

Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport Management Thursday, 4 September 2025

ADDENDA

2. Questions from County Councillors (Pages 1 - 4)

Questions and answers attached.

3. Petitions and Public Address (Pages 5 - 48)

Written statements attached.

This page is intentionally left blank

QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Questions are listed in the order in which they were received.

1. COUNCILLOR JAMES FRY	COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT
<p>The traffic light controls on the Marston Ferry Road/Banbury Road junction are extremely dangerous for pedestrians. Rather than wait three years or more for a full realignment of the entire junction to take place, please authorise urgent work to install pedestrian traffic light control buttons on the posts on the two corners of Marston Ferry Road. I don't want to hear more horror stories of people being hit or having very close shaves trying to get across the busy flows of traffic.</p>	<p>With current traffic flows, adding signal-controlled pedestrian crossings on these arms of the junction would necessitate both the complete redesign of the signal sequencing of the junction (which is likely to create excessive congestion - delaying key buses services), as well as physical works to the signals. The current signal equipment is not suitable for modification and as such the junction controller and other equipment would need to be replaced at a significant cost.</p> <p>The recorded accident history at this junction is comparatively good compared to many other locations both in the city and across the wider county – but it is recognised that recorded accidents do not necessarily reflect the perceptions of safety people using the junction may feel.</p> <p>It is considered that the current challenges and safety concerns may reduce when the traffic filter trial is in place, and this scheme may also enable the rephasing and redesign of the junction to have less of an impact - although funding to deliver this would still need to be prioritised.</p> <p>In other words, if Cllr Fry wants a better pedestrian crossing at the Banbury Road/MFR crossing, he must support policies to reduce traffic flows, which is exactly why the County Council is bringing forward the proposed congestion charge and filters scheme. He needs to be clear with residents whether he and his party support policies which will deliver the benefits he claims to want. The current policy of the Labour Party is to put cars first. It actively prohibits improving the junction in the way he describes, as he and I have discussed in person.</p> <p>He also seems to have a worryingly naive understanding of what an individual Cabinet Member can and can't 'authorise'.</p>

	<p>He might also wish to explain how he can justify being a member of the City Council Labour group, which supports the traffic filters, and the County Council Labour group, which opposes them.</p>
<p>2. COUNCILLOR JAMES FRY</p> <p>A topic close to the heart of the Cabinet Member for Transport. Will you provide exemptions from congestion charges for musicians bringing instruments into the city for rehearsals and performances? Several orchestras are worried about the impact of charges and penalties when the traffic filters are implemented.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Many venues will continue to be accessible without passing a congestion charging point.</p> <p>A permit for personal cars used as goods vehicles on behalf of a business is proposed. Musicians may be eligible for this if they are attending venues in the Oxford Permit Area, which covers the whole city.</p> <p>To be eligible, musicians would need to demonstrate (like any other applicant) that they meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You must be a paid or unpaid employee of a business, organisation or individual • You must regularly work in the Oxford Permit Area or Central Permit Area and need to transport (using a car) goods, tools or equipment that are necessary for operational work purposes and cannot reasonably be transported by foot, cycle, or public transport • You or someone living at your address must be the registered keeper of the car for which you are applying <p>The evidence you will need to supply in support of your application is as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For employees, a declaration of eligibility from your employer in your name • For sole traders, proof of your trading status and a declaration of your eligibility • Evidence of work within the Oxford Permit Area or Central Permit Area within the last six months (such as invoices or payslips)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A copy of your vehicle insurance showing that it is insured for business use• The V5C (logbook) for the car you're applying for, showing that you (or someone living at the same address as you) are the registered keeper.• If you're not the registered keeper, proof of your address (so we can confirm you live at the same address as the registered keeper).
--	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Item 5 - Cherwell Street Bus Service improvement Scheme - Detailed Design

We support this scheme, but would like the plans amended to include cycle symbols in the carriageway lanes on Cherwell Street and George St where people might be cycling.

It is good to see some future-proofing, with work done to enable a later upgrade to a toucan crossing at the George St-Cherwell St junction, as noted in paragraph 25. But there would have been even greater savings if this could have been done now: the extra cost of putting in a toucan crossing rather than a puffin crossing is much smaller than the cost of changing the crossing at a later date. So we would like to see a budget for implementing small walking and cycling improvements or additions as part of schemes like this.

Another suggestion was to have cycle symbols in the carriageway to legitimise cycling and warn drivers of the possible presence of people cycling. This has not been included in these plans, but is a minor enough measure that it could still be implemented without significant costs or further consultation.

We also suggested continuous footways across the Britannia Rd and Lower Cherwell St side entries, but too late for that to have any chance of making it into the plans.

These are among the features that should be included by default in any full-road design. That is, when any urban main road is being built or rebuilt, continuous footways should be put in across minor side street entries. And if cycling infrastructure can't be included then on-carriageway cycle symbols should be put in place as a "best we can do" fall-back.

This should all go into the Street Design Guide, but we don't need to wait on that. Thinking about active travel - and especially cycling, which is often forgotten - should be part not just of all bus improvement plans but of all highway schemes. This needs to be a clear message from the top down to all officers.

This page is intentionally left blank

Parking Restrictions on Conduit Road

Chair, Councillors and Officers, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

I am here as a Trustee of Trinity Church in Abingdon and its Community Centre – the Conduit Centre – which has served the Ock Street and wider Abingdon community for over 150 years. At our church meeting on 17 July, we discussed the proposed Residents' Permit Parking scheme for the Ock Street area and its impact on Conduit Road.

Conduit Road differs from much of the Ock Street area. Overnight, the road is fairly clear because most houses have driveways. During the day and evening, the road is used not just by residents and their visitors but also by people attending Trinity Church and its Conduit Centre, Carswell School, and the Albert Park. It is also only a 5-minute walk from the town centre. However, the main issue occurs at school drop-off and pick-up times, when cars can block driveways.

We have three main concerns:

First, the process. Trinity Church was not consulted last November when residents were asked about possible changes. Given the impact on our community work, groups like ours should have been involved from the start.

Second, the proposals. Removing all spaces opposite the church and making them residents-only would make access harder during the day and evening. Extending other bays alongside the church from two to four hours is also unhelpful. Most church and community activities fit within a two-hour period, and shorter limits allow better turnover.

Third, the impact. Trinity Church is more than a place of worship. The church and Conduit Centre host a toddlers' group, groups for the elderly, a food bank, uniformed organisations, weddings, funerals, and many community meetings – all dependent on reasonable nearby parking. These restrictions would disproportionately affect vulnerable groups and could reduce bookings for our Conduit Centre, impacting financial sustainability.

We believe a better solution to school traffic would be occasional traffic wardens at peak times, rather than restrictions affecting the road every day.

In conclusion, these proposals, as they stand, place an unfair burden on a long-established church and community centre. We urge reconsideration, ensuring the needs of residents and community groups are properly balanced.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

Written statement about proposed parking restrictions in Abingdon (Ock Street area) – submission to County Council meeting on 4 September 2025

As I am unable to attend on 4 September due to work commitments, I am submitting a written statement to the meeting at which the proposal for a residents' parking scheme in the Ock Street area of Abingdon will be considered.

The points I raised in my objection to the consultation are validated by the responses to the Consultation received from other residents in the area.

In particular:

- 1) The case is not made by the Council that this scheme is needed. The data I received in response to a Freedom of Information request submitted to both Abingdon Town Council and Oxfordshire County Council evidenced only a handful of complaints to either body or to the Town and County Councillors in the past 5 years. It cannot be said that there is groundswell of opinion that the scheme is needed.
- 2) If there is a problem with 'school parking' this should be addressed by better enforcement of the restrictions already in place on Conduit Road, or by the private parking management company responsible for Park Road.
- 3) As many respondents to the consultation observed, there is plenty of parking available during working hours. There is pressure on parking in the early evening once everyone is home for the night – and this is not addressed by the proposal.
- 4) Of 44 houses in Edward Street (3 of which are currently empty), 20 households have objected, evidencing the strength of opposition to this proposal.
- 5) At a time of a cost of living crisis, it is irresponsible of the Council to propose the introduction of a parking permit costing £132 per year. The County Council has already increased council tax by the maximum amount of 4.9% in this financial year. The proposed scheme represents a *further 7.9% annual increase* for any single person with one car who pays band C council tax, and a whopping *11.8% increase* for a household of two adults with two cars. Apart from Park Road and Park Crescent, this is not a wealthy area of Abingdon and this will add to hardship already felt by many.
- 6) For many residents, a maximum of 50 visitor permits a year is simply not an adequate allowance. It provides for less than one visitor each week, including any visits from a plumber or similar tradesperson. While the first 25 tickets may be free, a further charge of £31.50 for 25 more tickets, which almost everyone will need, represents an *additional 1.5% increase* on the single person's council tax figures I quoted earlier.
- 7) As many others have noted, the (charged) contractors' allowance of one week you propose is simply laughable. I recently had to have essential but unexpected done to my house, which took 7 weeks with a team of 3 to 4 workers here each day. At £31.50 a week, for 2 (sometimes 3) vehicles, that would have cost almost £500 on top of the already expensive repairs. And if permits are only available for one working week, we fear that contractors will start to refuse to work in this area – another hurdle for small local businesses which we are trying to support.
- 8) The proposal does not even mention the potential future provision of shared electric vehicle charging points, which seems a gross omission when this is one of the areas in Abingdon with the highest concentration of houses and flat with no driveway or off-street parking.

This page is intentionally left blank

I live on the Motte with my wife and two young children. Most of the street is too narrow for cars to pass side by side. Removing the yellow line encourages people to park on the kerb. When this occurs our double buggy cannot get past. Driving along that stretch of road (which has a blind corner) will get more hazardous. There will be a greater need for cars to reverse when they meet, which increases the risk to other road users. Emergency service vehicles such as ambulances and fire engines will be impeded.

That narrow section of the Motte is heavily used by pedestrians and cyclists going to or coming from school via Boxhill Park. As it stands they can cross the road without having to walk around parked cars.

Further up the street is a turning circle around a big tree. We live in view of this tree. Kids often play in the area. Our children cycle around the tree on balance bikes. The proposed parking bays will narrow the road and make it harder for parents to spot oncoming traffic. Extra parked cars will block lines of sight. I will be much less comfortable letting my kids play there if the street is littered with parked cars.

The road becomes wider around the turning circle, but this is by design. Trucks need the space to get around without clipping the kerb or reversing. There is no room for parking bays.

Most houses on the street are similar to ours, with 2 (or more) off street spaces. My wife and I were thinking about dropping from 2 cars down to 1, so that our visitors will find it easier to park. Not having unlimited low cost parking is a trade-off we knew we were making when moving into the centre of Abingdon. The proposed residents permit scheme will encourage more car ownership among residents, especially among those who can afford many cars. In our case our household will be able to have 2 residents permits - so 4 cars!

The cost of a permit that grants unlimited parking for one year is very low compared to the other costs associated with owning a car. If the permit scheme goes through, it will create a little more parking capacity for a short time, but that will soon be lost to cars and vans that are seldom used. Similar to adding lanes to a motorway, the benefits will be short lived, but the costs especially to pedestrians and children who want to play on the street will be permanent.

This page is intentionally left blank

I note that the recommendation for the parking arrangements for Abbott/Thesiger Roads is for the scheme not to include permits but retain the recommendations for double yellow lines, which I in general terms accept as a positive way forward.

As presently indicated on supporting drawings for the scheme, the lines extend right across the frontage up to the boundary with No. 5 but I would ask for consideration to limit the extension of the double lines on the side of the road to the bend only, leaving room for one parking space across my frontage and up to the boundary with 5 Abbott Road.

In my opinion this would meet the requirement of protecting the bend itself from parking but allow room for one car which would be extremely useful to visitors/service vehicles along that part of the road.

Can I therefore ask you to forward my request for consideration when the details of any approved scheme are drawn up.

I thank you in advance for your support in this request.

This page is intentionally left blank

Abingdon Centre North Parking

While noting from the meeting papers that the recommendation is on the whole to withdraw the proposed introduction of permit parking, I still wish to make a statement so it is on record and may assist the Transport Management Team in future work.

Resident permit parking may work well in areas like the main Abingdon Centre and Oxford city, but it is not the right solution for Abingdon Centre North. Areas like the main Abingdon Town Centre have a high proportion of property without off street parking and residents are competing for road parking along side shoppers, businesses and all-day commuters. It is places like this where Resident Permit Parking may (I say may as it may still not always be the case) be a suitable solution.

Abingdon Centre North though is not like this. It is a residential area where most properties have off street parking and there is little shopper or commuter parking. While close to town, the current restrictions mean there is only a small area (approx. 15 cars) where all day parking is allowed. This area is on the South end close to the town centre and while it is predominantly used by commuters this is not a problem to residents as it is not directly in front of properties.

The proposal claims there is a parking problem, but I can provide photos if required that clearly show there is not. Daytime the roads are fairly clear, with the odd car parked legally when visiting a resident. At weekends there are more cars parked, but this is spread across the estate as it is visitors to residents, not all-day commuters or shoppers on a Saturday. It is noticeable that even the roads near town where you might expect more parking for shoppers or commuters do not have any increased parking. In fact, the section for all day parking may even have spaces on a Saturday, clearly showing there is not need to change the Monday to Friday restrictions to include Saturday.

The current restrictions that are in place are ideal for Abingdon Centre North, in fact the person who came up with them should get an award. If people started parking illegally it is easily enforceable as a Traffic Enforcement Officer would only need to visit once and simply place penalty notices on offending vehicles. For permit parking they would not only need to visit multiple times but also check for permits, note vehicle registrations which is time consuming.

Permit Parking should NOT be used as a one size fits all solution, and I hope you can see that the current solution in Abingdon Centre North, of mixed 8am-4pm and 10am-11am Monday to Friday, with a few places Monday to Saturday is a near perfect solution for a residential area with a high proportion of off street parking and is working well and does not need to change.

This page is intentionally left blank

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I note that measures c) to g) of the Abingdon Centre North scheme are recommended to be withdrawn. I wholeheartedly support this withdrawal for the following reasons.

The proposals for Fitzharrys Estate, Abingdon sought to address three perceived problems which actually are not problems experienced by the residents.

1. To address issues arising from school parking

Irrespective of whatever restrictions are in place, parents will continue to drop off and pick up their children from school. Most parents are considerate with their parking for the relatively short periods at the start and end of the school day. The proposed measures, adding restrictions for 10 hours a day, 6 days a week and 52 weeks of the year, were not warranted, were excessive, would not have affected this situation and would have impinged more on residents than on parents.

2. To address all day parking from commuters

This issue is not relevant as the current restrictions already prevent people from parking for the whole day whilst working in town. These restrictions work well and I have submitted some photos, taken on a typical day, which clearly supports this. The current restrictions were agreed in 2004. The problem was solved then and, twenty years later, that solution remains effective.

3. To provide options for residents by way of parking permits

Introducing residents' parking would create a series of problems for residents, particularly in Clifton Drive where some properties do not have driveways. The roads are simply too narrow to allow for on-street parking. With the exception of Fitzharrys Road, it is difficult for two small cars to pass each other let alone delivery vans, emergency vehicles or the dustbin lorry. In the past year, two cars in Clifton Drive have been damaged by delivery vans.

The proposed annual cost was exorbitant (nearly double that being proposed for Banbury). Offering 25 free visitor permits is derisory and only being able to purchase an additional 25, would be totally inadequate.

Conclusion

It is my opinion that the current restrictions work and generally work well. Across the Estate, residents work together to deal with any practical issues and this is one of the great strengths of our community. The proposed measures would have significantly inconvenienced the residents and created problems that are currently non-existent.

I therefore ask that the Cabinet Member agrees to the withdrawal of measures c) to g) for Abingdon Centre North.

This page is intentionally left blank

ABINGDON: CENTRE NORTH AREA – PROPOSED RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING ZONE

Thank you for granting this opportunity to speak and to put forward a position on behalf of my family, close neighbours and the wider estate of Fitzharry's Manor. I was pleased to see the recommendation of Council Officers to this meeting to withdraw much of the proposed measures, and urge you to accept that recommendation.

For over 35 years I have worked as a consultant in the energy and environment sector and appreciate only too well the challenging decisions that must be made to encourage and incentivise behaviours to bring climate positive change. However, a lot of people on the estate have had sleepless nights worrying about the potential impact of the proposed changes, and the punitive nature of them.

My family and I have been resident at the end of Clifton Drive for 20 years this week, in one of the nine houses on the estate which have no off-street parking provision, and for whom permits would be essential – and therefore clearly punitive. The majority of houses on the estate do have off street parking and I do suspect that were this scheme to be introduced, uptake of permits would actually be quite low, and the argument that costs would be self-covering would not stack up.

I do note from the Officers report that it makes no attempt to understand the local detail of the Manor estate and makes a number of broad brush observations that are simply inaccurate. Thankfully, the recommendation is to withdraw the proposals; if the inaccuracies were considered correctly, this would only strengthen the argument to withdraw the proposals.

The estate has been subject to parking restrictions that I understand were introduced just a few years prior to our moving in. It is our belief that those restrictions, designed at the time hand in hand with the manor resident's association, have consistently delivered on objectives that this new proposal was seemingly put forward to try to solve.

Given that the current restrictions limit areas of unrestricted parking, there is simply not an issue of commuters/long term parking. These areas are commonly full during weekdays, but once they are full, there is only a few cars that end up on double yellows – and why, as many respondents have made clear, simple enforcement of the existing restrictions is all that is needed.

Thank you for listening to me, and I urge you to listen to the clear desires of the residents and agree with your Officers' recommendations to withdraw the measures.

This page is intentionally left blank

Mr P Fermer
Director of Environmental & Highways
Oxfordshire County Council
Network Management
County Hall
New Road
Oxford
OX1 1ND

CM/12.6.100/P0334

Dear Mr Fermer,

Re Abingdon Central North Area – Proposed Permit Parking & Restrictions

I refer to my letter dated 28 July 2025 and note that the provision of double yellow lines for the Thesiger Road area has been revised.

Referring to your plan reference *CIL/25-26/AB/CN/01* and the comments listed in your consultation, the provision of double yellow lines has now been reduced. Looking specifically at numbers 2, 4, 6 and 8 Thesiger Road, those outside number 6 and 8 have been removed leaving double yellow lines outside my property.

Considering specifically my property, as previously stated, I have never encountered any problems with parking in the forty-eight years that it has been in my ownership.

The proposed double yellow lines will significantly impact on the use and enjoyment of my property:

1. My daughters and grandchildren who visit regularly, visitors, friends and trades people will have to park further down the road which will impact on those without drives, such as number 8 and others, forcing them to park elsewhere with potential conflict which I have never encountered in Thesiger Road.
2. My daughters and grandchildren are very concerned that parking outside my property will not be available and are already worrying that coming to visit will cause friction with other residents by parking outside their property. Sadly this may curtail their visits which I depend on.

You are spending a great deal of time and money in this specific location trying to resolve a situation which does not exist.

This situation is causing my family and I a great deal of stress and anxiety and is detrimental to our quality of life.

Will you please amend your proposal and remove the double yellow lines from outside my property.

I have seen the attached map of the proposed Abingdon: Central North area - proposed permit parking & restrictions.

Opposite the triangle island, the suggestion looks excellent, but I am concerned that there will be a 'pinch point' between 6 Thesiger and the island, and traffic management and safety would be improved if the double yellow lines were extended to the boundary between 6 and 8 Thesiger Road.

Am I right in thinking that the dropped curb will be marked with a white line?
Otherwise I anticipate people parking on the dropped curb.

I am also concerned that the wide grass verges will be used for parking – which will degrade the environment / green space.

This page is intentionally left blank

Abingdon Ock Street & Central North Proposed Permit Parking Areas

I welcome the recommendations made in the officers' report, advising that most of the proposed measures are not approved or taken forward.

Many residents living in the areas of the two proposed schemes have contacted me, as District Councillor for the streets in question, to raise objections. Considering reports made to me by residents and my own experience as a resident of Abingdon, it's my view that daytime parking and commuter parking in the outlined areas is not problematic enough or inconvenient enough to justify the proposed parking permit measures.

Given the views expressed by residents that the parking arrangements in place currently are generally practical and workable, the proposed fee of £132 per parking permit is too high. There will be households who run more than one car and will practically unavoidably incur this fee intended to alleviate an issue which in the main does not appear to cause undue difficulty. That being so, the schemes do not strike me as good value-for-money propositions.

I trust that when the Cabinet Member makes a judgement on the schemes, they will not attempt to second-guess the conclusions suggested in the report. The schemes as proposed are not necessary and daytime parking is not a major problem. A majority of residents have made it clear, through the consultation, that they do not wish for these schemes to be implemented.

I note that Withington Court has been singled out and the parking permit scheme there has been recommended for approval. I accept that Withington Court is situated differently than other roads in the Fitzharris area and may have different requirements. If implemented, I hope that a review which considers the views of residents will be carried out with an open mind after twelve months, as indicated in the report.

I am in favour the new additional double yellow lines at corners and junctions which have been proposed in the final report. The lines should help visibility and enable easier turning.

As a more general point, one of the best ways to free up space occupied by cars on roads and streets – parked or in motion - must be by making alternative means of transportation more appealing and accessible. If cycle routes and public transport were more widely used as a means of commuting, then we'd find roads less prone to traffic or parking congestion, and resources more efficiently spent.

The consultations which have been carried out are a welcome example of public engagement and a worthwhile exercise. Nonetheless, the majority response from residents is clear.

Cllr Robert Maddison

Vale of White Horse, Fitzharris Ward

This page is intentionally left blank

As a resident living in the Ock Street area I wish to add my comments on the proposal for the Abingdon Ock Street area residents permit parking zone.

Generally I agree with the recommendations, specifically those to withdraw the proposals for the controlled parking zone as I, in line with others, felt that daytime parking restrictions were not necessary at this time.

I am however concerned that the recommendation is still to approve the extension of double yellow lines in the area around Victoria Road, Bostock Road, Edward Street and Exbourne Road as shown in Annex 7.

I do not agree with this and would request that these proposals also be withdrawn at this time as I do not feel that the extension of the double yellow lines will be beneficial for the area.

The reasons being; firstly, I do not believe that this will improve safety. At the moment the presence of parked cars means there are shorter visibility splays and these act as a natural traffic calming measure. The introduction of the double yellow lines will likely allow cars to negotiate the junctions at higher speeds. This would be detrimental given that cars are already driving down Edward Street at speeds greater than the stated 20mph limit, usually accelerating hard after slowly negotiating the junction. The addition of the double yellow lines could allow them to achieve higher speeds for longer sections of the road given they could have a higher initial velocity by traversing the junction in a straighter line and thereby making the roads less safe for other users.

Secondly the introduction of these lines will reduce the number of available parking spaces in the area. The five parking spaces that would be lost on Victoria Road around the start of Edward Street are equivalent to over 12% of the parking on Edward Street (40 spaces). Given that over the weekend (30th August) an HMO has been allowed on Edward Street close to the start with Victoria Road, this has the potential to introduce another six cars to this area. It is well known that the area is already under high parking stress overnight when residents try to park and evidence from recent parking surveys show that there is already evidence of illegal parking and that the average parking capacity in the area at night is 94%, rising to 100% on Edward Street and Exbourne Road (taken from the Oxfordshire County Council local highway authority consultation response by Andrew Mason to VOWHDC on planning ref: P22/V0193/N5D). This means that the loss of even a few parking spaces, even without the potential increase in cars from new developments in the area, will mean that the overnight parking situation becomes even more difficult for residents than it currently is and will lead to further parking problems given the issues with illegal parking already seen.

I would therefore request that the proposal for these double yellow lines is withdrawn at this time and that the situation is monitored both for safety and parking.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement – Ock Street area – Proposed Residents Permit Parking
21st August 2025

My family has owned Reeves Fish & Chip Shop since May 1989, but the shop has served Abingdon from 173 Ock Street since it was established by the Reeves family in 1919. It is one of the town's oldest businesses, and its success is attributed to both the quality of our food and our location near two critical parking bays on Ock Street

Many customers use these bays for brief stays, typically lasting less than 15 minutes. With current double yellow lines limiting parking options, any changes that allow more extended parking periods—such as resident permits or 2-hour free parking—would prevent our customers and suppliers from accessing the shop, threatening our century-old business.

We suggest that these bays remain designated for short-stay parking only, with a maximum limit of 20 minutes and no resident permits. This would:

1. Allow customers, including those with mobility issues, to support local businesses.
2. Enable access for public transport and emergency vehicles.
3. Help alleviate parking issues from schools and commuters.

Many adjacent properties have their own parking spaces. It doesn't seem fair that they should occupy the Ock Street bays too.

I encourage the council to consider our concerns regarding the shared bay plans.

Below are some images of the shop in 2025 and 1919 to illustrate the history behind our century-old fish & chip shop.



This page is intentionally left blank

Local Resident, Exbourne Road – Written Statement (Ock St Area – Parking Permit)

I have a couple of final concerns about the proposal and would appreciate it if you could kindly forward these to the consultation as well.

1. Regarding the 50 visitor permits per year, my 90-year-old next door neighbour has a cleaner that comes to her by car once a week. This obviously will use up her annual allowance of 50 visitor permits per year. I am extremely concerned that I would eventually be in this situation in years to come, where visitor allowance is used up by the weekly cleaner and I would not be allowed any visits from friends or family. To have a limit such as this on visitor permits is simply unworkable.

2. If the proposal goes through, the non-resident parking will shift onto Winterborne Road, Spring Gardens and Cemetery Road and the residents there will be unhappy about this. I don't believe that their opinion has been requested.

3. Dawsons Hair Salon on the corner of Edward Steet/Spring Road has employees and business customers who rely on this Ock Street area to park. This business will suffer if the proposal goes through

This page is intentionally left blank

For the cost of a permit, £132 per annum, residents of this area do not get a guaranteed parking space or any guaranteed parking at all. It is particularly unfair to residents of Exbourne Road and Edward Street who have no driveways or alternative parking and have to park on the street. The idea of purchasing 2 permits per household would not be realistic as there is only room for 1 car per house in both these streets. The parking situation is not dire enough to introduce permits and we have learned to live with it. No evidence has been provided by the County Council as to the issues, if any, caused by non-residents', shoppers', commuters' or school parking. How come we were not informed at the Autumn 2024 Consultation that there would be a cost for the permits and restrictive visitor parking? Had this been disclosed from the beginning there would have been an overwhelming rejection as in this consultation.

The arguments for it being to introduce a more environmental friendly area and encourage more people to cycle or take public transport are unrealistic. This is not London with an efficient transport system. Rather it is a more rural area where people have no option but to rely on a car to get to places that are inaccessible or too time consuming to get to by bus. There is no train station in Abingdon. The maximum of 50 visitor permits is unrealistic without consideration to normal healthy human needs. Consider friends and family stays, relatives tending to the sick or helping out, grandchildren visiting to be cared for or parents coming to do childcare. Weekday – not SUNDAY, visits from window cleaners, plumbers, gardeners, fencers, appliance repair engineers, chimney sweeps etc. If you add all this up over a year the meagre 50 visitor permits would be unworkable. My 90 year old neighbour has a cleaner coming to her by car once a week. This obviously would use up all her annual allowance of visitor permits. How can an old person be expected to do without visitors?

Trades people and contractors who will need to apply for permits will be easily put off by having to apply themselves. This has actually happened in other permit restricted areas. We have many Victorian buildings in this area that need more general maintenance than regular homes: scaffolding, roof and chimney repair, rising damp correction etc etc. Such work is essential and maintains the heritage of Abingdon. It is hard enough as it is to get these people with nowadays demand, to say nothing of the added costs of £31.50 being added to our bills.

We should be aiming to keep the community happy and we have a friendly neighbourhood where everyone helps each other. With this scheme we are encouraged to report cars parked without a permit on our streets to Trellints Control Room using Oxfordshire County Council's daily update. This kind of behaviour will cause animosity and will have a negative effect on our neighbourhood. If the proposal goes through, the parking from Spring Road and other visitors will shift onto Winterborne Road, Cemetary Road and Spring Gardens and which will cause overparking there. The customers and employees of Dawsons Hair Salon rely on neighbouring streets for parking. If the restrictions come in what will happen to the Salon? – probably won't survive like many other businesses in Abingdon who have suffered from the town centre parking reduction of 2 hours free parking down to one. Please increase this back to 2 hours and fix the multi-storey carpark.

Finally, there is mentioned in the proposal that 'residents of specified properties within Park Road will be able to apply for annual residents parking permits'. Are you referring to Nos. 4, 44, 46 and 54-60 Park Road, who have been included inside the Abingdon Ock Street area? Why have these properties been included, and why have they not got residents' parking rights on Park Road? There is plenty of space on Park Road, and the residents there do not pay for their on-street parking. I would like to see Oxfordshire County Council make the effort to obtain more space rather than charge the residents of this area for already available space. It would be simply a matter of getting our cars registered to be able to park there. I respectfully ask that these proposals be dropped and to please in view of the overwhelming objections, never raise them again.

Banbury: Central South area - proposed permit parking & restrictions

- The majority of the Consultation's survey responses objected to the scheme
- Most of the emails sent in, excluding duplications, objected to the scheme
- 5 out of 7 local businesses responding objected to the scheme, the other 2 wrote their concerns about it
- Samaritans, one of the 2 organisations responding, objected to the scheme. The other, which supports elderly people, wrote their concerns about it.
- Most of the various residents I talked to object to the scheme: they and their visitors can usually find nearby parking spaces.

Why is the scheme being recommended for approval?

[Only **31 out of 1670 properties** surveyed responded that they **support** the scheme.]

Why are better alternatives not being considered, such as allowing free daytime parking on a wide one way street that only allows nighttime parking, and allowing some residents to park outside their houses all day without the time limits and parking tickets?

Grosvenor Road has 24 residents' cars and 24 parking spaces. Having this scheme will not make more parking spaces!

Having a permit will not guarantee a space and more permits can be issued than there are spaces.

Why have new 'Pay & Display' parking areas near the town centre, which desperately needs all the customers it can get, instead it could just have new, time limited, parking?

Why not wait for the results of a survey of how well a Banbury scheme that's only just started works before introducing another new scheme?

There was poor advertising of the survey: the letters sent and the very few public notices gave internet links but did not say they could lead to an online survey. Instead the letter mentioned 'the detailed legal documents' that the link led to, which will not have encouraged people to look!

'Partially support/ concerns' should not have been put in the same survey option. Concerns needed a separate heading.

The agenda has a link to Annex 6, produced before the consultation ended, which bases its 'Evidence/ intelligence' on a 2024 informal consultation that covered 3 areas, not just this one. If the report's referring to all 3 areas responses, it's not relevant.

(The agenda does not give a direct link to Annex 5 which is referred to.)

The scheme should not be approved.

Thank you for letting me speak today.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 10 - Kidlington to Banbury: A4260 Corridor - Proposed Speed Limits

We support all of these speed limit changes. As we have done before, however, we urge that noise pollution be added to the remit of the Vision Zero speed limit programme.

It would not be a factor in most of these schemes, because of their rural location, but noise pollution reduction would be a strong additional argument for the 40 to 30mph reduction on the A4260 through Bodicote. While noise pollution is harder to measure, it is likely that the public health gains from reducing noise in locations like this would be greater than the gains from averting injuries. These gains come both directly, in fewer deaths from cardiovascular disease and lower rates of chronic diseases such as diabetes, but also in better sleep enabling a better quality of life.

It would also be good to have more emphasis on lower speeds positively enabling walking and cycling. The best known Vision Zero statement has a second clause "while increasing safe, healthy, equitable mobility for all" and that should be part of our Vision Zero programme. Here it was good to see the officers' report quoting DfT guidance that 40mph is only appropriate where non-motorised users are catered for through segregation of road space.

More generally, if the focus of speed limit changes was not so narrowly on injury reduction, they might attract broader public support.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 13 - Oxford, Market Street - Proposed Permanent Pedestrian & Pedal Cycle Zone

We support all of these measures except b) iii, relocating the start of the pedestrian zone 23 metres to the east. The Cyclox and OLS objections to this were not addressed in the officers' report, and we feel this should not be proceeded with until they have been addressed.

Reiterating our concerns, this would increase the area in which cycling is banned between 10am and 6pm, at which times it would become illegal to cycle to or from the cycle parking on Cornmarket in front of the new Jesus College building. What will happen is that the majority of people using that parking will continue cycling to it - or they might legally cycle to it at 9.45am and then cycle illegally away from it at 10.15am. So this measure will annoy some pedestrians, stress some people cycling, and unnecessarily contribute to conflicts.

Having cycle parking that can't be cycled to is not good practice. And people cycling to the medical centre are more likely than most to not be able to dismount and push their cycles. See <https://wanderingdanny.com/oxford/2024/07/cyclists-dismount-they-can-get-out-and-push/>

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 17 - Bicester: Charlotte Avenue & Elmsbrook Estate - Proposed Bus Lane, Goods Vehicle Loading Bay & 20mph Speed Limit

We supported all these measures in our consultation response.

The bus lane here is effectively a bus gate, implementing a low traffic neighbourhood. It is notable that the planning consent requiring that dates to 2012 and that its explicit goal was to inhibit short car trips within the housing development, in order to encourage walking and cycling. It will also serve to block use of the estate as a short-cut if there is congestion on the B4100, but that appears to have been an incidental consideration.

We hope that this sets further precedent for not giving residents exemptions from LTN modal filters, when ANPR cameras are put in place for buses.

This particular design was part of this being an "Eco-Town" development, but it is a design feature that should be universal. If a similar bus gate had been incorporated into Barton Park it would have avoided a lot of problems.

So we want the Street Design Guide to require all new developments to be implemented like this, prioritising sustainable transport by making walking, wheeling or cycling more direct than driving. But Transport Development Management should really be onto this already, given the goals and priorities in the LTCP and other county policies.

This page is intentionally left blank

I am writing in strong support of the proposed bus lane, goods vehicle loading bay, and 20mph speed limit. A view that I know we share with many other residents, which I hope you have also heard from.

As residents we have many reasons to move between Phases 3 and 4 and Phases 1 and 2 of Elmsbrook. There is a primary school, there are friends and family members, a business centre, and soon to be a community centre and cafe. For residents, these journeys are short and we should be encouraging the use of public transport and active travel to achieve them. This is in line with the local planning policy under which the Elmsbrook Eco Town was proposed.

Elmsbrook has many young residents and visitors. We know this as we live on the main public path in and out of Elmsbrook. Daily we see the foot and cycle traffic of residents and visitors going to the primary school or going into town. Those active travellers are able to enjoy their journey because of reduced traffic. Lowering the traffic further would allow even more young people and parents to travel by foot and cycle without feeling intimidated by traffic.

Apart from journeys, we regularly see young people able to play and cycle safely on our quiet local streets - something that's becoming increasingly rare in many communities. We believe the current low traffic levels are what make this possible, and that further reductions would enhance this safe environment even more without negatively impacting drivers who always have the option to drive via the B4100. On the contrary, reducing traffic will work to enhance the experience of those who do have to drive.

We're also concerned that rejecting this proposal might send the wrong signal about traffic expectations in the area. If Charlotte Avenue becomes seen as an acceptable bypass for the busy B4100, combined with unenforced speed limits, we could see through-traffic levels that would completely undermine the peaceful and safe environment around Elmsbrook and its primary school.

Similarly, by allowing a loading only bay, we enable a cafe and community centre business to function logistically on the site. By providing more facilities on site, this again helps prevent what could otherwise become unnecessary short car journeys to facilities in town.

We hope you see the sound reasoning in these points and look forward to you making the best decision which serves us well to continue to keep Elmsbrook a safe and peaceful environment for all.

This page is intentionally left blank

Good morning Councillor Gant. I'm Peter Turner, a committee member of Bicester Bike Users' Group and an Elmsbrook resident. I'm also a parent who cycles through this bus and cycle gate multiple times daily taking my 2-year-old to and from nursery, to walk our dog and any time I need to travel towards town. There is no alternative route for pedestrians and cyclists.

I'd like to start by highlighting that these aren't new restrictions - they are 15-year-old planning conditions that were consulted on in 2010 for the 398 home Elmsbrook development (approved in 2012), and tested again in 2023 for the 530 home Firethorn addition, with signage in place since day one and even the ANPR electrical connection already installed as per the approved plans.

This TRO simply delivers those commitments in line with Oxfordshire's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.

The decision today matters urgently: Oxfordshire's own 2024 traffic survey revealed over 40% of the huge number of vehicles already ignoring the signage were also exceeding the 20mph limit, right where children walk to school. It is completely at odds to expect families to choose sustainable transport with such a high volume of cars speeding through this narrow section.

Every day, I witness speeding, wrong-way driving forcing cyclists onto the verges, and drivers not willing to wait just a few seconds for a cyclist. Last April, I was forced to withdraw from a marathon due to injuries sustained from an aggressive driver in this bus gate. Families with children regularly spill onto the carriageway because the pavements aren't wide enough to accommodate them. A serious injury is only a matter of time.

Charlotte Avenue was intended to be a safe community spine road but has become exactly the opposite, a dangerous rat-run that punishes sustainable transport choices. Private cars have a convenient alternative with direct access to the B4100, whereas pedestrians and cyclists have no other option but to "run the gauntlet".

This decision also matters beyond the existing Elmsbrook development because it tests whether Oxfordshire's transport commitments are real. As highways authority, OCC didn't object to the 530 additional homes using the spine road (21/01630/OUT) because the applicant's traffic modeling, and council officers, assumed and assured that enforcement would happen. The application was allowed on OCC's assurance.

If families like mine, who want to cycle with our children, are driven back to cars by dangerous conditions, the ambitious targets set by the LTCP become impossible. Every family that abandons cycling due to safety fears represents multiple failed trips.

Without enforcement, OCC are approving massive growth while undermining the very transport behavior changes that growth depends on. The decision to implement and enforce these provisions today is the decision to protect families who support choosing sustainable transport. The days of ignoring the highways commitments made during planning applications must end.

I ask that you support the officer's recommendation and show that Oxfordshire's transport commitments are real and will protect the residents who depend on them.

This page is intentionally left blank

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

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

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

I will reiterate our original objection.

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

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

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank