

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

23 FEBRUARY 2023

SPEAKERS

WRITTEN SPEECHES RECEIVED

Statements received:

ITEM 5 - Abingdon Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

Patrick Chaizy

Laudably, the County Council has made, and is still making, substantial efforts to develop infrastructures aiming at improving the safety and comfort of pedestrians and cyclists. Such a development is appreciated as demonstrated, for instance, by the number of cyclists using cycle paths (me and my family included). However, it is regrettable that some cyclists, for some reasons, still use carriageways while only a few meters away from well maintained, broad and often empty cycle paths.

As it is not possible to prohibit cyclists from using the carriageway where there is an off-carriageway facility present, the promotion to cyclists of the use of cycle paths can offer a good value for money way of optimising the return on investment of the County Council and support [Rule 61 of the Highway Code](#) that recommends that cyclists:

“Use facilities such as cycle lanes and tracks, advanced stop lines and toucan crossings (see Rules 62 and 73) where they make (their) journey safer and easier.”

In practice, such an incentive could include road signs at the entrance of the cycle paths highlighting, for instance, that carrying on cycling on a carriageway creates an unnecessary opportunity for serious accidents (for all road users, i.e. not only for cyclists), defeats the purpose of the millions of pounds invested in cycle paths and/or contributes to the pollution by slowing the traffic down...

In addition, polls could be conducted (e.g. by the police if technically and legally possible) both to make the cyclists aware of the existence of the cycle paths and of their benefits as well as to understand the reasons why some cyclists do not want to use them (to try to solve their potential concerns).

However, currently, the LCWIP considers infrastructures but does not seem to mention the promotion of their use (apologies if it does).

Therefore, would the Council consider the implementation of means to promote to cyclists the existence and the use of cycle paths? As part or in parallel to the LCWIP?

Thank you.

Robin Tucker - Co-Chair – CoHSAT and 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.

Sam Larkin, the main author of the Abingdon LCWIP had some tough acts to follow with the Abingdon LCWIP. The Council's own LCWIPs for Oxford and Bicester, written by Patrick Lingwood, a man with decades experience of active travel. And our own Abingdon Liveable Streets Cycling and Walking Plan, developed with less experience, but with the input and enthusiasm of 40 people over partial lockdown during 2020. He's done an excellent job.

We were particularly impressed by the way he engaged with the community, inviting us to several workshops, joining our own meetings, and touring the streets of Abingdon to measure and record the current lie of the land.

Nowhere in Abingdon is more than 1.5 miles from the centre. That's 30 minutes' walk, or 10 minutes by bike. We already have neighbourhood centres that are within 15 minutes' walk or 5 minutes' cycle of every resident, but need improvements to routes and facilities. This plan shows how Abingdon can develop a transport network that will save us all money, benefit health and help the climate into the future. It contains 108 prioritised infrastructure improvements for walking and cycling that would transform movement in Abingdon.

We'd love them to be implemented tomorrow. In fact, on the strength of this plan, we think Abingdon should be the next mini-Holland bid. But failing that, we think a ten-year plan would be about right.

In summary, we support the Abingdon LCWIP, and hope you approve it and implement it.

Nadine Matough – Liveable Cities and Towns Coordinator

I am here today to make an address in support of the proposed draft Abingdon Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.

I am speaking on behalf of Sustrans, the charity making it easier for people to walk and cycle, where Oxfordshire is a priority area with most of our work focused on Abingdon.

We supported the development of this plan as a key stakeholder, and we welcome the full Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan publication including both the report and accompanying appendices. The LCWIP should be a technical exercise to identify walking, wheeling, and cycling networks based on guidance published by the Department for Transport in 2017. It is Sustrans' view that Oxfordshire County Council has delivered on the suggested outputs that will help local authority to identify improvements for future investment, ensure priority is given to active travel in

local policy and strategy and make the case for future funding for good quality walking and cycling infrastructure for all. It is an ambitious set of proposals that also supports the communities of Abingdon as well as the aims and objectives of the Cycling and Walking Investment strategy.

The technical guidance suggests that 'authorities should prioritise areas which have the greatest potential for growing cycling and walking trips' of which Abingdon is such an area. Alongside raised ambition for active travel in the town as well as more behaviour change and community activation projects being delivered, this plan will build on local opportunities as it has developed a package of individual schemes that will be beneficial to walking and cycling in the local context.

All maps and the network plan are legible, and it is clear what is being prioritised and why and how all the schemes fit into the wider network is well done. The programme of infrastructure improvements does set out to meet a certain good quality standard with reference to LTN1/20, Cycling Level of Service throughout and other key national policy and guidance.

Sustrans are in support of the proposed regular review of this first version of the LCWIP and suggest the commitment to refreshing the plan within the next 5 years to match growth in the area and maximise on developer contribution opportunities to ensure delivery of schemes proposed.

This LCWIP feels like one step forward – we now have detail for schemes in Abingdon which places the area in a better position to direct revenue funding to work up the detail to strategic outline business case stage.

ITEM 7 – Radley - Kennington Road and Whites Lane – proposed pedestrian and cycle crossings and shared use footway / cycle track

Robin Tucker - Co-Chair – CoHSAT and Chair - OCN

I'm not great athlete and I'm closer to 60 than I'd like to admit, but I cycle the 7 miles from Abingdon to Oxford in under 40 minutes, county hall to county hall. There's a 2 mile section on the road or inadequate path that can be intimidating depending on the traffic.

This proposed cycletrack, with other sections that link it to the railside track at Sandford Lane, and the off-road track at Radley Road will provide a complete, coherent, traffic-free route from Abingdon centre to Oxford centre – the first such route in the county.

Already, many people cycle this route each day, but you need a certain confidence. Two thirds of British adults think the roads are not safe to cycle. Cycletracks like this change that. They open cycling up to anyone, and I really do mean practically

anyone because the entry price is less than a tank of fuel, and more people can cycle than can drive.

There are some minor design issues, and it's good to see them noted. We'd like to pick them up in the spirit of co-production following the meeting. We hope to see the other sections approved and implemented soon also as per the Pye Homes planning permissions. Please monitor the cycling numbers before and after.

Make no mistake, this route will be a game-changer for thousands of people for travel between Oxford and its closest market town. We strongly support it.

Peter Barnett

I would like to make a specific point on this agenda item then lead on to related general points on Vision Zero and co-production going forward; both related to process. Cyclox supports the overall scheme but some defects of the design have been well covered in the Cyclox response.

First the specific: the report says that the detailed response from Cyclox "will be considered by the designers." Can Cyclox meet with the designers as they review and consider this?

This further review should ensure that there is appropriate feedback on these recommendations that either supports them or explains why they are not being taken forward. In the past, Cyclox almost never got reasons why reasonable and not extravagant design tweaks were not taken up. Occasionally, we got answers when asked in person at a later meeting.

Second, leading on to process: for the council's Vision Zero Programme to succeed, working practices and culture must change such that there is effective co-production with stakeholder groups from the start of any highway project, including with Transport Development Control in pre-application reviews with developers. There are good signs that this will happen, the latest Parkway design changes; the recognition that engagement over the Kidlington Roundabout should have been better, and the proposal by Councillor Enright that a co-production handbook be created for highway projects; this proposal is very welcome.

But we don't need to wait for a handbook to make these changes; they can happen now. But they have to be driven from the top of the council organisation: As the social care co-production manual says, the first step in co-production is to (and I quote) "get agreement from senior leaders to champion co-production." This means that senior leaders - officers and councillors - must drive this personally; it is not a task that can be delegated.

As the council is realising, too often in the past, we have seen inadequate and, to be frank, poor designs being put forward for initial consultation, such that much time, effort and money is wasted on making revisions; if indeed such revisions are even possible. Examples are the Oxford North A40 and A44 corridors and the first attempt

at the Kidlington Roundabout. With an effective co-production process going forward, money can be saved; with current budget pressures, this is essential.

The Oxfordshire Fair Deal Alliance is doing good things, yourself Councillor Gant especially; Cyclox can help you to do this. Use us effectively.

<https://www.scie.org.uk/co-production/what-how/>

Danny Yee – Oxfordshire Liveable Streets

Oxfordshire Liveable Streets welcomes the new crossings on Kennington Rd and Whites Lane and the creation of a foot-cycle track along that route. But we have concerns about some of the design details.

There are stretches where the track width is substandard or buffering from the road is absent or deficient. In most places this is unavoidable given the physical constraints, but there are stretches where the road widens to more than 6 metres -- the extra space here should instead be used to provide a buffer between the road and the track.

The plans attached to this item are very poor quality, and lack key vertical cross-sections. In particular, it is impossible to see what is proposed where the track crosses side entries.

The track should have clear priority over driveways and similar entries. It should be completely continuous and stay flat, with proper entrance kerbs used and give way lines for motor traffic marked as necessary. The alternative treatment, where the track dips down and up, gives the wrong idea about priority -- and inconveniences hundreds or even thousands of people walking or cycling at the expense of what might be two or four car movements a day.

This also holds for the entry to the Sports Centre. There will be more traffic here, but slowing that traffic and making it clear that people walking and cycling have priority is essential. As well as foot-cycle track continuity being maintained, the entry should be squared off and the turning radii tightened; occasional longer vehicles can wait for a gap in the traffic and use both lanes to turn.

Nadine Matough – Liveable Cities and Towns Coordinator

I am here today to make an address in support of the proposed Radley, Kennington Road and Whites Lane proposed crossings and shared-use footway/cycle track.

I am speaking on behalf of Sustrans, the charity making it easier for people to walk and cycle, where Oxfordshire is a priority area with most of our work focused on Abingdon.

This proposal is on a stretch of National Cycle Route 5 from church road junction and along Kennington RD to the Redrow development of which Sustrans are custodians of. This proposal ties in well with our network development plan to make more of the National Cycle Network traffic free and will contribute to making cycling between Oxford and Abingdon almost entirely traffic free. We support that this proposal will support and encourage those in the new developments or Redrow and Pye homes.

The width proposed in the plans is an ok width for there to be minimal conflict occurring between users. There is no separation techniques proposed at the moment, but we believe this may need to change in future as the rate of modal shift hopefully increases and with greater growth to mean the path use would be greater and require some form of separation to enable users to interact in a manner that does not detract from quality of experience.

The proposal fits with the desire lines of current users particularly cyclists and will allow for more protection on a 40mph road on both sides in addition to the current shared use path. In terms of inclusivity for vulnerable users and accessibility for all, especially being close to Radley schools, the proposal has good width for those in trikes, wheelchairs and prams etc, however the gradient upon approaching junctions and also the general camber of the path needs to be better considered. Crossing Church RD and the Sports Centre entrance should prioritise cyclists and pedestrians more, but all other proposed crossings clearly prioritise active travel and vulnerable users.

There are some concerns over reduction of biodiversity due to the retraction of the verge in some places and also on the materials used which should consider porous material such as flexi pave that is easily maintainable and provides longevity.

However, Sustrans are predominantly in support of this proposal especially if it is delivered in parallel with behaviour change initiatives that will increase the use of the route.

ITEM 10 – Long Hanborough - Regent Drive

Cllr Sam Newman - Parish Councillor

My name is Sam Newman. My partner and I are residents of Regent Drive and I am a Parish Councillor.

Having read all the documentation, I have questions that directly follow from statements made there by Bill Cotton. These include numerous promises, with no clarity or commitment over who, or when, or how things will be done.

Point 4 says there are “no implications in respect of equalities or inclusion”

- How has this decision been arrived at?
- Response 6 flags concerns about residents with health issues. Response 7 flags concerns about people providing services for the elderly. And response 25 flags these specific residents are elderly and receive regular visits, requiring parking.
- Those three specific concerns relate to equality and inclusion – what consideration to provision for these needs was given (e.g. permit scheme for those providing care)?

Point 15 says “it is recommended that the proposals are approved and then monitored with a view to reviewing at a later date, including the scope for introducing a residents permit parking scheme.”

- What process will be put in place for monitoring the impact of the recommended measures on both badly parked cars and local residents?
- How and when will views of residents be collected?
- The original proposal made no mention of a residents parking scheme, yet there was considerable call for one. When will scope for this be reviewed, as per the commitment in the recommendations, and a proposal be presented to residents?

Point 16 effectively recommends a consultation on extending the double yellow lines at the entrance to the estate.

- This recommendation was not in the original proposal but there was considerable call for it from residents. It is not just an inconvenience, but a safety issue. When will this proceed to consultation?

As a resident and Parish Councillor, I am concerned there are lots of promises from OCC to do things in the future, but no clarity or commitment over who, or when, or how things will be done.

ITEM 12 – Abingdon – proposed 20mph and 30mph speed limits

Robin Tucker - Co-Chair – CoHSAT and Chair - OCN

The private motor vehicle has brought great convenience to people who can afford it, but only those directly affected stop to think about the social costs. Five people every day are killed by motor vehicle collisions in the UK, and 50 seriously injured. This sits on top of a bigger, less visible toll from air pollution and physical inactivity. The benefits of using a private vehicle are to its user, but the damage affects all society, so reducing that damage is a basic act of fairness.

Reducing speed limits is one way that a Transport Authority can reduce the damage caused by traffic, and we are pleased that Oxfordshire has established itself as a leader in England's move to safer speed limits. Since I last spoke in favour of reduced speed limits, TfL has released results of its 20mph programme. Collisions resulting in death or serious injury are down 25%; collisions involving vulnerable road users are down 36%, and collisions involving people walking are down 63%. Lower speeds make people safer¹.

In addition, research by Future Transport shows that emissions from cars are lowest at 15 to 20mph, so lower limits are good for lungs as well as bodies². We are keen to maintain a good bus service, but we've been reassured by measuring this and finding buses spend most of their time under 20, and the centre to ring road impact was from 1 to 27 seconds.

We are very pleased that you have listened to consultation feedback, and the input from the Town Council which made the proposal, and put residents first by recommending the scheme consulted on. We want Abingdon to be a great town for people to get around in, but it can feel like it's under siege from fast-moving metal boxes. Lower limits will improve our air, make it safer for us to walk, wheel and cycle, and to live healthier, happier lives.

We urge you to approve these speed limit reductions for Abingdon, and, although I won't bore you with similar speeches, for the other communities that have requested them.

Cllr Andy Foulsham - Mayor of Abingdon-on-Thames 2022-23

¹ <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/media/press-releases/2023/february/new-data-shows-significant-improvements-in-road-safety-in-london-since-introduction-of-20mph-speed-limits>

² <https://futuretransport.info/urban-traffic-research/>

When the County Council first raised the prospect of a 20mph zone in towns and villages across Oxfordshire, this was met with great support by Abingdon Town Council, and we were determined to make a thoroughly researched response to your call for proposals. A working group was convened under a very experienced Town Councillor and the result was one of the most thorough reports that I have had the pleasure to read. This was the basis of our submission.

However, the Council was surprised and dismayed to see the scheme proposed by OCC officers last year to be different from that consulted upon, with major routes taken out of the scheme at the behest of the Oxford Bus Company, and it is this that I wish to address now, with particular reference to the route that I know best as it runs through my ward and is one that I travel on every work day, the section from the Vineyard up Oxford Road. A simple calculation shows that the impact of reducing a vehicle's speed from 30mph to 20mph for this distance (approx 1.3 miles) should take an additional 1 minute 18 seconds – and that is without the impact of the 5 bus stops and 3 sets of traffic lights and a roundabout which would have the same effect whatever the speed limit. The layover periods at terminus stops in Oxford and at the far end of each service are normally for quite enough time to absorb any slight increase in journey time.

In no way am I “anti-bus”! I travel to work on the bus and have held an annual season ticket for many years, and know that delays are not due to speed restrictions but are far more likely the result of traffic congestion, accidents or the problems of recruiting drivers.

For this reason, I urge you to approve the Abingdon scheme for 20mph within the ring road and 30mph along the ring road as originally proposed and put out for consultation. It will make the town a much better place for all road users, as explained in the Town Council submission, without detriment to bus users.

Cllr Andy Foulsham
Dunmore Ward, Abingdon TC & Abingdon Dunmore Ward, Vale of White Horse DC
Mayor of Abingdon-on-Thames 2022-23

ITEM 14 – Cumnor (including Farmoor): proposed 20mph and 30mph speed limits

Giles Edward

I am a resident in Farmoor within the current 40 mph speed limit area in the village.

A proposal has been made to make a proportion of the residential area of Cumnor Road (B4017) in Farmoor a 20-mph limit.

Cumnor Rd is currently a 40 mph area from the B4044 junction, southwards for approximately 400m from the B4044 junction up to the southerly edge of the village. At this point the speed limit becomes National Speed Limit.

The proposal for consultation makes the northern 200m of this road a 20 mph limit, but the remaining southern 200m will remain 40mph.

My request is that the committee consider extending the 20 mph limit to cover the full 400m of Cumnor Rd to the edge of the village, for three reasons:

- The residential area of Farmoor Rd includes the full 400m length. There are a number of residences exiting onto Cumnor Rd: in Oakes lane, Valley Farm and Valley Farm Barns, as well as a small office complex at Farmoor Court.
- The current proposal creates a complex speed limit regime in a 400m length of road. Starting at: national speed limit on Cumnor Rd (B4017) > to 40 mph > to 20 mph > to 30 mph on the B4044.
- This southern part of Cumnor Rd in Farmoor already has difficulties with drivers using it to accelerate up to (and decelerate down from) the national speed limit while in the village 40 mph area, rather than outside it. The effectiveness of traffic calming through the village would be significantly improved by clearly signalling the boundary of the residential area through making all 400m of the Cumnor road inside the national speed limit boundary a 20 mph zone.

Thank you for considering my points.

Cllr Judy Roberts

20 mph in Cumnor

The objective of reducing the speed limit in the proposed areas is to improve road safety and encourage walking and cycling. There have been points raised by Thames Travel but my view is that these points are where there are frequent bus stops and the bus is rarely travelling at the current speed limit owing to the number of stops.

On the Eynsham Road in the Dean Court area it is important to reduce speeds here as the proposed Community path would run along here. It is quite narrow at some places and buses frequently cross here so for cyclists to feel safe more care is needed in overtaking and at 20mph there would be less opportunity for overtaking.

20 mph in Farmoor

These cover residential areas and if the current proposals for 2 Solar Farms are approved, Cumnor Road South will become the access route for the construction of the farms and an electricity sub station. It will be very important that the HGV's pass through this area slowly.

30 mph on the B4044

The traffic along this section of the B4044 travels in an unusual manner owing to the taking of the toll fee at Swinford Bridge. By the time it reaches this stretch of houses, there is a constant space between each vehicle. The County Council school bus has been removed for the local children which means they have to cross the traffic in the morning and the evening. The gaps are so close that children are tempted to cross when it isn't really safe and reducing the speed limit would make the crossing so much safer.

Tom Christophers – Parish Chair

Dear Chair,

I write to you on behalf of Cumnor Parish Council in support of Agenda Item 14 in general but would like to make specific mention of the reduction in speed proposal in Cumnor village from 30mph to 20mph.

We as a council note the overwhelming support for the 20mph Cumnor proposal from the online consultation. 74% in support confirms what we as a parish council have been hearing from our community for a number of years now and also reflects the views and support from our District and County Councillors (Cllrs Jenner, Roberts and Ash).

We were a little concerned to see the recommendation to defer a decision pending further discussions to assess the acceptability of reduced proposals that meet the needs of all parties from the Corporate Director, Environment and Place.

We say this as the only real objection as such comes from Thames Travel regarding the stretch of road running Abingdon Road (at the A420 exit / entry points), Glebe Road and Oxford Road before the A420 flyover bridge.

To quote from the supporting papers, the objection is around:

"It is important that buses are able to make progress where it is safe for them to do so. Unlike a private motorist that may typically go along the road once in each direction in a day, buses operate along the above roads up to 67 times a day in each direction and so the impact is that much greater. Slowing journeys makes bus services less attractive to passengers and would serve to encourage negative modal shift from public transport to private motor vehicles, which is contrary to the council's policies. Ultimately if journey times become too great, either, extra bus and driver resource needs to be added to maintain the same level of service (i.e. increased cost for no increased revenue) or alternatively timetables need to be trimmed so that they can be operated with the existing resource (i.e. reduced revenue from the same operating cost). This could lead to services becoming financially unsustainable and so could lead to service reductions."

and from the Corporate Director, Environment and Place that the proposal should:

"...meet the needs of the bus operator and pose no threat to the operational viability of services."

I think what has been missed here is that this stretch of road only corresponds to 0.3 miles (or 0.4 miles for one bus route from Besselsleigh).

The Abingdon Road stretch from A420 slip road entry and exit to the Glebe flyover bridge is 0.4 miles coming off the A420 from Rockley; and, 0.3 miles from the flyover to the exit to the A420 heading to Oxford (and vice versa). Both these journeys for the S9 and 33 buses going to and from Oxford at the current 30mph in perfect driving conditions with no stopping for passengers would take:

S9 coming from Rockley to Oxford - 48 seconds
S9 going to Besselsleigh from Oxford - 36 seconds
33 going to Oxford from Wootton - 36 seconds
33 going to Wootton from Oxford - 36 seconds

By moving to 20mph the times would change to:

S9 coming from Rockley to Oxford - 72 seconds (an increase of 24 seconds)
S9 going to Besselsleigh from Oxford - 54 seconds (an increase of 18 seconds)
33 going to Oxford from Wootton - 54 seconds (an increase of 18 seconds)
33 going to Wootton from Oxford - 54 seconds (an increase of 18 seconds)

I'm not sure the brevity of the distance was taken into account by either bus company or Corporate Director and thus the implication that services would become potentially unviable may have been wrongly arrived at.

We don't believe the concerns are valid when put against a bus journey increase of 18 seconds and 24 seconds respectively across the entirety of each bus journey from their starting and end points in Wantage, Oxford and Wallingford that are in total 111 minutes (Oxford - Wallingford and Wallingford - Oxford) and 52 minutes (Oxford - Wantage and Wantage to Oxford).

We hope that provides better clarity and that we can highlight the oddity of seeking to defer (and potentially stop) a motion to reduce speed for safety and environmental reasons over 18 to 24 second increases in bus routes that represent in reality 0.3% of the total journey time for the 33 bus and 0.8% of the total journey time for the S9 bus.

This is something that our community has been fighting for and lobbying us (and our District and County Councillors) to support, for a good while. The prospect that it might be pushed back would be a difficult message to send back and may cause a loss in faith in democratic processes from the constituents who we all serve.

Yours sincerely

Tom Christophers
Parish Chair

ITEM 15 - Faringdon- proposed 20mph speed limit

Cllr Bethia Thomas

I am writing to you as I am aware that the decision to lower the speed limit in Faringdon is coming before you at your delegated decisions meeting on the 23rd of February.

I would like to express my full support for the scheme. The small area that has already dropped to 20MPH under a separate scheme has already brought benefits to the town centre, and I believe Faringdon Town Council approve of the extension of the reduction, and I have copied in Sally Thurston, Town Clerk for her information.

ITEM 18 – Kingston Lisle and Fawler – proposed 20mph speed limit

Cllr Johnnie Graham – Parish Councillor, Kingston Lisle and Fawler Parish Council

The Kingston Lisle & Fawler Parish Council (PC) strongly supports the proposal (Ref: CM/12.6.269) to introduce a 20mph limit to Kingston Lisle and Fawler.

There are two points, however, where we disagree with the final recommendation by the Corporate Director, Environment and Place.

1. We strongly request that the 20mph limit covers the 120m gap between the Kingston Lisle (KL) and Fawler village signs.
 - a. Near the KL village sign, pedestrians have to cross the road at a blind corner to continue on a well-used pavement between the villages, and to access a popular footpath at that point. Allowing vehicles to speed up between the two village signs will not enhance, but rather reduce, safety.
 - b. We feel that safety considerations should over-ride other policy principles in this particular instance, because:
 - i. The 120m gap can barely be described as a “wholly rural area”.
 - ii. The requirement to “make each village distinct” is hardly relevant in this case as the two villages share the same Parish Council, pub, village hall, cemetery and children’s playground, so are close to being one entity.
2. The second point of disagreement with the Director’s recommendation concerns the request to have a 30mph buffer zone on the road out of KL towards Baulking.
 - a. Firstly, we do recognise that this request is not connected with slowing down traffic before reaching the 20mph sign on entering the village.

- b. Rather, it is about correcting a dangerous situation on this downhill 600m stretch of road, at an opportune time when speed limits are changing and new signs are being erected.
- c. KL has a thriving racehorse training industry (c.80 horses and supporting many equine related local businesses) and other recreational horse riders. They use this road to access gallops adjacent to the foot of this hill and also to ride onwards to Baulking.
- d. Because of a sharp bend and a hedge, vehicle drivers, speeding up after leaving the village, can be legitimately travelling at 60mph to within 10-15m of a horse and rider before seeing it, setting up a very dangerous situation.
- e. This stretch of road is also well used by cyclists.

The Kingston Lisle and Fawler Parish Council respectfully request, in light of the above information and the safety concerns outlined, that the Cabinet Member for Highway Management decides that:

- The new 20mph limit is continued along the 120m gap between Kingston Lisle and Fawler.
- A 30mph limit buffer zone is implemented on the 600m stretch of road from the North of Kingston Lisle towards Baulking.

Cllr Yvonne Constance

I write as County Councillor for the Shrivenham Division, which includes the Parish of Kingston Lisle & Fawler, to support the submission of the Parish Council emailed today 20 February 2023 by Cllr Johnnie Graham. I serve also on the Kingston lisle Parish Council, so am fully aware of their awareness of a better decision to change to 20 mph for the whole distance from KL to Fawler.

As 20mph speed limit is to be installed in the village, the Parish Council has applied for that limit to be extended 120m from the Kingston Lisle signs to meet the Fawler signs down the hill.

Though officers have responded that this is 'wholly rural' and does not qualify, it is important to note that the hamlet of Fawler is part of the Parish and part of life in the village, and there is no need to 'keep both villages distinct' as they are one Parrish and function as one village, sharing the pub, the church, the playground and the village hall.

There is no point in permitting a different speed limit for 120 m. It will require signage which will clutter the space and gain nothing in terms of journey time or lessen motorists tendency to ignore. The new 20 mph speed limit should run from KL to and through Fawler.

The Parish Council makes the relevant point that there is a pedestrian pavement between the villages which requires walkers to cross the road near the KL sign,

which is on a blind corner. It will not increase safety if motorists are encouraged to speed up to 30mph (or more) at this point.

It makes sense and reduces unnecessary signage to install 20 mph from KI to Fawler.

The separate concern about reducing the approach speed on the western side of the village to 30 mph is as valid and important, but I suspect would require a separate consideration which the KLPC will surely undertake. I will support that application as well.

Cllr Yvonne Constance

ITEM 20 – North Hinksey – proposed 20mph speed limit

Cllr Alistair Bastin – North Hinksey Parish Council, Chair of the Environment and Wellbeing Committee

Good [morning/afternoon], Cllr Gant.

I'm Cllr Alistair Bastin, of North Hinksey Parish Council.

I chair the Environment and Wellbeing Committee.

Thank you for having me.

Two key issues in our Committee's remit are air quality, and road safety.

The proposal before you today will improve both air quality and road safety within the parish at minimal cost.

Your recent consultation, also before you today, revealed a substantial majority of public support.

And the Annual Parish Meeting of North Hinksey Parish in March 2021, which was held online with almost 100 attendees, considered the question "Should North Hinksey Parish be a 20mph zone?" The poll taken at that meeting showed over 90% of attendees in favour of the proposition.

Now speaking personally, one day I'd like to see the whole parish as a 20mph zone.

But I accept that West Way is a wide thoroughfare, so the proposals before you make a good and reasonable compromise.

Therefore I actively encourage you to accept the officers' recommendations, and approve the proposals as advertised.

Thank you.

Cllr Judy Roberts

This consultation had a 66% support from the consultation which was reflected in the 70% support it received in a Parish vote a few years before. The officer's recommend approval and I agree with them. Many of my residents that live upon the areas of Cumnor Hill constantly complain that people speed downhill through these residential areas. Reducing the speed limit to 20 will make people more aware of the speeds their vehicles are achieving whilst progressing down the hillside.

ITEM 23 - South Leigh - proposed 20mph Speed limit

Dick Pears - South Leigh and High Cogges Parish Council

Dear Cllr Gant,

Please treat this as the written submission for Thursday's meeting from South Leigh and High Cogges Parish Council in support of the provision of the 20mph scheme within the parish of South Leigh and High Cogges. The three roads in and out of the village are all single track twisting roads with no pavements or cycle lanes.

The Parish Council has read the report (Agenda Item 23 page 581) and the summary of objections and we agree with the officers that the scheme should be implemented to "improve road safety and encourage greater use of active Travel by reducing speeds"

Regards
Dick Pears