



## "Headington Central CPZ amendments" - consultation response by Oxfordshire Liveable Streets and CycloX

These proposals shuffle kerbside space between parking restrictions of one or another kind - single-yellow and double-yellow lines and visitor and/or permit parking. Alternative sustainable uses for the space involved do not appear to have been considered, despite being possible at almost all the proposed locations. This is contrary to the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) and the Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan (COTP), among other policies.

In some cases there are also safety concerns.

### Sustainable use of kerbside space

While Oxfordshire does not have a kerbside strategy with explicit policies on reallocation of kerbside space to sustainable uses, its broader policies imply most of such a strategy, more or less directly.

Possible sustainable uses for kerbside space on residential side-streets:

- seating - for people walking
- public cycle parking - for visitors to businesses or homes
- bike hangars - secure cycle parking for residents
- e-scooter/cycle parking bays - for hire schemes
- parklets - providing seating, mini-parks, micro-play areas, etc.
- street trees or garden beds (flowers, edible food)
- rain gardens - sustainable drainage
- car-club bays

Of these, bike hangars, streets trees or gardens, seating or parklets are expensive and would require a separate funding source, and hire cycle scooter parking and car-club bays need to be part of a coordinated city-wide provision, but ordinary public cycle parking is cheap and lacking on most residential streets.

Relevant policies:

- LTCP headline goals - 25% reduction in car trips, 66% increase in cycle trips
- LTCP 1 - Transport User Hierarchy
- LTCP 7 - Community Activation
- LTCP 8 and COTP Action 8 - Healthy Streets Approach
- LTCP 33 - Parking Management
- COTP Action 5 - Parking
- COTP Action 12 - Cycle Parking
- LTCP 38 and COTP Action 22 - Micromobility
- LTCP 39 - Car Clubs

Adding car parking will encourage car ownership and make driving easier, working directly against the headline LTCP car trip reduction goal. LTCP Policy 33 is quite explicit: **"Take measures to reduce and restrict car parking availability."** COTP Action 5 calls for "a consolidation and/or a reduction in public parking provision where appropriate".

In contrast, increasing cycle parking will make cycling easier and contribute to the headline LTCP goal for cycle trips. The user hierarchy in LTCP 1 suggests cycling parking should be prioritised over car parking and LTCP 33 is explicit: **"Ensure the parking requirements of all modes of transport are considered, in line with our transport user hierarchy"**. LTCP 7 talks about addressing "common barriers to cycling such as lack of bike parking" and COTP Action 12 includes delivering "a network of on-street residential cycle hangers across the area".

In Oxford, cycle parking has been concentrated at destinations, with almost no provision for public cycle parking on residential streets and only the three bike hangars deployed in Jericho for secure resident on-street parking. Lambeth's policy is to provide public cycle parking every 50m and secure resident parking every 100m, on every street. Oxfordshire does not have anything that explicit as a goal, but the policies above suggest those should be provided. There is currently a real shortage of cycle parking, both for many residents with constrained off-street space and for visitors, leading to cycles being parked on footways, locked to fences or lamp posts or signs.

LTCP 8 includes as a goal "Shaping the built environment, green spaces and infrastructure at a local level to improve health and wellbeing". And COTP Action 19 suggests "Public realm measures such as parklets where on-street car parking

space is repurposed as a social space with seating and planting". This suggests considering street trees (which positively affect mental health as well as helping with temperature moderation) and gardens, seating, and parklets. LTCP 8 also explicitly requires use of the Healthy Streets "Design Check Tool", but this does not appear to have been used for the proposed schemes.

LTCP 38 includes as a goal "to manage, monitor and support the use of passenger micromobility" and COTP Actions 12 and 22 include delivering "a public hire cycle scheme including e-bikes" and "an e-scooter hire scheme across central Oxfordshire". Provision of adequate hire-scooter/cycle bays is an essential part of this. The county is working with Lime and Voi to expand their provision - Lime has suggested 1000 hire e-bikes instead of the 100 they currently have deployed - which will require a greatly expanded network of parking bays across the city. This will require significant reallocation of space from car parking, so finding such spaces should be a key part of the renewal or upgrade of any CPZ.

LTCP 39 says "We will support the provision of zero emission shared cars and car clubs". Have the car club operators been approached to see if any of the spaces involved would be suitable as car-club parking bays?

Having a coordinated kerbside strategy would avoid different teams surveying the same streets for different purposes: one team trying to find spaces for hire cycle and scooter parking bays, one looking at public cycle parking, one looking at where street trees might be most valuable, one trying to improve car parking provision, one trying to improve walking and cycling routes, one co-ordinating car-club provision, and so forth. (We do not appear to have anyone tasked with deploying bike hangars or other secure resident parking facilities, or anyone looking at the possibilities for parklets or mini play areas.)

## The individual proposals

### All Saints Rd - OBJECT

Apart from the increase in car parking being inconsistent with policy, the proposed north-side parking bay extension is too close to the pedestrian crossing. A van or large SUV parked there would obscure visibility between a pedestrian crossing from north to south and someone driving or cycling from the east.



This space could, however, be safely used for cycle parking for visitors to the church and local homes.

The south-side space could be used for a hire-cycle/scooter bay, or a car-club bay.

### Bateman St - SUPPORT

This seems straightforward. The street is too narrow for parking and access and acceptable width footways. Double yellow lines here will help deter pavement parking.

It might, however, be possible to use this space for something that takes up less width than car parking (which has to allow for vehicles up to 2 metres wide).

### Gardiner St - OBJECT

The northern half of this space should be kept clear of car parking, consistent with the "daylighting" of intersections to improve visibility (and the Highway Code "DO NOT stop or park within 10 metres of a junction"). The southern five metres could be cycle parking.



## Kennett Rd - OBJECT

The space in question appears to have a dropped kerb for off-road parking. If the property no longer has the right to that off-road access, then this space could be used for cycle parking, noting that there is no public cycle parking on the 250 metres of Kennett Rd.



## Langley CI - SUPPORT

This seems like a straightforward safety measure.

## Lime Walk - OBJECT

The proposed northern parking spaces would block visibility of vehicles entering and exiting the Britannia Inn car park (on the east side) and the car service centre (on the



west side). The latter is particularly problematic as vehicles appear to have to reverse out of the service centre.



And the Lime Walk - London Rd junction has a terrible injury/collision history - more than one injury reported a year over the last decade - so creating a pinch point this close to that junction seems like a bad idea.

The space on the eastern side could be used for cycle parking, to serve the pub and the other businesses on London Rd, noting that there is no public cycle parking on the south side of London Rd west of Kennett Rd.

The space to the south could be used for cycle parking or, since it is at the bottom of a slope down from London Rd, as a rain garden for sustainable drainage.

### Stephen Rd + London Rd - SUPPORT

There seems to be a shortage of disabled parking and motorcycle parking in Headington Centre, so this seems reasonable. And making the London Rd junction corners "no loading at any time" is obvious - parking there is just dangerous on such a busy road.

### New High St 1 - OBJECT

Given the large number of terrace houses with no or very small front gardens, this would seem a prime candidate for a bike hangar. And that also makes visitor cycle parking important - there is currently no public cycle parking of any kind on the 450 metres of New High St.

### New High St 2 - OBJECT

Again, some of the homes here have no or very small front yards, and it is not clear if the blocks of flats on the eastern side have off-street cycle parking. This space should be used for public cycle parking (for visitors to the hairdresser as well as the residents), a bike hangar, or perhaps a hire-cycle/scooter parking bay.

### St Andrews Lane - NO OBJECTION

This appears to be to keep a driveway access clear of parking.

### Stile Rd - NO OBJECTION

These look like measures to help keep driveway accesses clear of parking.

### York Rd - OBJECT

Given ~6.5m of carriageway width, adding parking on the east side opposite the west-side parking seems problematic, given permitted vehicles can be up to 2m wide. With very low volumes of motor traffic this kind of parking can help provide traffic calming, but with higher volumes of motor traffic it becomes hostile for people cycling. It is also likely to lead to pavement parking.

Changing some of the permit parking to allow two-hour parking seems unproblematic, but if there is a demand for visitor car parking then there should be visitor cycle parking as well.