

Divisions affected: *Wolvercote and Summertown*

**CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT
25 JANUARY 2024**

**OXFORD: SOUTH PARADE – PROPOSED TWO-WAY CYCLING &
ASSOCIATED AMENDMENTS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

Report by Corporate Director, Environment and Place

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Cabinet Member for Transport Management is RECOMMENDED to approve the following as advertised:
 - a. permitting two-way cycling on the full length of South Parade,
 - b. replacing all current lengths of single yellow line waiting restriction on the north side of South Parade (Monday to Fridays 8am to 4pm) to 'No Waiting at Any Time' (double yellow lines).

Executive summary

2. National guidance on designing for cyclists commends allowing two-way cycling on one-way streets with the provision of appropriate road signs and markings, and therefore to help prevent obstructive parking and improve road safety, the County Council is also proposing to replace all of the existing lengths of single yellow lane waiting restrictions (which apply between 8am and 4pm Monday to Saturday) with new 'No Waiting at Any Time' (double yellow lines) parking restrictions.
3. The proposals as shown in **Annex 1**, will help ensure the safe movement of all traffic, mindful that the existing width of the road east of Middle Way does not permit vehicles to be parked on both sides of the road unless a vehicle is partly parked on the footway, and even on the wider section of the road to the west of Middle Way vehicles on the north side are frequently parked partly on the footway.

Financial Implications

4. Funding for the proposals (including consultation) has been provided by the County Council's Accessibility and Safety Programme, which will also fund their implementation if approved.

Equality and Inclusion Implications

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

Sustainability Implications

6. The proposals would help facilitate cycling and the safe movement of traffic in the area.

Formal consultation

7. A formal consultation was carried out between 14 December 2023 and 12 January 2024. A notice was published in the Oxford Times newspaper, and an email was sent to statutory consultees & key-stakeholders, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Bus operators, countywide transport/access & disabled peoples user groups, Oxford City Council, local City Cllr's, and the local County Councillor representing the Wolvercote and Summertown division.
8. A letter was also sent to approx. 440 properties in the area, and street notices were placed on site in the immediate vicinity.
9. 164 responses were received via the online survey during the course of the formal consultation, and these are summarised in the table below:

Proposal	Object	Partially support	Support	No opinion/ objection	Total
Two-way cycling	59 (36%)	6 (4%)	94 (57%)	5 (3%)	164
Parking restrictions	60 (37%)	16 (10%)	76 (46%)	12 (7%)	164

10. Additionally, a further 16 emails were received, comprising of 12 objections, three in support, and one non-objection. The full responses are shown at **Annex 2**, and copies of the original submissions are available for inspection by County Councillors.

Summary of responses

11. Thames Valley Police raised no objection to the proposals.
12. A city councillor expressed support for the proposals.
13. Cyclox, a local cycling group, expressed support for proposal and requested that on the length of South parade west of Middle Way, a cycle lane is

provided at the western end of the road to make it clear to all road users that two-way cycling is permitted.

14. The North Wall Trust objected to the proposal on the grounds of loss of parking, with particular concerns over the impact on visitors with disabilities, and requested that should the proposals proceed, consideration should be given to amending some of the existing parking places on the south side of the road to Disabled Persons Parking Places.
15. St Edwards School objected to the proposals should they impact on their receiving essential deliveries on both sides of South Parade, noting that the ability to receive deliveries to these two departments of the School on both sides of South Parade is critical to the functioning of the School and it is essential that these arrangements are maintained, and that any element of the proposed introduction of the two-way cycling lane must not prevent deliveries from taking place in these locations.
16. The North Wall Trust, which operate an adjacent theatre and arts venue objected to the proposal on the grounds of the loss of evening parking with their main concerns applying to the adverse effect on customers with impaired mobility.
17. ROX – a local group representing businesses in Oxford objected to the proposals citing safety concerns on behalf of all road users, and also noting that there is an existing nearby two-way cycle route between the Woodstock Road and Middle Way via Alexandra Park. Additionally ROX expressed an objection to the proposed amendments to the waiting restrictions stating that these will make it very difficult for businesses, including retailers, restaurants and charities, the Summertown Library and the North Wall Arts Centre, and noting that Summertown has very limited parking in this area and reducing it further will make it harder for people to visit, particularly the less-abled and infirm and those living off easy bus routes.
18. Objections were also received from nine local businesses and forty-one members of the public, the latter mostly being residents in the Summertown area, with the grounds for objection focussing on the loss of parking for businesses, schools and Summertown Library and their customers, blue-badge holders and also concerns over safety.
19. Ninety-eight responses were received from members of the public – the majority of these were supportive of both the proposed two-way cycling and proposed the amendment to the waiting restrictions, although noting some of the responses were expressions of no opinion or qualified support.

Officer response to objections/concerns

20. The proposal to permit two-way cycling in South Parade is in response to national guidance on cycle provision – Local Transport Note 1/20 – which states that that "There should be a general presumption in favour of cycling in both

directions in one way streets" (6.4.21) and in the context of roads such as South Parade, that where speed is low in urban areas, contraflow cycling without a dedicated cycle lane has been found to be successful even on narrow streets with on-street car parking.

21. A survey of traffic flows and speeds including a survey of current non-legal eastbound cycling was carried out in September and October 2023 and as summarised below:

- a. Motor traffic flows (weekday Mon-Fri 7am to 7pm):

Location	Traffic flows (motor vehicles)	Average speed
Between Banbury Road & Middle Way	1620	12mph
Between Middle Way & Woodstock Road	1570	17mph

- b. Pedal cycle flows:

Location	West-bound	East-bound (contraflow)
Middle Way / Stratfield junction	340	165

22. The above surveys indicate that the speeds are well controlled, and that the location meets the LTN 1/20 guidance in respect of permitting contraflow cycling without a dedicated cycle lane.
23. The survey also shows the significant level of currently illegal contraflow cycling that demonstrates the demand for eastbound cycling on the road.
24. Noting that there have been no reported injury collisions involving contraflow cyclists in the period 01/01/2000 to 15/11/2023 (the latter being the latest date for which data is currently available), formally permitting two-way cycling with the traffic management measures recommended in LTN1/20 for a road of this type is not considered to present a hazard, but should the proposal be approved the scheme will be closely monitored.
25. The proposed amendments to the waiting restrictions seek to further reduce the risks for cyclists and pedestrians, and also the general movement of traffic nothing that especially on the length of South Parade east of its junction with Middle Way, the width of the road where the current single yellow line (no waiting Monday to Friday 8am to 4pm) is not sufficient to allow most vehicles to park here without causing obstruction unless parked partly on the footway.
26. The request by Cyclox for the provision of a cycle lane at the western part of South Parade is noted and it is confirmed that – should the proposal be approved - in addition to the short length of cycle lane immediately east of the Woodstock Road junction already included in the design, consideration will be

given to continuing the lane eastwards to the Middle Way junction as an alternative to applying the lining options as detailed in LTN1/20 for lightly trafficked roads.

27. The length of South Parade between Middle Way and Woodstock Road is somewhat wider but drivers frequently still choose to park partly on the footway presumably due to concerns that should they park fully on the road they may present some obstruction and that their vehicles face a higher risk of damage by passing traffic.
28. The change to no waiting at any time restrictions will however not prevent legitimate use of this space (providing such activity does not obstruct the carriageway for footway) for loading or the setting down / picking up of passengers etc. including for example by the schools. Similarly blue badge holders will continue to be able to park (for up to three hours) where double yellow lines are proposed to be introduced in place of the single yellow lines in accordance with the national provisions for blue badges users to park on 'no waiting at any time' restrictions .
29. In respect of the North Wall Trust's comments on the impact of the proposals and their suggestion over changing some of the existing parking places on the south side of the road to Disabled Persons Parking Places, it is recommended that this is reviewed in consultation with the Trust following experience gained of the scheme should it be approved, together with the consideration of the possible reinstatement of shorter lengths of evening parking on the north side of the road in the vicinity of their premises, given that some visitors with mobility impairments may nevertheless not qualify (or have applied) for a blue badge.
30. It is however not considered advisable to review the proposed removal of the single yellow lines on the part of the road east of Middle Way due its narrower width.

Bill Cotton
Corporate Director, Environment and Place

Annexes Annex 1: Consultation plan
 Annex 2: Consultation responses

Contact Officers: Anthony Kirkwood (Team Leader – Vision Zero)

January 2024

Drawing No. _____

Key



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright, and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Oxfordshire County Council Licence No LA078805

Rev.	Date	Purpose of revision	Drawn	Checked	Approved


OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
 Bill Cotton
 Corporate Director for Environment and Place
 Communities
 Oxfordshire County Council
 County Hall
 Oxford
 OX1 1ND
 Tel: 0345 310 11 11
 Fax: (01865) 241577

Project title
 PROPOSED TWO WAY CYCLING AND ASSOCIATED AMENDMENTS TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS

Drawing title
 OXFORD SOUTH PARADE

Drawing Status

Scale @ A3	Drawn by	Checked by	Approved by
N.T.S.	JaC		
	Date drawn	Date checked	Date approved
	11/2023		

Oxfordshire Project No. & File Ref
 Drawing No. _____ Revision 0

ANNEX 2

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	<p>No objection – I assume this is to formalise what has probably been happening for years .</p> <p>In principle the Police have no objection , providing it is complimented by robust and visible signing and road markings.</p>
(2) Local City Cllr	<p>Support</p>
(180) Local group/organisation, (Cyclox)	<p>Support – Cyclox is in full support of this proposal. We wish to see two way cycling on as many one-way streets as possible in the city and in county towns and villages. Contraflow lanes help create comprehensive cycling networks and provide direct routes. They are recommended in LTN 1/20 which states:</p> <p>6.4.21 There should be a general presumption in favour of cycling in both directions in one way streets, unless there are safety, operational or cost reasons why it is not feasible.</p> <p>We would like to see a cycle lane on the west end of South Parade so that it is apparent to drivers that there is a cycle lane.</p>
(3) St Edward’s School	<p>Object – I am writing on behalf of St Edward’s School to object to the proposed two-way cycling and parking amendments on South Parade.</p> <p>The School currently receives essential deliveries on both sides of South Parade. Delivery lorries stop on the South side of South parade at all times of the day, delivering food and provisions every day of the week into the School's catering department. We also receive deliveries of parcels, post and other items to our Facilities Reception on the North side of South Parade, on the opposite side of the road to our catering department. Refuse collection is from the catering yard daily, and the compactor is taken away by lorry once a week. The ability to receive deliveries to these two departments of the School on South Parade is critical to the functioning of the School and it is essential that these arrangements are maintained. Therefore any element of the proposed introduction of the two-way cycling lane must</p>

	<p>not prevent deliveries from taking place in these locations. Currently, double yellow lines are in place across the North Wall, Catering Yard, and Reception Yard, where we typically handle deliveries.</p> <p>It is currently possible for delivery vehicles to park on double yellow lines to unload in these locations. This proposal will stop any parking on single yellow lines after 4pm, thereby ensuring clearer access to the new cycle lanes. As long as there are no local restrictions on loading and unloading over double yellow lines in the vicinity of our catering yard and facilities reception, our logistical operations should be largely unaffected. This must be assured.</p> <p>It is also important to note that disabled access to the Music School on the North of South Parade and the disabled lift to the first floor of the Music School which includes access to our Learning Support Department, is from the Facilities Reception yard. Any disabled pupils and members of staff who cross South Parade from the main school site on the South side of South Parade to the Music School site do so at the point where the pavement kerbs are lowered at the catering and facilities reception loading and unloading sites. It is essential for the School's compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 that the ability for disabled people to cross South Parade at this point is maintained and any two way cycle lane needs to incorporate this crossing point to ensure cyclists are made aware of the risk of disabled staff and pupils crossing the road.</p> <p>The School also owns three residential properties on North side of South Parade either side of the Music School, which are occupied by members of staff. We also rent two other properties on both sides of the road slightly further East which are occupied by members of staff. Several occupants of these properties are members of staff with young children. It is essential that the current residential parking bays on South Parade remain for these residents to park their cars close to the properties which they occupy.</p>
(4) Local charity, (Oxford, South Parade)	<p>Object – The North Wall Trust is a charity which operates from the North Wall Arts Centre on South Parade. We run a significant public programme of events, including regular public performances in the theatre, exhibitions in the gallery, and workshops for schools, young people and our local community. The current allowance for vehicles to park on the opposite side of the road from 4pm onwards is of significant benefit to our audiences and participants who would be considered to be vulnerable or in need of access support. This includes disabled visitors and those with limited mobility, as well as young people who are arriving at The North Wall for projects via arranged transport / taxis - such as participants of our Young Carers Group.</p> <p>We strongly encourage audience members, participants and visitors to The North Wall to use public transport, local council car parks and park and ride whenever possible, but there are specific groups of people, as referenced above,</p>

	<p>where this is simply not possible. Our objection is therefore based on grounds of access support for disabled visitors and vulnerable young people, who may otherwise not be able to use our services and facilities.</p> <p>If the proposal goes ahead we would urge the council to allocate some of the current resident-permit-only parking spaces on South Parade to become designated disabled parking spaces, as is the case on other roads in the area.</p>
<p>(5) Local business, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Object – I am a business resident in South Parade, my business Sarah Wiseman Gallery was established in 1998, and I have a wide knowledge of the street as we have been in this location since opening.</p> <p>South Parade is a mixed use street, with businesses, residential, public (library & health centre) and educational organisations. It is stated in the letter sent on 14/12/23 that ‘these proposals will help ensure the safe movement of all traffic’ – I strongly disagree with this statement.</p> <p>I do not think that allowing two-way cycling on South Parade is safe, it is a one way street and I have counted 10 points where either a road, driveways, or dropped curb on the north side of the street, would mean that cars would be turning right across the path of cyclists. Starting at Banbury Road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Turning into Prama House Carpark and driveway for 2 a South Parade 2. Driveway to parking at side of 3 South Parade 3. Driveway to parking 5 South Parade 4. Driveway to parking, residential property and businesses 7-8 South Parade 5. Residential Dropped Curb 10 South Parade 6. Middle Way junction with South Parade 7. Dropped curb for disabled drivers, Library & health centre South Parade 8. Entrance (exit gate further down South Parade) Northern House School 9. Facilities Reception Woodstock Road End of South Parade <p>In addition to this, cars come out of Stratfield road to cross South Parade to turn into Middle Way, and it would not be safe to have cyclists coming the other way. I believe it is likely that there will be accidents, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ingrained habit South Parade has been a one way street for decades 2. The street does not have a large amount of street lighting 3. Cars will be looking left for the flow of traffic 4. The entries to these access points are all designed for turning right with no obstructions

	<p>5. Cyclists often take no care, wear dark clothing and have no lights on their bikes. 6. There are no provisions in South Parade for delivery vehicles to park safely with many using the North side of the street – this is for residential and business deliveries.</p> <p>I do not believe that the removal of the existing lengths of single yellow line waiting restrictions (which apply between 8 am – 4pm Monday to Saturday) with new 'no waiting at any time' (double yellow lines) parking restrictions, will make any significant impact to street safety as these are the quietest times on South Parade with very little traffic.</p> <p>I would suggest to make cycling safer in Oxford a local by-law making it mandatory for all cyclists and scooter users to wear a helmet, wear a high vis jacket and have lights on their bike or scooter after dark, along with stopping a red lights would see a significant drop in accidents.</p> <p>I am aware that there has been a local resident group lobbying for changes to South Parade. As a business we have only been informally addressed and not invited to take part in any wider conversations, even though a professional has presented a proposal to select invited members of the community.</p> <p>I would therefore like to know what evidence the council has collected to initiate the proposed changes to South Parade, whether it has been influenced by this informal resident's group and if this is part of a longer term plan for South Parade.</p> <p>Any further proposals to the changes in South Parade should only be drawn up with the full knowledge and participation of all stake holders. It is unacceptable to not engage fully with business community on South Parade as it is the larger stakeholder in the street.</p>
<p>(6) Local business, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Object – Firstly, the time to reply to your letter was too tight, with many of the business enterprises being closed for the Christmas period, or at least part of it.</p> <p>Secondly, 2 way cycling is hardly new to South Parade, it happens already, and it is dangerous already. Silent traffic such as this is never a good thing; add this to a busy pedestrian route and you compound the problem with the number of young children, and younger foreign visitors, using the cut through between the Banbury and Woodstock roads.</p>

	<p>Thirdly, the businesses in South Parade attract visitors, to the restaurants, the gallery, offices, the little shops , the library and its garden etc. In addition to regular deliveries and waste disposal collections, etc., there is frequent dropping people off at the businesses, most of which have no parking themselves.</p> <p>In the case of elderly or disabled people, this dropping off exercise, and indeed picking up again, can take quite a few minutes. Your proposal in this respect can only be seen as very negative, verging on being discriminatory.</p> <p>Overall, as a small business myself, and recognising the effect on my neighbouring businesses similarly, I consider the proposals to be unhelpful, potentially unsafe, and most certainly damaging to us financially.</p> <p>On a more cynical note, the ‘take’ from parking fines will likely reduce – another funding source for the authorities bites the dust.</p> <p>My comments are brief, but I believe relevant for consideration. Small businesses are having a tough time at present – please do not make this any worse.</p>
(7) Local group/organisation, (ROX - backing oxford business)	<p>Object – We have digested the proposals and we must object on several grounds.</p> <p>With regard to cycling, we believe cyclists encouraged to cycle into South Parade from the Woodstock Road will be at risk of accidents, particularly when sweeping across from the south. Also, this will cause an extra hazard for drivers exiting South Parade into the Woodstock Road and looking for a safe space between traffic from the north and south. There is a link route parallel to and just a little north of South Parade, through Alexandra Park, which is currently used by quite a number of cyclists and this route should be made safer and used instead.</p> <p>The removal of car parking and even places to set down and pick up people and goods will make it very difficult for businesses, including retailers, restaurants and charities, the Summertown Library and the North Wall Arts Centre. Summertown has very limited parking in this area and reducing it further will make it harder for people to visit, particularly the less-abled and infirm and those living off easy bus routes.</p> <p>When there is a viable and safer alternative, this proposal would seek too high a price for the well being of Summertown and its businesses and community.</p>
(8) Local resident, (Oxford)	<p>Object – First of all I would like to know what consultation efforts have been made regarding the ludicrous proposed changes for South Parade. Since I live within half a mile and I have only just been informed about it. Yet again the council do not take consultation seriously.</p>

	<p>I would like my comments recorded in strong opposition to the proposed changes.</p> <p>Firstly, the council are yet again trying to disadvantage other road users in favour of a tiny minority - cyclists. In particular motorists, as part of their ideological war on cars. This is a good reason in itself to reject these proposals. The council need to grow up and start behaving like a democratically elected body, not a panel of dictatorial elites.</p> <p>Secondly, while South Parade is one way, the adjacent streets are one way in the other direction, therefore making South Parade two-way for cyclists will not improve cycle routes in any way, ergo the justification for these changes is erroneous and they should be rejected. Also these justifications should be investigated since they can only be the result of corrupt local officials acting at the behest of cycling pressure groups.</p> <p>Thirdly, South Parade is not wide enough to safely support two-way traffic. Removing parking is not a suitable solution as the parking provision is already inadequate and again the council are trying to deliberately disadvantage motorists as they have explicitly been doing all over Oxford.</p> <p>Removing parking will also disadvantage local businesses just like removing the parking on Cowley road has done.</p> <p>Furthermore the traffic lights outside BBC radio Oxford are far too close to South Parade for road users to safely turn left.</p> <p>As a local I can confirm that the layout of South Parade as it has been for the last 20 years is reasonable and safe and there is no good reason to change it. Unless you're an unhinged eco-fascist like Andre Gant trying to please the self-righteous cycle lobby.</p> <p>There are two schools on South Parade including a primary school, their access will be made less safe if two-way traffic is permitted on South Parade.</p>
<p>(9) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Object – The suggested removal of the single yellow lines on the north side of the street obviously has implications for any business which relies on customers being able to pull up outside, park during 4pm-8am, or has deliveries during the day and especially in the early morning. This will have a significant impact on the viability of the various businesses, and the functioning of the two schools.</p> <p>I think it is important to bear in mind that this is both a residential and commercial area, and Summertown's success as a town centre depends on respecting the needs of both. The single yellow parking is very important to the</p>

	<p>restaurants' evening trade and events at the Library and The North Wall, which are important cultural centres for Summertown. Residents value the additional parking for overnight guests and tradespeople.</p> <p>It is also a very dangerous road on which to have a cycle contraflow. Cars turning into the one-way street from the Banbury Road will certainly not be expecting cyclists coming the other way. There are then further turnings off and into South Parade: behind Suffolk House (where the Tesco's and Sainsbury's lorries back in); behind Prama house; by A Cut Above (with traffic down to the illegal car wash); down by Pompette; and then at Stratfield Road, Middle Way, the various entrances into St Edward's School and the St Edward's maintenance yard. This is to say nothing of all the taxis that congregate to drop off and collect from Northern House School. The proposed changes will present risks for cyclists, including where cyclists would have to leave the cycle lane and move out into the one-way traffic, and drivers. There is also a risk at the staggered Stratfield Road/Middle Way interchange which is much used by schoolchildren cycling to and from school.</p> <p>There is also a risk to pedestrians from cyclists. The fact that there would be a formal cycle lane would not affect this risk. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic, especially between the Banbury Road and Summertown Library. St Edward's pupils cross frequently between the sites on either side of South Parade and Staff cross to and from St Edward's maintenance yard and the catering department.</p> <p>There are, in short, far more hazards than for the contraflow on Little Clarendon Street, for example, which is hazardous enough as it is. The risks to all parties increases with the number of cyclists. If very few cyclists use this route then there is no need for a contraflow.</p> <p>However heavy the use, there is actually no need for this cycle contraflow as the next road to the south, Oakthorpe Road (traffic west to east), is very close and to the north there is Osberton Road with access to Banbury Road, Middle Way and South Parade. One of the advantages of cycling is that such small distances can be covered very quickly.</p>
<p>(10) Local resident, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Object – SP is a mixed street of businesses, schools and residents and depending on the time of day has several moods/atmospheres.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are taxis taking children to and from Northern House School mornings and afternoons. This is quite good because it discourages other traffic at those times. 2. There are delivery vans servicing the cafes and restaurants generally in the morning.

3. There are cars parked on the northern side of the street after 4 pm - either for the cafes etc between Middle Way and the Banbury Road - or between Middle Way and the Woodstock Road primarily for The North Wall Theatre at St Edward's school.

4. For many hours of the day/week SP can be extremely quiet and peaceful. I (Judith Pistone) have spent a lot of time walking in SP this year pre- and post- a hip op. Traffic is variable depending on the time of day but is not a problem.

We love living in SP for the variety of things that are available and the change of pace throughout the day. Any changes need to take into consideration all of us who live, work, visit SP.

We oppose the idea of two-way cycling and reduced evening parking because of the impact on people wishing to use the facilities in SP - we really do need to support the existing businesses that have built up a clientele over many years with the existing arrangements; and those people who have mobility problems and can't always walk so easily what seems an incredibly short distance to the relatively young and healthy. Presumably views of those who visit SP have not been sort. Or have they?

We have a car, cycles, mobility scooter, crutches and sticks - all used at times depending on the varying needs of either one of us. There will be visitors to the The North Wall Theatre for example simply put off if parking at the western end is curtailed. Where are they supposed to park? The same issue applies at the eastern end.

Regarding businesses and what seems to be happening in other areas, we get the feeling that they are not considered to be of prime importance in Oxford - but they are the reason people like to live here - and presumably provide a good income for the Council.

Now, of course, cyclists have to be considered. Will this be safer for the cyclists? There are many entrances on the north side and these present an extra hazard for the cyclist. Delivery vans will have to use the north side of the street. Nevertheless we contend that cyclists are catered for quite well and have numerous other street options. If parking at the west end of SP was maintained for the evenings, how many cyclists are likely to be affected? I doubt very many, if any, and in any case, they have other options in the surrounding streets that car drivers don't have. It feels that cyclists are being given an unfair priority at the expense of others - it is as though to restrict them in any way is beyond the pale rather than a sharing of limitations. We feel that parking for the North Wall Theatre should be considered essential.

	<p>As regards parking on the pavement at the eastern end (I haven't seen it at the western end), a white line could be put on part of the pavement as in other parts of Oxford to assist parking and still allow space for pedestrians. There are pavements on both sides so reducing the width one side is not the end of the world.</p> <p>SP is a street with different levels of vibrancy and fluctuating energies. It doesn't take much to begin to minimise this and to create a more sterile environment.</p>
<p>(11) Local resident, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Object – While I like the idea of a 2 way cycling plan, I don't agree at all to removing parking spaces from Summertown. There is additionally at least one disabled parking space on South Parade and I see it being used frequently by disabled visitors as it is close to the supermarkets and cafes.</p> <p>Summertown suffers deeply from lack of parking provision already and cutting off more parking will cause access to become even more difficult to residents who live further away. There are a number of cafe's, bars and restaurants on or near South Parade and many people visit and socialize and use the parking on South Parade to access these places. Your proposal would hurt the local economy.</p> <p>Individuals who have bikes are generally students who have many options to navigate the Summertown streets and I don't see the need for a 2 way cycle path on South Parade. Car Parking is being strangled progressively by Oxford City bureaucrats who only seek to make their job relevant by doing something. I would prefer to see a scheme whereby parking provisions are increased in Summertown and would welcome such a scheme. Free parking would be better. Maybe a multi-storey car park near Marks and Spencers would be helpful. Only then might I support removal of some select parking spots in some areas.</p> <p>I spoke to some people in the street today, including merchants of shops. They complain that because the cost of housing is high in Summertown they cannot afford to live there so have to commute in for work, sometimes from outside of Oxford or the other side of town. How do you expect them to have sustainable employment if they cannot travel to work. The bus service is far too slow through the City Centre.</p> <p>Overall, I object to your proposal of removing parking spaces from anywhere in Summertown, without the replacement of alternative parking provisions in the locality. Conversely, I would approve and applaud provision of many new and additional parking spaces in Summertown to boost visitation, employment and the local economy.</p>
<p>(12) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	

	<p>Object – I would like to object to the removal of existing single yellow waiting restrictions currently in place in South Parade.</p> <p>Furthermore, the deadline for comments of 12th January 2024, seems a little premature, given that most businesses will be closed between Christmas and New Year.</p>
<p>(13) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Object – Parking in South Parade is an amenity to those who wish or need to visit the businesses there, and thus also an amenity to those businesses, as they thereby have more custom than they otherwise would have. It is in all our interests that these businesses prosper, as they provide employment and pay national and local taxes, as well as rent to their landlords, on which tax is also paid.</p> <p>There is barely enough parking for residents in the area, and so even by using ‘Guest permits’, it can be difficult for local residents to have visitors (whether trades or friends and relatives). Those parts of South Parade with a single yellow line therefore currently provide valuable additional parking for such visitors, overnight, after 4pm each day, and on Sundays. Social interaction is important – it is not just a ‘nice to have’, as it impacts people’s mental health and sense of wellbeing.</p> <p>Therefore, unless there is a substantial benefit from the proposed changes, things should be left as they are.</p> <p>Looking now at the need for and potential benefits of the proposed changes, here is my analysis:</p> <p>The section to the East of Middle Way: It is hard to argue that allowing parking on both sides of the road when it is not actually wide enough unless people park partly on the pavement (ie. the section East of Middle Way) is appropriate, and so it seems sensible to make the yellow lines there double.</p> <p>There would then be room for a cycle lane, but (without attempting a detailed analysis) I do question how many people would benefit from it. Also, I wonder what the safety data for these ‘against the flow’ cycle lanes is like? I regularly use the one in Little Clarendon Street, and am always a little concerned about cars coming the other way. By adding this cycle lane, the Council would be responsible for any accidents occurring as a result.</p> <p>The section to the West of Middle Way: As you say yourself, this section is wide enough to provide parking on both sides of the road, with no need for people to park partly on the pavement. If you want to stop people parking partly on the pavement in that section, raising the</p>

	<p>kerb by a couple of inches should achieve this. If they still do so, then they should be fined in accordance with existing traffic laws. It is neither fair nor appropriate to punish those who obey the law, simply because others don't.</p> <p>In terms of a cycle lane: Cyclists coming Southwards down the Woodstock Road can access Middle Way or the Banbury Road by using Osberton Road. Cyclists riding Northwards up the Woodstock Road can access Stratfield Road or the Banbury Road by using Oakthorpe Road. The percentage of cyclists for whom using South Parade represents a significant benefit over Osberton or Oakthorpe Roads is infinitesimally small. There is therefore little justification for a cycle lane.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe the optimal outcome is: In the section to the East of Middle Way, to replace the single yellow lines with double. A cycle lane could be introduced here, but I would question the need, and I believe there may be a safety issue.</p> <p>In section to the West of Middle Way, leave the single yellow lines in place and increase the height of the kerb. There is no justification for a cycle lane, especially considering the potential safety issue.</p> <p>The removal of some of the parking (as above), will surely have some impact on businesses, so why not consider their interests by having the parking restriction in the West section end at 3pm instead of 4pm?</p>
(14) Local resident, (Oxford, Jordan Hill)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object risk to both cyclists and drivers, and pedestrians too at times of congestion</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection I have no firm opinion on the matter.</p>
(15) Member of public, (Abingdon, Staniland Court)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object I travel to Northwall art centre weekly to access the art award course. I deliver 5 children there all of which have Autism. We need to be able to stop and park there short term at drop off and collection. The children cannot come out alone. Similarly schools use this centre and are dropped off and collected by bus. The centre is important to their education but parking is vital to their safety. See north walls risk assessments on their website.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object</p>

	<p>I travel to Northwall art centre weekly to access the art award course. I deliver 5 children there all of which have Autism. We need to be able to stop and park there short term at drop off and collection. The children cannot come out alone. Similarly schools use this centre and are dropped off and collected by bus. The centre is important to their education but parking is vital to their safety. See north walls risk assessments on their website.</p>
<p>(16) Local resident, (Cutteslowe, Buckler)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object You are isolating disabled people. A one way street is exactly that.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object As it is it's almost impossible to park in Summertown for disabled people</p>
<p>(17) Local resident, (Cutteslowe, Wentworth)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object The safety of pedestrians is at risk now with cyclists riding in both directions. Cyclists do not know the road rules which are then often flouted. Local business rely on deliveries who park on the single yellow line when they are permitted too. The school opposite the North Wall relies on taxis to transport vulnerable students to and from school, the proposal would make it difficult for the taxis and the school. Don't risk the viability of small, independent and local businesses as is the case in East Oxford.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Please see previous response</p>
<p>(18) Local resident, (Kidlington)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object It puts pedestrians at greater risks. Instead of appeasing the vocal cycling lobby, let's put pedestrians at the forefront of planning as they are the most vulnerable users of the public space There are greater priorities to make the Summertown safer for all.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object There is no effective enforcement in the area as it stands so this won't actually help</p>
<p>(19) As a business, (North Wall / St Edwards School, South Parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object</p>

	<p>Parking is already extremely limited in this area, and adding a two-way cycle lane in the place of the single yellow line would limit parking options even further.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Severely reduces parking flexibility. I work along this street and hardly ever see people cycling down this road anyway. I think parking flexibility should be a priority over two-way cycling</p>
(20) Local resident, (Oxford, Arlington Drive)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object The parking places are much more important than the tiny amount of extra cycling this will promote. Unequivocally the parking spaces are used by people who want or need to use them. Therefore, also unequivocally, their removal will inconvenience people. I am both a cyclist and motorist (maybe in a ratio of use 1 to 2). I am really annoyed by the continuing reduction in amenity for motorists and it does absolutely nothing to increase my bike usage.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object See previous answer.</p>
(21) Local resident, (Oxford, Banbury)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object This is not fair on people who have to drive to work. Why are drivers constantly penalised? Instead of appease a minority please invest into the future which is education of our children.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object I dont care about this just let cars through</p>
(22) Local resident, (Oxford, Banbury Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object I would like my comments recorded in strong opposition to the proposed changes. Firstly, the council are yet again trying to disadvantage other road users in favour of a tiny minority - cyclists. In particular motorists, as part of their ideological war on cars. This is a good reason in itself to reject these proposals. The council need to grow up and start behaving like a democratically elected body, not a panel of dictatorial elites. Secondly, while South Parade is one way, the adjacent streets are one way in the other direction, therefore making South Parade two-way for cyclists will not improve cycle routes in any way, ergo the justification for these changes is</p>

erroneous and they should be rejected. Also these justifications should be investigated since they can only be the result of corrupt local officials acting at the behest of cycling pressure groups.

Thirdly, South Parade is not wide enough to safely support two-way traffic. Removing parking is not a suitable solution as the parking provision is already inadequate and again the council are trying to deliberately disadvantage motorists as they have explicitly been doing all over Oxford.

Removing parking will also disadvantage local businesses just like removing the parking on Cowley road has done. Furthermore the traffic lights outside BBC radio Oxford are far too close to South Parade for road users to safely turn left.

As a local I can confirm that the layout of South Parade as it has been for the last 20 years is reasonable and safe and there is no good reason to change it. Unless you're an unhinged eco-fascist like Andre Gant trying to please the self-righteous cycle lobby.

There are two schools on South Parade including a primary school, their access will be made less safe if two-way traffic is permitted on South Parade.

Parking amendments – **Object**

I would like my comments recorded in strong opposition to the proposed changes.

Firstly, the council are yet again trying to disadvantage other road users in favour of a tiny minority - cyclists. In particular motorists, as part of their ideological war on cars. This is a good reason in itself to reject these proposals. The council need to grow up and start behaving like a democratically elected body, not a panel of dictatorial elites.

Secondly, while South Parade is one way, the adjacent streets are one way in the other direction, therefore making South Parade two-way for cyclists will not improve cycle routes in any way, ergo the justification for these changes is erroneous and they should be rejected. Also these justifications should be investigated since they can only be the result of corrupt local officials acting at the behest of cycling pressure groups.

Thirdly, South Parade is not wide enough to safely support two-way traffic. Removing parking is not a suitable solution as the parking provision is already inadequate and again the council are trying to deliberately disadvantage motorists as they have explicitly been doing all over Oxford.

Removing parking will also disadvantage local businesses just like removing the parking on Cowley road has done. Furthermore the traffic lights outside BBC radio Oxford are far too close to South Parade for road users to safely turn left.

As a local I can confirm that the layout of South Parade as it has been for the last 20 years is reasonable and safe and there is no good reason to change it. Unless you're an unhinged eco-fascist like Andre Gant trying to please the self-righteous cycle lobby.

There are two schools on South Parade including a primary school, their access will be made less safe if two-way traffic is permitted on South Parade.

(23) Local resident, (Oxford, Banbury Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object As a cyclist as well as a car driver I am concerned about safety for cyclists. We have seen other ill-conceived road plans like the changes to Cowley Road which have made it more dangerous for cyclists. I see no reason for cyclists to need a route Eastbound along South Parade. Rogers Street provides access from Middle Way to Banbury Road.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object This restricts parking close to shops</p>
(24) Local resident, (Oxford, Davenant Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object The proposed removal of parking would further exacerbate the systemic abuse of disabled parking spaces on South Parade and Banbury Road, Summertown in particular. Despite ongoing representations since 2020 the council and councillors seem to do nothing to address this issue. Disabled drivers deserve better A high proportion of cyclists fail to have lights or appropriate reflective clothing and would be at significant risk of head on collision with oncoming vehicles, particularly during the dark or poor weather Ironically literally hundreds of cyclists cycle two ways on South Parade already so the existing restriction is disregarded in practice. Why spend money in straightened economic times formalising the situation ?</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Would place further pressure on disabled drivers by further limiting parking availability thereby promoting the abuse of their spaces</p>
(25) Local resident, (Oxford, Davenant Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object There is very little parking available for users of businesses along South Parade. Cyclists can easily use Rogers Street to travel towards Banbury Road. Better cyclist training would make that work more reliably than at present.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object too little parking for users of businesses along South Parade</p>

<p>(26) Member of public, (Oxford, Edmund Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object I do not feel that it is safe for pedestrians to attempt to cross this road with two way cycling in place. Because of the narrowness of this road I feel that cyclists may believe that rather than staying to the correct side of the road they have carte blanche to ride on whichever side is (as they see it) best for them depending whether they want to turn left or right at the top of the road. Sadly despite the Councils desire to support and encourage cycling, there are many cyclists in Oxford who do not see that, as part of the bargain, they should fully adhere to the rules of the road. I feel this proposal makes pedestrians more vulnerable to collisions in the road. It also needs to be remembered that the Highway Code classes pedestrians as the most vulnerable road users and the council needs to factor this into any plans.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object There are businesses in this street, they will inevitably need deliveries and customers may want to pick up items. I am thinking of the art gallery, where large pieces cannot be moved by bike or on the bus. Surely if we want to keep a thriving and vibrant community we have to protect businesses that provide jobs.</p>
<p>(27) Local resident, (Oxford, Hamilton Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object This goes on all the time and there is no room for cars to deal safely with two way traffic....same thing in Little Clarendon Street....endless near accidents</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object There is too little available parking already and given the demographics and distance to bus stops not everyone is able to cycle. Also the roads are unsafe locally for all ages given the no of unrepaired potholes</p>
<p>(28) Local resident, (Oxford, Harpes Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object The road is not suitable for two way cycling. Too many turn offs and businesses requiring van/lorry deliveries. It will cause an accident</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Businesses require people to be able to park</p>

<p>(29) Local resident, (Oxford, Islip Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Restaurants are struggling in South Parade anyway, many are now closed and it is slowly becoming a ghost street. Parking nearby restaurants is essential, particularly in the evening. This area already has very limited parking. I fear the proposals will cause a further decline in the street.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object As above</p>
<p>(30) Local resident, (Oxford, Lakeside)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Dangerous president set for cyclist thinking all one way roads can be lford by cyclists. Already happens elsewhere, eg Observatory st</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Prevents people from short term parking to use shops</p>
<p>(31) Local resident, (Oxford, Millway Close)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Free parking is a valuable resource to local residents and visitors alike. Given the plethora of relatively low traffic parallel roads to South Parade, it seems unnecessary to spend resources on modifying this road. As the trend to increase cycling in Oxford continues, I am conscious of a lack of effort to ensure cyclists use the road/cycle lanes responsibly. I am confident that all councillors and its officers have encountered cyclists crossing traffic lights and zebra crossings across the city. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Further restrictions are not required. Free parking is a valuable resource to residents and visitors alike.</p>
<p>(32) Local resident, (Oxford, Observatory street)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object</p>

	<p>It is extremely dangerous to open a two way cycling in street that are one way. If you look at Howard street where it has happened, it is a disaster!</p> <p>Now we have scooters, motorbikes and electric bikes using the street on both ways and it is often a nightmare. In Observatory street and St. Barnard street people use both ways already at their own risk. It is shameful, this has happen because this County permits any kind of behaviour to two wheels drivers. Please do not do it. There are not only young and able people living in Oxford. The old and the disable need to drive their cars and it has become almost impossible to drive for them because your policies are only directed to favour the cyclists. Most of them do not use simple bikes but powerful objects that zoom around like they own the city.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object There are not enough free parking places in Summertown. The shops need people to go to Summertown...</p>
<p>(33) As a business, (oxford, south parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object too many cyclists</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object on street parking supports local businesses</p>
<p>(34) Local resident, (Oxford, South parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object The one way road is currently bush as it is and cars already drive up the wrong way sbd with the single yellow line allowing people to park after 4pm prevents people from driving the wrong way</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object People need to be able to drop off people to the local businesses</p>
<p>(35) As a business, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object There is already woefully inadequate parking in South Parade for residents, businesses and customers. Many, if not all, of the businesses here are deeply concerned that further reducing these will have a very detrimental effect on trade. We are also concerned that once these measures are in place, further reduction in the ability of drivers to pass freely will ensue. Summertown has a generally older population, many of whom rely on their cars to live. Cyclists, on the other hand are, by definition fit and able, and they are already able to go almost anywhere they please without issue. I am not sure there is a need to disrupt things in this way.</p>

	<p>Parking amendments – Object as above</p>
<p>(36) As a business, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object I think this is a very bad idea. The council needs to put in NEW one way signs at the junction of Middle way and South Parade, and the entrance to Prama House parking and South Parade. We already see some very dangerous near miss car/ cycle accident happening and cyclists going the wrong way would cause even more near accidents.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object The removal of the single yellow line would be detrimental to people stopping for short trips into the local shops, as there is such a shortage of parking in Summertown already.</p>
<p>(37) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield rd)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object This will make parking in the area for locals even more difficult as parking spaces will be occupied more in the evenings.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object As before - this will make parking in the area for locals even more difficult as parking spaces will be occupied more in the evenings.</p>
<p>(38) Local resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Another ridiculous Cyclox driven transport idea.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Parking is important, we need more not less</p>
<p>(39) Local resident, (Oxford, Cowley)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object No change to parking please.</p>

	<p>Parking amendments – Object Please keep parking as it is.</p>
<p>(40) Local resident, (Oxford, Elizabeth Jennings Way)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object South Parade hosts several businesses that benefit from the parking provisions currently available. Both adjacent parallel roads permit cycles in both directions meaning there's currently little inconvenience to cyclists travelling from Woodstock Road to Banbury Road, but the removal of parking spaces in the evening will have a detrimental effect on the restaurants, theatre and events hosted by the library. Unless it is the intent of the council to ensure the closure of these businesses, this is not a good idea.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object As previously stated, the businesses on South Parade are supported by the provision of parking. Especially the permitted parking in the evening on both sides of the road.</p>
<p>(41) Local resident, (Oxford, Elms drive)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Cyclists are dangerous</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Persecution of motorists</p>
<p>(42) As a business, (oxford, South parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object two way cycling is just so dangerous to pedestrians</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object its time to prioritise pedestrians</p>
<p>(43) Local resident, (Oxford, South parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object To many bikes and I personally don't want all the cycle lanes and LTNS</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object The council doesn't care what I think</p>

(44) Local resident, (Oxford city, Leckford)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object</p> <p>1). Car traffic east of middle way is too heavy for oncoming cyclists to be safe. 2) Cyclist exiting S.Parade onto Banbury road will make this an unsafe junction 3) There is little enough car parking in Summertown to remove more along S Parade</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object</p> <p>There is too little parking in Summer town at present let alone removing some</p>
(45) As a business, (Oxford, South Parade)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object</p> <p>Objecting - dangerous, the road is too narrow, we have frequent deliveries all day</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object</p> <p>i run a business centre with over 100 different companies all receiving post and frequent couriers all day, not to include contractors. and taxi's - this would be impossible for my clients</p>
(46) Local resident, (Summertown, Stratfield Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object</p> <p>There are already few parking spaces in South Parade, this will only make matters worse. It will also have an adverse effect on local business.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object</p> <p>There are already not enough parking spaces. This will only make matters worse and have a detrimental effect on local business.</p>
(47) Local resident, (Summertown, Bishop Kirk)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object</p> <p>The cyclist would be at danger NOT safe for them this is a road that has many deliveries for the much needed local business .. some of these deliveries are large trucks for Tesco and also for Teddys school. Object strongly as the system works well at the moment it also is safer for cyclist to use the nearby residential streets that are already on way and also restricted to 20mph</p>

	<p>Please do put a sign up informing cyclists it is a ONE way road for them too as they are often putting themselves in danger I have almost been knocked off the road as a pedestrian as the cyclist is coming from the wrong way. The one way system works SO ALL walkers cyclists and vehicles know which way to look TO AVOID CONFUSION AND SAFETY ...</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Are we trying to shut down commercial business in Summertown ... parking is important I note it is used well by most people. Please please DO NOT RUIN our neighbourhood East Oxford has been ruined by such incompetent decisions are you trying to create more unemployment and poverty for local areas and shut business down...</p>
(48) Local resident, (Summertown, Portland)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object I think the single yellow line parking is a significant help to the businesses and don't want to see that end. Not selfish, I live in Portland Road and would walk anyway.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Very unhelpful. This parking is much used in the evenings for people using the restaurants and take-out.</p>
(49) As a business, (Summertown, South Parade)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object The junction of Banbury Road and South Parade is problematic as it is. To allow cyclists to exit onto the Banbury Road is nothing short of irresponsible.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Short-term parking is essential for local businesses. Any further restrictions on parking in the area will have an adverse effect. Over recent years, businesses have dealt with numerous challenges, with many still not trading to pre-covid levels. To put further barriers in place for shoppers & restaurant guests is incredibly short-sighted.</p>
(50) Local resident, (Summertown, Stratfield Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object It is fine as it is.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object</p>

	It is fine as it is.
(51) Local resident, (Summertown, Woodstock Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Removing all parking on the north side of South Parade continues the county council war on the motorist. Cyclists cycle west to east at present with no issue and that should be allowed to continue.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Removing all parking on the north side of South Parade continues the county council war on the motorist.</p>
(52) Local resident, (Summertown, Portland)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object The local businesses need convenient drop in parking - leave it alone</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Too much interference - leave it alone</p>
(53) As a business, (Summertown, South parade)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Very hard to travel in for staff and clients with parking prices so high and nowhere to park on street as it is.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object On street parking supports local businesses</p>
(54) Local resident, (Summertown, Oxford, Bishop Kirk Place)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Firstly, the key element of the proposals would be to remove the hugely valuable flexible parking provision that currently exists on the single yellow lines on South Parade, which allow for parking to take place Monday to Saturday from 4pm in the afternoon, and all day Sunday. This provision is actively and frequently used and is hugely beneficial for visitors (and local residents) seeking to make use of the shops and amenities in the area. What cost/benefit analysis has taken place to determine the lost revenue, opportunity cost and inconvenience for local businesses and residents that will result from the removal of parking capacity?</p>

	<p>2. allowing cyclists to travel in both directions on a road that motorists already frequently mistake for a two-way road (I have witnessed two such incidents in the past couple of months alone) is dangerous and will surely add to the confusion.</p> <p>3. There is absolutely no need for this provision: cyclists have plenty of access routes to/from Woodstock/Banbury roads</p> <p>4. Even if this allowance for cyclists were made, there is absolutely no reason to remove existing part-time parking provision - there is more than enough room already on the road for both cyclists and cars - and i say that as both a cyclist and a driver.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object The part-time flexible parking provision that currently exists on the single yellow lines on South Parade, which allow for parking to take place Monday to Saturday from 4pm in the afternoon, and all day Sunday, is extremely valuable (which can be evidenced by the large number of vehicles that make use of it).y. This provision is actively and frequently used and is hugely beneficial for visitors (and local residents) seeking to make use of the shops and amenities in the area. What cost/benefit analysis has taken place to determine the lost revenue, opportunity cost and inconvenience for local businesses and residents that will result from the removal of parking capacity? Additionally, even if the proposed permission were introduced to allow two-way cycling along South Parade, there is absolutely no reason to remove existing part-time parking provision in order to do so - there is more than enough room already on the road for both cyclists and cars - and i say that as both a cyclist and a driver.</p>
(55) Local resident, (Summertown, Oxford, Hamilton)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Another anti-car measure. It's hard enough to drive already. Now there will be more cyclists to watch out for, coming the other way. And less parking. Cyclists are already very well catered for. Why not just close all the roads to traffic while you're at it? It is what you really want to do. Another anti-car, pro-cyclist plan - it's disgraceful and makes life impossible. For pedestrians as well! I have been run down twice by cyclists in Summertown. When they're allowed to go both ways on a narrow road, people get massacred and cars can't pass. But you don't care about any of that, do you? All you care about is making life even more difficult for drivers. I don't know why I bother to fill this out.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Already not enough parking.</p>
(56) Local resident, (Summertown, Oxford, Hernes Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Object I believe this will cause confusion to elderly residents and possible accidents.</p>

	<p>Parking amendments – Object I believe this will impact local businesses and elderly residents who use the parking.</p>
<p>(57) As a business, (Summertown, South parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Too many cyclists</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object On street parking supports local businesses</p>
<p>(58) Local resident, (Sunnymead, Summertown, Carlton Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Vehicle access and parking is at a premium in Summertown and this should be protected, not sacrificed for cycle access. The proposed scheme should not be allowed to remove parking on this road.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Vehicle parking spaces should be maintained in this road, not sacrificed for additional cycle lanes. There are many shops nearby, which are the heart and lifeblood of the area, and maintaining these time-limited parking zones is essential.</p>
<p>(59) Rather not say, (Oxford, Banbury Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object It will be dangerous, there is already significant cycling routes in the area that could do with funding to repair them.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support South Parade gets very congested especially in the evening with people parking long both sides. This will only work if it is properly enforced.</p>
<p>(60) Member of public, (Summertown, Ferry Pool Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object I use South Parade to access the shops, library and theatre. In my view, allowing two-way for a vehicle in a one-way road is a confusing and potentially dangerous policy . If it is allowed, use of the pavement by bicycles should be strictly forbidden, efficiently policed and fines imposed</p>

	<p>Parking amendments – Partially support Which proposals? I have already given my objections to two-way use (see above) With regard to no parking , sometimes it is necessary to park to load/unload eg at the charity shop ; the wine shop, picture gallery</p>
<p>(61) Member of public, (Summertown, Moreton)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object There are plenty of other roads that cyclists can use to access Banbury / Woodstock Roads so no need to change cycling one way to two-way. It would be more beneficial to add another disabled parking bay part-way down South Parade so that there isn't only 1 by the old Prama House / HSBC building. There needs to be a disabled parking bay closer to the amenities!</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support some parking, including disabled bays should be allowed on one side of South Parade, but not on both if it will cause difficulties for vehicles as well as pedestrians</p>
<p>(62) Local resident, (Wolvercote, Home Close)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object South Parade has poor visibility for pedestrians trying to cross due to legal parking on one side and delivery vans half on the pavement the other. It is difficult for those of us who are no longer as nimble as we once were to dodge out of the way of cyclists who do not look out for other road users.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support There are too many hazards and restrictions for Summertown shoppers as it is (including cycling on the pavement). Why discourage business from shoppers who cannot walk from the further reaches of Cutteslowe from supporting local businesses? Sometimes my shopping is cumbersome and so I have to go into Oxford because at least the bus is relatively convenient. but I could easily achieve my goal in half the time in Summertown if it was possible to use my little car.</p>
<p>(63) Local resident, (Oxford, Lonsdale Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Even with additional signage - in itself an eyesore - I believe this poses a risk to pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support</p>

	<p>Cars frequently park on pavement on North side making it difficult to get past.</p>
<p>(64) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object 1. The current unlawful two-way cycling does not itself justify a change. Cyclists also break the law in the western section of Oakthorpe Road but none of this should result in legitimising those actions. There should be more effective enforcement. 2. If there is to be any change, two-way cycling should be restricted to the eastern part of South Parade because (a) cyclists approaching from the north should be encouraged to use the existing cycle network in Middle Way; and (b) cyclists travelling from the south should be discouraged from turning right across potentially heavy traffic from Woodstock Road into South Parade, alternative routes being available.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Even if cyclists remain prohibited from two-way cycling, the road is not wide enough for parking on both sides while retaining access for large vehicles and pedestrians.</p>
<p>(65) Local employee, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object 1. The road is not wide enough to allow cyclists to travel against the flow of traffic, whether or not no waiting restrictions are introduced. 2. Regardless of the introduction of a no waiting zone, vehicles will still pull up here and ignore the restrictions (in much the same way that cyclists ignore the law now and cycle the wrong way down the one way street) as there is no sensible alternative if they are making deliveries to the businesses and homes in South Parade, taxis dropping off and picking up passengers to the businesses and homes in South Parade, collecting refuse from homes and businesses in South Parade. This will force cyclists into the middle of the road and oncoming traffic. 3. There are many, many taxis that congregate in South Parade to collect pupils from Northern House School at the end of the school day. Unless a more sustainable method of school transport is adopted, this will continue and cause massive danger every school day afternoon. 4. Every single traffic scheme that Oxfordshire County Council adopts is a disaster. There is no reason to suspect this will be different. Examples of disasters are the widely-hated LTNs in East Oxford; the congestion and pollution causing traffic lights on the Botley Interchange (not the current roadworks); the dangerous 20mph speed limits introduced randomly - for example on the A338 in East Hanney.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object</p>

	<p>They won't work as there is no viable alternative for deliveries and collections from South Parade.</p>
<p>(66) As a business, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object</p> <p>The School currently receives essential deliveries on both sides of South Parade. Delivery lorries stop on the South side of South parade at all times of the day, delivering food and provisions every day of the week into the School's catering department. We also receive deliveries of parcels, post and other items to our Facilities Reception on the North side of South Parade, on the opposite side of the road to our catering department. Refuse collection is from the catering yard daily, and the compactor is taken away by lorry once a week. The ability to receive deliveries to these two departments of the School on South Parade is critical to the functioning of the School and it is essential that these arrangements are maintained. Therefore any element of the proposed introduction of the two-way cycling lane must not prevent deliveries from taking place in these locations. Currently, double yellow lines are in place across the North Wall, Catering Yard, and Reception Yard, where we typically handle deliveries.</p> <p>It is currently possible for delivery vehicles to park on double yellow lines to unload in these locations. This proposal will stop any parking on single yellow lines after 4 pm, thereby ensuring clearer access to the new cycle lanes. As long as there are no local restrictions on loading and unloading over double yellow lines in the vicinity of our catering yard and facilities reception, our logistical operations should be largely unaffected.</p> <p>It is also important to note that disabled access to the Music School on the North of South Parade and the disabled lift to the first floor of the Music School which includes access to our Learning Support Department, is from the Facilities Reception yard. Any disabled pupils and members of staff who cross South Parade from the main school site on the South side of South Parade to the Music School site do so at the point where the pavement kerbs are lowered at the catering and facilities reception loading and unloading sites. It is essential for the School's compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 that the ability for disabled people to cross South Parade at this point is maintained and any two way cycle lane needs to incorporate this crossing point to ensure cyclists are made aware of the risk of disabled staff and pupils crossing the road.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object As above.</p>

<p>(67) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object South Parade is a very dangerous road on which to have a cycle contraflow. Cars turning into a one-way street from the Banbury Road will certainly not be expecting cyclists coming the other way. There are then further turnings off and into South Parade: behind Suffolk House (where the Tesco and Sainsbury's lorries back in); behind Prama house; by A Cut Above; down by Pompette; and then at Stratfield Road, Middle Way, the various entrances into St Edward's School and the maintenance yard. This is to say nothing of all the taxis that congregate to drop off and collect from Northern House School. The proposed changes will present risks for pedestrians, cyclists (including where cyclists would have to leave the cycle lane and move out into the one-way traffic), and drivers.</p> <p>There is no need for this cycle contraflow as the next road to the south, Oakthorpe Road (traffic west to east), is very close and to the north there is Osberton Road with access to Banbury Road, Middle Way and South Parade</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object The removal of the single yellow lines on the north side of South Parade has implications for any business which relies on customers being able to pull up outside, park during 4pm-8am, or has deliveries during the day and especially in the early morning. This will have a significant impact on the viability of the various businesses, and the functioning of the two schools.</p> <p>The single yellow parking is very important to the restaurants' evening trade and events at the Library and The North Wall, which are important cultural centres for Summertown. Residents value the additional parking for overnight guests and tradespeople</p>
<p>(68) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object As a resident of Stratfield Road, I would oppose any further restrictions on parking, vital for local traders. I see the logic of creating a cycle lane along the length of South Parade but I feel that there is little demand given the availability of alternative routes.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object As above.</p>
<p>(69) Local employee, (Witney, Mead Lane)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object</p>

	<p>The issues on south parade which are taxi's blocking the road and a general lack of road knowledge will not be solved by adding a cycle lane. If anything, this will only increase issues as taxi drivers will still illegally mount kerbs, and now with increased cycling and traffic still driving down South Parade, you are likely to have more accidents.</p> <p>What would be best, is a dedicated taxi rank.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object This parking is vital for local businesses such as North Wall, Wild Honey, Grape Minds, Bia etc to remain not profitable but viable.</p>
<p>(70) Local resident, (Wolvercote, Home Close)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object I have 2 family members with blue badges and restricted movement. Removing any parking at all in the Summertown area will just make life harder for people who really need to use a car. We have one car between 3 households but do need it for some essential journeys.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object These are are busy for cars in the evenings for us using the theatre, local restaurants and shops that are open late.</p>
<p>(71) Local resident, (Wolvercote, Collett Drive)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object Road is narrow and with parked cars having cyclists coming up against the flow of traffic seems risky.</p> <p>I am severely sight impaired. With vechiles often parked on the pavement Itis often nessecary to walk in the road. The speed bumps and cyclists already make it hard enough. Having cyclists coming in both directions will over make this worse. There is a way round using Osberton Road or Beach oft Road and cyclists don't take long to cover the distance. If you could ban cars from using the road,then that would work better,but that s not possible and neither is banning parking in the road.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support As above.</p>
<p>(72) Local resident, (Wolvercote, Elmthorpe Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Object</p>

	<p>it is opening the road up to more accidents especially as in the evening drivers ignore parking restrictions and a car can barely get through anyway and add in the mix cyclists coming from all directions, often with no lights and helmets, its an accident waiting to happen</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support how would this be enforced in the evenings? A major problem is lack of spaces to park in the main part around the corner as people do not leave after 30 mins. More parking is needed</p>
<p>(73) As a business, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Partially support The road is already quite congested. I partially support because increasing cycling infrastructure is a positive step forward however if this causes more issues of traffic movement through the road then we would object as the motor passage is still 1 way.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object South Parade is a vibrant street of shops, many of which rely on the ability to drop off individuals to those shops. The shops keep the local economy thriving - by putting in this parking restriction you will reduce access to the shops and therefore traffic/business. I would expect it would impact the longevity of businesses staying in the area.</p>
<p>(74) Local resident, (Oxford, Portland Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Partially support My husband has a blue badge and we frequently need to park in South Parade.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object As above because of my husband's mobility problems.</p>
<p>(75) As a business, (Oxford, South Parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Partially support Two way cycling is a reasonable request, although the streets are very navigable by bike as it is. There are no plans to provide alternative/additional parking spots for the spaces being removed, and until there are, this is just half a plan.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object There are no plans to provide alternative/additional legal parking spots for the spaces being removed, and there are plenty of people in the gap between 'mobile' and 'blue badge' who rely on driving and parking. They, and businesses trying to operate in the area, rely on places they can park for local shops. At the moment, given the two way cycling on</p>

	<p>Oakthorpe Road, Stratfield Road, and Rogers Street the number of people benefitting from these spaces greatly outweighs the number of cyclists inconvenienced by adhering to one way streets.</p> <p>In addition, if the council was serious about making pavements navigable, there are several stretches, especially on the south side, which are so uneven as to be dangerous for many with mobility issues. Fixing those would have far more impact.</p>
<p>(76) As a business, (Summertown, South parade)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Partially support</p> <p>I support the no parking, but this will have a big impact on drop off in the area. Some small businesses rely on customers being able to park outside for a short period. To either pick up or drop off items. However I do think with one way traffic and two way cycling, this will create more accidents. Talking away the parking but keeping the rest as it is would get my support.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object</p> <p>See my previous answer. This will severely impact small businesses.</p>
<p>(77) Local resident, (Oxford, Davenant Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Partially support</p> <p>I am content with this as long as cyclists do not use the pavements. I am discouraged from walking up and down the Banbury and Woodstock roads because cyclists do not keep their lanes and many are very aggressive, especially if asked to keep off the pedestrian lanes. Why is there no enforcement?</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support</p> <p>Why is this obligatory if I support it?</p>
<p>(78) Local resident, (Oxford, Harpes Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Partially support</p> <p>In view of the amount of careless/illegal cycling in the area, provision for safe pedestrian crossing would be an essential addition to the existing plans (and indeed a crackdown on pavement cycling throughout the area would be most welcome - near misses, actual contact, and insults from cyclists are common, and I speak only for myself).</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support</p> <p>Having to squeeze past cars partially parked on the pavement is a regular experience and a complete ban would clarify the situation for everyone. Deliveries, including to traders, should of course still go ahead unimpeded.</p>

<p>(79) Local resident, (Oxford, Rymers Lane)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – No objection Most European countries allow 2 way cycling in roads like these by default - it should be the norm as it works and causes no issues.</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection the road is narrow so this is required.</p>
<p>(80) Local resident, (Summertown, Banbury Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – No objection Cyclists seem to go both directions along South Parade anyway. My MAIN interest is that, if cyclists feel their needs are recognised, they might at last stop riding along the pavements. I'm elderly, can't dodge speeding bikes quickly, & I resent sharing a pedestrian pavement with cyclists who skim past only inches away from me. I feel I am put at risk.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Many of the cars that park in South Parade do so for a very short time - I've watched from the cafe! Collecting takeaway or school children/ rushing to the nearest cash machine.</p>
<p>(81) Member of public, (Witney, Wadards Meadow)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – No objection Cyclists already use it as a two way cycling street and so it makes sense to make it safer for them.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object There are many businesses on South Parade which do not have customer parking and the limited parking currently available is very useful. The car park (Alexandra Court) often get filled up. I would expect alternative parking options to be created if spaces were being taken away.</p>
<p>(82) Local resident, (Cutteslowe, Buckler Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I support the proposal of two-way cycling because I use the South Parade to get from Banbuty Road to the Summertown library and back. It is convenient for me to use South Parade Street in both directions</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection</p>

	<p>If the Oxfordshire County Council will find any other solution to make the South Parade street two-way for cyclists, without prohibiting the waiting, I would be still happy</p>
<p>(83) Local resident, (Oxford, Capel Close)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It allows access to shops from the North and access back again via Middle Way without going on the main road. Also general travel East West is made easier in a bike. In Brussels all one way streets are 2 way for cyclists and that makes navigating the city really pleasant and encourages cycling as every route is a short cut.</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection I live in Oxford and cycle almost daily to and from Summertown. I was in Salisbury up to a few months ago and I am overwhelmed with the excellence of the cycling infrastructure and ecstatic to think there are proposals to make it even better!</p>
<p>(84) Member of public, (Oxford, Cricket Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I cycle regularly in Oxford and would find 2-way cycling in South Parade helpful for local connections to schools etc.</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection Full width of road will be needed for safe 2-way cycling</p>
<p>(85) Local resident, (Oxford, Hayfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Anything to support safe bike routes and access around Oxford is a good thing. The current one way system is inconvenient for bikes.</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection Will additional parking be created elsewhere?</p>
<p>(86) Local resident, (Oxford, Hill Top Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Important to promote use of cycling as way of getting to work, shops, parks, friends rather than car. Bikes don't pollute, are quieter, and take up less use of road space and less space to park. This road provides a safer quicker route than using nearby busy main roads</p>

	<p>Parking amendments – No objection South Parade needs to be 2 way for cyclists to enable safer, less polluting cycling route in both directions . No waiting at any time restrictions will remove parked cars in this narrow street and allow cyclists more safe road space.</p>
<p>(87) Local resident, (Oxford, Jackson Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support South parade is a convenient connecting street between the Woodstock and Banbury roads. There is a traffic light on the woodstock road that would allow for safe crossing of cyclists from the woodstock road cycle path to connect to the Banbury road. Two way cycling is already happening on south parade so it would be safer if there are marked lanes and signs for motorists.</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection I have no objection to this.</p>
<p>(88) Local resident, (Oxford, Lonsdale rd)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I am a cyclist</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection Safer and easier for cyclists thoughl wonder how business without rear access will be able to receive deliveries</p>
<p>(89) Local resident, (Oxford, Plater Drive)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support This adds a vital east-west link across the poorly joined-up cycling network in Oxford.</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection No comments</p>
<p>(90) Local resident, (Oxfors, Islip road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I support because we have to go a dangerous route to go home every day</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection Make sense and saves tjme</p>

<p>(91) Local resident, (Sunnymead, Oxford, Bucker rd)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It would be easier to get from the Summertown library back to the Banbury Road. Absolutely not essential for me, but would be nice.</p> <p>Parking amendments – No objection Allowing to park there "just for a moment" kind of defeats the purpose, but Amazon Prime drivers would park there anyway :)</p>
<p>(92) Local resident, (Oxford, Blenheim Drive)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support We live on Woodstock road and cycle all over Oxford with our kids. Being able to cycle up south parade would enable safe cycling route to the north of summertown without having to cycle all the way down Stratfield Road and Oakthorpe.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object Hard enough already to park anywhere in summer town on the rare occasions we drive!</p>
<p>(93) Local resident, (Oxford, Thorncliffe Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Too dangerous to cycle down Banbury road through summertown, so I go down Stratford road and rejoin Banbury road north of summertown. Frustrating not to be able to cycle down south parade two ways.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object So dangerous currently. Cars coming onto pavement to park have almost hit my children on more than one occasion.</p>
<p>(94) Local resident, (Oxford, Southdale Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I am a cyclist and this ruling would allow ease of safe travel between Banbury and Woodstock roads due to the traffic lights at both ends which allow for safe right turns on a bike</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object It is important to retain some parking for people with limited mobility</p>

<p>(95) Local resident, (summertown, Beech Croft Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support compliance is low already - makes better route</p> <p>Parking amendments – Object quick shop say 30 mins max should be the restriction</p>
<p>(96) Local resident, (Oxford, Hobson Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Two-way cycling will benefit cyclists without adversely affecting other road users.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support It depends where, exactly, but it would certainly good to do more to discourage parking close to the corner with Banbury Road.</p>
<p>(97) Member of public, (Oxford, Little Clarendon Street)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I used to live near Summertown, and cycled to the library. It was ok to get there from Banbury road, but once at the library, the only way out was out onto Woodstock Road. The one way road doesn't make it easy to go *back* to the main shops on Banbury road once you've been to the library. It would be much better to have a two-way cycle path for bikes to get up and down the road,</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support I always cycled to this road so never had to park there, but worth pointing out there is already a large car park in Summertown near the leisure centre.</p>
<p>(98) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support As a cyclist and local resident I welcome the provision of a cycle lane to better provide for direct routes for cyclists</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support This would only work if properly enforced, otherwise it has no meaning</p>

<p>(99) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Excellent idea as cyclists already commonly pedal west to east on South Parade to the surprise of motorists driving east to west. The system works well on the eastern portion of Oakthorpe Road. However, on Oakthorpe Road, bollards have had to be installed on the south side, near the junction with Banbury Road. Some though should be given to whether such bollards will be needed on South Parade, if these changes are approved.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support Good idea but may not be necessary on weekends. I doubt that this regulation will be enforced.</p>
<p>(100) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It will be more convenient for cyclists, which includes me.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support The loss of parking will inconvenience some drivers: evening visitors and customers eg to restaurants but people are too dependent on their cars. There is a good bus service.</p>
<p>(101) Local resident, (Oxford, Woodstock)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I am a local resident and support the increase in number of cycle lanes. This one is needed to link with that on the Woodstock Road pavement (which ideally should be upgraded to one in the roadway itself as until recently was planned).</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support How much of an impact would this have on the businesses in the street that eg need to unload food? And would a ban be necessary for the siting of the cycle lane?</p>
<p>(102) Local resident, (Oxford, Victoria rd)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I cycle and would value being able to cycle in both directions. Many cyclists already do this but not legally.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support Some concern about businesses at the Woodstock road end</p>

<p>(103) Member of public, (Standlake, Manor Crescent)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support A safer route from Banbury to Woodstock road for cyclists, especially children.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support Outside school run times there could be some waiting allowed</p>
<p>(104) Local resident, (Summertown, Hamilton Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I cycle on a daily basis from the Woodstock Road to Hamilton Road and it would be extremely useful to be able to cycle down South Parade, and avoid having to attempt to cross the Woodstock Road (where there is no pelican crossing) and be forced to cycle down Osberton Road. This can be hazardous given the number of vehicles turning from both the north and south into St Edwards School and the Nuffield gym.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support I think it would be beneficial as so many cars drive down South Parade and park haphazardly for several minutes to use the supermarkets. Many have pulled out in front of me without indicating.</p>
<p>(105) Local resident, (Summertown, Woodstock Rd)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Works well in little Clarendon street and will help on cycling and access. It may mean less parking spaces which is already a problem in SUMMERTOWN which is a bit of a blow</p> <p>Parking amendments – Partially support There should be balance for parking and cycling . Could be 1 hour waiting surely ?</p>
<p>(106) As part of a group/organisation, (Abingdon, Bostock Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support The proposal would add a valuable cycling route between Woodstock Road and Summertown centre. This is high usage area for cycling and we welcome this positive proposal to enable an additional safe route for people to cycle to shops and education.</p> <p>It fits with the guidance set out in LTN 1/20 that "There should be a general presumption in favour of cycling in both directions in one way streets" (6.4.21) and the example shown in Figure 7.4. As para 7.3.5 notes "Where speed is low in urban areas, contraflow cycling without a dedicated cycle lane has been found to be successful even on narrow streets with on-street car parking."</p>

	<p>Parking amendments – Support With parking on one side of the road, there is no practical space for parking on the opposite side. The additional restrictions brings them in line with sensible practice. An additional input is to consider whether the street would benefit from staggered parking on opposite sides, in order to act as traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds.</p>
(107) Member of public, (Adderbury, Round Close Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support For the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support For the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
(108) Local resident, (Cutteslowe, Wren Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support A cycle route is needed between the Woodstock Road and the Summertown shops</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Parking won't be possible if there are to be 2 lanes for cycles</p>
(109) Local resident, (Oxford, Apsley)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It would make cycling easier and safer and discourage car use</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Would discourage car use in this area; there is on street parking nearby which can be used instead.</p>
(110) Local resident, (Oxford, Bartlemas)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Important through route for cyclists. May need parking spaces removed to make safer, but contraflow riders may make drivers slow down (sadly)</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Cycling should be easier and safer here</p>

(111) Member of public, (Oxford, Bartlemas Close)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support My experience of contraflow cycling elsewhere in Oxford is that it is safe for cyclists and poses no extra risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Discouraging parking will make the street clearer for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
(112) Local resident, (Oxford, Bateman Street)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Easier cycling to and from Summertown is always welcome! Main concerns are around ensuring safety of cyclists traveling against the flow of car traffic.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Safety of cyclists is hindered by parked cars.</p>
(113) Local resident, (Oxford, Beech Croft Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support As a local resident who cycles on South Parade I strongly support the proposals. Allowing two-way cycling will increase cycle safety and open an important route for those cycling from Middle Way onto South Parade going towards Banbury Road. Making the single yellow lines double yellow lines should help with obstructive parking during the day. However, it would be great if there could be increased enforcement of the double yellow lines.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support This proposal will increase cyclist and pedestrian safety. Cars parking along South Parade obstruct visibility for pedestrians crossing the road.</p>
(114) Local resident, (Oxford, Benson Place)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I believe it is important to encourage cyclists and give them better routes through the city.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support</p>

	<p>It will be important to keep the cycle lane clear of parked cars.</p>
<p>(115) Local resident, (Oxford, Beresford Place)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I cycle along there regularly and it is annoying that it is not two-way already as this would be a really helpful and time-saving connection. It will also make this street more attractive as a destination, help with visionzero and just make sense. After all, the road is wider than many other two-way streets.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support As before, this will make this road more attractive, calmer and is key for visionzero. Put in some bike parking at corners in future as well to add to the safety.</p>
<p>(116) Member of public, (Oxford, Boundary Brook Rd)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support As someone who lives and cycles around Oxford, I really like the two-way cycling streets. It slows down drivers further and makes Oxford much easier for cyclists to navigate, it also greatly reduces people cycling on the pavement, making it safer for pedestrians.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Reduced parking spaces will hopefully reduce the number of people driving past park and rides to park in Oxford.</p>
<p>(117) Local resident, (Oxford, Cunliffe Close)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support We cross the road often with kids on bikes.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support I know that people who are living on the south parade might have a problem to park. People who are visiting restaurants might park on parking lot behind shops.</p>
<p>(118) Member of public, (Oxford, Duke St)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support South Parade is a lively connector road between Banbury and Woodstock Roads. It is a destination. Access to efficient transport is required to allow South Parade to flourish. Bicycles are that transport mode. I strongly support two-way cycling on South Parade.</p>

	<p>Parking amendments – Support South Parade is a traffic sewer. Cars parked detract from this street and obstruct pedestrians and cyclists getting to venues.</p>
<p>(119) Local resident, (Oxford, Grimbly Place)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It makes for a shorter route on a bike when cycling home from town via Jericho</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support To make more space for cyclists</p>
<p>(120) Local resident, (Oxford, Grove street)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Easier for parents who live locally and collect their children from nearby schools.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support For more bikes being used instead of cars.</p>
<p>(121) Local resident, (Oxford, Hamilton)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Cycling should be made a more attractive option for everyone - better than choosing a car. This will go a little way to helping that,</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support To make it easier and safer for cyclists.</p>
<p>(122) Local resident, (Oxford, Hamilton Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I cycle to avoid any use of a car in Oxford and the route from Summertown shops via South Parade to the Nuffield Health Club is possible by cycle only one way at present - at least requiring a considerable detour on the return.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support It is currently clogged with cars and taxis at times, especially a bumper to bumper line of taxis to pick kids up from the school - who should be using buses or walking.</p>

(123) Local resident, (Oxford, Home Close)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I support this change, because it will provide a safe cycle route from Middle Way to Summertown shops, and because it will discourage parking on the pavement on South Parade</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support I support this change, because it will provide a safe cycle route from Middle Way to Summertown shops, and because it will discourage parking on the pavement on South Parade</p>
(124) Member of public, (Oxford, Howard)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support As a city, we are responsible for providing a better cycling network for the benefit of all residents.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support cars create hazards by parking and getting back in the carriage way and block the view making it unsafe for cyclists</p>
(125) Local resident, (Oxford, Merton Court)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support We need to encourage more cycling, prioritize cyclists and persuade more people onto bikes. Pro bike strategies will help this and support local commutes, reducing traffic, safer streets, reducing air pollution.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support If it is harder to park, driving will be discouraged.</p>
(126) Local resident, (Oxford, Monmouth Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Allowing two way cycling here will make legal a route often taken by cyclists from Woodstock Road to the shops and cafes of South Parade and Summertown. It seems safe, so why not?</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Single yellow lines are often used for long term free parking outside of their hours of operation. This street is not suitable for that, so double yellows would be much better.</p>

(127) Local resident, (Oxford, Old Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support As a matter of policy I think EVERY one-way street with a speed limit of 20mph or less should be two-way for cyclists. A consistent policy would add safety as motorists would know to expect two-way cycling in all local one-way streets. This is the policy throughout France where the speed limit is 30km/h or less.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support This is justified by the increased safety.</p>
(128) Local resident, (Oxford, Ridgefield Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support More safe traffic routes are needed cross city.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Too often blocked with parked cars</p>
(129) Local resident, (Oxford, Salisbury Crescent)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Cycling is the solution to many of our problems</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support We need to reduce the use of cars</p>
(130) Local resident, (Oxford, South Parade)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Two-way cycling happens anyway, I think making it legal would make cycling safer.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Motorist park on the right hand side of South Parade in a most unkind manner, frequently invading the sidewalk in a way that makes just walking difficult. Navigating that side of the road with a pram or a wheelchair frequently becomes simply impossible. I totally support this measure.</p>

<p>(131) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support This will regularise huge amounts of contraflow cycling on the short stretch between Middle Way and Stratfield Rd. It will also provide a useful route for people cycling down Woodstock Rd to get to Summertown, allowing them to stay in the bus lane as far as South Parade instead of mixing with motor traffic on Middle Way.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support A necessary concomitant of enabling contra-flow cycling.</p>
<p>(132) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Will make some trips easier and more direct, and also regularise massive amounts of technically illegal contra-flow cycling (especially from Middle Way to Stratfield Rd). Please mark a contraflow cycle lane (as on Oakethorpe Rd) and protect its entry (from Woodstock Rd) and exit (onto Banbury Rd) with wands, to prevent motor vehicles overrunning it.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Need to reduce parking to keep enough width for contra-flow cycling. Also essential if a contra-flow cycle lane is to be marked. Reducing parking here will also improve things for pedestrians, as vehicles are parked on the pavement.</p>
<p>(133) Local resident, (Oxford, Sunderland Avenue)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Will encourage cycling</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Remove cars</p>
<p>(134) Local resident, (Oxford, Thorncliffe Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It would make the area much more permeable, but would probably require wands so as not to be dangerous. I would also suggest enforcement needs to be prioritised</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Please enforce existing restrictions as well</p>

<p>(135) Member of public, (Oxford, Banbury road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Why not put a l t n in as well</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Why not put a ltn in as well</p>
<p>(136) Local Cllr (i.e. Town/Parish/District), (Oxford, Bullingdon rd)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support My understanding is that guidance suggests one way streets for vehicles are two way for bikes in order to encourage active travel. This would help local residents within the immediate neighborhood to not have to do a large loop on to a busy dangerous main road by bike to make trips within the streets immediately proximate to South Parade. Two way cycling and introducing no waiting restrictions at any time will make it safer for all people on bikes but particularly children to make journeys in the neighborhood by bike rather than being forced on to busier roads due to the one way system as is currently the case.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support The cars parked currently on the street make it narrower and more dangerous to cycle down in particular when cycling with young children. Removing this will reallocate road space to support cycling and will give a wider passing space for vehicles.</p>
<p>(137) Local resident, (Oxford, Complins close)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Cyclists should be able to take a shorter route - there is enough space. In Ghent, where I'm from, Cyclists can ride in any one way street in both directions and it works well</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Too many cars are blocking the road for cyclists</p>
<p>(138) Local resident, (Oxford, Harpes Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Direct access between banbuand Woodstock roads by bike.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Parking makes it unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians</p>

(139) Local resident, (Oxford, Hayfield road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Kids school run v important</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Kids need the freedom to move safely without being killed by 4x4s this will help if it happens</p>
(140) Local resident, (Oxford, Islip Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support My daughter and I cycle daily from Summertown to Jericho to take her to and from her school. I fully support this change to South Parade as it has long been a source of frustration that there isn't a proper cycle route from Woodstock Rd to the Summertown shops area. It would make a wonderful difference to the safety of our daily cycle. We are also regular visitors to the Summertown Library on South Parade which would be positively helped by this change. I really hope this goes ahead! Great idea!</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support There is a lot of bad parking by very large cars in this area. A blanket 'no waiting' should help make things clearer. It would improve the experience for the large amount of pedestrians and cyclists in this area with more space and better sight lines.</p>
(141) Local resident, (Oxford, Stone Meadow)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support As a cyclist, this would provide an additional west-east route in North Oxford. Further it would stop people parking on the north side of South Parade as often happens. In a recent experience, they refused to move their vehicle even when politely asked to do so.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support See my previous response</p>

<p>(142) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I would like to cycle in the area with my child and family. Safer cycling would help encourage people too cycle and reduce the air pollution. There is a larger council car park in the area that cars can use. This is a school route for children cycling down startfield Road and crossing at the lights so this should be priority over a bit of parking convenience.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Keep it clear for bikes, parking just causes everyone else to swerve. They can park in the council car park.</p>
<p>(143) Member of public, (Oxford, Sunningwell Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I agree it makes sense for these connecting roads to be two-way for cyclists, as it's often unclear for cyclists how to get between Banbury and Woodstock Road.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support No comment</p>
<p>(144) Local resident, (Oxford, Harbord Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I regularly use this route to cycle east to west. When I need to return the alternative routes are much less convenient. I would strongly support 2-way cycling with appropriate safety notices on South Parade.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support The road really isn't wide enough for this. It regularly causes blockages.</p>
<p>(145) Local resident, (Oxford, St John Street)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Additional cycle lanes will help local families who cycle with their children to school.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Additional cycle lanes will help families who cycle with the children to school</p>

<p>(146) Local resident, (Oxford, Kingston Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I cycle in this area daily, and would find the two way option very useful.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support I cycle in this area daily, and would find it very useful to be able to cycle west-east along south parade.</p>
<p>(147) Local resident, (Summertown, Squitchey Lane)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It allows people living north of Summertown a much safer way to the shops.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Cycling must be given priority</p>
<p>(148) Local resident, Summertown, Sunderland Avenue)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Key route to allow safe cycling around summertown</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Too many people obstruct the footpath and road and make it an unsafe thoroughfare. Today I watched someone abandon their car partly blocking road and footpath to get a cup of coffee. Totally selfish behaviour that put all other road users at risk!</p>
<p>(149) Local resident, Summertown, (Portland Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support My whole family cycles, and this will benefit us.</p> <p>Also many people park on the right-hand side (as you look down from Banbury Road) and onto the pavement. Often I have had to walk into the road or push my cycle onto the road when walking /wheeling a bike up the street (because you currently can't cycle up there) - and you can't use the pavement because cars have parked on it.</p> <p>Would be helpful on two counts.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support As above.</p>

(150) Local resident, (Summertown, Banbury Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Bike safety is abysmal in Oxford. More needs to be done to ensure that people are able to bike safely, so that more people are able to do it and reduce their environmental impact.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support We need to design cities that are for people, not cars.</p>
(151) Local resident, (Summertown, Elizabeth Jennings Way)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support To improve the cycling routes and provision in my local area.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support To improve cycling on this road.</p>
(152) Local resident, (Summertown, Lonsdale)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support South Parade should be closed to motor vehicles. Entrance from Banbury Road is dangerous. Experience as a pedestrian is bad. Cycle lanes are fine but PLEASE educate cyclists to use their bells. I use the footpath down to the Cherwell School from Lonsdale Road to walk my dog and have many unpleasant experiences of cyclists riding close and fast from behind without warning. I do not wear any form of headphone/earbud and am still taken by surprise</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Too much of this in Summer town.</p>
(153) Local resident, (Summertown, Lonsdale Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Simplifying cycle routes. Reducing dangerous parking on north side of South Parade.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Cycle safety, pedestrian safety.</p>

<p>(154) Local resident, (Summertown, Osberton Rd)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support This is a great idea to make the route between homes and schools safer and easier for children and parents, the road is wide enough to support two way cycling and one way car traffic</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support This will make it safer to cycle two way along South parade, the road is wide enough to support two way cycling but in the event of a wider vehicle on the road there will be more places for vehicles/cycles to pull in to pass each other safely</p>
<p>(155) Local resident, (Summertown, Portland)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It will be extremely useful. I say so as a cyclist.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support So much wrongly-parked traffic on that side of South Parade.</p>
<p>(156) Local resident, (Summertown, Portland Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support this because it happens all the time anyway, by cyclists contravening existing regulations/signs. 2. Also I very much hope it will also result in improved provision of one way signs for motor traffic, which are currently inadequate (especially for traffic emerging from the several little courtyards and parking areas off the north side of the road), as well as very clear signs to alert pedestrians to the new arrangement. 3. I think the exit of cyclists from the east end of S Parade onto the Banbury Road will need careful consideration and control so near the pedestrian crossing and given the probably visibility problems there. 4. Safety for St Edward's pupils and staff (already compromised by wrong-way cyclists) will need to be ensured. 5. Signage for southbound traffic in Middle Way and northbound traffic in Stratfield Road will need to be put in place to alert them to the two-way traffic. <p>Parking amendments – Support I have been concerned for many years that the arrangements in South Parade - and indeed in many other one way streets in Oxford - are in no way conducive to the safety of the driving/cycling/walking/disabled public. Parking onto the pavement should never be tolerated, and damages the pavements as well as often forcing vulnerable people out into the road, often up and down kerbs. South Parade is a particularly complicated street for extra traffic and pedestrian movements.</p>

(157) Local resident, (Summertown, Portland Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support extra way for cyclists to connect between Banbury and Woodstock Roads</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Road is narrow and congested. Illegal parking on northside of road dangerous and obstructs footpath when vehicles partially parked on it. Very hard for mobility users and prams etc to pass</p>
(158) Local resident, (Summertown, Stratfield Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I support measures to make getting about without a car easier and more welcoming. I hope you will install wands to protect cyclists and that there will be clear signage on the Woodstock Road, from where it is currently difficult for northbound cyclists to turn right.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Measures to reduce car use on South Parade will benefit all of us. The measures will need to be properly enforced.</p>
(159) Local resident, (Summertown, Thorncliffe Road)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Anything to make the city safer for cyclists is a good thing</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support .</p>
(160) Local resident, (Summertown, Victoria Roadside)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It gives a safe cycling corridor from West to East..</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support It is much safer all around. Parking efforts at the East end of the South Parade often causes traffic blockages even extending to Banbury Road.</p>

<p>(161) Local resident, (Summertown, Middle Way)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support As Middle Way is an existing cycle route cyclists already naturally turn left on S Parade to access the shops. It would be safer for all if there was a designated cycle lane.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Cars are parking on the pavement on North side of S Parade which blocks prams and wheelchairs. By the way, double yellow lines will not stop them. If not enforced you will have wasted your time.</p>
<p>(162) Local resident, (Summertown, Southdale)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I'm a cyclist and it will make my journeys easier and safer.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Will make it easier and safer to cycle along South Parade</p>
<p>(163) Local resident, (Summertown Oxford, Hamilton Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I'm a cyclist and it is very challenging cycling around the area.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Too many cars using small side roads</p>
<p>(164) Local resident, (Summertown Oxford, Lonsdale Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I cycle this road very regularly to and from school and would LOVE it if this were two way for bikes. It would be much safer for me and the kids and also encourage more cycling in the area. Cycling needs to be prioritised much more than it is in Summertown and this can only help.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support This would encourage safer cycling in Summertown and make a big difference my school run.</p>
<p>(165) Local resident, (Summertown, Oxford, Blenheim Drive)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support</p>

	<p>Better access for cycles. Good route for children to/from local schools. Safer with less cars parked as people can park very badly on South Parade</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support As before. Parking often unsafe</p>
<p>(166) Local resident, (Summertown, Oxford, Lonsdale Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It will significantly improve access to the retail and other facilities of Summertown by residents of the developments west of Woodstock Road and Wolvercote, by bike, and thus encourage this active travel mode. The elimination of unregulated parking on the north side of South Parade is also important, not just in order to facilitate the introduction of two-way cycling, but to terminate the ubiquitous obstruction of the footway by vehicles parking thereupon. These measures are long overdue.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support As already stated, this measure is necessary to eliminate parking on the north-side pavement, which is occurs every evening. When vehicles are not parked on the pavement, the resulting width of accessible carriageway is too narrow for safe movement of vehicles. When vehicles are parked on the pavement, pedestrians are not only inconvenienced, but are put at risk by having to walk in the carriageway.</p>
<p>(167) Local resident, (Summertown, Oxford, Osberton Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support It would be much safer for cyclists.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support It is quite a busy road between Banbury and Woodstock, and parked cars make it worse.</p>
<p>(168) Local resident, (Summertown, Oxford, Stratfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I am a cyclist and live in Stratfield Road and this would complement the same two-way traffic for cycles as Stratfield Road.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support</p>

	<p>Only way to make it safe. However the taxis that drop off and pick up at Northern House will need to be accommodated.</p>
<p>(169) Local resident, (Summertown, Oxford, Woodstock Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Fantastic idea. Will help with a direct cycle route into and from Summertown.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Road is very narrow- even now without a cycle lane road can become blocked. Especially if there are large vans or lorries delivering to local businesses.</p>
<p>(170) Local resident, (Oxford, Southdale)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I could not see a detailed plan of the proposal, but when coming up the Woodstock road it is not possible to cross to the Banbury Road for a long stretch. It would make West-East access much better, including for school aged children and families on bicycles.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support I could not see a plan for how this would work, but essentially the public highway should not be used for the storage of vehicles which might then put in danger people cycling or walking by having to navigate around them into traffic. I would imagine that the businesses in South Parade will need some supply deliveries at some point though, so that should be accommodated.</p>
<p>(171) Local resident, (Walton Manor, Hayfield Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Coming from Woodstock road is already quite stressful as a cyclist and given SP is usually the most obvious route to get to summertown apart from the restaurants, library and shops, it makes sense to improve accesibility for cyclist through a 2-way access.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support I strongly support no waiting at any times since it's just too stretch to have lorries waiting there.</p>

<p>(172) Local resident, (Waterways, Frenchay Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support I am an active cyclist living on the edge of Summertown. This proposal will extend quieter cycling routes through Summertown using both Stratfield Road and Middle way. Both these roads help cyclists stay away from the busier Woodstock road and Banbury Road routes, for at least part of their journeys. Two way cycling along Stratfield Road would also be useful but I imagine residents would oppose the reduction in parking this would require. As an additional thought; pavement parking should not be allowed on any of these roads. The pavements are too narrow to allow for safe access with vehicles parked on pavements. It is very hard to navigate a wheelchair, walker, push chair or pram along these streets, and crossing the road safely is sometimes impossible. The 'wands' on Oakthorpe Road have greatly improved that junction with Banbury Road but, again, I doubt this using this approach more widely would be supported locally. Many thanks for your efforts here. Wendy Stone</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support That stretch of South Parade is busy and parked cars make it less safe.</p>
<p>(173) Member of public, (Wheatley, Templars Close)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Cycling should be promoted as a transport choice across the County. Opening up this road for use by cyclists in both directions supports the goal of increasing participation in cycling. Great health outcomes & reduces car usage</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Discouraging car use is as important as prioritising cycle access</p>
<p>(174) Local resident, (Wolvercote, St Peters Road)</p>	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Without being able to cycle both ways down South Parade, when you are coming towards town along Middle Way (a nice way to cycle so summertown), in order to get to the west side of summertown shops then when following the law you have to go all the way around Stratfield road and back up Banbury Road which is quite a big way around. Also, given the incredibly large number of cars that park on the side of the road on South Parade, there is clearly space for a bike lane. There is one on Little Clarendon Street and that is far more narrow.</p>

	<p>Parking amendments – Support South Parade is currently abused by waiting cars. This makes the junction with Banbury road fairly dangerous with cars and bikes entering the junction as well as pedestrian traffic crossing fairly often to get in and out of Summertown shops. Without cars on the pavement, there could be a far quieter and calmer liveable street at the top of South Parade with a nice space outside what is currently Columbia Coffee Roasters. I believe there is still an empty retail unit "Travel Solutions" and that might be easier to fill if cars weren't always blocking the pavement on the road.</p>
(175) Local resident, (Wolvercote, Meadow Prospect)	<p>Two-way cycling – Support Local resident</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Support</p>
(176) Local resident, (Summertown, Hamilton)	<p>Two-way cycling – No objection This will be much safer for cyclists.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support Best for residents and restaurants users</p>
(177) Local resident, (Summertown, Oxford, Capel Close)	<p>Two-way cycling – No objection I would like to cycle in South Parade - also on my way back home. I would appreciate if this is allowed.</p> <p>Parking amendments – Support It seems well thought through.</p>
(178) Local resident, (Oxford)	<p>Support – Having received notice of the above scheme by post, I can say that we are very supportive of adding cycling provision and parking restrictions to South Parade.</p> <p>The flow of traffic is often heavily restricted by cars using the single yellow sections as it is, which is unsafe. It also means that pedestrian walkways are completely blocked on occasion, which again is dangerous.</p>

	<p>Always good to promote additional cycle routes for cyclists and make cycling easy and convenient - it's great for Oxford.</p>
<p>(179) Local resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>Object – I strongly propose to object to the removal of parking in South Parade as a resident of Oxford for over thirty years. Oxford is being the target of consistent anti motorists over the past few years & becoming a hostile place to visit. Can you not for once leave things as they are. I have no knowledge of anyone being killed or injured in South Parade but would be devastated if as a result of your proposals if the shops that are there would got to the wall. Already the street is blighted by empty decaying buildings which is a far more important issue. Leave things as they are!!!</p>