

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 23 March 2023 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 12.25 pm

Present:

Voting Members: – in the Chair

Councillor Andrew Gant

54/22 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

(Agenda No. 1)

There were none.

55/22 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

There were no questions from County Councillors.

56/22 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

The following speakers addressed the meeting:

(All speakers on all the items have 3 minutes except for County Councillors representing the relevant division who have 5 minutes).

Item	Speakers
5. Witney Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cllr Dan Levy (5 mins, MS Teams)
6. Wantage – Market Place West – proposed permanent amendment to vehicle access and parking places	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bill Falkenau – Clerk, Wantage Town Council (3 mins, in person)• Cllr Jenny Hannaby (5 mins, in person)
General comments in support of 20mph speed limits in Oxfordshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Danny Yee – Oxfordshire Liveable Streets (3 mins, in person)
15. Uffington: proposed 20mph speed limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mike Tustin (3 mins, MS Teams)• Benjamin Rule (written statement)• Carineh Shahbazian (written statement)
18. West Hanney: proposed 20mph speed limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cllr Sally Povolotsky (5 mins, MS Teams)
19. East Hanney: proposed 20mph speed limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cllr Sally Povolotsky (5 mins, MS Teams)

Statements submitted for 23rd March 2023

57/22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

(Agenda No. 4)

Cllr Andrew Gant approved the minutes of the meeting from 23rd February 2023, subject to the following amendment (*italicised*):

38/23 ABINGDON – PROPOSED 20MPH AND 30MPH SPEED LIMITS

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **DEFERRED** the proposed introduction of 20mph and 30mph speed limits in Abingdon as advertised, *pending further discussions to assess the acceptability of reduced proposals that meet the needs of all parties.*

Cllr Gant explained that the deferrals from the previous meeting on 23rd February 2023 would be considered for decision at the next meeting on 27th April 2023.

58/22 WITNEY LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING PLAN (LCWIP)

(Agenda No. 5)

This report presented the strategic Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) produced for Witney. The LCWIP identified a network of walking and cycling routes in and around Witney (including potential future routes) and set out high level proposals for improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure which made up this network. These infrastructure improvements were intended for development over a ten-year period to 2033 and would help to enable modal shift from private vehicle use to active and sustainable modes of travel. The LCWIP was also well aligned with the County Council's nine priorities as outlined in its Strategic Plan 2022-2025.

The Chair, Cllr Gant – Cabinet Member for Highway Management, invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made.

Cllr Dan Levy spoke in support of the approval of the Witney LCWIP.

Noting that the active travel tranche 3 scheme intended to improve the public realm to make the High Street a more accessible, pleasant environment for people to walk, cycle and spend time, Cllr Levy enquired as to whether any of the policies in the LCWIP could be delivered through that scheme.

The Senior Transport Planner responded that the High Street and Market Square schemes had similar objectives and the pertaining active travel schemes were likely to be within the first of the LCWIP schemes to be delivered.

The Chair welcomed the report and thanked officers, in particular Odele Parsons, Senior Transport Planner, for the work that had gone into this proposal. The Chair felt the plan was extremely thorough and an excellent example of coproduction and constructive local engagement in the design of a scheme. The plan was also clearly aligned to the introduction of 20mph speed limits across Witney.

The Chair was pleased to note the reference to walking and wheeling in the report, reflecting the Council's commitment to making networks accessible for all.

The Chair also welcomed the inclusion of cycle parking in the report.

The Chair noted and addressed responses to the consultation.

A number of respondents took the view that funding for the plan could be better spent on other areas. The Chair's response was that the Council's policy of bringing forward LCWIPs facilitated access to funding opportunities from a variety of sources, including government grants, for schemes that delivered on national priorities such as increased walking and cycling.

The Chair invited officers to address the potential loss of vegetation and green space that may result from implementation of some proposals. Officers explained that the plan would avoid using green space where possible, but as each individual scheme was designed some grass verges may be lost to accommodate widened paths and other infrastructure. The loss of vegetation would be considered as a last resort and weighed against the benefits from increased active travel over motor vehicle use. Each scheme would undergo consultation and a Climate Impact Assessment and opportunities to increase vegetation or plant trees would be sought. Some schemes would also improve and increase access to green space.

In response to some objections received through the consultation, the Chair cited a report published by DfT (2020) which stated that there could be up to a 40% increase in shopping footfall from walking infrastructure improvements. This reflected the Council's belief that an enhanced public realm and cycling and walking infrastructure was better for the local economy.

The Chair highlighted that the policies within the plan were iterative and more could be brought forward as the scheme matured and evolved. Officers reiterated that the consultation highlighted a number of additional schemes and elements which could be considered in future iterations of the LCWIP. There was regular liaison with district and town councils regarding such matters.

The report referenced the potential cycle route between Witney and Eynsham via the A40. The Chair enquired whether consideration was given to a leisure route between Witney and Eynsham. Officers stated that this had not been considered within the Witney LCWIP but as the strategic development area in west Eynsham came forward the route would be covered.

A response from West Oxfordshire District Council and a query from the Creative Community Connector regarding funding for a bridleway between Deer Park Road and Downs Road and Deer Park Road, south of Range Road linking Deer Park Road

and the Bridleway was received. The Chair requested that officers respond and provide clarification regarding funding for these proposals.

The Chair wished to express his gratitude to the Windrush Bike Project and its excellent advocacy for such projects. The Chair asked that officers give due regard to the comments submitted by Windrush.

The Chair noted the response from the Witney Traffic Advisory Committee

Officers confirmed that the consultation responses had been fully considered and incorporated into this version of the LCWIP.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the Witney Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.

59/22 WANTAGE - MARKET PLACE WEST - PROPOSED PERMANENT AMENDMENT TO VEHICLE ACCESS AND PARKING PLACES

(Agenda No. 6)

The report presented responses received to a consultation on an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order which came into effect on 3 January 2022. This Order continued on an experimental basis the provisions of Covid related Temporary Traffic Regulation Order which suspended waiting and parking places at the Western end of Market Place, the southern end of Alfred Street, and the northern end of Church Street in Wantage. The Order also prohibited the use of these parts of the above roads by all vehicles.

The aim of the Wantage Town Council promoted scheme was to provide outdoor seating and facilitate environmental improvement for the benefit of pedestrians, including customers of adjacent businesses. The temporary closure was implemented with planters and barriers.

The Chair invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made.

Bill Falkenau, Clerk of Wantage Town Council delivered his written statement, which was subsequently endorsed by Cllr Jenny Hannaby.

It was noted that 43 objections and 44 concerns were received from members of the public, broadly relating to seven main issues which are highlighted in the report. The Chair stated the importance of officers taking objections into consideration but did agree with their responses to the concerns raised.

Officers assured the meeting that they had worked hard to develop robust proposals for Wantage.

The Chair thanked all consultation respondents.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the permanent prohibition of vehicles and removal of parking places from the western end of the Market Place, continuing to utilise temporary planters and barriers, pending technical approval by the County Council of Wantage Town Council's consultant's permanent scheme design and subsequent construction works.

60/22 WITNEY: THE LEYS PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

(Agenda No. 7)

The report presented the responses received to a statutory consultation on traffic proposals comprising of the introduction of traffic calming features in the form of speed cushions and hump in The Leys, Witney. The proposals were put forward by the Witney Town Council to address anti-social behaviour, particularly in the form of vehicles speed over this short distance.

The Chair noted that this proposal had been promoted by the town council and was an excellent example of input from people with detailed local insight.

The overriding objections to this scheme came from residents of Witney many of whom were not local to the scheme. Their objections were that traffic calming was not necessary and a waste of money. It could be surmised that they did not experience the anti-social behaviour because they did not live close to the Leys.

These concerns, along with the 59% of objections raised, were taken back to Witney Town Council which subsequently undertook a second informal consultation. Responses were taken to the Town Council's Parks and Recreation Committee with 67.5% of respondents in favour of traffic calming. The responses and comments from Witney Town Council and the Witney Traffic Advisory Committee further supported the introduction of the traffic calming measures.

The Chair commented that this was an extremely comprehensive and detailed report.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed traffic calming features as advertised.

61/22 CHARLBURY - B4022 THE SLADE PROPOSED ZEBRA CROSSING AND B4026 SPELSBURY ROAD PROPOSED EXTENSION OF 30MPH SPEED LIMIT

(Agenda No. 8)

The report presented responses received to a statutory consultation on traffic proposals comprising an extension of the existing 30mph speed limit on the B4026 Pound Hill/Charlbury Road northwards to beyond the access to the camping and caravan site, replacing the existing 40mph speed limit in the process. This aspect superseded the proposed extended limit, which was previously consulted on in May 2022, and sought to improve road safety for vulnerable road-users, specifically the

pedestrians walking to and from the camp site, bringing forward changes suggested over some years by local residents in the town. Additionally, a zebra crossing was also proposed for The Slade, which sought to improve road safety by assisting vulnerable pedestrians cross the carriageway in the vicinity of the Charlbury Primary School.

The Chair noted and addressed responses to the consultation.

Thames Valley Police felt that changes to the highway, for example through narrowing and providing vertical traffic calming or realigning the road, may be required to encourage lower speeds in addition to any change in the speed limit. The Cabinet Member queried whether those suggestions had been considered by officers to which the reply was affirmative.

The objections received stated that the proposed changes were unnecessary – citing a lack of need, potential impacts on journey times, the low number of accidents in the area, and the increase presence of road signage.

The Chair strongly believed in the 20mph policy improving road safety for residents. The proposal was aimed to make the roads safer, encourage residents and visitors to the nearby campsite to, to walk or cycle, and reduce noise pollution.

The zebra crossing would facilitate safer crossing for young pedestrians attending the local school and vulnerable road users and signing and other measures would be sympathetically applied.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** as advertised the following proposals:

- a) The extension of the existing 30mph speed limit on the B4026 Pound Hill/Charlbury Road northwards to beyond the access to the Camping & Caravan site, and
- b) a zebra crossing (a crossing for pedestrian use only) on The Slade, in the vicinity of the Charlbury Primary School.

62/22 SUTTON COURTENAY - B4016 DRAYTON ROAD - PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES AND EXTENSION OF 30MPH SPEED LIMIT

(Agenda No. 9)

The report presented responses to a consultation on a proposal to extend the existing 30mph speed limit and introduce a new traffic calming measure on B4016 Drayton Road, Sutton Courtenay.

The aim of the proposed schemes was to address the concerns raised by Sutton Courtenay Parish Council on the speed of vehicles entering and travelling through the village. The proposal comprised of an extension of the existing 30mph speed limit, and new chicane at approximately 20 metres and 40 metres west of the access to No.9 Drayton Road.

The Chair commented that this was a straight forward scheme and a good example of effective engagement with locally elected representatives.

The Chair highlighted the consultation response from Stagecoach Bus Company which raised its concern that the proposed distance between the chicanes would make navigation through the features a struggle for larger vehicles such as buses.

Officers explained that the traffic calming measures were trialled on-site with a temporary chicane at the proposed location. Video evidence raised no issues regarding large vehicles navigating through the proposed chicanes with the proposed dimensions and distances.

The Chair thanked respondent seven for their detailed response to the consultation and noted that they, a local resident, had undertaken detailed local analysis which found improvements in speed and safety and noise pollution. Overall, the consultation responses had provided detailed, local insight.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** as advertised the following:

- a) The extension of the existing 30mph speed limit on the B4016 Drayton Road, Sutton Courtenay westwards by approximately 70 metres, and
- b) a new kerbed traffic calming chicane on the B4016 Drayton Road (with buildouts) to be located approximately 20 metres & 40 metres west of the access to No. 9 Drayton Road.

63/22 BUCKLAND - BUCKLAND ROAD AT BUCKLAND MARSH - PROPOSED 40MPH SPEED LIMIT

(Agenda No. 10)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on a proposal to introduce a 40mph speed limit at Buckland Marsh. The restriction was requested by the County Councillor and Parish Council.

The Cabinet Member felt that this proposal was a good example of a non-residential road with not many active frontages meeting the criteria for a 40mph schemes.

The Cabinet Member addressed the four responses to the consultation.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed introduction of a 40mph speed limit at Buckland Marsh as advertised.

Meeting adjourned for 7 minutes.

64/22 BENSON: PROPOSED 20MPH AND 50MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 11)

Prior to the consideration of Benson: proposed 20mph and 50mph speed limits, the Chair invited Danny Yee (Oxfordshire liveable Streets), to address the meeting. His contribution did not pertain to a specific item rather it was a general statement in support of 20mph speed limits across Oxfordshire.

The Chair thanked Danny Yee for his contribution and gave assurance that other schemes (as per the submission) were actively under consideration albeit timings and budgets were both complicating factors and impacted by other factors. The Chair stated that the Council was committed to delivering the 20mph policy across the county.

The Chair reminded the meeting that the Council was grateful to its bus company partners for their continued engagement. Bus companies were clear where they saw reduction in speed limits impacting their service and reliability, and the Council, as the highways authority, had the job of delivering both priorities (road safety and bus services) to improve both active travel and public transport.

The Benson: proposed 20mph and 50mph speed limits report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph and 50mph speed limits in Benson.

The Chair addressed the responses received to the consultation.

Bus companies raised concerns rather than objections. The Chair highlighted the comment from Stagecoach regarding Edge Road and requested that officers take this into consideration

Officers explained that the centre of Benson, where the bus company's main reservations lay, was paradoxically where implementation of the 20mph speed limit was most important. Achieving 30mph through the site was unlikely at most times anyway due to speeds being compromised by traffic, thus officers believed that the concerns raised did not justify amending the proposals.

A number of respondents queried why the village of Preston Crowmarsh was not included in the proposals. Officers had omitted the village in error and a 20mph limit scheme would be promoted over the coming few months.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the following proposals as advertised:

- a) New 20mph speed limit throughout Benson, replacing the majority of the existing 30mph speed limit, and
- b) a new 50mph speed limit will on the westerly unnamed road to Rokemarsh, from its junction with the B4009 The Sands northwards for a distance of 195 metres.

65/22 CHARLBURY: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 12)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Charlbury.

The Chair noted and addressed responses received to the consultation.

Whilst there was overwhelming support for the extension of the 20mph on the Woodstock Road, a number of respondents believed that the steep gradient on the Slade dip would create problems with a 20mph limit.

Officers acknowledged these as being reasonable concerns but felt that, on balance, the proposals as published offered the best solutions. They would monitor and review how the proposals worked in practice.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

66/22 NORTH ASTON: PROPOSED 20MPH AND 50MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 13)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in North Aston, and a new 50mph speed limit on the A4260 Oxford Road between Deddington and North Aston.

Officers confirmed that 50 mph proposals would be funded separately from the Council's Accessibility Road Safety Fund.

Officers would continue to review speeds within this area in light of the consultation response received from North Aston Parish, which supported the 20mph limit as suggested but wished for a 40mph limit from the Duns Tew Crossroads and into North Aston. The Chair encouraged the Parish Council to keep in touch with officers regarding the proposal

The Chair concluded that the responses showed clear support for both the 20mph and 50mph speed limit proposals. The strong call for a lower limit on the connecting road from the A4260 was a predominately rural area without any specific mitigating factors to support a lower speed limit but would be kept under review by officers. The Chair encouraged locals to engage with the Council regarding how the proposals performed in practice.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed introduction of 20mph and 50mph speed limits in North Aston as advertised

67/22 SYDENHAM: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 14)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Sydenham.

The Chair noted that the Parish Council was in full support of the proposals. One concern and one objection were received, namely the enforceability of the proposals and undue sign clutter, respectively. Officers confirmed that signage would be replaced like for like.

The Chair felt that the scheme would improve road safety and encourage greater use of active travel by reducing speeds.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

68/22 UFFINGTON: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 15)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Uffington.

The Chair invited the speaker to address the meeting and then addressed points made in the written submissions received.

The Chair thanked the speaker for his considered contribution. In response, the Chair stated that the Council's 20mph policy was about enhancing road safety and believed that driving through a small village at 20mph was safe and would enable traffic to flow properly. The Chair agreed that ongoing discussion regarding the interface between 20mph limits and public transport was vital and the Council was dedicating time and effort into working with its partners on such proposals. The Council's ambition of reducing car journeys was ambitious but vital nonetheless due to the number of car journeys surpassing the capacity of road networks.

Officers confirmed that they were working with bus companies and freight providers and discussing reprofiling of local businesses' delivery schedules with Better Business. The scheme would be monitored and kept under review to ensure that the system worked for everyone.

The Cabinet Member felt that the scheme would improve road safety and encourage greater use of active travel by reducing speeds. Officers reiterated that objections and concerns raised had been considered and all schemes would be monitored and kept under review.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

69/22 WATLINGTON: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT

(Agenda No. 16)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Watlington, including Christmas Common.

The Cabinet Member address the consultation responses and invited officers to remark on some of the objections received.

Harmans Way would form part of Watlington Edge Road and was designed at 30mph to encourage use of the bypass for through traffic which made up a high percentage of the flow. The Chair welcomed proposals that would liberate historic market squares from through-traffic.

The Chair highlighted the concerns raised from the Local Councillor and local residents and welcomed their detailed responses. Officers reassured the meeting that any implemented proposals would be kept under review.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits, but with the amendments in Britwell Road as outlined in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the report.

70/22 WEST CHALLOW: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 17)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in West Challow.

The Chair noted and addressed the responses to the consultation.

Five online responses were received from members of the public, with three in support and two voicing objections. Both objections centred around the principle of the 20mph initiative with claims it is ineffective and undemocratic.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

71/22 WEST HANNEY: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 18)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in West Hanney.

The Chair invited Cllr Povolotsky to address the meeting.

Five online responses were received from members of the public with three in support, and two raising objections. Both objections centred around the principle of the 20mph initiative with claims it was ineffective and undemocratic.

The Chair reminded the meeting that these schemes formed part of a countywide programme of works that sought to improve road safety and encourage use of active travel. The objections received challenged the philosophy being the democratically agreed policy to promote 20mph speed limits in communities.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

72/22 EAST HANNEY: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 19)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in East Hanney.

The Chair invited Cllr Povolotsky to address the meeting.

The Chair shared Cllr Povolotsky's concern regarding parents parking outside the school in the area instead of using the village hall carpark which was made available to them. This issue was raised in a response to the consultation in which safety during school drop off was described as "terrible".

The Chair agreed that ongoing discussions with Speedwatch and bus companies was key.

The Chair addressed respondent six, a local resident, reiterating his commitment to Vision Zero.

The objection and concerns raised by bus companies reflected their view that reduced speed limits compromise service viability and may lead to modal shift away from buses. Officers felt that there were no immediate threats to services but recent discussions with Oxford Bus Company regarding proposals for reduced limits in Abingdon suggested their concerns over the A338 proposals should be considered seriously. The Chair thanked bus companies for their responses.

The Chair reassured the meeting that the interface between the 20mph policy and the objectives and priorities of bus companies were very carefully considered. The Chair approved of officers' judgements with regard to this scheme and felt that the proposals were appropriate and workable. Partners were encouraged to keep in touch regarding how the scheme performed in practice.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposals as advertised.

73/22 WOODCOTE: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 20)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Woodcote.

The Chair noted that Thames Travel Bus Company objected to the introduction of 20mph speed limits on the B471 Oxford Road and on the Reading Road from the east of the village to its junction with Greenmore, citing the lack of active frontages on these sections. The bus company was concerned that this would encourage or lead to frequent and planned mixing between vulnerable road users and motorised traffic and that maintaining the 30mph limit would provide a buffer between the national speed limit and the 20mph limit.

Given its rural location just off the A4074 and the distances involved on the Oxford – Wallingford – Woodcote – Reading corridor, Thames Travel Bus Company believed it unlikely that cycling and walking would constitute significant mode share for journeys on this corridor. Thus, the Council should be seeking to maximise support for public transport on this corridor to help achieve decarbonisation aims.

The Chair felt that the bus company’s submission warranted further consideration and wished to defer decision on this item ideally to the 27 April 2023 meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management agreed to **DEFER** a decision on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits so that officers could conduct further conversations and engagement with bus companies.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

23 MARCH 2023

SPEAKERS

WRITTEN STATEMENTS RECEIVED

ITEM 5 – WITNEY LCWIP

Cllr Dan Levy

I am speaking as the County Council Active Travel Champion, and as someone who spends a lot of time in Witney, and who represents a division where residents look equally to Witney and to the city.

I am pleased to support the adoption of the Witney LCWIP. It is a thorough piece of work. The officers of this council and WODC, and the individuals and organizations which have contributed all deserve our sincere thanks.

The LCWIP sets out locations where improvements to infrastructure are required to remove barriers and increase the attractiveness of walking and cycling to residents and visitors to Witney. Some of these barriers should never have been built in the first place, and could have been removed in previous rounds of infrastructure building, but that does not diminish the importance of making things better when we can. The suggested improvements are thorough and evidenced and necessary.

The ambition is to make walking and cycling the preferred methodology for short journeys, and to double cycling trips by 2031. That is ambitious, and entirely the right objective. We can particularly note that the two senior schools in Witney should be aiming to have the sort of cycling levels we see at Lord Harry's in Abingdon or even Cherwell in North Oxford. Witney has really good stretches of bike facility already. Much of this, like the route from Cogges to the town centre which I often use coming in from Eynsham, is completely traffic free. Witney is compact and flat, and the LCWIP outlines plans to get round the one significant hill. Unfortunately the existing good bits tend to end in road junctions that are at best inconvenient and at worst dangerous or barely passable.

This LCWIP identifies those bottlenecks, and prepares the groundwork for when money becomes available to fix them. It is a key step in fixing the problems.

Combined with our ambitious strategic active travel network which will link Witney to outlying towns and villages and to Oxford, and with the commendable whole town 20 mph safety measures and the opening of the High Street to walkers and cyclists with most cars directed to the huge free carparks nearby, I am confident that a thriving Witney will be a beacon of active travel in future years and part of an active Oxfordshire.

ITEM 6 – Wantage – Market Place West – proposed permanent amendment to vehicle access and parking places

Bill Falkenau – Clerk, Wantage Town Council

Good morning. I am Bill Falkenau, Clerk to Wantage Town Council. Thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of the permanent prohibition of vehicles and removal of parking places from the western end of the Wantage Market Place.

The Town Council's ambition to pedestrianise this area goes back to July 2018. A number of events in the Market Place had demonstrated that the ambience in this area could be significantly improved by closing it off. Dialogue regarding what would be involved to introduce a permanent closure commenced in early 2019. The prospect of conducting short trials to test feasibility were contemplated. The elections in May 2019 changed the makeup of the Town Council but it remained committed to pursuing the change. There were a couple of Sunday afternoon events held in the area in the latter part of 2019. The pandemic outbreak in March 2020 prompted the need for social distancing and it was apparent that the closure of the area provided an appropriate route for pedestrians to pass through, maintaining a suitable distance apart. This prompted an 18 month temporary closure from 4 July 2020.

Later in the pandemic, when the public were being encouraged to only gather outdoors, the area accommodated al fresco hospitality. The County Council, being aware of, and supportive of the Town Council's long-term ambitions, agreed to extend the closure period for a further 18 month period from January 2022 under an experimental order. During the closure period the Town Council's consultant and County Council officers have been working together to agree details of a final scheme. This led to the County Council consultation between January and July 2022.

The Town Council's responses to the consultation objections/concerns are detailed in the report. There is strong support for the scheme. Principal objections/concerns related to disabled persons' parking places, and these have been addressed.

The temporary closure of the area has been in place for coming up to two years and nine months. Few schemes are given such a lengthy period of test. No major issues or problems have emerged. Whilst there are some loose ends, there is agreement that these can be dealt with.

May I, on behalf of the Town Council, request that the recommendation of the Corporate Director, Environment and Place be approved.

Statement in support of 20mph schemes across Oxfordshire

Danny Yee – Oxfordshire Liveable Streets

I fully support the traffic speed reduction measures being decided on today, but these will have relatively small effects compared to reducing speed limits in Oxford. Tens of thousands of people a day walk and cycle along or across Oxford's main roads, and reducing speeds there is the single biggest contribution you could make towards both Vision Zero and enabling active travel -- and would be vastly cheaper than either junction rebuilds or corridor upgrades.

I understand your reluctance to upset the bus companies. But if we have to wait first on Network Rail to finish their bridge works and then on eighteen months for the traffic filter trial to finish, that means a delay of over three years! Meanwhile, Wales is set to make 20mph the built-up area default in September, Scotland is committed to that by 2025, and other local authorities in England are moving forward. This change is going to happen sooner or later, so the bus companies need to accept it.

A conservative estimate -- based on STATS19 injury data and evidence from 20mph changes on Iffley Rd and in other local authorities -- is that reducing the speed limit on the current 30mph roads in Oxford would, over three years, avert or reduce the severity of more than ten serious injuries.

20mph limits would also enable walking and cycling for tens of thousands of people currently deterred by motor traffic. Lower speeds make using zebra crossings easier, make informal crossings usable by children and slower adults, and make cycling along - and most importantly across - main roads safer and less stressful.

Three years is two whole cohorts of Year 5 and 6 children, many of whom will miss out on being allowed to walk or cycle to school by themselves, and on the gains in independence and well-being which that brings.

So - as I have previously argued for School Streets schemes - I urge you to prioritise 20mph schemes based not just on how easy they are, but on how much of an effect they will have. Please make Oxford's main roads 20mph as soon as possible.

ITEM 15 – Uffington – Proposed 20mph speed limits

Benjamin Rule

I object to the proposed implementation of a 20mph speed restriction in Uffington.

Oxfordshire has a policy of implementing 20mph in towns and villages. The speed policy statement specifies benefits from increased active travel and a reduction in casualty rates and improved road safety.

The questions facing the Cabinet Member today are:

1. Does 20mph restriction in Uffington specifically deliver these stated benefits? and
2. Can proposals for Uffington be prioritised over other locations in the County?

The answer to these questions is no. The proposal must be rejected by the Cabinet Member.

Regarding benefits. **20mph will not encourage active travel in Uffington.** The village is well provided with footpaths allowing all of the 30mph zone to be reached safely on foot.

Speed in the village centre is reduced by road layout and on street parking. A 20mph zone exists for relevant school times. Uffington is remote. Active travel to other locations places the individual in a 60mph area not covered by this policy. There were 15 individual consultation responses. **The majority (12 out of 15) and majority of supportive responses (6 out of 9) said it would not encourage travel change.**

The proposal has been progressed with no analysis of casualty rates in Uffington. Department for Transport figures show 10 accidents in the whole of Uffington Parish since 2013. Outcomes were:

- Across the whole parish 14 injuries: 13 minor and 1 serious (a motorcyclist)
- Of the 10 accidents only two occurred in the 30mph area, both described as 'slight'
- Of the two accidents in the 30mph area none involved cyclists or pedestrians
- There have been no accidents involving pedestrians at all in the parish since 2013 and only 1 cyclist injured in an accident with a car on Whitehorse Hill (a 60mph area).

Replacing the existing 30mph restriction in Uffington with a 20mph restriction will have no impact

on accident rates. Accident rates in Uffington Parish would be improved by focussing action in the 60mph areas.

The declared resource prioritisation statement lists the following in order of priority. I have added the facts relevant to the Uffington proposal:

- a) Recorded KSIs (None recorded in Uffington 30mph zone)
- b) Evidenced minor incidences (2 slight car accidents, no cycle or pedestrian accidents)
- c) Evidenced near misses (No evidence provided for this for the Uffington 30mph zone)
- d) On a school walking route (Does apply, but 20mph warning lights already provided)

- e) Level of pedestrians walking along or crossing the road (As expected in village of this size)
- f) Level of active frontage (No shops face 30mph zone directly, the shop has its own car park)
- g) Areas of high traffic volume expected for the type of road (No evidence of this in Uffington)
- h) Local [funding] contribution (No funding being provided)

Therefore, ***the Uffington proposal cannot be approved ahead of other existing proposals with much stronger cases.*** The Abingdon proposal (already deferred) has many serious cycling accidents and some fatal accidents. The Thame proposal (submitted prior to the Uffington proposal) is in a later tranche despite there being a number of serious pedestrian, cycling and motorcycling accidents recorded. If the Council wishes to achieve the stated objectives and benefits then the available money must be prioritised accordingly. Uffington is not one of those locations.

Carineh Shahbazian

I object to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Uffington because I do not believe that it will achieve its stated aims, namely improving road safety or increasing the number of journeys made by bicycle instead of by car.

Those people advocating for the scheme to be introduced in Uffington have not been able to demonstrate that doing so would achieve either of these aims in the village. Therefore, spending money on implementing this scheme in Uffington would be a waste of money which given the current economic climate, is unconscionable.

If there is a real desire to improve road safety in Uffington, money needs to be spent correcting the problems which actually affect road safety in the village (namely the poor road quality which also poses a significant safety risk to cyclists and the poor visibility due to inconsiderate / illegal parking).

If the aim is to increase journeys made by bicycle, then analysis of the sorts of journeys which people might swap car for bike and the issues currently preventing them from doing so needs to be undertaken before any schemes are proposed or funded.

If there is a serious desire to improve road safety in Oxfordshire in general, money needs to be allocated to a range of initiatives which correctly target the identified causes of road traffic incidents in the worst affected locations, not on a first come first served basis for a scheme where nobody has undertaken due diligence to show that it would provide any benefit in the location for which it is being proposed.

Mike Tustin

My name is Mike Tustin a resident of Uffington. Due to the fact that Uffingtons proposed 20mph zone is on a road that is largely used by village residents and the fact that the road is not an essential transport route for Oxfordshire I am broadly in favour of reducing the speed limit to 20mph in this village and other small villages especially as the plan has kept the limit to 30 in the faster more open run out zones of the village.

However, I am not in favour of reducing all 30 speed limits to 20 mph all over Oxfordshire thereby reducing traffic flow and making travelling by car or any other means in Oxfordshire less pleasant than ever. A county already in turmoil over the debate between working people having to drive private cars due to less public transport and county council officials wanting to reduce those journeys whilst at the same time increasing housing in rural areas, centralising health care (on Oxford), as well as increasing travel necessary for employment and education.

I think it is particularly noticeable that without exception all applications considered by this council are to reduce speed limits to cause congestion. Where are the applications to improve traffic flow and increase speed to offset the current continued reduction in driving speeds across Oxfordshire? This stampede to promote politically correct 20 zones also effects journey times on public transport too and like the forest of now rusting speed cameras funded by government will probably get lost in time when people take no notice.

The advertised main arguments for 20mph zones are:

Road safety. Granted 20mph reduces the physical damage done to a person if they are actually run over. How many pedestrians got run over and seriously injured or killed on Oxfordshires roads in 2020. 23 reduced from 45 in 2016 without 20s. Not very many when you consider 136 die or are seriously injured in cars and on motorcycles in the same period.

A person running in front of a car waving a flag could be more effective. But would the reduction in road deaths be worth that cost. Perhaps this is the next step if government offers funding.

Would it not be better to spend the huge sums of money that are currently funding 20mph zones on repairing road drainage systems and potholes so a driver or cyclist can lift their eyes off the road surface when driving in Oxfordshire without breaking your car. If that was achieved my own driving would be better and not have to be punctuated by swerving to avoid the frequent massive craters and deep floods caused by blocked drains (after only 5 minutes of rain). This would allow me to concentrate on other road users better and not spend a large percentage of my available mental capacity scanning the road ahead for the myriad of potentially very expensive car breaking obstructions let alone pedestrians.

Reduced pollution. I would like to see the hard evidence that lowering the speed limit from 30 to 20 actually reduces pollution. My own car has to be driven in a lower gear to do 20mph rather than 30 and as such the engine will be combusting more in a given distance than before. My personal view would be that this reduction in pollution is a fantasy, perhaps dreamt up by politicians to make 20s more palatable to the masses. Added to the basic reduction in speed additional traffic queues and tailbacks caused by 20mph zones are surely likely to increase emissions. Finally, no one seems to have considered the move to electric cars where reduced speed limits will make no difference to the emissions of these cars. As a result, the emissions argument is a poor one to persuade people to support 20mph zones. Another government funded message that I hear every morning on the local radio station.

ITEM 19 – East Hanney – Proposed 20mph speed limits

Cllr Sally Povolotsky

I am here as the WARD Councillor for Steventon and The Hanneys to speak on the East Hanney 20mph

The need to allocate housing (and employment) is not a justification for failing to meet policy objectives and, specifically, to mitigate the effects of traffic generation. From an East Hanney perspective, I want to repeat village fears and the parish council that the village is being sacrificed to enable unbalanced growth in Wantage/Grove and the surrounding area. We are all struck by the fact that the 'Healthy [and Safe] Streets Approach' summarised in LTCP is focussed on the towns and city but not on villages where the reverse effects are being experienced.

The 20mph I hope is the start of measures to help make our villages safer, we already have issues with children being able to safely cross the road due to parking outside the school, despite provision being offered at the Village Hall Car Park. The village and parish council has been championing 20mph through signage, bin stickers and banners at the main village entry. The A338 now has a new crossing to help those homes on the frontage on both sides of the main road to cross. The A338 is at full capacity in every possible way, and having encountered buses on that road myself, I would like to ask them to kindly slow down, as the bend in the road at La Fontana can cause hazards when confronted by a bus and/or a HGV. The comments by Thames Travel lead me confused, there are many homes with a frontage and a two businesses onto the A338 including Dews Meadow Farm shop and La Fontana as well as a depot for a housing association. The reference to Summertown, has a straight section and then a series of bends and historic bridge and heritage buildings...

Ironically I was here a month ago speaking about Steventon and their 20mph which also deferred due to Thames Travel issues, and Chair perhaps you will read with interest the number of buses caught speeding by the speedwatch group there, and I am hoping The Hanneys will form a Speedwatch group as well. We already have a TAS on the A338, and the traffic crossing, its unfair on residents to have to continually ensure the speeds inside the village and on the A338. As the ward councillor I will be supporting this approach in the same way I did for Steventon.

We want children to be able to move around the village safely to school by walking and cycling, residents to their provisions like the pubs, village hall, allotments and the wonderful newly refurbished. I disagree with the comment – or take a different slant on the one by the bus company, the short distance makes ALL the difference in encouraging walking and cycling, and horse riding locally especially given the semi and rural location, and new estates being connected to the older village. The school is walkable and well within cycling distance throughout the east and west Hanney parish boundaries. Please help us make this safer by granting this 20mph request.

In relation to the Thames valley police comment, I think perhaps they are geographically confused as they are talking about the A4260?

This page is intentionally left blank