

Introduction

As a precursor to Witney Oxford Transport Group “WOTG” responses to the Examination questions which we provide below, we would like to highlight that WOTG has previously provided responses to the Pre-Submission Draft Area Action Plan as part of the Regulation 19 consultation held in August-October 2020.

WOTG’s response to the Regulation 19 consultation is listed as item 56 in the Consultation Representations Received. WOTG believes the issues raised during the Regulation 19 consultation remain valid, and our responses to the consultation have been reiterated, where applicable in the Examination list of questions.

WOTG draws attention to one particular development since October 2020, as anticipated in section 3) of the Group’s October submission. On 23 January 2021, the Transport Secretary launched the third and final round of his department’s Ideas Fund, within the Restoring Your Railway initiative first announced on 28 January 2020. WOTG submitted its bid, for funding towards project development of a new railway in broadly the A40 corridor between Oxford, Eynsham / Salt Cross Garden Village, Witney, and Carterton / RAF Brize Norton, on 5 March 2021. Government has said recently that it expects to announce its decisions this summer after the Rail Minister’s Expert Panel meets in June.

WOTG has focussed its review and responses to Examiner Questions within the following Matters:

- Matter 6 - Movement and connectivity
- Matter 8 - Viability

Matter 6 – Movement and connectivity

Issue

Whether the policies on movement and connectivity are justified, effective, and consistent with national policy.

Relevant Policies – 13-17

Questions

Transport infrastructure requirements

1. Does the evidence base demonstrate a clear understanding of the transport infrastructure challenges and opportunities associated with delivery of the AAP?

A general comment would be that the Salt Cross Garden Village Area Action Plan “AAP” document provides a high-level summary that whilst clearly presented, lacks the level of depth to show how a specific infrastructure intervention is deemed satisfactory to mitigate unacceptable levels of congestion and journey time delays across the local highway network.

Conversely, the technical evidence base documentation provides detailed technical information for discrete topics, however there is a lack of communicating continuity and holistic integration to determine whether assumptions are common across disciplines.

The outcome of this is that it is difficult at times to navigate a clear pathway from input assumptions through to output modelling results and thus understand their inter-relationship to specific infrastructure modifications and mitigation measures (project interventions) that may make the proposal acceptable.

2. Does Appendix 5 of the AAP clearly identify all the necessary transport infrastructure requirements, including those necessary to encourage walking and cycling? Is this list accurate, comprehensive, and reflected in the policies?

It is settled policy in Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Connecting Oxfordshire Volume 3 Rail strategy that "The county council will retain the option of a rail line to Witney as a longer-term aspiration in its A40 Strategy and will pursue opportunities to realise the aspiration with Network Rail and train operators in the future".

To ensure this policy can be achieved satisfactorily in the future we would expect Appendix 5 of the AAP to include a requirement that the proposed Salt Cross Garden Village development design solution does not hinder or prohibit the future provision of a new railway line and station multi-modal interchange being constructed adjacent to the Eynsham bus Park and Ride facility currently set out in the AAP development plans.

3. Taking each transport infrastructure requirement in turn, what are the specific sources of evidence that support the need for it and the chosen policy approach? Is each requirement justified by the evidence, deliverable, appropriate in terms of when it is required and any phasing, with a source of financing identified? How have alternatives been considered?

Evidence Base documents highlighted below and produced by Wood consultants, are of key importance to understand the implications of Salt Cross Garden Village on the local highway network, and whether proposed infrastructure interventions are satisfactory to mitigate impact of delays and congestion to road users: -

- **EV7:** Cotswolds Garden Village AAP & West Eynsham SPD: Developing the Transport Evidence Base (May 2019)
- **EV13:** Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village AAP Transport Strategy Report (July 2009)
- **EV14:** 2031 Forecast Year Modelling VISSIM Microsimulation Modelling Report (July 2020)

Evidence Base EV14 review:

The report describes the modelling approach undertaken, however it is unclear if all of the highway network modifications assumed in the modelling assumptions have been included within the infrastructure improvement project scope, thus it is difficult to be entirely confident there is no gap between the two.

We would recommend that a simple table, indicating each modelling assumption that is cross checked against an element of infrastructure scope, would be most helpful to provide an appropriate level of confidence that there is no scope "linkage gap" and that the infrastructure improvement projects to modify the road network are sufficiently scoped and budgeted for to achieve the modelled journey time output results.

Section 3.1 describes vehicle flow inputs. It is noted that the model assumptions have forecast a threefold decrease in HGV volume on some occasions, however it is unclear how this assumption has been verified and deemed appropriate for the modelling exercise.

Section 7, Summary and Conclusions of the EV14 report show Wolvercote Roundabout remains a significant constraint and a critical source of AM peak congestion for vehicular travel east from Eynsham into Oxford.

Typically, a report of this nature would provide an indication of the capacity of each modelled junction with and without the development, however this has not been provided. This information would indicate the level of traffic generated as a proportion of the total capacity of a junction and importantly provide the reader with an understanding of the level of 'headroom' available at each junction, and if a congestion problem is occurring, or likely to occur and also the level of highway modification required to mitigate an issue.

The modelling results indicate that the additional trips generated from the Salt Cross Garden Village development add delays of 4.5 minutes (in 8ha employment case) and 2.5 minutes (in 4ha employment case) as a result of the additional 2,200 dwellings proposed by 2031.

As wider context, the Salt Cross Garden Village represents only a relatively small proportion of the potential 7,000+ dwellings to be developed along the A40 corridor within the next decade, as per West Oxfordshire District Council's Local Plan. Extrapolating the anticipated additional delays at Wolvercote Junction modelled by Wood, then the 7,000 new dwellings could potentially generate three times greater (14+ minutes) delays at Wolvercote Junction leading into Oxford in the AM peak.

This illustrates the limitations of the proposed A40 corridor improvements particularly at the point where the additional vehicles converge closer to Oxford and it is evident that infrastructure capacity improvements are not proposed to the degree required to mitigate substantial delays to travellers.

4. How have shared transport infrastructure requirements arising from development under the AAP and of the West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (SDA) been considered? How have the cumulative effects of development of the SDA and AAP been considered?

No comment provided.

5. How have the effects on the A34 been considered? How does the chosen approach in the AAP reflect engagement with Highways England?

No comment provided.

6. Are any modifications necessary for soundness?

As set out in our response in October 2020 to the Regulation 19 consultation we accept the plan is legal and complies with the duty to cooperate. However, we do not believe it to be sound, for the reasons stated in our response to the consultation and reciprocated in these responses to Examiner questions.

Response to this question relates to the unsound nature of achieving **Policy 15** in the development's predominant reliance on a highway-based solution to address travel problems on the A40 corridor.

The reasoning for this includes:

- 1) It is settled policy in OCC Connecting Oxfordshire Volume 3 Rail strategy that "The county council will retain the option of a rail line to Witney as a longer-term aspiration in its A40 Strategy and will pursue opportunities to realise the aspiration with Network Rail and train operators in the future".

By ignoring the rail option and only supporting a predominantly highway-based option the AAP is undermining this strategy. It is not sound for an AAP to undermine a strategic policy in a way which could put a cap on further housing and other developments along this corridor.

- 2) The AAP is unsound in so far as it declares that this will be a "zero-carbon" development. AAP s. 5.42 reads: "*The Garden Village is an exemplar net-zero carbon, energy positive development which meets the challenges of climate change head-on.*"

No predominantly car-based development could be carbon-free in the foreseeable future as road vehicles will still be using fossil fuels long after 2040 - the year that fossil-fuel vehicle sales should end (or 2030 if a more ambitious target is set).

To help meet its own carbon-free commitment and national carbon reduction policy obligations the AAP should, as a minimum, hold open the option of

considering rail-based options because zero-carbon rail transport is currently the only way to ensure the AAP is deliverable on a policy-sound basis.

- 3) Oxfordshire CC and West Oxfordshire DC policy and AAP have been superseded by HM Government's policy and announcement on Reversing Beeching and re-opening railways. Since the drafting of the AAP funding is now available under the Restoring Your Railway Ideas Fund and other linked funds. WOTG has subsequently applied to the Restoring Your Railways Ideas Fund for funding to support the development of a Strategic Outline Business Case for the Oxford to Carterton railway line, and a response is currently expected in June/July 2021.

There are many examples (e.g., the Borders Railway in Scotland and the "Robin Hood Line" in Nottinghamshire/Derbyshire) where very successful rail re-openings have taken place where it was previously felt impossible. Locally, the resounding success of even just the first, Western Phase of the East/West Rail, between Oxford via Oxford Parkway and Bicester, and on to London Marylebone, is proof positive of the maxim "build it and they will come".

Furthermore, WOTG believe there is a significant opportunity at Eynsham and furthermore along the wider Oxford to Carterton rail corridor to utilise Land Value Capture and raise material funding contributions from landowners to share in the funding and benefits of the railway project, and importantly without impacting the commercial viability of developments. This methodology is expanded in our response to Matter 8 – Viability.

It is therefore unsound to proceed with only inadequate transport proposals when there are external funds available to explore and develop sustainable transport options.

- 4) Section 8.33 of the AAP misleadingly states that Hanborough Station is 1.8 miles from the AAP area. It may well be from the north side of the area, but in reality, for many of the new residents a journey of over 3 miles would be required which is unrealistic for walking to commute to the station, is a long cycle for many people and, by virtue of both distance and the very characteristic of Lower Road, is far more likely to be driven.

This contradicts the stated garden village principles (sections 2, 4, 8 Garden Village Principles). Having to drive across the countryside to another town to access sustainable transport is not a basis for an exemplar green village.

Section 8.11 of the AAP states "*Walking and cycling must be at the heart of all design decisions - from strategic master planning of the site through to the design of individual homes. This will support a reduction in reliance on the car for those living and working at Salt Cross, in turn bringing a range of benefits including improved physical and mental health, a better quality of life, an improved environment and increased productivity*".

- 5) The reliance on bus services which currently do not exist is unsound as there does not appear to be evidence that a garden village of 2,200 new homes (5,459 est. population) could support the proposed 20-minute frequency bus service, particularly as the strategic focus is on bus improvements on the A40 corridor which is in the opposite direction from Hanborough.

Priority is given to walking and cycling for local journeys. Unless the s.106 requirement includes a subsidy in perpetuity there is no way to ensure that bus services continue to operate (other than a long-term subsidy from Oxfordshire County Council which has not been secured).

Road congestion at Hanborough is a recognised problem and improvements there are dependent on funding from sources that the AAP has no control over. It is also subject to the preparation of an SDP (the outcome of which is unknown) and national investment decisions yet to be taken regarding the North Cotswold line.

We support the proposals to improve the rail offer and connections to Hanborough, but it is only part of the provision needed. We note that the Stantec June 2020 Transport Assessment does not believe a regular bus connection to Hanborough is viable, as has been accepted by Oxfordshire County Council. (section 9.6.20).

There is no sound sustainable transport policy proposed for journeys beyond the Garden Village, so the AAP is internally inconsistent and unsound on that basis.

- 6) Finally, since the policy context for the AAP was developed, Oxford has become a greater priority for rail investment. East-West Rail is under construction beyond Bicester to Bletchley, cross-Oxford routes including the reopening of the freight-only Cowley branch to passenger services are being prioritized with the so-called 'Metro-isation' of routes across Oxford now a potential reality (submitted by Network Rail to HM Government as part of "Project Speed" in August 2020), and on 26th May further funding was announced for the expansion of Oxford station.

The Oxford–Eynsham–Witney–Carterton rail route is not yet an agreed proposal but is strongly supported by the new county administration, and by nine of the ten county councillors in West Oxfordshire who have pledged to define and protect a rail route as part of the A40 Programme. This line would be a western extension of an 'Oxford Metro' serving the major towns and proposed developments (unlike the North Cotswold line which misses most of them). Both 'arms' of an Oxford Metro – to Cowley and via Eynsham westwards – are therefore entirely consistent with the DfT's principal criterion for the Restoring Your Railway Ideas Fund, the principle of "restoring lost rail connections to communities" – like the WOTG bid.

WOTG does not intend to propose a particular solution for the AAP. We simply seek to have wording amended to ensure rail is a consideration for the A40 corridor in accordance with OCC's rail strategy and to request there is a requirement in the AAP that provides assurance the development does not hinder or inhibit the future provision of a railway line and interchange railway station at Eynsham Bus Park and Ride.

A40 specific questions

7. To what extent has the A40 Corridor Strategy influenced the proposals?

No comment provided.

8. Are the necessary transport infrastructure requirements to the A40 sufficiently clear in the policies? Do policies 14, 15 and 17 repeat requirements, using different language without justification? Is modification required to remove repetition and improve clarity?

No comment provided.

9. Is the requirement for an underpass between the Garden Village and Eynsham justified and deliverable? What alternatives were considered?

No comment provided.

10. Is safeguarding of land along the southern boundary for the widening of the A40 justified?

No comment provided.

11. Is the prohibition of additional junctions on the A40 justified?

No comment provided.

Hanborough station specific questions

12. Will the policies achieve good connectivity between Salt Cross and Hanborough Station? How were options considered and discounted? Will the chosen policy approach be deliverable and effective?

We would reiterate our response to Matter 6, question 6, and in addition query the robustness of assuming the proportion of residents that would select active travel means on a regular basis to utilise Hanborough Station, which is a c. 3-mile journey for a large proportion of the development. We believe the predominant mode of choice by residents noting the distance, will be by motor vehicle.

This contradicts the stated garden village principles (sections 2, 4, 8 Garden Village Principles). Having to drive across the countryside to another town to access sustainable transport is not a basis for an exemplar green village.

13. How does policy in the AAP relate to the masterplan being developed for Hanborough Station?

Policy 15 states "Connections to Hanborough Station must be significantly improved and take account of the Masterplan being developed for the station. Consideration must be given to a new entrance from Lower Road south of the railway, with a focus on bus, pedestrian and cycling accessibility."

WOTG is aware West Oxfordshire District Council is developing a station masterplan that is ongoing, and as of yet has not seen an output from this. We believe there is limited information or specific requirements set out in the AAP that could be used to inform the Hanborough masterplan design development.

14. Are the financial contributions towards the North Cotswold Line Transformation and development of Hanborough as a transport hub justified?

We believe there is an important interface between the AAP and the existing Hanborough Station and NCL Transformation, particularly prior to the Oxford to Carterton railway line being delivered in the future, thus contributions should be provided to the enhancement of these existing railway assets to improve their capacity and amenities in the interim.

In terms of a long-term solution the Oxford to Carterton rail line will provide a fully comprehensive and more attractive, high-capacity and green travel alternative for Salt Cross Garden Village residents, and A40 road users, to travel into Oxford and locations across the UK rail network.

Sustainable Transport Hub specific questions

15. Will the chosen policy approach be successful in integrating the Hub into the wider development of Salt Cross? How has connectivity to the wider Garden Village been considered?

No comment provided.

16. Does the evidence consider the benefits and potential impacts of the Hub (in particular the park and ride), including effects linked to users from outside the Eynsham area?

Other key planning permissions relating to the Garden Village have been granted by councillors on the basis that a rail line can be accommodated into the existing plans. The Oxfordshire County Council Planning & Regulation Committee meeting on March 8th 2021 granted planning permission to the Eynsham Park & Ride on the basis of such representations.

Per this [video link](#), officers assured councillors the park and ride plans would "not prevent any future rail investment that might happen" (at 1hr 28 mins). When one asked, "does

this scheme preclude or impinge upon a potential future railway option?" officers replied: "I don't believe it does impinge or stop any future investment in a railway...this route...doesn't prevent a future investment in rail infrastructure" (at 1hr 34 mins).

17. Is expansion of the park and ride appropriately considered?

As per Matter 6, Question 2 response any future expansion of the park and ride will need to consider the proposed WOTG requirement that a solution should not inhibit or hinder the provision of a future railway station interchange at Eynsham and new railway line.

Car and cycle parking specific questions

18. Are the absolute maximum car parking standards in Policy 16 justified and consistent with local and national policy? How have the standards taken account of policy in Paragraph 105 of the Framework? Is modification required to ensure consistency with national policy?

No comment provided.

19. Are the prescribed minimum standards for cycle parking in Policy 14 justified?

No comment provided.

Other questions

20. Will the requirements of Policies 13-17, in combination with others, be successful in managing risks associated with rat running (including linked to schools)?

No comment provided.

21. Are the requirements in Policy 17 preventing occupation of Salt Cross (unless car free) until completion of related infrastructure works, including the A40 bus lanes, justified and deliverable?

No comment provided.

22. Do the policies serve a clear purpose and avoid unnecessary duplication?

No comment provided.

23. Are any other modifications necessary to Policies 13-17 for soundness?

Please see WOTG response to Matter 6, Question 6.

Matter 8 – Viability

Issue

Whether the AAP is supported by appropriate evidence of viability to demonstrate that the policies are justified, effective, and consistent with national policy.

1. Does the AAP clearly set out all the expected contributions from development?

Upon review of available documentation, it is evident Land Value Capture (LVC) has not been explored to assess the benefits, and potential landowner / developer contributions that could be generated from the Salt Cross Garden Village if a new railway station were to be situated adjacent to the bus park and ride site.

Context:

Land Value Capture is a way to capture the increase in the value of land and buildings generated by the improved accessibility of transportation. Improved access has value which is reflected in the price people pay for land and property, similar to the premium attached to residential that has waterfront views.

This uplift in value due to improved accessibility will vary depending on the local circumstances. For example, in the case of the Croydon LRT extension in south London, the increase was negligible because the area already had good public transport links. In other cases, however, where congestion is high and the improved access is transformational, such as the Jubilee Line extension in London, the uplift can be substantial.

We strongly believe a new railway station at Eynsham would be in the latter category and thus provide a transformational change, and as such contributions could be obtained by local authorities from this methodology.

Research:

The University of Leeds recently undertook an academic study title Land Value and Transport Modelling and Appraisal (August 2019) [LINK](#) that was commissioned by Transport for the North, West Yorkshire Combined Authority and the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council.

The study evidenced that there is a premium on being well connected. Ease of access to employment is a key driver of property values, with rail, road and pedestrian accessibility to jobs all adding value.

Research for the average property uplift due to Manchester Metrolink stations was found to be +6.3% for the 0-1km catchment. This varied across Metrolink lines with +10.5% found in the higher income South Manchester catchment. The Airport Line was extremely high, with a +20.6%, having employment centres at both ends of the line and opportunities for international connectivity. It was also evident a premium uplift in property value of +18% on average was applied to new homes.



Prior to the University of Leeds work, earlier analysis has produced larger uplifts in some cases in London, including for the Jubilee Line Extension. Notably, Transport for London (2017) reports work by Savills which shows the premium for the JLE 'zone of influence' compared with a 'control area', oscillating between +30% and +60% after opening in 1999 up to June 2004.

Earlier work was by Gibbons and Machin (2005) who undertook a quasi-experimental study of two urban rail investments in London: the Jubilee Line Extension (JLE) and the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) Lewisham Extension. Gibbons and Machin found that the uplift within a 2km new station catchment is +9.3%, with no effect beyond the 2km threshold.

The uplift values indicated through the aforementioned research is new money, additional profit for the landowner or developer, which only happens if the improved accessibility is provided. It makes sense therefore that the extra profit to landowners / developers generated by the new transport service should be shared with the local authority providing the service.

2. Is the viability evidence underpinning the AAP a proportionate assessment? Is it suitably comprehensive, covering all the expected contributions? Is it robust, based on up to date information and evidence of need?

The Salt Cross Garden Village Financial Viability appraisal undertaken by Aspinall Verdi (31 January 2021) and commissioned by West Oxfordshire District Council provided the results of market research regarding potential housing unit sales values in Table ES1, and as per below extract:

Unit Type	Size (sqm)	Value (£)	£ psm
1-Bed Flat	50	£235,000	£4,700
2-Bed Flat	65	£280,000	£4,308
2-Bed House	75	£335,000	£4,467
3-Bed House	95	£370,000	£3,895
4-Bed House	135	£535,000	£3,963
5-Bed House	160	£620,000	£3,875

As explained in the response to question 1, research has shown that property values increase, potentially up to 60% within a c. 1 – 1.5km area around a new railway station.

Appendix 5 of the Aspinall Verdi report provides a project proforma development appraisal that indicates potential revenue generated from open market sales of homes.

A range of potential property uplift values (between 5% and 15%) were applied to the Aspinall Verdi gross sales values for each phase of the development on the basis of assuming a new railway station is provided.

The outcome of the indicative exercise shows there is potential to generate material profit uplift of between £22m and £66m to the total development value. Furthermore, should the profit uplift from the new railway station be shared in an equitable manner with the local authority transport promoter (i.e. 50:50) then contributions of between £11m and £33m could be provided to support funding the new railway infrastructure specifically from the Salt Cross Garden Village development.

This approach would require the landowner or developer entering into a contribution agreement with the local authority's appointed agent and agreeing to share in the uplift in profits derived from the new railway station. Importantly, a fundamental principle of LVC contributions is that they would not impact the viability of the development, as the share in this new money is above the assumed property values that would form part of the development appraisal.

This specific example illustrates contributions that may be captured from Salt Cross Garden Village alone, which is at an advanced stage of development. There remains a significant opportunity to utilise Land Value Capture to generate funding contributions that in totality could achieve a material proportion of the total project cost. This LVC methodology can be deployed for other sites at Eynsham not included within the Salt Cross Garden Village, and at other locations where new railway stations may potentially be situated along the railway corridor.

	Units	Unit Price	Gross Sales	Property value uplift as a result of new railway station built within close proximity to development		
				5%	10%	15%
Phase 1 - Open Market Sales	90	£ 391,150	£ 35,203,500	£ 1,760,175	£ 3,520,350	£ 5,280,525
Phase 2 - Open Market Sales	400	£ 396,195	£ 158,478,100	£ 7,923,905	£ 15,847,810	£ 23,771,715
Phase 3 - Open Market Sales	310	£ 401,320	£ 124,409,200	£ 6,220,460	£ 12,440,920	£ 18,661,380
Phase 4 - Open Market Sales	310	£ 399,700	£ 123,907,000	£ 6,195,350	£ 12,390,700	£ 18,586,050
	1,110	Total additional profit		£ 22,099,890	£ 44,199,780	£ 66,299,670
		50% share of profit to Local Authority		£ 11,049,945	£ 22,099,890	£ 33,149,835

E-Rail commissioned to review LVC potential for Oxford to Carterton rail corridor.

WOTG has commissioned E-Rail to undertake a Land Value Capture assessment for the proposed Oxford-Eynsham-Witney-Carterton rail corridor. E-Rail Ltd., a UK company, assists Government and Promoters of railway infrastructure to fund projects using its proven Land Value Capture methodology. The initial LVC appraisal is expected to be complete in June 2021.

E-Rail engage with landowners and developers to seek their active participation in the infrastructure project based on the increase in value that land enjoys when transport is delivered, and beneficial planning consents are achieved because of the transport.

E-Rail prefer to become involved in such projects at the earliest opportunity and in this way, we can maximise the values captured. The later E-Rail is engaged, and the more preliminary work is in the public realm, the less may be achieved.

E-Rail adopt the principle that transport should drive development and not development driving transport. The latter is usually more expensive. Public fixed transport means sustainability, high capacity for long-term growth, and excellent green credentials and is more acceptable to most parties affected by the project.

E-Rail has completed its role in the task of re-opening the Ashington Blyth Northumberland line with some £35-40m likely to be raised in the next ten years from multiple sites within a short distance of the proposed new stations. It is undeniable that land values increase when fixed transport is provided. There is therefore a need for an equity position for the parties where the landowners contribute towards the cost of delivering the reason for the increase in value. Both sides need something from the project but only when the value is realised, not in advance.

WOTG believe that there is potential for E-Rail to utilise its proven LVC methodology to obtain landowner / developer contributions for the proposed new Oxford to Carterton railway line. Based on empirical research and available information on the development appraisal there appears to be an opportunity to obtain material contributions to support the rail project from the Salt Cross Garden Village development, without impacting viability of the scheme. We propose to discuss the outcomes of the E-Rail LVC study with West Oxfordshire District Council, and Oxfordshire County Council, once it is available. We would ask that both local authorities consider the merits of land value capture in this process to support the funding of a new railway line and station for Eynsham / Salt Cross.

3. Does the viability evidence reflect the recommended approach in national planning guidance?

No comment provided.

4. Overall, has the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies in the AAP been considered and will the cost not undermine deliverability of the plan?

No comment provided.

5. Are any modifications necessary for soundness?

WOTG would recommend a requirement to modify the AAP to include the requirement that Land Value Capture is a methodology to be included as part of the process for obtaining contributions to support new public transport infrastructure.

The Land Value Capture modification should be referenced directly to obtaining contributions to support funding and provision of a new Eynsham station interchange that would be served by regular operational services between Oxford and Carterton and providing access to the wider UK rail network.