

# Executive

## Local Transport Plan 3 (2011-2030): Cherwell District Council Response to Consultation by Oxfordshire County Council

7 June 2010

### Report of Head of Planning Policy & Economic Development

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present information and update the Executive of the consultation on the emerging third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) with a view to making a further representation to the full consultation in late 2010.

This report is public
-----------------------

#### Recommendations

---

The Executive is recommended:

- (1) To note the contents of this report and consultation to date and to agree to continue to monitor the preparation of the LTP with a view to making a further response to the consultation on the Draft LTP in late 2010
- (2) To agree the proposed responses set out in paragraphs 1.25 to 1.52 as the basis of the Council's response to the "scenarios" public consultation.
- (3) To comment additionally that:-
  - The scenario-based consultation is not helpful in considering the specific transport needs and issues relating to areas of Cherwell District. There should, therefore be specific consultation on scheme choices relating to specific locations in the county.
  - The final LTP should be organised district-by-district and by settlements to create a stronger spatial link with Local Development Frameworks.

#### Executive Summary

---

##### Introduction

- 1.1 Oxfordshire County Council is currently preparing its third Local Transport Plan (LTP). The LTP sets out a vision for transport in Oxfordshire. It is required to produce an LTP by April 2011 in order to meet the requirements of the Transport Act 2000 (amended by the Local Transport Act 2008). The previous two LTPs cover a 5 year period and the current LTP runs to 2011. The emerging LTP will cover a longer time period of 20 years allowing greater flexibility in its development and sets the long term strategy and transport objectives for the area. This brings it into line with the Oxfordshire Sustainable Communities Strategy ("Oxfordshire 2030") and provides some headroom beyond 2026 which is the timeframe within which LDFs are being prepared.
- 1.2 The Plan will focus on the attracting and supporting inward investment and growth whilst delivering transport improvements and the infrastructure required to support the growth. It will also aim to:
- Tackle congestion
  - Improve quality of life
  - Respond to County Council objectives to relating to reducing deprivation tackling congestion, the economy, community and climate change
- 1.3 Reports on progress and preparation of the LTP were presented to the County Council's cabinet on 15 September 2009 and 5 March 2010. The latter report set out the results of consultation on a draft set of objectives and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report.

### **The role of the Local Transport Plan**

- 1.4 The local transport plan is a document which sets out the vision, objectives and outcomes for transport in Oxfordshire. It also includes a programme of investment in new transport schemes and maintenance of the existing network.
- 1.5 There have been two previous LTPs. **LTP1** covered the period 2001-2006. **LTP2** (adopted in April 2006) covers the period 2006-2011. It included a programme for improvements across the County and focussed on five priority areas
- tackling congestion
  - delivering accessibility
  - safer roads
  - better air quality and
  - improving the street environment
- 1.6 **LTP3** will cover the period 2011-2030 and is due to come into effect in 2011. It will focus on attracting and supporting economic investment, growth and delivering transport infrastructure and services to tackle and improve quality

of life. It will respond to the Oxfordshire Sustainable Community Strategy, "Oxfordshire 2030" and help meet the County's strategic objectives of developing a world class economy, healthy and thriving communities, better public services, breaking the cycle of deprivation and managing the environment and climate change.

1.7 More specifically, the Plan will:-

- provide the policy and context for the Access to Oxford project
- enable the County Council to bid for additional Government funding for other major schemes over the next 20 years
- help secure funds from development and ensure these are spent effectively

1.8 The LTP will contain two parts; a long term policy/strategy document and a shorter term delivery programme currently proposed to cover a 3 to 5 year period initially and then rolled forward.

### 1.9 **Consultation Progress**

1.10 In preparing LTP3 the County Council is undertaking a series of consultations at key stages of the project with a final full consultation taking place in late 2010. A series of newsletters have been produced since the preparation of the LTP3 began in July 2009 and are referred to in the Appendices.

1.11 To date four out of a total of six stages to the consultation have been completed.

- Consultation 1: 27 July – 4 September 2009 (Completed) – Objectives – to agree the objectives to be used to guide the development of LTP3 to decide which improvements are made to the County's transport network and how these are prioritised. A CDC officer response was made to ensure the Council's participation in the following stages of consultation and to be kept informed of progress.
- Consultation 2: 27 July – 21 August 2009 (Completed) – Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Scoping Report – asked a series of questions seeking feedback on the approach to SEA.
- Consultation 3: 23 November – 18 December 2009 (Completed) – Long list of schemes – to propose a list of transport schemes to be included in the Plan. This list, insofar as it relates to Cherwell District, is attached as appendix 2 to this report.
- Consultation 4: 18 January – 19 February 2010 (Completed) Policies – to comment on each of the policies to be developed for inclusion in the plan (see attached list) CDC officer submitted holding comments on 19 February 2010 in response to the consultation.

1.12 A draft set of policies were prepared following the consultation on the LTP objectives. These covered 19 topics, including walking cycling disability bus and rail services.

1.13 The two further periods of consultation that are/will be taking place, as

follows:-

- Consultation 5: 10 May – 20 June 2010 – Scenarios – to comment on alternative strategies for meeting objectives in each settlement type
- Consultation 6: 1 October – 2 January 2010 (to be confirmed) – Draft Local Transport Plan – to comment on the Draft Plan

- 1.14 The fifth round of consultation (“scenarios”) is in progress now. The following section considers this consultation and proposes a response from the District Council.
- 1.15 During this lengthy consultation process, it has been difficult to judge the appropriate stage at which to seek a formal Executive decision. Furthermore, given the number of previous consultations and the amount of time allowed by the County Council for each one, it would not been possible to bring reports before the Executive for every consultation. Officer comments have been made on previous consultations where possible. It has seemed sensible, however, to bring a report before the Executive now, as this provides the opportunity to comment on the County Council’s emerging ideas before a full Draft LTP is produced. A further report will be brought before members at the Draft LTP stage, almost certainly before the end of the year.

### **Scenario testing**

- 1.16 As noted above, Oxfordshire County Council is currently consulting on a number of “scenarios”. A copy of the full consultation paper has been sent electronically to all councillors and is attached as **appendix 1** to this report.
- 1.17 In this consultation, the County Council is asking for views on what overall approaches it should follow for transport in Oxfordshire over the next 20 years. They are calling these “scenarios”. **It should be noted that the County Council says that it is not looking at specific schemes or projects as part of this stage of consultation, but the choice of scenario will influence which schemes are progressed in the future.**
- 1.18 The first comment to make on this approach is that this separation between scenarios and consideration of possible specific schemes seems artificial. Across Oxfordshire, work on LDFs is well advanced and it does not seem particularly helpful to consult with local people on a document that will have a direct bearing on these LDFs without setting out some of the clear transport choices that will influence them. This is particularly the case given that earlier consultation on the LTP did refer to scheme lists and these lists are already influencing work on LDFs and the Spatial Planning & Infrastructure Partnership’s Local Investment Plan / Local Investment Agreement work (see report elsewhere on this agenda). The strategic infrastructure schemes contained within the Local Investment Plan are listed in appendix 3.
- 1.19 The County Council has tested a number of possible scenarios for each of the four settlement types that will form the basis of the LTP. These settlement types are:-
- Oxford
  - the larger towns (including Banbury and Bicester)

- the smaller towns (including Kidlington)
  - the rural areas
- 1.20 From these, three scenarios have been selected for each settlement type. The County Council is asking for views on which of these we think would best deliver the overall objectives of the LTP for each settlement type.
- 1.21 In setting out these scenarios, the County Council wishes to make clear that it is highly likely that the funds available to the Council during the early part of the Plan will be very tight and therefore that only limited progress will be able to be made towards meeting our transport goals in the first five years, or perhaps even longer. In deciding upon preferred scenarios, consultees are asked to remember that the new Local Transport Plan is a long term document and that the preferred strategies will not be able to be delivered overnight.
- 1.22 The development of the scenarios has been guided by earlier work on the LTP which have sought to identify objectives for LTP3. A matrix of these objectives, and the relative importance they have within each of the settlement types, is shown on page 4 of appendix 1.
- 1.23 The following section considers a response from this Council to the scenarios. In doing so, attention is being focussed on those areas which directly affect Cherwell District. The proposed response is being informed by a number of documents prepared either by Cherwell District Council or the Cherwell LSP. These include the Draft Core Strategy, the Cherwell Rural Strategy, the Cherwell Economic Development Strategy and “Our District, Our Future” – the Cherwell Sustainable Community Strategy.
- 1.24 Before giving comments on each of the scenarios, some general comments on the scenarios can be made.

#### **General comments on the scenarios**

- 1.25 It is recognised that putting together a Local Transport Plan for any area is a complex task, and Oxfordshire County Council is to be commended for seeking to present some of the myriad of potential policy choices in an illustrative fashion.
- 1.26 That said, the general nature of the consultation, which explicitly and deliberately does not refer to specific schemes, makes it harder for consultees to make meaningful comments from a local perspective. This can be seen in several ways.
- There is no differentiation within any section (except, by definition, that for Oxford) between different locations. For example, scenarios are put forward for the “larger towns” en bloc, and this does not recognise that these towns vary in significantly, both in size and in the unique combination of land use and transportation issues they face. There is a very real danger that drawing too many conclusions from a “one size fits all” policy approach may not fully reflect these differences, and may therefore not do justice to the differing needs of different areas.
  - The way that the scenarios are presented may suggest that some types of schemes are unique to a particular scenario. For example, in “larger towns”, schemes to manage lorry movements are only included within the “supporting economic growth” scenario. In reality, schemes to manage

lorry movements could potentially appear as part of any of the “larger town” scenarios.

- The lack of any mention of specific schemes makes it difficult to judge the potential effectiveness and relevance of any given scenario in a given situation. For example, two specific road schemes for Banbury were included in the “long list” of schemes which was drawn up towards the end of 2009 (see appendix 2). These schemes are not, however, specifically mentioned as part of any scenario for the larger towns. The only mention of road improvement schemes comes as a general reference in the “supporting economic growth” scenario. Since the County Council has already identified these schemes (whilst not, it should be made clear, having expressed a view on them), it would be possible to include them as specific options within any scenario testing for (in this case) Banbury. As this has not been done, it is difficult to take a view on what the “supporting economic growth” scenario means for Banbury.

- 1.27 Although the County Council does not identify specific schemes within the “scenarios” consultation, it has done so in other documents. In the Oxfordshire Local Investment Plan prepared by the Spatial Planning & Infrastructure Partnership (LIP) in March 2010, a number of schemes are identified as “strategic infrastructure schemes to deliver top-priority growth schemes in the short term 2010-15”. Whilst some of these are known commitments (for example the SW Bicester perimeter road) there is reference to the “*Banbury priority north-south vehicular corridor*”. This refers to a package of measures to support the LDF which could include improvements along Concorde Avenue / Upper Windsor Street and/or Oxford Road / Southam Road. If this is clearly a County Council commitment in the LIP then it should have been included within the current scenarios consultation for the LTP.
- 1.28 It is therefore considered that the scenarios consultation has a number of shortcomings which will make it difficult for local people to meaningfully engage with the consultation process. All of the various consultations (both this one and the previous stages of the LTP) will only be brought together when the Draft LTP is produced for consultation later this year. This will be the first time that people will be able to understand the implications of the approach being taken by the County Council in its LTP, and the fear is that by that stage, it will be less easy for the LTP to change strategy if local people are unhappy with it.
- 1.29 It should be noted that the County Council is aware of these limitations, and recognises in its consultation document that in practice, it is likely that the programme of schemes within the LTP will not be as clear cut as the scenarios might suggest. The County Council also suggests that just because a particular type of scheme is not included within a scenario does not necessarily mean that it would not be able to be delivered. It would, however, be less likely to come forward compared to scheme types that are included within any scenario. What the scenarios try to indicate is what the overall balance of the County Council’s programme would be likely to be.
- 1.30 Overall, it is considered that the final LTP should be presented on a geographically specific basis with sections covering individual districts and settlements. This has been the format of previous plans and it creates a better relationship with the work of local planning authorities on LDFs at a

district level.

- 1.31 Having made these general comments, the following section considers the scenarios as they have been presented for consultation.

### **Comments on the detailed scenarios**

#### **1) Options for Oxford**

- 1.32 This report does not propose a detailed response to the scenarios for Oxford, except where these impact upon Cherwell District. The scenarios for Oxford focus on the impacts and transport choices as they relate to the city, but clearly these will have wider implications. Of particular relevance to Cherwell District are the impacts of strategies to manage traffic arriving at the city from the north, including through the use of rail and Park & Ride facilities.
- 1.33 Members will be well aware of the proposals for a new rail station beside the Water Eaton Park & Ride which are being promoted as part of Chiltern Railways Evergreen 3 proposal. The Council has previously supported this proposal, whilst recognising its sensitive location in the Green Belt.
- 1.34 Clearly, any measures which seek to reduce congestion and promote transport choice within Oxford can be supported, provided these do not have an adverse impact on surrounding areas. Scenario A focuses on promoting walking and cycling, however says little about how vehicle movements will be managed. Scenarios 2 (increasing transport choice) and 3 (promoting public transport) both address vehicle movements more explicitly, recognising the role of Park & Rise and rail services.
- 1.35 It is suggested that the Council does not express a particular support for any one scenario, however maintains its support for the use of both bus based Park & Rise and rail services provided that:-
- these are managed in such a way as to not increase congestion on local roads, and
  - they at all times respect their sensitive location (insofar as they relate to land within Cherwell District) in the Green Belt. In considering any proposal to expand existing sites within Green Belt areas, the County Council would be expected to clearly demonstrate the “very special circumstances” that exist which would justify the development in a Green Belt location in accordance with Government Green Belt guidance.

#### **2) Options for the larger towns**

- 1.36 Within Cherwell District these include Banbury and Bicester. More information can be found on pages 10 – 14 of appendix 1.
- 1.37 The different scenarios for the larger towns can be summarised as follows.

	Scenario	What would this mean?	Possible types of schemes?
<b>A</b>	Promoting lower emissions	Delivering major improvements to walking and cycling reinforced by marketing and publicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle networks</li> <li>• Better facilities for pedestrians</li> <li>• Encouraging people to make fewer trips by car</li> </ul>
<b>B</b>	Promoting transport choice	Spreading investment over different types of transport schemes such as measures for drivers, bus users, cyclists and pedestrians.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better facilities for buses</li> <li>• Park &amp; Ride</li> <li>• Improving traffic management</li> <li>• Better facilities for pedestrians</li> <li>• Cycle networks</li> </ul>
<b>C</b>	Supporting economic growth	Direct improvements to the road and rail network and better bus services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selected road improvement schemes</li> <li>• Rail improvements</li> <li>• Better bus services</li> <li>• Cycling and walking network</li> <li>• Managing lorry movements</li> </ul>

### Options for larger towns: Comments

- 1.38 Previous work on the LTP has indicated that the top priority objectives for the larger towns are (1) reducing congestion, (2) increasing the quality and use of public transport and (3) increasing cycling and walking.
- 1.39 Within Cherwell's Draft Core Strategy our own vision statement (which mirrors much within the Cherwell Sustainable Community Strategy) aims, amongst other things, to:-
- protect our natural resources and reduce the impact of development on the natural environment
  - foster a growing economy with good transport links
  - reduce dependence on the private car by improving road, rail and public transport links and increasing access to services for those that need them. There will be a focus on measures aimed to manage road congestion, improving public transport, and improving access to town centres and other shops and services.
- 1.40 When considered against these aims, the scenario that has the "best fit" would be **scenario B: promoting transport choice**. This has a focus on improving facilities for public transport, traffic management (tackling congestion), improving facilities for pedestrians (including to town centres) and developing the cycle network. This scenario is not, however, an ideal fit for the following reasons:-
- It focuses spending on "park and ride" to cater for trips to the larger towns. This is not something which is generally being promoted within either Banbury or Bicester in the LDF or the Sustainable Community Strategy. Indeed, there are serious doubts about the economic viability and transport or environmental benefits of Park & Ride in towns of this size.
  - It does not recognise the possible need for selected road improvement schemes that may be a necessary consequence of the major growth that



our larger towns will need to accommodate under the housing targets that Cherwell needs to deliver up to 2026. In particular, as a consequence of the eco-development at North West Bicester, a number of selected road improvements may be needed.

- It does not mention “managing lorry movements” which only appears in scenario C. Schemes which help manage lorry movements may be an important part of an overall traffic solution, particularly where this helps relieve congestion and support the vitality of historic town centres such as Banbury.

### 3) Options for the smaller towns

1.41 Within Cherwell District this only applies to Kidlington. (NB: Although it is a village, Kidlington has been included in the “smaller towns” category in view of its size.) More information can be found on pages 15 – 19 of appendix 1.

1.42 The different scenarios for the smaller towns can be summarised as follows:-

	Scenario	What would this mean?	Possible types of schemes?
<b>A</b>	Promoting lower emissions	Investment on means of transport that have low or no emissions backed by education and publicity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle networks</li> <li>• Better facilities for pedestrians</li> <li>• Encouraging people to make fewer trips by car</li> </ul>
<b>B</b>	Promoting transport choice	Spreading investment over a wide range of different types of transport schemes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better facilities for buses</li> <li>• Improving traffic management</li> <li>• Better facilities for pedestrians</li> <li>• Cycle networks</li> </ul>
<b>C</b>	Supporting economic growth	Improvements to the road networks, particularly where new development puts these under pressure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selected road improvement schemes</li> <li>• Improved traffic management</li> </ul>

### Options for smaller towns: Comments

1.43 Previous work on the LTP has indicated that the top priority objectives for the smaller towns are (1) improving the conditions of local roads, footways and carriageways, (2) reducing congestion and (3) increasing cycling and walking for local journeys.

1.44 Within Cherwell District, in setting a vision and spatial strategy for our villages and rural areas, the Draft Core Strategy recognised the unique role of Kidlington. Within the Draft Core Strategy and the Sustainable Community Strategy, it was recognised that for Kidlington we need to:-

- Ensure sufficient access to services
- Ensure stronger links between industrial areas, the airport and local residents and the village centre
- Position Kidlington in economic terms in view of its unique place on account of the airport, Begbroke Science Park and its proximity to Oxford and promote the sustainable commercial and recreational potential of the canal and airport.
- Continue to explore the potential for a new station
- Address the issue of the main road bisecting the village and traffic

management.

1.45 When considered against these aims, the scenario that has the “best fit” would be **scenario B: promoting transport choice**. As with the larger towns above, this has a focus on improving facilities for public transport, traffic management (tackling congestion), improving facilities for pedestrians (including to town centres) and developing the cycle network. Again, however, this scenario is not an ideal fit for the following reasons:-

- It does not address Kidlington’s unique relationship with Oxford and its public transport links.
- It does not address the aspiration within Kidlington to explore the potential for a new station.
- Although it supports better facilities for pedestrians, it does not go as far as scenario A which refers explicitly to creating “*pedestrianised areas (where appropriate), wider footways, more pedestrian crossings and higher standard links for new development*”. All of these would be worth considering in view of particular issues affecting Kidlington relating to the impact of the A4260 Oxford Road on the village, and the particular issues created by the need to secure good access to employment opportunities in Kidlington.

#### 4) Options for Rural Oxfordshire

1.46 Within Cherwell District, this relates to everywhere outside of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. More information can be found on pages 20 – 24 of appendix 1.

1.47 The different scenarios for the smaller towns can be summarised as follows:-

	Scenario	What would this mean?	Possible types of schemes?
<b>A</b>	Promoting lower emissions	Investment on means of transport that have low or no emissions backed by education and publicity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle networks</li> <li>• Improved connections from villages to footpaths and other rights of way</li> <li>• Encouraging people to make fewer trips by car</li> <li>• Speed reduction measures</li> </ul>
<b>B</b>	Managing movements	Encouraging more efficient transport of goods around the county with the aim of reducing the number of lorries on rural roads.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transferring freight onto the railway</li> <li>• Improving the road network</li> <li>• Efficient movement of freight</li> <li>• Traffic management on rural roads</li> </ul>
<b>C</b>	Promoting transport choice	Spreading investment over a wide range of different types of transport schemes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved cycle links</li> <li>• Better connections to rights of way from villages</li> <li>• Better links to rail stations</li> <li>• Improved bus services</li> <li>• Speed reduction measures where there are accident problems.</li> </ul>

#### Options for rural Oxfordshire: Comments

1.48 Previous work on the LTP has indicated that the top priority objectives for

rural Oxfordshire are (1) improving the conditions of local roads, footways and carriageways, (2) improving accessibility to work, education and services and (3) increasing cycling and walking for local journeys.

- 1.49 Within Cherwell District, the Draft Core Strategy, the Sustainable Community Strategy and the Rural Strategy aim, amongst other matters, to:-
- Protect, maintain and improve local services (and, by inference, access to local services) wherever possible
  - Support a sustainable rural economy that offers local employment
  - Identify where traffic control is both desirable and beneficial
  - Improving road safety particularly arising from speeding vehicles and dangerous driving
  - Invest in community-based and alternative transport solutions
  - Improve links between villages for walkers, cyclists and equestrians
- 1.50 When considered against these aims, the scenario that has the “best fit” would be **scenario C: promoting transport choice**. This seeks to support a range of transport measures which would improve accessibility as well as reducing speed in rural areas. A shortcoming of this scenario (and indeed of this scenario in all of the settlement types) is that because investment is being spread over a range of types of schemes (bus, rail, cycle, speed reduction, rights of way) inevitably less can be done in any one specific area. In some ways, the local objectives for the rural areas are best met by scenario A (promoting lower emissions) however whilst this scenario would allow for relatively significant levels of investment, it would not focus spending on public transport improvements that would benefit real areas.

### **Comments on the list of schemes**

- 1.51 In view of the evident difficulty in commenting sensibly on the scenarios, it is important for the Council’s consultation response to refer to the emerging schemes listed in appendix 2 and offer comments on Cherwell’s needs. This should be done with reference to the work done on the LDF Core Strategy. The Council should support inclusion of the following schemes in the LTP.
- Banbury priority north-south vehicular corridor
  - Bicester Park & Ride
  - M40 junction 9 improvements
  - Transport improvements at and around Bicester
- 1.52 This list corresponds with the recently agreed LIP. However, additional schemes will need to be considered to reflect:-
- The emerging proposals for the eco-development at North West Bicester
  - Measures to address traffic problems in the vicinity of Bicester Village
  - Strategic housing and employment allocations in Banbury and Bicester

made in the Core Strategy

- Measures to promote access to, and use of, rail stations including those arising from Evergreen 3. This will include access by all modes to the new railway station at Water Eaton Parkway.
- The need for footpath and cycleway improvements across the whole district, including in rural areas
- The need to reduce traffic speeds, including in rural areas.

### **Conclusion**

- 1.53 The preparation of the LTP is ongoing with further consultation to take place in May and June before the publication of a Final Draft LTP3 in late 2010. Six stages of consultation are taking place with consultations one to four completed. The consultation process will culminate in a full consultation between October 2010 and January 2011. It is recommended that a further report is presented to the Executive to consider the Council's full response.
- 1.54 For now, it is recommended that the responses set out in paragraphs 1.25 to 1.52 above form the basis of the Council's response to the current "scenarios" consultation.

## Background Information

---

- 2.1 This is the first time the Executive has considered LTP3. The Plan consultation process was reported to Oxfordshire County Council Cabinet on 15 September 2009 and subsequently on 5 March 2010. A series of newsletters have been published to support the consultation process.

## Key Issues for Consideration/Reasons for Decision and Options

---

- 3.1 The Executive is invited to consider the contents of this report and the information contained in the supporting documents which provides further detail on the LTP3 contents and consultation process.

The following options have been identified. The approach in the recommendations is believed to be the best way forward

<b>Option One</b>	To endorse the views expressed in this report as the Council's response to the consultation on scenarios within the LTP3
<b>Option Two</b>	To amend or add to the consultation response as the Executive considers appropriate.
<b>Option Three</b>	Not to respond to the consultation

## Consultations

---

<b>Councillor Gibbard</b>	None
---------------------------	------

## Implications

---

**Financial:** There are no direct financial implications of making a consultation response. However there may be financial implications when specific transport schemes have been identified in terms of how they will be funded through planning obligations and developer contributions for example, through a community infrastructure levy.

Comments checked by Eric Meadows, Service Accountant, 01295 221552.

**Legal:** There are no legal implications from this report.

Comments checked by Nigel Bell, Solicitor, 01295 221687

**Risk Management:** There are no risks to the Council in participating in the consultation on the emerging LTP3 at this stage. Further consideration of risk will be set out in a subsequent report when the Draft LTP3 is published for consultation.

Comments checked by Rosemary Watts, Risk

**Wards Affected**

---

All

**Corporate Plan Themes**

---

**Theme 4 Promote a prosperous and sustainable economy**  
**Theme 6 Protect and enhance the local environment**  
**Theme 8 Rural focus**

**Executive Portfolio**

---

**Councillor Gibbard**  
**Portfolio Holder for Planning, Housing and Economy**

**Document Information**

---

<b>Appendix No</b>	<b>Title</b>
Appendix 1	Consultation 5 – Scenarios (produced by Oxfordshire County Council)
Appendix 2	“Long list” of schemes for consideration in LTP3
Appendix 3	Table of strategic infrastructure schemes included in Local Investment Plan.
<b>Background Papers</b>	
Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2030, Discussion Note 1: Agreeing the Objectives, July 2009, Oxfordshire County Council Strategic Environmental Assessment of Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 3, Scoping Response Summary, September 2009, Halcrow Group Limited Local Transport Plan 3 Newsletter Issue 1, July 2009 Local Transport Plan 3 Newsletter Issue 2, November 2009 Local Transport Plan 3 Newsletter Issue 3, March 2010 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 (2011-2030) Cherwell District Committee/Oxfordshire County Council Bilateral Meeting 5 March 2010 Local Transport Plan 3: Consultation on Draft Policies, Background Document Oxfordshire County Council Cabinet Report, Local Transport Plan 3, Objectives and Strategic Environmental Assessment, 15 September 2009	
<b>Report Author</b>	Andrew Bowe, Implementation Officer Philip Clarke, Head of Planning Policy & Economic Development
<b>Contact Information</b>	01295 221842 andrew.bowe@cherwell-dc.gov.uk