

## DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Thursday, 21 May 2020 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 11.50 am

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE -- in the Chair

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillor John Sanders  
Councillor Judy Roberts (for Agenda Item 5)  
Councillor Jamila Azad (for Agenda Item 12)  
Councillor Michael Waine (for Agenda Item 13)  
Councillor Emily Smith (for Agenda Item 14)

**Officers:**

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

Part of meeting

**Agenda Item**                      **Officer Attending**  
14.                                      L. Turner (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.*

### 1/20 **QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS**

(Agenda No. 1)

*Councillor Emily Smith*

There was a consultation on cycle paths on Bath Street in Abingdon a few months ago that proposed minimal changes. Some of the white lines have been painted on but do not seem to be in line with OCC standards in terms of width and local residents are concerned that the new lines are actually more dangerous for people on bikes - please can you ensure these lines are inspected and corrected immediately? Now you have greater powers to improve road layouts to increase cycling and walking to aid social distancing, please can you look again at Bath Street in Abingdon and consider removing the car parking to make space for a safe and segregated cycle way into the town centre?"

*Response by Cabinet Member for Environment*

I can confirm that the refurbishment of the existing markings were carried out under routine maintenance works and were therefore reinstated as previously marked. The S278 improvement works for cycle lanes have been technically approved but the legal agreement is not in place yet. These works are linked to the proposed roundabout improvements and David Wilson Homes (DWH) site on Wootton Road and Dunmore Road which have not yet had reserved matters approval from Planning. Until these are in place DWH cannot produce a programme of work and implementation dates for the cycle lane improvements. It is further complicated by the current COVID 19 pandemic with the project manager for these schemes at DWH being furloughed at present. The Council is currently reviewing options across the public realm to respond to COVID-19. This does include walking and cycling responses and your suggestions for Bath Street will be taken into consideration as part of the review.

*Councillor Smith*

Thank you for that response. How might local members and members of the public influence the programme of works that might be taken forward and whether not amendments to it could be considered.

*Response by Cabinet Member for Environment*

Although this is a shared responsibility between County and District Council planning issues were, however, a matter for the District Council so you as local member and indeed members of the public would be advised to approach the District Council in that regard. In principle amendments could be made to a scheme through some additional measures but that would be a matter going forward.

**2/20 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**  
(Agenda No. 2)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
County Councillor Judy Roberts	5. Oxford North Hinksey: Botley Road and Westway – Traffic Measures – Proposed Extension of 20mph Speed Limit
County Councillor John Sanders	7.Oxford: Sher Afzal Close – Proposed Waiting Restrictions

County Councillor John Sanders	11. Oxford: Kirby Place – Proposed Waiting Restrictions
City Councillor Tom Hayes County Councillor Jamila Azad	12. Oxford: Morrell Avenue – Proposed Zebra Crossing
Rachael Shaer County Councillor Michael Waine	13. Bicester: Various Streets – Proposed Waiting Restrictions
Robin Tucker County Councillor Emily Smith	14. Abingdon: Northcourt Road: Proposed Amendments to Traffic Calming Measures

### **3/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Agenda No. 3)

None declared.

### **4/20 BURFORD: A40 - SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION AND SIGNALLED CROSSING ON A40 BY BURFORD SCHOOL**

(Agenda No. 4)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE4) a report setting out responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a 20mph speed limit within Burford in place of the existing 30mph speed limit, a 30mph speed limit on the A40 from just east of its junction with Tanners Lane to just east of its junction with the B4020 Shilton Road and on the A361 south of the A40 to just south of the access to Burford School in place of the existing 40mph speed limit. It was also proposed to extend the 40mph speed limits on the A40 and A361 to create an appropriate length of transitional speed limits on the approaches to the proposed 30mph limits on these roads.

Additionally, the proposals had included provision of a signalled crossing for pedestrians (a puffin crossing) on the A40 just to the east of the existing footbridge as a replacement for the latter but reflecting the strong opposition to that element a recommendation had been made to defer a decision on provision of the footbridge.

The Cabinet Member noted two submissions of support from John White the Mayor of Burford and the local County Councillor Nick Field-Johnston for the speed limits and deferral of the crossing. That reflected the level of responses received locally.

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

to approve the proposed reduced speed limits at Burford as advertised but with consideration being given to reducing the extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit on the A361 The Hill, but to defer a decision on the installation of a puffin crossing (a signalled crossing for pedestrians) on the A40 by Burford School in place of the existing footbridge.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**5/20 OXFORD NORTH HINKSEY: BOTLEY ROAD AND WESTWAY - TRAFFIC MEASURES - PROPOSED EXTENSION OF 20MPH SPEED LIMIT**

(Agenda No. 5)

The principal elements of the Botley Road Improvement scheme had been approved at the Cabinet Member for Environment delegated decisions meeting on 19 December 2020 following a consultation in the autumn of 2019. At that meeting, however, it was agreed to carry out a consultation on an extended length of 20mph speed limit to that originally proposed. This report (CMDE5) considered the results of that consultation.

County Councillor Susanna Pressel had advised by email that she had been lobbied by many people in her division over the years to have a 20mph speed limit on Botley Road. That included a massive petition presented to Cabinet in April 2018 and she and many others were delighted with this proposal to extend it beyond Binsey Lane. Supporting the extension she added that the further the 20 mph extension reached along the road the better.

County Councillor Judy Roberts wholeheartedly supported the proposal and agreed with the principle of 20mph traffic through residential areas even when they were major routes. This would improve the residential experience by improving local accessibility, reducing noise and air pollution. The main reason for extending the 20 mph area was because there was a small distance of 30 mph just before a crossing. And now phase 1.5 is all 20mph. However, as there was a pedestrian crossing between Duke Street and Earl Street planned for phase 1.4 with a small section of 30 mph leading to it the same principle should surely apply for that phase. She felt that this reinforced the case for the whole length of the Botley Road Corridor to become a 20 mph Zone making it viable to introduce average speed cameras to enforce the speed limit.

Recognising the issue raised by Councillor Roberts the Cabinet Member asked officers to investigate how that could be rectified and having regard to the information set out in the report before her and the representations made to her at the meeting confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposals as advertised and ask to investigate extending the 20 mph limit between Duke Street and Earl Street.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**6/20 OXFORD - B4495 WINDMILL ROAD - PROPOSED EXTENSION OF 20MPH SPEED LIMIT**  
(Agenda No. 6)

As part of the Access to Headington project a request to extend the 20mph speed limit, which currently applied only to the northernmost part of Windmill Road, to include the whole road had been accepted, resulting in a formal consultation in 2017. That had then been approved at the Cabinet Member for Environment meeting on 7 September 2017. However, due to delays in progressing the project a re-consultation was required due to it being beyond two years since the first formal consultation. The report (CMDE6) considered the results of the re-consultation which had also included the adjacent signalled junction of Windmill Road with The Slade and Old Road.

Councillor Roz Smith had written advising that there was a lot of support for reducing vehicle speeds in Windmill Road and her delight that the 20mph speed limit had been recommended for agreement and she urged the Cabinet Member to support that recommendation.

Noting the objection from Thames Valley Police the Cabinet Member recognised that these proposals were being introduced county wide at the request of local councils and residents and there was strong local support here as well including the local member. Taking the view that his proposal could only improve safety and having regard to the information set out in the report before her and the representations made to her at the meeting confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposals as advertised but to include also the adjacent signalled junction of Windmill Road with The Slade and Old Road.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**7/20 OXFORD: SHER AFZAL CLOSE - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**  
(Agenda No. 7)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE7) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce waiting restrictions at Sher Afzal Close, Oxford put forward as a result of development of the former Cowley Swimming Pool site for residential purposes.

Supporting the proposal Councillor Sanders had concerns regarding enforcement in the absence of a controlled parking zone but, in the circumstances, this seemed a reasonable compromise.

The Cabinet Member recognised that a CPZ for the Temple Cowley area had been included in the wider CPZ programme for Oxford and sources of funding for that were being carried out. There had been 4 objections regarding loss of parking and pressure from displaced vehicles but the issue of parking provision had been carefully reviewed as part of the planning process for the residential development in the Close. She noted the proposals were being funded by the developer. 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 confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve proposed no waiting at any time restrictions and a disabled persons parking place at Sher Afzal Close, Oxford as advertised.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**8/20 OXFORD: SUNDERLAND AVENUE - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING PLACES**  
(Agenda No. 8)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE8) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a length of no waiting at any time restriction and amended daytime permit holder parking places (Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm) due to the development of adjacent land required by a change to an existing property and its access arrangements and funded by the developer.

County Councillor Paul Buckley had not objected to the proposals.

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

to approve proposed no waiting at any time restrictions and parking places by number 53 Sunderland Avenue as advertised.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**9/20 OXFORD: THE OVAL AND DESBOROUGH CRESCENT - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

(Agenda No. 9)

The Cabinet Member considered (CMDE9) responses received to a statutory consultation on a proposal to introduce waiting restrictions at The Oval and Desborough Crescent, Oxford put forward as a result of the development of adjacent land for residential development.

Michael Kelly a local resident strongly objected to suggested parking restrictions surrounding the Oval and Desborough Crescent. Visitors and residents have to park somewhere and with new houses currently being built oval considered the situation would only get worse.

County Councillor Gill Sanders advised that the original proposal put forward by County Officers had been to introduce parking restrictions on the whole of the Oval. However, a revised proposal from James Graham of Oxford City Council recommending retention of parking over a large part of the outer ring of The Oval – against the pavement had her support along with fellow City Councillors for Rose Hill. There had never been any problems with parking on The Oval and it was important to retain this for the use of visitors to the area. She endorsed comments submitted by some of the local residents opposing any parking restrictions. She did not oppose the installation of double yellows around the grassed area at the centre of The Oval – although, in her 20 years working in Rose Hill she had never seen a car parked there and there was ample room for buses to drive around the Oval – even when cars are parked there as the road was very wide.

Noting the strong objections to the proposal the Cabinet Member recognised the merit of the revised scheme as put forward by Councillor Sanders and city council representatives which had taken account the local feeling and history of the area. 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 a revised scheme as suggested by the local county councillor in conjunction with representatives of the City Council for a less restrictive scheme for parking along a large part of the outer ring of the Oval against the pavement noting that any final scheme would follow consultation with the local member and bus operators.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**10/20 OXFORD: WARREN CRESCENT - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

(Agenda No. 10)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE10) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a length of no waiting at any time restriction at Warren Crescent in place of the existing permit holder only bays Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm due to the development of adjacent land for housing and the requirement for the construction of new accesses to the development.

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

to approve proposed no waiting at any time restrictions in Warren Crescent as advertised.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**11/20 OXFORD: KIRBY PLACE - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

(Agenda No. 11)

The Cabinet member for Environment considered (CMDE11) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce waiting restrictions at Kirby Place and Don Bosco Close, Oxford put forward as a result of concerns received from residents and City Council members about parked vehicles obstructing the relatively narrow sections of both Kirby Place and Don Bosco Close particularly larger service vehicles chiefly Kirby Place where the refuse vehicle was often prevented from accessing the road.

City Councillor Saj Malik thanked city & county officers for their work in processing this and meeting me on the site more than once and on behalf of local residents urged the Cabinet Member to approve the report. The double yellow lines were very important for public safety and not just to alleviate any nuisance for residents whose driveways were frequently blocked especially those on emergency call outs. There were also problems for waste collection lorries accessing Kirby place because of parking requiring city refuse staff to drag and every single bin to Temple road and then return them. Most importantly there could be access problems for emergency service vehicles. Approving the scheme will benefit all the above and residents.

County Councillor John Sanders supported the proposal which would help resolve issues pending a CPZ in the area.

The Cabinet Member noted the objections but considered the scheme would benefit residents and alleviate concerns regarding access for emergency vehicles. Therefore, having regard to the information in the report and the representations made to her at the meeting she confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve proposed no waiting at any time restrictions at Kirby Place and Don Bosco Close, Oxford as advertised.

Signed.....  
 Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

## **12/20 OXFORD: MORRELL AVENUE - PROPOSED ZEBRA CROSSING**

(Agenda No. 12)

The Cabinet Member considered (CMDE12) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a zebra crossing on Morrell Avenue, Oxford put forward and funded by Oxford City Council.

City Councillor Tom Hayes spoke as one of two elected city councillors for St Clement's Ward alongside County Councillor Jamila Azad. During his time as a Councillor he had been made aware of the concerns surrounding the volume of traffic and speeding, and the resulting effects of air pollution, reduced safety, and less liveable spaces come up every session. The issue of provision had been ongoing for many years. However, the vast majority agreeing on the need for a crossing did not mean there was a vast majority in favour of one location for it although everyone who had provided a view has done so with the public interest uppermost in their minds. While supportive of the proposal he recognised that it would be unlikely to receive full support but once the crossing had been installed and the material benefits felt, seen, and heard, he believed that people would be persuaded of its merits. With the pandemic response reaching into a new phase, he was concerned about the potential move away from using public transport to private cars and vans which of on a significant scale could significantly affect Morrell Avenue. He supported installation of the crossing with proper signage and hoped that the County Council could install cycling infrastructure and coloured cycle lanes on Morrell Avenue, to further encourage people to make use of active and sustainable transport modes.

County Councillor Jamila Azad Morrell Avenue Crossing had been sought by residents of Morrell Avenue for last twenty years. It was a very steep Road with 240 houses, many driveways and trees on both sides. Traffic travelled very fast coming from Headington through Warneford Road into Divinity Road and Morrell Avenue and it was now a rat run. There had been a lot of accidents on this road with people driving at more than 40mph even though there was a 20mph speed limit and flashing lights to slow them down. Because of the number of driveways and trees on this road feasibility studies had been carried out twice which had found this to be the only suitable place to have a crossing because of schools, language centres, playground and hospitals nearby. There are many elderly and disabled residents and parents with children living on this busy road and with 6 bus stops on both sides and there had been a big increase in traffic levels over the last 4 years and a crossing was desperately needed.

Noting that Cyclox, although not objecting in principle to the crossing, had objected to the width of the traffic lane, which they said did not comply with guidance issued by Transport for London in respect of lane widths and should be narrower than the

proposed 3.5 metres the Cabinet Member accepted an officer response that the width at 3.5 metres was not regarded as hazardous and indeed experience of similar lane widths in the county had not shown there to be any safety problems. Noting that this was a city council initiative funded by them and having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to her at the meeting she confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed introduction of a zebra crossing on Morrell Avenue, Oxford.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**13/20 BICESTER: VARIOUS STREETS - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

(Agenda No. 13)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE13) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce and amend waiting restrictions on residential roads within Bicester where parking, in particular by commuters, was resulting in road safety and access problems for residents. The proposals put forward following discussions and site meetings with officers and local members would be funded by developer contributions.

The Cabinet Member noted the following statement received from Steve and Louise Dixon, local residents who had during the consultation sent their broad approval for the proposed parking restrictions but with a concern regarding the different timings for each side of the road and how that might not solve the issue (as most of the parked vehicles belong to staff from nearby Eden Cars who could just switch sides at the appropriate time). They were pleased to see that that concern had been addressed in the report. However, in their additional submission they had asked about the possibility of resident permits being provided to allow a second household vehicle or visitor’s car to park outside their house during the restricted hours as none of the residents’ homes, including their own, was adjacent to the area of dangerous parking at the top of the road at the junction with Buckingham Road. Family/visitor parking would therefore not affect the passage of traffic entering and leaving the road in any way whatsoever. As the intention is to extend the restricted parking some way into the avenue this would be a big issue for them as they only had for one car on their drive. If we are unable to have a resident’s permit one of our household vehicles would have to be parked outside a fellow resident’s property a long way from our home causing inconvenience to them. Also they noted that a few residents had suggested double yellow lines on the road which they felt should be disregarded completely.

Rachael Shaer spoke as a resident of Browning Drive for nearly 20 years. Their home was just outside the proposed waiting restriction zone along Browning Drive and near the Kingsley Road /Bunyan Road junction and 2 houses from Harts Veterinary centre on Browning Drive. She stated that in all the time she had lived

there she had never witnessed severe parking issues in the proposed area. She accepted that there would be increased vehicles and parking having a parade of shops and a veterinary centre close by that consisted of very short term parking and as there were no houses directly impacted she could not see an issue. She objected strongly to the proposed waiting restrictions being put in place for two main reasons. Firstly, if this went ahead then cars which could not access Harts Vet small car park would then not be able to park where they currently do which was generally on Browning Drive in the proposed waiting restriction zone. Although near the junction that was very wide with good vision and provided ample parking on a long stretch of road by the vets and a fenced/grassed area and so causing no obstructions. It had taken many years of communication with the vet's practice to get them to encourage their ever-growing number of customers to park away from residents' houses. They had had many years of blocked driveways, restricted access and not being able to park their own and visitors' cars outside our own homes but if this proposal went ahead then they would be back to square one with all the problems they had before but worse. As well as access to her own and her neighbours' properties being affected she was extremely concerned regarding her disabled parents who lived almost opposite the vet and the problems this would cause them and their carers having clear access daily. Secondly, when the car park for the shopping parade was full, which it often was at peak times, the extra cars would park either on the grass verges which would be ruined, along the busy Bucknell Road causing even more safety issues or along Browning Drive outside our houses again causing safety issues. We have families with children, elderly and disabled people who are all vulnerable. In conclusion, all these restrictions would do would be to move and increase any parking issues further up the road causing access and safety issues to a great many more people than was happening now. These proposals would have a huge negative impact her family and the local neighbourhood.

County Councillor Michael Waine on behalf of fellow councillors Lawrie Stratford and Les Sibley spoke in support of the proposals They had as local County Councillors arranged for these proposals to come forward having worked with officers over a long period of time to respond to concerns from residents and had part funded the work through joint use of their respective Councillor Priority Funds. While fully supporting the proposals as recommended they accepted that they might not resolve all the parking problems in each area and could have knock-on effects of moving parking elsewhere and therefore they asked that should the recommendation be accepted a review be carried out six months following completion of the signage and lines to look at the impact of the measures. He gave an undertaking that should further work be needed to put in hand any further measures then they would again consider joint action with OCC using their Councillor Priority Funds.

Officers confirmed the proposals had been brought forward to address issues from the general growth in the Bicester area.

The Cabinet Member considered each of the elements individually. However, having regard to Browning Drive she was minded to defer those proposals having regard to the representations she had received from the local resident and the officer report which had stated that more residents had been against the proposed restrictions than in favour and that even some of the supporters had raised concerns regarding displacement. Also, as there seemed to be some issues regarding future proposals

for the vet's practice there might be some merit in deferring those particular proposals.

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

to:

- (a) subject to a 6-month review approve the proposed waiting restrictions as advertised for:

Blake Road  
 Graham Road with the suggested additional area on the corner of Graham Road/Bucknell Road.  
 Windmill Avenue  
 Fallowfields noting that if after a 6 month review an extended restriction was necessary that would be supported out of Councillor Priority Funding.  
 Green Close  
 Lambourne Crescent  
 Longfields – (& Fallowfields) as a first stage.  
 Maple Road  
 Moor Pond Close  
 Barry Avenue  
 Blenheim Drive  
 Ewart Close  
 Kingsley Road  
 Shakespeare Drive with implementation of the restriction delayed until after reinstatement of normal levels of public transport.

- (b) the proposals for Browning Drive be deferred to enable further consideration and investigation.

Signed.....  
 Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**14/20 ABINGDON: NORTHCOURT ROAD: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES**

(Agenda No. 14)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE14) responses received to a statutory consultation to provide amended traffic calming measures (originally installed in 1990 as a safety scheme) as a result of a major maintenance scheme for the road The amendments put forward by the Area traffic team in consultation with the local member and other officers would be funded by the Oxfordshire County Council major maintenance programme.

Graham Paul Smith, Cycling UK had submitted comments setting out concerns regarding the scheme. He considered it should not be approved in its present state and listed a number of issues including its design which he considered would fail at reducing speed and be less effective than the current scheme and likely to speed-up motor traffic. The face-to-face consultation had seemed inadequate for a road with many frontages and mixed uses, particularly at the Oxford Road end. A top-down Highways scheme approach was not appropriate for a residential street with two schools, a College and two community centres, two shops and a Public House. It would worsen the environment for cycling, contrary to County Policy and he considered that the proposal squandered Major Maintenance Scheme money, focusing merely upon reconstruction.

Speaking on behalf of Oxfordshire Cycling Network and as an Abingdon resident Robin Tucker had objected to the proposals because they failed to consider the context of the street, safety and the Council's policy to encourage modal shift to low carbon transport and make the street less safe. Northcourt Road was a residential street with a Nursery, Primary School, Secondary School, Further Education College, Community Centre, café, 2 shops and a pub all directly accessed from the road. It was very busy at school times with evidence of 'rat running' between Wootton Road and Oxford Road, and antisocial driving. The current measures were insufficient to assure safety and Crashmap.co.uk had shown 8 Incidents in only 5 years. In 4 of them a cyclist had been a casualty, in 3 a pedestrian was a casualty and in 3 a child had been a casualty. All this on a residential road ½ a mile long. The proposal replaced 5 full-width humps that were only comfortable at 20mph, with speed cushions that can be driven over in many cars at 30mph hardly feeling a thing. It would encourage people to buy wider cars, increase speeds and, therefore, danger on this street, even before you considered what happens when children return to school all trying to stay 2 metres away from each other. Contrary to the officer's report, there were only 3 (14%) of consultation responses in support. One was supporting their proposal of a speed reduction to 20mph. The Police noted the ineffectiveness of speed cushions at slowing motorcycles. Additionally, 17 (81%) of responses to the consultation objected or raised concerns. In the last several weeks, Northcourt Road had been transformed with a surge in families walking and cycling together to take their daily exercise. They would like to keep that when children returned to school. To that end they had proposed a modal filter and 'School Street' approach to take out traffic driving through and near the school gate. Funding for that was available under the DfT's Emergency Active Travel Fund but if that was not possible he urged consideration be given to a reduced speed limit to 20mph to improve people's survival chances.

Councillor Emily Smith advised that the first case she had as a County Councillor two years ago, was about cycle safety on Northcourt Road. That incident had been as a result of the appalling state of the road surface. There was a primary school, secondary school and college on Northcourt Road. Students from the other two secondaries also travel to school using this road and it was vital that children and parents feel able to walk and cycle safely here. Resurfacing would of course make the road smoother and safer for people to ride bikes along. However, she was speaking against approval of this scheme because the officer's report stated that this scheme comprised "relatively small changes to the road layout" and she considered

that it should comprise big changes. She had been calling for change to the layout from the moment Northcourt Road had made it onto the maintenance programme and it seemed nonsensical to her to spend all this money on a resurface scheme without taking the opportunity to make some significant changes. For the past 18 months she had been raising at every opportunity the need for a different layout before resurfacing and yet when the consultation document came out it was for resurfacing with “relatively small changes”. The report suggested funding was the blocker and she had been told that because this was a maintenance scheme it was handled in a different way from a capital scheme looking at new road layouts. Either way, it seemed the suggestion that we do resurfacing then come and dig bits up at a later date was disappointing. When money was short, surely it was more efficient to make the changes all in one go and with less disruption for residents. We are also in the middle of a climate emergency and the county council passed a motion to do all we could to enable active travel.

There were several improvements suggested in the consultation responses that really were needed:

- a proper zebra crossing near to Dunmore Primary and more raised crossings
- Narrower lanes for motor traffic
- Raised junctions to keep cycle paths and pavements level
- bollards to protect the verges but more importantly to stop parents parking outside the school at drop off times
- reducing traffic volumes at the beginning and end of the school day - we should be considering Northcourt Road as a Schools Street
- discouraging cars and lorries using this narrow road as a cut through with the use of modal filters – at least during the morning and evening rush hours.

While it would be good to get rid of some potholes this scheme could be so much more ambitious. People were walking and cycling more as a consequence of the lockdown and now would be the perfect time to make some bigger changes that would have lasting changes on the number of students especially travelling to school on foot or by bike. Not to spend a bit more money now to get this scheme right seemed like a wasted opportunity.

The Cabinet Member was clear that this was a maintenance scheme and not a comprehensive scheme and while acknowledging that currently there was no funding available to address the improvements suggested by the local member and others she asked officers whether this scheme would inhibit future schemes which might involve some of those elements.

Officers advised that while some of the proposals suggested had merit it was difficult to answer that. The point of resurfacing was to protect the life of the road and that needed to be done now. Future schemes could only be installed on a good and sound road surface. There was no funding to improve layout but that could be investigated to see what could be done but it was unlikely that there would be sufficient funding to undertake anything major.

The Cabinet Member thanked everyone for their input and information and while she understood the desire for more to be done there was currently insufficient funding to deal with all the problems referred to. She recognised that this was first and foremost

a maintenance scheme to protect the life of the surface of the road and not a comprehensive improvement scheme. However, it was noted that while there was no identified finance for major and substantial improvements officers would where possible investigate what could be added to help cyclists. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to her at the meeting she confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed amended traffic calming measures on Northcourt Road, Abingdon as advertised.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**15/20 EAST HANNEY - A338 - PROPOSED PUFFIN CROSSING**

(Agenda No. 15)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE15) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a puffin crossing on the A338 at East Hanney put forward as a result of calls from the parish council following numerous requests from parishioners.

Councillor Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor had expressed her full support for the scheme along with the East Hanney Parish Council.

Noting the developer funding for the scheme and the strong local support including the local member and parish council and having regard to the information as set out in the report the Cabinet Member confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the proposed introduction of a puffin crossing (a signalled crossing for pedestrians) on the A338 at East Hanney.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**16/20 A424 - FULBROOK TO IDBURY PROPOSED 50MPH SPEED LIMIT**

(Agenda No. 16)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE16) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a 50mph speed limit on the entire length of the A424 Burford to Stow road within Oxfordshire put forward following a review of the recent accident history, including several accidents resulting in fatal injury, and, if approved, to be funded by the Road Safety budget within the County Council's Capital programme.

County Councillor Nick Field-Johnson had expressed his full support for the 50mph speed limit as there has been several fatal accidents at the bottom of the hill by Burford.

Noting that there had been 3 objections based on need for it and whether the limit might be counter-productive if it resulted in driver frustration the Cabinet Member noted that the report indicated that the limit was considered to be consistent with DFT guidelines on setting local speed limits. Acknowledging the comments submitted by the local member with regard to the number of accidents and having regard to the information set out in the report she confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the 50mph speed limit as advertised.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**17/20 GRAFTON WITH RADCOT - A4095 AT PIDNELL BRIDGE - PROPOSED REVOCATION OF STRUCTURAL WEIGHT LIMIT**

(Agenda No. 17)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE17) responses to a statutory consultation to revoke the structural weight limit at A4095 Pidnell Bridge prohibiting the passage of track laying vehicles and vehicles with an axle weight exceeding 6 tonnes put forward as a result of a review of structural weight limits following maintenance of the A4095 Pidnell Bridge which had strengthened the bridge sufficiently to remove the above restrictions.

Councillor Hudith Heathcoat had expressed her support for the proposal.

Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report the Cabinet member confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the revocation of the structural weight limit at A4095 Pidnell Bridge and noting that this was for removal of the heavier structural restriction and not the 7.5 tonne limit.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

.....