myself, I can confirm that our insurance company paid us for loss of earnings during the recent closure as passing trade was unable to stop/park. Watlington residents cannot alone support the retail businesses. We can only survive with the help of passing trade. The effect of the new road on Cuxham, Britwell and Pyrton must be considered. Especially Cuxham, should the 3K houses go ahead in Chalgrove as the bypass will make the B4009 a rat run.
- 781 I am very concerned about the plan to re-route traffic around Watlington town center. In it's current form the plan will definitely lead to more traffic along the B480 (Cuxham Road) from the proposed by-pass. This road (B480) was never designed to take the amount of traffic proposed by the re-routing of traffic around the town center. The road (B480) is primarily residential and will lead to a massive increase in noise for those living next to the road. Additionally, a number of children cross this road during the busy rush-hour, on their way to school. The road already has a number of dangerous blind-bends caused by overhanging trees and bushes that the council have failed to maintain. I understand the popularity of the view that routing traffic around the town center will create a calmer high street with less traffic. However, those who purchased properties on the high street and the B4009 were aware of the traffic issues when they purchased their properties and this issue must have formed part of their buying decision. By comparison those living on the B480 (Cuxham Road) will have the increase in traffic forced upon them by this plan. Their properties will be devalued as a consequence and the noise pollution and danger will increase significantly.
- 782 I believe that building a ring road around Watlington will just increase the amount of traffic in the area and the B 4009 in particular will become much busier. Also, there will be much more sound pollution from a faster road around the perimeter of the town.
- 788 I do not think the current proposals outline in enough detail the traffic issues. It covers traffic flow through Watlington however as an outlying hamlet co dependent with Watlington we already suffer a huge increase in 'rat run' traffic seeking to avoid Watlington, I think speed controls regardless of what is chosen will mean cars will flows through outlying hamlets such as ours which essentially go un patrolled (I have seen one only police camera in 6 years in our area where cars dont just speed but fly through). As a hamlet, we do depend on Watlington as service point, we dont however enjoy any services many would expect such as transport. Yet we bear a significant burden of the traffic. WE happily chose to live in a hamlet the trade off of course low noise and traffic, we now have all the inconvenience without the benefit. Watlington's hamlets are an important part of their sustainability yet we continue to fall between the cracks and are disregarded unless a sustained fight is mounted, this does not represent good planning.

- 793 I don't want to see traffic totally taken away from the centre of Watlington, I think it provides energy and keeps the town 'alive', but I do like the idea of the new road that will re-route the HGV's. I am very against having ANPR cameras and unnecessary road signs.
- 795 I fully agree that traffic should be diverted away from the town centre - better still, make sure it can't get through there in the first place since it's clear that no one is following the rules. As you've acknowledged, '[th]e key source of air pollution in the town centre is vehicle emissions. The street canyons formed by the high buildings in the area prevent pollution from dispersing quickly. The area by the Town Hall is a bottleneck for traffic and, at peak periods, traffic congestion results in higher concentrations of pollutants in the air.' I think the biggest contributor to this poor air quality however (not to mention the noise and vibrations) is all the overweight HGVs that are 3x the permitted weight of 7.5 tonnes that continue to use the town as a shortcut. And the only reason they do this is because, a) they can, and b) it doesn't cost them i.e. no penalty.
- 805 I really would prefer not to have unsightly traffic lights and also beeping pelican crossings that will inevitably follow.
- 819 I would only support a bypass if it was a B road which was in keeping with the countryside rather than a fast invasive bypass
- 830 In Policy 2, item 2b, we believe that stating that development will only be permitted where it does not have a severe adverse impact may be setting an unrealistic standard. We suggest that the word "severe" is replaced by "significant" on the basis that any development having a significant adverse impact should not be permitted.
- 831 in principle, again only if outlying areas given the same treatment and traffic and parking is addressed
- 832 In support, but needs to reflect that we need to reduce the amount of traffic in the village. So need to balance this off.
- 834 Is there a way to improve spread of traffic across more roads, my thoughts are that all traffic will use the new road thereby only "moving" the issue to another location.
- 835 It does not make sense to run the road through the new housing estates. With these houses attracting young families, their safety should be a priority. It should have a maximum speed of 20mph.
- 838 It is essential that additional car parking facilities are created as a priority, but not at a distance from the town centre. What are the possibilities of some expansion of the existing main car park, even if only for a limited number of additional spaces? Could some land be purchased in Hill Road, beyond the Carriers? When the by realigned B4009 is open, more on street parking should be allowed. In conjunction with a 20mph speed limit, it will be an important traffic calming measure.

- 839 It is essential that through traffic is managed, even with the new road, effectively through clear signage (Village traffic only, No through traffic, etc...) and enforcement. Enforcement is very much needed. Also, any removal of speed bumps or effective narrowing of the road, through cars parking, needs to be retained, as to continue to discourage traffic from taking a short cut through the town. We also need to discourage traffic for the Lys Mills estate coming through the village by enforcing the 7.5T limit.
- 843 It is vital to preserve a route for some form of bypass - it should also be possible to incrementally construct the bypass. A 20mph speed limit should be considered for this road as well as the town centre. Additional restrictions to through traffic may be necessary in the centre, carefully designed to attract business traffic.
- 846 It would appear that traffic along Cuxham Road will increase as a result of Henley area traffic to/from M40 via the new bypass. Even if traffic is directed along Britwell Road we believe it will use Cuxham Road as it is wider. We suggest therefore that Britwell Road and Cuxham Road sections to the new bypass are made one way.
- 849 It would be great for the town centre as well as improving safety around the small lanes leading to the schools if a new drop off point/car park could be built towards the rear of Icknield School serving the secondary and primary school. At present the buses and many parents in large vehicles all converge on the school at once whilst hundreds of children cycle and walk between them. If the schools car parks in front could be pedestrianised with traffic coming off the bypass via a separate entrance, it would make it much safer for those walking and cycling. It might also allow the provision of more classrooms at the primary school (surely required) as well as enhanced green space in front of Icknield school. For instance, look at the amazing giant redwoods in front of Gillotts School and how they make the school much greener and softer with all the attendant benefits that trees provide.
- 850 Its all very well having vehicle weight limits on the roads but a waste of time and energy unless they are regularly managed and companies-drivers penalised for abusing the law.
- 853 Keep existing parking bays through Watlington and increase them to reduce traffic volume.
- 864 must improve and manage road traffic - and discourage Watlington as a destination to cut through from Junction 6 / M40 to Oxford/Reading.
- 870 Need to make the centre a 20 zone and limit lorries
- 872 New road width as narrow as possible (Pyrton lane presently "groans" as it supports HGVs passing each other breaking up the edge of the lane). Place Chicanes either end of habitation or more frequently as speed control. Ideally no street illumination on a through route. Keep street illumination to minimum level (new luminaires have extremely controllable "footprints") in residential back streets/culdesacs. All to retain starlit nights.
- 873 New route of B4009 is not 'future-proof' since it will run through the middle of planned sites A, B & C exposing residents of these homes to all the pollution problems that currently blight residents on Couching Street and Shirburn Street. The new route should be placed further west beyond the planned sites.

- 874 new/improved road infrastructure and junctions must be a pre-requisite to accommodate any new developments
- 888 On the basis of scale, distance from services requiring more car journeys into the village, distance from school eating more car journeys etc. General increase in traffic resulting from development even if the link road is confirmed and completed. Unclear if the part of the proposed road in Pyrton parish is viable ... could houses go ahead without that?
- 890 Only if removing HGV and enforcing speed limits
- 892 Overall I support the WNDP. There are some issues I believe could be improved on, or more information given, but broadly the WNDP has obviously had a lot of hard work and thought go into it and it addresses the major issues that I care about. . I completely agree that pollution from traffic through the town centre is a major problem currently, and as a mum with a toddler and baby it is intimidating walking on narrow pavements with lots of traffic including HGVs through the town. I support the proposed rerouting of the B4009, with some caveats which I will outline below. I agree with the plan for increased affordable housing and also increased services eg swimming pool and expansion of schools and GPs.
- 895 Particularly support 20mph limit in town centre together with solutions which will enable pedestrians to feel safer and improve air quality. Long term the realigned B4009 will ultimately achieve these goals but in the interim innovative solutions to improve the current situation should be considered.
- 907 Protect yes. Enhance, what do you mean? Enhance could mean make it more attractive to visitors and enhance the economy by having people visit the shops but that could increase the traffic which means more pollution and traffic congestion.
- 909 Providing the infrastructure can cope with it, and Traffic is reduced in Pyrton Lane.
- 910 Questions as to what comes first ... will the road be built first in order to deal with the HUGE increase in 'building' traffic that will no doubt be needed over the next 3 (?) years, for the process of creating the houses. From which direction is this predicted building traffic most likely to come?? Once completed - how are they to patrol the weight limits - when already the weight limits through Watlington are being broken?? Also - for the existing roads - there was mention of extending a one way system / cycle way around the town. This would assist in encouraging only locals / visitors to Watlington, to use the local roads. Cannot see any further discussion of this.
- 913 Removing the traffic bottleneck at the Townhall and end of Shirburn street by a new bypass would greatly enhance the air quality and make Watlington a very pleasant place to live, work and visit
- 916 Ring road / bypass and pollution - these are existing issues that need dealing with first.
- 917 Road passes through new development not around it

- 922 Site PYR1 that my clients have an interest in lies within Pyrton Parish, however it will be a key site in helping with the delivery of the Watlington Relief Road that is currently identified as running through the site in question. While the general objectives of policy with the emerging plan are supported that seek to improve and manage traffic, the route of the safeguarded road, as currently shown, is not supported as it will prohibit the delivery of PYR1. It is considered at this stage that further engagement with my clients is necessary to discuss is the route of the road and how this is delivered without blighting PYR1.
- 927 Sorry must object unless all traffic and parking issues for Watlington and its surrounding hamlets ( now rat runs) is adequately provided for and must be outlined at this stage. In addition to the outlying hamlets who underpin the sustainability of the town the new development proposals do not adequately provide details and assurances for parking spaces to for at least 2 cars per residence, with over flow for visitors and to provide for shared/ multi generational dwellings that will only increase going forward. Parking on the roadside is inadequate, single lane hopping in order to navigate the road is completely inadequate ( they ought to be signed as single lane roads unsuitable for heavy vehicles the same as country lanes because in effect they are exactly that, it is absurd to plan to build these as solutions) , especially given the increased presence of delivery vans which will invariably slow traffic. Driver frustration will mean people will avoid such roads and place increased pressure on the rat runs already endured by the hamlets outside Watlington.
- 937 Support as long as traffic and parking conditions both within Watlington and its surrounding hamlets are adequately provided for. Failing adequate traffic and parking I cannot support the proposal
- 942 Support the long term objectives of the realignment of the B4009 provided that it is in conjunction with the housing developments proposed. I am not sure that it is realistic to have the realigned B4009 going through new housing as indicated on the proposed housing sites. I am concerned that if the realigned road runs through housing there will be a risk of children or elderly being injured or killed because they have to cross a fast and busy road. By diverting the realigned road to the outside of proposed future developments will definitely make this a "ring road" but will ensure safety for children and elderly. In the interim emphasis should be on improving air quality through other traffic management measures which could be implemented using the Community Infrastructure levy.
- 944 Support the proposed new by pass road but it MUST go further (towards Cuxham) than linking with the current roadabout and Willow Close Road
- 951 The addition of a bypass is likely to lead to increased traffic around Watlington as more people would use it as a viable route to Oxford/Reading rather than existing major routes.
- 952 The alternative route is one thing but improvements in the flow in town sit alongside it Parking is just a big an issue - the garage site will be commercially non viable with the alternative route. The garage businesses should re-locate to the west of town and a residents permit car park established before the owner sells it more flats!

- 953 The building of a ring road or bypass must be the first consideration to alleviate traffic congestion and pollution. They have and always will be the concern for the people of Watlington and until this has been done there will always be opposition to anything proposed. It is the solution.
- 954 The bypass road is needed to prevent further deterioration of the town. Reducing the speed limit may help, but the volume of traffic is the issue along with heavy goods vehicles that use Watlington as a "cut through"
- 957 The current traffic makes it very difficult to get through Watlington at peak times and with all these extra houses, I really think that Watlington will grind to a halt without a ring road to make traffic by pass the town centre.
- 971 The plan does not improve traffic, it makes it worse. Watlington will die if traffic is routed around the town. The garage will shut. The garage is part of Watlington character. The shops will die.
- 975 The plan is the best of a bad job, but should go forward subject to the following: 1. It must be conditional upon the re-routing of the B4009 2. The plan must be implemented as one project to ensure that the re-routed road is completed before any new build. If the development proceeds piecemeal there is a risk that the new road will not be completed 3. 238 houses is a significant number and assurances must be obtained that the cost of infrastructure improvements to meet the significant extra need are guaranteed. There will be greater burden on the schools, doctors' surgery, amenity areas, public transport links and car parking etc 4. The re-routed road will take some traffic out of the town centre, but the extra houses will increase the traffic in Brook Street and out of the town towards Howe Hill. A better and consistent flow of traffic up Couching Street and Shirburn Street most secured. A 20mph limit can be imposed, but the current congestion caused by a relatively small number of car parking spaces in these roads must be removed and double yellow lines provided along the whole of this route. Stationery or very slow moving traffic caused most of the air pollution. If the traffic keeps moving the pollution is much less. The pinch point at the town hall cannot be overcome, but the obstruction caused by parked cars can be erased in an instant.
- 979 The properties along Shirburn street, Couching Street, Brook Street and the high street are intrinsic to the character of Watlington. The deterioration of these properties due heavy road use undermines the integrity of the buildings also the aesthetics. Damage to property from heavy goods vehicles is evident and is also a healthrisk. This supports the need for a bypass. For those shop keepers that believe this has an impact on "passing trade" I would suggest that is minimal would be outweighed by the construction of 140 dwellings on site A.
- 984 The realigned B4009 will not alleviate traffic from Nettlebed, which will either continue to drive through Watlington or use the Christmas Common road to access the M40. The proposed traffic lights in Watlington will deter traffic from using this route, and use Christmas Common as an alternative, making the Christmas Common Rd as the second unofficial bypass for Watlington. There are already traffic issues on this road with speeding and destroyed verges as a result of lorries trying to pass one another. A proposed new priority road layout at Christmas Common has been favoured by all as a traffic calming measure. This has got to be implemented before work starts, as there is currently a real risk of road fatalities in Christmas Common.

- 985 The risk of a bypass is a great risk to increase the traffic. However if there are 7500 houses at Charlgrove we need a bypass. If there are not 7500 houses at Charlgrove, we do not need a bypass. We need effective traffic control, traffic lights, and enforce the weight limit.
- 989 The school buses need access via the new relief road. Children are crossing Love Lane to the path to the rec continually and it's only a matter of time before the heavy traffic at school leaving time causes a tragedy.
- 996 The traffic through Watlington is totally unacceptable and needs to be addressed. HGV going up and Pyrton Lane is very damaging - taking HGV away from these lanes has got to be a priority. Re siting the B4009 is necessary - but it will meet with strong opposition from a lot of residents.
- 998 The wording of 2b is problematic: "does not have severe adverse impact". That suggests that, for example, "very bad impact" is acceptable -- which it is not. How is "severe adverse impact" defined? If the housing development proceeds and the bypass is built, then the new housing and B4009 traffic must be managed away from Pyrton Lane, without actually cutting Pyrton Lane off from the B4009. Pyrton Lane is too narrow to take more traffic: when the town traffic was diverted via Pyrton Lane a few years ago there were problems.
- 1000 There are three reasons for this: firstly the bypass would require a much larger number of houses to be built than is required under the 2033 guidelines, which in turn means that this objective is in contradiction of the main objectives of the Watlington plan. Secondly, there is clear evidence that the bypass will result in a gigantic growth in traffic along the B4009. The bypass can only be funded if several hundred houses are built in Watlington and is a critical element in the development of several thousand in Chalgrove. This alone will more than double the existing traffic from 10,000 to 20,000 - 25,000 cars a day. The bypass will also attract traffic from the surrounding area (a repeatedly proven phenomenon) and will become another alternative to the traffic on the A34 heading to the Midlands, and avoiding the traffic jams around Oxford. The small potential decrease in pollution through the centre of Watlington will be offset by a huge increase in pollution to the whole area. It is ludicrous to suggest that the 700 to 1000 houses required to fund the bypass, the light, air and noise pollution from the bypass will not affect the historic views of Watlington from all sides.
- 1001 There has been mention of traffic calming measures in the town once the new B4009 is in place, including a 20mph speed limit. I am not sure how much value a reduced speed limit would add, as I consider it a good run through the town if I reach 20mph. Other measures to encourage use of the new road should be put ahead of this if there is an either/or decision required.
- 1003 There is no consideration of traffic coming from the Reading/ Nettlebed Rd, are you assuming that this traffic will just disappear and not travel using Couching and Shirburn Street. Should we not consider linking this to the bypass plans? Perhaps using the natural line of the Icknield way after all it was good enough for the Romans.
- 1008 This can be done by managing the traffic through the village and to include cycle routes through the village and new planned areas of growth. This retains the village feel.

- 1014 This is ABSOLUTELY Necessary/ Without this, I do not support the housing applications. Making the centre of town one way might also help but we need to have a ring road and stop large HGVs coming through the town centre and is it causing significant congestion right now.
- 1015 This is essential for the survival of the town. The town has already suffered for many years due to the bottle neck and the inability of traffic to pass through it or access it. Trade is lost and large vehicles are a danger to pedestrians, surrounding lanes and villages are being destroyed due to the lack of a suitable by-pass around the town. The neighbourhood plan must address this issue. no expansion of the town in any format can realistically take place until this issue is solved and therefore must be an essential element of future development, not as a piece meal scheme but as a whole. Restrictions on existing non B roads close to but outside the Town must be imposed to protect these as part of any proposal.
- 1016 This is essential. Existing infrastructure will not support the extra traffic. Also traffic from new housing developments at Chalgrove will be using Watlington roads to get to the M40
- 1017 This is our number 1 issue that needs sorting ASAP. Couching Street is not designed to take the size and volume of traffic that passes through the town.
- 1023 This road will kill off business in the town centre as traffic will no longer be passing through as they will use the bypass instead. This has been clearly demonstrated with the closure of the High Street due to the D&G fire as it was like a ghost town during this period. It is great to hear that you will be providing more recreational space but who will maintain this and administer its usage. There is always capital round to build these facilities but never enough money to run them on a day to day basis. The Sports Pavilion is a good example of this as the users cannot even arrange to keep the building clean without the Parish Council having to pay for it.
- 1024 This town desperately needs a bypass of some description. Some extra housing seems like a small sacrifice to make.
- 1025 To most people this is THE most important change - one that has been ignored by OCC/SODC for far too long! The alternative route is required regardless of Chalgrove but if it is to happen it must be accompanied by traffic management measures and increased parking. The garage site is the ideal place for a residents car park - a garage and small convenience store could be located to the west of the town where it will be needed The Parish Council MUST take the necessary ownership of key issues as opposed to taking no action
- 1029 Totally agree with 20 mph also electronic signs indicating speed not only entering the town but also leaving especially on Britwell Rd .
- 1033 Unless the bypass is built before hand the town will not be able to accommodate the works and traffic. Where will the traffic go that uses Pryton Lane during this phase?

- 1034 Use of additional traffic calming schemes should be considered on existing and any new roads to help enforce speed limits and where possible also limit HGVs over the agreed weight limit. Signposting should promote the new section of the B4009 around the west of Watlington as the best route for through traffic. Any additional car parking space should not encourage traffic through the town centre if possible. Car parks should be clearly signposted for those people visiting the village for recreational use eg cycling and walking. Footpaths/pavement adjacent to the new roads should be included to encourage walking especially in the proximity of the school..
- 1042 Watlington needs to grow as a service centre and employment location, particularly bearing in mind its location and access to the M40, however due to the existing traffic issues it loses out to nearby settlements. This needs to be rectified to preserve the town, by the provision of a suitable road network around the town as a whole.
- 1046 We already have traffic issues: again, difficult to see how this will improve with the vastly-increased volume of traffic that must come from the new homes.
- 1048 We broadly agree with the development plan with the development to the North and West and selected in-fill as appropriate to maintain the size and scope of Watlington. We would ask the team to reconsider whether there is scope to maintain the routing of the new road through Willow Close given that the existing 5-6 properties that would be affected could be re-developed to provide a closer density on the side of the new development that was closest to the town centre (potential for additional elderly / young family accommodation). This would maintain the shortest route around the town (saving costs on road construction), would allow for a simplified access to the schools directly from the new road and would run the new road past industrial estates, school play grounds and the allotments for the majority of its route, rather than directly through the middle of the new residential areas.
- 1051 We don't necessarily need a ring road, but traffic needs better management
- 1053 We firmly support traffic restrictions in the town centre and on Britwell Road. Also the widening of pavements as a safety necessity. We believe it is imperative to enhance the character of Watlington in the design of the new housing sites, but also that Watlington must be developed to provide necessary additional services to support the growth in people. The Town Centre should allow development of shops - the Co op is too small, too busy and poorly stocked to serve the current number of inhabitants.

- 1054 We fully support the strategy for development sites having to safeguard a route for the realigned B4009. Providence Land acts for the landowners of Sites B and C as well as PYR2 in the draft Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan which is also required to deliver the new route. We are fully supportive of the spatial strategy to provide an alternative route for traffic through the town, facilitated by development sites coming forward along the new route. Our objection concerns the lack of reference to the emerging Local Plan and its Second Preferred Options consultation which proposes Policy TRANS 3 (Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Transport Schemes) and requires proposals not to harm the delivery of the bypass nor prejudice its construction or effective operation. As this is a policy in a strategic plan then there is no need for the Neighbourhood Plan to provide its own version of policy TRANS 3. Instead, it should reference it and be entirely consistent with it. Without this change, the Plan will not meet the Basic Conditions for Neighbourhood Plans, specifically the requirement to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority.
- 1060 We must not allow more heavy traffic to pass through the town on their daily commute - the town CANNOT sustain this. I do believe that the town can grow in the number of houses and that this would benefit the local businesses however, the infrastructure needs to be addressed BEFORE building starts or it will never get built!
- 1061 We need cameras and monitoring. Much lower speed limit. MUch better signs at the town hall. The town hall area at the Fish Shop is very dangerous, especially for pedestrians. Trucks get stuck passing. Traffic lights work. There was a temporary one. The big trucks need to get out of the town. Ring road on the far side of the residential areas.
- 1063 We need to be getting as much traffic away from the town centre as possible, and we should be enforcing it, not just watching the HGV's continue to rumble through the town centre.
- 1070 We think this is already a problem area and will become intolerable if an alternative route is not built asap as part of this development. Traffic flow will urgently need to be managed on the Britwell road and town centre to cope with the extra vehicles using it from Watlington and Benson developments.
- 1077 While we agree that we need more housing where there is a deficit in the plan and more details are required are: 1) the need for a better road solution; 2) there is no limit to the number of houses; & 3) the need for added infrastructure such as schools, doctors etc. Finally we would like to see a commitment on the affordable housing which gives locals priority rather than people from outside Oxfordshire

1079 Whilst I overall support the provision of a relief road/bypass, with an aim to reduce through traffic through the town centre, I have two concerns: The new realligned B4009/B480 junction just north of the Willow Close roundabout. I worry that if this is a standard crossroad, then through traffic for people to cross the B480/Cuxham road from M40 to Wallingford will have to cross the road, and this will very quickly cause traffic to back up either side of this, waiting to cross. This waiting traffic will be in the middle of the new "A" and "B" development areas therefore transferring the pollution to these residential areas. If the traffic flows increase significantly with flow north towards the proposed new Chalgrove airfield then traffic from the M40 direction will have to cross right at the crossroads. This usually delays traffic significantly more, with some drivers not aware of the correct priority at such a junction, as well as the delays inherent with a crossroad. This may encourage some drivers to go through town as that way they stagger the crossing, first turning right and then left if going from east-to-west, or only having to make a right turn at a T junction at the current B4009/B480 junction, and then having priority travelling through the new crossroads. A roundabout would mitigate these concerns to some degree. The second is that adequate crossing points and traffic calming measures are put in place given that the relief road doesn't look like it is going to be the boundary of homes and that some new homes are going to be built on the northern side of it, and therefore residents will have to cross this regularly e.g. getting to school etc. The design of the road should ensure the speed limit is obeyed, as otherwise commuters etc will regularly do the speed the road allows similar to that which occurs in Shirburn where there is a 30mph road with residential streets off it, yet no adequate speeding measures are put in place.

1081 Whilst land has been safeguarded for a bypass in the South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan 2033 Second Preferred Options Consultation north and west of Watlington, it is not clear that this is deliverable. There are a number of constraints including but not limited to land ownership (no land secured to the northwest/northeast/southeast of the Pyrton Lane/Station Road/B4009 crossroads), the narrow width of Pyrton Lane, the presence of a substantial number of nationally important, mature and protected trees and the fact that the junction is currently a crossroads, which would need to be significantly enhanced to accommodate bypass traffic movements. - Atkins' Evaluation of Transport Impacts document (ETI) (on behalf of South Oxfordshire District Council) shows that the modelled scenarios that include development at Chalgrove as well as the consented Benson residential development are forecast to result in much greater delays along the B480 corridor to and from J 6 of the M 40 through Watlington and across the district than other development options. With more traffic on the B 480 through Cuxham and on to Watlington and Shirburn and the B 4009 to the M 40, it therefore does not seem a natural conclusion from a highway capacity perspective to take the scenarios forward that include major development in Chalgrove/Watlington. As noted within the supporting evidence, "Further transport infrastructure mitigation to that already planned... will be required to accommodate growth at this location." Traffic surveys carried out by agents for the Homes & Communities Agency for Chalgrove Airfield of the additional traffic levels on the B4009 from Watlington to the M 40 have been quantified and there is a 350% difference between the impact upon delay in the AM and PM peaks (18% and 68% respectively) with no explanation for the discrepancy. This may be reflective of the fact that the consultant's Technical Note (dated 7 October 2016) appears to show that the model used to forecast traffic flows is not representative of observed flows between Watlington and the M40 Junction 6 (an all ways movement junction ), particularly in the PM peak. Policy 2 does not address this. - The impact upon each corridor appears to have been undertaken from a capacity perspective only. Other qualitative factors such as the impact upon listed buildings, nationally important protected and unique trees, air quality and registered parks do not appear to have been factored into the analysis thus far and should be incorporated into any future assessments. The proposed bypass will not remove air pollution that currently impacts on the centre of Watlington, it will only relocate more pollution to the route of the new by pass and impact the associated new residential development and the current and proposed educational and recreational facilities. In summary the impact of the much higher housing numbers that will be allocated to Watlington over the numbers reported in this plan, in large part to provide developer funding for the cost of the bypass will have a significantly greater impact than Policy 2 is stating.

1082 Whilst Watlington requires improved traffic management through and around the town, and should accept the building of new houses, the plan as presented fundamentally fails to do this while protecting 'the scale, character and setting of Watlington', as per the objectives laid out in the Watlington Neighbourhood Development Plan (WNDP). As presented, it is a major threat to the character of our wonderful rural (large) village. As the minutes of meetings with the 'GVA' and 'HCA' on the WNDP website indicate, the plan as presented will not result in 238 new houses being built, but between 400-700 new houses so as to pay for the construction of a substantial by-pass depending on whether SODC or Developers build it. This would radically alter the 'scale, character and setting of Watlington' and would have dramatic consequences for the surrounding area. Nowhere in either the SODC 'Second Preferred Options' plan nor the WNDP is provision made for schools, medical facilities, shops and amenities for 1000 or more people living in 400 plus new homes. It is a completely impractical proposition. If this is allowed to go ahead Watlington will no longer be the attractive village in a rural setting that it currently is. The by-pass as currently envisaged to the west of Watlington would destroy the green buffer between it and the village of Pyrton and presents major hazards for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders on what are currently country roads and lanes. Evidence from the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) in March 2017 found that road schemes of the scale envisaged in this plan induces increased traffic, leads to significant environmental damage and has little economic benefit to local communities. The aspiration to provide 40% affordable homes also means that public transport will have to be increased in order to meet the needs of this demographic of resident. The WNDP must be considered within the broader context of a major housing development proposed in the SODC 'Second Preferred Options' plan of 3,000-3,500 homes on Chalgrove Airfield. Such a development would have a significant impact on Watlington and surrounding areas, doubling traffic on the B480 and B4009 as residents seek access to the M40 motorway and local amenities. The WNDP steering group should be doing everything possible to coordinate with Pyrton, Cuxham, Chalgrove and the Haseley Brook Action Group (HBAG) their objections to such a development that will dramatically affect Watlington. Given this wider context and the needs and desires of those beyond the remit of the WNDP (e.g. SODC and Oxford County Council), the WNDP group is urged to seek the professional advice of experts in areas such as Public Affairs, Legal, Development Planning etc, either independently or from among interested members of the Watlington community. By accepting the advice and guidance of officials in SODC the WNDP runs the risk of being distorted by other priorities, such as the development of Chalgrove Airfield. The WNDP group need the best possible advice available and this should be independent of SODC. Changes Required: 1. The provision of 238 houses should be the maximum number of houses acceptable in the WNDP. 2. Development should be achieved through in-fill on the various plots of land to the north, within the village and with modest development around a much reduced relief road via Willow close as originally envisaged. 3. The relief road should be kept as a modest country road so as to discourage the build up and use by large and heavy vehicles. 4. Any relief road should take account of the needs of rural activities – walkers, cyclists and horse riders, facilitating access to existing footpaths and bridleways and providing safe crossing points.

1083 Whilst Watlington requires improved traffic management through the town and some houses should be built, the current plan fails to protect 'the scale, character and setting of Watlington', as per the objectives laid out in the Watlington Neighbourhood Development Plan (WNDP). As presented it presents a major threat to the character of our wonderful rural small town. To pay for the construction of a substantial by-pass depending will require far more houses than the current minimum of 238 - and estimates range from 400-700. This would radically alter the 'scale, character and setting of Watlington', would have dramatic consequences on the surrounding area and environment. Nowhere in either the SODC 'Second Preferred Options' plan nor the WNDP is provision made for schools, medical facilities, shops and amenities for 1000 or more people living in 400 plus new homes. The proposition has not been thought through. The by-pass as currently envisaged in the plan to the west of Watlington is a major construction and would destroy the green buffer between Watlington, Cuxham and Pyrton and presents major hazards for pedestrians, cyclists, rural ramblers and horse riders on what are currently country roads and lanes. Evidence from the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) in March 2017 found that road schemes of the scale envisaged in this plan induces increased traffic, leads to significant environmental damage and has little economic benefit to local communities. The aspiration to provide 40% affordable homes also means that public transport will have to be increased in order to meet the needs of this demographic of resident. Changes Required: 1. The provision of 238 houses should be an absolute maximum number of houses acceptable in the WNDP. 2. Development where possible should be achieved through a mix of in-fill on the various plots of land to the north, within the village and with modest development around a much reduced relief road via Willow as originally envisaged. 3. The relief road should be kept as a modest country road so as to discourage the build up and use by large and heavy vehicles. 4. Any relief road should take account of the needs of rural activities – walkers, cyclists and horse riders, facilitating access to existing footpaths and bridleways and providing safe crossing points.

1087 With particular attention to be paid to: - greater use of High St for traffic bound from J6 through to Britwell/Chalgrove, thereby avoiding Couching St - better utilisation (2way?) of Spring Lane for access to Hill Road car park, doctors etc for those coming from Brook St or Howe Road, thereby avoiding Couching St - traffic calming and/or 20 mph limit for Pyrton Lane, similar to that recently confirmed for Littleworth Rd in Benson - stronger enforcement of 7.5t limit Additional concerns of deteriorating situation of parking at J6, which while not part of this plan will only be exacerbated as a result of development.

1090 With the added comment that the route through Willow Close be reconsidered as providing the shortest routing.

1091 With the increase in homes to be built in South Oxfordshire as a whole and the increased volume of traffic that will result in trying to access the motorway a relief road is essential. Please make sure there are enough paths and pavements to ensure access to schools and the high street and encourage safe pedestrian use, including with push-chairs.

1093 WNDP need to be mindful of the impact of traffic pressures in the surrounding area and villages not just within Watlington. Also, with the increased population there is likely to be a shortage of car parking in the town centre. This is already the case now, before any development.

1094 Would like to see the Willow Close link being used as it was originally intended. I still don't understand why the Willow Close road is not going to be used more as I understand this was the purpose of leaving it to be able to be linked into in the first place? I sincerely hope that any development in sites B & C will have an obligation to link into Willow Close or else those people living in that road the adjoining Sycamore, Beech etc. will continue to use Pyrton Lane to get round Watlington and this would be a big opportunity missed.

1096 Yes, but the roads leading to that centre of employment must be fit for purpose.

1098 You say that you will the 7.5t weight restriction will continue to apply but I find it hard to believe this is the case as there is no reason for it to be with a bypass round the town. I would like to know how the enforcement of this limit will be improved because if there is a way to do this then why is it not being done now