

# DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Thursday, 29 July 2021 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 11.42 am

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor Tim Bearder – in the Chair

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillor Mohammad Fadwalla (for Agenda Item 4)  
Councillor Damian Haywood (for Agenda Item 4)

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting

G. Warrington (Law & Governance); Eric Owens (Assistant Director Growth & place), Paul Fermer (Assistant Director Community Operations); S. Rooney (Head of Service Highway Maintenance), A. Kirkwood (Environment & place)

Part of meeting

**Agenda Item**

**Officer Attending**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 4. | N. Barnes, E. Walters & A. Summersbee (Environment & Place) |
| 5. | J. Whiting (Environment & Place)                            |
| 6. | J. Richardson (Environment & Place)                         |
| 7. | M. Wasley (Environment & Place)                             |
| 8. | R. Moore (Environment & Place)                              |
| 9. | M. Francis (Environment & 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.*

## **1/21 DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

(Agenda No. 1)

There were no declarations of interest.

## **2/21 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS**

(Agenda No. 2)

**Councillor Glynis Phillips**

“Traffic problems at the Barton Park junction with the northern bypass continue to give cause for concern.

I quote from the residents WhatsApp:

“an 18 wheeler truck heading for the crossing .... probably did not see the light change to red soon enough. So he pulled a full on emergency stop right in front of me. All his wheels locked up and was just skidding like on ice making a huge loud of tyre smoke. You can still see the brake marks in the road.”

Another resident reported a lorry stopping so far into the intersection that it was blocking the bus lane and the right turn into Barton Park.

The Cabinet Member met with residents on 2nd June and so my question is what progress has been made with installing barriers at the traffic lights and putting speed cameras in the northern bypass and would he consider reducing the speed to 40mph on this stretch of road and installing elevated traffic lights so that oncoming traffic has ample warning that they need to slow down?”

**Response from Cabinet Member for Highways Management**

“Thank you for taking this up with me I know you have been working closely with the community there and that the residents value your contribution. It is a shame that some people have chosen to be confrontational and insulting towards me on social media as this makes dealing with everyone's legitimate concerns more challenging.

Officers are still considering what type of barrier may be suitable, if any, for installation at the crossing. The issue here is that pedestrian barriers would provide very little protection should a vehicle lose control at the crossing and could indeed lead to a more severe injury for someone waiting at the crossing. Any barriers installed would only give those using the crossing a feeling of being safer and are likely to provide little protection in the event of a collision. As you know the council's budget is extremely limited and the small pot that is allocated to road safety must be used where it results in meaningful enhancements rather than just perceptions of increased safety. I have been working closely with the Police who have looked at the speed data and collision stats at the junction. The collision data shows that between 1/1/2015 and 30/4/2021 (76 months), there have been 4 collisions reported. Obviously, we don't want to see any accidents on our roads, but there are significantly more accidents on other routes.

I have asked officers to raise the issue of average speed cameras with the Police as it seems this could be the best system to have a meaningful effect on reducing speeds on the ring road. I am not able to provide any further information on that point at the moment.

There are already high-level signals at the junction, as shown below.



Ultimately it is regrettable that these deficiencies weren't identified at the planning stage because the council taxpayers are now being asked to foot the bill to rectify something the developer should have paid for. We will continue to look at sensible solutions, but we must prioritise our funds and there isn't currently the case for the costly measures requested at this junction.”

### 3/21 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Mazhar Dogar	)
Anthony Cheke	)
Craig Simmons	)
Sadiea Mustafa Awan	)
Claire Ridley	)
Robin Tucker	)
Peter McIntyre	)
Richard Parnham	)
Hannah Worker	)
Ping Low	)
Tom Sinclair - Oxfordshire Liveable Streets	)
Jeannette Lindsey-Clark- Kings Oxford	)
David Maw	)
Jason Mosley	)
Zubair Ahmed	) 4 – Oxford – Divinity Road, St



Sean Wilde	)Road – Traffic Calming
Written representations from Councillor Nathan Ley	9. Abingdon: Larkhill Road – Proposed Waiting Restrictions

**4/21 OXFORD - DIVINITY ROAD, ST MARY'S AND ST CLEMENT'S AREAS: PROPOSED LOW TRAFFIC NEIGHBOURHOODS AND QUIETWAYS**

(Agenda No. 4)

The Cabinet Member for Highways Management considered (CMDHM4) the results of a pre-statutory consultation for a proposal to introduce a Low Traffic Neighbourhood scheme in East Oxford covering the areas of Divinity Road, St Mary's and St Clement's and including key findings on which areas and filters were more widely supported or objected to and by which user group.

Prior to the public presentations the Cabinet Member read out the following statement:

“Doubts have been raised as to whether decisions with regard to LTNs are able to be made by an individual Cabinet Member at a delegated decision meeting or by the full Cabinet on the grounds that as the LTN crosses multiple cabinet competencies. Those doubts have been raised under Part 4.4 of the Oxfordshire County Council Constitution (Cabinet Delegated Decisions).

That section read: “In the event of a difference of view arising on what constitutes a “material departure” or “major implication”, the Leader of the Council will, if the question cannot be resolved by other means, determine whether or not reference should be made to the full Cabinet...”

He then confirmed that there had been no difference of view as the context here was the difference of view between Cabinet members, not between any other parties. As such there was and had been no discussion about whether the matter should be referred to the Full Cabinet and it would be the Head of Paid Service (i.e. Chief Executive) who would liaise with the Leader of the Council over such an issue. There was no suggestion in paragraph 4.4 that it would be a routine matter for there to be such disagreement as it simply provided a mechanism for resolving any such intra-Cabinet disagreement.

This matter had featured in the first Forward Plan after the formation of the new Cabinet, quite clearly marked as a single delegated decision and the Cabinet Member confirmed that no discussions had taken place between the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive for any requirement for this process to change and to be considered by full Cabinet and that this issue had always been intended as a delegated decision as evidenced by the Forward Plan history. It was not considered that this was a decision that had major implications for more than one portfolio, although it had been recognised that like many decisions it would have effects on other portfolio areas.

Mazhar Dogar spoke both as a lifelong resident of Oxford and on behalf of the Cowley Traders Association. LTNs had proved to be the most divisive and contentious issue he had experienced and a recent consultation of over 200 businesses many of whom were independent traders showed an overwhelming number opposing the LTN proposals. Those businesses had over the last 18 months faced huge problems and continued to do so. They needed support and assurances from the County Council but instead had been ignored from day one of this process with little or no consultation or involvement in its design planning. They were vitally important to the community providing employment and vibrancy to the community as well as financial support through business rates. Going forward they needed support and involvement as integral stakeholders in the design of a comprehensive revised LTN scheme. They all recognised the climate change emergency and wanted to play their part in addressing that but for that to happen there needed to be full integration and he urged that everyone work together because 'team work made the dream work'.

Anthony Cheke advised that in 1985 when Oxford City Council still had some traffic powers, although ultimate decisions still resided with the County Council, and prompted primarily by activists in the Divinity Road Residents Association, the City planned a year's experiment closing all the roads north of Cowley Road to prevent 'rat-running' through traffic. The County Council, then unsupportive of the idea, forced a reduction to 3 months. The closures, physical gates with padlocks, were installed on 1 January 1985 and removed at the end of March. He had lived in East Oxford since buying a house in Hurst Street in 1979 and since 1985 he and his wife had run a bookshop at 34 Cowley Road near The Plain. To him the present LTN plans for East Oxford seem scarily like Groundhog Day and despite ample advance warnings of traffic chaos, the experiment went ahead and by mid-January there were complaints in the press about traffic congestion at the Plain and longer journey times. Traffic was solid for much of the day outside their Cowley Road shop and discouraging customers from coming to East Oxford. Hollow Way was the other main pinch point for congestion. While petitions in favour were collected from cyclists, there were much larger protests against the scheme expressed through public meetings, cars hooting if they wanted roads re-opened with eventually an 'open our roads' candidate standing at the local elections. The County Council then decided, given the traffic chaos, that road closures were not the way forward, but that traffic calming measures could be introduced. Hence the speed humps in Magdalen Road and Howard Street and chicanes in Divinity Road. Traffic did not 'evaporate' in the 1985 experiment but was simply displaced onto roads that were still open. The official report concluded "the amount of traffic in the city as a whole remained unchanged" but transferred to The Plain, Hollow Way and the ring road. Disruption extended well beyond East Oxford and increased traffic was most noticeable along Banbury and Woodstock Roads, Rose Hill and the eastern and southern parts of the ring road. The present plans close more than twice as many roads as in 1985, so the resulting gridlock, inconvenience, wasted time, extra pollution and misery for residents in radial roads will be even worse. This is inevitable, predictable, with ample past evidence to prove it so there is no need for the 'experiment' as it has already been done. He appealed to the new administration running the county council to cancel these LTNs before more of Oxford was driven crazy while going about their normal business.

Craig Simmons limited his comments to the St Mary's element of the LTN having lived there for 20 years. All the concerns expressed in the report had also been raised during the informal consultation carried out by local councillors and residents and centred on 4 issues but were based on a misunderstanding of the scheme design. The 4 issues raised were the Circus Street filter which had been located where there was adequate turning space, the James Street filter SM5 did not reduce parking spaces, the suggestion to improve access to Silver Road by moving the SM9 filter to Essex Street would break the scheme by allowing traffic to flow between Iffley Road and Cowley Road and with regard to Howard Street different SM10 options had been explored but with only 2 viable locations. School access was a red herring. There would be challenges but delaying the trial for more consultation would achieve nothing and issues coordinated by the anti Cowley LTN scheme should not be allowed to affect the east Oxford scheme which should be progressed with no further trial or delay.

The Cabinet Member thanked Craig Simmons and other councillors for their work on this and hoped that their input would continue.

Submissions were then received from speakers attending the meeting virtually.

Sadiea Mustafa Awan referred to the following recent statement put out by Oxfordshire County Council

*"Oxfordshire County Council respects the rights of residents and organisations and welcomes the views of all to be submitted on the proposals for the LTNs ... Feedback is vital so that any decision taken is based on a rigorous assessment of the needs and opinions of the community."*

This entire consultation process had been marketed digitally with the County Council encouraging residents to respond online. However, Oxford with the highest ethnic minority population in the South East outside of London and who were predominantly low income and working class families with limited, or no access to equipment or the internet were, as a result, even if advertently, being disenfranchised by this process. That also applied to many others from disabled, elderly and vulnerable groups who also lived in Oxford. She had not seen any steps being taken by Councillors to level this up and as a result the consultation and the LTN scheme was a form of socio-economic discrimination and also a form of institutional racism. The County Council was we are told led by a progressive alliance but what was progressive about disenfranchising these groups? You might argue the ends justified the means but an injustice was an injustice! The County Council needed to engage with the community and it was incumbent upon all in the organisation to level up before any decision was made. At the moment residents were being pitted against resident and area against area and the County Council needed to take steps to unify the community and help to heal those divisions. The County Council was between a rock and hard place because if it made a decision now, one side would feel let down and so it needed to come up with a solution that worked for the many and not the few. This would only happen by having meaningful conversations with all who lived in the community. Residents needed to feel seen, heard and listened to and to achieve real, lasting and sustainable change with decision making needed to be from the bottom up and not top down. She asked for consultation with the community for a revised which could

then go out for full and meaningful consultation to include all sections of the community.

Claire Ridley spoke on behalf of the Divinity Road Area Residents' Association (DRARA) which represented around 600 households on 6 streets off the Cowley Road. She pointed out that traffic was their number one problem and with narrow streets, largely passable only in one direction, they were forced to live in Oxford's biggest traffic sewer suffering daily with the effects that was having on their lives and physical and mental health. The urgent scale of this problem was reinforced by the Council's traffic survey in 2019 which showed 6,000 cars, vans, even HGV's used Divinity Road on an average working day! There was massive support across their streets for an LTN and a recent community resident survey showed that 83% of the 439 respondents had supported a trial LTN, a result which had been mirrored in the Council consultation, where 62% of residents from the wider Divinity Road Area had indicated strong support. The fact that some who lived outside the neighbourhood had objected had been entirely predictable and proved that their residential roads were being used as an inner ring road and that needed to be urgently addressed. It was strategically vital to act with neighbours across East Oxford and collaborate to build a better future. Those who supported LTNs knew that despite personal inconvenience the ways in which we travelled needed to adapt and there was huge support for the Active Travel and Connecting Oxford programmes to become a reality and for the County Council to have the confidence to actually deliver a vision for transport into and around Oxford city and urged that this opportunity should not be lost and these bold but wholly necessary proposals that were already County Council policy be followed through.

Chloe Clark advised that she lived very close to the proposed East Oxford scheme and the only way in and out of her home was via Marsh Road, onto Oxford Road. As a motability car user, which had helped her to get back on the road again, she had become more independent and was now able to transport her children to school/nursery/activities. However, since the LTN schemes had been introduced in Cowley, displaced traffic on the arterial roads had caused her journeys to increase in time/duration and while she needed to be on the road, she did not need the added stress/burden of fighting through Cowley traffic to get anywhere. She was concerned that if the proposed schemes went ahead, this would cause even more traffic displacement and congestion locally having experienced issues from the Cowley schemes since day one. The LTN schemes were not flexible or accessible enough to meet the needs of disabled motorists and we should not have to bear the brunt of the effects of experiments. Disabled people had no choice but to drive. She attended the recent demonstration on Cowley Road to voice her opposition to the schemes and afterwards in a BBC News clip, people who had attended that were referred to as "certain aspects of the community" by the Cabinet Member and she had found that extremely disrespectful as had many others coming across as their travel needs were an inconvenience to the plan and aspects to be dismissed as collateral damage. Disabled people should not have to wait for large scale evaporation or hope for modal shift just so they could go about their lives again and punishing some of the most vulnerable people in society was not acceptable.

The Cabinet Member apologised to Ms Clark if she'd found his remarks offensive and assured her that that had not been his intention.



Aijaz Ali a resident of Hollow Way had lived in Oxford all his life and for the last ten years had been a taxi driver, which was now proving to be very difficult due to the placement of LTNs in his neighbourhood and surrounding areas. There had been increased levels of pollution on his street which had meant he and his family could no longer leave windows onto the street open as the toxicity levels were extremely high. He did not consider that LTNs had solved anything but just moved pollution from somebody else's street to theirs with increased levels of traffic throughout low traffic neighbourhood areas and, therefore, he was totally against the scheme.

Robin Tucker speaking as Chair of Oxfordshire Cycling Network explained that the problem with our cars is that we had forgotten about their impact on others, as we journeyed to work, shops and schools. Their convenience and intimidation caused much of 100,000 UK deaths from physical inactivity each year. Causing air pollution accounted for another 30,000 deaths and the last time we had seen deaths on that scale, the whole country had been locked down. Everyone sought their own favoured journey but society as a whole suffered and was what economists called a 'tragedy of the commons'. One car was not so bad, but thousands a day added up to oppression and illness. He accepted that he had rat-run down Magdalen Road and sat in jams on Cowley Road, cursing the traffic when he was the traffic. How could we escape a problem like this? In the May local council elections, at least 130,000 voters (over 60%) voted for candidates who supported the CoHSAT policy to reduce car dependency in existing and new developments and 39 of those candidates were elected. Going against our psychology to think of our individual short-term needs, rather than society's long-term needs meant that the introduction of LTNs was never going to be easy. Everyone agreed that the main roads were still too busy and if that traffic were reduced then buses and disabled use cars could get around quickly with less people getting ill. There were enormous social benefits to be gained as evidenced by the Cowley LTNs from quieter, safer streets, where people of all ages and abilities could now walk, wheel, cycle, meet and play.

Peter McIntyre advised that St Mary's where he lived showed the strongest negative balance of the three areas with voting against the low traffic neighbourhood schemes clear and that needed to be respected. People around the zone could not be excluded as they would be the most affected from displaced pollution. That did not mean giving up on making roads safer and reducing emissions and he invited the council to search for consensus, involving residents and those who used the roads and he proposed a "slow traffic neighbourhood" for St Mary's with other interested areas explored and costed as an alternative. A slow traffic neighbourhood aimed to reduce speed, increase safety, encourage cycling and walking and reduce harmful emissions and was based on a code of practice agreed between community residents, local authorities, police, and road users, especially those who drive for a living. The aim of the code was to change behaviour and make life safer for pedestrians and cyclists by agreeing practices binding on all road users. The central right in this social contract was to use the roads with the central obligation being to use them safely and treat each other with care and consideration. The code would be drawn up by the council(s), community representatives including councillors, police officers, professional drivers (delivery firms, taxi drivers, building trade skilled workers, etc) and cycling groups with consultation through public meetings, group meetings and on-line. What was different in the slow traffic neighbourhood?

- The 20mph speed limit became a priority for local policing (supported by cameras) with zero tolerance for speeding or aggressive behaviour.
- Pedestrians had right of way at crossing points, including at raised 'humps' in the road, with appropriate signage and road surfacing.
- Cyclists had right of way on internal roads with a requirement for cars and vans to slow down for cyclists, giving room to pass and not to overtake on the narrow roads.
- Residents and businesses that regularly worked in or passed through the area would sign up to the code to drive safely and with consideration with a voice in agreeing the content of the code.
- The slow traffic neighbourhood was clearly badged at all entrance roads and large 20mph limit signs on the surface of the roads and with raised crossing points at all entrances.

The advantages of a slow traffic neighbourhood were that:

- It focussed on driver behaviour and courtesy
- It supported and encouraged cycling and walking and careful, considerate drivers.
- It worked through collaboration.
- Through-routes remained open and accessible to those who used them safely.
- The rules were the same for everyone and did not provide unbalanced privileges or set one road user against another.
- It reduced pollution inside the area and did not increase pollution outside it.
- It encouraged citizens to play an active role in education and enforcement.

Richard Parnham explained that his submission to the meeting did not make an argument about the merits of the planned East Oxford LTNs but rather was requesting that no formal decision regarding LTNs should be made at this meeting – unless and until Oxfordshire County Council's (OCC) monitoring officer/legal team had concluded that the Cabinet Member for the Highways Management actually had the power to make such a decision under a) the OCC constitution and b) general principles of public law. The basis of his request had been based on part 4.4 of the Oxfordshire County Council constitution, Delegated Decisions by Individual Cabinet Members Standing Delegation. According to that the default position was that "Each member of the Cabinet has a general authority to take decisions within her/his given portfolio". However, there was an exception to that position under paragraph "c" of the OCC constitution referring to: "decisions with major implications for more than one portfolio" should normally "fall to the full Cabinet". He maintained that any LTN decision fell within this "full cabinet" decision-making requirement, because LTNs appeared to have a potentially major impact on multiple OCC cabinet roles including Children, Education and Young People's Services, Community Services and Safety, Climate Change Delivery and Environment, Travel and Development Strategy, Member for Adult Social Care and Public Health and Equalities.

He was aware that Part 4.4 of the OCC constitution gave the OCC leader a discretion to decide what amounted to "major implication" after "taking account of the advice of the County Director". He had requested a copy of any such advice via a freedom of information request. However, any decision reached by the leader of the county council after taking the advice of the County Director on this point must be rational/reasonable and making the East Oxford LTN decision a full cabinet decision

was an obvious way to make a rational and reasonable policy decision regarding LTNs, because it allowed multiple affected cabinet members to take part in the decision. Nothing in his interpretation of the OCC constitution would prevent the Cabinet Member for Highways Management leading the delivery of any LTN that had been approved by the full cabinet but delivery of an LTN was arguably a separate issue from the approval of the LTN policy itself, which he argued should only be made by the full cabinet.

Hannah Worker advised that the County Council seemed to believe that the streets were not predominantly being used by residents but as cut throughs and, therefore, blocking them was necessary and she asked had there been any reports or investigations to evidence that statement? In her time living in the area she had witnessed very quiet and safe streets other than on a very few occasions at the very peak rush hour (when local residents were driving to and from work) and the only problems with traffic that she had encountered had been on Cowley and Iffley roads and not on the roads proposed to be blocked off. Had there been any assessment of the impact the road blockages would have on traffic flow on the main roads which were already highly congested and forcing local residents to only be able to access other parts of the city by driving up to the joining roundabout (the Plain) which would, in her opinion, only increase congestion and pollution levels and did the county council have any evidence to suggest this would not be the case? Increased congestion would impact a huge number of people and businesses and it would be negligent if the county council had not properly assessed that impact. The consultation process had been deeply flawed with the online consultation form using very leading questions and quoting Question 6 "Thinking of the east Oxford LTN local area, which of the following are priorities for you?" by way of example she felt that at no point had the questions asked if participants believed that LTN plans would deliver on these priorities. Therefore, she considered the questions redundant and inferred that the county council had already decided on the communities perceived priorities by proposing the LTN and, therefore, the questions merely attempted to validate the plans and not gain useful information from the community. The online form, at no point gave any acknowledgment that traveling by car was a necessity for many who had no choice but to drive for work, collect children or access affordable food shopping. Personally, the proposed road blockages would increase her journey to work from 2miles (10mins) to 4miles (30mins). She already cycled as much as she could but her car was vital for her job and road blockages would not remove the fact that her car was a necessity for both work and affordable food shopping. Throughout the questionnaire there had been insufficient space to detail concerns and adequately describe 'other reasons'. No public meetings had been held and so those not comfortable using computers had not been able to contribute their opinions on the plans. Also, insufficient time had been given to respond and she had only been informed by a Council leaflet four days before the consultation came to a close. Similarly, there had been insufficient notice given for those wishing to speak at this meeting. All of this invalidated the consultation as the whole community had not been given a fair opportunity to voice their opinions and it appeared to her that the county council had not undertaken due diligence in informing local residents but had been trying to receive as little feedback from the community as possible.

Ping Low spoke on behalf of the staff and customers of the Goldfish Bowl, an independent family run business on Magdalen Road for over 50 years and, like most businesses, who had already suffered a lower footfall due to the pandemic and the introduction of controlled parking some 18 months ago on Magdalen Road. There were approximately 60-80 businesses along Magdalen Road which were not just bricks and mortar buildings but provided a service. Aside from The Goldfish Bowl, she listed Thai, Tibetan and Vegan eateries, an organic food shop, community focused pubs, Pegasus theatre, coffee roastery, a Buddhist centre, Samaritans, Silvesters and, of course, all the Asian corner shops that were there for all during the pandemic when the large supermarkets had fallen short of goods on their shelves. All these businesses served to support the diversity and contribute culturally to the local community and visitors to the area. The proposed LTN with the inevitable traffic congestions and longer travelling times would deter and even stop customers visiting the area and so without paying customers businesses that relied on people from outside the area visiting them would be unable to carry on. That was the reason why, at the consultation, 60% of people living outside the area objected fiercely to the proposals. It was not just deliveries that concerned local businesses but the negative impact on footfall affecting our livelihoods and jobs. For their business 99.9% of their customers needed to come by car in order to transport water and livestock. They had seen from the plans that Magdalen Road might have two-way traffic which would be catastrophic as the road was not wide enough to accommodate parked cars and two-way traffic. Currently brewery lorries and fresh meat and other delivery trucks often blocked access when delivering. They had also been informed that the school headmistress could stop traffic on Hertford Street during school opening and closing times and as there was no other alternative access route, businesses along Magdalen Road would effectively have business interrupted during those times. She requested that the views of the business community be heard and acted upon.

Tom Sinclair for Oxfordshire Liveable Streets advised that even though the consultation showed a majority of residents in favour of LTNs the Council should proceed carefully and not be swayed by the views of people whose only contribution to the relevant areas was to drive through them. No one would be stopped from driving to any address by LTNs and traffic on peripheral roads around LTNs would not necessarily go up and indeed it sometimes went down. Disabled people were not all disadvantaged by LTNs with many people with disabilities greatly advantaged by safe roads and clean air. Business owners massively overestimated the numbers of customers driving to them and people on foot and bike in fact come more often and spend more in the long run. As car ownership in LTNs drops, even taxi drivers can expect to profit. LTNs were an astonishingly effective intervention with road injuries, violent crime and air pollution declining steeply. Small businesses flourished and social connections between neighbours increased as traffic diminished. People responded to incentives and LTNs created those incentives to spend more time outside the hermetically sealed bubble of a car. More people and fewer cars on the streets encouraged more foot traffic, more contact with neighbours, more active travel, which in turn encouraged yet more people into the streets. For these benefits to be realised, it would not simply mean dropping a few planters and then leave it to others to defend them, the County Council needed to lead by investing, gathering evidence and communicating the benefits and not conceding the narrative to an angry minority urged on by newspapers stoking controversy. The County Council must embed LTNs in a wider network of safe, direct routes for people on foot and

bicycle, so that these became the default way to get around within the city. Cars on UK's roads since the 1950s had risen from 4 million to 34 million with numbers still climbing, partly because the more there were, the less suitable roads became for any other use. Streets today and even pavements were treated chiefly as publicly funded car parks, where once they were places in which children played and communities built. Conversely many people now only ever glimpse their neighbours as they scuttle to their cars and drive off and you can't build community in an out-of-town shopping centre. At a time when the disastrous costs of air pollution, childhood inactivity and road noise have become utterly unignorable and when the council is a long way behind on its targets for reducing transport emissions, Oxfordshire voted for courageous politicians to lead from the front rather than cower before the rage of a small minority who think that any inconvenience whatsoever to a motorist is an undemocratic affront and now was the time to live up to the challenge.

Jeannette Lindsey-Clark spoke on behalf of Kings Oxford and its staff who felt that by putting more traffic onto the boundary roads, which were often already quite narrow placed an increased burden on those residential streets where many people lived. LTNs also led to idling traffic when there were roadworks or accidents as no one could divert via a side road creating long delays for drivers and making the situation worse for the health of people living on the boundary roads. Some of their students and staff also travelled in by bus which were also then delayed. A number of staff walked or cycled and had had no problem doing so before the LTNs as traffic in the LTNs was minimal. However, as the traffic on Cowley road had now increased with part or most of their journey on the Cowley road, the pollution was worse for them for most of their journey. Shops and restaurants were on the Cowley road and staff and students had always walked to them but now that walk was more polluted. Student and staff walk/cycle or take buses between our Cowley and city centre sites and now that journey along the Cowley road was often slower and more polluted. There were no direct public transport links to Cowley for many staff, so they had to go into the city centre and back out with many living in areas such as Aylesbury, Swindon and villages around Farringdon where transport links were poor and a public transport option would turn their journeys into 90 minutes or more for trips each way. Property in Oxford was expensive so people had no choice but to live in other areas and commute. They also had a few workers with disabilities, who, although they did in fact live locally, had no choice but to use a car. Kings generated income as an employer and for local families in terms of homestay with students spending money in the local economy around Cowley. It was felt by many that the LTNs did not seem to be a genuine attempt to do something about pollution in Oxford but appeared to be tokenistic and making life harder for those who had to drive in the area and rather than working towards creating a fairer and more equal society it was creating further inequalities. None of their staff had responded to say they were in favour of the LTNs but accepted that that did not necessarily mean there was no support. Kings also had a city centre site and teachers who could easily cycle or walk in or take trains, worked at that site. Those who don't have that option and needed to drive tended to work at the Cowley site. She added that City centre staff had no issues with the introduction of the zero emission zones in the city centre in terms of our school, students and staff.

David Maw a resident of the St Mary's area addressed his comments solely to the proposals for that area. He welcomed the notes of caution in the officer report as whatever the intended gains might be from an LTN, the current proposal for the St Mary's area was brutal, cutting the area in half and a simple journey say from Silver Road to the Redbridge Recycling Centre would more than double in length, requiring a route via The Plain or Between Towns Road. It was unclear, though, whether there was really a problem in the St Mary's area as since the introduction of the CPZ, there had been noticeably lower traffic volumes and whilst there was a build-up of traffic in Howard Street at peak times, that was short-lived and most of the time the area was quiet. Peak-hour traffic, though annoying, was not a justification for cutting the area in half. The main problem was not car use but car ownership as the roads were lined with an overabundance of parked vehicles and so ways needed to be found to disincentivise car ownership by making the alternatives more practical, efficient and economical and not by making car use intolerable. Some people were necessarily reliant on cars and most people were confronted with occasions when some car use was unavoidable and necessary journeys needed to be short and efficient. There were two ideas in the report that were concerning. Firstly that 'it is not possible to assess the impact of LTNs without trialling' but the idea that significant changes of the sort proposed could be entertained without modelling any consequences was alarming. Surely some modelling should have been possible from careful study of road use over a period but if none was possible he felt that called the whole approach into question. Secondly 'LTNs were a steppingstone towards behavioural change' suggesting that it was considered acceptable to use the daily lives of residents as material for a sort of social experiment without specifically eliciting their consent. He was so far unpersuaded that an LTN scheme would be beneficial in the St Mary's area and any revised proposal would need to be fundamentally different from the current one.

Jason Mosley a resident in Rose Hill had a strong interest in the success of the LTNs in East Oxford. He and his family had already benefitted from the Cowley LTNs and hoped to see similar gains from the expansion of this approach to other parts of the city. Their interest and support for the LTNs was from both a family perspective but also from a community standpoint. From a family perspective, they had already experienced improvements to their lives from the Cowley LTNs. His 13 year old attended Oxford Spires Academy and cycled through the Florence Park and Temple Cowley LTNs daily to reach school. His 10 year old daughter was a member of Oxford City Swim Club and they cycled together through Littlemore to practice or for competitions in the Leys Leisure Centre & Pool and he had noticed dramatic improvements in safety for cycling with children through these areas. However, as the lockdown conditions changed and traffic levels increased so had the danger posed by traffic to children cycling through residential streets. This related to the East Oxford LTNs as important community infrastructure such as schools, parks, shops and leisure/athletic facilities were located in and around East Oxford. They also cycled to the Oxford Brookes Climbing Centre, which required using Divinity Road and Southfield Road -- narrow residential roads with high levels of traffic, including taxis and delivery vans often driving aggressively between pinch points -- as well as Magdalen Road - a daunting and polluted route. His son attended events at the Gameskeeper shop on Cowley Road with friends and because of rat-running traffic on James Street, Bullingdon Road, St Mary's and Hurst Street he needed to run a gauntlet from the relatively quiet Meadow Lane to reach his destination. He believed

these experiences had wider implications as their children became older as the social and community infrastructure they wanted to access was increasingly located in places such as East Oxford and Cowley and as parents, they wanted to be able to allow their children more independence in relatively safe urban conditions. Significantly reducing through traffic on residential streets opened up important possibilities for children to socialise and exercise that independence. They strongly supported the LTNs and hoped the County Council would work to see them effectively implemented for the widest benefit along with the necessary complementary measures -- such as the Connecting Oxford agenda and School Streets to reduce traffic volumes and pollution across Oxford city.

Zubair Ahmed a resident of Littlemore spoke against LTNs. He understood the need for change and to reduce pollution levels in the City but did not believe closing off neighbourhoods and diverting traffic to already congested roads was the solution. He had heard many points of view and spoken to individuals on both sides of the debate and although the number of individuals in support of the current LTN proposal was substantially smaller than the number of individuals against it, they had a much greater influence on the decision makers and, therefore, he believed that LTNs would go ahead (whether in this format or another) with the majority that had objected being ignored. He had come to this conclusion as OCC had previously stated that they would listen to all individuals that were affected but had made it clear they were not happy with the results of the recent informal consultation and arguing that 'most residents want it' ignoring the overall result of the informal consultation. He believed LTNs were a very selfish approach by those who lived within them to make others in the surrounding area suffer with increased congestion and pollution and had obtained misleading data to support the view that they 'worked'. 'Active Travel should not divide communities the way it had but should be prioritised to unite instead. The proposed LTNs had been based on hypothetical scenarios or opinions and not facts and as OCC had said they wished to work on facts, this made it impossible to authorise the proposed LTNs as the facts regarding the benefits of whether LTNs were beneficial to the greater cause were not available. No data had been produced with regard to pollution rates in the current areas or for those areas where displaced traffic would go so without that data prior to installation of any LTN, the post LTN would be misleading and inaccurate. He believed the supporting group were out of touch with large portions of their community and were only listening to the opinions of those within their own circle. He understood Oxford had the worst pollution levels outside London but the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 website stated that Oxfordshire consistently ranked high for quality of life and remained the most rural county in the South-East so how was it possible for Oxfordshire to be consistently ranked so highly in that regard while Oxford was considered worst for pollution in England? He understood that the ETRO could be implemented without public consultation but for a council that had said they wanted to listen to all those affected by the proposed LTN but then not listen to those individuals who were not in support would be wholly irresponsible. The majority of people that responded to the informal consultation did not want LTNs in Oxford and he supported the majority in this case and not the privileged minority.

County Councillor Mohammed Fadwalla set out comments with regard to the Anti-LTN and Pro-LTN lobbies. *Anti-LTN* - Presenting LTNs as a health benefit for the poor who lived outside the area took no account of carers, elderly people, those with

disabilities and those with young families Taxi and private hire drivers and delivery drivers who were key workers in the city and them getting no exemption meant they would be disadvantaged financially by added journey time. The Muslim community had four mosques in east Oxford which were attended by thousands of people and not everyone could easily take to two wheels or manage a long walk. Residents also had to travel considerably further for medical care and shopping. Many east Oxford residents were among the lowest-paid in the city who were often working more than one job and spending longer accessing basic resources and there was research evidence linking financial poverty with time. with residents inside the LTNs already close to the limit of their resources. When comparing Oxford with LTNs in other cities we needed to recognise the better public transport infrastructure that those places enjoyed. He asked for more consultation with business and religious groups and schools to improve their understanding of LTNs, the bigger picture and the evidence from other parts of the country implementing LTNs. St Clements and Morrell Avenue needed to be included in that consultation too. He was also concerned over the impact on vehicle movements and air pollution on St Clements, Cowley Road, Iffley Road Hollow Way, Morrell Avenue, Church Cowley Road, Henley Avenue and Oxford Road. *Pro –LTN* - given the level of support for the trial LTNs from residents – what more was needed to implement a democratically chosen option? What was the Council doing to ensure LTNs were implemented and sustainable and within what timeframe and was funding available to achieve that.

County Councillor Damian Haywood considered that as 90% of votes cast at the recent local elections were for candidates who had stood on a platform for LTNs there was a clear and definite mandate to proceed. He had knocked on every door in his division with very few against the scheme. He then referred to the following issues in support of LTNs:

Traffic and car harm – nationally in 2019 1750 people had been killed as a result of collisions with 26,000 seriously injured.

Air pollution - traffic was a major contributor to air pollution with an estimated cause of death of 28,600 in the UK annually with traffic noise also contributing to other health issues. Car travel dominated service transport emissions by 61% and making cars electric would not be enough as car use needed to be cut overall by 34%. LTNs were a clear option to do that. In 2019 7% of car journeys had been under a mile with a further 17% between 1 and 2 miles. That needed to change and would require bold action not only as individuals but through to county, regional, national and international action before it was too late. Many of the lowest income households had higher levels of non-car ownership with 40% having no access to a car. Car ownership was more unaffordable for many groups so it was imperative to invest in public transport and provide safer cycle and walking routes as alternatives to benefit those groups.

Safer spaces - vehicles on minor roads were responsible for more pedestrian casualties than vehicles on major routes. LTNs could reduce those figures.

8 in 10 children failed to amass one-hour daily movements to prime young cardiovascular systems and bone density. Ill health from non-activity accounted for 1 in 6 deaths in the UK and 5 million globally.



Society urgently needed to transition to a healthy and more sustainable mode of transport and while he recognised that many people needed to use cars we needed to be brave to avert the environmental crisis facing us. LTNs were a start and he urged that the Cabinet Member proceed.

The following representations were from members of the public who had submitted copies of their presentations beforehand and had been due to attend and speak but had been unable to do so due to connection problems:

“Aijaz Ali a resident of Hollow Way, Oxford who for the last ten years had been a taxi driver. That had proved very difficult recently due to the placement of LTNs in his neighbourhood and surrounding areas. Also increased levels of pollution on his street meant his family could no longer leave windows open onto the street because toxicity levels were extremely high. He did not accept that LTNs had solved anything but just moved pollution from somebody else’s street to theirs and causing increased levels of traffic throughout such low traffic neighbourhood areas and so he totally opposed to the scheme.”

“Hugh Goodwin was a director of LVR Homes with a head office in Iffley Road. He was also a Blue Badge holder who frequently parked his car in Temple Street and some years ago had been a Councillor with responsibilities for all highway matters for a city much the same size as Oxford and so was fully aware of the problems facing the County Council. They had overcome most of the problem by having single entry streets alternating in each direction and by allowing partial car parking on pavements. The St Mary’s LTN was much more drastic and would lead to a tremendous grid lock because the Plain junction originally designed in 1950 would not be able to handle the peak traffic flows without causing a huge backing up of cars and buses in Iffley & Cowley Roads. He restricted his comments to Temple Street although they could apply to several other roads in the area. That street currently had 24 parking spaces on the west side and 15 on the east plus 3 doctor spaces and 3 disabled spaces – a total of 45 which were usually fully occupied which made it impossible to turn around. There was a doctors’ surgery and a dentist on the east side and a church on the west. Elderly people were often brought to these venues by taxi or a carer who then waited for them or arranged to return shortly to take them home. However, if the Cowley Road end was closed off as is being proposed then the only way out for any of the 45 vehicles parked there or dropping off would be to reverse back into Iffley Rd as there was no turning head in Temple Street or indeed any of the other roads that you are proposing to partially close. It appeared to him that this scheme had been designed by people who were predominately cyclists and that one of the intended consequences was to force residents to abandon their cars and cycle instead but in his view that just wouldn’t happen. There were already many elderly residents in this area who would never take to a bike and others like himself travelled extensively around the area and beyond. He suggested:-

- 1) That the Plain junction needed to be traffic light controlled at peak times such that Iffley & Cowley road traffic could move more freely so reducing the need for ‘rat runs’.
- 2) Temple St (and possibly others) should be one way with entry only from the Iffley Rd end.”

Written representations were received from the following:

Ingrid Skilbeck raised issues as an emergency responder for her mother and highlighted added delays for her journeys, congestion on Divinity and Southfield Roads, health impacts for Cowley Road residents from increased traffic and access for delivery vans which had increased.

Ivon Asquith supported the comments submitted by DRARA and the implementation of traffic filters to make roads safer for walking and cycling with less pollution and noise and long-term benefits for personal health and the environment.

Rosemary Pocock raised issues of access for disabled people and carers visiting them as a result of the LTNs. She accepted the benefits for able bodied people but many disabled would be directly affected. She also raised issues of access to public transport.

Dr Daniel Emlyn-Jones supporting LTNs but in favour of Option A as that presented a more nuanced process to preserve neighbourhoods rather than promote substantial wholesale change if even only for a trial period.

Sally Pinnington objected to further LTNs in Oxford. More thought needed to be given to avoid discriminating against those residents unable to walk or cycle, pollution in the peripheral areas which had not been monitored, access for carers and emergency services and effects on local businesses.

Emma Lawrence-Jones in support of the LTN scheme on grounds of increased safety and less pollution. She felt there would be dramatic improvements and hoped that the scheme would progress.

Hester Crombie on behalf of Comper School in support of the scheme to reduce pollution and traffic around the school. Some concern though regarding the proposed quiet route along Hertford Street which might lead to increased levels of commercial vehicles back to Iffley Road and Magdalen Road.

Dr Rebecca Klaus objecting to the scheme which she considered had been poorly thought through and would just create more pressure on streets on the Iffley Road side of the St Mary's ward. Maps relating to the scheme had been difficult to understand coupled with a lack of clarity regarding the impact of the LTN on business in the area.

Christopher Morgan opposing the trial because the scheme on Divinity Road was not what had originally been agreed and he considered a better option would be an invisible gate at the top of Divinity Road at the junction with Warneford Road or just a no entry sign.

Dr Rebecca Miles on behalf of the Hilltop Community Traffic Working Group who would have been in favour of properly thought through and coordinated initiatives across the whole of Oxford. They did not support solutions which simply pushed the

problems from one set of streets to another and a worsening of traffic levels along the Cowley Road,

City Councillor Jemima Hunt sought clarification as to the County Council's plans were for a rapid roll out of LTNs to offset the speed at which climate change was accelerating and ensure Oxford was falling in line with other UK cities who had successfully implemented LTN schemes.

The Cabinet Member confirmed that he had received full transcripts of all the written submissions which had been available to him on the day. He thanked everyone who had spoken at the meeting and those who had sent in written comments along with all who had taken part in the debate either through the consultation stages or by direct representation to him via email and in writing. He had listened carefully and appreciated the tone and manner of the discussions from the vast majority but added that social media wasn't the best forum to debate such a polarized issue so he had not engaged via that format. Similarly press reports had offered a contradictory stance. Therefore, having regard to that background he wanted to outline very clearly what the stated aim of the new administration at the County Council was with regard to this matter: which was "To create a transport network that makes active travel the first choice for short journeys and invests in public transport to significantly reduce our reliance on car journeys. In areas of planned housing growth, prioritise active and public transport over road capacity for cars and accelerate our support for communities in implementing 20mph zones."

He outlined three reasons for this which included a massive underestimation of climate change delivery and the need to do things differently and urgently. Secondly research had found that road injuries had halved in low-traffic neighbourhoods installed during the coronavirus pandemic when compared against areas without the schemes. Also, safer, less polluted, quieter streets were what residents in the proposed areas overwhelmingly seemed to want as had been borne out by the consultation and the local election results in May. Finally, roads were expensive as had been illustrated by the previous Conservative administration who had borrowed £80m and had been subsidising the money the Government had given in order to maintain the road network to the tune of roughly £15m a year. That money would run out in 2024 which left the County Council with the choice of borrowing more with cuts then necessary to essential services in order to service this ever-increasing mound of debt or taking some difficult decisions that might actually enable the issue to be addressed.

The County Council was determined to deliver its policy aim as shared by the new joint administration to reduce traffic in Oxford and LTNs were part of that.

However, listening to people here today, it was also obvious that certain sections of the community were being disproportionately affected including parents with special needs children, taxi drivers trying to make an honest living, bus operators looking to get people efficiently around the city while their service had been rocked by COVID. Equally it was clear that change could never be achieved without inconvenience and if residents were currently making short trips across the city in a private car they would be asked to explore alternatives but to do that attractive alternatives needed to be provided. The County Council needed to make people safe but make the transport

infrastructure work which would need an holistic, planned comprehensive approach that gave this planned change every chance of success.

Therefore, with sincerest apologies to residents that were desperate for him to make their lived environment better, all those that wanted fast action to combat climate change and those that knew we can't afford to maintain the roads we have a bit more time was required to get this right. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report and to the representations made to him at the meeting he confirmed his decision as follows to:

- a. Note the responses to the non-statutory consultation on the east Oxford low traffic neighbourhood including quietways (LTN).
- b. Agree that officers review the options based on the consultation output, update the proposals and reconsult but having regard to the substantive arguments which were now known that that consultation should be very specifically targeted and measured.
- c. Agree that the outcome of consultation on revised proposals be reported to a future Cabinet Member for Highways management meeting.
- d. Instruct officers to fully assess the impact of the delay on resources and budget on the wider Active Travel programme.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Highways Management

Date of signing.....

**5/21 OXFORD: COWLEY CENTRAL EAST AND WEST CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**  
(Agenda No. 5)

The Cabinet Member for Highways Management considered (CMDHM5) responses received to a statutory consultation to amend the recently introduced Cowley Central East and West CPZs in respect of current exemptions for permit holders at time limited parking places and in respect of waiting restrictions on Crowell Road in the vicinity of its junction with Lewin Close.

Marko Jung spoke on behalf of the Lewin Close Owners' Association and in support of the introduction of a double yellow no parking at any time outside their road. Neither of the two objections brought any evidence backed argument against ensuring emergency vehicle access to a road with 16 households with both appearing to be objections against any further traffic and parking management on Crowell Road. The Owners' Association did believe the additional restriction to 30m of road would impede parking opportunities on Crowell Road, which was rarely fully occupied and the proposed double yellow line covered the close entrance, a short area to the north, which was not adjacent to any property on Crowell Road and a

short area to the south, which just overlapped with the front of 36 Crowell Road. It was also worth noting that the properties opposite the proposed double yellow line had large driveways with parking and for those reasons the Association did not believe that the proposal would impact on parking availability for residents of Crowell Road.

The Cabinet Member thanked Mr Jung for his comments and having regard to the information set out in the report and to the representations made to him at the meeting confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve the following amendments to the Cowley Central East and West Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ):

- a) Cowley Central East CPZ: to amend the legal order by removing the exemption for permit holders not having to comply with parking restrictions at the following time restricted parking places:
  - i. 30 minute parking in parts of Barns Road and Cleveland Drive;
  - ii. 1 hour parking in parts of St Lukes Road
  - iii. 2 hour parking in parts of Barns Road.
  
- b) Cowley Central West CPZ: to introduce a section of 'No Waiting at Any Time' (Double Yellow Lines) on Crowell Road west side for 15 metres either side of the junction with Lewin Close. This in place of the current 'No Waiting 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday'
  
- c) Cowley Central East CPZ: to allow residents of Nos.147-169 & 156-166 Oxford Road to apply for both residents & visitor permits subject to a check of any properties granted planning permission on the basis of being car-free developments.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Highways Management

Date of signing.....

**6/21 LAUNTON: BICESTER ROAD - PROPOSED NO RIGHT TURN RESTRICTIONS AT ACCESS WITH EAST WEST RAIL PROJECT SITE AND ALLOTMENTS**

(Agenda No. 6)

The Cabinet Member for Highways Management considered (CMDHM6) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a proposed no right turn restriction from an access on the south west side of the Bicester Road at Launton (currently serving allotments) approximately 45 metres south east of its roundabout junction with the A4421. The proposal had been put forward as a result of the additional use of this access by vehicles as part of the East West Rail project and due to restricted visibility to the right. Funding for the consultation on the proposals had been provided by the East West Rail Alliance and, if approved, would also be funded by them.

Speaking on behalf of the Launton Plotters Committee Wendy Foster outlined the allotment holders support for the proposal for the following reasons:

1. It was a safe entrance and exit for all the plotters to drive cars, bikes or walk.
2. The added speed bumps on the road meant that traffic would be cautious and slow.
3. They felt that turning left out of the allotments and going around the roundabout to go back to Launton was much safer than turning right straight onto the main road back to Launton Village.
4. Vehicles travelling from Launton to the allotments would be able to turn safely left into the allotments without worrying about traffic trying to turn right.
5. Some drivers would feel very nervous if there was a right turn out of the allotments into Launton village and would probably go around the roundabout anyway.
6. The traffic lights over the bridge would be able to slow traffic down so that Launton allotment holders could go in and out of their road safely.
7. They felt that as the road to the allotment came under Oxfordshire County Council highways it would mean that safety would be maintained and if there were any problems the police could easily be called.
8. Vehicles would be naturally travelling at a slow speed along the main highway from the roundabout and out of the village so this would add to the safety of the turning.
9. They recognised the concerns expressed by Thames Valley Police but acknowledged the response of the Corporate Director that the roundabout should appreciably improve compliance as compared to the many other similar restrictions currently in place.

The Cabinet Member for Highways management having regard to the information set out in the report before him along with the representations made to him at the meeting, which he acknowledged highlighted the need to introduce the measures confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve the proposed no right turn restriction from a new access on the south west side of the Bicester Road, Launton as advertised.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Highway Management

Date of signing.....

**7/21 GOSFORD: WATER EATON LANE - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

(Agenda No. 7)

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management considered (CMDHM7) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce no waiting Monday to Friday between 9am and 5pm on both sides of Water Eaton Lane south of the existing no waiting at any time restrictions in the vicinity of its junction with Bicester Road. Funding for consultation on the proposals had been provided by Gosford and Water Eaton Parish

Council and from the County Council's Parish Support Budget and if approved implementation would be funded by the Parish Council.

Ruth French advised that there was overwhelming opposition from residents living on Water Eaton Lane to this proposal in its current form for reasons of safety, inconvenience and enjoyment of their property and also others in nearby roads, especially Beagles Close, who were extremely concerned at the prospect of increased parking in those roads. Commuter parking was not recognised as a problem and not one local agricultural or business had commented in support of the proposal. The parish council had not sought the views of local residents before putting this proposal forward to the county council, either this year or in 2017 and on neither occasion did local agricultural businesses contribute to the consultation or voice any concerns with existing arrangements. The proposal had not been supported by evidence and recent, time-randomised, daily spot checks had shown very few incidents of problematic parking. The previous proposal in 2017/18 had been similarly rejected due to lack of evidence and the report currently before the Cabinet Member confirmed the lack of any perceived problem with regard to commuter parking. There had been an increase in leisure visitors to the lane last year due to pandemic lockdowns, but those numbers had now substantially reduced. She had not seen a single vehicle obstructing the passage of traffic or reducing the visibility at the junction with Beagles Close and making decisions based on occasional individual complaints without putting them into the context of the 'normal' situation created an extremely biased picture that should not be used as a basis for such a drastic change. This proposal would not improve safety and if there was a genuine, evidence supported, problem with parking in this street, then a more balanced, proportionate solution needed to be found. She asked that the proposal be rejected as it currently stood as there was no evidence base for it and residents did not want it considering that it would worsen, not improve, safety and nuisance parking while adversely affecting the normal use and enjoyment of their properties. The parish council needed to look again at this issue, gather and analyse relevant data, and consult with their constituents, the local residents, before submitting another proposal to the County Council.

A written representation had been received from County Councillor Ian Middleton noting the predominantly negative response to the proposal which seemed to be based on the belief that the road was fairly wide and parked cars did not create a significant obstruction. There were also concerns about the lack of off-street parking for visitors to local residents, although as far as he understood, the vast majority of properties along the road had off street parking for their own vehicles, although that did not mean that the concerns of those residents who did not have that facility should be ignored. Also, the impact of imposing restrictions on Water Eaton Lane but not on Beagles Close could mean that cars would be forced to park there to avoid the restrictions. The local parish council fully supported this application and there had been previous applications for restrictions. The main argument for the restrictions had been that this road was frequently used by agricultural vehicles and large vehicles delivering to agricultural sites accessed by the lane. One side of the road ran along a field that was in common use by local farmers and he had spoken at length to one of them who had recounted stories of where it had been almost impossible for these essential vehicles to access these areas due to parked cars along the road. He had

understood that on many occasions vehicles had had to mount the pavement to get past which was hardly ideal and could result in damage to the pedestrian areas and even adjacent properties. The other argument for restrictions had been concerns that this road was often used by people parking before accessing the local bus services or Parkway rail station. In the case of Parkway that was around a 20 minute walk but he understood that some people used folding cycles which was a situation that was likely to get worse if plans to substantially increase development in the area went ahead. As the local county councillor he represented the wishes of all local residents and users of this road in achieving a result that would accommodate the largest number of people. Weight needed to be given to the concerns of the local farming community as agriculture was an important aspect in a rural setting and of course very important to the local and national economy. Equally, the concerns of residents needed to be taken seriously as were the wishes of the parish council who represented the wishes of the wider local community. On balance he tentatively supported the proposals given that the waiting restrictions would only apply through the daytime, which would hopefully address the majority of the access problems for the local farmers without inconveniencing visitors and residents too much. However, if there were other ways of addressing these problems it would seem prudent to consider them. Serious consideration needed to be given to the concerns of residents who either didn't have off street parking or relied on parking in other areas that might become more congested if the restrictions were introduced on the Lane and indeed the impact of displaced parking on Bicester Road and Beagles Close. Consideration should also be given, if possible, to the inclusion of some nearby Resident Only parking in areas that would not impede access on Water Eaton Lane but could address the concerns of residents who might need visitor or overflow parking. This matter was finely balanced between the needs of different aspects of local community life and all those who will be affected

The Cabinet Member thanked everyone for their submissions which clearly highlighted the difficulties in reaching a decision to meet the concerns of all sides. This was the second application by the Parish Council so it was obvious they had concerns but he also had to acknowledge the concerns expressed on behalf of local residents. It was clear that further evidence would be required including a parking survey to help make an informed decision and, therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report before him, the representations made to him at the meeting including confirmation from officers regarding the benefits of carrying out a parking survey he agreed that it would be appropriate to defer the proposal and so confirmed his decision as follows:

to defer consideration of proposed waiting restrictions on Water Eaton Lane for further investigation to include parking surveys.

Signed.....  
 Cabinet Member for Highways Management

Date of signing.....



**8/21 DIDCOT: BRASENOSE ROAD AND SLADE ROAD - TRAFFIC CALMING**  
(Agenda No. 8)

The former Cabinet Member for Environment on 19 November 2020 had approved proposals for a 20mph speed limit but, having taken note of representations made by residents objecting to or raising concerns about the traffic calming measures, had asked officers to investigate alternative provision of raised tables at junctions on the route (in addition to the 2 proposed at the Churchill Road junctions), namely at Morrells Close with Brasenose Road and possibly Icknield way and Oxford Crescent.. The proposals had been put forward as part of the approved residential development at Great Western Park and, if approved, would be funded by developers.

Following the Cabinet Member's decision on 19 November, officers requested the developers to explore this alternative design and the report now before the Cabinet Member for Highways Management set out the original design details along with the results of further discussions with the developer on the alternative scheme.

Speaking against the proposals Dawn Elsley highlighted that no previous accidents had occurred in Slade Road/Brasenose Road and no traffic surveys had taken place in Slade Rd/Brasenose Rd either before the Great Western Park estate was built or since to measure whether the volume of traffic had increased or indeed decreased. She considered that to be a fundamental and necessary measurement which should have been undertaken to assess whether a calming system needed to be installed. However, she considered that these proposed road calming measures were being installed without the benefit of sound data on road traffic history when it might actually be the case that the road had less traffic than before the GWP development. As the prohibitive cost of installing an improved road calming scheme (raised junctions only) had been mentioned she suggested that current road traffic levels should be measured, simple 20pmh signs installed and then measured again to establish their effect. That would allow for an informed decision to be made regarding next steps for road calming measures and potentially be cost saving? Bedroom & lounge windows in their property were situated at the front of the house and noise from braking and accelerating vehicles between cushions would significantly increase noise and air pollution. A speed cushion would present another obstacle to negotiate when reversing on to or reversing out from their driveway over their dropped kerb causing a potential safety issue. On investigation, there appeared to be no specific criteria to the positioning of cushions in a road and that that this was solely an engineer's decision. Therefore, they were requesting that the speed cushion proposed outside their property be moved to along the road where driveway access would not be affected or where residents had expressed support for the calming scheme. They had suggested additional raised junctions along the length of Brasenose /Slade Road (sited at Oxford Crescent/Icknield Close/Churchill Road) but had been advised that the cost of doing that was too high. The proposal had caused major conflict between their immediate neighbour and neighbours opposite as they were all opposed to having speed cushions outside their properties. A subsequent proposal with a suggestion to move one speed cushion to have a 'staggered pair' outside their properties had caused further upset regarding access obstruction to their neighbours' driveways.

Also speaking against the proposals Sean Wilde reiterated his objections to the proposals namely:

- Health and safety issues as a result of increased dangerous manoeuvres reversing over speed cushions on drives
- Creating poor environment from increased vehicle fumes and vehicles slowing & increasing speed
- Increased noise
- Increased pollution
- Parking issues/complications for visitors etc
- Damage to vehicles
- Additional wear & tear on roads surrounding the speed cushions as evidenced on other roads where these had been installed

A survey had been carried out to assess whether residents were in favour or against the project with the majority vote being against, which felt as if their views and concerns were not being heard/considered. Residents had never been informed what the original objective of the scheme had been or even consulted as to whether the proposed plan was wanted or why it was still being considered. They could understand why such a traffic calming scheme would need to be implemented if prior to the GWP development there had been say 300 cars using Slade Road/Brasenose Road travelling at 30mph and then post GWP that had risen to say 600+ cars travelling in excess of 30mph but that wasn't the case. Traffic monitoring surveys had not been conducted either pre or post GWP development so why was the scheme still being considered. In fact, having lived here for numerous years he considered that the volume of traffic had actually reduced in recent years, which he thought was mainly due to the road through the GWP development opening up. This scheme had probably been put in place to cover a potential problem but as in his opinion this was no longer the case they could not understand why the scheme was still required or even being considered. No accidents had been recorded on the proposed roads even with two schools and a large park on these roads. As the original costs of the scheme were not known it's hard to know if the 655% proposed increase for the alternative plans for raised tables at junctions which they had proposed as a compromise at the meeting in November 2020 were a true figure. The County Council had not been aware of that information either, so it was hardly a satisfactory review/justification/response. S106 agreements weren't cast in stone and could be amended so those funds could be used on more acceptable projects required elsewhere in the town. There were also plans for another new road between Harwell village/Milton interchange (A4130) which could provide another alternative route to use and so potentially reduce the need to use Slade Road/Brasenose Road even further. He asked for a serious review of the reasons why this scheme had originally been suggested and whether the original/expected outcome of the scheme still stood. He questioned whether the County Council were just blindly going ahead with the project without any consultation with the impacted residents just because funds were available. This scheme needed to be re-evaluated as residents clearly didn't support it.

In response officers confirmed that a survey had been carried out at the planning stage which had highlighted the need for a scheme prompting the S106 agreement. Responding to suggestions for alternative 20 mph signing that would not be as

effective as traffic calming. The road at 3.7 metres wide encouraged faster traffic and positioning of the staggered cushions avoided dropped kerbs. Speed surveys had shown traffic speeds above recommended limits so calming would be beneficial.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the concerns expressed by residents and accepted that there was a difference of opinion on whether this scheme was required but he did not want there to be an accident before anything had been done which might have prevented that. These proposals were for speed cushions and not raised tables across the whole width of the road and were the kind of measure usually welcomed. His predecessor had taken into account the concerns of residents and had asked officers to investigate but the alternative scheme they had suggested had been costed and had proved to be too expensive and therefore unacceptable to the developers. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report, the representations made to him at the meeting and the further advice given in response by officers he confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve the traffic calming measures in Brasenose Road and Slade Road as originally advertised between 30 September and 30 October 2020 and as shown at Annex 2 to the report CMDHM8.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Highways Management

Date of signing.....

**9/21 ABINGDON: LARKHILL ROAD - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**  
(Agenda No. 9)

The Cabinet Member for Highways Management considered (CMDHM9) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions at the south end of the Larkhill Road. Funding for the consultation on the proposals had been provided by Abingdon School who would also fund implementation if approved.

County Councillor Nathan Ley had expressed his support for the proposed waiting restrictions on Larkhill Road adding that the community was broadly supportive of the measures with the main priority being safety. Despite that, he was cognizant of concerns raised by some local residents and he hoped that Abingdon School would continue to be proactive in its engagement with staff and students to promote active travel options to school, or transport solutions which did not have detrimental knock-on effects to the wider town.

Having regard to the information set out in the report before him and the comments from the local member the Cabinet Member for Highway Management confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve the proposed no waiting at any time restrictions on Larkhill Road as advertised.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Highway Management

Date of signing.....