

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 30 April 2020 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 11.45 am

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE – in the Chair

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Liz Brighthouse (for Agenda Item 4)
Councillor Ian Corkin (for Agenda Item 11)
Councillor John Sanders

By Invitation:

Officers:

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

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
11.	J. Cox (Community Operations)

The Cabinet Member for Environment 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.

20/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Agenda No. 1)

None declared.

21/20 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

Councillor John Sanders

“In view of the pressures on the work of Officers during the Coronavirus emergency, can the cabinet member advise whether it is still planned to implement the two CPZs for Cowley (Cowley West and Cowley East) later this year? “

Cabinet Member for Environment

“I’m afraid I can’t give an answer as to how long any work programme will be delayed due to the current crisis but as the situation with regard to Covid19 improves and social distancing measures can be relaxed officers will continue to review where we are and make every effort to avoid delays. Officers I’m sure will keep local members posted.”

22/20 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Stephen Creed (resident) County Councillor Liz Brighthouse (Churchill & Lye Valley)) 4. Oxford – Hollow Way North –) Proposed Controlled Parking) Zone
Steve Malton (Resident) Judith Harley (Elder Stubbs Charity)) 5. Oxford – Cowley Marsh Area) Proposed Controlled Parking) Zone
Rakesh Joshi (LCP Developments)	8. Oxford: Various Locations – Proposed Exclusion from Permit Eligibility for Residents Permits
Giles Cattermole (Wallingford Town Council)	10. Wallingford: A4130 Wallingford Bypass – Proposed 40 mph Speed restriction and Right Turn Prohibition
Tim Hibbert (Wendlebury Parish Council) County Councillor Ian Corkin (Ploughley)) 11. Wendlebury: A41 Proposed) Extension of 40 mph Speed Limit) and 50 mph Speed Limit)

23/20 OXFORD - HOLLOW WAY NORTH - PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

(Agenda No. 4)

Following approval by the Cabinet Member for Environment in June 2018 and April 2019 of a programme of new CPZs in Oxford she now considered (CMDE4) responses to a formal consultation to introduce a new CPZ in the Hollow Way North area.

Stephen Creed (resident of Cranmer Road/Hollow Way). Since the opening of Parade Green in James Wolfe Road there had been persistent parking of student cars in Cranmer Road at various times including overnight and weekends. On occasion his driveway had been blocked. Also, his car tyres had been slashed in December along with about 4 student cars being similarly damaged. There was also the noise disturbance from cars doors slamming in the late evening as students parked their cars. He considered the proposed CPZ hours for Cranmer Road (9am-5pm Mon-Fri) insufficient as it would still allow students to park in Cranmer Road in the evenings, overnight and weekends. The existing problem in Cranmer Road would also be exacerbated further because Cranmer Road only had daytime restrictions, whereas nearby roads James Wolfe Road, Hundred Acres Close and other roads had evening, overnight and weekend restrictions and only allowed permit holders in the evening and overnight (6.30pm-8am - 7 days week). That would cause significant displacement of student parking onto Cranmer Road exacerbating the existing problem in Cranmer Road. Students would also be able to park overnight in Cranmer Road but not other roads. One of the roads with these overnight restrictions was Hundred Acres Close which was approximately the same distance from the Parade Green main entrance as Cranmer Road. So it seemed to him sensible for Cranmer Road to have the same restrictions. As he was likely to pay for a permit anyway (for 9am-5pm) then the CPZ hours might as well be extended in Cranmer Road to evening, overnight and weekends and he asked for this to be considered.

Responding to the Cabinet Member officers confirmed that the situation in Cranmer Road could be monitored and if appropriate included in a later consultation.

Councillor Brighouse expressed her concern over student parking with their cars used predominantly for recreation left sometimes for weeks. She had been disappointed with the level of response to the consultation but confirmed a number of residents had been in touch with her supporting implementation as soon as possible and before September. She empathised with Mr Creed but felt many residents would speak against that change. There was a high multi occupation in this area with upwards of 1200 students and it needed to be monitored carefully.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the points made by Mr Creed and echoed the point by Councillor Brighouse on the desirability for priority implementation.

Other written representations had been received from:

Darryl Ross who saw no need to implement a controlled parking zone for Hollow Way north. The majority of residents had voted against this proposal and if there was a problem at all from increased traffic or parking it was due to the increased number of students from Oxford Brookes. Oxford City Council had granted planning permission

for thousands of new accommodation places in the area, with conditions that students were not allowed to bring cars to Oxford. Those conditions were not policed by the Council neither did Oxford Brookes take responsibility to deter or penalise students who brought cars to the city and parked on adjacent residential streets. He asked why should local residents pay for the duties that Oxford Brookes and the city council are neglecting and be taxed for the privilege of parking outside their homes? Why should local residents have to incur financial penalties on top of the further noise, congestion and anti-social behaviour caused by the unsustainable density of student accommodation that has been forced upon the area. He asked for an alternative proposal to be considered where either Oxford Brookes was required to act upon its duties in terms of policing students with cars or were forced to pay for a scheme where residents could apply for 2 vehicle permits per household, plus a provision for annual visitor permits. Then the council will be able to raise revenue from "foreign" cars that were illegally parked.

William Reed a local resident felt that there had been scant analysis of local peoples' views and suggested that there was a reason to depart from the policy. There was virtually no non-residential parking in the Close before the opening of Parade Green with almost no non-residential parking in the Close now. Clearly there was no demonstrable need for a CPZ in East Field Close.

Parking Permit Costs had not been justified in the report with reference only being made to the proposed charges being the same as those which applied to many other CPZs. One letter of comment (6) argued that any first permit should be free with another arguing, in effect, that as CPZs pursued a policy objective of benefit to the wider community then the cost of the scheme should be funded generally. He supported those views arguing that if a scheme was introduced then charges should be lowered because of the economies of scale derived from the number of CPZs now in existence.

Regarding the hotel and guest house permit scheme he had commented in his response that whilst the draft Order contained provisions for a hotel and guest house permit scheme, neither the public notice nor the Statement of Reasons referred to the proposed introduction of such a scheme. The draft Order contained an entire section (Part) on this element. Therefore this element could not be introduced because local people had not been told about it or invited to give their views.

More residents had objected to the CPZ proposals than had supported them and this balance of objection needed to be borne in mind when deciding if the policy objectives outweighed the objections. He did not think they did and had suggested in his comments that the money available for the Hollow Way North scheme could be used to better and wider effect and not used specifically and solely for residents' parking.

She acknowledged the representations made to her at the meeting and the strong written objection from Mr Ross regarding student vehicles. It had to be remembered that although Oxford Brookes could, if aware of a particular problem, approach that tenant but had no powers to enforce matters on the highway. She acknowledged the point raised by officers regarding the rationale behind limiting parking in Hollow Way to daytime parking as opposed to 24 hours was that Hollow Way was primarily a

residential zone unlike, for example, Cowley Marsh. With regard to the points raised by Mr Reed pressures did vary in the zone and if some roads were omitted then other roads would suffer from displaced parking.

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

to approve proposals as advertised for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Hollow Way North area, but to review specific suggestions for minor adjustments as raised in the consultation responses and noted in paragraphs 11 and 17 noting that there would continue to be monitoring of parking particularly in the Cranmer Road area where there was significant student parking and review the opportunity to extend the scheme to evenings. Part of the monitoring would need to gauge impact on limited daytime where there could be more parking evenings and weekends regarding problems of displacement.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

24/20 OXFORD - COWLEY MARSH AREA - PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE
(Agenda No. 5)

Following approval in June 2018 and April 2019 of a programme of new CPZs in Oxford, the Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE5) responses to a formal consultation on a new CPZ in the Cowley Marsh area.

Steve Malton a resident spoke in favour of a CPZ in this area. It was not uncommon to have to park over 100m from your own property, or to have to do 3 or 4 laps of the block before a space became available. Residents were parking on blind corners or across driveways, as there was simply no space available although that had improved slightly due to the absence of students due to the ongoing Covid situation. Having reviewed other responses he had seen that a number of people had stated that they saw no issue with parking while noting that the majority of those respondents lived at the more southern end of the proposed zone - Bhandari Close, Morris Crescent, etc. While he had no doubt that they genuinely saw no issue in their area, he hoped they would also acknowledge that there were genuine issues in areas adjacent to the existing zones such as sections of Cricket Road and Ridgefield Road north of Howard Street, which lay adjacent to two existing zones, and needed this CPZ to prevent both commuter parking and spillover from the other zones. While the areas of the zone further away might not see problems now, should they be excluded from a new zone, those issues would quickly move to those areas. Others had objected to permits even though they had dedicated parking. As you will be aware, permits are not required for parking on land that is part of the residents' own property, so I hope the concerns of these residents can be met. He believed the creation of a CPZ in this area would make it less attractive as an informal park and ride for

commuters; reduce the number of cars brought in by residents of HMOs and encourage residents just inside the boundary of adjacent zones to obtain their own permits and use the zone where they lived. Finally, he sought assurances that new subdivisions, and existing subdivisions made without planning permission, be excluded from permit entitlement.

Judith Harley spoke on behalf of the Elder Stubbs Charity who owned the allotment site adjacent to Bhandari Close, within the Cowley Marsh Area proposed CPZ. As there was no parking provision within the site allotment holders and employees parked in Bhandari Close and Cricket Road. They opposed the proposals as no provision had been made for allotment holders or employees or contractors and, if approved, as advertised would make it difficult for them and others to park near to the allotments, especially during evenings and weekends, or for longer daytime periods and as many allotment holders were elderly and often needed to transport equipment and materials to the site they needed to park close by. The proposals for Bhandari Close and Cricket Road would particularly penalise those who wish to access the allotments in summer evenings and weekends. The restrictions did not apply in Barracks Lane, where the CPZ proposals made special allowance for parking near to the Barracks Lane allotments offering them flexibility for allotment use, with 4-hour parking slots and a wider range of parking times. There had been no such allowance or consideration for their needs. Weekends and light summer mornings and evenings were particularly popular times for gardeners to tend their allotments, yet the current proposals offered no opportunity at all to park before 8 a.m. or after 6.30 p.m. and no opportunity to park for more than two hours during other times. Two of our employees – our allotment site Estate Managers, one of whom lives in West Hanney – often started work at 7.30 a.m. and could finish at any time between 1 p.m. and 4 .30 p.m., so they would be extremely inconvenienced. They were the first port of call for any emergency on site and could not rely on public transport, especially when they might have heavy tools to transport to the site. Your proposals offered business and contractor permits but with limited availability and at a charge. They were not a business, but a registered charity, with a remit to provide facilities, grants, and open space for those who were disadvantaged in Oxford East and we relied on contractors for heavy-duty site maintenance. They had three permanent employees, occasional temporary employees, occasional contractors, over one hundred allotment holders, a range of volunteers and eleven Trustees. You propose exemptions to include universal service providers; vehicles used in connection with road works and works to utility services and official funeral vehicles so could these exemptions not be extended to include those who work on, or in association with, our allotments? On behalf of our allotment holders and employees I am asking you to change the proposed restrictions in Bhandari Close and Cricket Road to offer increased parking time and extended parking hours for non-permit holders and the opportunity for our allotment holders and employees to park at length at weekends. It was logical, fair, and appropriate to provide us with at least the same flexibility for parking, or more, as at Barracks Lane allotments. We appreciate that the CPZs are being proposed to reduce parking pressure for residents due to commuter parking, but we are not commuters. Please amend the proposals for Bhandari Close and Cricket Road to offer a minimum of four-hour parking between 7.30 a.m. and 9.30 p.m. every day, with exemptions for those parking on allotment business.

The Cabinet Member noted representations had been received from:

Mohammed Mannan a resident who had lived in this area for the last 35 years and who supported the proposal. He considered the parking situation was getting worse every year especially in term time when the university was open. Sometimes people parked their vehicles on our street and then went to work in town by bus making it difficult to park our own cars.

County Councillor Jamila Azad advised her residents had suffered for years from fly parking and commuters parking in front of their doors. This part of Cowley Road had a high level of traffic, heavy lorries and 10 Buses but residents were having to park hundreds of meters away as spaces were often taken by commuters who wouldn't qualify for a resident parking permit. The current proposal for permit parking for residents on the side streets along Cowley Road would bring real benefits to those living there but didn't allow residents of Cowley to have parking permits. She requested that the scheme be extended to include the length of Cowley Road allowing residents there to qualify for parking permits.

John Grogan, Nicole Ashman & Luisa Parnell opposed the proposed Controlled Parking Zone & Parking Restrictions, for several reasons. They lived in Reliance Way, so our objections referred to that road, although they imagined they were also likely to apply to nearby roads as well. Firstly, the zone seemed to aim to reduce parking during working hours (mon-fri, 8am-6.30pm), despite there not being an issue of over-parking during working hours in Reliance Way, even outside of the current pandemic situation. Normally, there was ample parking during working hours as most people drove from their homes to their work and parked there, leaving Reliance Way quiet. There were few businesses around this area, meaning people did not drive to park here during the day. Any attempt to reduce parking by non-residents during these hours was an attempt to solve a problem that did not exist. Secondly, as this scheme would not help the residents of Reliance Way in any way, because the problem did not exist the proposal, therefore, to charge them £65 for parking which was currently free and was free when we bought or rented the properties was an unnecessary surcharge for living in these streets. Thirdly, the proposed permit scheme was heavily biased against HMO properties with the limit of two permits per household clearly set up for a family, while properties with more than two adults living in them would not be able to get enough permits. In this case, what would they do? Finally, given that people were now due to the pandemic working from home more and actually parking in these roads during the day instead of driving away to work and the uncertainty about how long this situation would last and when/if people would be going back to work this seemed the worst time that such a proposal could be considered, let alone implemented. The only reason they could see for this proposal was the revenue it would bring to the Council, from the residents of these streets.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the representations she had received and as with all such schemes there were varied opinions. She was mindful that it had been suggested that a review of the scheme be carried out approximately 12 months after implementation of the CPZ should it be approved, but with a review of its impact specifically on the Cowley Road being carried out within six months of its implementation. She further noted advice from officers who considered that as they were satisfied that correct procedures had been used when progressing this scheme a complaint lodged against the scheme on those grounds should not hold up implementation.

Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to and received by her at the meeting the Cabinet Member confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve proposals as advertised for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Cowley Marsh area, noting that local consultations may be carried out in respect of changes to proposals for part of Barracks Lane and Elder Stubbs Charity Allotment Groups regarding arrangements to include the possibility of issuing visitor permits, in respect of minor changes to proposals for no waiting at any time restrictions and that properties on Cowley Road itself would also be eligible for permits on the same basis as those proposed for those properties on the side roads included in this CPZ.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

25/20 ABINGDON, HENLEY, OXFORD AND WALLINGFORD: AMENDMENTS TO FEES FOR RESIDENTS VEHICLE AND VISITOR PERMITS AND ON-STREET PARKING

(Agenda No. 6)

Following approval on 21 January 2020 by Cabinet for revised fees the County Council was then obliged to advertise its intention to alter the Traffic Regulation Order to give effect to these changes the Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE6) responses received to a statutory consultation to increase fees for on-street parking and parking permits required in Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs).

Having regard to the information set out in the report before her the Cabinet Member confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed increases to fees for permits for the Controlled Parking Zones in Oxford, North Hinksey and Henley on Thames and for on-street pay and display parking in Abingdon, Henley and Wallingford as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

26/20 OXFORD - ORIEL SQUARE AND TURL STREET - AMENDED ACCESS RESTRICTIONS

(Agenda No. 7)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE7) responses received to a statutory consultation on a proposal to amend the permitted vehicles in Oriel Square and Turl Street in Oxford and having regard to the information set out in the report before her the cabinet Member confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed amendments to access restrictions applying to Oriel Square and Turl Street, Oxford.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

27/20 OXFORD: VARIOUS LOCATIONS - PROPOSED EXCLUSION FROM PERMIT ELIGIBILITY FOR RESIDENTS PERMITS

(Agenda No. 8)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a report (CMDE8) which is sought to confirm the proposed exclusion of eligibility for parking permits for residents of 77A-81A London Road Oxford in accordance with a planning condition set by Oxford City Council for the redevelopment of these properties.

Rakesh Joshi (LCP Developments) spoke on behalf of, London and Cambridge Properties Limited (LCP), which owned numbers 77a-81a London Road, Headington. LCP had obtained permission to convert the first floor from offices to two flats in May 2019 subject to conditions. All of the relevant conditions had been discharged apart from Condition 4, which required an order governing parking at the properties to be varied by the County Council. Until this had been confirmed the properties could not be occupied. LCP had no objection to that condition and had applied for the necessary order. Furthermore, the flats had been converted and sold to overseas purchasers, subject to this condition being satisfied. The officer report set out the relevant background to this issue and he noted that that there had been no objections from Thames Valley Police or any other emergency service. Furthermore, the order was consistent with adopted policies of both Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council. There had been one objection from a local resident but he considered that that appeared to be ill-conceived and as concluded in the officer report, confirmation of the order would have no adverse impact on any adjoining neighbour. In view of the above he asked that the officer recommendation be approved.

Having regard to the information set out in the report before her along with the representation made to her at the meeting the Cabinet Member confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed exclusion of eligibility for 77a to 81a London Road Oxford for residents and visitor permits as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

28/20 PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND TRAFFIC CALMING - BANKSIDE, BANBURY

(Agenda No. 9)

The Longford Park residential development in south east Banbury was underway with a significant number of homes already completed and occupied. As the site was further developed, a new junction at Bankside was being constructed with measures proposed to provide for the additional demands for travel arising from the development. If approved, those measures, which included the replacement of the existing traffic calming chicanes with speed cushions, a raised zebra crossing and the introduction of additional waiting restrictions, would be funded by the developer. Also proposed, although not requiring formal consultation were advisory cycle lanes on both sides of the road along its full length, reflecting that Bankside already formed part of a signed cycle route to the station. The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE9) responses received to a consultation on the proposals.

Having regard to the information set out in the report before her the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed waiting restrictions, zebra crossing and traffic calming measures at Bankside, Banbury, as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

29/20 WALLINGFORD: A4130 WALLINGFORD BYPASS - PROPOSED 40MPH SPEED LIMIT AND RIGHT TURN PROHIBITION

(Agenda No. 10)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE10) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a permanent 40mph speed limit on the A4130 Calvin Thomas Way, which formed part of the Wallingford bypass, between its roundabout junctions at Slade End and the Hithercroft Road and a prohibition of the right turn to and from the A4130 at the junction of the access to new residential development to the east of the A4130 Calvin Thomas Way. The proposed speed limit and right turn prohibition would replace existing temporary Traffic Regulation Orders giving the same effect as the current proposals. It was, however, intended, once the development was completed in several years' time, to remove both proposed restrictions when construction works were complete, though noting that a further consultation would be required ahead of these restrictions being revoked. The proposals had been put forward to accommodate the development of adjacent land and, if approved, would be funded by the developers.

Councillor Giles Cattermole (Wallingford Town Council) opposed the imposition of speed limits on the A4130 Calvin Thomas Way, whether temporarily or permanently. The A4130 was a major trunk road and should, therefore, be subject to speed limits below the National Limit only where specifically justified. Calvin Thomas

Way had been built to serve as a bypass to Wallingford and to ease traffic loads and pollution through the centre of the town which was an Air Quality Management Area particularly at the notorious choke points at Wantage Road, the Waitrose crossroads and over Wallingford Bridge. It was over 50% longer than the direct route through the town centre and already had speed restrictions along 0.9 miles of Portway. Further speed restrictions on the 1.05 miles of Calvin Thomas Way would significantly reduce the relative attractiveness of the bypass and lead to increased traffic choosing the town centre route. Wallingford Town Council proposed instead:

1. 'No Right Turn' instructions for traffic both entering and leaving the site [so that entering traffic comes from the Slade End Roundabout, and leaving traffic goes to the Hithercroft Roundabout],
2. Adequate slipways both onto and off the southbound A4130 carriageway, to enable safe deceleration from and acceleration to trunk road speeds
3. A lane separation barrier on the A4130 for 50 metres either side of the site entrance

Given these measures, no speed restrictions would be necessary. The Town Council also considered that a permanent TRO for this site was inappropriate, given the temporary nature of the requirement and the site developer should be responsible for applying for Temporary TROs to cover the works for the entirety of the build programme.

In response to the suggestion from the Town Council officers responded to confirm that the scheme would not alter the current situation on the ground and that following completion of the development the speed limits would be removed. Also, it would be ultra vires for the County Council to seek provision of additional slipways onto and off the southbound carriageway of the A4130 and that officers from the Roads Agreement Team would be discussing with the developers their offer to provide additional signing in Wallingford to dissuade drivers from using alternative routes through the town.

Having regard to the information set out in the report before her along with the representations made to her at the meeting including officer advice the Cabinet Member confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the 40mph speed limit and prohibition of right turns as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

30/20 WENDLEBURY: A41 - PROPOSED EXTENSION OF 40MPH SPEED LIMIT AND 50MPH SPEED LIMIT
(Agenda No. 11)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE11) responses received to a statutory consultation to extend the 40mph speed limit on the northbound

carriageway of the A41 on the approach to its roundabout junction with Vendee Drive and also to introduce a 50mph speed limit to the south of the extended 40mph put forward following a review of the recent accident history and specifically at the A41 roundabout junction with Vendee Drive, where there had been a significant record of injury accidents involving northbound vehicles on the A41 travelling at excessive speed.

Tim Hibbert (Wendlebury PC) advised that Wendlebury was a small village of 180 households with no street lighting, or pavements and was a vibrant community that tried to maintain a quality of rural life. It was vital that the current physical containment of the village was understood. The M40 to the West, the A41 to the North and the Chiltern Railway line to the South. Junction 9 fell within the parish boundary as well as part of the A41. The remainder of the A41 fell within the parameters of Chesterton Parish Council, the neighbouring Parish. To set the context in relation to the proposed speed reductions in this report the A41 and Bicester itself were already experiencing operational stress and a number of serious collisions and fatalities had been reported at the A41/Vendee Drive junction and on the A41 near Wendlebury in recent years. Both Junctions 9 and 10 of the M40 were already operating at capacity and when accidents occurred, significant queueing and rat running occurred on surrounding roads. Wendlebury suffered from severe 'rat running' through the village from traffic being diverted to avoid Junction 9. For safety reasons, the Parish Council, supported by OCC had introduced a speed limit of 20 mph. There were a number of major commercial developments as part of Cherwell Local Plan Policy Bicester 10, not only on the A41, but particularly adjacent to the Vendee Drive roundabout. The Parish Council was particularly concerned with the real impact of traffic congestion from these developments as they would inevitably generate a significant amount of extra travel.

Their concerns over the proposals centred on an absence of appropriate data which prevented the PC being in a position to make a judgement. A further concern was there was no information to show that the impact of developments around the Vendee Drive roundabout had been considered, or the impact of Tritax Symmetry warehouse proposals. To what extent had the traffic from the future developments been taken into account? Enforcement options were also critical, to help us make a judgement it would have been helpful to see this data as well. Had a cost benefit analysis been carried out? In August 2018, there was a fatal accident on the A41 by the pedestrian crossing at Wendlebury. The Inquest concluded that death was caused by excessive speed. Following that accident, OCC were to look at proposals for a bridge crossing, funded by a third party. To date there had been no progress some 20 months later.

In summary the Parish Council supported a comprehensive review of the A41 from Junction 9 to Vendee Drive roundabout but saw the rebuilding of this roundabout as the priority to improving traffic management. The committee report talked about this in vague terms, with no indication of time scale or funding. They had been unable to comment on the proposals due to the lack of evidence and enforcement options. Had this been available, they could have offered a clearer response. The question also arose as to why only one side of the A41? Also had the traffic impact of all the potential developments being considered?

County Councillor Ian Corkin referred to the well documented history regarding the section of the A41 from Junction 9 of the M40 and the roundabout at Vendee Drive.

In more normal times, the route was very well used for traffic accessing Bicester with a history of speeding and the Vendee Drive roundabout was recognised by very many local residents as being poorly designed and difficult to use. The immediate area around it had increasing levels of significant development, as well as the entrance and exit to Bicester Park & Ride. In the past couple of years, there had been 3 fatal road traffic collisions on this short stretch of the A41, the most recent a double fatality on the roundabout itself between a vehicle using the roundabout and another entering it from the north bound leg of the A41. Having discussed the issues on numerous occasions with Oxfordshire County Council officers and Thames Valley Police, he had no doubt at all that these changes would make a very significant improvement to this section and he strongly supported them, as did many local residents. Not only would it improve the layout and signage, but also facilitate space for active speed enforcement, something that could not currently take place on this stretch of road. He also welcomed Thames Valley Police's commitment to make sure that this happened on a regular basis.

He accepted that this was only a very small part of the overall solution needed on the A41 through Bicester and he would continue to pursue those, including the ongoing Options Report that was looking at the specific issues by the Wendlebury bus stops, the wider A41 Bicester review, the emerging Bicester active transport strategy and the work by officers to tie this in with the actual and proposed development around this stretch of the A41. A much more holistic solution would be required to satisfy all of the safety concerns of local residents, and he concurred with the comments from Wendlebury PC that this was not happening quickly enough. However, the question for today was would this specific proposal help or hinder the aim of making the A41 safer for all residents to use and the resounding answer to that was that it would and in endorsing the officer recommendation asked that it be approved.

County Councillors Les Sibley (Bicester West), Michael Waine (Bicester Town) and Lawrie Stratford (Bicester North) submitted the following joint statement to say reducing the speed limits from J9 heading North on the A41 to the Vendee Drive roundabout would have minimal if any benefits at this time. Most traffic accidents occurred at either the poorly designed 7 arm Vendee Drive roundabout or the A41 Pioneer Way/Premier Inn traffic light junction. Following the A41 Safety and Audit review Highway Officers were currently looking into various options to help improve road safety at these accident hot spots as a priority and so they were reluctantly suggesting that the proposed extension of speed limits be deferred until the various issues regarding the A41 Vendee Drive roundabout, the access and exit issues of the Bicester Park & Ride, the A41 Pioneer Way/ Premier Inn traffic light junction, and the impact of cumulative development in the area on the local road network had been addressed and that should happen as a matter of urgency. Additionally, they were still waiting for an update particularly with regards to the status of the proposed Bicester South East Link Road and the proposed route for the Oxford - Cambridge Express way which would have a major impact on Bicester's road network.

The Cabinet Member thanked everyone for their full and comprehensive submissions. She understood from officers that the intention was to have a comprehensive review of this area including the Vendee Drive roundabout which would include further developments proposed for that area and officers would ensure future engagement with local stakeholders regarding that ongoing review in the

longer term. However, this proposal had been a specific response to a number of serious traffic incidents including 3 fatalities to achieve an immediate safety gain and as such would be funded by the Road Safety budget within the County Council's Capital programme. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report before her and the representations made to her at the meeting including officer advice regarding the immediate safety issues the Cabinet Member confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the extension of the 40mph speed limit and introduction of a 50mph speed limit on the A41 as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....