

**Delegated Decisions by Cabinet  
Member for Transport  
Management**

**Thursday, 14 December 2023**

**Written Statements**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 6

## Didcot Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

My name is Kevin Wilkinson and I am a cyclist from Didcot. I was Chair of the Harwell Campus Bicycle Users Group from 2006 until October this year and have been cycling to the Campus every day for 18 years. I am now at the Culham Science Centre and cycling commuting every day. I am a member of the Didcot LCWIP steering group.

Didcot is suffering from congestion and this is getting worse as new housing is built. At the moment the default mode of transport for most residents is the private car even to get to Didcot Parkway to continue their journey on public transport. As a consequence the roads are busy and uninviting for pedestrians and cyclists causing more residents to resort to using the car.

The Didcot LCWIP, if implemented, will offer an alternative to the 'car first' option for transport in the town by encouraging cycling and walking. However for it to work there will be difficult decisions to be made where car use may be restricted or stopped. We have seen in Oxford that a small but vocal opposition can cause transport improvements to be jeopardised. Didcot will be faced with the same issues, but I believe that knowing this will allow the County Council to anticipate opposition and go ahead with what is needed for the town to flourish in the future.

The benefits of increasing cycling and walking in the town, even by a small percentage, are manifold from the reduction in congestion and pollution to the health benefits of exercise and increase in wellbeing of pedestrians and cyclists.

I would like to submit my support for the Didcot LCWIP.

Regards

Kevin Wilkinson

This page is intentionally left blank



**Address to Highways Decision Meeting, 14 December 2023  
re Didcot LCWIP  
– Robin Tucker, Co-Chair, CoHSAT, Chair, OCN**

An LCWIP is a key document to aid the walking, wheeling and cycling development of a town. It identifies the schemes that will be candidates for funding from DfT, developers, the council or other sources.

We're pleased to see the Didcot LCWIP come forward as the seventh LCWIP in Oxfordshire, as a joint product between the County Council, Systra and the local community with an active steering group and over 400 people inputting to the various stages of consultation. Harry Davis at OCC, Nicola Wyer at South and Vale, and Agnese Polonara and James Walker at Systra have done a great job in developing a plan that covers both the strategy and the details.

We're particularly pleased to see the Annex 2 Consultation report, showing the consultation inputs, and the responses on how these have been included in the plan.

Also of note are the breadth of the plan, including Milton Park and villages near Didcot, and how it includes future transport and development schemes.

With much growth planned for Didcot, it is essential that a plan for sustainable transport is in place as soon as possible, or we'll see more cars and more carbon. We'll not dwell on HIF1 today. This plan covers the walking and cycling aspects very well. We hope you will approve this LCWIP and implement it.

*Robin Tucker  
Co-Chair, CoHSAT  
Chair, OCN*

This page is intentionally left blank

## **HARWELL: BLENHEIM HILL, BURR STREET, HIGH STREET & WANTAGE ROAD – PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING AND CYCLE PROVISION**

Paragraph 21 of the consultation report acknowledges concerns by residents that loss of parking opposite the War Memorial caused by the installation of four bollards will exacerbate an existing issue with parking in this area.

This plan severely disadvantages local residents, does not calm traffic, and confers no benefits to anyone else. There have been two accidents in the last year in this area, one resulting in the complete write off of a car, the other seriously damaging a car and dangerously close to crushing a child. Forcing residents to park on the street will exacerbate this and other problems.

Bollards may reduce parking, but given the shortage of alternatives a more likely outcome will be that they will just be parked further into the street. Contrary to claims made in paragraph 21 this will worsen visibility for vehicles transiting the driveway adjacent to White Cottage, impede cyclists, increase collisions with high street traffic and the parked cars.

Paragraph 21 claims that the area is not designated parking. However the area is de facto designated parking and according to Google Street View has been used as such since at least 2008. The surface is composed of small concrete cobbles with grass growing between them, commonly known as grasscrete, explicitly designed for parking, again visible on Google Street view. According to the revision history on the General Arrangement drawing used in the consultation, version P5 issued on 1/9/2022 removed reference to grasscrete.

I request the cabinet member rejects installation of the bollards opposite the war memorial.



This page is intentionally left blank



05<sup>th</sup> December 2023

Re: Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport Management, Thursday, 14 December

I read with disappointment the recommendation to proceed with the proposed traffic calming measures for Harwell Village in their entirety without properly considering the comments, concerns and objections made by the residents of the village.

The survey that residents were invited to complete was inadequate – it only asked for opinions on the three proposed raised tables for the village and yet the proposal overall contains a great many elements beyond these three very specific measures. Even a cursory examination of the published responses amply demonstrates that the raised tables are not the principal concern. The comments in favour of the proposal also make no reference to any feature of the proposal other than the raised tables. Despite this, less than 50% of the responses were in favour of the proposal, with more responses raising objections or concerns.

This is a poorly thought through package of measures but the consultation appears to have been deliberately focused on a small number of specific proposals that were always unlikely to be controversial – and yet still couldn't generate a majority of respondents in favour of the proposal. You might as well have asked the residents of the village if they were in favour of world peace. Any recommendation to approve this proposal a) has no mandate from the village residents, and b) entirely fails to account for the wishes of the residents who have provided detailed constructive commentary on how to improve the proposal.

Kind regards,

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 9

I am the District Councillor for North Leigh and have been a resident there for 25 years. I am a retired Chartered Surveyor and have experience with highway issues in various contexts over a 47 year career.

I have, for some years, been trying to get some consistency on the speed limit along this very busy section of the A4095 - namely from the junction of Common Road to the 40 mph limit that starts as you approach the turn to Freeland shortly after the Cuckoo Lane turn. **In my view the whole section should be limited to 40 mph and not 50mph as at present**, given the predominant tree lined bends, poor visibility, busy junctions, blind summits, often excess water due to poor drainage (Osney Hill in particular), and various "no overtaking" markings or double white lines.

In particular, I invite you to compare the A4095 east of Cuckoo Lane to Long Hanborough - which is largely straight with good visibility in all directions with fewer junctions - it's all 40 or 30mph and then ask why our section permits 50mph, so often ignored in practice.

On the section I refer to, **we have had two fatal accidents and numerous other RTAs** between Osney Hill Farm just west of Common Road and Boddington Lane/Cuckoo Lane staggered junctions in the last ten years or so. Motorbike riders regularly speed at c. 80 mph along this section of road and many cars well over 50mph and TVP do no speed enforcement to discourage it.

In the last six years, almost 200 houses have been built in North Leigh ( and hundreds more in and around Witney) and a further 55 have been granted consent to use the recent new access( for 50 houses) directly onto the A4095 between Common Road and the Park Road junction, which is almost opposite Estelle Manor's revised entrance - the subject case.

There is no cycleway along the A4095 in this section but one is planned and already partly funded. Creation of the cycleway would complete a missing link in the cycleway between Witney and Long Hanborough rail station - providing it would encourage more cyclists to connect to trains, something you and OCC are keen to encourage if I understand it. At present, cyclists who dare use this section are at greater risk.

I am not a highway engineer, but it is obvious to me (and to many residents I have spoken to about it) that with the increase in traffic along the A4095 over the last twenty years or more and using these new and existing junctions, involving left and or right hand turn manoeuvres, the extra traffic Estelle Manor is already and will be generating once their approved development is completed, the Football Club entrance on a bend with double white lines - with buses and supporter traffic - having a consistent 40 mph limit between Common Road and 40mph limit existing just east of Cuckoo Lane start would be so much safer for all and less muddling. Given the poor accident in this section, what is proposed in Item 9, is simply not addressing the real speed /safety issue properly or in a common sense approach - **so I would ask you as the Cabinet member responsible and empowered to make positive changes to enhance road safety here to have this rethought and impose a consistent 40 mph limit on the whole section from the Common Road junction through to the current east of Cuckoo Lane 40mph limit.**

**If you haven't driven or cycled along this section I suggest that you do so before making the decision before anyone else is killed or injured.**

Thank you for hearing me.  
Harry St John

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 11

Item 11 Joanna Matthews Trustee, Unlimited Oxfordshire

Dear Councillor Andrew Gant,

Unlimited Oxfordshire is a Disabled People's Organisation (a registered charity too) - we made a submission to the Broad Street Consultation this summer.

I am writing to you as a trustee of Unlimited about the Report for Item 11: OXFORD: BROAD STREET - TEMPORARY PUBLIC REALM SCHEME 4 Specifically, I am writing about the misleading presentation relating to Unlimited Oxfordshire's concerns about the relocation of four Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPPs) to Parks Road, forcing most users to walk an additional 200 metres to the places that they want to visit.

In Paragraph 46, Unlimited's concern about the additional 200 metres of walking is not mentioned.

In Paragraph 50, this concern is included by the words "and location", which you could easily miss (particularly considering that the reports for all of the Meeting Agenda total about 1,000 pages).

Also in Paragraph 50, Unlimited's concern is fobbed off by the sentences: *"Officers have observed both locations are well used by blue badge holders. Furthermore, the reallocation of the disabled bays across Broad Street and Parks Road has resulted in a net gain of one bay in the local area."* This is repeated in Paragraphs 72 and 73.

The Report fails to point out that the four DPPPs in Broad St are very well used; during a large part of the day, when a vehicle leaves, the space is taken by another vehicle usually within a minute or two, often immediately. The DPPPs in Parks Road are moderately well used, and when a DPPP there is vacated it usually remains vacant for much longer than those in Broad St.

Additionally the Broad Street spaces are level access on both sides making it easier for a Disabled driver and passenger to get into and out of their vehicle, this includes those who use motorised wheelchairs reversing in and out of a rear vehicle door. The Park's Road spaces have a pavement kerb one side and the road on the other. Some Disabled people, but not all, can use them.

Blue badge holders are being discriminated against! Visiting most of Broad St and Turl St after parking in Parks Road is very difficult or impossible for some Disabled people. As I am sure you qualifying criteria to get a Blue Badge are:

- you claim Personal Independence Payment because you can't walk further than 50 metres
- your mental health stops you from making journeys because of overwhelming distress
- you have a permanent and substantial disability which means you're unable to walk or find it very difficult to walk (on assessment of providing proof)

Unlimited Oxfordshire (on behalf of our members but also all Blue Badge holders in Oxfordshire) wants an additional four DPPP's in Broad St to so that more Disabled people can access goods, services and a social life in Oxford City Centre - just like non-Disabled people. This is a low cost solution. A simple rearrangement of the seating areas in Broad St would enable that.

Please don't be misled by the Report. Please could you direct officers to prepare an amendment to the Broad St scheme that will include an additional four DPPP's in Broad St.

kind regards,

Joanna Matthews (Trustee)

for and on behalf of Unlimited Oxfordshire

A registered charity

Broadening horizons and opening doors

[www.unltdox.org.uk](http://www.unltdox.org.uk)



## **Address to Highways Decision Meeting, 14 December 2023 re 20mph Speed Limits – Robin Tucker, Co-Chair, CoHSAT**

At CoHSAT we are pleased to see another set of communities requesting a reduction in local speed limits and these being brought to decision today.

Some people seem to accept of the dangers of traffic, but we do not think it ethically acceptable to just ignore the hundreds of people being killed thousands injured on our roads as a by product of our current transport system.

Reducing speed limits is a proven effective intervention for reducing casualties. We accept that without enforcement it doesn't bring every driver's speed down from 30mph down to 20mph, but data from many locations shows that speeds are reduced, they are reduced more where they were faster to start with, and casualties can be reduced by about 20%.

This is good news for the people of Oxfordshire, even though we'll probably never know the names of those who have been saved from injury or death.

The lower speed limits also support people who want to walk, wheel or cycle, by making it safer to use or cross the roads. This reduces pollution and congestion, improves physical and mental health, and because these modes don't require spending thousands of pounds each year on a car they are good for equity too.

Overall this is a low cost policy with multiple benefits and we urge you to approve these speed limit reductions.

*Robin Tucker  
Co-Chair  
CoHSAT*

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda Item 20

From: David Wilkinson, Dorchester resident.

I wholly support the introduction of a 20mph zone in Dorchester-on-Thames.

I have lived in the village for 16 years. I drive, and walk in the village every day where I observe driving behaviour including frequent near-misses caused by drivers going too fast for the road situation. I also worked on the Speedwatch project as a volunteer.

To give just three examples, a lower speed limit will improve safety in the following example situations:

1. Cars driving through the village where the way is narrowed by parked cars and visibility for pedestrians, cyclists and other drivers is hampered.
2. Cars driving on the bridge over the River Thame which has narrow pavements and a blind bend. 30 mph is too fast for this bridge including where it approaches the built-up area – this is where schoolchildren cross the road in the mornings and wait for school buses.
3. Cars driving on roads such as Bridge End, Watling Lane and Drayton Road, which do not have pavements and are very narrow for all or part of their length.

With traffic moving more slowly I will feel encouraged to walk and cycle more in the area.

There may be a small visual impact on the historic streetscape from the new signage. As a heritage professional I consider this manageable and a small price for the increased safety.

The difference in Nuneham Courtenay with drivers going more slowly since a 20mph zone was installed is already clear.

The Welsh Government have usefully summarised evidence in favour of 20mph limits, here, <https://www.gov.wales/introducing-20mph-speed-limits-frequently-asked-questions#74843>

showing that: 20mph zones reduce deaths and injuries, lower the average driving speed, and encourage walking and cycling; they do not increase air pollution as opponents have claimed.



David Wilkinson, 9-12-23

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 29

Thank you very much for the documentation. I am now unsure of the status of any proposal for a 20 mph limit on the Reading. In case it should be appropriate or useful I want to state that it would be a very great error to leave the Reading Road out of the 20mph limit area for a number of reasons.

## 1) Increasing traffic density

Traffic density is ever increasing on this already over-burdened road which in itself necessitates a reduction in speed in order to promote safe usage by pedestrians and cyclists and the comfort and peace of residents.

## 2) Residential along its length

The Reading Road is an increasingly populated residential area which has properties along its entire length including the medical centre, a retirement home and a nursing home. Many of these properties have tight or partially concealed junctions which would be made safer and less difficult by a reduction in speed limit.

## 3) Pedestrian and pavement difficulties and safety

Many residents, including myself walk to town. The pavement along the Reading Road is narrow in most places and traffic is intimidating particularly for those of us who have unsteadiness of gait; in addition it is necessary to cross the Reading Road without formal crossings at least twice (three times for residents on the Southern East side) to walk to town with a further crossing at the North end. A lower, enforced, speed limit would help, although the ideal solution would be to increase the width of the pavements and introduce traffic calming measures, which are present on the Wantage Road and in Crowmarsh Gifford, but inexplicably absent from the Reading Road.

## 4) The safety of Cyclists

There are many cyclists who use the Reading Road, including myself, although my wife has stopped as she finds it too intimidating. There are two constant constrictions by lengths of parked cars, which make the road single lane. Many vehicles attempt to overtake cyclists in these areas which is frankly dangerous. A 20mph limit would encourage vehicles to follow cyclists rather than overtake and which would in turn encourage people to cycle.

## 5) Consistency across the town and county.

It is frankly baffling that the Reading Road should be excluded from a county and perhaps nationwide movement towards 20mph limits. There is no conceivable reason not to include it for reasons of consistency alone.

I am completely opposed to this 'two stage' process. I think it will encourage people, particularly those in a hurry and likely to speed, to use the Reading Road in preference to other roads into town increasing both traffic density and speeding until the 20 limit extends throughout. Completely illogical and actually harmful.

Please let me know if you need any further information. I am not looking to speak about this, but simply want to register my opinion on an important matter of safety.

Yours sincerely  
Andrew Millar





### 20mph for Thame – Statement for OCC Meeting 14/12/2023

Our first aim is not to delay the project to change Thame to 20mph; however, our key concerns are that the areas left out of the current proposal are believed to be high or higher risk areas regarding pedestrian safety.

Hopefully you have all seen the request from the Governors of Lord Williams's School who share our concerns.

**Oxford Road** is adjacent to Lord Williams's (Upper) School (LWS) – which has in the region of 1,200 students and 150 staff accessing the site every weekday during term time - The site is also home to the Town's Leisure Centre with approximately 200 members with access 7 days a week.

In recent years a new housing estate with 203 new houses was built opposite and across the Oxford Road from the school. (some of which are home to LWS students)

There is a bus stop directly opposite the entrance to the School and Leisure Centre used by students and members of the public.

**There are no pedestrian crossings on Oxford Road, despite previous petitions (2021) from residents on the Renaissance Development (Previously Rycote College).**

If **risk assessing** this one area, the high volume of vehicle traffic on one of the main roads into the Town, coupled with the high pedestrian numbers and lack of a pedestrian crossing - would identify a greater **likelihood** of a collision of cars and pedestrians than would be likely on a quieter road. If the speed limit is left at 30mph the **severity** of any collision is likely to be greater than for a collision at just 20mph, as such justification for Oxford Road to be included in the 20mph scheme would be a **suitable control measure**.

The same assessment can be carried out for the other areas not included in the current scheme:

- **Thame Park Road**, the current proposal shows the speed limit would change from 20mph to 30mph at the junction with **Chowns Close**. This is another high traffic area (pedestrians and cars) on a busy pedestrian route for students and parents, not just heading to and from Lord Williams's Lower School but also to John Hampden Primary School on **Park Street**. With the road heading up over the railway bridge it's already difficult to see what is coming to cross safely, keeping this area to 20mph would greatly improve the safety here.
- **Youens Drive** is a fully residential road with limited passing areas, it is unclear why this has been left out of the current scheme for change?
- **Kingsey Road & Churchill Crescent**, similar to Oxford Road, Kingsey Road is close to Lord Williams's Lower School with circa 1,044 students between the ages of 11 and 14 years. Whilst there is a crossing person on duty and not all students cross Kingsey Road, The council and governors of the school agree it would be safer to have a blanket 20mph on the roads around Thame.

In addition to the safety concerns a message that everything within the ring road is 20mph is much simpler to share and to enforce through a cultural shift (Thame only does 20!).

As per my opening paragraph TTC would like to progress with the scheme even if the areas we have raised as a concern take longer to agree and put in place.

**And finally** – with evidence of many accidents – including, tragically, fatal accidents on the **Tythrop Way** section of the bypass; Another area with high pedestrian crossings (walkers, dog walkers crossing to access the public bridleway / right of way to Haddenham and people crossing to access the skate park and football ground) As well as feeding the three main access roads into Lea Park. **TTC would request that this section of the bypass be reduced to 30mph.**