

Danny Yee – East Oxford CPZ

Cave St has half a dozen terrace houses which open directly onto the street and would hugely benefit from on-street cycle parking. And there is no cycle parking provision for visitors either. So I urge you to either reject (b) or send it back to have this space allocated as cycle parking instead.

The two proposed parking locations on Nye Bevan Close are directly on junctions which should be kept clear to ensure visibility; the parking bays on Leon Close are opposite right-angle off-street parking. So please reject (d) and (e). These spaces could more safely be used for either micro-mobility bays or cycle parking.

Both Cowley Rd and St Clements have terrible injury records, especially for people cycling, and car movements in and out of side streets are a major contributor to that. So we should not be adding short-stay parking on the side street stubs here, but should try to keep visitor car parking, other than loading and disabled parking, localised to the Union St and St Clements car parks. And all car parking in these areas should be charged for, here and anywhere where demand exceeds supply.

On Bath St, the cycle parking should be in the space closest to St Clements, so as to be more useful for visitors to the shops there. And we oppose the conversion of permit parking bays to shared use bays, both here and on Boulter St. If there are more resident parking spaces on these streets than are needed, then the spare space should be reallocated to cycle parking, not converted to shared use bays. Streets can have both general cycle parking and micro-mobility parking. Please modify (a) and reject (g).

The officers' report talks a lot about the need for balance, but on most residential streets this appears to mean allocating 100% of the available kerbside space to either car parking or access for off-street car parking. I do not see how this can possibly be considered balanced.

My daughter has just turned thirteen and is now cycling independently around Oxford, to visit friends or go to after-school activities. In winter that often involves cycling in the dark, and one of the challenges she faces is finding parking at destinations, where she often has to hunt around to find a fence or post to lock her bike to. So I was flabbergasted to find the officers' report talking about women and vulnerable people and the problems they face cycling because of poor infrastructure, but then using that as an argument for more car parking and against putting in cycle parking. Why is safety for drivers - adults who are protected in cars - being prioritised over safety for children and adults who cycle?

The absence of proper cycle parking also results in cycles obstructing footways, which creates problems for people using wheelchairs, mobility scooters, and buggies. A lack of cycle parking is part of our infrastructure problem, and one we have the power to address in schemes like these.

Lambeth, which has lower cycling rates than Oxford, has a goal of having cycle parking every fifty metres on residential streets. Even without an explicit goal like that, we have to provide something for people cycling and not just address the needs of people driving. And it's good that we are planning more car club bays and thinking about micro-mobility, but if we want a comprehensive city-wide hire e-bike scheme then we are going to need to reallocate significantly more kerbside space for micro-mobility. And we should be at least thinking about seating, parklets, street trees, bike hangers, and rain gardens.