

Divisions affected: *Hanborough & Minster Lovell*

**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT –
16 NOVEMBER 2023**

LEAFIELD: PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMITS

Report by Corporate Director, Environment and Place

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Cabinet Member for Highway Management is RECOMMENDED to approve the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Leaffield as advertised.

Executive summary

2. The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Leaffield as shown in **Annex 1**.

Financial Implications

3. Funding for consultation and the proposals themselves has been provided by the County Council's 20mph Speed Limit Project.

Equality and Inclusion Implications

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

Sustainability Implications

5. The proposals would help encourage walking and cycling within Leaffield by making them safer and more attractive.

Formal consultation

6. Formal consultation was carried out between 06 September and 29 September 2023. A notice was published in the Witney Gazette newspaper, and an email 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, West Oxfordshire District Council, the local District Cllrs, Leaffield parish council, and

the local County Councillor representing the Hanborough & Minster Lovell division.

Statutory Consultee Responses:

7. Thames Valley Police and Leafield Parish Council responded to the consultation. The Police re-iterated their views concerning OCC's policy and practice regarding 20mph speed limits which they consider as 'concerns' rather than an objection. The Parish Council expressed support for the proposals.

Other Responses:

8. 127 online responses and an email were received. 10 expressions of concern were re-allocated, with two in support and eight objecting. The summary of respondents is outlined in the table below:

Local Resident		Member of Public		Business	
Supporters	Objectors	Supporters	Objectors	Supporters	Objectors
59	30	5	28	1	1

9. The following table is a summary of the objections and concerns raised, with the views of some respondents covering more than one category:

View/Opinion	Number of responses
Not necessary	35
Waste of money	18
Increased pollution	17
More dangerous due to road rage / lack of concentration	11
No safety justification	10
Will not be respected	10
Only outside schools, residential streets and in accident spots	9
Will be detrimental overall	6
Will not be enforced	5
Increased congestion	4
Bad for commerce	2
Too many limits will dilute effectiveness	2
No alternative transport available	1
Increased sign clutter	1

10. Those who responded online, were also asked whether if the 20mph speed limit proposals were implemented would it likely influence a change to their mode of travel in the area, the results of which are shown below:

Travel Change	Number
Yes – walk/wheel more	17 (13%)
Yes - cycle more	10 (8%)
No	93 (73%)
Other	7 (6%)

11. The consultation responses are shown in **Annex 2**, and copies of the original responses are available for inspection by County Councillors.

Officer response to objections/concerns

12. The main purpose of the scheme is to encourage greater use of active travel by reducing speeds; this is also expected to reduce accidents. The aim of reducing speed limits is to change driver’s mindsets to make speeding socially unacceptable and make more environmentally friendly modes of travel such as walking and cycling more attractive, and also help reduce the Counties carbon footprint. This forms part of a countywide programme of works that seeks to deliver ‘a safer place with a safer pace’.

13. A high level of responses were equally balanced with 65 plus the parish council in support and 59 objecting. An unusually high 25% of respondents were members of the public. The authority considers objections along the lines of it being unjustified, anti-car, a waste of money, not enforceable or pointless to not warrant amendments to a proposal. As such the authority has not addressed any specific comments made of this nature in this report.

Bill Cotton
Corporate Director, Environment and Place

Annexes Annex 1: Consultation plan
 Annex 2: Consultation responses

Contact Officers: Phil Whitfield 07912 523497
 Geoff Barrell 07392 318869

November 2023




Drawing No. _____

Notes:

- Proposed 20mph limit
- Existing 30mph limit

© Crown Copyright and Database rights 10023943 2017

Rev.	Date	Purpose of revision	Drawn	Checked	Approved

 **OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**
 Bill Cotton
 Director of
 Communities Operations
 Oxfordshire County Council
 County Hall
 New Road
 Oxford
 OX1 1ND
 Tel: 0845 310 1111

Project title
 Leaffield 20mph

Drawing title
 General Layout

Drawing Status

Scale @ A3	Drawn by ER	Checked by GJB	Approved by GJB
	Date drawn 01/08/23	Date checked 01/08/23	Date approved 01/08/23

Oxfordshire Project No. & File Ref

Drawing No.	Revision
-------------	----------

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	<p>Concerns – Thames Valley Police welcome the opportunity to engage on plans for road safety improvement and acknowledge that 20mph limits can be a useful tool in road safety. There are other reasons 20mph limits may be desirable for communities, such as environmental concerns, and creating a shared space environment to encourage greater diversity of road users.</p> <p>Compliance with 20mph limits is a challenging issue as there is a difference between the achievable results of the various available schemes. For example a sign-only scheme will only have a limited effect on the mean speeds, as opposed to other schemes that influence the road environment, which is recognised as being key to achieving compliance. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the vulnerable road user being less safe. It can also cause a dis-proportionate number of drivers to criminalise themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute.</p> <p>Thames Valley Police have no policy to enforce based on arbitrary speed limits alone but will enforce based on threat of harm, risk and resourcing. 20mph limits are not excluded from this and will be enforced where appropriate. There should be no expectation that the police would be able to provide regular enforcement if a speed limit is set too low as this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources and there are no additional resources available to support extra enforcement. Messages from partners that police will not enforce need to be discouraged. Such messaging can encourage non-compliance and should be avoided.</p> <p>The policy of Thames Valley Police is to use sound practical and realistic criteria (Setting local speed limits - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)) when responding to Highway Authorities in an effort to promote consistency and to reduce the burden of constant and unnecessary enforcement. The advice shown in Circular Roads 1/2013 states.</p> <p>The key factors that should be taken into account in any decisions on local speed limits are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • history of collisions • road geometry and engineering • road function • composition of road users (including existing and potential levels of vulnerable road users) • existing traffic speeds • road environment

	<p>However I recognise Oxfordshire County Council now have their own Policy for Setting Speed Limits and I expect full compliance of that policy going forward in relation to both monitoring , future engineering and self-enforcement through Community Speed Watch .</p> <p>Our stance remains that primarily 20 mph speed limits and zones should be self-enforcing</p> <p>Speed limits should be considered as part of a package of measures to manage vehicle speeds and improve road safety. Changes to the highway (for example through narrowing, providing vertical traffic calming or re-aligning the road) may be required to encourage lower speeds in addition to any change in speed limit. Though these may be more expensive, they are more likely to be successful in the long term in achieving lower speeds without the need for increased police enforcement to penalise substantial numbers of motorists.</p>
(2) Leafield Parish Council	<p>Support – Leafield Parish Council wishes to advise that it supports the proposed 20 mph speed limits as shown in the plans.</p>
(3) Member of public, (Abingdon, Bowyer Road)	<p>Object – I do not feel that any benefit is gained changing to 20mph in fact it increases pollution & with regards to road safety it is the responsibility of the road user to be observant at all times along with pedestrians & cyclists, horse riders.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(4) Member of public, (Bicester, Waveney Close)	<p>Object – Too many inappropriate 20 speed limits are being put in in Oxfordshire. They do NOT make the roads safer as drivers tend to ignore them Jen they seem inappropriate which cancels out the areas where 20 is really needed. Why not use a 25 limit where you need to slow traffic and only use 20 where it is dangerous to go faster. Too many blanket 20 limits in villages are counter-productive and I hav heard that in some places traffic is going faster than before the limit was changed. PLEASE - only use 20 where it is vital for safety - please consider 25 when you need traffic to go a bit slower and leave 30 on other roads. 20 should really only be needed on narrow residential roads and cul-de-sacs and where a road is narrow and winding and going faster would be dangerous. Too many 20 limits where they are not essential just frustrate drivers who will, unfortunately, tend to ignore them.</p>

	Travel change: No
(5) Member of public, (Bicester, Whimbrel Close)	Object – We've managed fine with 30mph. Pollution is worsened by these twenty zones dotted around. People won't obey them anyway except in built up areas with poor visibility or outside schools. The reason people don't obey the new ones going up everywhere is because they're totally unnecessary. Travel change: No
(6) Member of public, (Chinnor, Mill Lane)	Object – 30 mph limit is absolutely fine - 20 mph will cause more pollution and traffic Travel change: No
(7) Member of public, (unknown)	Object – manual-transmission cars travelling at 20mph will do so in a lower gear. Engines work less efficiently at low speeds, creating more pollution from partially-combusted hydrocarbons. Travel change: Other go elsewhere
(8) Member of public, (Deddington, Nether Worton Road)	Object – Not sure it is really necessary. The police need to be spending their time catching those involved in rural crime Travel change: No
(9) Rather not say, (Didcot)	Object – Please stop trying to enforce these ridiculous 20mph speed limits, Steventon already has one in place, absolutely not necessary. You lot won't be happy until all cars are forced off the roads and won't listen to opposing views. Fine outside of schools for instance, but only in small areas and at times when needed. Fed up with this Country and County, how about sorting out the pot holes first!!!

	Travel change: No
(10) Local Resident, (Ducklington)	<p>Object – 20 mph limits should be for school roads and known accident hotspots or tight village roads. Not everywhere which people either ignore or creates harassment by other drivers where complied with.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(11) Local Resident, (Field Assarts, The Ridings)	<p>Object – No need for speed limit so low. Lower speed limits are causing the country to grind to a halt. Also lower speeds are more dangerous as drivers don't concentrate at lower speeds and are distracted by their radio or things in the car and just have to concentrate less and spend time focusing on the speedo as hard to keep to 20 miles. I have seen an increase in accidents in 20 limits. Also difficult to overtake cyclists so you spend more time trying to overtake on the wrong side hence more dangerous. People get frustrated and drive too close to slow cars and most ignore the speed limit. This is NOT a safety action this is a money making scheme. It also increases emissions and reduces mpg. How many accidents have there been in Leafield due to speed? We have lived in the area for 16 years and never seen an accident. The large number of parked cars makes it difficult to do 30 anyway and this is more dangerous than the 30 limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(12) Local Resident, (Field Assarts)	<p>Object – Reductions of speed limits throughout Oxfordshire to 20mph are ridiculous. Modern cars have perfectly good brakes to be able to stop effectively from 30mph. Gearing means at 20mph a car is often required to be in a lower gear meaning increased noise, fuel consumption and therefore emissions. Drivers spend more time worrying about their speed and therefore spend more time being distracted by looking at the speedometer. Leafield itself has so many parked cars on the road that even 30mph is difficult to achieve at times. Cyclists are often travelling at the same or greater speed as cars so overtaking becomes almost impossible. In all the time I have lived locally I have not seen any accidents in the village. What is this going to achieve other than lengthening journey times and raising emissions? This will not encourage people to walk or cycle more as we are in a remote location.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(13) Local Resident, (Finstock, Witney Road)</p>	<p>Object – Having travelled through many locations that are already at 20mph it only annoys people further causing them to either ignore the speed and tailgate others or for them to accelerate harder when leaving the zone. A waste of time and money with the 20mph zones. Unless outside a school.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(14) Local Resident, (Finstock, High Street)</p>	<p>Object – There are sufficient parked vehicles on this stretch of road to make a reduction in the speed limit superfluous. Either there are parked cars, in which case you will be driving at 20 or less, or it is clear and 30mph is safe.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(15) Member of public, (Freeland, Hurst Lane)</p>	<p>Object – 20 mph speed limits create additional particulate emissions which are principal cause of spectacular growth in Alzheimer's which is already expected to kill 1 in 3 of us. They can only reduce accidents if there are any and county councils own research only related to urban, not rural areas where there are considerably more traffic hazards, parking lorries, hidden turns more pedestrians etc. Every motoring orgn in country views them as bad idea yet the council seems to think it knows best. It feels like bullying to me with even the so called consultation exercise being manipulated to favour a supporting vote (i.e. "do you agree" rather than "what do you think about")</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(16) Member of public, (Goring, Gatehampton Road)</p>	<p>Object – Because I live in Oxfordshire and will be affected by changes to the speed limits in the county.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(17) Member of public, (Goring, Wallingford)</p>	<p>Object – The introduction of 20mph limits are extending beyond the bounds of what is reasonable and required on safety grounds.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(18) Member of public, (Grove, Cane Lane)</p>	<p>Object – 30 is fine Travel change: No</p>
<p>(19) Member of public, (Hailey, Church Lane)</p>	<p>Object – There is no need for a change Travel change: No</p>
<p>(20) Member of public, (Henley, St Marks)</p>	<p>Object – Fed up with the council spending money on speed limits that are totally a waste of our council tax. Travel change: No</p>
<p>(21) Member of public, (Kirtlington, Bletchington Road)</p>	<p>Object – The only government detailed study of this approach was in Northern Ireland and showed it did not work. It is a waste of tax payers money Travel change: No</p>
<p>(22) Local Resident, (Leafield, Fairspear Road)</p>	<p>Object – No benefit at all in reducing speed limit. Money would be better spent on improving dreadful condition of roads in the area. Travel change: No</p>
<p>(23) Local Resident, (Leafield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Object – Very low history of incidents in the village involving cars (3 in nearly 20 years, no major injuries). 20mph has a big effect on the efficiency of travel and commerce. I am a firm believer that educating all road users (pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, horse riders etc) is by far the best way to make road usage safer. Travel change: No</p>

<p>(24) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Object – Cannot access accident/casualty numbers to support the lower limit - have lived on Lower End 46 years and not aware of any serious incidents apart from one involving my own stationary vehicle and a drunk driver - a lower speed limit would have made no difference to his idiocy The police are stretched to the limit - how are they going to enforce? They don't enforce the 30 limit - it will be just a whitewash</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(25) Rather not say, (Leaffield)</p>	<p>Object – It 8s not necessary in Leaffield, traffic is minimal.</p> <p>Travel change: Other I would not frequent any business in Leaffield.</p>
<p>(26) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)</p>	<p>Object – Totally not needed</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(27) Local Resident, (Leaffield)</p>	<p>Object – I do not believe it is necessary and if anything encourages more dangerous driving because of road rage because of the in appropriately low speed</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(28) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Witney Lane)</p>	<p>Object – Have there been any deaths or injuries on the proposed areas. Are you just doing it because a small minority have requested it. It has been 30 mph since forever or are you jumping on the bandwagon and following suit. No no no</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(29) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Witney Lane)</p>	<p>Object – I think 30 mph is fine when it is a limit adhered to. Enforce it with cameras by all means. Reducing it to 20 mph throughout the length of the village is in my view simply not necessary though I do think that , as some councils do, it should be 20mph at times when children are going to / from school .</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(30) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Fairspear Road)</p>	<p>Object – No reason to reduce the speed, as shown in Witney, this has just increased congestion and air pollution and road rage. I would much prefer you spent the money improving the state of the roads, you could actually improve safety by installing paths around the village, especially along the village green. I've just been on holiday, through two other counties and Oxforshire's roads are noticeably worse. Stop the 20mph roll out and fix my street instead. Thank you</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>How could it, I live in a rural village and work different shifts through out West Oxon. How will changing the speed limit on my street affect how I drive to work except make my journey longer and more frustrating and cause engine damage.</p>
<p>(31) Local Resident, (Leaffield)</p>	<p>Object – Be its ridiculous to be crawling along everywhere at 20mph</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>No because there is no other way of getting to where you wanna go</p>
<p>(32) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Object – 1. Most people living in Leaffield of working age need a car in order to commute. Cars are designed to be driven on roads, but their design speed is NOT 20mph, so to drive at this speed is uneconomical.</p> <p>2. I do not know of any traffic incidents in Leaffield since we have lived here (10 years +) that have resulted in casualties. I believe that part of the reason is the road design - the meandering 'design' of the village makes it difficult to accelerate to speeds up to 30mph. Safe driving should be part of any driver's intention when they get in the car. If anybody wishes to drive above the 30mph limit in Leaffield, then a 20mph limit will have no effect in slowing them down.</p> <p>3. My biggest objection is in the Statement of Reasons that the 20mph limit will improve air quality and reduce road noise. As I have already commented, cars are not designed to be driven at 20mph and in general the driver will need</p>

	<p>to change down a gear in order to keep the engine at high enough revs to not stall. The engine noise will therefore be similar or possibly worse than driving steadily at 30mph. I believe that road noise would be a small part of the total noise, and there would be little difference in road noise between 20 and 30mph.</p> <p>It then follows on that driving at similar or higher revs, but at a lower speed, means the emissions being produced by the car are GREATER for the same distance covered than at a higher speed in a higher gear. I have also had this conversation with a local candidate during the recent local elections and he confirmed that the 20mph limit imposition had nothing to do with improving air quality.</p> <p>4. My points above are, in general, for petrol and diesel vehicles, as these are the majority of cars on the road until electric cars become more affordable for those of us that do not earn six-figure salaries. A car is essential for work for many of us, but imposing speed limits where there is no good reason is unfair to road users - taking this to its logical 'safety' limit, at what point in the future will we be expected to have a red flag waved by somebody walking in front of the car?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(33) Local Resident, (Leafield, Lower End)	<p>Object – 20 speed limit should be only around schools.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(34) Rather not say, (Milton, Frog Lane)	<p>Object – Unnecessary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(35) Member of public, (Nettlebed)	<p>Object – All these 20 mph limits are a waste of time and money. They are not enforced, everyone ignores them. The majority do not drive fast in these areas and those that do will certainly take no notice</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(36) Local Resident, (Oxford, Barracks Lane)	<p>Object – With the drive for cleaner air. It is illogical to make a car do higher revs for a long distance. Ie, if I am travelling for 1 mile with a rev of 1000 (normal for 30pmh) for 2 minutes, that is a lot less co2 than 2200 revs (as in lower gear) for 3 minutes. More co2 production.</p>

	Travel change: No
(37) Member of public, (Oxford, Laburnum Road)	<p>Object – 20mph speed limits are popping up all like a rash over the place. There are places such as housing estate road that will benefit, however I suspect the vast majority not enforced. But, to place 20mph limit on major roads or major access route is just plain stupid. It causes unnecessary hold ups for buses, results in dangerous tailgating and dangerous overtaking. This negates any perceived benefits.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(39) Member of public, (Oxfordshire)	<p>Object – I am against all random speed limits imposed simply because a small number of residents fill in a form. If the area has had a high number of accidents, is next to a school etc then I can see the logic of reducing the speed limit. In most locations however the new limits are not observed by the majority of motorists and it is a complete waste of the council's funds that could be spent on more worthwhile things. I also hate the massive proliferation of road signage in the area which is destroying the natural beauty of this unique county.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(40) Local Resident, (unknown)	<p>Object – No need</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(41) As a business, (Ramsden, Witney road)	<p>Object – Unnecessary restrictions</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(42) Local Resident, (Shipton)	<p>Object – more traffic pollution more noise pollution. disgusting idea traffic crawling through which emits more pollution and more noise</p>

	Travel change: No
(43) Member of public, (Shrivenham, Berens)	Object – Reduced speed limits increase local exhaust emissions and do not deliver increased road safety as an isolated scheme. Travel change: No
(44) Member of public, (Stonesfield, Longore)	Object – 20 mph is not safer for anyone. Those who go faster than 30 are certainly going to exceed 20! 20 is not good for cars and this is just an expensive way of forcing cars off the road. Motorists also have rights so stop thinking of cyclists who regularly go through my village at more than 20 with no bells!! I also object to being policed by other interfering residents who should get a life!!! Too many rules in this country and no rewards!!! Travel change: No
(45) Local Resident, (Stonesfield, Churchfields)	Object – No accidents on this road. Focus should be on fixing potholes which are a danger. Travel change: No
(46) Member of public, (Stonesfield, Cockshoot)	Object – There is good visibility along the streets I'm Leafield. I do not believe that a 20 mph limit will make it safer. Rather it allows for drivers to lose concentration There has never been a statistical argument supporting 20 mph It will not deter anyone who already speeds through the area Travel change: No
(47) Member of public, (Wallingford, Iges Lane)	Object – 20mph zones significantly increase fumes by drivers braking and driving in low gear. 25 would be a good compromise.

	Travel change: No
(48) Local Resident, (Wallingford, Station Road)	Object – There is not enough evidence that the proposed speed limit makes our streets safer and less polluted. It actually does the opposite because drivers get flustered and drive even faster. Travel change: No
(49) Local Resident, (Watchfield, Beverley Road)	Object – Show me the evidence of speeding at this location Travel change: No
(50) Member of public, (Witney, Edington Road)	Object – Blanket 20mph speed limits are causing worse driving behaviour. Dangerous overtaking manoeuvres have been observed on numerous occasions in Witney where the blanket 20mph has been in place for some time now. The 20mph limit is generally ignored and does not apply to those mad cyclists who insist on ignoring all traffic signs anyway. 20mph limits are not enforced so are pointless. Yet another blatant waste of public funds with no identified improvements anywhere. Travel change: No
(51) Member of public, (Witney, Heron Drive)	Object – By putting 20mph signs seemingly everywhere now you are actually diluting their importance and as a result very few adhere to the limits anyway. Far better to target very specific areas such as schools which will drive greater compliance. Further as modern car create greater emission at this speed it seems counter intuitive when considering the impact on the weather Travel change: No
(52) Member of public, (Witney)	Object – I transit through Leafield for work and where required, because of road conditions, parked cars etc, most people drive at 20mph or under. Those that don't, wouldn't obey a restriction anyway. It would be a waste of money.

	Travel change: No
(53) Member of public, (Witney, Orchard Way)	<p>Object – Failure of 20 mph elsewhere. It has created problems rather than helped.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(54) Member of public, (Witney, Thorney Leys)	<p>Object – Speed limits aren't the answer, they will always be broken. It is more to do with the ability of the driver to anticipate what might/can happen. Make the driving test stricter. Make car manufacturers implement mobile phone non-usage while moving, and the fines for using a mobile higher. More spot checks for drink/drug driving. Also, with a lot of areas using 20mph, there now appears to be the same amount of traffic on the road, but for longer, more pollution.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(55) Member of public, (Witney, Windmill Road)	<p>Object – Trying to keep a modern car to 20mph, spend more time looking a Speedo and not watching Road, driving in a lower gear at higher revs for longer journey times is also not good for the environment</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(56) Local Resident, (Witney, Thorney Leys)	<p>Object – No need, a waste of money during the current climate.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(57) Member of public, (Wootton nr Abingdon)	<p>Object</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(58) Email response, (unknown)</p>	<p>Object – These speed limit reductions are part of a national craze and represent more "do gooding" and feel good to the council rather than achieving anything useful.</p> <p>OCC would achieve greater road safety if it spent money on cleaning road & village signs in addition to cutting foliage away which obscures directional signs in Oxfordshire. The roundabout opposite the Defence Academy is so badly overgrown that apparently one foreign student recently went the wrong way around it.</p> <p>On one side of the roundabout the keep left sign is not obscured but totally invisible due to weed growth.</p> <p>A further question Oxfordshire CC should ask is just how many accidents have there been in these proposed speed reduction areas and if the answer is none or very few over the last 10 or so years then any money spent putting new signs on the road & elsewhere is clearly a waste.</p> <p>Do please spend some money improving road safety by making all directional signs clearly visible by clearing the foliage that you have allowed to overgrow.</p>
<p>(59) Local Resident, (Leafield, Fairspear Road)</p>	<p>Concerns – a blanket 20mph limit is an oversimplification of the issues that need to be addressed.</p> <p>As a resident for 25 years, I have seen a huge increase in traffic during that time but am not aware of increase/decrease of speeding. I walk around the village often so know the roads well.</p> <p>Definitely need 20mph around village green, school, church and centre of village.</p> <p>Think blanket 20mph will reduce impact in village centre where most needed.</p> <p>don't like the idea of repeater signs - street scene already cluttered.</p> <p>Existing 30mph not visible- The Ridings- due to overgrown hedges.</p> <p>Why stop 20mph at farm on Ridings? there is no pedestrian footway for those who live down there, take my life in my hands if walk down there to visit friends.</p> <p>At least need to extend the 30mph south on Ridings beyond current position to at least Purrants Lane, this is a Sat Nav route for delivery vehicles who drive too fast on the unrestricted road through dangerous bends. It is also a popular published coin try walk ! I have had to jump into the hedge several times and know friends who have lost wing mirrors on this piece of road.</p> <p>Also cars drive too fast from Field Assarts crossroads up Buttermilk/ Witney lane to village, 30mph needs to extended south to crossroads or 40mph introduced - please look at this.</p> <p>Agree need 20mph where no pedestrian footways.</p>

	<p>Need new pedestrian foot ways i.e. pub to School on North side of green to encourage more families to walk children to school. And top of Ridings from Green to Bungalow garages because high grass verge mean people have to walk in the road to pass parked cars- not enough space for two cars to pass or car to pass a pedestrian. Please take a look at this.</p> <p>The fastest through traffic is Fairspear Road to/ from the Ridings.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(60) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Harolds Close)	<p>Concerns – How are you going to police this? I've never seen any Police vans doing speed checks in Leaffield especially Fairspear Lane which is like a race track at times. Most people will completely ignore the signs and continue to fly around the village - for that reason, it's a pointless waste of money</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(61) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Hewitts Close)	<p>Concerns – I don't believe everyone will abide by it. I don't mind the limit being 20, I seldom exceed this anyway due to parked cars. It's the parked cars I find more worrying as it's a gamble whether you pull out or not, it's impossible to have clear visibility. I'd prefer this be sorted rather than reducing the speed limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(62) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)	<p>Concerns – Although this is a great idea, it won't be enforced and won't stop speeders. The money would be better spent on a school zone 20 mph and traffic calming in other area. The roads through the village should all be single lanes with passing places. The spare road space could be planned parking for residents or dedicated cycle routes. Better road crossings and speed bumps in lower end would also be useful.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(63) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)	<p>Concerns – I don't think it's necessary.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(64) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Ridings)	<p>Concerns – They only work where needed, or they get totally ignored</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(65) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Fairspear Road)	<p>Concerns – I don't think this will make any difference, the cars that come through the village at the moment don't even do 30mph, I live on Fairspear Road and it is awful the speed they go, in my opinion we need speed bumps all the way along that road in order to make it slower, 20mph speed would just be a waste of time and money and will make no difference whatsoever.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(66) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Harolds Close)	<p>Concerns – Very few drivers stick to the existing speed limit. How is the new limit going to be policed?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(67) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Hewitts Close)	<p>Concerns – I don't believe drivers will adhere to it.</p> <p>Parked cars on the road through the village sometimes cause drivers to take risks because some are parked close to the side roads (such as Harold Close, Hewitts Close and Hatchings Lane) so if restrictions could be put in place to solve the issue it would help.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(68) Member of public, (Sutton Courtenay, Bradstocks Way)	<p>Concerns – I can see no valid reasons to reduce to a blanket 20 mph anywhere excluding around schools. This is just lazy policy without imagination. Purchasing school buses and staggering school ends of day would take so many cars off the road at these crucial times, solves many problems. Safety and pollution.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(69) Local Resident, (Banbury, Caernarvon Way)	<p>Support – 20mph is a safe and reasonable speed for residential areas, allowing better response times for avoiding crossing pets, children, the elderly, hedgehogs and other wildlife, and for allowing parked cars to pull out. The issue is that many if not most drivers seem to ignore the 20mph restrictions and there are rarely any proper enforcement measures. In our 20mph area, motor scooters and motor bikes are able to slip between ineffectual speed bumps, sometimes travelling at least 40-50 mph unhindered.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(70) Member of public, (Cholsey, Charles Road)	<p>Support – Safer walking and cycling. Encourage active travel.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(71) Member of public, (Cholsey, Villa Close)	<p>Support – Leafield is a small village with narrow roads and lots of junctions that and parking make it very difficult driving through so a 20mph limit would reduce the risk to those in and travelling through the village.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(72) Member of public, (Hethe, Main Street)	<p>Support – I am supportive of 20 mph speed limits for all villages and other residential areas across Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(73) Member of public, (Kidlington, Benmead Road)	<p>Support – The introduction of 20MPH in Kidlington has made cycling considerably safer. I also understand it makes pedestrian safety considerably better.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>

<p>(74) As a business, (Kidlington, Langford Lane)</p>	<p>Support – 20mph is a safer speed limit, particularly where children are involved. My experience is it causes no delays to be limited to 20mph so why not reduce the speed limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(75) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Chimney End)</p>	<p>Support – People drive far too fast through the village. There are often children walking and cycling and the 20mph would keep them safe. Also better for the environment and air pollution.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
<p>(76) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Chimney End)</p>	<p>Support – Vehicles drive WAY too fast through our village - it's dangerous for kids and adults. My wife, daughter and I were very nearly knocked down this summer by a speeding motorist who didn't even stop after we all jumped into the hedge to avoid them! Leaffield Primary School is situated on the village green with parents and children crossing the roads here at all times of the day. This area, Fairspear Road, and Lower End all need to be reduced to 20mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(77) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Fairspear Road)</p>	<p>Support – To make the village safer for people walking and riding bikes, especially for children. To improve the atmosphere of the village.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(78) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Fairspear Road)</p>	<p>Support – I live on fairspear Road and drivers always go beyond 30mph, so I would welcome a lower limit</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(79) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Fairspear Road)</p>	<p>Support – There are limited paths in some areas of the village and in some cases they are not very wide. Young children walk to the local primary school and often large vehicles travel quite quickly. It will reduce a lot of danger throughout the village which is often used as a 'rat run' during rush hour times.</p>

	Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more
(80) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Fairspear Road)	<p>Support – Leaffield is a small rural village with a narrow road and narrow pavements with lots of cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders. Many children cycle to the village school. 20mph is the sensible speed for such a context. Plus the village is only a mile long. At 30mph this would be a 2 minute journey: at 20mph it's a 3 minute journey. What do the supporters of 30mph propose to do with that extra minute?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(81) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Greenwich Lane)	<p>Support – I am entirely in agreement with the 20mph limit but fail to understand why on the no. 2 image this is not extended down the Southern branch of Greenwich Lane at the Eastern end of Leaffield . This is a narrow single lane with a 'blind' bend which has a derestricted sign at its Northern entrance frequently used by cyclers, walkers, horse-riders and children playing.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(82) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Harolds Close)	<p>Support – I have two young boys we often cycle through the village and I hope a 20 mph limit would make it safer although other traffic calming between lower end and the church would be good.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(83) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Harolds Close)	<p>Support – Most roads through Leaffield are not particularly wide. Furthermore, there are parked vehicles along both sides of the road, especially the road running through Lower End at out to the Ash Track. The only pavement running through Leaffield is not continuous. Pedestrians have to cross the road as well as take care when walking along the sharp bend by the church. This particularly applies to adults and children making their way to the School. A 20 mph speed limit would address these hazards.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(84) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Hatching Lane)</p>	<p>Support – Need deterrent to speeding Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(85) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – Primarily for safety within the environs of the village. Also environmental reasons. To preserve the ability of residents to move around the village on foot or bicycle without concern for their safety. In particular to help with the safety of children and the elderly. To alert motorists approaching the village at speed - who are sometimes over-familiar with the roads and don't anticipate people being on the roads - to slow down and indicate they are now in a village. Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(86) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – The current traffic is too fast considering the limited footpaths within Leaffield. Any reduction in speed (even if some drivers do not abide by the new limits) is a benefit to the community Travel change: No</p>
<p>(87) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – It's a small narrow country road with lots of park cars and pedestrians Travel change: No</p>
<p>(88) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – Through traffic is often travelling too fast through the village. It is a danger to children especially on the narrower stretches. Travel change: Other No. We walk to school, shop etc but use cars to travel out of the village.</p>
<p>(89) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – The village is often a rat run for delivery vans. We need a 29mph limit to control speeds and maintain safety.</p>

	Travel change: No
(90) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)	<p>Support – Safer for pedestrians with less likelihood of severe injury or death if involved in a collision. Quieter traffic sounds. Easier for pedestrians to cross the road.</p> <p>Travel change: Other No, I already walk or cycle</p>
(91) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)	<p>Support – Commonsense. Reduces likelihood of serious injury to people and animals.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(92) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)	<p>Support – I support the proposals</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(93) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)	<p>Support – To reduce likelihood of accidents involving school children, other pedestrians and pets. To reduce damage to roads.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(94) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Purrants Lane)	<p>Support – The reduced speed limit in the centre of the village and around the school will be most beneficial for parents and children going to and from school, hopefully encouraging more to walk rather than use cars. Wish it had been in force when we had children and granddaughter at the school.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(95) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)</p>	<p>Support – I think this is a great idea to slow the traffic down in Leaffield. We have certain spots in the village that have no pavements or where the pavements are narrow, especially just past the Church on Lower End. Also the exit from the village hall and preschool has bad sightlines so keeping traffic slower here would be very beneficial. Having the traffic slower will benefit the families walking to school as well as many older people who walk to the shop and the church etc. I fully support 20mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(96) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)</p>	<p>Support – '- Narrow roads. - Dangerous volume and speed of HGV vehicles. - Primary School playing field is on The village green which is open to the road.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
<p>(97) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)</p>	<p>Support – Traffic regularly travels too fast through the village which is lacking a pavement in some parts or narrows through the village. This makes walking with fast traffic a challenge and feel dangerous. The school also uses the green for pupils during the school day and for after school activities and reducing the speed limit makes children playing safer.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(98) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)</p>	<p>Support – Strongly support, what has taken you so long?!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(99) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)</p>	<p>Support – Safety</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(100) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)</p>	<p>Support – The village is currently regularly sped through with little to no concern for the residents in particular past the school and some of the very narrow lanes.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
<p>(101) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens/Ridings)</p>	<p>Support – Driving slowly through Leaffield is safer for people, especially the young and the elderly, and for animals, *much* quieter and adds to the rural feel of living here.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(102) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Ridings)</p>	<p>Support – Supporting, as lower speeds would be beneficial</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(103) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Ridings)</p>	<p>Support – I fully support a 20mph speed limit through Leaffield as it should lead to a safer environment for our residents. It should slow traffic around our school which is surrounded by roads with no pavements. The change is long overdue. The 30mph speed limit was put in place decades ago, when traffic was so much lighter. I would ask at this time that the 30mph limit outside the 20mph limit could be looked at and perhaps extended to cover the area between Leaffield and Field Assarts and Fordwells. The roads are very narrow from The Ridings (Leaffield) to these villages and vehicles often travel at dangerous speeds between the villages. I would also ask that the 30mph limit is looked at and extended from Buttermilk Lane (Leaffield) through to Field Assarts.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(104) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Ridings)</p>	<p>Support – The proposed 20mph speed limit through the village of Leaffield is, in my opinion, long overdue given the position of the school on The Greens, in the centre of the village. There are no pavements for the children and parents to walk on at this point and the current speed of the cars, lorries and school buses that drive through are a cause for concern. In addition, I would like the County Council to consider extending the current 30mph speed limit along The Ridings to continue all the way to Field Assarts and to introduce a 30mph speed limit along Buttermilk Lane again to Field Assarts. There is already precedence for this on the country lane from Charlbury to Spelsbury as well as on</p>

	<p>other similar roads around the county and across the country. There are no pavements on these stretches of roads, there are horse riders, cyclists, dog walkers, adult and child pedestrians, parents with pushchairs who have to squeeze into the hedges when traffic races along the roads until, in The Ridings, the vehicle hits a road hump, and then many will race along to the next.</p> <p>It was disappointing to read that: “A section of the existing 30mph speed limit will also be retained on The Ridings, with Officers having taken the current road environment & traffic usage into account.” I wonder what time of day the Officers were on site and if they spoke to any residents on The Ridings, which is where I live. Regardless, I would like consideration given to extending the 30mph as stated above please.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(105) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Ridings)</p>	<p>Support – There is daily evidence of the dangers caused by speeding traffic through our community and I believe a reduced and clearly visible speed limit would help to mitigate these dangers to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. I live on The Ridings and both the amount and speed of traffic have increased very considerably since I moved here 6 years ago. There are no footpaths and walking into the village centre from here means facing a steady flow of traffic which has either not slowed down since entering the area from Field Assarts or has speeded up as it heads out of Leaffield. It is dangerous and unpleasant and I would welcome any measures which would lead to greater safety and more awareness of the importance of abiding by appropriate speed limits. Do we need to wait for a serious incident to occur before action is taken?</p> <p>Travel change: Other I would walk and drive in greater safety</p>
<p>(106) Local Resident, (Leaffield)</p>	<p>Support – reduces vehicle noise throughout which is augmented due to acceleration following endless bobbing in and out of opposing traffic due to parking on roadways increases pedestrian safety due to lack of pavements, narrowness of pavements (where they exist), blind curves near church, on Witney Lane, and at village hall driveway, lack of crosswalks at Fairspear Rd junction and where pavement switches sides in Lower End Blind exits from track at both ends opposite school combined with defacto narrowness of roadway due to parking along school</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(107) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Witney Lane)	<p>Support – Safety of pedestrians & cyclists, particularly children</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(108) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Witney Lane)	<p>Support – This would be a safer limit for a small village</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(109) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Witney Lane)	<p>Support – I think this is needed. Vehicles drive too fast through Leaffield, and the data shows that 20mph zone can improve the environment and reduce accidents</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(110) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Witney Lane)	<p>Support – To be safe and consistent with most of the other villages and Witney that already have 20mph limits. The Primary School is located in the centre of the village and there are no footpaths next to the road near the school, so it is very dangerous to walk to the school in autumn and winter when the greens are too wet to walk on. The only place to walk is on the road edge so traffic control and traffic calming is essential.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(111) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Fairspear Road)	<p>Support – The streets/lanes are narrow with poor visibility in areas. This, combined with a busy village school and a strong cycling community means that 20mph is a sensible limit and easily adhered to with minimal impact, and significant benefits to residents.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>

<p>(112) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Fairspear Road)</p>	<p>Support – Drivers drive way way too fast in our village endangering children, adults and pets Travel change: No</p>
<p>(113) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Fairspear Road)</p>	<p>Support – I live on fairspear Road, there are so many children walking this road for school, at the same time lots of people are driving to work. I'm sure it would make all parents feel a lot safer if all vehicles has to drive slower. Travel change: No</p>
<p>(114) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Greenwich Lane)</p>	<p>Support – Local children walk and cycle daily, residents walk and cycle around this small village - our roads are narrow with parked cars along most roads. 20mph is a safer speed to allow for sudden slowing/pulling in. The current 30mph seems often ignored, particularly by large vans and lorries which are regular road users through Leaffield, many times I myself have witnessed many vehicles swerving onto a path or grass verge to avoid a collision or allow a pedestrian to cross/pass. All vehicles need to be slowed down to make the village safe. Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
<p>(115) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Harold's Close)</p>	<p>Support – 20mph needed as the road is narrow in places and cars are parked on road. Pedestrians walking to school and shop on narrow pavements with need to cross road as pavement ends on one side then starts on the other. Difficult junctions from Greenwich lane, Hatchings lane and the village hall as well as other junctions to houses. Travel change: No</p>
<p>(116) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – Cars are often not reducing speed in the village. Lots of children needing to cross the road . Elderly also needing to cross who are not always steady on their feet Parked cars belonging to residents on the road so speeds need to be slower. Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>

<p>(117) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – Safer for everyone</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(118) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – There is speeding leading into and out of the village in particular lower end. The current speed reduction device is in effective, the long straight allows for cars to see far ahead a exceed the speed.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(119) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – Vehicles travel too fast through Lower end</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
<p>(120) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – I fully support a 20mph speed limit. It is good for nature, especially the local cats and hedgehogs, for vehicles to drive slower. I have two small children and a dog and it will be easier for us to cross the road and walk the country lanes.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
<p>(121) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – Safety concerns</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(122) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)</p>	<p>Support – The increase in traffic travelling at speed through Leaffield especially going by the school which is on the Green with hardly any pavements, is horrendous. We live by the school and daily I worry about the safety of the children. The same coming out of the entrance of the village hall in Lower End. Visibility and the lack of a pavement makes it dangerous to cross the road to the pavement on the other side. In Lower End children and Mums with pushchairs have to cross the road as pavement runs out on one side and they have to cross to the pavement on the other side. It would be much safer if there was a 20mph speed limit. The same leaving the village by the Ridings as no</p>

	<p>pavements. The speed in Fairspear Road coming off the straight mile is ridiculously fast. I am so for the 20mph over the whole village.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(123) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Greens)</p>	<p>Support – I believe it is safer for pedestrians, cyclists and car users</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(124) Local Resident, (Leaffield, The Ridings)</p>	<p>Support – Reduce speeding and make it safer</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(125) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Witney lane)</p>	<p>Support – Very narrow roads, which are single lane in places leading to cars mounting the pavement to pass. It's very dangerous indeed so 20mph is absolutely required to avoid further accidents.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(126) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Witney Lane)</p>	<p>Support – I fully support the scheme, however Witney Lane is not on that list & this is the narrowest lane in the village where homes are closest to the road & traffic frequently speed along this stretch. Why is it the only road not on this list?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(127) Local Resident, (Leaffield, Witney lane)</p>	<p>Support – Safety of walkers and cyclists</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>

<p>(128) Local Resident, (Leafield, West Oxfordshire, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – Most of the traffic passing through Leafield appear to be people enroute to somewhere and most of them seem to ignore the 30 limit - so I'm in favour of trying a 20 limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(129) Local Resident, (Leafield, Witney, Lower End)</p>	<p>Support – Great idea. The roads are very narrow and lots of children walk to and from the local school.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
<p>(130) Local Resident, (Ramsden, Witney Road)</p>	<p>Support – We live on the B4022 on the edge of Finstock. We frequently travel through Leafield, which is littered with parked cars. I support any action to keep speeds lower and keep locals safer.</p> <p>Please also look into the B4022 through Finstock and the Leafield cross roads. It is supposed to be 40mph but this is not observed. It is a race track! Paul Ogborne</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(131) Member of public, (South Oxfordshire, Farm Close)</p>	<p>Support – There are schools on this road</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>