

## **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.

