

**Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for
Transport Management
Thursday, 27 March 2025**

ADDENDA

3. Petitions and Public Address (Pages 1 - 18)

Submitted written statements attached.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Danny Yee (on behalf of Oxfordshire Liveable Streets) – BSIP Delivery Plan

We support measures to improve bus services but urge that they be coordinated with active travel provision.

When active travel schemes are being planned and designed, the bus operators are among the stakeholders involved. Sometimes the constraints they want to impose are frustrating, but even then it is good to know the situation from the start. And they often have useful input into other design matters.

In the same way, active travel groups should be involved in schemes such as those before you. Bus schemes almost always have significant effects on cycling, and often on pedestrians, and that is too often overlooked. Recent examples include schemes for removing parking on Abingdon Rd and Hollow Way. The first of these was perceived even by opponents as a cycling scheme, and the second sparked widespread concern from pedestrians.

And the schemes before you continue the same trend. The first one, on Cherwell St in Banbury, proposes to rebuild a junction and stretch of main road, but the plans for this (recently consulted on) totally ignore cycling, not mentioning it at all. But one of the primary cycling routes in the Banbury LCWIP runs along George St and across this junction! It may be impossible to do anything at all here for cycling because of the need to provide for buses and cars, but if so that should be openly debated, not just assumed.

So we have two recommendations:

1) Bus schemes, like other highways schemes, should have input from the active travel team. And that team needs an experienced lead officer (to replace Patrick Lingwood): the current team has some great people in it, but they are relatively inexperienced and lack knowledge of cycling. We also want someone at director level given responsibility to achieve the county's cycling trip targets.

2) Active travel stakeholders should be involved in co-production of all highways schemes, including BSIP-funded ones. There may be some of these we have no interest in, or no resources to engage with - just as the bus operators don't get involved with most active travel projects - but almost all these schemes have some effect on walking and cycling.

Without this, opportunities for improving walking and cycling risk being compromised - the next rebuild of the George St - Cherwell St junction is likely to be decades away - and the LTCP trip targets will move ever further away.

This page is intentionally left blank

Member of Public – BSIP Delivery Plan

I wanted to raise a concern about the BSIP item on the agenda of the delegated transport decisions meeting on the 27th May 2025. I'm afraid I am too late to submit a public comment formally to the meeting so I will email.

In item 5, annex 1 (BSIP), there is a proposal to add an extra lane of motor traffic to Horspath Driftway purportedly to alleviate traffic on the Slade and thus improve bus services.

As I've raised before, Horspath Driftway has pitiful active travel provision, in spite of the death of a cyclist in recent years near the junction with the ring road. This proposal to add motor lanes could only be viable if the existing meagre cycling provision is removed. I would also note that this is proposing to create more traffic outside the Slade Park fire station, this adding risk to the fire service. This will also add pollution and noise outside the East Field Close and Awgar Stone road residential areas.

Additionally it's hard to see how funneling more motor traffic into the Slade will alleviate congestion and improve bus services. In fact it would almost certainly make it worse due to induced demand. Even if this is at an early consultation stage, spending £100k of officer resources on such a backward proposition seems absurd to me.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Addresses to Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for
Transport Management Meeting
27 March 2025
BSIP Delivery Plan**

From: Robin Tucker, Co-Chair of the Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel.

CoHSAT, is the Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel, and we include bus travel in our vision because bus users on average walk an extra 20 minutes a day, and buses are a vital complement to walking, wheeling and cycling for longer journeys.

As such, we support this BSIP Delivery Plan and the proposals within it. For people who say we should have carrots to use public transport, this contains £7million of carrots in the form of ticket subsidies, extra routes and boosted frequencies. The capital schemes for bus stops and bus priority we also support. As Danny Yee notes, the design of road schemes is critical to walkers, wheelers and cyclists, and we need to be engaged at an early stage.

The Citizens' Assembly, 34 representative and well-informed citizens, were also big fans of buses.

They recommended going beyond the current plan for traffic filters with a car-free city centre, more attractive to visitors, and so buses and bikes are needed to move more people in less space.

They wanted not just lanes, but whole roads designated for buses, cycles and taxis. They wanted more simple, affordable and well-explained tickets, particularly for young people – MyBus is the right direction, but the message needs to get out more.

They also looked further ahead to where an expanded Zero Emission Zone and Workplace Parking Levy provide less congested routes, funds for mobility hubs and better services from them.

Most importantly, they recognised that something had to be done, rather than just complaining about the traffic and then having no policy to address it. They, like you with this BSIP, recognise that a mix of traffic management, public transport and active travel is the only way out of the jams we are in. In conclusion, we support this BSIP plan and encourage you to go further, with an integrated transport view.

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee (on behalf of Oxfordshire Liveable Streets) – Bicester 20mph Speed Limits

We support these 20mph speed limits but are disappointed they don't go further.

The strengths of leaving decisions about 20mph speed limits to parishes and town councils are clear, but the Bicester scheme illustrates the problems.

First of all, and most obviously, one goal of the 20mph speed limits is injury reduction, with Vision Zero as a broader goal. But the overwhelming majority of road injuries in Bicester occur on the roads that are not being changed to 20mph.

Secondly, the scheme aims "to encourage walking and cycling within Bicester". But, again, the roads being omitted from the scheme are the ones that are most important for connectivity and are currently the greatest barriers to active travel.

People walking or cycling need to cross the main roads, and to walk and cycle along them, but almost none of these roads have protected cycling infrastructure, some of them have narrow footways with no buffer from the carriageway, and formal crossings are infrequent. Lower speed limits would make a huge contribution to ameliorating these infrastructure defects: there is too much traffic for most people to cycle on e.g. Banbury Rd even at 20mph, but that would still help some; walking along a road next to motor traffic is less stressful if speeds are lower; and compliance with both signal and zebra crossings is better with 20mph speed limits.

Even opponents of 20mph speed limits often support them around schools, but pretty much every part of Bicester is within a kilometre walk of a school. If all the students at Bure Park Primary lived west of Banbury Rd and all the students at Southwold Primary lived east of Banbury Rd, none of them would need to cross Banbury Rd to get to school. But that is not how the world works. Children need to walk and cycle across and along Banbury Rd.

It is too late to change this scheme now, but we urge that once the 20mph programme is finished, a further programme is run to look at the "holes" left. This should focus on the basic holes, on connectivity, and on Vision zero.

The basic holes are all the stretches of road which clearly meet the criteria for 20mph speeds, but which were omitted from the initial programme.

Connectivity would cover sections of road that may not be "built up" but which are essential parts of the walking and cycling network (actual or planned) and lack protected cycling infrastructure or footways.

And Vision Zero concerns should focus on injury hotspots, but take into account problems with sparse data. Locations with high volumes of buses and HGVs may have low overall injury rates, but a relatively high risk of those that do occur being serious or fatal.

This page is intentionally left blank

Member of the Public – Bicester: Proposed 20mph Speed Limits

I deplore the prospect of the 20mph proposed speed limits in Bicester with the exception of schools. Despite the public consultation showing 69% disapproval? Does the electorate's opinion count for nothing to the Liberals?

Driving at 20mph is not good for any car. Apart from the higher fuel consumption, there is less cooling and you're driving in a gear that the car was never designed to drive in for prolonged periods. I drive a luxury hybrid automatic car that displays the parking light when driven at 20mph and I fear long term damage to my vehicle.

Bicester is fast becoming a permanent congestion hell, with a further 22,000 houses planned, the closure of the London Road rail crossing (again public consultation showing the need for a vehicle bridge), the proposed Puy du Fou resort, distribution warehousing and constant roadworks.

I hope that you listen to the electorate and common sense prevails. I certainly will be using my vote in the next local elections to show my disapproval if this ridiculousness goes ahead.

This page is intentionally left blank

Paul Troop – Bicester 20mph Speed Limits

Bicester Streets Historically Managed for Cars

The county is required to manage the street network for all users. But in Bicester, this has not been happening. To date, the network has been built almost exclusively for cars, often with comfortable, wide, and multiple-lane carriageways but narrow, unprotected, footpaths and few, if any, cycle paths.

Risk Increases Exponentially with Speed

A person riding a bike hit at by a vehicle at just over 30 is likely to die, but if hit at just over 20 is likely to survive. Speed is therefore a massive risk and disincentive to cycling. It discourages many but the brave and foolhardy and explains why cycling rates are so terribly low in Bicester compared to towns where the streets are properly managed.

Benefits of Cycling being Choked

Cycling is a policy 'no brainer'. It should be quick, convenient, enjoyable, healthy, mentally stimulating, sociable, quiet, good for the environment, and support the local economy. But at present, it is much too difficult to cycle in Bicester.

Network Not Resilient

The historical approach also puts all the transport eggs in one, very vulnerable, basket. This was shown this Tuesday when the closure of the M40 routed much of the traffic through Bicester, bringing many vehicle movements to a halt, and the town to a standstill.

Change Less Consequential than Imagined

The consequence of changing speed zones for many drivers is also much less than some imagine. For instance, average daytime speeds along Queen's Avenue, the main arterial route through Bicester are already below 20. Other arterial roads have averages only a little over 20.

Too Conservative

However, the proposals do little other than reflect much of the status quo. The 20 zones are almost exclusively closed residential neighbourhoods where the vehicle speeds are probably closer to 10-15 mph already. The main arterial roads that pose the danger due to non-existent or poor cycling infrastructure are largely untouched and remain at 30, or even 40. We would have liked to see many of these revert to 20, particularly around the town centre. To facilitate and encourage cycling, the whole route from home to destination needs to be safe, not just portions of the route.

Qualified Welcome

Therefore, we give a qualified welcome to the proposals as a small step in the right direction but ask that speeds on the arterial routes are reviewed soon.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Addresses to Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for
Transport Management Meeting
27 March 2025
Bicester 20mph speed limit proposals**

From: Robin Tucker, Co-Chair of the Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel.

CoHSAT, and our 25 member groups strongly support the proposal for 20mph speed limits, however, we are concerned that the proposal leaves some of the key streets used by people walking, wheeling and cycling, and near schools at 30mph.

The evidence the effectiveness of 20mph schemes is solid. A meta analysis¹ of 70 studies of 40 schemes showed crash and casualty reductions of 20 to 40%, and noise, emissions, fuel consumption and traffic congestion were reduced because traffic flowed more smoothly – a point often lost on objectors.

The latest results from Wales estimate that by now 10 lives have been saved, and 100 fewer serious injuries². Despite a fuss about reviewing the scheme and reverting roads to 30, for the whole of Cardiff, after reviewing requests for hundreds of roads³, only parts of 4 roads will return to 30mph, showing how 20 really is best for most urban roads.

We think 20mph should apply to more roads in Bicester. A wider and earlier 20 scheme in Banbury would probably have saved Anthony Paine, killed in March 2023 on North Bar Street bar a driver at 29 to 36mph in a 30 limit. The crash investigator said the driver had “insufficient time to react”, but that at 20 he might have⁴.

This is one reason why sections of London Road and others we list should be included in the 20mph zone. To save lives. Another is that it makes that town a more pleasant environment to live, work and shop in, just as it has in my own town of Abingdon.

As vehicle sizes grow, we hope you will approve the proposed 20mph limits and extend them to provide fuller protection and a better street environment in Bicester.

Robin Tucker, Co-Chair, CoHSAT

¹ <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/16/11/4382>

² <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c78w1891z03o>

³ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/crlxzlr695eo>

⁴ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c77rjp2l6j3o>

This page is intentionally left blank

Councillor David Hingley – Adderbury & Bloxham Proposed Parking Restrictions

I note you are considering proposed parking restrictions in Adderbury & Bloxham tomorrow at item 7 of your agenda.

Following an Adderbury parish council meeting last night, I can confirm that the proposal related to Adderbury before you is acceptable, and that I support those recommendations as laid out, which are to approve the double yellow lines on High St/Croft Lane and to not approve the other Adderbury measures, given responses to the consultation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Objections to Boswell Road Traffic Calming Proposal

Good Morning

I'd like to argue against implementing the proposed Boswell Road Traffic Calming Measures. The proposal included a concern around safety while crossing the road and cars going too quickly. As a local resident who has lived in the area for over 10 years, I have never witnessed anyone struggling to cross the road, or cars going too quickly down the route where the changes are being proposed and therefore, I believe the proposal is unnecessary.

- Anyone wanting to use the footpath that links Boswell Road to John Smith Drive would either be entering Boswell Road from Barns Road, Fredeick Road or Knolles Road.
 - Anyone coming from Fredeick or Knolles can already ensure they are on the correct side of the pavement, meaning they would not need to cross where the new crossing is proposed.
 - Anyone coming from Barns road would either get of the bus outside the park and be on the correct side of the road already or can walk up to the bollards near the little roundabout (linking Barns and Bartholomew Roads), which again puts them on the correct side to enter the footpath. The Bollards are a safer place to cross the road than further down where the bus stop is and even if people are crossing there, they can cross at the entrance of Boswell Road which has a clear view of traffic coming in and out.
- The car parking spaces which would be lost are vital to local residents and as the parking permits have increased again this year. How does the council justify putting up the price of the permits for local residents while removing their parking space?
- The parked cars already provide a reason for traffic entering and exiting Boswell road to slow down and not travel too quickly in that area.
- At a time when the council budget is very tight, this seems a very expensive and unnecessary project which is being done to appease big business rather than local residents. Does the council have figures on how many people struggled to cross the road to get to the footpath, or saw cars travelling too fast and is this more than those affected by the lack of other services? The money would be better spent elsewhere.

This page is intentionally left blank