

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 16 July 2020 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 12.45 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE – in the Chair

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Roz Smith (for Agenda Item 2)
Councillor John Howson (for Agenda Item 4)
Councillor Emma Turnbull (for Agenda Item 4)
Councillor Les Sibley (for Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Kieron Mallon (for Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Emily Smith (for Agenda Item 12)
Councillor Judy Roberts (for Agenda Item 13)
Councillor John Sanders)

Officers:

Whole of meeting G. Warrington (Law & Governance); P. Fermer, H. Potter and A. Kirkwood (Community Operations)

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
4.	R. Freshwater (Community Operations)
7.	J. Cox (Community Operations)
10.	R. Moore (Community Operations)
13.	L. Turner (Community Operations)
14.	J. Wright (Community Operations)
18.	H. Battye (Growth & Place)

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports,, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

1/20 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

Councillor Roz Smith

"I note the forward plan shows a decision to be made about the new controlled parking zone for the Headington Quarry Conservation area is to be made at the October meeting. The informal consultation showed the majority of residents to be in agreement. As the lock-down eases more non-residential, commuter parking is taking place. Please could you inform me how and when the formal consultation will take place?"

Suggested zone be retitled HQN.

Cabinet Member for Environment

"Councillor consultation will take place from August 24 – September 7 followed by the Statutory and Public consultation, which takes place week commencing September 14 until October 12. This will be followed by a review of the comments and objections (October 17- November 23), which will also be discussed during Cabinet Members Decision due to take place week commencing November 9."

Councillor Roz Smith

"The Access to Headington project included an off-road cycle way on the part of the Old Road which is narrow and steep, particularly hazardous for cyclists. Recognising that works are retro fitting as best possible, the completed off road cycle ways are being used but the stretch of Old Road is still be completed thereby putting many off using this route, particularly Cheney School pupils. Could the cabinet member please give indication as to when works might start on this section?"

Cabinet Member for Environment

"There is a detailed design and Oxford University are currently in discussions with the Council regarding the dedication of land to facilitate the construction of this proposal, which is progressing positively.

We are currently at an advanced stage of bidding for alternative funding from DfT and hope to be able to confirm the outcome of the bid in the next month. If the bid is successful we would expect work to commence this Autumn.

I note your additional enquiry regarding alternative funding being part of the second Tranche of funding but I'm not able to confirm that."

2/20 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Patrick Davey Tim Morris Jamie Hartzell John Mair David Hearn Bernadette Evans Pip McCallister County Councillor John Howson County Councillor Emma Turnbull)))) 4 – Walton Street Proposed) Experimental Closure))))
Rachael Shaer County Councillor Les Sibley) 7 – Browning Drive, Bicester –) Waiting Restrictions
County Councillor Kieron Mallon	8 – Banbury Easington Area – Proposed Environmental weight Limit and Proposed Raised Junction Table with Zebra Crossing at Springfield Avenue Junction with Horton View and Ruskin Road and Easington Road
Tom Christophers (Cumnor PC) County Councillor Judy Roberts	13. Cumnor – Cumnor Hill & Side Roads: Proposed 30mph Speed Limit
Jonathon Stowell	14. West Oxfordshire: Asthall, Charlbury and Minster Lovell: Proposed Structural Weight Limits

3/20 OXFORD: WALTON STREET - PROPOSED EXPERIMENTAL CLOSURE
(Agenda No. 4)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE4) presenting an 'overview' of responses received in the course of a statutory consultation following implementation in November 2019 of an experimental Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) prohibiting access by motor vehicles to and from Walton Street at its junction with Beaumont Street and Worcester Street in Oxford. A determination on whether to make the experimental order permanent would normally follow promptly following the end of formal consultation but in light of the ongoing COVID-19 situation and following a significant number of responses received during formal consultation the Cabinet Member was being recommended to defer a decision on Walton Street until a later date while recognising that a final decision on whether to make the trial closure permanent would still be required before May 2021.

Patrick Davey (St Bernards Road Residents) advised that the Walton Street closure had led to an extra 500-750k cars per year being 'rat runned' into our side-street of St Bernards Rd. Additional cars, which bumper to bumper would stretch 4-5000 miles. That is on top of what we already had, on top of what was already our fair share and taking Walton Streets fair share. Unfair indeed while at the same time traffic now using south Walton Street was zero which was quite unfair and Walton Street, the major arterial highway for entering and leaving Jericho was now a sea of unimaginable tranquillity at the expense of devastation in St Bernards Road.

You are well aware of these issues and the problems and we have appreciated your expressed sympathy and promises of mitigation. However, no mitigation has occurred.

In light of this, I could have shouted for identical treatment as Walton Street - total closure right now for St Bernards Road. However, I have sought to have principles for traffic flow:

- 1) equity with each area to take their fair share of traffic
- 2) traffic to exit by the shortest route to the major roads around Jericho/Walton Manor (Beaumont St, St Giles, Woodstock Rd)
- 3) no internal rat running between different areas.
- 4) reduced overall traffic.
- 5) enhanced environment

I have met with many others throughout Walton Manor and Jericho to create plans that had community wide support and were just, equitable and sought to enhance our environment. With compromise between different streets and groups we believe a solution will be found, a just one.

However, in the interim, we request mitigation for St Bernards Road and I am urging you today:

1. To re-open Walton St, given the imminent bus gate.
2. To commit the county council to implementing our mitigation in St Bernards Road within 4 or 5 weeks.

3. To further develop and implement the Jericho Low Traffic Neighbourhood Plans.

I urge you to do what is right and fair and very much hope that you will be able to help us all create a wonderful environment for the future in which we all wish to live and of which we are all proud.

Tim Morris a resident in Observatory Street while not representing the collective views of Observatory Street residents advised that having discussed the closure with neighbours he felt able to broadly express a collective view and concerns. In general, he was reassured that the Council was taking seriously the concerns expressed by many residents and businesses in Jericho and Walton Manor and given the proposal to postpone a final decision on closure for the time being he asked for the following three points to be taken into account:

1. Low Traffic Neighbourhood: he endorsed the need for - and benefit of - *maximum consultation* with local residents on achieving a low traffic neighbourhood
2. Observatory Street: was a very narrow, residential road, with a speed limit of 20mph inadequately enforced by the existing road-traffic humps, suffering from rat-running before the closure of Walton Street but as a result of the closure, traffic volumes prior to lockdown had increased. There was now more rat-running by traffic seeking access to Walton Street and Jericho that would previously have entered at the south end of Walton Street. Hence, the effect of the closure was inequitable with the south end of Walton Street disproportionately enjoying the benefits of reduced traffic, while streets that run east-west such as Observatory Street had suffered. We assume that this had not been the intention of the Council when it instituted the closure so, therefore, we seek a more equitable traffic solution in the context of the overall goal to reduce traffic volumes in the centre of Oxford. Our solution would be to close Observatory Street to all traffic except residents and introduce a two-way flow for them. That would stop the constant flow of through-traffic such as vans, trucks, taxis and delivery vehicles for takeaways (now much increased by restaurant closures etc) and also facilitate and enhance the proposed pedestrianised area on Walton Street as well as having important environmental benefits.
3. Walton Street Closure: He supported and reinforced the vital importance of continued closure of Walton Street in conjunction with the proposed Worcester Street bus gate and a parking levy on visitors as incentives to limit traffic flowing into Jericho and Walton Street from outside the area, as consistent with the local traffic policy goals.

Jamie Hartzell spoke on behalf of Don't Choke Jericho, a group of local residents calling for a low traffic neighbourhood for the whole of Jericho and Walton Manor. They hoped for a fresh perspective to the debate and to work with the County Council to develop solutions that the whole community could support as ultimately we would all need to compromise if we were to reach a solution as a community and decide the way forward.

For the last few months, we have been encouraging residents to rise above the 'No more traffic in my street' approach and consider the neighbourhood as a whole.

Every individual street was important but we need an integrated, well-designed and fully consulted low traffic neighbourhood for the whole of Jericho and Walton Manor based on clearly articulated principles. Firstly we should aim to reduce traffic, distribute it equitably between the remaining streets and support initiatives to reduce traffic volumes.

We see six things that unite the whole community:

- A thriving community and street life
- Buoyant cafes, restaurants, cinema and shops
- Clean air
- Access to, and for, essential services
- Safer and quieter streets
- And clear steps to address climate change.

Our consultation work to date has brought us to a compromise solution that delivers on all of these. Move the barrier further north and replace it with four traffic filters preventing all through traffic but leading to a fairer distribution of local vehicles between north and south thus ending the plight of residents in St Bernard's and Leckford Roads to the North. In the south, the elderly and disabled would again have access to essential services and with reduced congestion it might even be possible to bring the bus back. Southern Jericho would again have some local traffic but nothing like before.

The most exciting of the four filters would be in Walton Street itself, where pedestrianisation of the middle part of the street is proposed and with sufficient investment and good design could make Walton street a come-to destination, giving traders a much needed boost in these difficult times.

Having spoken with Walton Street outlets we have found a much more nuanced picture and although some were fearful of change and there were complex challenges in how to manage deliveries others had welcomed the chance to spill out into the streets and create an environment where customers were more willing to linger and browse.

Don't Choke Jericho would welcome a decision to defer with further consultation but not if that results in inaction. Designing and fully consulting on a low traffic neighbourhood is a lengthy business, and we need to start now. We stand ready to help. Finally, you might think from the published papers that the numbers in favour of closure are similar to those against but the two Jericho Connections petitions are duplicates of each other with the same signatories with 30% of them from outside of Oxfordshire and their signatures took 7 months to gather, whereas ours took just 3 weeks.

David Hearn considered that closure of the Walton Street artery had been a disaster well before the Covid lockdown with research by shopkeepers and local businesses as well as protests in the local press showing that to be the case. There had been a lot of propaganda and misinformation put about which was both false and inaccurate. He along with many others wanted Walton Street to remain open and were frustrated that it remained closed and neither did he want bus gates provided.

Bernadette Evans (Jericho Traders Association) advised that Walton Street had been a retail destination since 1825. Having survived the Spanish Flu pandemic of 1918 it now faced the threat of COVID but, before this, our businesses were facing another significant threat – the continued closure of Walton Street. She was speaking on behalf of the JTA which represented the 44 businesses in the neighbourhood. Our request was simple, please help us survive the COVID threat but also the much longer-term threat that closing our street posed. The current situation was double blow and for some of our traders would be a fatal one.

In most of our forty plus shops you will see a Save Jericho window sticker. A business impact survey conducted in January and February this year and well before COVID suggested 82% of Jericho businesses had reported a loss of customers and revenue, which had been caused by the road closure. We had yet to receive a response to that survey from the Council and would like to know whether it had accepted its findings.

When the decision was made to bring in the ETRO we were uncertain if thought had been given to whether businesses would be affected by closing the road or even if the Council realised how many of us there were in Jericho, how much wealth we generated, how many jobs we had created and our contribution to making Jericho the special neighbourhood it is. We feel our businesses have been overlooked or worse still - simply considered inconsequential.

Jericho was and is a destination shopping area – not just used by locals but customers from outside Oxford who needed access by car. It's unlikely that people if they're busy will just 'pop' to Jericho for a quick lunch in a cafe if they had to use park and ride or public transport. Customers just wouldn't accept the inconvenience and would go elsewhere where they could park. We don't want rat runners in our neighbourhood but our definition of rat runners would be drivers who use Walton Street and whose destination is somewhere other than Jericho.

Pretty much all Jericho shops were doing well before the road was closed and we simply do not understand why the Council has put us in this position. We have been grateful for the support shown such as the new signs on the approaches from Woodstock Road but sadly it only helps slightly and can only be a sticking plaster. In the wake of COVID we welcomed both the Council's and central government desire to help the retail and hospitality trade in these difficult times and right now, you have the power to help us. Please reopen Walton Street while you undertake the new extended consultation period and don't allow your decision to be a factor that means trade on Walton Street does not survive.

Pip McCallister for Jericho Connections believed that Jericho should be accessible to all residents, workers, shoppers and visitors whether they arrived on foot, public transport, bike, car and even boat. We value our community, businesses and our environment as well as our historic connections to the rest of Oxford and it's essential that Jericho continued to be a vibrant place to both live and visit and so we will continue to campaign to reduce the impact that non-essential traffic and pollution has on our neighbourhood.

Jericho Connections submitted its petition on 26th May requesting that OCC reopen the road for six months in order to collect baseline data which would allow them to

scientifically assess how successful the ETRO had been in meeting its aims. Without that essential data we argued that it would be impossible to evaluate the outcomes. Since then, the petition has continued to grow and had now reached almost 1,000 signatories although we notice that in the officer report the 252 paper petition numbers had not been included.

Jericho Connections submitted its formal objection to the ETRO on 29th May 2020 setting out the following key issues:

Increased isolation for our most vulnerable residents. We feel that the closure breaches (amongst others) the Equality Act and the Public Sector Equality Duty Act 2011.

Displaced traffic and increased journey times had resulted in additional congestion and reduced air quality in other parts of the neighbourhood with carbon emissions generated in these longer journeys more than negating any reduction of emissions within Jericho itself. Data subsequently released suggests that air quality within Jericho had never actually exceeded recommended levels and it was also worth noting that the Walton Street pollution data showed no significant drop during 2019 demonstrating that traffic flow (pre Covid) was not as reduced as supporters had claimed but was effectively static. The closure of the south end of Walton Street had only cleared traffic from one-fifth of the entire length of Walton Street but left the remaining majority (four-fifths) of Walton Street under increased pressure from existing and intensified chaotic traffic. In addition, for those reliant on cars or taxis (to access work or medical treatment for example), the additional mileage came with an increased personal cost whilst local businesses who made deliveries were experiencing increased operational expense.

Impact on local businesses. Walton Street could be described as the lifeblood of Jericho and the closure of Walton Street to through traffic has had a huge, negative impact on local businesses with 84% emphatically opposed to the closure and 82% reporting a downturn in trade prior to the Covid lockdown. At a time when businesses were struggling to survive the impact of the pandemic, these (mainly independent) businesses need local government support rather than further obstacles to recovery.

Jericho was unique. With three hard boundaries (Worcester College, the Lucy's Development and the Oxford Canal) Walton Street was the only way in and out of this special enclave. Comparing Jericho to Waltham Forest and forcing an inappropriate model on a completely different type of geographical area was simply ludicrous. Jericho had no public transport links whatsoever, whereas the residents and businesses of Waltham Forest had easy access to multiple forms of public transport 24/7.

It was a misconception that Jericho was an affluent area and while a considerable level of gentrification had occurred since the area was saved from demolition in the 1960s in reality social housing and private rentals made up the majority of properties within Jericho. Jericho had almost 15% pensioner households and 38% 'lone parent families' with dependent children, whilst the poverty rate amongst children and older

people was higher than the city average with 51% of all children & 65+ living below the poverty line.

The pro-closure lobby are quoted as wanting to “*return Walton Street to a quiet residential street*” ... Walton Street had never been a quiet residential street and it's very existence stemmed from the need to serve the growing manufacturing, academic and boating communities within Jericho and Walton Street had been a commercial street since the area was developed almost 200 years ago.

Jericho Connections welcomed the announcement that future consultation with all stakeholders was planned and were keen to develop an alternative Liveable Streets proposal that secured viable connections to the rest of Oxford; encouraged an equitable distribution of traffic throughout Jericho & Walton Manor; promoted roads that were as congestion-free as possible and supported a vibrant independent retail and food offering.

John Mair a retired citizen of Jericho with an active interest in the future of this area advised that since the closure of Walton Street through force majeure and brave leadership, living in Jericho had been a joy. Few cars, better air, much safer for pedestrians (especially children), cyclists and motorists. It is a portent and a pilot for the future of us all. Local shopping had been much easier especially in lockdown. Parking was easier and I can see no rational reason to have a full opening up of the street. The campaign based on that is simply based on a false premise. There are alternatives:

- a bus gate at Worcester street instead of the current ugly plastic barrier allowing through emergency vehicles, taxis, delivery lorries (at certain times), mobility vehicles and using ANPR, cars with Jericho/Walton Manor parking permits.
- the bus gate in Hythe Bridge Road was a non-starter. An un-necessary impediment to the flow of traffic from the north to the west of the city recreating rat runs in Jericho that had been driven out.
- The idea of imposing a Mini Holland in part of Walton Street was not a good idea as it would replace one rat run with three new ones including one past a primary school and the proposal was fatally flawed.

The best solution, in his opinion, was the Walton Street bus gate plus severe traffic calming on Walton Street-speed limits/bumps and much widened pavements from Gt Clarendon to Cranham Street to provide a Jericho pavement culture. Those who trade and adapt to this new reality would benefit. Those who do not would lose.

The Cabinet Member advised that there would be a separate consultation on the bus gate proposals and that that was not part of the decision process today.

County Councillor John Howson. When I addressed the Cabinet about the last iteration of Local Transport Plan 4, I started with the following quote paraphrased from Enrique Penalosa, former Mayor of Bogotá, Colombia:

“A developed country is not a place where the poor have cars. It's where the rich use public transport.”

The Cabinet Member I'm sure recognises the importance of this quote, but not in North Oxford. There is no mention of bus services in the officer's report, save under the comments from Bus Users Oxford – Restore some through services to Walton Street.

This lack of interest in the consequences typified the whole approach to this scheme and unlike the recently announced Low Traffic Neighbourhood in East Oxford, where the scheme had been fully researched in advance and those living locally consulted, the Walton Street Barrier ETO extended an existing temporary closure and was introduced with no prior consultation.

That partly might be my fault and if so I apologise. The residents of Kingston Road had been complaining about traffic using their road as a rat-run despite, speed humps and two VAS signs and I came to the September delegated decisions meeting to remind the Cabinet Member of their concerns.

However, taking action without consultation, has brought us to where we are today. A request from officers to defer because of the need for more time to analyse the results of the post-hoc consultation.

There had been significant unintended consequences in my division from the closure and others may talk of those elsewhere, but in my Division St Bernard's Road and Leckford Road have become the first and second routes out of the area from a much wider area than before the barrier was put in place. The temporary measures put in place are unsightly and, unless the latest traffic data shows otherwise, had largely failed to achieve their objective of deterring drivers. Others might wish to comment upon the signage.

The fact that more than 600 comments and 5 petitions had been received is a testimony to the concerns of residents across the affected area. The first petition was presented to Cabinet more than six months ago and it will now be 18 months before the outcome is finally decided.

In the meantime, events had overtaken us. On the day this decision to defer was announced, at 10am, a further announcement at 2pm introduced a 'temporary' bus gate in Worcester Street. That would be a bus gate with no buses, but with plenty of tourist coaches making use of their right to enter St Giles from that direction.

Can I ask the Cabinet Member to help my residents understand the position of the Walton Street barrier in this wider scheme of traffic management by answering the following three questions?

What is meant by 'temporary' – is it the same length of time as the Walton Street ETO?

What hours would the bus gate be in operation?

What permitted use by residents would be allowed and would it be from the date the bus gate came into operation; since virtually the whole of central and north Oxford is controlled by CPZs, residents of which CPZs will be allowed any priorities in relation to the bus gate?

Let me end where I began, with buses. The county has agreed the following improvement to services within Oxford from September 2020:

- New service 20, three journeys per day on weekdays, between Rose Hill and Cowley;

Sadly, there's still no money for buses to return to Walton Street and Kingston Road despite the restrictions on car use imposed upon local residents by the two closures.

Responding to Councillor Howson the Cabinet Member advised that these issues were still being decided. The consultation period would be the same as for the experimental temporary closure but it was hoped that it would not take that long. The bus gate proposals had been introduced at short notice to take account of exceptional circumstances.

County Councillor Emma Turnbull advised that it was clear from the presentations from residents and traders that there was a lot of frustration and concern felt by local people that decisions which affected their lives were being taken out of their hands or imposed without adequate input or consultation. She didn't doubt the experimental TRO had been imposed with the best of intentions namely to reduce traffic levels and pollution but she hoped lessons could be learnt about the importance of community engagement and the drawbacks of relying on temporary powers. She was pleased that the recommendation was to postpone a final decision as more work clearly needed to be done to engage locally and come up with proposals that reflected this vibrant area. Residents and traders clearly had many ideas and she had had conversations about ways that Walton Street and neighbouring streets could be boosted by removing awkwardly placed parking and bike racks and opening up the area for tables and chairs at permitted times while retaining space for public transport and cycling. The area had the potential to be a thriving low transport neighbourhood but it was important to spend the next few months getting things right with a serious effort made to include Walton Street in the Tranche 2 travel bid. She echoed the comments by Councillor John Howson with regard to the temporary bus gate. A time frame for these various proposals would be useful.

It was noted that two other submissions had been received. The first from Richard Lofthouse supporting closure of Walton Street and the second from Gero Miesenböck objecting to the current form of closure because the traffic barrier was in the wrong location

The Cabinet Member for Environment thanked all the presenters and the positive and constructive way they had made their submissions. She had been pleased to hear speakers from both points of view at the same meeting and in a formal council structure. She noted the comment that mitigation measures proposed for St Bernard's Roads had not been implemented and that needed to be investigated. A decision on the experimental TRO would be made before January 2021 but recognised that the bus gate, despite being an additional and separate temporary measure would have an impact and needed to be assessed. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the officer report and to the representations made to her at the meeting she confirmed her decision as follows:

to defer a decision on the continuation of the above experimental order pending further analysis and assessment of its impact with County officers maintaining contact over the next phase prior to a decision.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

4/20 OXFORD: CENTRAL AREA - PROPOSED ADDITIONAL CYCLE PARKING PLACES

(Agenda No. 5)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE5) a report presenting responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce additional cycle parking places in Oxford city centre at New Road, Queen Street, Ship Street, Speedwell Street, Turl Street and Wellington Square.

Officers confirmed that the proposals had been included in the Active Travel Tranche 1 funding.

Noting that there had been 46 responses to the consultation with only one objection received to each of the sites the Cabinet Member for Environment, having regard to the information set out in the report before her confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve proposed additional cycle parking places in central Oxford on New Road, Speedwell Street, Wellington Square and Ship Street.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

5/20 OXFORD - GODSTOW ROAD: PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

(Agenda No. 6)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE6) presenting responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce six pairs of speed cushions on Godstow Road at Wolvercote, Oxford put forward in conjunction with Oxford City Council who had undertaken to fund the project subject to approval being given to proceed with the scheme.

The local member County Councillor Paul Buckley had submitted the following comments in support of the introduction of these traffic calming measures. However, having noted that the Oxford Bus Company had not responded to the consultation and since their number 6 bus serving Lower Wolvercote was an essential service for many residents of Lower Wolvercote, for accessing other parts of Oxford, he had sought assurances from Oxford Bus Company that the speed cushions would not

impede their buses. The Managing Director of OBC had assured him that their lack of response had been because they had not foreseen a major problem. However, he had pointed out that buses would need to straddle speed cushions to avoid a jolt to passengers and this would not be possible if there was on-street parking on both sides of the road. Parking on one side only could be accommodated, but only by the bus moving to the other side of the road, to straddle the other cushion of the pair. He had requested that these factors were taken account when the cushions were installed and any feasible measures employed to mitigate the problem. He corrected paragraph 14 of the report as he understood the Oxford City Council had agreed to fully finance the proposed measures from CIL funds generated by the Mill Site development.

Officers confirmed the detail of the response from the Oxford Bus Company.

Having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to her at the meeting the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed introduction of speed cushions on Godstow Road as advertised.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

6/20 BICESTER: BROWNING DRIVE - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS
(Agenda No. 7)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE7) presenting responses received to a statutory consultation on a proposal to introduce and amend waiting restrictions on Browning Drive, Bicester where parking - in particular by commuters – is resulting in road safety and access problems for residents. The proposals had been considered at the Cabinet Member for Environment delegated decisions meeting on 21 May as part of a larger group of proposed waiting restrictions in Bicester which had been put forward following discussions and site meetings with officers and the local members and while the other proposals had been approved at that meeting, a decision on the proposals for Browning Drive and Kingsley Road had been deferred to allow further investigation.

County Councillor Les Sibley considered the need for on street parking restrictions in Browning Drive, Bunyan Road and Kingsley Road in Bicester as urgent as it was patently evident that inconsiderate and dangerous parking of vehicles at the T junctions created a hazardous and dangerous situation for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. The report stated that an objection had been received that the parking restrictions would adversely affect residential parking in Kingsley Road but he pointed out that there were no residential parking facilities in this road. The CO-OP HGV vehicle which delivered twice a day to the local store was an ongoing traffic

and parking issue that needed to be resolved as the vehicle when it parked by the bus stop/post box in Kingsley Road to load and off load blocked the entrance to either the car park at the front of the shops or the car park to the rear. This ongoing situation was a potential safety hazard for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. Drivers of local buses had also complained about inconsiderate and dangerous parking of vehicles at both T junctions as it caused visibility and other safety issues. Thames Valley Police had not objected indicating that without traffic restrictions in place they were unlikely to prosecute an offending motorist. Bicester Town Council supported the traffic regulations requesting that yellow lines are enforced. Local Bicester Town and County Councillors also supported the proposal.

He understood the concerns from some residents that introduction of double yellow lines might lead to issues of displaced parking and should the recommendation be agreed then a review should be undertaken following completion of the signage and lines to address any issues that might arise.

Rachael Shaer a resident of Browning Drive expressed concern over a fundamental error in regard to the Browning Drive Waiting Restriction Proposal as it stated that 'The proposal was to introduce and amend waiting restrictions on Browning Drive where parking – in particular by commuters – is resulting in road safety and access problems by residents.' That was not true and was very misleading as there was no commuter parking! Commuter parking insinuated cars were parked all day whereas the parking that happened in the proposed area on Browning Drive was all short term. She added that she had seen no evidence of effective consultation with residents or further investigations with regard to these proposals since the last meeting, which is what she had been led to believe would happen.

As she had stated previously at the May meeting she objected strongly to these waiting restrictions. There were no houses directly impacted at present whereas by introducing the restrictions many houses and families would most certainly be. If this went ahead then cars which cannot access Harts Vet small car park would then not be able to park short term where they currently do in the proposed waiting restriction zone. She agreed that was near the junction but the junction was very wide with good vision and provided ample parking on a long stretch of road by the vets and a fenced/grass area and caused no obstructions. She reiterated that it had taken many years of communication with the vets to encourage their customers to park away from residents' houses further down the road and we had endured years of blocked driveways, restricted access and not being able to park outside our own homes. If this proposal went ahead then we would not only be back to square one but worse. As well as access to her own and her neighbours' properties being affected she was extremely concerned regarding her disabled parents who lived almost opposite the vet and the problems this would cause them and their carers needing clear access multiple times daily as well as ambulance access as needed.

In conclusion, all these restrictions would do is move and increase parking issues with local residents further up the road where the cars who could not park in the proposed zone just moving further up the road to cause access and safety issues to a great many more people than was happening now. She stressed again the negative impact these waiting restrictions would have on her, her family and the local neighbourhood.

The Cabinet Member thanked Councillor Sibley and Mrs Shaer for their presentations. She asked what form had the further consultation taken and why had Mrs Shaer been unaware of what had been carried out.

Officers responded that there had been no further full consultation and information remained as set out in the report submitted to the May meeting. However, officers had been back on site with road safety officers during which it had been observed that the junction had been blocked requiring cars turning right having to cross over the lane.

The Cabinet Member accepted this was a standard double yellow line proposal at a junction which she considered appeared dangerous. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to her at the meeting she confirmed her decision to approve but having regard to the concerns expressed to her by the resident asked for a review and report back after 6 months to see if the proposal was working satisfactorily.

to approve the proposed waiting restrictions on Browning Drive and Kingsley Road as advertised with a review after 6 months with report back to the Cabinet Member for Environment.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

7/20 BANBURY - EASINGTON AREA: - PROPOSED ENVIRONMENTAL WEIGHT LIMIT AND PROPOSED RAISED JUNCTION TABLE WITH ZEBRA CROSSING AT SPRINGFIELD AVENUE JUNCTION WITH HORTON VIEW AND RUSKIN ROAD AND EASINGTON ROAD

(Agenda No. 8)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE8) presenting responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a 7.5 tonne environmental weight limit in the Easington area of Banbury and raised junction table with zebra crossing at the Springfield Avenue junction with Horton View and Ruskin Road. The proposals had been put forward as a result of discussions between the local County Councillor and residents to improve road safety and the feeling of security in the vicinity of the two schools on Springfield Avenue and secondly to prevent the existing problems of HGVs rat-running through this area.

Peter Monk had been due to make a statement but in his absence that was read out by an officer:

"I write to point out that the proposals will not produce the benefits sought. There is no dispute that the traffic calming and regulation measures already applied to this area of Banbury have not produced the improvement expected. It is therefore surprising that 'more of the same' is now being proposed. There is no evidence, yet, that penetration by HGV vehicles serving nearby, new housing developments are

using Sycamore Drive, Timms Road and Springfield Avenue as an alternative to the Oxford Road - although it is a possible future scenario.

The extension of the existing weight restriction will not, I suggest, make the route less attractive to drivers seeking to save time and avoid congestion - the only things that will do that would be better enforcement of the present measures (unlikely with current police resources) or self-enforcing measures. The latter would be effective but probably bring forth cries of protest from residents - especially those who vociferously advocate 'pouring good money after bad'.

Will a second pedestrian crossing close to the existing one at Horton View / Ruskin Ave be any more of a deterrent than the existing one just north of that junction? He suggested not.

The situation at that point is exacerbated by the 'snack and sweet' shop on the south-west corner (which is very popular with students) and the existence of a 'table hump' at this point which encourages young people to believe that it is an authorised crossing - which it isn't. How there have not been more injuries at that point is amazing.

Better student discipline at this location could be achieved by: -

- a) the schools providing supervision at assembly and dispersal times,
- b) remove the 'table' at this point (or convert it to a 'hump') and extend the guardrails on the east side of Springfield Ave. as far as possible towards the south-bound bus stop and,
- c) convert the existing zebra crossing to a Toucan.

The latter would provide motorists with a visual warning of the crossing position and impose some control over the current careless use by students, both on foot and cycle and also imbue elderly residents of Stanbridge House, and elsewhere, with confidence to use this crossing point instead of crossing randomly, as now.

Whilst the use of the zebra crossing near the BGN entrance is better it could be 'tabled' (as elsewhere) to provide a more discernable speed limit measure OR converted to a Toucan (also as at other schools in the area).

I offer these suggestions as alternatives to those proposed but would also comment that improvements to dwellings in the area are quite frequent and local merchants use three and four axle vehicles for deliveries etc., and I believe these will not be permitted under the weight restriction Order. How will these function in future?

Presently there is virtually no enforcement so the restriction is generally ignored."

Commenting on Mr Monk's submission Councillor Kieron Mallon felt the alternative proposals he had mentioned in his submission would not be viable. He advised that his proposals were, however, trying to pre-empt the effects of planned development of up to 2,000 houses in this area and had been requested by the schools and many local residents and there had been no objections from local businesses. Outlining the history of Old Easington from its inception in the early 1920s to provide council houses for soldiers returning from war and their families it had a road layout designed for the traffic of the day, with narrow roads, sharp junctions and in some cases poor visual splays and was not designed for modern traffic. Some remedial work had been carried out in the 1960s on Springfield Avenue, as even then, it was used as an easy cut through to/from two south Banbury main roads namely the Bloxham Road.(A361) and Oxford Road (A4260) for cars but since then there had been no further major engineering works undertaken.

Old Easington had one of the largest secondary schools in Oxfordshire namely Wykham Park Academy (formerly Banbury Grammar and Banbury School). Also on the same campus is The Space Academy with the largest Roman Catholic Secondary school in Oxfordshire, Blessed George Napier, next door. It had the Queensway, Harriers View and Bishop Loveday Primary Schools bordering on it with thousands of pupils per day using the paths and roads in this location to access these schools. The former Banbury Grammar School building had been extended and converted into elderly sheltered housing, with over a hundred residents using and crossing the increasingly busy and potentially dangerous residential roads to access the Post Office, small shops and bus stops. As a result of an existing weight limit restriction on the Timms Estate in South Banbury and to avoid the corridor of traffic signals on Oxford Road, large vehicles and HGVs had been using short cuts through the Easington area when travelling from Oxford Road to Bloxham Road or vice-versa. There was also increasing use by construction traffic traveling to and from the new developments on Bloxham Road and the absence of a weight limit meant this route was shown on "sat-navs" as an acceptable alternative.

The large Banbury 17 (Saltway) designated housing area in the local plan would see 1,500 plus houses built at both ends of Old Easington to the West, between the A361 and the A4260. That was well under way and construction traffic and HGVs were already using these inappropriate residential Easington roads as a short cut to avoid the traffic lights on the main Oxford Road. This would become far worse when phases 3 and 4 of Banbury17/Saltway development started. Therefore, potential for conflict with parents, children, pedestrians and cyclists was greatly increased.

He had witnessed these problems and been approached by residents with numerous complaints of large vehicles and construction HGVs using this residential area, leading to noise and potential air pollution, debris and dust falling from construction HGVs, safety issues, damage to highway infrastructure and highway verges due to the size and increasing numbers of large vehicles. Major concerns from the local schools had led to him as the local member attending site visits with Head Teachers and there had been numerous visits by OCC Officers to assess the situation. The current proposal was to erect signs at all possible through-route entry points, namely Grange Road, Farmfield Road and Horton View on the A4260, and Easington Road and Springfield Avenue on the A361. There was a suitable alternative route via the A4260 and A361 at South Bar.

There was considerable support for the scheme from all local elected members at Town, District and County level and neighbouring County Councillors and schools as well as the majority of residents and verbal support from local businesses. Funding for consultation and signage had already been secured through S106 contributions from developers and as a comprehensive package to improve safety in the area it met the criteria of the OCC Walking and Cycling strategy, better ways to schools strategy and the emerging Covid 19 walking and cycling safety government scheme and for all these reasons he asked that the Cabinet Member approve the proposal.

He undertook to speak to objectors and also to Mr Monk.

Officers confirmed that advanced signing would be provided.

The Cabinet Member noted that the local member having consulted widely on the scheme as part of a larger strategy would continue to meet with objectors including Mr Monk. She noted the widespread support from schools and that local businesses had not objected. It was S106 funded and was being promoted in anticipation of further development and that seemed eminently sensible. Therefore, having regard to that and to the information set out in the report before including the representations made to her at the meeting she confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed 7.5 tonne environmental weight limit in the Easington area of Banbury and proposed raised junction table with zebra crossing at the Springfield Avenue junction with Horton View and Ruskin Road as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

8/20 CHERWELL & WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICTS - VARIOUS LOCATIONS: PROPOSED DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACES

(Agenda No. 9)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE9) presenting objections received to a statutory consultation on proposals to remove, amend and introduce disabled persons parking places (DPPP's) at various locations in the Cherwell and West Oxfordshire districts put forward following requests from residents, including – where a new place had been requested - an assessment of eligibility, applying the national guidelines on the provision part of such parking places.

Officers explained the difference between an advisory space and a statutory space and advised that one of the respondents in respect of Hook Norton – High Street (number 26 in Annex 13 to the report) had requested that his submission which had been classified as a concern be recorded as an objection.

The Cabinet Member for Environment noted the amendment and complimented officers on their work in examining these proposals so carefully and having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to her at the meeting confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed provision of Disabled Persons Parking Places (DPPP) at: Bridge Street Banbury; Bretch Hill, Banbury; Cheviot Way, Banbury; Evenlode Drive, Bicester; New Street, Deddington - noting this DPPP is to be an informal rather than statutory DPPP; The Paddocks, Deddington; Wadards Meadow, Witney; Leys Close, Wroxton;

but defer approval of the proposals at the following locations pending further investigations: Angus Place, Banbury; Ribston Close, Banbury; Blake Road, Bicester; Walterbush Road, Chipping Norton; High Street, Hook Norton.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

9/20 DIDCOT - LARCH DRIVE & DIAMOND DRIVE: PROPOSED BUS GATE

(Agenda No. 10)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE10) presenting responses received to a statutory consultation to provide a bus gate at the point where Larch Drive met Diamond Drive, Didcot to replace a concrete barrier which currently prevented the passage of any motor vehicle.

Officers read out a submission from a CJ MacDonald-Bradley setting out requirements for advanced signage to this location. He had also urged that the recommendation not to allow motorcycles to pass the gate be reconsidered, for the reason specified clearly by the one Respondent. It would not prevent motorcycles but merely 'hinder' them, possibly leading to frustration and to them looking to ride on pavements or other, to avoid camera enforcement. If the Council did insist on preventing the very few motorcycles that passed here then it must be prepared to ensure that the restriction was enforced.

Officers confirmed that the developers Taylor Wimpey had now agreed to provide for advanced signing and the intention was to prohibit all motor vehicles except buses.

Noting that the main objection had been met by the developer providing advanced signing and having regard to the information set out in the report before her and representations made at the meeting the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed bus gate at the point Larch Drive meets Diamond Drive.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

10/20 SUTTON COURTENAY - MILTON ROAD: PROPOSED SHARED USE FOOTPATH/CYCLE TRACK

(Agenda No. 11)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE11) presenting responses received to a statutory consultation on a proposal to designate a 20-metre length of existing footway as a shared use footpath/cycle track to facilitate access to and from an approved new off-road cycle route between the Milton road and Milton Park.

Officers confirmed funding would be provided via the local growth fund as part of the Science Vale network Project.

Noting that although there had been one objection local support for this scheme had been high in comparison the Cabinet Member for Environment therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to her at the meeting confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed widening of a footway to provide a shared use footpath/cycle track on Milton Road at the access point to an off-road cycled track between the Milton road and Milton Park.

Signed

Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

11/20 ABINGDON - BOULTER DRIVE, CULLERNE CLOSE AND LOYD CLOSE - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

(Agenda No. 12)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE12) presenting responses received to a statutory consultation on a proposal to provide no waiting at any time and no waiting between 9am and 5pm Mondays to Fridays at Boulter Drive, Cullerne Close and Loyd Close, Abingdon put forward by the local member in response to concerns over safety and the obstruction of traffic arising from parking on the bend on Boulter Drive, around the Boulter Drive/Cullerne Close & Loyd Close junctions and within Loyd Close itself.

Officers read out submissions from:

A resident of Loyd Close who had objected strongly to any parking restrictions on Loyd Close. When he had purchased his property in Loyd Close there were no parking restrictions as with most residential areas. However, when approval was given to building an extension to the surgery and the pharmacy in a residential area it had been deemed that there would be no detrimental effect on traffic in the area, which on reflection had been naïve. It now seemed very unfair that the first houses on both sides of Loyd Close would be discriminated against in relation to on road parking all because of that decision, which had been objected to by the residents of the area for these very reasons. The parking issues on Boulter drive were caused solely by the inconsiderate parking of the staff from the medical centre who could easily park at the community centre car park and should be encouraged to do so. Since the COVID-19 pandemic it had become obvious that cars parked on Boulter drive belonged to staff at the medical centre because very few patients were attending the medical centre. What are we to do when work is being carried out on our properties and tradesmen need to park near the property? We have friends come to visit when parking would be prohibited, where would you suggest they park?

We cannot fit two cars on our drive and would have a yellow line outside the house preventing us from parking both our cars. It would be sensible and fair for the small number of households affected in Loyd Close to have residents parking as they do in

parts of Oxford. We feel we are being discriminated against even in Loyd Close alone where some residents would be able to park outside their houses. We are opposed to any parking restrictions proposed in Loyd Close and if parking restrictions are required then residents parking would be the fairest solution.

County Councillor Emily Smith advised that issues with poor parking in this area had been raised with her over the years as a result of people using the medical centre parking across driveways and restricting visibility around this busy junction. A previous scheme put forward a few years ago had not gained public support but there was now s106 funding set aside to pay for parking restrictions and signage in this location. She had worked with Abingdon Town Council to carry out an informal consultation first to gauge the views of the people living in Loyd Close and had met with the Business Manager at Long Furlong Medical Centre to hear about difficulties and possible solutions. As this informal consultation had been fairly positive she had decided to use some of her Councillor Priority Fund to pay for a formal consultation. 72% of respondents had been supportive. There had been objections and county officers had addressed those. Regarding comments made by the nursery they should not be negatively impacted as the waiting restrictions would begin at 9am and the nursery did have some parking spaces. Other objectors raised the need for the car park outside the community centre to be enlarged and some residents and the Medical Centre had raised that with the developers of the large North Abingdon Development, which would, in my opinion, be an appropriate request to make as part of their s106 agreement. However, there was currently no s106 agreement to cover that so while it is possible that s106 funds could be forthcoming for a bigger car park in the future, that could not be guaranteed.

Therefore, on balance, and given the 72% support for these parking restrictions she urged that the parking restrictions as consulted on be approved in the hope that s106 negotiations might to help bring forward an extension to the Long Furlong car park as well.

Officers confirmed that there were signs at the Medical centre asking people to park at the Community centre car park and that the owner of 2 Loyd Close would be negatively impacted.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the point made by the objector regarding resident parking but advised him that until the Vale of White Horse District Council acquired civic enforcement powers that was not an option. She nevertheless was sympathetic to his views and wondered if a partial solution could be to make further overtures to staff at the medical centre to encourage their use of alternative parking at the community centre a short distance away and suggested that the local member could use her local connections to pursue that. She noted the local member's efforts to rationalise this issue, her funding of the consultation and the 72% level of support. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report together with the representations made to her at the meeting she confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve proposed waiting restrictions at Boulter Drive, Cullerne Close and Loyd Close Abingdon as advertised.

Signed.....
 Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

12/20 CUMNOR - CUMNOR HILL & SIDE ROADS: PROPOSED 30MPH SPEED LIMIT

(Agenda No. 13)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE13) presenting responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a 30mph speed limit on Cumnor Hill in place of the existing 40mph speed limit and also a 30mph speed limit on the Kimmeridge Road residential development as requested by Cumnor Parish Council and, if approved, funded from s106 contributions received from developers, the Area Parish Support budget and Cumnor Parish Council.

Tom Christophers (Cumnor Parish Council) gave a brief synopsis of the parish of Cumnor and the distinct and unique identities of the several communities which made up a parish with 7,000 residents. For almost a decade those residents had raised concern over the speed driven by traffic along the Cumnor Hill, from the boundary with North Hinksey parish to the centre of Cumnor village, which served as an extension of one of the main arteries out of Oxford. The recent case of a local schoolgirl being struck by a car, however, and the subsequent speed surveys (three) commissioned by Cumnor Parish Council provided evidence that traffic speeds should be lowered to a 30mph speed limit without additional supporting traffic calming measures.

The landscape of this road had changed greatly from when it was first designated and residents and the parish council recognised that it had not moved with the times and was no longer appropriate or sustainable with increased traffic volumes. The environment in the parish had changed considerably and the continued traffic speed was now at odds with the current and forecast future development of the hill. Cumnor Hill served as a thoroughfare to three local schools in Cumnor and North Hinksey parishes and the number of school children that walk and cycle up and down the hill had grown over the years and by formally lowering the speed limit the aim would be to prevent this type of incident as referred to above, or worse, occurring again.

There was a lot of support from within the community to mitigate the inherent danger presented by the volume of traffic travelling at 40mph along this road at present. Cumnor Parish councillors and our district and county councillors unanimously support this proposal and we are confident that this reduction in speed along the Cumnor Hill has the support of those who live within and neighbour the Parish, as well as those who travel through it given the 93% (332/358) who backed the consultation. Furthermore, a local petition had gained 1,859 signatures in support of a reduction to 30mph with a paper copy containing a further 305 signatures.

In urging that the proposal be supported he took the opportunity to ask that if funding could be found by Cumnor Parish Council to cover the cost of reducing the speed limit on the part of Oxford Road currently remaining at 40mph would the Cabinet Member see any issue that would prevent this stretch of road also being lowered to 30mph?

Following advice from officers that that would need further speed survey work and public consultation the Cabinet Member could see no reason for that work not to proceed.

County Councillor Judy Roberts advised that over the last five years more and more local residents had asked about reducing the speed limit on this road to 30 mph. The no overtaking signs had been there since the 1960's which indicated to her that drivers should take care on this road as the view ahead at most points was restricted. She referred to the serious accident last year involving a schoolgirl crossing the road and a well-supported petition had been started at that time asking for a speed reduction. It is a documented fact that accidents at 30 mph were rarely fatal whereas at 40 mph they were much more likely to be fatal and the fact that 94% of the respondents to this consultation were in favour of this change indicated the strength of local support. The number of dwellings on this road had increased by at least 250 in the last eight years as well as the Kimmeridge Road development of 192 dwellings. Two care homes had also been constructed housing 142 residents and all this new development had changed the feel of the area from rural to suburban and she felt it was now time to reduce the speed limit to 30 mph in line with the fact that the road had street lighting along its entire length. She wholeheartedly supported the proposal and for further consideration to be given to reducing the speed limit on that part of Oxford Road currently remaining at 40mph subject to funding being found.

The Cabinet Member noted the objection by Councillor Susannah Pressel the member for Jericho and Osney who had objected on the grounds that a 20 limit should be introduced rather than 30 although officers had advised in the report that a 20 limit here would not comply with national guidance on setting local speed limits.

She then thanked the presenters for their submissions. Having regard to the information they had presented and the information set out in the report before her the Cabinet member for the Environment confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed 30mph speed limits as advertised and that officers undertake a speed survey on the section of Oxford Road currently remaining at 40mph with a view to seeking a reduction of that limit to 30 mph.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**13/20 WEST OXFORDSHIRE: ASTHALL, CHARLBURY AND MINSTER LOVELL:
PROPOSED STRUCTURAL WEIGHT LIMITS**

(Agenda No. 14)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report presenting responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce structural weight limits at the bridges over the Windrush river at Asthall (with the restriction at Asthall also including a width restriction) and Minster Lovell and an administrative amendment to the existing structural weight limit order at the Evenlode river bridge at Charlbury put forward as a result of a review of structural weight limits required pending maintenance of these bridges. In the case of the bridges across the Windrush river at Asthall and Minster Lovell it was proposed to make permanent the current temporary traffic regulation orders, for which there was a statutory maximum duration of 18 months which was close to expiry. The proposed amendment to the permanent order for the Evenlode river bridge at Charlbury is for administrative purposes to remove any ambiguity in the order in respect of where the weight restriction applied.

She also noted that County Councillor Nick Field-Johnson supported the proposals along with similar support from Councillor Liz Leffman with regard to the bridge at Charlbury.

Jonathon Stowell (Minster Lovell Parish Council) advised that the bridge at Minster Lovell was an 15th century 4 arch structure but was in a bad state. A crack had appeared in the main arch with further damage to the walling on both sides caused by large vehicles too big to use the bridge attempting to take the tight turns and in view of that it was felt locally that an 18 tonne limit was too high and that it was frequently breached by 3 axle vehicles. A lower limit would be more suitable. They were also concerned locally that forthcoming changes to restrictions to the bridge limit in Burford would lead to overspill traffic unless the Minster Lovell bridge was given the same restriction of 7.5 tonnes and therefore the parish council were asking for the limit to be reduced.

Officers confirmed that they were progressing with changes to Burford Bridge along with a 7.5 tonne weight restriction through Minster Lovell commencing at the Asthall Barrow roundabout along Burford Road to Minster Lovell. That was in connection with the new Downs Road roundabout on the A40 and should prevent lorries over 7.5 tonnes accessing minster Lovell except for access. However, signing for that was still some way off.

Mr Stowell sought clarification why an 18 tonne limit was being pursued on the bridge when a 7.5 tonne weight restriction was being imposed on roads.

Officers advised a structural limit would still be required for the time being and that the two issues needed to be kept separate.

The Cabinet Member advised Mr Stowell that she needed to make a decision on this issue today due to the expiry of the temporary restriction but that there was nothing to stop Minster Lovell parish Council from putting an application for a 7.5 tonne weight limit and she further undertook that that should be done as part of Oxfordshire County Council's revenue budget. Therefore having regard to the information in the report and the representations made to her at the meeting the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the structural weight limit and width limit at the bridges over the Windrush river at Asthall and Minster Lovell and an administrative correction to the existing structural weight limit order at the Evenlode river bridge at Charlbury as advertised with the suggestion that Minster Lovell Parish Council submit a separate application for a 7.5 tonne restriction with that consultation funded by Oxfordshire County Council.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

14/20 CARTERTON - B4020 BURFORD ROAD: PROPOSED 40 MPH SPEED LIMIT & EXTENSION OF 30MPH SPEED LIMIT

(Agenda No. 15)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE15) presenting responses received to a statutory consultation to extend the 30mph speed limit on the B4020 Burford Road at the north end of Carterton to reflect adjacent residential development and the construction of a new junction giving access to the development.

Councillor Nick Field-Johnson supported the proposal.

Noting the support of the local member and the Shilton Parish Council the Cabinet Member having regard to the information set out in the report and the representation made to her at the meeting confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed extension of the 30mph speed limit on the B4020 Burford Road at the north end of Carterton as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

Approved

15/20 ALVESCOT - B4020 MAIN ROAD - PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING GIVE WAY LAYOUTS

(Agenda No. 16)

The Cabinet Member considered a report (CMDE16) presenting responses received to a statutory consultation to provide traffic calming give way layouts on the B4020 at

Alvescot put forward by Alvescot Parish Council who have undertaken to fund the project subject to approval being given to proceed with the scheme.

The local member Councillor Ted Fenton had submitted the following comments. Not being an expert in traffic management he felt these things seemed to two drawbacks:

1. Some drivers hurried to get through the ‘chicane’ before they had to wait, increasing the danger.
2. Everyone who had to slow down or stop at one of these was therefore automatically accelerating as they moved through them so even though it was from a slower start or even a standstill they were necessarily getting faster when we would prefer that they were slowing down. Some, of course, took their foot “off the gas” as they reached a reasonable speed but he felt that many didn’t.

He would far prefer to see visible and tactile speed reduction measures such as bright yellow “rumble strips” at the entrance to villages.

Officers advised that the parish council had been advised to do a local informal consultation which they had done and which had received a lot of support. They had suggested alternatives as part of that consultation. Chicanes were generally received favourably and were used throughout the county and seen as being more effective than rumble strips, which had maintenance costs due to wearing out.

Noting the objections which had been on the grounds of necessity but also the strong support for a scheme initiated by the parish council and funded by them following a lot of consultation the Cabinet Member having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to her at the meeting including confirmation that chicanes had proved to be effective when used elsewhere she confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed introduction of traffic calming give way layouts on the B4020 at Alvescot.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

16/20 INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY BOND POLICY
(Agenda No. 17)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE17) outlining the outcome of an update to the council's Security Bond Policy following an internal audit focusing on bonds. The bond audit, published in April 2018, identified where the bond process could be improved and where further guidance was needed to improve the

robustness of the process. The updated Policy outlined clearly when a security bond was needed but also, by assessing the other methods of recovery and enforcement, had reduced the circumstances for when a bond was required whilst still protecting the County Council from financial risk.

Noting that the policy would speed up and clarify the process the Cabinet Member having regard to the information set out in the report confirmed her decision as follows:

to:

- (a) approve the revised Security Bond Policy as summarised in paragraphs 16-21 and attached as Annex 1 to the report CMDE18;
- (b) approve the use of the policy in relation to security bonds secured through section 106 agreements for County Council infrastructure and services.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

Approved

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

- (a) **FIELD**
- (b) **FIELD_TITLE**