

Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport Management

Thursday, 24 April 2025

ADDENDA

3. Petitions and Public Address (Pages 1 - 14)

Written statements attached.

This page is intentionally left blank



Address to Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport Management Meeting 24 April 2025

LCWIPs for Chipping Norton and Woodstock and area

An LCWIP is a key step in the development of active travel for a town or area. It sets out the potential for growth in walking, wheeling and cycling, and prioritises the schemes that can bring this about. This becomes the basis for future funding and network development, whether the source is DfT, developers or Council funds.

So we're pleased to see two more LCWIPs coming forward for approval today, for areas in West Oxfordshire. Both have been developed with a process that involved local stakeholders, in identifying key destinations and the best routes to link them.

The potential for active travel in Chipping Norton, Woodstock and the villages around them is significant. They have both suffered from becoming car dominated places in recent decades. But improving walking and cycling routes can start to shift that balance, and offer healthy and less expensive options for those who want to take them. That is good for the people making the choice, good for those still in motor vehicles, who benefit from less traffic, and it provides a safer and healthier environment from everyone.

That potential is made clear by both the supportive and unsupportive comments to the consultations. The supportive comments are keen that these plans come to fruition. The negative comments are of two main types. First about how car dominated Chipping Norton and Woodstock are, and how LCWIPs need to be linked to traffic management; we agree with these comments and this should be something for parallel action. Second are concerns over whether walking and particularly cycling routes can be built as a coherent and safe network in these space-constrained towns; we share these concerns, but the LCWIP is a necessary initial step and increases the ability to gain funding or developer action.

Chipping Norton and Woodstock are heavy with cars, but these plans provide options for the citizens who can and will take them, and to tug on the thread that will unpick the fabric of car domination, and the harms that it does to people and the environment of our market towns. This is why we support these LCWIPs.

Robin Tucker, Co-Chair, CoHSAT

This page is intentionally left blank

Colin Carritt – Woodstock LCWIP

I am writing in support of **Agenda Item 5, “Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan for Woodstock and Surrounding Areas”** for your determined on 24th April 2025.

The Woodstock Area is a good fit for a rural LCWIP. It's on the A44 Corridor Strategy, a road of significant hazard for cyclists and pedestrians. It's within cycle commuting distance to Oxford City and Kidlington Airport and Business Park. It has excellent public transport links by bus to Oxford, Witney, Oxford Parkway and Hanborough Railway Stations, all of which facilitate so called “first mile/last mile” travel on foot or by bike. Woodstock town itself is recognised as a significant local service area with a thriving secondary school, as well as numerous leisure, retail and hospitality venues that all attract significant inward travel. And, of course, high volumes of tourism traffic are generated by Blenheim Palace, traffic that would benefit from even a modest modal shift from car travel to rail, bus and cycle travel. A Woodstock and Surrounding Areas LCWIP will compliment the County's Strategic Active Travel Network (SATN).

I set up the Village Travel Network back in 2020 to promote better active travel connectivity between the communities of Woodstock, Bladon, Hanborough, Combe, Stonesfield and Wootton. Our network comprises parish councillors and others from all of these communities and importantly it includes Blenheim Estates, who immediately recognised the synergy with its own vision to reduce its carbon footprint.

In 2023 we produced our Village Travel Network Active Travel Plan which was sent to your Transport Planning Team. Your officers refined, modified and extended our Plan, added two further parishes (Begbroke and Tackley) and the result is the Woodstock and Surrounding Areas LCWIP. I commend it to you wholeheartedly.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cllr Katherine Miles – City Councillor for Summertown ward

As the ward councillor for Summertown, I would like to make formal representation at the decision meeting on Thursday regarding the relocation of the parking bays on Frenchay Road.

Therefore, I wish the following statement to be made on my behalf in representation of the feedback I have received from residents and in line with the remarks I have made through the formal consultation.

The relocation of car parking onto the pavements at Frenchay Road is contrary to the county council's policies which prioritise pedestrians at the top of its user hierarchy. Allowing vehicles to park partially on the pavement will restrict those walking, in a wheelchair or using a pram and pushchair on this very narrow section of pavement. Therefore, I cannot support the current proposals before you.

There are multiple interconnecting issues at the junction of Frenchay Road and the bridge, as well as at the junction with Bainton and Hayfield road that have been formally and informally raised during this consultation, including the risks posed to vulnerable road users, a key active travel corridor for residents including children travelling to and from local schools, on this stretch of road.

I request that the Cabinet member discounts the option of allowing vehicles to park partially on the pavement and instead requests a review of alternative options that puts vulnerable road users at its heart. At the same time, I request that in scope the review, the County Council also considers issues related to speeding vehicles and visibility over the bridge and scope for measures to prevent potential collisions at the crossroads with Hayfield and Bainton Roads.

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee - Frenchay Road, Proposed Relocation of Parking Bays

I urge you not to defer this decision, but to reject this scheme outright and to instruct officers to come back with an alternative approach to solving the problem. If there is no other solution, the fallback should be removing the parking, not restricting the space available for pedestrians.

The 1.5 metre width from Inclusive Mobility is a minimum, not a target. We should be trying to do better than minimum wherever possible, and this footway is a busy pedestrian corridor, because the bridge concentrates everyone walking or wheeling onto this side of the street.

1.5 metres on a path with open grass on either side is reasonably comfortable, but 1.5 metres with a garden wall on one side and a parked car on the other is not. The street I live on has 1.5 metre footways, and if I see two people approaching I will walk in the carriageway to avoid the awkwardness of passing them.

When parking alongside a kerb, drivers usually stick to that (though the occasional SUV can be seen with one wheel on the pavement). When parking is delimited only by painted lines, drivers are not so constrained, and many of them will park further onto the footway than the markings allow. So the width available to pedestrians is often significantly less than the marked width.

Finally, if car parking is marked on the pavement, then cars will be driving on the pavement. That changes at least the perception of safety quite radically: parents with a three year old are now unlikely to let them walk on ahead, even if they can be trusted to stop at the next kerb or crossing.

The bigger policy question is how serious the county is about the leading Policy in its LTCP, and whether it places pedestrian comfort and safety above car parking. Or, looking at it another way, whether the spatial costs of increasing car widths should be borne by car owners or by pedestrians. People are eagerly awaiting the reduction or removal of pavement parking across Oxford - to go the other way and add new pavement parking sends entirely the wrong message about the county's priorities.

So I urge you not to defer this scheme but to reject it, and to ask officers to come back with an alternative or, failing that, to remove the car parking.

Removing the car parking would also have other gains: it would leave space for a parklet with seating, cycle parking, street trees, or any other kerbside use that requires less width than a car -- perhaps for _widening_ the footway. This would also prevent any problems with a wider effective carriageway increasing vehicle speeds (officers' report paragraph 24).

Decisions by the Department for Transport (paragraph 6) will have no effect on this decision and are a red herring: DfT is not going to stop local authorities authorising pavement parking where they choose to.

Changing the street network so the bridge can be filtered and people driving to or from residences on the northern part of Frenchay Rd use Elizabeth Jennings Way (response o32, paragraph 26) is a brilliant idea. It would make driving out of the city more direct, but make driving into or through the city centre less direct -- inhibiting just those trips the county is trying to discourage with the traffic filters and Zero Emission Zone. This seems unlikely to increase traffic on Elizabeth Jennings Way so much as to inhibit cycling, but should be accompanied by traffic calming on the long "exit arc" of EJW, where vehicle speeds are often too high.

Ian Taylor – Proposed Relocation of Parking Bays, Frenchay Rd

Regarding the Frenchay Road pavement option; I am unable to attend but would like to add a further submission.

There are many roads, in North Oxford alone, where the traffic is parked closely and where there is even less passing space than Frenchay. These roads do not have permissible pavement parking. I can quote Chalfont, Polstead, Hayfield Road, Osberton Road, Stratfield Road and several more where no such request has been made by emergency or waste services, and where the tightness of the road is perfectly acceptable for patient two way passing. The key word is patient. a wait of a few seconds is usually all that is required.

This request has clearly been made by a local resident impatient with cars approaching the switch over of parking sides at the same time, most likely a resident of 'new' Frenchay over the bridge. The dangerous and potentially escalating promotion of pavement parking is hugely to be avoided for all the reasons you have had submitted, not to mention potential damage to cars' steering geometry and suspension.

Thank you for taking this submission.

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT OF [REDACTED]

RE. PROPOSAL TO RELOCATE PARKING BAYS ON FRENCHAY ROAD

OCC DECISIONS MEETING, 24TH APRIL 2025

1. I live at [REDACTED] Oxford. My house is on the corner of the crossroads between Frenchay, Hayfield and Bainton Roads, and immediately adjacent to the parking bay under consideration.
2. I understand the proposal is to relocate the residents parking bay on the south side of the road to be partially located on the pavement.
3. I make this statement as I am **strongly AGAINST** the proposal, for the following reasons:
 - i. The current arrangement of parking bays serves as a **traffic calming measure**. The parking bays narrow the road to the acceptable width of a (carefully driven) lorry or fire engine, however they do cause any driver to need to slow down to pass through. The Hayfield-Bainton route is heavily used by cyclists – *particularly parents taking/accompanying children to school on bicycles who want to avoid the main Woodstock Road that runs parallel* – it is a busy back route for cyclists. The Frenchay/Bainton/Hayfield crossroads are already hazardous as on the other side of the crossroads, cars and delivery vans often do not slow down or stop where they are supposed to, but fly over the junction. It is a near DAILY occurrence that I hear / see angry cyclists ringing their bells and shouting at drivers who do not stop at the crossroads. Altering the parking bays on the west side of the junction would simply exacerbate the problem, particularly as cars approaching from the west would be driving at a greater velocity having the momentum of the hill of the bridge behind them.
 - ii. The south side pavement under proposal for cars to partially park on is not wide. Restricting the width further would be **problematic for wheelchair and pushchair users** who are unable to use the north side pavement as it does not have a dropped kerb at one end and simply stops before it reaches the bridge, necessitating crossing the road with a pram or wheelchair very close to the brow of the hill (and therefore a blind spot for oncoming cars).
 - iii. I am confused by this proposal as it seems to advocate for the use of cars, **prioritizing car use over the welfare, facilitation and encouragement of cycling and walking**. It seems at odds with the other policies of the Council who are making otherwise commendable efforts to reduce car use.
 - iv. I am **genuinely fearful that if this proposal is approved, a cyclist will be injured or killed on the junction**.

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee – Davenant Rd – Traffic Calming and Enhancement of Tree Pits

Our primary concern here is that chicanes can, with some levels of traffic, create a hostile environment for cycling. Examples of this include Rymer's Lane before the Cowley LTNs and Kingston Rd at busy times of day, where the badly designed bypasses may actually make the chicanes worse.

We would like to suggest two broader policy measures:

Firstly, we ask that measurements of traffic volumes and speeds be included in consultations on schemes that involve traffic calming, as it is hard to evaluate either the need for the schemes or how well they will work without that information. Indeed this information could usefully be included with most highways schemes - measures of vehicle and pedestrian flows would have been useful to have with the Frenchay Rd scheme, for example.

Secondly, we would like to see the county establish, as part of its work on the Street Design Guide, a policy on traffic calming measures, addressing when they are appropriate, what form they should take, and how locations needing them should be prioritised. This would largely be based on research into policies and standards and studies, from both the UK and overseas.

Without such guidance, traffic calming measures will continue to be introduced in an ad hoc fashion, driven by a few residents or individual councillors in particular locations.

This page is intentionally left blank