<u>Item 19 - Oxford, Railway Lane (Littlemore) - Proposed 20mph Speed Limits and Traffic Calming Features</u>

We urge that part a) of the recommendations be approved but part b) either not be approved or be modified to say "Approve the construction of two almost-full-width speed hump traffic calming features".

OLS and Cyclox raised substantive objections about the use of speed cushions. These have not been addressed.

I will reiterate our original objection.

Active Travel England's advice is "Speed cushions should be avoided as they can force a cyclist into changing their position on the road, which may conflict with motorised traffic." LTN 1/20 says "Cushions are not a preferred form of traffic calming because they constrain the ability of cyclists to choose their preferred position in the carriageway and are particularly hazardous to riders of three wheeled cycles."

We believe that on balance speed cushions here will do more harm than benefit, as any speed reduction benefit is likely to be low given the street layout, but the risk to tricycles could be significant. So if speed humps remain impractical because of damp proofing concerns, we urge that no traffic calming measures be put in at all.

We suggest, however, that "almost full width" speed humps - not reaching to the very edge of the carriageway - would avoid touching any house walls but provide the same effect as full width speed humps, slowing traffic without constraining cycle location or unbalancing tricycles.

We would also like a clear county policy that says "don't use speed cushions". This could go into the Street Design Guide and could be made informal policy before that. But really it shouldn't be necessary: LTN 1/20's position on speed cushions is clear, and the county's commitment to inclusive cycling is clear, so speed cushions should not be coming up anywhere.