

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT – 12 SEPTEMBER 2019**

### **OXFORD – ACCESS TO HEADINGTON – FURTHER CONSULTATION ON TRAFFIC MEASURES**

#### **Report by Director for Community Operations**

#### **Recommendation**

1. The Cabinet Member for the Environment is RECOMMENDED to approve the proposals as advertised.

#### **Executive summary**

2. The Access to Headington project is focused on improving orbital connections in Headington and more specifically, access to the major hospital and employment sites. The project includes a package of transport measures aimed at:
  - a. Improving bus journey times and service reliability by reducing traffic congestion at junctions and on roads leading to the major hospital and employment sites;
  - b. Upgrading and linking existing and new signal-controlled junctions to enable greater bus detection and prioritisation across the network;
  - c. Providing a higher standard of cycle route provision and, in particular, more legible and continuous design than seen at present; and
  - d. Enhancing pedestrian and cycle routes by providing greater priority at side-roads, and new and improved crossings.
3. A report presenting the responses to the consultation on the project carried out in February and March 2016 was considered and approved at the Cabinet Member for Environment delegated decisions meeting on 9 June 2016. That report is available on the Oxfordshire County Council website (<http://mycouncil.oxfordshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=931&MId=4764&Ver=4>).
4. However, due to the implementation of the scheme taking longer than anticipated and the statutory time limit of two years from the start of a consultation to the implementation of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and other measures subject to statutory consultation, the County Council is required to re-consult on measures approved at the 9 June 2016 meeting. It is accepted that this unforeseen situation is very regrettable especially as the majority of the measures subject to consultation have been constructed or are under construction.

## Consultation

5. Formal consultation on the proposal was carried out between 11 July and 8 August 2019. A public notice was placed in the Oxford Times newspaper, and sent to statutory consultees, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Oxford City Council and the local County Councillors. Street notices were placed on site and letters sent to approximately 700 properties in the immediate vicinity adjacent to the proposals.
6. Thirty-one responses in total were received. Those in relation to the proposed traffic regulation order amendments are summarised as below:

Proposal	Support	Object	Neither/No opinion
Parking Provision Amendments on the Cherwell Drive Service Road	1	1	29
One Way Traffic Restriction on the Cherwell Drive Service Road	2	1	28
Parking Provision Amendments on Headley Way	2	0	29
Parking Provision Amendments on Windmill Road	3	9	19
Additional Residents Parking in the Windmill Road area	2	17	12
Prohibition of Entry Restrictions in the Headington Area	1	2	28
Prohibition of U-Turns	5	0	26

7. The responses received with regards to the proposed traffic & safety improvement schemes are summarised as below:

Proposal	Support	Object	Neither/No opinion
Changes to Crossing Facilities	1	2	28
Side Road Entry Treatments	1	2	28
Advisory On-road Cycle Lanes	2	2	27
Off-road Cycle Lanes	3	1	27
Shared-Use Pedestrian & Cycle Lanes	2	2	27
Bus Stop Relocations	1	1	29

8. The responses which included objections or concerns and contained accompanying reasons/text are set out at Annex 1 with copies of the full responses available for inspection by County Councillors.

### **Response to objections and other comments**

9. Thames Valley Police did not object to the proposals as responsibility for parking enforcement does not fall to them within Oxford City.
10. Oxford Bus Company and Stagecoach Bus Company sent a joint response acknowledging that much of the scheme was already complete. A significant concern was the detailing of the raised side road entry treatments at junctions used by bus services, where the 1:10 gradient shown was considered too severe for buses to cross them without causing discomfort and possibly injury to bus occupants, with a maximum gradient of 1:12 being considered appropriate. In practice the 1:10 gradient entry treatments have only been used at junctions with side roads not used by scheduled bus services, but it is agreed – as requested by the bus operators – that this matter is reviewed to ensure that such problems are avoided.
11. The bus operators also commented on the importance of new cycle infrastructure adequately accommodating bus stops so as not to present any safety risk or loss of amenity for bus passengers and also a more general observation on the importance of an integrated approach to encouraging sustainable travel modes that did not adversely affect the viability of bus services. Both these concerns are accepted and it is agreed that further dialogue with bus operators will be very helpful to ensure both these objectives are met.
12. Oxford Pedestrians Association (OXPA) expressed a strong objection to the proposed additional resident car parking places on the side roads off Windmill Road to compensate for the removal of some parking places on Windmill Road itself, on the grounds that it prioritised car travel over pedestrian movement, with particular concerns being expressed over the proposed part footway parking in Holyoake Road and St Anne's Road, which would reduce the width of footway available to pedestrians. While acknowledging the need to provide safe and attractive provision for pedestrians, the issue of parking availability in this area is clearly of strong local concern as evidenced by the response of the Windmill Road Residents Group (see below), and the current proposals are considered to represent an appropriate balance following detailed investigations prior to the consultation on the scheme in 2016.
13. The Windmill Road Residents Group response raised a number of queries and concerns, including an increase in parking pressure in the area since the 2016 consultation, possible discrepancies between the consultation plans and schedules in respect of parking places on Windmill Road and concerns over the suitability of some of the proposed additional parking places on the side roads and requested a comprehensive review of the current Headington East CPZ including in respect of permit eligibility per property. While at present there is no funding for such a general review and as noted above the detailed work carried out on the development of the scheme that was consulted on in

2016 is still considered to be robust, checks will be carried out to address the possible discrepancies between consultation plans and traffic regulation order draft schedules.

14. Cyclox, a local cycling group, expressed an objection in respect of the siting of the toucan crossing on Old Road, and the detailing of the proposed parallel zebra crossing on Windmill Road and also concerns on the detailing of the largely now complete cycle provision on Headley Way and Cherwell Drive, including the lack of a raised entry treatment on Elms Road and the treatment of bus stops, and also concerns at the treatment of the cycle provision on the London Road at the Osler Road junction. Concerns were also raised that the ramp gradients at the now constructed side road entry treatments were too slack, allowing vehicles to travel over them at too great a speed. Noting these comments, it is accepted that this retrospective consultation in respect of many of the features is unfortunate and that it is considered now too late - taking account the current progress with the scheme - to significantly amend those features still to be constructed. However, a post completion safety audit will be carried out and the council will be happy to review with Cyclox any lower cost changes subject to availability of funding.

15. Responses were also received from one business and twenty-five members of the public; the majority of which related to parking provision on and adjacent to Windmill Road and the provision for cyclists and pedestrians as discussed above, although concerns were also raised on the now completed raised side road entry treatments and reversal of traffic flow at the Cherwell Drive service road. Noting all these comments, it is not considered viable to significantly amend the design of the still to be constructed elements of the scheme, and those that have been completed will be the subject of a post completion safety audit and then on-going monitoring.

### **How the Project supports LTP4 Objectives**

16. The proposals would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic.

### **Financial and Staff Implications (including Revenue)**

17. Funding for the proposed measures has been provided by Local Growth Fund and s106 contributions.

OWEN JENKINS

Director for Community Operations

Background papers: Plan of proposed waiting restrictions  
Consultation responses

Contact Officers: Hugh Potter 07766 998704  
Stewart Wilson 07801 740354

September 2019

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	<p><b>No objection</b> - in relation to the proposal for Windmill road to install a 'parallel crossing'. This is a completely new design for me and probably most people living in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Once installed I do wonder what level of education/promotion is being considered for this new crossing especially for those crossing with a cycle. I believe a similar crossing is being considered north of the County but not aware of any like facility.</p> <p>My concern focuses on the level of compliance at a facility that most motoring public will be unfamiliar with. And why this design is favoured over a Toucan, especially on such a busy road .</p> <p>Please ensure this design meets all necessary design standards and speed monitoring has taken place. I am aware this road regularly features in terms of speed complaint.</p>
(2) Bus Operators, (Oxford Bus Company & Stagecoach)	<p><u>Side Road Entry Treatments</u> – <b>Support</b> (with amendments):</p> <p>Both operators recognise the merits of clearly signalling pedestrian and cycle priority across side road junctions, in maximising the safety, efficiency and attractiveness of cycling as a mode. Creating seamless surfaces as far as possible, with no change in levels for cyclists, while also slowing down and dissuading turning traffic from cutting in front of cyclist while making turning movements, is clearly in principle, both appropriate and desirable to achieve the broad aims of the scheme.</p> <p>However, several bus routes enter and leave the main arteries using certain of these side roads, and specifically: Girdlestone Road, Wood Farm Road, Derwent Avenue, Coniston Avenue, Oxford Road (Marston)</p> <p><b>Object</b> - to the proposed transition gradient of 1:10, which we consider to be excessive. The nature of the vertical displacement, quite apart from being extremely uncomfortable for bus passengers, will be approached and/or departed from at an angle by buses. The effect of this will be to create both substantial lateral deflection of the upper saloon of a bus, as well as a vertical one experienced by all occupants. In addition, the nature of air suspension on a</p>

## CMDE4

bus is likely to cause an exaggerated vertical deflection for each movement, aggravating both discomfort and risk of passenger falls and injury within the vehicle. This is unacceptable.

We would urge that this detail is reviewed carefully in dialogue with ourselves, and, if necessary, tested in some manner.

A transition gradient of no greater than 1:12 is likely to achieve all the same intentions of the current approach, whilst significantly mitigating the risks outlined above.

### Off road cycle lanes & Shared-Use Pedestrian & Cycle Lanes - **Support** (with amendments):

Note that at the time of the consultation, these have already been constructed and are in use. Which is helpful as it means we can look at them and see how they work in reality.

We note that the style of provision is similar to that being designed and provided in other cities in the UK and Europe. This marks a paradigm shift from the road layout where a footway was separated from all other traffic by a kerb, with pedal cycles required by law to use the carriageway. The new standard is for pedal cycles to be separated from other vehicles.

Power-assisted small vehicles such as electric stand-on scooters, skateboards, and lightweight electric motorcycles, as well as power-assisted pedal cycles and mobility scooters, are increasingly being used. Irrespective of how the rules for use of these are evolve, there need to be a recognition that the nature and use of a wider range of personal mobility modes will open up both new opportunities and quite significant challenges. Not least, such devices can sustain significantly higher speeds, for even casual users, than pedal cycles.

It is essential that, in providing for greatly improved cycling facilities, safe and convenient access for bus passengers to bus stops is not materially compromised. Up to now, within Oxford city, it is evident that almost all bus passengers get to the stops on foot or using wheelchair or other walking aids. As bicycles are not permitted on any buses, and there is no cycle parking at any of these bus stops, there are unlikely to be any combined bicycle-bus journeys. We are therefore especially concerned that pedestrian safety along these major corridors is not undermined, and that safe waiting facilities are provided for at the stops. Additionally, it is essential that alighting bus passengers are not descending directly into the path of moving cycles and other small vehicles. It is not realistic for disembarking passengers to lean out of a bus door aperture to check for moving cycles

We note that the space for the off-carriageway cycle lanes is taken mainly from footways. In addition, within the detail, it was observed that wherever there was a fixed obstruction in the pavement, it was located within the pedestrian

## CMDE4

section rather than the bicycle section. Site visits and experience show that illegal parking is more likely to obstruct the pedestrian section also.

Some of our passengers are likely to use the new infrastructure to travel by bicycle instead of bus, and we wish them well. However, many of our passengers, walking to the bus stops, will be worse off. Their journeys will be more hazardous and less enjoyable, constant heightened vigilance will be necessary. Pedestrians, and those with wheelchairs or pushchairs, are more likely to need to squeeze through narrow sections of footway. There will be collisions. Those involved in collisions will include frail individuals, the very young, the very old, and otherwise vulnerable people. Some people with visual impairment or poor balance may feel afraid to go out on their own as a result.

We recognise that mode shift from personal car use towards cycling would be advantageous, in terms of both reductions in congestion and improvements in air quality. Reducing vehicular traffic to the point where the remaining traffic can flow freely would cut bus journey times, and thus attract and retain new passengers, as well as improving the quality of life of those for whom the bus is the only way for them to travel.

However, there is a risk that the new infrastructure attracts existing bus passengers but not those who currently travel by car or taxi. A scenario that leaves bus journey times no better off, while eroding the customer base materially by even a few percentage points, will significantly undermine the longer-term viability of bus services concerned. The “positive spiral” of improving service frequencies and rising passenger numbers seen in the city from the 1970s until relatively recently, could quite credibly be thrown into reverse. Declining bus service frequencies will make the service significantly less convenient and attractive. Higher traffic levels are highly likely to result.

Clearly, this specific scenario is highly undesirable. To avoid this, we would urge that the proposals are brought forward in better synchrony with parallel measures to further actively dissuade the use of cars and taxis in Headington. The actual use by cyclists (and potentially other motor-assisted users) of a range of different levels of provision along a route, some dedicated, some shared, is something that is only becoming apparent after delivery of earlier phases of the Access to Headington scheme. The reality, as observed on 7 August, was that all the people observed riding bicycles, with one notable exception, did use the off-carriageway cycle facility wherever it was provided.

However, appropriate use of shared facilities clearly poses significant conflicts, especially at bus stops. The existing Cinnaminta Road bus stop on Windmill Road is similar to a number of others within the scheme. Several passengers were waiting at the stop, some under the bus shelter but others standing on the pavement behind the shelter, which is designated for shared use. During the site visit, at least one fast-moving cyclist on the pavement chose to bypass the stop by joining the road and returning to the pavement some metres past the stop. Many cyclists wish to make swift

CMDE4

	<p>progress and negotiating either ambulant or waiting pedestrians mitigates strongly against this. This incident highlights the potential for conflict in these kinds of scenarios, and while we would broadly support the general, principle of designing off-carriageway provision, dedicated or shared, to allow easy diversion into the carriageway around bus stops. this principle also raises a number of questions of what happens when the off-carriageway provision is affected by larger numbers of ambulant and waiting pedestrians, and how people will respond, in the complete absence of any accepted or enforceable “rules”, or even accepted behavioural protocols, to manage the conflicts that are certain to arise.</p> <p><u>Bus Stop Relocations</u> - On the general principle of the bus stop relocations, we broadly support the intentions and we have set out our reasoning below for the record. During the site visit it was observed that each bus stop is very different in the way it is laid out. In many cases there is a disconnect between the bus stop clearway set out on the road, and the passenger facility on the footway. Buses were seen to stop half off the clearway markings so that passengers could alight and board the bus. We look forward to working with the Council to raise the standard of bus stops to a consistent high quality.</p>
<p>(3) Local Group, (Oxford Pedestrian Association)</p>	<p><b>Objection:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - In particular we wish strongly to object to the introduction of 'Permit Holders Footway Parking- proposed additional parking places' in Holyoake Road and St Annes Road.</p> <p>We have said before in response to consultations on Access to Headington that the project seems to be about smoothing vehicle flow rather than encouraging active transport. We see that this is now explicit in the current proposals. Parking spaces will be removed from Windmill Road: "Windmill Road- For the most part parking will not be permitted so as to facilitate traffic flow". Residential streets should not be converted to freeways. Pedestrians do not like walking alongside fast-flowing traffic which is noisy and dangerous. We would instead like to see traffic calming measures, and parked cars can be one means of achieving this. The County Council needs to decide whether they wish to encourage people to use cars, e.g. to drive to and from work, or walk. At present it seems the former.</p> <p>The prioritisation of the motor vehicle over the pedestrian is particularly seen in the proposals to introduce "Footway Parking" in Holyoake Road and St Annes Road. Streets in this area were laid out mostly in the 1930s. The ratio of pavement space to road space would then have been considered appropriate, with growing belief in the motor car as 'the future of transport'. But attitudes should be shifting. Indeed, the second theme of the current local transport plan 'Connecting Oxfordshire' is "Reducing emissions: Reduce the proportion of journeys made by private car by making the use of public transport, walking and cycling more attractive". Walking is not made more attractive by allowing cars</p>

CMDE4

	<p>to park on the already limited pavement space. Our objection to 'footway parking' is twofold. First, the obvious, that car owners should not encroach upon space that was dedicated for pedestrians including those in wheelchairs or mobility scooters or parents with babies in buggies. The roads in question are not blessed with particularly wide pavements. But our broader objection is that making pavement parking legal anywhere sends the message that it is an acceptable practice. To illustrate this, one of us (KF) went out this morning (a typical weekday, Weds 24th July) to inspect the locations where footway parking is proposed. On a short walk down Windmill Road (just the northern end) and along St Leonard's Road (just the western end) he saw five and three vehicles, respectively, parking on pavements. OxPA's Facebook page regularly carries pictures of pavement parking throughout the city. A County Councillor has observed to us "this is illegal and can be enforced"- but clearly either the will or the means to enforce are lacking, so OxPA believes that a dear message needs to be sent out that pavement parking is not acceptable anywhere.</p> <p>The aims of Access to Headington are described on the County Council's website: "Access to Headington will improve facilities for pedestrians, public transport and cyclists". In summary, Oxford Pedestrians Association is far from convinced that these aims will be achieved by the present batch of proposals relating to parking. Instead these proposals seem aimed at prioritising the needs of the motorist over those of the pedestrian. We believe a major rethink is needed.</p> <p>More broadly, we note that for twenty years Oxforde hire County Council has published LTPs which state a vision of 'prioritising pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users'. Over this same time period pedestrians have steadily lost pavement space to parked vehicles. This is due to a widespread lack of enforcement of the practice, and also to its normalisation by lines painted on pavements. For convenient pavement use pavements should be 2m wide (we quote the County Council's Active and Healthy Travel Officer). The County already allows the minimum of 1.5m to be the norm in many places, and in some places less than this. And even when the minimum width of 1.5m is allowed this leaves no margin for overhanging hedges or parked bicycles, or bins, or cars parked carelessly taking up more than the space allocated to them. At 1.5m two wheelchairs cannot pass one another. Until policy about prioritising the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users is put into practice, with the default priority no longer given to motor vehicles, pedestrians experience themselves at the bottom of the heap, with no priority.</p>
<p>(4) Local Group, (Windmill Road Residents Group)</p>	<p><b>Objection:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - 1. there has been an increase in the number of permits issued in streets affected between 2016-19 and hence parking demand. Based on data supplied by the County Council in Freedom of Information requests 9236 EIR (8 December 2015) and 15329 FOI (31 May 2019), there is evidence of a sharp increase in the number of permits issued on Windmill Road itself since the last major consultation on Access to</p>

## CMDE4

Headington, from 78 valid permits at the time of the request in 2016 to 88 valid permits at the time of request in 2019. This is a substantial increase in a relatively short period but is consistent with what residents have been reporting to us in recent years. It is not known the reasons for this but part of it could well be the 'professionalisation' of Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs). There is clearly therefore a fair amount of risk in the parking space budget as the number of HMOs increases and when they are being converted (without further statutory consent) from use as student accommodation to medium-term accommodation for young professionals. As such, the context in which the original consultations took place in 2016 has now changed.

2. The number and location of the new parking spaces proposed are less than ideal given the changing environment. There are two in Rock Edge opposite Nos. 5/6 that are of significant concern in terms of maintaining a proper safe contraflow on this road and allowing residents to enter/exit their properties without difficulty. Two at the North end of York Road are also problematic being positioned so close to a busy junction with significant amounts of traffic flow twice a day at the start and end of the school day at Windmill Primary.

3. An audit of the proposed spaces was carried out by residents during the period of the consultation and also a review of available spaces again in each street. Unfortunately, due to lack of resources, given this consultation is taking place during peak holiday period, the spaces north of Margaret Road were not audited. We trust highways officers will look closely again at these spaces in light of this response. It is clear that more could be done to rationalise existing space layouts and we would like to request a meeting with County Council officers at the earliest opportunity to discuss how this could be achieved. There has been no review of these streets since the CPZ was installed many years ago. This is particularly the case in Gathorne Road, where there is good scope for adding spaces especially at the junctions.

4. The stretch of retained parking south of Gathorne Road on Windmill Road on the East Side does not conform to previous descriptions in publicity from the revised 2016 consultation. That stated that an extra two spaces were being added to this stretch. However, the overall length of the parking space is identical in the wording of the draft Traffic Order. To create an extra space the County Council would have to include part of the middle section which includes a fire hydrant currently protected with double yellows. The length corresponds to the existing parking bay so there is absolutely no net gain.

5. The area of retained parking just north of Gathorne on the West side of Windmill Road seems to stop quite a long way short of the new proposed crossing. It is not clear whether all of that space is needed as drawn and whether it could be extended south to increase parking space availability given the heavy parking load demand on Windmill Road.

CMDE4

	<p>We are therefore of the view that before any works move forward a comprehensive review of the HE parking zone is now needed.</p> <p>This is the only parking zone that is being affected by widespread removal of parking spaces in the city at this time so we are of the strong view it would be a timely and cost-effective opportunity to carry out this work providing value for money for the taxpayer. We note that A2H project costs have already increased by a very significant sum since its commencement. A review of the zone now would provide good value for money compared with having to undertake a review at a later stage to rework changes. As part of this review, we would request that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- each individual street is assessed to see what extra parking spaces can be inserted</li> <li>- parking restrictions dating from an earlier period when for instance a football stadium existed in Headington be reviewed for their current relevance</li> <li>- disabled parking bays that currently lie just on the road be reassessed to see if they can be viable if moved to part-pavement parking as now happens with new bays, potentially allowing further road width and the opportunity to extend existing parking bays</li> <li>- a fresh parking load survey is carried out at a suitable time in HE zone to assess current demand. This needs to be carried out during university term time and importantly cover 24 hour periods to include evening and late night/early morning load</li> <li>- consideration is given to the introduction of a cap on the number of permits per household in HE zone. The zone is anomalous in the city as having no cap whereas 2 per household is becoming common. This would provide protection for an increase in parking demand in the future (this trajectory is already observable and evidenced) and protect against large swings in demand from year to year where buildings are currently used as HMOs.</li> </ul>
(5) Local Group, (Cyclox)	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Changes to Crossing Facilities</u> - Toucan crossing on Old Road. The siting of this toucan crossing is too far east – it would be better sited to be closer to the two bus stops just to the east of Valencia Road, as the cut through to Demesne Furze is a very popular route for both walkers and cyclists. As there is no segregated cycle route on Old Road at this point, it is important that people on bikes can get off their bikes and off the road before the crossing using a flush kerb, so that they don't have to stop at the crossing, and then have to manoeuvre their bike to be facing the</p>

## CMDE4

right direction to cross. So on the inbound side on the approach to the crossing there needs to be an extended flush kerb.

The parallel zebra on Windmill. We support a parallel Zebra at this point, but we object to its layout. As there is no segregated cycle route on Windmill Road at this point, it is important that people on bikes can get off their bikes and off the road before the crossing using a flush kerb, so that they don't have to stop at the crossing, and then have to manoeuvre their bike to be facing the right direction to cross. So on the approach to the crossing there needs to be an extended flush kerb.

Advisory On-road Cycle Lanes - Elms Drive: We are very disappointed to see that Elm Drive does not have a side road entry treatment like most of the other side roads along Cherwell Drive and Headley Way. This is the one road that is used as a major rat run between Cherwell Drive and Marsh Lane to avoid the traffic lights at the Cherwell Drive/MarshLane junction. It is as though the planners / engineers have observed that there is more traffic along Elms Drive and there shouldn't be a SRET there to ensure that motor vehicle traffic is not impeded. Yet this is where it should have been imperative to slow down and reduce traffic encouraging them to use the main highway.

London Road Osler Road: There is a major problem at junction with cycle path. After negotiating a petrol station forecourt entrance/exit; then cars entering and exiting parking on the pavements outside 'Subway'; conflict with pedestrians at a crossing with textured pavement and a dangerously angled gully prior to junction. There is no safe way to navigate from the cycle path into the main body of traffic at the start of Headington shops. Either cyclists have to give way as they are expected to move from the cycle path onto Osler Rd and pull out into traffic on to the London Road. The give way is at a curious angle. The alternative is to move into a bus gate lane if moving into traffic before Osler Rd. We object strongly to the Give Way at the junction as the cycle path is effectively the cycle provision for the main London Rd. Pedestrians do not have to give way to traffic at the junction. This creates conflict between pedestrians and drivers and cyclists.

Off-road Cycle Lanes - Headley Way Junction with JR: Before the traffic lights went live the junction performed well as the cycle path exited the shared use path just before Eden Drive and continued alongside St Anthony's and over the junction back to the shared path across a buff signalled lane.

However, the traffic lights now have a left filter which renders this path dangerous as cyclists proceeding straight ahead, along the on-road cycle path crossing the junction, will have to wait in the left lane in conflict with vehicles turning left into the JRH. If at the phase of lights on left filter an approaching cyclist would not be able to get across to the right ASL.

CMDE4

	<p><u>Shared-Use Pedestrian &amp; Cycle Lanes</u> - On the route from London Road to St Joe's the white line dividing the peds from cycle users has gaps at every drive way, there should instead be a dotted line so it is clear to car drivers that there is cycle and ped priority. Also because of these gaps the line is curiously unaligned. Also the passage past trees creates pinch points but it isn't clear yet how the lining will be handled.</p> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <p><u>Side Road Entry Treatments</u> - Clearly much of the construction has already been completed so it is unlikely that any of these comments will be able to make a difference. This has made this consultation extremely problematic as a result.</p> <p>It would be useful to see a detailed design of the raised entry treatment on these side roads as it is difficult to ascertain the steepness of the ramps, or the radii of the corners. Some of the latter look quite wide on the plans. The Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards do not specify the design of side road entry and suggest referring to the London Cycling Design Guidance and to the Welsh Design Guidance - Active Travel (Wales). As a result, we can't point to specific Oxfordshire policies and guidance about how you would expect to address cycle friendly junction design.</p> <p>We support a 1 in 5 ramp rather than a 1 in 10 ramp as this will result in drivers of motor vehicles slowing down. We are assuming from the plans that there will be no give ways for cyclists at any of these junctions. There is not enough information to judge the tightness of the corner radii – some of them look wide on plans.</p> <p>The entry to St Joe's will create problems at school arrival and leaving times with pavement parking. Enforcement will be needed.</p> <p><u>Bus Stop Relocations</u> - The bus stops along Headley Way should face out to the road rather than in towards the cycle path and pavement.</p>
<p>Proposed Traffic Regulation Order Amendments</p>	
<p>(6) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>One Way</u> - The imposition of a one-way system will inconvenience drivers travelling from the South East and cause additional traffic load through the new traffic light junction with Marsh Lane. This may also lead to safety issues with</p>

CMDE4

	<p>drivers either queuing in the carriageway of Marsh Lane to turn right into the service road across two lanes of traffic attempting to get through the lights onto Headley Way or driving further up Marsh Lane and then turning around to access the service road via a left turn. Having used the new traffic light junction it is clear that vehicle speed through the junction has increased markedly with the switch from roundabout to traffic light so that any vehicles attempting to turn right will constitute a safety risk.</p> <p><u>Parking Provision Amendments on Windmill Road</u> - The existing parking arrangements provide greater convenience for local residents. Making additional provision in surrounding streets will be less convenient for those residents whilst also increasing pressure on parking for residents of the surrounding streets. The reasoning for these changes appears to be to speed up traffic along Windmill Road. This road is a key pedestrian route to Windmill Primary School - the largest in Oxfordshire and the existing parking arrangements provide a measure of traffic calming, serving to reduce traffic speed along Windmill Road. Making this narrow, busy carriageway effectively a clearway will inevitably lead to higher traffic speeds leading to safety concerns for vulnerable road users using both the road and adjoining pavements. It should be noted that the adjoining pavements are in places both very narrow and very poorly delineated from the carriageway with very low/non-existent kerb stones. As a fit healthy adult, I do not feel entirely safe walking along sections of these pavements and unless additional safety and traffic calming measures are implemented I fear creating a clearway to speed traffic through Headington will exacerbate these concerns. The situation for more vulnerable pedestrians will be worse. Displacing parking from Windmill Road to surrounding streets will increase vehicle movements and reduce safety in surrounding streets. Many of these surrounding streets - such as Gardner Street are currently very safe streets for vulnerable road users - effectively being 'quiet streets' due to the existing TROs and planning. As such they see high volumes of pedestrian and cycle traffic to and from Windmill Primary School. Increasing vehicle movements in these streets will reduce safety for these users. Adding additional parking spaces in these surrounding streets, many of them close to junctions, will further reduce safety as sight lines are compromised. For example the two spaces at the North End of York Road close to the junction with Margaret Road will reduce sight lines in the vicinity of Windmill Primary.</p>
<p>(7) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - The proposed additional two spaces on the east side of Rock Edge will force traffic on to the wrong side of the road on the approach to a blind corner and are therefore dangerous.</p> <p>There is at present a DPPP outside 11/13 Gathorne Road which no longer seems to be in use. If this space were to be converted to general use and pavement parking as in the rest of Gathorne Road, it would enable at least one extra space to be created on the opposite of the road."</p>

CMDE4

<p>(8) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Parking Provision Amendments on Windmill Road</u> - No extra parking provision should be made in this area, particularly as it is near to a primary school. This would further put at risk the safety of children walking and cycling to school as it would attract more vehicles to the area.</p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - The additional parking spaces on York Road are particularly concerning as they are very close to the primary school entrance. This area is already dangerous and congested with motor vehicles at school drop-off/pick-up times.</p>
<p>(9) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Parking Provision Amendments on the Cherwell Drive Service Road</u> - I object to the additional bay near the yellow lines to Copse Road. This looks to be close enough to the junction that on a bicycle, I will continue to be threatened by motorists who overtake near junctions, then have to swerve at the last minute having spotted a parked car. The other additional bays are fine.</p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - I am highly concerned by bays near junctions (within 4 car lengths). I have already had near misses and collisions near Windmill School when cycling with a child, where the police are unable to take action due to the prevalence of illegal parking (including parking on the pavement at double yellow lines) near junctions by the school.</p> <p>If the parking was to become legal, I expect the situation and associated risks to become worse, and I would have to seriously consider driving my diesel car to Headington Quarry Foundation Stage School instead of cycling with my daughter.</p> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <p><u>Parking Provision Amendments on Windmill Road</u> - I am concerned by the additional residents bays near Windmill School - I have complained about bad driving there in the past, and been told by the police that the prevalence of</p>

CMDE4

	<p>illegal parking near the school makes it impossible to prosecute drivers who have collided with me while driving to drop off children at the school, despite the police agreeing that the driver was not driving safely. I do not expect legalising extra parking there to make it safer for me and my children - quite the reverse.</p>
<p>(10) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - My objections relate primarily to the placement of parking bays nearest junction and corners, which make visibility to cross, especially for children, very difficult. This problem is compounded in areas of 1930s semis by the wide radius corners at junctions which mean that pedestrians have to walk a fair distance into the road to look for oncoming traffic. It will also be made more dangerous by rising numbers of electric cars which will not be heard, as well as not seen due to the obstruction of these parked cars. My strongest objection is to the placement of 2 parking spaces at the top of York Road opposite Windmill School. Parked cars in this location will make it impossible for children to safely cross the road. It's an accident waiting to happen. It makes a mockery of all the good work going on to reduce air pollution, increase children walking to school, and develop a 'school street'. It is dangerous, it creates a hostile environment through design, it shows a total lack of regard or respect for children's capabilities of independence and for parent's ability to easily negotiate their neighbourhood and routine journeys on foot without stress. The only way these parking spaces are acceptable is if they are combined with pavement build outs so that pedestrians can see past the parked cars without stepping into the carriage way.</p> <p>More broadly I object to the addition of any parking spaces. On the east side of Windmill Road in the HE zone there are normally many existing empty bays, especially on York Road along Rock Edge and outside the larger semidetached houses on the east side which all have their own drive but there are also parking bays in front of the houses on the street (26-40 York Road). There is no need for additional spaces to replace those removed on Windmill Road, there are already spaces empty. Designating more street space to the car is contrary to the principle of the county council having declared climate emergency. We need to reclaim street space from cars at every opportunity and reserve it for community space, active travel and green infrastructure.</p>
<p>(11) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - This will seriously affect visibility at the crossing for children and for drivers. This is a tricky corner already at school drop-off and pickup times with many children arriving on foot, on bicycle and on scooters to the school and many drivers doing laps of the surrounding roads looking for temporary parking spaces so</p>

CMDE4

	<p>they can park up and drop off or collect their children. Adding in two permanent parking spaces at this particular junction, so close to the school, will cause chaos and make many of those journeys much more dangerous. Whilst I appreciate this is only for a small amount of time each day and in the school term time, The impact and disruption that this will cause negates the benefit of two parking spots at this particular junction. We need to find spaces further away from the central point of the school.</p>
<p>(12) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - The two new spaces at the top of York Road are too close to the school, and appear to contravene the Highway Code distance rule for parking close to a junction.</p>
<p>(13) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Parking Provision Amendments on Windmill Road</u> - Adding further parking spaces to the surrounding roads and filling up the residential streets with cars is not a solution.</p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - The visibility from Holyoake Road towards St Leonards Road is very limited. Adding an extra parking space at the junction of Holyoake and St Leonards Road will increase chances of road traffic collisions. Every day there are several near misses at that particular junction and the traffic coming down from Holyoake road will not be able to assess for oncoming vehicles on St Leonards Road, without actually being on the opposite lane, if an extra space is added. Adding an extra parking space there will cause accidents.</p>
<p>(14) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Parking Provision Amendments on Windmill Road</u> - The existing parking spaces around half way up on the west side of Windmill Road currently act as a natural traffic calming measure, as they force vehicles travelling towards London Road to slow or stop to allow oncoming traffic to pass They also act as a visual cue to slow down on what is otherwise a long, straight section of road.</p> <p>The issue is not caused by these parking bays, but by people parking illegally further up, near to the shops. This prevents traffic from using the separate left- hand lane to turn west onto London road. I have never seen any parking enforcement here and have had to point out to drivers myself that pulling halfway onto the pavement is not only illegal,</p>

## CMDE4

but holds up the traffic flow, and is dangerous for my two young children who are using the pavement.

Additional Residents Parking - ROCK EDGE: The current situation is that Rock Edge is essentially a set of two blind bends, exiting on the south west end to Windmill Road at a busy junction, just before a bus stop and set of traffic lights at the crossing with Old Road.

I live on the west side, between the two blind bends. At present, I have off- road linear driveway parking for up to three cars. There are three existing parking spaces on the east side, opposite my home. The proposals show an additional parking space added to either end of these existing parking space. The proposed additional space to the north would be immediately opposite my driveway. This would in all likelihood make it impossible for me to exit my driveway to turn right (south) and would create a danger, as it would increase the time needed to manoeuvre in and out.

Vehicles travelling southwards (towards the Windmill Road junction) would also be forced to swing out earlier onto the opposite side of the road as they come around the bend, in order to avoid any vehicle parked in the additional bay to their nearside. This would be precisely where I would be manoeuvring out of my drive. There is also restricted view across the bend due to the trees on the nature reserve.

My neighbour at number 5 has one of the existing bays immediately opposite his driveway, and reports that when a vehicle is parked in the bay he is unable to enter or exit his driveway without executing a three point turn, which is clearly hazardous between two bends.

The additional space to the south of the existing three spaces would also create a danger. As the situation stands, vehicles driving past those bays southwards are forced to use the opposite side of the road to get past them. This additional space would extend the distance they are forced to use the opposite carriageway towards the next bend, before being able to return to the correct side of the road.

This is particularly hazardous when taken in conjunction with the proposed additional two spaces on the south side of Rock Edge, as these will also force cars travelling in the opposite direction (northwards) onto the opposite carriageway, as they too head towards the blind bend.

Essentially, these proposed parking spaces will combine to force vehicles travelling towards each other on to the same section of road, which happens to be a blind bend. Vehicle travelling towards the junction with Windmill Road will also be travelling on the incorrect side of the road, further reducing visibility across the bend.

The four existing bays to the south side of Rock Edge at the Windmill Road junction are regularly used. At busy times,

CMDE4

	<p>traffic queues from Rock Edge towards Windmill Road, and is forced to use the opposite side of the road with the bays to their nearside as they wait to turn left or right onto Windmill Road. Traffic turning into Rock Edge from Windmill Road is unable to do so when vehicles are occupying the section of road they are attempting to turn into. At present this is not too much of an issue, as drivers approaching the junction towards Windmill Road from Rock Edge are able to queue behind the existing bays, allowing oncoming traffic to pass. Extending the existing bays towards the blind bend will reduce visibility and space to queue, and will therefore block the junction, and cause drivers to reverse back into Rock Edge, again towards the blind bend.</p> <p>Clearly at some point in the past, an assessment has been undertaken regarding the viability of providing parking spaces in Rock Edge, taking into account the two blind bends; residents' access to their driveways, and the busy junction with Windmill Road. The proposed additional bays appear to be an attempt to shoe horn additional capacity into the sideroads around Windmill Road, at the expense of the above considerations, and creating significant risks to residents and road users, and the likelihood of increased congestion as the junction with Windmill Road becomes blocked at busy times.</p> <p>YORK ROAD: The proposed two additional parking spaces at the junction of York Road and Margaret Road are immediately adjacent to the main pedestrian crossing for Windmill Primary school where one of my children attends, and will block the view of traffic turning into York Road. This will be particularly hazardous, given the number of children crossing York Road to use the pedestrian crossing when going to and coming from school.</p>
<p>(15) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Parking Provision Amendments on Windmill Road</u> – Parking bays in Windmill Road are not the main problem. Traffic currently negotiates these steadily and with minor delays: they keep the speed of vehicles down and ensure caution. The real problem is at the north end of Windmill Road, towards the shops, where illegal parking of delivery and private vehicles creates traffic jams. This is particularly true of access to the left-hand feeder-lane, which is often hampered by illegal parking. It is at this section, especially at peak times, that traffic comes to a complete stop - both ways.</p> <p>Removing all the parking bays to the south of this point will not solve the current traffic chaos approaching the junction with London Road. It will certainly allow traffic to move faster but be less safe and simply create faster tail-backs when it meets illegally parked vehicles at the approach to the junction-lights.</p> <p>By re-siting parking bays in the surrounding local roads, this plan avoids dealing with the real problems of illegal parking and risks creating further chaos in narrow side-roads.</p>

CMDE4

	<p>Instead of taking parking bays away, the plan should consider accommodating delivery vehicles at the north of Windmill Road. At present, both pavements, east and west, are broader than average: it may be possible to create 'pull-ins' for delivery vehicles, taking some pavement space.</p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - The plans propose an additional 2 bays, sited opposite and between Nos. 1 and 2 Rock Edge. The existing parking spaces are in regular use.</p> <p>Already, on a regular, (and illegal), basis, cars park in the position of the proposed new bays. This causes problems both for myself, (living at No. 1), and for my neighbour, (at No.2), as we cannot enter or exit our drives without slow and difficult manoeuvres to avoid damaging those parked cars. Often we have to park in bays on the road, if we cannot access our drives: a farcical waste of space.</p> <p>Previous plans for parking must have considered the positions now chosen for bays, but rejected them - presumably in the interests of safety. How have the safety considerations now changed?</p> <p>To site 3 new bays, all on the same side of the road, near bends, and forcing traffic into the on-coming lane, seems foolhardy and dangerous.</p>
<p>(16) Local Business, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objection:</b></p> <p><u>Parking Provision Amendments on Windmill Road</u> – I am deeply concerned about losing the parking spaces and the permit holders' space in front of my property. I have owned shop on Windmill Road since 1990. Due to previous parking restrictions implemented by the council the successful garden centre “S. West &amp; Sons” (at No 74) closed down, and I am now fearing my business will be seriously affected with an imminent closure, a very strong possibility if the proposed changes go ahead. A large proportion of our stock and heavy/bulky items which our customers need to collect in vehicles, whereas by removing parking facilities are business will be destroyed. I would like the council to investigate the opportunity to review the parking possibilities of either allowing a reduced loading and unloading and/or to provide spaces in the entrance way of Langley Close which is directly opposite the shop and has parking bays only for permit holders, which could easily be changed for loading/unloading and permit holders.</p> <p>I would like to mention Windmill Road is a relatively uncongested road, where traffic moves freely in both directions, however on the occasions when there are queues the problems are caused by traffic congestion on London Road and Old Road. The focus should be on Old Road as a designated cycle track from Windmill Road junction and will help the totally congested route for all commuters. If the council is so adamant in having the main roads clear, I would also</p>

CMDE4

	<p>like to comment on the hideous bus stop opposite Cinnaminta Road which brings traffic to a complete standstill on a daily basis.</p>
<p>(17) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <p><u>Parking Provision Amendments on Windmill Road</u> – The objectives are clear that safety and traffic flow are the main driving reason for spending a lot of money. I think removing parking bays along Windmill road will not serve either purpose for the following reasons....</p> <p>At either end of Windmill road are already congested traffic light controlled cross roads. Smooth flow along Windmill road unslowed by parked cars will only serve to allow people to sit at either end of the road in longer traffic jams polluting the air quality and therefore affecting safety and reduce traffic flow not aiding it.</p> <p>At night Windmill road already is a danger with cars gunning it down to hit the green lights. With no cars to make them slow down this will get worse. It is a long straight road and will need effective traffic speed measures in place before removing parking bays.</p> <p>These plans cost money at a time of cuts to essential services. Theses plans will not achieve the objectives and do nothing to address the main issues there are with traffic in headington - the hospitals. Let's get imaginative to ensure staff, patients and residents get a better deal. Free bus travel during peak times for all staff and patients - on the pick me up if necessary for the elderly or less mobile.</p>
<p>(18) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objection:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> - specifically those that relate to the changes to the parking bays to be added in Rock Edge. My primary reason for objection relates to safety of road users on Rock Edge.</p> <p>For cars approaching from east to west entering Rock Edge. By adding another parking space you are creating a condition whereby cars driving from east to west will be in direct collision with cars driving from west to east. This is because cars driving from east to west will be forced to drive on the right hand side of the road to avoid the cars in the parking bays.</p> <p>Looking east to west, you can see that the driver of a car following the blue path will not be able to see any car driving</p>

CMDE4

	<p>along the green path until they almost meet at the point marked in a red X. This is an incredibly dangerous situation to create and by adding this extra space, the driver following the green path has far less time to pull to the left hand side of the road.</p> <p>In addition to the safety issues I have described above, with the addition of the 2 parking bays cars will have less space to queue if they would like to turn onto Windmill Road. The existing parking bays are regularly used but drivers have reasonably adequate visibility and can wait behind the existing parking bays if necessary. By adding the additional two spaces, a conflicting zone will mean that cars following the orange path are forced to reverse backwards to allow room for cars entering from Windmill Road. This in itself is a safety hazard but will exasperate the issues I have already highlighted above as they will be reversing towards a blind bend.</p> <p>As I hope you can understand from my descriptions above, adding the new parking bays on Rock Edge will significantly increase the risk of accident for road users on Rock Edge and this is the reason for my objection</p>
<p>(19) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objection:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> – I would like to object to the proposed additional parking space on St Leonards Road, near the bottom of Holyoake Road. Whilst additional spaces are welcome, this one is too close to the junction with Holyoake Road. The current parking at that location means that cars in one direction have to cede priority. Cars turning left out of Holyoake Road onto St Leonards will not have enough space to complete the turn and to straighten up prior to the parking space to then check if the road is clear.</p> <p>When cars have illegally parked in the area for the new proposed parking space, we have noticed there are more car horns sounded and screeching of brakes.</p>
<p>(20) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objection:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> – One of our children is a pupil at Windmill Primary School on Margaret Road. The school already has a problem with parents/carers parking dangerously around the corner of Margaret Road and York Road to drop off/collect children. Adding parking spaces at the top of York Road will make this a dangerous bottleneck with limited visibility for drivers and cyclists coming from different directions, and for pedestrians using the zebra crossing outside the school (close to the junction), unsure if road users have seen them in time as they turn the corner.</p>

CMDE4

	<p>The proposed parking place directly opposite the junction with Mark Road is equally dangerous, as it would force York Road users into the middle of the road to pass the parked vehicle, just when traffic might be approaching along Mark Road. It would become more dangerous for road users coming out of Mark Road, and for pedestrians walking along York Road and crossing the end of Mark Road. It's a busy route for the school run and Year 5/6 children walking on their own might struggle to see and be seen. It's usually illegal to park opposite a junction so we are amazed that this space is being proposed.</p> <p>The additional parking along Rock Edge would also make it more difficult and dangerous to navigate as a road user, and could increase the chance of collisions. We are disappointed that the proposals to benefit traffic flow on Windmill Road could result in creating dangerous road layouts in residential side roads.</p>
<p>(21) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objection:</b></p> <p><u>Additional Residents Parking</u> – The objection specifically regards the proposed additional parking spaces on York Road.</p> <p>The plans outlined on Sheet 6 (online) do not show existing double yellow lines or parking restrictions in this area, although the key indicates they should be on the plan. This is of considerable importance as this junction is opposite the main entrance to Windmill Primary School, the largest primary school in Oxfordshire. No indication is given of: 1) double yellow lines on both sides of York Road on the approach to the junction; 2) yellow zig-zag lines on Margaret Road outside the school; 3) white zig-zag lines on the approach to the zebra crossing which crosses Margaret Road opposite the main school entrance close to the junction with York Road.</p> <p>During school opening and closing times, this area is extremely busy with both pedestrian and vehicle activity and becomes congested with traffic. The mouth of York Road facing the school is a crossing place for some parents and pupils approaching the zebra crossing from the south-west direction (walking along the west side of York Road and the south side of Margaret Road). Note that the school offers a wide range of extra-curricular activities, which means that some pupils may be entering the school from 8am and not leaving until after 4pm.</p> <p>Placing four parking spaces 8 metres from this junction on a section of York Road that currently has double yellow lines on both sides will reduce driver visibility on the approach to this junction close to where children will be entering or leaving the school or crossing the road. Presumably, the parking restrictions here are primarily to safeguard children near the school and retaining them would therefore be extremely sensible.</p>

CMDE4

	<p>There are issues with inappropriate parking by some parents and carers close to the junction on double yellow lines during school times. The school team with help from the police (PCs/PCSOs) have invested a great deal of effort to try to reinforce appropriate parking in this area to keep it as safe for the children as possible, encouraging parents and carers not to park close to the school or junction during busy periods. Removing the double yellow lines and placing parking bays close to this junction may encourage further inappropriate parking, reducing visibility and potentially the safety of children.</p> <p>As a parent of a pupil at Windmill School who crosses York Road close to the junction to reach the zebra crossing, I am concerned that siting parking places on the west and east sides of York Road 8 metres from the junction with Margaret Road is potentially unsafe, as parked cars in this location will reduce driver visibility. I believe the parking restrictions on this section of York Road should be retained for reasons of pedestrian safety.</p>
<p>Proposed Traffic &amp; Safety Improvements</p>	
<p>(22) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Side Road Entry Treatments</u> - There seems to be no consideration about residents living in the side roads and how we get onto Headley Way. The addition of the humps will make access even more difficult. We are currently marooned in our homes during rush hours and can only reasonably use cars between 10 am and 2.45 pm. Quite frankly all the roadworks with resultant disruption have not improved conditions for local residents and the humps will only make things worse.</p>
<p>(23) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Advisory On-road Cycle Lanes</u> - Segregated cycle lanes would be preferable as motorists use advisory lanes for parking.</p> <p><b>Concerns:</b></p> <p><u>Shared-Use Pedestrian &amp; Cycle Lanes</u> - There should be segregation between pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

<p>(24) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Changes to Crossing Facilities</u> - We wish to raise a few points in opposition to the proposed installation of a combined pedestrian-cyclist 'zebra crossing' close to the junction of Gathorne Road and Windmill Road as part of the next phase of Access to Headington. These points relate to the necessity for such a crossing, the type of crossing chosen and the resulting impact, and the exact position of such a crossing if it were to be built.</p> <p>The necessity: We are unclear as to the purpose of the crossing, most specifically the 'cyclist' element. As the proposed cycle routes along Windmill Road are on-road and are 'one-way', we are unclear which cyclists would wish to use it. Those approaching Windmill Road along Gathorne Road are few in number: those who turn left can join the cycle route without crossing the road; those turning right are highly unlikely to dismount, push their cycle along the pavement to the crossing, remount, and cycle across. They are more likely to turn right from the road junction without using the crossing, or if they require a crossing they could continue up St Anne's Road (rather than turning down Gathorne Road), turn down Margaret Road, and use the existing pedestrian crossing at that junction. There is of course the possibility that those turning right from Gathorne Road would illegally cycle along the pavement to use the proposed crossing, putting pedestrians at risk. The installation of this crossing may be seen by some to condone, or even encourage, this illegal behaviour. Those already cycling North on Windmill Road will have almost no necessity to cross the road at this point. This leaves those cycling south on Windmill Road. We recognise that some will wish to enter the hospital, however they are not permitted to cycle on the pavement and then through the pedestrian entrance to the south of the Gathorne Road junction. Despite the existing signage to this effect, many still do. We are concerned that installing a 'cyclists crossing' at this point will encourage and condone this behaviour. If improved cyclist access to the hospital site is required, then improvements should instead be made to the road junction to the site, to enable cyclists to move from the cycle lane at that point, and not 100m up the road where many will see cycling on the pavement as a valid option.</p> <p>The type of crossing We do not believe that a 'zebra crossing' is the right type of crossing to be installed. It is widely recognised that those living close to roadways can be affected by lower air quality caused by cars idling outside their homes, and the environmental impact of cars slowing and accelerating, rather than driving smoothly, is known. We therefore don't believe that a crossing which forces cars to slow, or stop, and then accelerate again, is the correct approach. We believe that a central island, enabling the pedestrian to cross the road in two stages, improves the experience for pedestrians without adversely affecting the local environment. In addition to this, there is currently a problem with the speed at which cars travel on Windmill Road late in the</p>
--	---

CMDE4

	<p>evening. We believe the council is already aware of this and is considering reducing the speed limit - though without enforcement this will have little affect as the 'speedsters' already disregard the speed limit, so changing it will have little effect on their attitude. An unused zebra crossing will not slow them down, but we believe a central island may make them drive with a greater degree of caution and therefore achieve an additional benefit.</p> <p>We would also be concerned that cyclists would not use the crossing safely. Whilst some will be cautious, others may think it is their right to swing across the road without waiting and would expect the motorists to stop. If an island were in place it would be clear that cyclists should dismount and act like pedestrians - this is possibly a slower method, but is certainly safer for all.</p> <p>The location of the crossing (assuming the zebra crossing rather than our proposed 'island' crossing)  The proposed location of the crossing is currently directly outside the entrance gate to number 143 Windmill Road. We believe it is misplaced for two reasons.</p> <p>Firstly, its positioning will have a significant impact on number 143: the 'Belisha beacon' and pedestrians waiting to cross may affect access/egress from their gate; it will spoil the outlook from their property; the kerb is not currently lowered, requiring greater cost/effort to install it.</p> <p>Secondly, it is too close to the junction. Whilst we understand it needs to be sufficiently close to be useful to those using Gathorne Road, its current location increases the risk of accidents when cars turn right quickly from Gathorne Road and then do not stop in time as someone uses the crossing, or another road user stops quickly in front of them. Our proposed solution - assuming the zebra crossing is installed - would be to position it between 139 and 141 Windmill Road. There is a gap between these houses, so has far less of a detrimental effect to the residents of those properties than it would to those in 143 if positioned where proposed; the kerb is already lowered at that point, making installation easier; it is slightly further from the junction, reducing the risk of accidents, without significantly affecting the benefit it offers to pedestrians.</p> <p>To summarise:  The proposed crossing type does not provide solutions to existing problems, and if anything creates further issues; A different crossing type - a central island - provides improved mobility for pedestrians and dismounted cyclists, but does so in an environmentally responsible way. It may also act as a traffic calming measure;  If the zebra crossing is installed, it would be far better situated in the gap between 139 and 141 Windmill Road, rather than directly in front of the gate to 143 as currently proposed."</p>
<p>(25) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Objections:</b></p> <p><u>Side Road Entry Treatments</u> – I understand that where pedestrians are already on the flat top humps, all road users</p>

CMDE4

	<p>should wait for them to continue to cross the road. However, many pedestrians do not even stop to look left/right to check whether it is safe to cross the road, continuing to cross oblivious to their own safety. I believe 'look left/look right' markings should also be at these sites. What is the actual thinking behind the flat top humps?</p> <p><u>Shared-Use Pedestrian &amp; Cycle Lanes</u> - A considerable amount of money has already been spent on this type of cycle lane and time and time again, cyclists remain on the road instead of moving to the cycle lane. If these lanes are to be put in place, it should be compulsory for cyclists to use them.</p> <p>This type of area needs to be thought through more logically as you often see these areas set up more for cyclists than pedestrians who often have to share their half with overgrown bushes.</p>
<p>General Comments</p>	
<p>(26) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Object</b> - with specific regard to Windmill Road on the following grounds:</p> <p>Windmill Road is a narrow, residential street. This proposal completely fails to respect the needs of the residents. The County Council is thus failing in its basic duty of care to those of its 600000+ residents, many of whom live in and around Windmill Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disabled provision: There is no provision for disabled parking spaces, nor are there any reasonable parking allowances for emergency or our health visitors.</li> <li>• Reduction in parking spaces:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The extending of double yellow lines to the single yellow area opposite 87 Windmill Road will exacerbate the problem of off-peak parking.</li> <li>○ Loss of 5 parking bays: In the detailed plans for removal and 'replacement' visitor and/or permit parking spaces in the area, on 'Windmill road Plan 1' there are shown the removal of 8 bays to be 'replaced' by what seems to be 3 additional bays. However, in practice it is only 2 additional bays - out of sight - in Norton Road. An extra bay in Gardner Road is not accessible directly from Windmill Road, because bollards block the way from Bateman Street. It is therefore useless to Windmill Road residents.</li> <li>○ The removal of parking spaces outside Richard Ford's shop will result in vehicles parked illegally for loading/unloading</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Increased traffic miles: The resulting effect would mean increased traffic as drivers drive round the area</li> </ul>

CMDE4

	<p>searching for a space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of green spaces/Front gardens lost: The remaining front garden spaces in Windmill Road will be under increased pressure to pave over for cars – as many others have already done; many illegally, thus increasing run-off and flooding</li> <li>• Increased speeding: There is no evening parking envisaged for the spaces at Ford's thus opening Windmill Road to becoming a race track in the evening.</li> </ul>
<p>(27) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p><b>Object</b> - I am writing to suggest that the council should take this opportunity to reassess the distribution of residents parking spaces at the southern end of Windmill Road. There has been no review of the distribution of these spaces since the scheme was first instigated and both circumstances on the ground and some regulations have changed. Given that the cost of A2H has risen steeply, it might make sense to undertake a rigorous survey of the provision now, rather than having to alter things later when flaws in the new proposals become obvious as it is put into practice. It is also important to reflect on the provision of multiple residents parking permits to H.M.O.s. There are demographic changes taking place in the whole area concerning the balance between student accommodation and renting of properties by young professionals. This in turn has a direct bearing on the need for and number of parking spaces. I also have strong reservations about the proposal to raise the footway at the end of Gathorne Road. This is based on the same design that has been implemented at the junction of St Margaret's Road and Wharton Road. However carefully and slowly this junction is driven through it causes extreme discomfort, throwing driver and passengers from side to side, particularly painfully for anyone with back problems. In addition the lack of a drop kerb at the junction suggests to pedestrians that the footpath is continuous and that they have right of way, rather than vehicles on the road as is the case in law. This confusion could lead to potential accidents as vehicles stop and start whilst trying to turn off a busy Windmill Road.</p> <p>My objection to all of the Windmill Road alterations remains the same as it was when the scheme was first mooted. Namely Windmill Road has a set of traffic lights at either end and these contain all the traffic within it and so there will be no speeding or easing of access to Headington as the traffic flow is bottled within a fixed distance..</p>