

Claire James

From: Catherine Small [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 September 2023 14:27
To: Palmer, Leanne
Subject: Comments on Appeal reference: APP/U3100/V/23/3326625.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Ms Palmer,

I understand that you are the case officer handling the above appeal. I would like to set out some comments for consideration by the Inspector when reaching his conclusions in this case. My comments relate specifically to the proposals for the Clifton Hampden Bypass.

I am strongly opposed to the proposed route of the Clifton Hampden Bypass. I have already lodged my main objections to the scheme, all of which still stand (and which I understand will be presented to the Inspector). However, in light of the fact that so much time has passed since the original planning proposals were submitted, I now wish to add some further comments.

The Bypass proposals were originally published by Oxfordshire County Council back in 2016, **7 years ago**. Local and national transport needs and goals have transformed considerably since this time, yet the scheme has not been revisited or altered in any material way. Two points arise in particular:

1. Back when the Bypass was originally proposed, the Council suggested there was a need to move traffic congestion away from the centre of Clifton Hampden village (and into the neighbouring village of Nuneham Courtenay instead), and to encourage more road users to use the single lane, countryside route to Oxford, bypassing the dual carriageway A34. The environmental impact of making the journey into Oxford easier for drivers by using this countryside shortcut was inappropriate back in 2016; it is fundamentally contrary to environmental goals now. The County Council claims it wishes to discourage the use of cars in favour of public transport, in order to reduce the county's carbon impact and improve air quality. Alleging that the Bypass will make road travel easier for drivers*, at the expense of the local environment and residents' health, completely contradicts the Council's alleged environmental priorities. Proposed changes to the road infrastructure need to be assessed in parallel with the country's current climate goals, not the goals of 7 years ago.

2. In addition, the traffic needs of the county have fundamentally changed since 2020. The impact of Covid has seen a significant shift in work patterns, and more and more people now work from home rather than commuting into Oxford. The Bypass plans were drawn up with peak, rush hour patterns in mind, and data was collected at a time when online working from home was not a realistic prospect for most people. This is no longer the case, and commuting hours now look significantly different to how they did a few years ago. In spite of this, the proposals have not been reconsidered in light of the new, post-Covid commuting patterns of the county. The Bypass is no longer required in order to move hordes of commuters away from the centre of the village, as was originally intended. Carving up the countryside in order to fulfil a need which no longer exists cannot constitute acceptable road planning.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objections.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Small

***my previously lodged comments have already addressed the issue that the proposed route of the Bypass would not actually ease congestion; it would merely move it from one village to another.**