

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 25 February 2021 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 12.30 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE – in the Chair

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor John Sanders (for Agenda Item 2)
Councillor Susanna Pressel (for Agenda Item 4)
Councillor Les Sibley (for Agenda Item 5)
Councillor Lawrie Stratford (for Agenda Item 5)
Councillor Michael Waine (for Agenda Item 5)
Councillor Dan Sames (for Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Pete Sudbury (for Agenda Items 8 & 9)
Councillor Jenny Hannaby (for Agenda Item 10)
Councillor Jane Hanna (for Agenda Item 10)

Officers:

Whole of meeting G. Warrington (Law & Governance); E. Owens, P. Fermer, H. Potter and A. Kirkwood (Communities)

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
4.	R. Freshwater (Communities)
5.	J. Cox and J. Lee (Communities)
6.	O. Parsons (Communities)
7.	R. Calver (Communities)
9.	N. Tompkins (Communities)
10.	R. Moore (Communities)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

36/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Agenda No. 1)

There were no declarations of interest.

37/21 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

Councillor John Sanders

As it has been agreed to implement Active Travel measures in Cowley over the next month, I would appreciate knowing the proposed implementation dates for:

The CPZs for Cowley East and West

The three LTNs in Cowley

The School Street proposed for Temple Road

*Response by Cabinet Member for Environment*CPZ East and West

- 19th Feb – Letters posted out to residents inviting permit applications.
- 1st March – Works start to install signs and make any line changes.
- 15th March – Permit schemes become operational, websites updated, and enforcement officers start patrolling.
- 15th March to 28th March - Warning notices issued to vehicles parking without a valid permit.
- 29th March - Live PCN's issued to vehicles parking in contravention.

The three LTNs in Cowley

- Church Cowley - March 1st
- Florence Park - March 8th
- Temple Cowley - March 15th 2021

School Street proposed for Temple Road

The School Streets Trial for St Christopher's will be going in alongside the Cowley LTN starting from 15th March. It will be an initial 6 week trial with an option to extend or alter it.

38/21 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
County Councillor Susanna Pressel	4. Oxford – Ferry Hinksey Road and Osney Mead
Chris Brennan – Sustrans Paul Troop - Bicester Bike Users' Group County Councillor Les Sibley))) 5. Bicester Active Travel)

County Councillor Lawrie Stratford County Councillor Michael Waine))
Mark Upton - Oxfordshire Association for the Blind	6. Witney Active Travel
Calum Miller Jenny Surtees (also representing Anthony Henman) Harriet Bayly Sami Cohen Richard Washington Maggie Davison Chris Brennan Johanna Stephenson Nathan Wiles County Councillor Dan Sames))))) 7. Islip – B4027 River Bridge and)Wheatley Road))))))
County Councillor Pete Sudbury	8. Long Wittenham High Street and 9. Wallingford St Georges Road
County Councillor Jane Hanna County Councillor Jenny Hannaby) 10. Grove: Denchworth Road &)Cane Lane

39/21 OXFORD - FERRY HINKSEY ROAD AND OSNEY MEAD: PROPOSED SHARED USE FOOTWAY/CYCLETRACK, PARALLEL CROSSING FOR CYCLISTS AND PEDESTRIANS AND AMENDMENTS TO PARKING PLACES

(Agenda No. 4)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE4) responses received to a statutory consultation on proposed pedestrian and cycle improvement measures on Osney Mead and Ferry Hinksey Road (Oxford) put forward as part of a wider highway improvement scheme, being delivered by the University of Oxford (via a Section 278 agreement) to improve access by sustainable travel modes to/from and through the Osney Mead Industrial area. As Osney Mead was an identified development site in the adopted Oxford Local Plan the proposals would therefore help facilitate and support potential future re-development and growth of the Osney Mead area whilst also improving a key sustainable travel link to Oxford City Centre from the West.

County Councillor Susanna Pressel was less than happy with the report. The summary of the public consultation responses (in paragraph 7 of the report) stated

that 8 people objected to the proposals for shared use, 1 supported with 5 having concerns. This was incorrect as all 5 who allegedly had concerns were, in fact, adamantly opposed to the idea of shared use with one of them (number 15) even saying “please record this as an objection”! Others who were also listed as having concerns said things along the lines of shared use was “dangerous and unpleasant to use” and “I’m not going to use shared cycle tracks no matter what. They are always a bad idea and in fact all the cyclists who had replied had objected strongly to the shared use proposals. The one person who supported them was clearly a driver and those who made no comment clearly not cyclists. OXTRAG who represented people with visual and mobility impairments were also strongly opposed, of course and she stressed that this was not an organised campaign by cyclists with everyone making very different points. The proposal set out in paragraph 10 to paint a line down the pavement was not good enough to address the concerns made. She accepted that it wasn’t desirable to spend a lot of money on this scheme, since the whole area was soon to be completely redeveloped and in view of that she suggested as had many other respondents that pavements should not be widened and money spent on dropped kerbs that no cyclist would use but for the time being advisory cycle tracks should be painted on the carriageway, which was where cyclists wanted to be and where they were safest (since there is a 20 mph limit here) with improvements to the road surface by getting rid of potholes and one dropped kerb at the end of the path from the lock with a segregated cycle track when the roads were redesigned in a year or two from now. The footway was not safe, because of conflict with vehicles at each entry/exit and often with pedestrians. This was a scheme which nobody liked and one which she considered would be a waste of money.

In response to questions regarding options to delay the scheme officers confirmed that funding would be lost if not spent within a set timescale, which were very tight and as this was third party funding and not growth deal funding it would not be possible to renegotiate how that was used.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the concerns regarding shared use and the lack of support for the scheme and while accepting the comment from officers that shared use paths worked in other areas wondered whether it was the right scheme in this case. However, having regard to officer advice that extending the width of the footway to 4 metres would allow for it too be incorporated into future development as a segregated footway and the constraints on funding timescales she confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve proposals for a shared use footway/cycle track, parallel crossing and amendments to parking places as advertised but with careful monitoring of the shared use footway.

Signed.....
 Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

40/21 BICESTER: PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL MEASURES

(Agenda No. 5)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE5) responses received to a consultation for the statutory and legal measures required to proceed with the Bicester active travel scheme and which included a 20mph speed limit, toucan crossings and legal conversion to shared use footway/cycle tracks. The Bicester active travel scheme would in its entirety be reported separately to the Director of Growth and Economy, under delegated authority, on 26 February for implementation decision subject to the public consultation and available funding.

Chris Brennan (Sustrans) asked why closure of the Causeway as a through route had been ruled out of consideration and suggested that a trial closure at minimal expense should be considered. The Summary of Assessment for the Bicester Active Travel Scheme stated its purpose as the promotion of active travel for short journeys as opposed to carbon intensive modes and contributing to Oxfordshire County Council's ambition of reducing carbon emissions with the aim of this second tranche of DfT funding being to support active travel interventions that would aid the reopening of the economy and social distancing; reallocate road space for cyclists and develop both cycling and walking as an attractive alternative mode of travel for short journeys. However, a full closure to motor vehicles on Causeway had been suggested by a number of stakeholders but had not been taken forward to consultation due to a number of factors including timescales for delivery and a lack of political support. The 2020 survey of Bicester residents had included questions on how they travelled to the town centre with walking and cycling combined representing a greater proportion than car travel. The survey included questions on levels of traffic management that the local population would accept with generally a lot of support for change. Closure of the Causeway would be beneficial and asked for a trial closure to through traffic scheduled for October 2021 to coincide with the Women's Tour of Britain cycle race on Monday 4 October to show that Bicester really was serious about cycling and the Active Travel Scheme.

Paul Troop - Bicester Bike Users' Group broadly support the proposals and were looking for solutions that would work for all road users including shared spaces which, while not perfect would be unavoidable where space was limited, but needed to be as wide as possible. With regard to the Causeway he asked the Cabinet Member to defer approval until the county officers had shared their plans as the current thinking seemed unworkable and dangerous. The Causeway was a beautiful, old and characterful street that was the only real connection for pedestrians and cyclists between the town centre, Bicester Village, the historical quarter of Bicester and south and west Bicester and connecting these areas had crucial economic, health, air quality, touristic and safety importance. But it had been much neglected with provision for pedestrians poor and for cyclists non-existent in one direction, leading to widespread lawbreaking. The optimal solution would be to close Causeway to motor vehicles as accommodating one-way motor traffic would be challenging. It is very unclear what was being proposed and the concern was that if it was planned to just paint a contraflow cycle lane on the existing carriageway that would not work for either pedestrians or cyclists. Pavements would remain too narrow for pedestrians with a painted line providing no protection for vulnerable cyclists and encouraging higher vehicle speeds and a workable alternative would be for a much

wider shared path on one side at a different level from the motor vehicle traffic but if approval was given now, there would be nothing to stop pressing ahead with an ill-thought through plan that would work for nobody. He asked the Cabinet Member to defer a decision on the Causeway portion of the scheme until plans were available.

County Councillor Les Sibley agreed in general with the Active Travel Proposals as outlined in the report particularly the parking restrictions on Villiers Road and Lodden Close, the 20mph speed limit and quiet Zones, improvements to the Toucan Crossings and the shared use footpaths and cycleways, the new uncontrolled crossing East of Lodden Close, particularly as it involve removing a pair of road humps but could not support the proposals in relation to the Causeway. He also welcomed the planned upgrade and extension to the footpath from the Middleton Stoney Road to the Kingsmere Shopping area but felt that the funds available would have been better directed to widening the existing footpath on the Middleton Stoney Road from Villiers Road to the Howes Lane/Vendee Drive roundabout. Cyclists were not a regular sight on the Middleton Stoney Road and were only likely to be seen on the narrow footpath on the north side of the road, which raised safety issues for both pedestrians and cyclists as they had to go onto the road to pass one another. Cyclists avoided using the advisory line because the road was prone to flooding with pools of standing water due to the roadway drains in the advisory line being blocked by debris. He considered that there would have been greater value for money from linking up the Middleton Stoney Road with the 6000 Homes on NW Bicester ECO Development, West Bicester, Kingsmere and the Kings End area. He thanked all of those involved for their efforts and hard work over many months in bringing forward the Bicester Active Travel proposals and looked forward to the next round of funds to deliver the Middleton Stoney Road project in its entirety.

Thanking officers for their work on this scheme County Councillor Lawrie Stratford appreciated the need to deliver something within a very tight timescale but nevertheless had some concerns. There was evidence that the proposed 20mph speed limit would reduce speeds it was unlikely to be enforced. The Toucan crossings with appropriate enhanced facilities would aid people with disabilities/mobility issues but requiring a cyclist to dismount to cross a road was not a feature he supported as too many cyclists already cycled to a crossing, continued straight onto the highway, frequently leaving a driver with little time to take appropriate action. Shared footpath/cycleways could certainly be a benefit but each one needed to be assessed. The proposals with regard to the Causeway s especially from the Church down to Market Square needed more thought as the Causeway was far too narrow to facilitate a 'contra flow' system for cyclists but would benefit from significant improvements to the pavements which could probably accommodate some widening. At present walkers meeting someone pushing a pushchair / buggy resulted in one or other having to step into the road. He noted that there were some suggestions that the Causeway should be closed to all motor vehicles but in order to do that alternative routes would need to be available for those dependent on their cars and needing to take a longer trip effectively displacing the environment impact.

County Councillor Michael Waine advised that since the government Active Travel policy had been introduced he had taken the opportunity to consider the walking and cycling needs in Bicester and it was clear to him that Bicester was a town of predominately walkers and joggers, not cyclists which suggested to him that the

Bicester Active Travel Budget would be better spent on repairing and upgrading the town’s footpaths in order to meet the needs of most residents. However, he accepted that the money needed to be spent on a scheme which met government criteria and not necessarily value for money. The proposed measures largely achieved this but in common with the other Bicester County Councillors he strongly objected to a contra flow lane in the Causeway which they believed would make life hazardous for pedestrians, parents with buggies and mobility vehicle users. If anything, these very narrow pavements should be widened as part of the scheme to facilitate safer conditions for those on foot. Possibly when future finance was available thought should be given to improving walking and cycling from the north of our town to and from secondary schools or perhaps more especially to and from the growing ‘new’ retail centre of Bicester south of the hamburger roundabout on the A41. He endorsed the earlier comments that the recommendations be agreed except for b) ii insofar as it referred to the contra flow element on the Causeway and that any decisions on that be left to evolve over time and not forced on the town at this point in time.

The Cabinet Member for Environment thanked everyone for their comments which suggested a consensus of approval for the proposals apart from the element proposing a contra flow for the Causeway. Therefore, having regard to the information in the report together with the representations made to her at the meeting she confirmed her decision as follows:

- a) to approve the proposed 20mph speed limit, toucan crossings and shared use footway/cycle tracks as advertised and as permanent measures;
- b) to approve the introduction of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order including the following provision for waiting restrictions at Loddon Close and Villiers Road and width limit and loading restrictions on the Causeway;
- c) defer proposals for a contra flow cycle lane on Causeway.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

41/21 WITNEY: PROPOSED ACTIVE TRAVEL MEASURES
(Agenda No. 6)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE6) responses received to a formal consultation on statutory and legal measures required to proceed with the Witney active travel scheme which included a 20mph speed limit, toucan crossings and legal conversion to shared use footway/cycle tracks. The Witney active travel scheme in its entirety would be reported separately to the Director of Growth and Economy, under delegated authority, on 26 February for implementation decision subject to the public consultation and available funding.

Mark Upton spoke on behalf of the Oxfordshire Association for the Blind. The Association supported all the 20mph zones and the addition of 2 new toucan

crossings, which would help improve the confidence and independence of visually impaired people. However, they opposed the introduction of shared use for cyclists and pedestrians on Tower Hill. As this was not segregated a visually impaired user would not be able to identify that they were in a shared space with obvious disbenefits. They were also concerned that as it was beside a busy road, pedestrians would be forced into the roadway to avoid passing cyclists. A segregated line, appropriate tactile paving with pedestrians on the side away from the road would provide a safer route for everyone. Although they opposed the shared space scheme at Witan way, they felt that while the shared path could be suitable as it was off the roadside there was not enough space by the crossing point on the Waitrose side and that could cause congestion of pedestrians/cyclists forcing people into the road. That could be improved by removing a section of barrier and widening the crossing point, allowing pedestrians and cyclists to stand side by side when crossing. With regard to the Oxford Hill shared space that was on a very busy road which would certainly not work as shared space, even if pavements were widened. They urged the council to reconsider any shared use schemes and reinvest in shorter areas with the proper infrastructure. That would cost more but they felt that investment into less areas with the right infrastructure would be better than more areas which were less safe. Tactile paving provided vulnerable road users and should be used appropriately.

Officers advised that every effort had been made to follow government guidance for segregation but as this was a retrofit scheme with constraints on space there was no alternative other than for a shared use facility. The proposal was for a minimum 3metre width but a segregated facility would require 4 metres. No lining or tactile paving had been included.

The Cabinet Member accepted the merits of active travel and the need to target the young and less confident cyclists. However, the concern for some as had been pointed out by the speaker was that this was being done to the detriment of pedestrians. There was a need to set the right standard for future schemes and she considered it vital that everything that could be done was done to provide the right facilities including tactile paving within the available space and guidelines. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report together with the representations made to her at the meeting she confirmed her decision as follows:

- a) to approve the proposed 20mph speed limit, toucan crossings and shared use footway / cycle tracks as advertised as permanent measures with a requirement that tactile surfaces at the beginning and end of shared use footways/cycle tracks and intersections along those routes be afforded priority over cycling facilities;
- b) to approve the introduction of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order for the removal of car parking on at 146 - 152 Corn Street, Witney.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

42/21 ISLIP - B4027 RIVER BRIDGE AND WHEATLEY ROAD: PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNALS INCLUDING ONE-WAY RESTRICTIONS ON MILL STREET AND SPEED LIMIT CHANGES

(Agenda No. 7)

In order to protect the damaged narrow three span masonry arch bridge across the River Islip on the B4027 from further damage a scheme comprising permanent traffic signals and other traffic management measures has been identified. While inevitably that would lead to some traffic delays and queuing in the village it was seen as the least-worst option to help address long standing concerns over the safety of pedestrians crossing the bridge, where the only provision was a narrow 'virtual' footway using carriageway markings. Separately from the above proposal, a request had been received from Islip Parish Council to extend the 20mph speed limit on the B4027 Wheatley Road, which currently terminated just south of the above bridge to the current terminal point of the 30mph speed limit and to then provide a 'buffer' 40mph speed limit in place of the current 50mph speed limit south of Islip. Although the speed limit proposals were not identified in the context of the proposed signals, they were complementary in that lower speed limits would help mitigate the risk of shunt type accidents on the northbound approach of the B4027 into the village when vehicles were queuing on the approach to the signals.

Calum Miller objected to the proposed changes to traffic management on Islip bridge on the grounds that as the County Council had failed to conduct a fair consultation it was, therefore, unlawful and open to challenge. He suggested the proposal be withdrawn and a lawful consultation undertaken giving those affected by the proposed changes sufficient information and adequate time to respond. He considered the Cabinet Member was being misled as the proposed changes to Islip bridge had never been directly consulted on and the fact that a number of consultees had chosen to comment it should not be assumed that there had been a fair process. Consultation needed to occur when proposals were at a formative stage; giving sufficient reasons for any proposal and allowing adequate time to consider and respond. It was not reasonable for the county council to argue that publicising the minor change alerted interested parties to the more major proposal. Furthermore, the information provided in support of the minor change had been insufficient to allow consultees to understand how the different parts of the proposal joined so preventing a meaningful and informed response. There were no mitigating factors to justify this failure to consult fairly and rather than trying to sneak its proposal through behind a more minor change the county council should carry out a proper consultation on the management of traffic through the village.

Jenny Surtees agreed that the bridge needed remedial works but blocking agricultural machinery crossing the River Ray in Islip would cut them off from a significant portion of the land they farmed at Kirtlington affecting the viability of their business. Hard restrictions that prevented wide or tall machinery from crossing the bridge meant that any machinery would have to be moved via the A40 / Oxford ringroad / A34 which not only increased the journey to their nearest customer from 5 miles to 25 miles at increased cost but involved moving abnormal sized, slow moving loads on already very congested roads increasing the potential risk of accidents. The nature of their work was weather dependant so these movements could not be planned more than 12 hours in advance creating problems with police escorts and permissions. There

were four farmers based in the immediate area who farmed both sides of the river who would be affected with a loss of local jobs. The Islip 'rat run' was a symptom of the wider inadequacy of the surrounding road network and restricting traffic on this route would not solve the bridge issue but rather increase congestion & emissions as had happened during the 2019 & 2020 floods. Emergency service access would be affected and as an agricultural community they had already been affected by Brexit, the loss of the BPS payment & now Covid all of which they had weathered through sheer hardwork, commitment & determination but it would be impossible for them to overcome being physically cut-off from the majority of their business. She urged the Cabinet Member to reconsider how the weights and flow of traffic & work were managed in consultation with those most affected.

She also read a submission on behalf of Anthony Henman who farmed 1200 acres north and south of the Bridge as far afield as Begbroke and including land at Islip, Noke and Woodeaton since 1862. Part of their farming operations involved the movement of a Combine Harvester (and its associated convoy) which was 3.7 meters wide and involved a carefully orchestrated manoeuvre, stopping and redirecting traffic at strategic points through the village and stopping traffic going north up The Walk to enable them to bring the machine the wrong way down the one-way system. There was no other option as other routes were too narrow or congested with parked cars or impossible to pass due to the width and length of the machinery involved. Before any decision was made, the farming community needed to be consulted to reach a mutually beneficial solution to maintain the safety of the bridge without denying them access to their livelihoods particularly during the busy harvest period. Installation of the proposed lights would make it impossible to get the combine harvester through the village because they would have no control over the flow of traffic and that would be devastating for their business. They also had concerns with the increase in pollution from vehicles sitting at lights and the gridlock which could occur in other parts of the village. There was also the issue of how emergency services would pass through the village serving the local community. The B4027 was one of the least congested roads enabling a good route for ambulances travelling to the Accident and Emergency Department at the John Radcliffe Hospital which was particularly important for his family as his son had life threatening allergies and had been admitted twice to hospital in under a year, both times needing emergency assistance. They considered this a badly thought out proposal and asked for a better alternative to be found to meet local requirements.

Harriet Bayly had lived in Islip for over 15 years next to the B4027 (the main route through the village) and consequently had long-standing experience of any changes in traffic flow through the village. As a family they were completely opposed to this recommendation. The consultation had been extremely limited with insufficient information for the proposal to be properly considered with no traffic modelling data or modelling of levels of expected air and noise pollution. Temporary traffic lights pre and during the COVID-19 pandemic had demonstrated the impact of both types of pollution which seriously impacted the health and wellbeing of residents and would likely exceed legal levels. There were issues of safety of pedestrians including nursery and school children walking to the village primary school at rush hour due to the change in the nature of the flow of the traffic with the lights increasing traffic queues with stationary traffic at various points through the village such as the High Street pinch point, which was already a dangerous point for pedestrians. The lights

might also perversely make it harder for pedestrians to cross the bridge. She requested that a clear and open discussion was needed about how the structure of the bridge could be protected (or ideally replaced), making it safer for pedestrians on the bridge and how the traffic in Islip could be better managed.

Sami Cohen also expressed concerns about the consultation process. The initial consultation letter from the County Council had been entitled 'Proposed One-Way Traffic Restriction – Mill Street (Islip)' and had been limited to the proposal to introduce a one-way traffic system on a portion of Mill Street and sent only to those households in the immediate vicinity of the proposed change. The text of the letter went on to say that the one-way proposal was being put forward as a result of 'the plan' to introduce traffic signal controls on the Bridge with nothing about narrowing the bridge and putting three sets of traffic lights at specific points on and near it. These were clearly important and substantial proposals which, if implemented, would have significant and far-reaching consequences for the village and for many of its residents and local farmers who currently relied on the bridge to move farm vehicles and machinery yet neither the principle nor the practical details such as the precise locations of the proposed traffic lights had so far been the subject of a consultation with local residents who had received virtually no information to enable a proper evaluation of the proposals before making what she considered to be a premature decision.

Richard Washington reiterated the objections submitted in November 2020 concerning Kings Head Lane which was extremely narrow and bounded by high walls on both sides with no pavement for pedestrians and no possible place to escape from passing traffic and no other way for people in six properties to leave their homes on foot other than stepping into the traffic. The configuration of Kings Head Lane related to the proposed traffic lights in two important ways. Firstly traffic lights would replace a vital safety measure currently present in the form of signage which required traffic to come to a standstill at the bottom of Kings Head Lane whereas, if the proposals were implemented, traffic would move through Kings Head Lane without the need to stop. Kings Head Lane would be extremely dangerous under these conditions as evidenced by direct experience of temporary traffic lights in place in January 2021 and on occasions prior to that. The report missed the crucial point that concern for pedestrian safety derived from moving not stationary traffic. Kings Head Lane was the narrowest road through Islip and the only highway bounded by tall walls. The pollution dispersion potential was near zero and stationary traffic would lead to a rapid accumulation of pollutants. The response that the traffic lights would be phased to minimise queueing through the village was completely inadequate and the notion that there would be no consequential queues was wrong. Quite simply if the bridge was broken then it needed to be fixed.

Graham Davison advised that having moved to Islip in 2016 they had experienced the effects of temporary traffic lights on the bridge and the problems that caused with traffic queues building up very quickly outside their house and along the Bletchingdon Road even at non rush hour times, with an increase in both noise and pollution. As drivers became more frustrated with waiting, crossing the road became much more dangerous especially for the elderly, children, those with impaired vision, push chairs and wheelchairs. It was noticeable during the first lockdown in March 2020 how life had become much more pleasant by their house, with less noise and noticeably

cleaner air. Many other roads in the village would be affected by the pollution caused by waiting traffic if traffic lights were installed and when there was flooding traffic was backed up well past the station. It would be better to either repair the bridge and construct a foot bridge or rebuild the bridge to benefit current residents and future generations rather than pursue a short-term solution which put lives at risk and costing a considerable amount of money.

Chris Brennan spoke as a stakeholder in Cherwell District Council's 'K5 Better Together' partnership which covered wellbeing with a focus on helping to 'improve opportunities for walking and cycling within Kidlington and surrounding villages' including Islip. His specific concerns about the Islip Traffic proposals were to request three additional features to be incorporated into the scheme. Advanced stop line for cyclists approaching the traffic lights from the south as this was the direction where queues of vehicles might build up and so would assist both residents of Collice Street and Bridge Street who wanted to cycle to the local shop as well as assisting cyclists from outside the village approaching from Wheatley Road. 'Keep clear' road markings on the Wheatley Road by the junction with Collice Street and Bridge Street to assist residents of those streets when heading home and coming south over the bridge on a bicycle or in a car to turn right across queuing northbound traffic. A contra-flow cycle lane on the one-way section of Mill Street so that east-bound cyclists did not have to follow the vehicle diversion up The Walk and down Kings Head Lane.

Wilf Stephenson considered the County Council had acted unlawfully and demonstrated contempt for the residents of Islip throughout the long saga of traffic over Islip Bridge. The County Council had failed to carry out the statutory fair consultation required for these proposals by consulting only in relation to the one-way traffic proposal for the end of Mill Street with no proper traffic surveys or environmental impact assessments carried out. The proposals took no account of the significantly greater frequency of flooding that now regularly closed the end of Mill Street and Lower Street, forcing all north/south traffic through the village to use King's Head Lane. The proposals would force traffic to and from Mill Street to make dangerous turns from Church Lane into the Kidlington Road or from the Walk into King's Head Lane and Middle Street with the latter requiring measures to allow safe passage of traffic through Church Square, including provision for the new bus stop on Cross Tree Green. He urged that the proposals be deferred and a proper consultation carried out to address the neglected repairs to Islip Bridge, volumes of traffic and the hazards to pedestrians.

County Councillor Dan Sames spoke in support of recommendation (b) but not (a). He had great reservations concerning lights at the bridge as on previous occasions that had resulted in traffic backing up and there was every expectation that that would happen again. He had tried to organise a local meeting but that had been difficult due to current restrictions but it was clear from the representations made at this meeting that there were strong objections to recommendation (a) and that such a major scheme clearly needed a full and thorough public consultation and as had been explained by previous speakers it would be sensible to take a bit more time to find a better more suitable solution and he urged deferral of recommendation (a).

Written representations had been received from:

Brian Henman, Pegtop Farm setting out his concerns and objections to the proposed traffic scheme.

Nick Hedges suggesting closing the bridge except for cyclists and pedestrians as being the most cost effective.

Islip Parish Council objecting the proposal in its current form. And while recognising the need for structural and/or mitigation work to the bridge to make it safe had been unable to assess either the validity of the proposals or the impact on the village of any associated works due to inadequate consultation. They supported the 20mph speed limit change on the Wheatley road, Islip.

The Cabinet Member thanked everyone for their full and informative submissions. Clearly there was a lot of local concern over the proposed mitigation measures but equally there was pressure on the County Council who were not in a position to replace the bridge yet were required to carry out repairs and so a scheme would inevitably be required to enable those repairs to be carried out. Acknowledging the pressure on county officers she hoped that a few months delay would not exacerbate the situation with regard to the integrity of the bridge yet allow further consultation locally to make residents understand the urgency for repairs to be carried out and to come up with a more acceptable scheme. Therefore having regard to the information set out in the report before her and the representations made at the meeting the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed her decision as follows:

- a) Defer the proposed scheme for traffic signals on the B4027 river bridge at Islip and the one-way restriction on Mill Street as advertised in order to undertake further local consultation on the issues of traffic on and safety issues for the B4027 river bridge;
- b) Approve the proposed 20mph and 40mph speed limits on the B4027 Wheatley Road as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

43/21 LONG WITTENHAM - HIGH STREET - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

(Agenda No. 8)

Following provision of cycle bypasses in October/November 2020 at the two existing traffic calming build-outs in High Street, Long Wittenham complaints and comments had been received from cyclists that vehicles parking close to the build-out on the north side of the road had prevented cyclists from using the bypass. While it had been hoped that drivers would refrain from parking too close to the build-out without the need for waiting restrictions that had not been the case and the need for the latter had, unfortunately, been confirmed by recent experience.

County Councillor Pete Sudbury confirmed that although there had been a problem the situation had improved with the areas concerned virtually always clear and therefore there were no safety issues.

Officers understood the comments from the parish council and while accepting that problems had diminished to some extent this was seen as a very limited and proportionate measure to remove any issues. The visual objection raised regarding lining had been dealt with.

The Cabinet Member for Environment acknowledged the objections by Long Wittenham Parish Council and local member but as this formed part of the overall cycle network in this area and having regard to comments by officers regarding the limited nature of the scheme and the amendments made to reduce the visual impact of it she confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the waiting restrictions at the existing traffic calming build-outs on Long Wittenham High Street as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

44/21 WALLINGFORD - ST GEORGES ROAD - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS
(Agenda No. 9)

As part of enabling works for a new £6m teaching block on the school site a new car park was being proposed for staff of Wallingford School on the west side of St Georges Road and requiring no waiting at any time restrictions adjacent to the access of the car park onto St Georges Road to ensure adequate visibility for vehicles using the access.

Councillor Pete Sudbury did not consider there was a safety issue and that the site should be used outside school times.

Officers confirmed that there would be a visibility splay as with any other development and the provision of parking had been a condition of the permission.

The Cabinet Member for Environment acknowledged that out of school use would be within the gift of the school and so having regard to the information set out in the report before her and the representations made to her at the meeting confirmed her decision as follows:

to approve the waiting restrictions at St Georges Road, Wallingford as advertised.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

45/21 GROVE: DENCHWORTH ROAD & CANE LANE - PROPOSED 30MPH SPEED LIMIT AND PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES

(Agenda No. 10)

Proposals to introduce a 30mph speed limit on Denchworth Road with a prohibition of motor vehicles at Denchworth Road and Cane Lane on parts of the existing highway being superseded by a new road layout as part of an approved major residential development were first consulted on in 2017 and approved as part of a package of wider highway works by the Cabinet Member for Environment on 23 November 2017 and 8 March 2018. However, due to delays in the developers progressing the 30mph speed limit and new road layout beyond the two years from the start of the previous consultation, a further consultation on the traffic regulation orders giving effect to these specific provisions had been statutorily required.

Councillors Jenny Hannaby and Jane Hanna spoke in support of the proposals highlighting the large-scale development, increased traffic and safety issues in the area.

Officers would discuss with the local members issues raised regarding provision of a pathway.

Having regard to the information in the report before her together with the representations made to her at the meeting the cabinet Member for Environment confirmed her decision as follows:

approve the 30mph speed limit and prohibition of motor vehicles at Denchworth Road and Cane Lane as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....