

**ANNEX 6 - COMMENTS FROM PARKING RETENTION CONSULTATION
(Thursday 28 April to Monday 23 May 2016)**

Reference	RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS RELATED TO TROs	OCC RESPONSE
408	Email response (Headington resident)	<p>Objection due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests council reviews the other streets in the Headington CPZ that it has not reviewed as part of these plans, for their potential for creating additional parking spaces. • Does not appear to have considered joint cycle and pedestrian use on the Windmill Road pavement, despite the pavement width allowing this on the stretch between Bateman Street and Old Road where most of the parking would be lost. • Possible as a minimum to implement this approach on one side of the road thereby only losing parking on one side of Windmill Road. • Another solution would be to direct cyclists down residential streets either side of Windmill Road to avoid the heavy traffic and buses on that street. • Plans do not indicate benefits to local residents but instead to commuters who are not residents. 	<p>The footway is not wide enough for a shared path between Mattock Close and Bateman Street, so a shared path from Old Road is possible up to Bateman Street only. Further consideration would also have to be given to how cyclists deal with the NOC access and bus stop. On carriageway provision however means cyclists have priority here and it also means the provision along Windmill Road is more consistent.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
409	Email response (Unknown)	<p>Objection due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels scheme contradicts itself as it states it supports new housing and job but without attracting more traffic. • Opposes the removal of Windmill Road parking for cycle lanes which will not reduce cyclist's journey time. 	Comments noted.

410	Email response (Windmill Road Residents' Action Group (WRRAG))	<p>Neither welcome nor object to the proposals – has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of 20 parking spaces along Windmill Road welcomed cautiously by most residents • Generally welcome retention of tiger crossing on Windmill Road • Urge OCC to go ahead with addition of parking bays in streets adjacent to Windmill Road (especially along St Anne's Road and Rock Edge) • Ask OCC to review opportunity to introduce some tree planting at the ends of the new bays proposed south of Margaret Road • Ask OCC to trial of electric vehicle charging points on street in Windmill Road • Request that if works go ahead: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advanced liaison with residents as to the scheduling of works to minimize any day to day disruption ○ New parking bays in side streets (detailed in previous draft traffic orders) are constructed prior to works on Windmill Road to provide additional capacity while works progress 	Comments noted.
411	Email response (Cherwell Drive)	<p>Objection due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree removal will reduce habitat for wildlife and remove character from the area. • Cannot see the benefits as a resident considering the cost and disruption. 	Comments noted – see main report for response regarding tree loss and access to Cherwell Drive shops.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes change to direction at the service roads. Asks what provision is going to be made for Co-op delivery vans? • Lives in a flat on Cherwell Drive and access to the flat will get blocked if the lorries have to turn in at the bottom and then park straight away on the left to make their deliveries. 	
412	<p>Email response (County Councillor for Headington & Quarry, City Councillors for Headington)</p>	<p>Neither support nor object to the proposals</p> <p>Windmill Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome revised proposals generally, but remain very concerned about safety aspects relating to some of the alternative proposed parking bays in adjacent streets • Objection from two residents about proposed location of tiger crossing, preference for it to be moved further south. Other residents welcome the proposed location • Request for crossing at junction with Bateman St • Request for introduction of 20mph limit along Windmill Road, with introduction of solar powered speed signs • Request that repeater bike symbols are used in advisory cycle lanes and cycle lanes are visibly delineated with physical features <p>Headley Way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share residents' concerns about the materials used for the retaining walls and whether the materials chosen can have sound-proofing properties • Width of footways on northbound side of Headley Way will be unable to accommodate mobility scooters and double buggies with these proposals 	<p>Narrow footways on Windmill Road mean finding a suitable location for a new pedestrian crossing near Bateman Street is difficult. Furthermore, from on-site observation it is not clear where the main desire line would be – currently there is significant demand to/from Margaret Road which already has a pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>The current extent of the 20mph in Windmill Road (as elsewhere) reflects the outcome of extensive consultation ahead of the implementation of the limit in 2009. If a 20mph was to be introduced then other supporting measures would also be required to ensure vehicle speeds kept to the limit.</p> <p>Trialling traffic signals at junctions is not considered necessary and it would still require the junction to be constructed as designed, otherwise it</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are local concerns about surface water drainage as residents are aware of an underground spring. The water is currently taken up by trees which are due to be removed, so we believe it may be expedient to investigate this further before the June cabinet member decision meeting • Concern about the repositioning of bus stops to be staggered (if queued vehicles try to edge out behind parked buses when two buses arrive at the same time). • Continuing concern about the change in direction of traffic outside the shops on Headley Way from residents and businesses. • Request that traffic flows be measured more accurately at different times of the day if temporary trial traffic lights be installed 	<p>would not operate as efficiently nor would it be safe. A significant amount of modelling work has been undertaken to assess and understand the potential impacts of the proposal, which have been designed by experienced engineers. The county council would not be putting forward a design unless it was confident that it would work and be beneficial.</p> <p>The designs have been developed with the county council's drainage team and based on detailed drainage surveys.</p> <p>Proposals with half-on/half-off pavement parking mean that the narrowest point of the lower footway on the western side of Headley Way (downhill) would be 0.65m. This is still sufficient to accommodate a 240L wheelie (0.58m width) which is the most common type. An upper footway, which has level access, is also available and has a width between 1-1.2m – DfT guidance suggests an absolute minimum of 1m. Proposals are to resurface the upper footway, but because of the space constraints it cannot be widened without compromising the project budget.</p>
--	--	---	---

			Other comments noted.
413	Email response (Oxford Civic Society)	<p>Objection due to the following reasons:</p> <p>Headley Way, would urge adherence to the earlier proposals due to following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.25m cycle lane is inadequate on downhill section, as is narrowed footway for half on half off parking • Proposals compromise safety and are a retrograde step to encouragement of shift to active travel modes • Narrowed footways represent an impediment to pedestrians, and most particularly to the disabled and users of mobility scooters • Consider provision of cycle lane behind parking to provide separation 	<p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Cycle lanes behind parking would require more space, and on Headley Way that would mean cutting further into the embankment and a more significant retaining structure would therefore be required. Not only would this result in all trees needing to be removed, but the cost is likely to be significant and so could outweigh any benefit and/or other parts of the project could not be delivered.</p>
414	Email response (Chair of St Anne's Road, Gathorne Road, Rock & Margaret Road Residents Association)	<p>Neither support nor object to the proposals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the general comment on whole scheme being a waste of money is ignored the updated solution is far better than the original 	<p>The main report confirms that the project overall provides significant benefits (estimated at £3.88 for every £1 spent in the business case submitted to the DfT).</p>

415	Email response (Windmill Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would prefer no change in the area but the revised proposals appear to be a good compromise between the needs of residents and the wish of the County Council to install bike lanes. • Supports the retention of a reasonable number of parking places. 	Comments noted.
416	Email response (St Annes Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports plans to retain some parking on Windmill Road. • Grateful the time has been taken to listen to residents. • Supports the new proposals as oppose to the original ones. 	Comments noted.
417	Email response (Windmill Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrees in principle to the new plans. • Concerned about dangerous speeding of traffic up and down Windmill Road. • Supports the introduction of chicanes and the installation of an additional for the new crossing just north of Gathorne Road. • Would like to see a few illuminated 'Slow Down' warning signs that light up when someone is speeding 	Comments noted.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports cycle lanes from Margaret Road towards London Road in order to get speeding cyclists and others off the pavements. • Would like to see monitoring and fines enforced for cyclists on the pavement. 	
418	Online Consultation (St Annes Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels planners ignore concerns of local residents • Keeping residents parking on the current spaces provides a brake on speeding traffic and gives residents the right and ability to park outside their house or flat. 	Proposals have been amended a number of times to address concerns made by local residents. Latest proposals provide some parking on Windmill Road which are considered to overcome concerns regarding speeding.
419	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated plans for Windmill Road retention of parking are an improvement. • Chicane after the first 4 bays (heading south) is a good idea for traffic calming. • Concerned about speeding in off peak times. Hopes this can be monitored and action taken if necessary. 	Comments noted.
420	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	No objections to the updated plans.	Noted.
421	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	Objects due to the following reasons:	Parking surveys undertaken clearly show some capacity is available in side

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All parking spaces on Windmill Road need to be kept to reduce speed of traffic with a balance of quality of life for residents. The spaces are full to capacity most of the day and night. No acceptable alternative has been planned. 	roads. Furthermore, some additional spaces are to be provided within side roads and proposals to retain some parking will be the potential for overspill parking is reduced.
422	Online Consultation (Valentia Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hopes there is consideration for disabled people in wheelchairs who need a wider pavement & blind people, Parking halfway on the pavement is a real obstacle & shared cycle pedestrian areas are difficult to navigate when you can't see the white dividing line. Feels it is a shame to lose mature trees, replacing them with saplings isn't the answer they take years to grow. 	Proposals with half-on/half-off pavement parking mean that the narrowest point of the lower footway on the western side of Headley Way (downhill) would be 0.65m. This is still sufficient to accommodate a 240L wheelie (0.58m width) which is the most common type. An upper footway, which has level access, is also available and has a width between 1-1.2m – DfT guidance suggests an absolute minimum of 1m. Proposals are to resurface the upper footway, but because of the space constraints it cannot be widened without compromising the project budget.
423	Online Consultation (Coniston Avenue)	<p>No objections but has the following comments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to understand why it is not possible for JR traffic to access the site from the bypass. An access road from the bypass was promised to residents when the hospital was built and we are still waiting. 	See main report regarding alternative access to JR Hospital.

424	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>No objections but has the following comments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed that the new proposals will mean the loss of 5 parking bays between Margaret Road and Gathorne Road • Pleased that provision will be made for permit parking on the western side of Windmill Road between Mattock Close and the NOC access, and a further 9 parking bays provided for opposite the NOC. • Welcomes the proposed "Tiger Crossing". • Overall welcomes the plans • Asks perhaps there could be provision for some appropriate trees planted? 	<p>Proposals mean 29 trees will be lost, but replaced with 31 as close to the removed tree as is possible.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
425	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>Objections due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of any parking spaces is an outrage to the residents who have invested serious amounts of money in their house purchase. • Residents will pave over front gardens to park. This is bad for the environment. • Confused as to why Windmill road is not set to 20mph with a number of schools and a hospital entrance on the road. • Concerned the plans will only speed traffic up. 	<p>Proposals to remove parking have been amended, with some parking now retained. This is to accommodate cycle lanes which are required to support growth in jobs and housing and ensure this does not lead to additional traffic but more people using sustainable modes.</p> <p>The current extent of the 20mph in Windmill Road (as elsewhere) reflects the outcome of extensive consultation ahead of the implementation of the limit in 2009. If a 20mph was to be introduced then other supporting measures would also be required to</p>

			ensure vehicle speeds kept to the limit.
426	Online Consultation (Gathorne Road)	<p>No objections but has the following comments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes the retentions of 20 parking spaces on Windmill Road. • The loss of 18 spaces will not be compensated for. 	Proposals include the provision of approx. 26 additional parking spaces in side roads off Windmill Road.
427	Online Consultation (Cherwell Drive)	<p>Objections due to the following reasons:</p> <p>Headley Way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers the initial proposal of not retaining those parking bays, as I don't believe there is sufficient space • Segregated off-road cycle path uphill is excellent. However, the advisory cycle path downhill is very worrying, providing narrow car lane and insufficient cycle lane width which will lead to safety issues • Moving the cycle lane between the parking and the vegetation would be preferable 	<p>Cycle lanes behind parking would require more space, and on Headley Way that would mean cutting further into the embankment and a more significant retaining structure would therefore be required. Not only would this result in all trees needing to be removed, but the cost is likely to be significant and so could outweigh any benefit and/or other parts of the project could not be delivered.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
428	Online Consultation (Stile Road)	<p>Objections due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed additional parking on the east side of Stile Road is dangerous. • Access to driveways at 25, 25A and 34 Stile Road will be restricted making it more likely that their residents will park on the road, defeating the purpose of adding additional and unwanted parking bays. • Feels the argument put forward by residents in the first 	Beyond scope of this specific consultation regarding proposals to retain some parking on Headley Way and Windmill Road, but comments noted.

		round of consultation have not been listened to.	
429	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>Objections due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking, which they need for their family near their flat, will be removed. • Does not have a permit so will not be able to park near their property. • Will pursue legal action if a permit is not allocated to flat due to infringement of human rights. 	<p>Parking on Windmill Road already requires a parking permit so if parking without a permit this is not allowed.</p>
430	Online Consultation (Staunton Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic may flow more easily going down/up Headley Way but it still has to stop at the roundabouts the top and bottom of the road, therefore asks what advantage is this part of the proposal? • Asks how will residents parking on Headley Way all fit in as all bays are used by residents at the moment? • Half-on half-off parking restricts access to pedestrians • Parking on the road slows traffic down. 	<p>Testing of the proposed signal junctions confirm there will be significant benefit in terms of reducing delay and congestion.</p> <p>Proposals with half-on/half-off pavement parking mean that the narrowest point of the lower footway on the western side of Headley Way (downhill) would be 0.65m. This is still sufficient to accommodate a 240L wheelie (0.58m width) which is the most common type. An upper footway, which has level access, is also available and has a width between 1-1.2m – DfT guidance suggests an absolute minimum of 1m. Proposals are to resurface the upper footway, but because of the space constraints it</p>

			cannot be widened without compromising the project budget.
431	Online Consultation (Headley Way)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that general access to the JRH site (staff, patients, visitors) be increased to include access via the new roundabout under construction on the by-pass. • This would reduce the volume of traffic entering the JRH via Marston and Headley Way and probably avoid the traffic queues currently encountered in Headley Way. • This would also have health benefits for Headley Way residents in terms of reduced pollution from car fumes. 	Beyond scope of this specific consultation regarding proposals to retain some parking on Headley Way and Windmill Road, but comments noted.
432	Online Consultation (Stagecoach Oxfordshire)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <p>Headley Way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise that total elimination of on-street parking is likely to have unintended and unhelpful consequences and support the revised proposals in the main, to retain as much parking as if feasible while still securing the objectives of the scheme • Essential that 2 buses can pass each other on Headley Way, thus clear carriageway of 6.2m is essential and preferably 6.5m (this is not achievable by retaining parking in short section) • There will be an over-proliferation of stops in a short section northbound on Headley Way. Rather than move the stop from outside 60a southwards it is effectively redundant and can be deleted as an alternative is available very close by to the south. Gap between the two remaining stops is 	Comments noted, but beyond scope of this specific consultation.

		<p>still within what is appropriate in an urban environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Southbound off-carriageway cycle facility on Headley Way conflicts with boarding and alighting bus pax at stop o/s 59 Headley Way. This is a safety issue, especially given the fact that cyclists will be needing to read a very complex and unconventional situation, with multiple hazards within just 60m: junction, bus stop and merge to carriageway in very rapid succession. Cycle facility should transition onto carriageway just west of Bowness Ave junction. Kerblines to be realigned to allow cyclists and general traffic to pass stationary bus with less deflection. Given the proliferation of side roads, and very high permeability of streets here, do we seek to see Bowness Ave stopped up and used only for pedestrian access? Bellmouth could then be used for the bus stop? <p>Windmill Rd S/B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strongly welcome new parking restrictions in favour of residents and where applicable 2 hour off-peak as proposed• RH turns to Old Road and the NOC are a serious issue• Configuration of the shadow RH turn ghost islands needs to be looked at to maximise stacking capacity for those seeking a RH turn to Old Road in particular. Combining the central RH turn lane for both NOC and Old Road (by deleting chevrons) would assist at no cost. We still urge that the NOC eastern access is relocated northwards to opposite 125-127 Windmill Road, and/or is converted to left in only.• Moving existing s/b bus stop northwards to the area between 159-173 has been suggested as this brings the stop away from the junction and ought to assist with	
--	--	---	--

		<p>general traffic flow at the Old Rd junction, granted that residential amenity would be an issue with the stop now outside residential properties. We nevertheless ask that this is looked at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement of signals with SCOOT/MOVA on old Road/Windmill Road junction is assumed, or alternatively some kind of bus detector loop on the eastern arm of the junction. The current phasing causes serious delays in the am peak in particular, exiting Old Road from the east. • Off-carriageway parking on the Old Road eastern arm approach would also be highly beneficial as currently two buses cannot pass on this section of Old Road when cars are parked. This can cause the old Road crossroads to become blocked 	
434	Online Consultation (Norton Close)	<p>Objections due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of removing any parking on Windmill Road will create more pressure on surrounding roads and public car parks. • Norton Close already has cars parked on grass verges and double yellow lines. • The Council makes pressure worse by allowing new developments and permits. • The Shopping district needs sufficient parking. • Removing parking on Windmill Road will speed up traffic; currently parked vehicles act as chicanes. • Cyclists will be cycling on the pavements because they don't feel safe with fast moving traffic on a relatively narrow very busy road. • Feels the scheme improves access at the expense of 	<p>Proposals include the provision of approx. 26 additional parking spaces in side roads off Windmill Road. Two separate surveys also confirm there is also some spare capacity in side roads.</p> <p>Proposals to increase the width of cycles lanes to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking, will make some cyclists feel safer and confirm to drivers that cyclists have greater priority.</p>

		locals.	
435	Online Consultation (Norton Close)	<p>Objections due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of any parking space on Windmill Road and replacing it onto side roads will put unacceptable pressure on those surrounding roads which are used as rat runs particularly St Leonard's, Holyoake and Stile roads. • Large vehicles access the coop - it would be highly dangerous to place more parking bays close to junctions such as those proposed at Stile and St Leonard's and will reduce visibility for pedestrians and cyclists. • Proposals will speed up traffic on Windmill Road. It will remove the chicane effect that parked vehicles create. This will make it more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclist with a primary school close by in Margaret Road 	<p>Proposals include the provision of approx. 26 additional parking spaces in side roads off Windmill Road. Two separate surveys also confirm there is also some spare capacity in side roads.</p> <p>Proposals to increase the width of cycles lanes to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking, will also visually narrow the road and help reduce vehicle speeds, as well making some cyclists feel safer and confirm to drivers that cyclists have greater priority.</p>
436	Online Consultation (Inott Furze)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals are not a good use of money while Oxford's roads need urgent repair. • Would like to see all car parking removed on Windmill Road. Adding cycling and retaining parking will be dangerous. 	<p>The main report confirms that the project overall provides significant benefits (estimated at £3.88 for every £1 spent in the business case submitted to the DfT).</p> <p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision and working with limited available carriageway</p>

			widths.
437	Online Consultation (Cumberland Road)	Objects due to the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please do not remove any more parking from Windmill Road. 	Comment noted.
438	Online Consultation (Marcham Road, Abingdon)	No objection but has the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need proper, decent and continuous cycle lanes. Cars are coming before pedestrians. Should be reversed. 	Continuous cycle lanes are provided, with lane widths widened to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking. Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision and working with limited available carriageway widths.
439	Online Consultation (Christ Church, St Aldates)	No objection but has the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asks could you please provide a continuous cycle path between City Centre and Headington and Summertown and Headington? Cycle paths end unexpectedly and are sometimes being replaced with a parking space. If a cyclist does not know the route they end up being directed by the cycle path in to a parked car's boot. Laybys for buses should be provided so cyclists do not have to overtake them up hill. 	Outside scope of this specific consultation, but comments noted.
440	Online Consultation	Objects due to the following reasons:	Trialling traffic signals at junctions is

	(Headley Way)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glad to see retention of parking. • Asks why there are spaces between the parking bays and is this necessary? • Concerned about the proposed removal of trees. • Opposes to the proposed removal of the trees outside the shops and the widening of the road seems unnecessary. • Concerned about changing the direction of traffic in the service road in front of the shops. Asks how can this help? • Would welcome a trial run of using traffic lights with a temporary set up for a few weeks before making this a permanent feature. • Lights will just cause the traffic to back up at busy times and hold it up at quiet times (while roundabouts offer a free flow at such times.) • Worried about all the upheaval this will cause while the works are in progress and that there will be little improvement. 	<p>not considered necessary and it would still require the junction to be constructed as designed, otherwise it would not operate as efficiently nor would it be safe. A significant amount of modelling work has been undertaken to assess and understand the potential impacts of the proposal, which have been designed by experienced engineers. The county council would not be putting forward a design unless it was confident that it would work and be beneficial.</p> <p>For comments about removal of trees and signalisation of junctions see main report.</p>
441	Online Consultation (Old Road Campus, Headington)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaving the Kennedy Institute at Old Road Campus due to transport as a principle reason for leaving. • Old Road Campus has been allowed to be overdeveloped. • Things will be easier for cyclists to the detriment of car drivers and safety of pensioners on the pavement. • The plans will slow down the buses which get people 	Comment noted.

		<p>who cannot afford to live in Oxford into work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ease traffic in Headington stop the London Buses picking up in the street bus stops. The other buses cannot get past and are therefore continuously delayed. 	
442	Online Consultation (County Councillor for Barton, Sandhills & Risinghurst)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <p>Windmill Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please reconsider the proposal to create additional parking spaces outside 25 and 25A and east side of Stile Road as these will not work. 	Outside scope of this specific consultation, but comments noted.
443	Online Consultation (St Annes Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asks now that some parking provision has been reinstated on Windmill Road, would you please deleted the proposed new parking bay outside No.21 St Anne's Rd? The proposed bay would remove a bee-friendly tree 	Comment noted.
444	Online Consultation (Old Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly supports the revised plans for Windmill Road between Old Road and Mattocks Close. Gives plenty of space for traffic flows without making the road too wide. Allows people who live on that segment of Windmill Road to park reasonably conveniently 	Comments noted.

445	Online Consultation (St Annes Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please think hard about maintaining trees along the road on St Anne's or replacing them if needs be. 	There is no proposal to remove any trees along St Anne's Road.
446	Online Consultation (Bowness Avenue)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer parking spaces for residents • Increased volumes and speeds of traffic which will increase risk of accident. • Poorer pedestrian access due to half on/half off parking, especially for buggies, wheelchairs and children travelling to school. • Removal of 6 trees with only one replacement. 	<p>Proposals now retain some parking along Headley Way, and two separate surveys also confirm there is also some spare capacity in side roads.</p> <p>Proposals with half-on/half-off pavement parking mean that the narrowest point of the lower footway on the western side of Headley Way (downhill) would be 0.65m. This is still sufficient to accommodate a 240L wheelie (0.58m width) which is the most common type. An upper footway, which has level access, is also available and has a width between 1-1.2m – DfT guidance suggests an absolute minimum of 1m. Proposals are to resurface the upper footway, but because of the space constraints it cannot be widened without compromising the project budget.</p> <p>29 trees would be removed, but replaced with 31 trees as close to the removed trees as possible.</p>

447	Online Consultation (Staunton Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headley Way and Windmill Road designated Super Cycle Routes (SCR) fail to live up to standards. • SCRs should be continuous, segregated as much as absolutely possible, with priority at side junctions and "a minimum width of 1.5m, with 2m the default for the busiest sections". • Parked cars are inherently dangerous for cyclists. • Make the cycle lanes as safer by running the cycle lanes inside the parking spaces. 	<p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Revised proposals for cycle lanes increase the width to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking. On the downhill section of Headley Way the lane width is 1.25m plus a 0.75m buffer because the concern of increased risks due to higher cycle speeds.</p>
448	Online Consultation (St Annes Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asks now that some parking provision has been reinstated on Windmill Road, would you please deleted the proposed new parking bay outside No.21 St Anne's Rd? • The proposed bay would remove a bee-friendly tree 	<p>There is no proposal to remove any trees along St Anne's Road.</p>
449	Online Consultation (Farmer Place)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly supports the plan to make a full cycle path along Headley way, as this road is widely used for many 	<p>Comment noted.</p>

		cyclists that commute to work and school everyday.	
450	Online Consultation (St Annes Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asks now that some parking provision has been reinstated on Windmill Road, would you please deleted the proposed new parking bay outside No.21 St Anne's Rd? • The proposed bay would remove a bee-friendly tree 	There is no proposal to remove any trees along St Anne's Road.
451	Online Consultation (Ramsay Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed that the original proposal to remove car parking from Windmill Road and Headley Way has been reverted. • Car owners are being prioritised above cyclists. • As a cyclist hates cycling past parked cars. Feels it destroys the point of having a cycle lane in the first place. • Installation of premium and super cycle routes as described in the LTP are now dashed. 	<p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Revised proposals for cycle lanes increase the width to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking. On the downhill section of Headley Way the lane width is 1.25m plus a 0.75m buffer because the concern of increased risks due to higher cycle speeds.</p>
452	Online Consultation (Kennett Road)	Objects due to the following reasons:	Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes the original proposals, which involved removing car parking from Windmill Road, should remain. • The notion that each resident has a right to place a car on the public highway is not tenable for the city as a whole. • Windmill Road is particularly hazardous for cyclists, since the presence of parked cars means that the bicycle lane is continually invaded by cars. 	<p>safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Revised proposals for cycle lanes increase the width to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking. On the downhill section of Headley Way the lane width is 1.25m plus a 0.75m buffer because the concern of increased risks due to higher cycle speeds.</p>
453	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>Objects to the proposed Tiger Crossing immediately outside their property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests a much more suitable location would be further towards the Old Road junction, where the houses are elevated away from the roadway. <p>Additional comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadly in favour of the principles behind the proposed changes to Windmill Road • Proposes extend the proposed parking spaces north of Gathorne Road by two cars, move the crossing to outside 149 Windmill Road, and reduce the parking spaces south of Gathorne Road by two cars. • Does not believe a new crossing is required on Old Road. 	<p>The Tiger crossing cannot be relocated to the south because of access to driveways and because the footway is elevated.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We're concerned that cyclists will use the crossing to swing across the road with little warning to other road users, leading to an increased risk to the cyclist • Asks why do you believe that people want to cross the road at this point? Your proposal provides cycle lanes along the length of Windmill Road, connecting the existing crossing. Not clear why cyclists would wish to cross the road here. 	
454	Online Consultation (Langley Close)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great to see the plans, looks fantastic. • Asks will the improved measures lead to traffic travelling faster along a very narrow road? • Resident has 4 children who walk daily on this route so would be keen to see some traffic calming measures or an extension to the 20mph limit to further along the road. 	<p>The current extent of the 20mph in Windmill Road (as elsewhere) reflects the outcome of extensive consultation ahead of the implementation of the limit in 2009. If a 20mph was to be introduced then other supporting measures would also be required to ensure vehicle speeds kept to the limit.</p> <p>Retaining parking and wider cycle lanes will help to keep vehicles speeds down, visually narrow carriageway and raise profile of cycling along Windmill Road.</p>
455	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans are contradictory to your stated aim of "Promote health and wellbeing by reducing transport's environmental impact". • These plans will only increase the impact of motor 	<p>Retaining parking and wider cycle lanes will help to keep vehicles speeds down, visually narrow carriageway and raise profile of cycling along Windmill Road.</p>

		<p>vehicles on the local community when the largest primary school in the county is being developed round the corner in Margaret Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road is too narrow and too straight, so no parked vehicles along Windmill Road will make it extremely easy for vehicles to drive at excess speed along the road, without making much difference to actual transit time during peak periods. • Suggests enforce the loading time rules in force already in Windmill Road, i.e. 8am-9:30am and 4:30pm-6pm there is no loading. • If it was no parking on Windmill Road at those times, but off-peak parking was still allowed, the disruption to the local community would be minimal and you could still implement the basic intentions of your plan. 	<p>Other comments noted.</p>
<p>456</p>	<p>Online Consultation (Gardiner Street)</p>	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans retreat from the forward-looking strategic vision of continuous mandatory cycle lanes in Windmill Road and Headley Way • Evidence suggests there is little substantiated demand for existing on-street parking in most of the WR and HW sectors proposed. • Enabling cars to access on-street parking bays has required cycle lanes to be demoted from the mandatory designation to advisory status. • Cycle lanes added on both sides of the roads, seem to leave too little road width for buses to pass each other easily without slowing and/or pulling in. This situation will lead to vehicle invasion of the (now advisory) cycle 	<p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Revised proposals for cycle lanes increase the width to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking. On the downhill section of Headley Way the lane width is 1.25m plus a 0.75m buffer because the concern of increased risks due to</p>

		<p>lanes, putting cyclists at greater risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New cycle routes do not adhere to Super Cycle Route criteria. 	higher cycle speeds.
457	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome new proposals but they do not address the problem on Margaret Road. At present the parked cars act as a chicane and slow the traffic down. Without the parking bays cars will speed unless other measures are put in place. • Asks could the whole of the road be designated a 20 mph zone? Could a sign that lights up be put up to remind drivers of the speed limit? Could pedestrian lights be installed near Bateman Street? • Proposed parking bays in Gardiner Street and Windsor Street are inaccessible from Windmill Road unless the bollards are removed in Bateman Street. Will the bollards be removed? • Are road humps necessary across the side roads? Unclear who has priority. 	<p>The current extent of the 20mph in Windmill Road (as elsewhere) reflects the outcome of extensive consultation ahead of the implementation of the limit in 2009. If a 20mph was to be introduced then other supporting measures would also be required to ensure vehicle speeds kept to the limit.</p> <p>Retaining parking and wider cycle lanes will help to keep vehicles speeds down, visually narrow carriageway and raise profile of cycling along Windmill Road.</p> <p>No bollards will not be removed.</p>
458	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of a tiger crossing and cycle lane at or wider than 1.5m along Windmill Road from Margaret Road to Rock Edge is very welcome. • Fails to address hazardous situation for pedestrians and cyclists along east side of Windmill Road where there is a lack of elevated pavement. 	Comments noted.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worried that planned humps for side roads will make it easier for drivers wishing to speed down the full length of Windmill road, thereby causing more harm than the current situation. 	
459	Online Consultation (Lonsdale Road)	Separate report sent due to lack of capacity in response box online.	
460	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised TROs proposed for Windmill Road offer some improvements on the previous proposal Clearer cycle lanes, and some on-street parking retained and used to create a chicane to slow down the traffic. The proposed crossings should improve some of the routes for cyclists, and enable safer road crossing, as well as slowing traffic which will also improve safety. Concerned over speeding traffic towards western end of Windmill Road increasing the risk of an accident and damage to their property. reduced parking will still move more cars owned by Windmill Road residents into the surrounding side streets, increasing car crime and neighbour disputes, and presenting a risk to personal safety when walking a distance late at night or in the dark Removing U-turns from Windmill Road will increase traffic flow in the side streets. Requests Windmill road a 20mph limit to reflect the residential nature of the entire road 	Comments noted.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests the parking bays retained on Windmill Road reflect the maximum possible 'per car' length for every space, so that parallel parking can be done quickly and safely • Ensure that as many additional parking spaces as are safe/practical are created in the surrounding side roads so that people can park as close as possible to their houses • Improve the streetscape with plantings and street furniture and road markings that make it clear that Windmill Road is a residential road; • Facilitate the installation of dropped kerbs for houses with no adjacent on-street parking, particularly in view of the increasing future reliance on electric vehicles and the need to access charging points, which currently can only be done with off-street on-property parking. 	
461	Online Consultation (Gathorne Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised plans are a significant improvement on the original proposals, but there would remain fewer parking spaces than currently exist. • Raised platforms are confusing and dangerous as pedestrians attempt to cross around and in front of vehicles. • Raised platforms are unpleasant to cross, especially problematic for people being transported by ambulance. • Feels the scheme is expensive and sees little benefit to improve access. • Opposes the loss of trees on Headley Way 	Side road entry treatments have been implemented across the city and generally work well, and give pedestrians and cyclists more priority. Other comments noted.

462	Online Consultation (New High Street)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please do not create additional car parking in Stile Road to provide parking spaces for cars unable to park on Windmill Road. • There isn't the room for cars to manoeuvre into their drives opposite No 25 and No 25A and residents will then park on the road which will defeat the object of creating additional spaces. • Delivery lorries also have to access this road to get to the Co-Op and this will be impossible if there is car parking on both sides of this narrow road. • Yellow box should be reinstated at the top of the road. 	Comments noted, but outside scope of this specific consultation regarding retention of parking on Headley Way and Windmill Road.
463	Online Consultation (New High Street)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking spaces would be incompatible with the current use of Stile Road and would render the use of driveways at numbers 25 and 25A difficult and hazardous. • Reducing carriageway on Stile Road will not allow Co-op lorries to pass through. • Map on the parking plan is out of date by more than two decades – number 25 now contains two semi-detached houses. Access would be compromised by the plans. • Visibility will be reduced by half on/half off parking bays. • Yellow box should be reinstated at the top of the road. 	Comments noted, but outside scope of this specific consultation regarding retention of parking on Headley Way and Windmill Road.
464	Online Consultation	No objection but has the following comments:	Proposals include the resurfacing of

	(Headley Way)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased that revised plans have kept some parking on lower Headley Way. • Please consider the option of making these remaining spaces on lower Headley Way resident permit holders parking only at all times. • Some areas on the upper footpaths on lower Headley Way are in need of repair. Hopes repairs to the upper footpaths would be considered when work commences on the road and lower footpaths. 	the upper and lower footway. Other comments noted.
465	Online Consultation (Stile Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed extra parking in stile road 25 and 25 a and on corner with st Leonard's road on the grounds of safety re delivery lorries, many incidents of cars and bicycle drug in the wrong way down the road • Lack of vision for crossing the road for children going to St. Andrews and. windmill school and quarry foundation stage school 	Comments noted, but outside scope of this specific consultation regarding retention of parking on Headley Way and Windmill Road.
466	Online Consultation (Stile Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking spaces would be incompatible with the current use of Stile Road and would render the use of driveways at numbers 25 and 25A difficult and hazardous. • Reducing carriageway on Stile Road will not allow Co-op lorries to pass through. • Map on the parking plan in out of date by more than two 	Comments noted, but outside scope of this specific consultation regarding retention of parking on Headley Way and Windmill Road.

		<p>decades – number 25 now contains two semi-detached houses. Access would be compromised by the plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visibility will be reduced by half on/half off parking bays. 	
467	Online Consultation (Trinity Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of on-street parking. This is reducing the rights of residents in favour of drivers of traffic passing through, particularly heavy vehicles. • Speeding up traffic will only make the road more dangerous for everybody. • The houses have no garages and so the residents need somewhere to park. The addition of more houses by in-filling, multi-occupancy and granting of non-residential use has made the parking shortage worse. • Bus stops are inconveniently placed on narrow pavements where they cause much obstruction. 	<p>Proposals to reduce the amount of parking on Windmill Road are to accommodate cycle lanes and improve traffic flow. These proposals are part of wider strategic ambitions to increase use of more sustainable modes so that additional growth in housing and jobs does not lead to a worsening of traffic conditions.</p> <p>Proposals now include the retention of some parking bays along both Headley Way and Windmill Road. Surveys also confirm that there is spare capacity on side roads, and additional parking bays are proposed off Windmill Road.</p>
468	Online Consultation (Stile Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stile road is too narrow for proposed parking. • Pavement on Stile Road frequently used by people with pushchairs, reduced mobility and motability buggies and very vulnerable older folk shopping at the Co-Op. Additional parking would cause a danger. • Driveways will have limited access. 	<p>Comments noted, but outside scope of this specific consultation regarding retention of parking on Headley Way and Windmill Road.</p>

469	Online Consultation (Windmill Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes the proposed changes to the parking provision in Windmill Road and Headley Way. • Section of road around 72 Windmill Road is demonstrably too narrow to permit any parking bays as they seriously affect the flow of traffic. 	Comments noted.
470	Online Consultation (Gathorne Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate use of S106 money – they are investigating ways to challenge the use of S106 money to fund A2H. • Local residents have to suffer from reduction in residential parking and increased traffic speed and with this increased risk of accidents and severity. • This is of particular concern as the Margaret Road crossing of Windmill Road is used by children going to Windmill School, and this school is being expanded, so even more children will be using this crossing in the future. • Suggests the crossing of Windmill Road from Margaret Road to Mattock Close should have staggered traffic lights (believes Cyclox made a similar suggestion). • As it stands, cyclists turning right into Mattock Close would have to cross two lanes of faster moving traffic. 	<p>The main report shows the project has significant benefit, with a business case submitted to government estimating that for every £1 spent there would be £3.88 in transport benefits.</p> <p>Proposals now retain some parking and along with wider cycle lanes will help to keep traffic speeds to more appropriate levels. This should increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
471	Online Consultation (Stile Road)	Objects due to the following reasons:	Comments noted, but outside scope of this specific consultation regarding

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about additional bays outside 25/25A Stile Road. • These extra parked cars will cause a narrowing of the Stile road to a point where it will be very difficult for Co-op delivery lorries to pass by the parked cars safely, and without causing damage. • Asks can the bays outside the co-op 1 hour parking, be used for permit holders as well. They used to be available for permit holders a number of years ago. 	retention of parking on Headley Way and Windmill Road.
472	Online Consultation (Margaret Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence suggests there is little proven demand for existing on-street parking in most of the WR and HW sectors proposed. Claimed parking demand is not from local residents and the lack of disabled bays cannot justify exceptions. • The revised proposals require cycle lanes to be demoted from mandatory to advisory status - clearly not the means to get people out of their cars and onto cycles or fulfilling a primary aim of A2H. • Cycle lanes on both sides of the roads appear to leave not sufficient width for buses to pass each other easily without slowing or even pulling in. Cyclists will be put at even greater risk. • Providing extra car parking space does not discourage private car ownership and ignores the highly successful car club which has been operating in Headington for a number of years. • Private cars should not sit parked on congested publicly owned highways that exist to promote movement. 	<p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Revised proposals for cycle lanes increase the width to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking. On the downhill section of Headley Way the lane width is 1.25m plus a 0.75m buffer because the concern of increased risks due to higher cycle speeds.</p>

473	Online Consultation (London Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to give proper consideration to cycling in this area. • Council continues to have concern only for buses. 	<p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Revised proposals for cycle lanes increase the width to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking. On the downhill section of Headley Way the lane width is 1.25m plus a 0.75m buffer because of the concern of increased risks due to higher cycle speeds.</p>
474	Online Consultation (Bateman Street)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised proposals for Windmill Road, retaining some parking spaces are an improvement • Believe that the additional spaces proposed on side roads as originally planned should be fully maintained. • Believes the scheme is an unnecessary use of public money which could be much better spent elsewhere. • The scheme will have a practical negative effect on the quality of life for everyone looking to park their car in the evening, whilst having nebulous benefits. • The scheme has no impact on decision-making around 	<p>The main report shows the project has significant benefit, with a business case submitted to government estimating that for every £1 spent there would be £3.88 in transport benefits. Other comments noted.</p>

		<p>jobs provision at the hospitals in Headington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic lights at each end of Windmill Road will still cause traffic build-up at peak times. • Further parking spaces in side roads could and should be made available, and none should be dropped if the revised scheme retaining some spaces on Windmill Road goes ahead. 	
475	<p>Online Consultation (Oxfordshire Cycling Network)</p>	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly believe that the safety of the many cycle users and other users using the route for travel should outweigh convenience of a small number of residents parking private cars • Request that as an intended Super route, the route is designed to at least be safe (2m should be the minimum here) • If parking is essential, use parked cars as buffer between cycle users and motor traffic • Note increase to 1.5m advisory cycle lanes in some locations, however 1.8m (2.0m in TfL standards) should be minimum 	<p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Revised proposals for cycle lanes increase the width to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking. On the downhill section of Headley Way the lane width is 1.25m plus a 0.75m buffer because the concern of increased risks due to higher cycle speeds.</p> <p>Cycle lanes behind parking would require more space, and on Headley Way that would mean cutting further into the embankment and a more significant retaining structure would therefore be required. Not only would</p>

			this result in all trees needing to be removed, but the cost is likely to be significant and so could outweigh any benefit and/or other parts of the project could not be delivered.
476	Online Consultation (Gathorne Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme does not consider the potential bus route to JR using the bus-only road across the Northern Bypass as part of the Barton Park development. • Bad timing - the road works on the pipeline from the JR to the Churchill are due to start sometime in the summer and take 18 months. • Suggests a reduced scheme of advanced stop lines for cyclists and the replacement of roundabout with traffic lights at Marsh Lane and the bus gate on the Churchill site 	<p>Even if buses are to use the new junction on the A40 other buses will use the B4494, which is designated as a rapid transit route in the Oxford Transport Strategy.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>
477	Online Consultation (St Annes Road)	<p>No objection but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes parking retention on Windmill Road. • St Annes Rd additional bays - requests that space is maintained for either a replacement tree (previously knocked down) at the Rock Edge end of St Annes or to retain space for the existing bee farm. • Where parking is stopped on the narrower part of Windmill Rd there should be traffic calming measures. • Ongoing review needed to ensure that parking spaces for shoppers in St Leonards Rd car park are not lost to 	Comments noted.

		resident parking.	
478	Online Consultation (Cyclox)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headley Way and Windmill Road parking retention is not consistent with the intentions of LTP4 regarding Cycle Super Routes. • The proposals continues to make no provision (i) for those on bikes southbound to cross safely to the entrance to the NOC (ii) for safe traverse between Bateman Street and St Leonard's Road (iii) for a traverse that follows desire lines of pedestrians and people who cycle between Margaret Road and Mattock Close. 	<p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Revised proposals for cycle lanes increase the width to 1.5m, and 1.8m where there is parking. On the downhill section of Headley Way the lane width is 1.25m plus a 0.75m buffer because the concern of increased risks due to higher cycle speeds.</p>
479	Online Consultation (Apsley Road)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed that the cycling provision on Headley Way and Windmill Road do not meet the standards of the Cycle Super or Premium Routes. • The safety of many cycle and other road users is being put at risk through the wishes of a small number of residents requesting retention of parking. • Grateful for increased cycle lane widths on Headley Way and Windmill Road and the buffer space. However, do not meet TfL standards and are merely average 	<p>Officers believe that this approach is the best compromise between the safety of cyclists, keeping some on-street parking provision, working with limited available carriageway widths and a desire to reduce the potential for any further loss of trees and grass verges.</p> <p>Revised proposals for cycle lanes increase the width to 1.5m, and 1.8m</p>

		<p>standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parked cars create conflict between vehicles and cyclists so will not attract more cyclists via the scheme. 	<p>where there is parking. On the downhill section of Headley Way the lane width is 1.25m plus a 0.75m buffer because the concern of increased risks due to higher cycle speeds.</p>
480	E-mail response (Member of Cycling UK & Cyclox)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed comment on various design elements of scheme that are felt could be improved specifically for cyclists 	<p>Design issues have been reviewed, but cannot be accommodated in all instances. To maintain consistency and weigh up requirements for all road users the majority of the suggestions will be difficult to accommodate.</p>
481	E-mail response (Headley Way)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcomes parking retention on Windmill Road. • Dislikes tree removal. Would appreciate as much retention as possible. • Does not feel there is a need for traffic lights at the bottom of Headley Way. Thinks this will only cause congestion. 	<p>See main report for comments on tree removal/replacement and signalisation of junctions.</p>
482	Letter (Headley Way)	<p>Objects due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Toucan on Headley Way • Relocation of bus stop • Removal of trees 	<p>There is already a crossing on Headley Way and the proposal is to upgrade this to a Toucan (pedestrian and cycle crossing). See main report for officer response regarding removal and replacement of trees.</p>

483	Letter (Old Road)	<p>Supports proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Believes this is a better compromise and reflects the fact that parts of Windmill Road, so without some parking vehicle speeds could increase. Believes 1.8m is a good width for a cycle lane.	Comments noted.
-----	-------------------	---	-----------------