

Division(s) affected: *Rose Hill & Littlemore*

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT

04 SEPTEMBER 2025

OXFORD: RAILWAY LANE – PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT & TRAFFIC CALMING FEATURES

Report by Director of Environment and Highways

RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet Member is **RECOMMENDED** to:

- a) **Approve the introduction of a 20mph speed limit on the new road accessing the residential development, leading north-westwards from Railway Lane, as advertised, and**
- b) **Approve the construction of two Speed Cushion traffic calming features on Railway Lane, as advertised.**

Executive Summary

1. This report presents responses received to a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce a 20mph speed limit in Littlemore on the new (as yet unnamed) road accessing the residential development, leading north-westwards from Railway Lane for a distance of approximately 200 metres, and two Speed Cushion traffic calming features (approx. 2m long, 1.7m wide & 75mm high) to be introduced on Railway Lane, located either side of its junction with Chapel Lane, as shown in **Annex 1**.
2. The proposals have been put forward as a result of residential development, and will help ensure adherence to the Council's policy that all new residential developments should see a lower speed limit as standard in the area, and will ensure the speed limit within the development matches that of the surrounding residential streets.
3. Additionally, the related 'Section 106 Agreement' specified that works were also required at the end of Chapel Lane, with speed cushions being identified as the most suitable form of traffic calming measure agreed with the County Council. The traffic calming measures have been included in the 'Section 278 Agreement' works for road safety reasons as part of the approved planning process.

Sustainability Implications

4. The proposals will help promote road safety for all road users within the area, especially for the more vulnerable road users such as pedestrians & pedal cyclists.

Financial Implications

5. Funding for consultation on the proposals (and implementation if approved) has been provided by the developer.

Legal Implications

6. The consultation that has been undertaken complies with the consultation requirements for the various elements as required by law including under the Highways Act 1980, the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and any other relevant legislation.
7. The scheme has been promoted by Oxfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority and Traffic Authority under the Highways Act 1980, and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Comments checked by:

Jennifer Crouch (Head of Law - Environmental)

Jennifer.Crouch@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Equalities and Inclusion Implications

8. No negative implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of the proposals.

Formal Consultation

9. Formal consultation was carried out between 05 June and 04 July 2025. A notice was published in the Oxford Times newspaper, and an email was sent to statutory consultees & key-stakeholders, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Bus operators, countywide transport/access & disabled peoples user groups, Oxford City Council, local City Cllr's, Littlemore Parish Council, and the local County Councillor representing the Rose Hill & Littlemore division.

10. Relevant parish/town councils, and local Cllrs (including County, District, Parish, Town) were also encouraged to use the consultation documents provided to publicise the proposals amongst local residents as necessary
11. 11 responses were received via the online survey during the course of the formal consultation, and these are summarised in the table below:

Proposal	Object	Partially support	Support	No opinion /objection	Total
20mph speed limit	3	1	7	-	11
Traffic calming	6	2	3	-	11

12. Additionally, a further three emails were received directly, with Thames Valley Police & Oxford Bus Company not objecting, and 'Oxfordshire Liveable Streets' objecting to the proposed use of speed cushions, wanting to see full-width sinusoidal profile speed humps be used instead.
13. The full responses are shown in **Annex 2**, and copies of the original responses are available for inspection by County Councillors. Any comments received that Officers identify as containing personal abuse and/or other personal information will be redacted as appropriate.

Officer Response to Objections/Concerns

14. The proposed traffic calming was originally meant to be 'raised table' feature at the planning stage, however this was deemed not possible as the location is adjacent to the wall of a house, with no kerbs – the table would have raised the carriageway above the existing damp proofing level, and as such would have been problematic to construct.
15. In relation to concerns raised about obstructive parking in the area, Officers point out that – as part of a separate consultation through the 'Traffic & Road Safety' team – additional 'No Waiting at Any time' parking restrictions (double yellow lines) are being proposed on the corner of Chapel Lane and along the southern side of Railway Lane, which Officers feel will help mitigate the issues.
16. With regards to the objections in relation to the 20mph speed limit, Officers stress that it is current Oxfordshire County Council policy – when approving or adopting new developments – that all new residential developments should see a lower speed limit as standard where appropriate. The proposed speed limit also conforms with the relevant approved planning applications. and is the planned 'design speed' of the roads within the estate.

Paul Fermer
Director of Environment and Highways

Annexes

Annex 1: Consultation plan
Annex 2: Consultation responses

Contact Officers:

Julian Richardson (Lead Engineer – Regulatory Planning
Enforcement)

September 2025

NOTES

1. This drawing is to be read in conjunction with all relevant documents and specifications.
2. Dimensions are suitable for 'Planning' purposes only.

KEY

	Site boundary
	Proposed 20mph speed limit extent
	Trunk road
	Proposed works within the existing junction



0.0 10.0 20.0 30.0 40.0 50.0
Scale = 1:500 @ A1

DRAWING NO. 6000105 FROM
TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER
20MPH ON SITE SPEED LIMIT AND TRAFFIC CALMING
MEASURES ON HAINSBURY LANE/CHAPPEL LANE JUNCTION
SCALE: 1:500 @ A1
REV: SKIN A2
DATE: 18/01/2015

A. Email responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(e1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	No objection
(e2) Head of Built Environment and Infrastructure, (Oxford Bus Company)	No objection – This is entirely sensible.
(e3) Local group/organisation, (Oxfordshire Liveable Streets)	<p>Object – The speed limits are unproblematic, but we object to the proposed use of speed cushions.</p> <p>Speed cushions are dangerous for cycling. They push people cycling away from the safest place in the carriageway and either into the gutter or into the very middle of the road. They are even more dangerous for tricycles and mobility scooters, where the forced camber risks overturning the rider. And speed cushions are ineffective at slowing motor vehicles, since larger SUVs can straddle them.</p> <p>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." Cycle Infrastructure Design, 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."</p> <p>So we urge that full-width, sinusoidal profile speed humps be used instead, with designs following paragraph 7.6.5 and Figure 7.8 in LTN 1/20.</p>

B. Online responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(o1) Rather not say, (Fritwell, Fritwell Lane)	<p>20mph speed limit – Object Traffic calming – Object</p> <p>No evidence presented. Save the money . It's too slow on that road</p>
(o2) Local resident, (Littlemore, Railway Lane)	<p>20mph speed limit – Object Traffic calming – Object</p> <p>Due to the nature of the road traffic is usually slow anyway</p>
(o3) Local resident, (Witney, Westcote)	<p>20mph speed limit – Object Traffic calming – Object</p> <p>It is anti motorist</p>
(o4) Local resident, (Oxford, Sunderland Avenue)	<p>20mph speed limit – Partially support Traffic calming – Object</p> <p>Use sinusoidal ramps not speed cushions. From LTN 1/20 "7.6.8 Speed cushions are a form of road hump and are therefore subject to The Highways (Road Hump) Regulations 1999. The dimensions allow wide tracked vehicles such as buses, ambulances and HGVs to straddle them. Cushions are not a preferred form of traffic calming on cycle routes 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."</p> <p>and</p> <p>7.6.5 Vertical deflection features: Sinusoidal ramps have a smooth transition profile on both sides of the hump as shown in Figure 7.8. They are more comfortable for cyclists and should normally be used where on-carriageway cycling is anticipated. Any difficulties in achieving the sinusoidal profile may</p>

	<p>be overcome by using preformed sections. These are particularly useful for approaches to flat-topped hump and speed tables. The profile of precast products should be checked to ensure it conforms to current regulations."</p>
<p>(o5) Local group/organisation, (Cyclox)</p>	<p>20mph speed limit – Support Traffic calming – Object</p> <p>We support the proposal for 20mph along the street. We also support traffic calming, but are concerned to see that you mention speed cushions. We object to that design.</p> <p>Cycle Infrastructure Design in Para 7.6.8 states: "Cushions are not a preferred form of traffic calming on cycle routes 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."</p> <p>Cyclox's position is that we support sinusoidal speed ramps and this is supported in LTN 1/20 para 7.6.5 "Sinusoidal ramps have a smooth transition profile on both sides of the hump [.....]. They are more comfortable for cyclists and should normally be used where on-carriageway cycling is anticipated."</p> <p>We are unable to find any policy on traffic calming designs on your website and would like to have input in the future if you are going to make policy decisions on traffic calming measures as these directly affect the comfort of cycling.</p>
<p>(o6) Local resident, (Oxford, Morrell Avenue)</p>	<p>20mph speed limit – Support Traffic calming – Object</p> <p>Speed cushions are really bad for cyclists. Sinusoidal full width speed bumps are needed here.</p>
<p>(o7) Local resident, (Littlemore, David Nicholls Close)</p>	<p>20mph speed limit – Support Traffic calming – Partially support</p> <p>Would be bonkers to not have this extension be 20mph like the rest of Littlemore has been for years. This is also a new residential street so 20mph (or lower!) is entirely appropriate.</p>

	<p>The traffic calming feature speed bump on Railway Lane isn't currently needed as the road surface is so bad it's difficult to go quickly anyway. Would maybe be better to have speed cushions here such that cyclists don't have to negotiate the speed bumps, though this island is probably an improvement over current provision due to horrific potholes.</p>
<p>(o8) Local resident, (Littlemore, Astrop lane)</p>	<p>20mph speed limit – Support Traffic calming – Partially support</p> <p>I live down Astrop lane, directly opposite where the new development is happening and right at the end of Railway Lane. Traffic calming measures are a good idea, however, a particular place that is dangerous is the entrance way to chapel lane. Plenty of times cars have come barrelling out of chapel lane onto railway lane, not looking right to see if anyone- car, lorry, bike, pedestrians- is coming. The addition of 90 more families particular in this small area will be exposed to risks on our one and only access route out of this area.</p> <p>Additionally, The car's parked on the corner of chapel lane can heavily obstruct the view for all road users to see, when coming out of Chapel Lane, if another road user is coming from Astrop Lane/ the new development. It is important this particular issue is addressed.</p>
<p>(o9) Local group/organisation, (Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel)</p>	<p>20mph speed limit – Support Traffic calming – Support</p> <p>We support these proposals as 20mph is the normal and appropriate speed limit for residential streets, and the traffic calming helps to make this the natural speed. Like most housing streets in Littlemore, this is part of a low traffic neighbourhood, and so with the speed limits and calming should not suffer from major traffic problems.</p>
<p>(o10) Local resident, (Bloxham, A361)</p>	<p>20mph speed limit – Support Traffic calming – Support</p> <p>Safer and better for the planet</p>

<p>(o11) Local resident, (Oxford, Arnolds Way)</p>	<p>20mph speed limit – Support Traffic calming – Support</p> <p>Reducing speed of traffic to a safer level make very good sense in terms of reducing accidents and the lessening the impact of any accident</p>
--	---