

**Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for  
Transport Management  
Thursday, 9 October 2025**

**ADDENDA**

**3. Petitions and Public Address** (Pages 1 - 24)

Written statements attached.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3

## **Danny Yee (Oxfordshire Liveable Streets) – CMD Transport Management (09/10/25) Oxford and Didcot: Various Locations – Proposed Permanent School Streets and ANPR Enforcement**

We support making all of these schemes permanent.

The need to expand the Sandhills scheme is already being addressed - there is an open consultation on an add-on expansion to include Delbush Ave.

It is clear that the SS Mary & John scheme is, while useful, not really satisfactory. A scheme with two cameras, on the Chester and Bedford junctions with Warwick St, would be the most straightforward expansion, but as other schemes expand -- and a proposed scheme in Didcot appears to involve six cameras -- a five camera scheme covering the whole of Iffley Fields starts to seem plausible. This probably needs the school and local councillors to decide what plan they support.

The Tyndale scheme has been a big success and the layout is straightforward. The traffic displaced to Horspath Rd is a problem, but much less of a problem than it was on Barracks Lane.

The Manor scheme appears to be working well.

The New Hinksey scheme probably needs a third camera to cover Wytham St. But this would then be looking quite expensive for its effects, given this is a half form entry school. The all-schools prioritisation survey that has been carried out might make schemes like this less likely.

We urge that the outcomes of that prioritisation survey, and in particular the criteria used, be made public. It is important that we have some kind of objective framework for prioritising schemes, but any such scheme is likely to have made some mistakes. The commitment of school leaders and local councillors will still be important. And some School Streets schemes will bring strategic gains, in that they will improve important cycling routes - Barracks Lane or Charlbury Rd in Oxford, for example - and this has probably not been included in the prioritisation metrics.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Mapledurham Parish Council – CMD Transport Management (09/10/25) - A4074 Road – Proposed 50mph & 40mph Speed Limits**

I refer to your e-mail of 21 May 2025 in which you advised of the consultation on proposals to reduce the speed limits applicable to lengths of the A4074 road between Heyford Hill, Oxford and the county boundary at Caversham. I am afraid that this response is after the published date for representations. However, the Parish is small and the Council only meets bi-monthly. It considered the proposals at its meeting yesterday.

The Council supports the proposed reduction of the speed limit on the A4074 road through the Parish, to 40mph, as proposed in the Oxfordshire County Council (A4074 Ipsden to Mapledurham) (Speed Limits) Order 20\*\*. Residents of Chazey Heath have been calling for such a reduction for many years, so they, in particular, welcome the proposal.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Danny Yee (Oxfordshire Liveable Streets) – CMD Transport Management  
(09/10/25) – Oxford to Caversham: A4074 Corridor – Proposed 40mph & 50mph  
Speed Limits**

We support all of these speed limit changes.

But we continue to urge that all schemes that review speed limits -- and the larger programmes that bring those forward -- include reducing noise pollution and enabling active travel and access to public transport as goals, alongside addressing road danger.

In most cases, this would provide additional motivation for changes already proposed, and would help attract support for them.

For example, dropping the Heyford Hill roundabout and its approaches from 50mph to 40mph will make the walk or cycle from the Mogridge Drive development across the ring road less intimidating. It will also make it more comfortable for residents, from there or Heyford Hill Lane, to cross the A4074 to access bus stops. And it will bring significant noise abatement for residents of Rose Hill.

(Signal crossings are not a panacea for pedestrian and cycle accessibility. When they involve high-speed multi-lane roads they can be quite intimidating, witness the unhappiness at Barton Park -- where dropping the crossing to 40mph or 30mph may happen now because there were four STATS19 injuries in 2024, but would also be warranted as a scheme to enable walking and cycling.)

In other cases, these extra considerations might involve additional changes, but often quite small ones that might make significant differences to peoples' lives.

On noise pollution grounds, the most obvious change would be to include in the Heyford Hill roundabout 40mph changes an extra 200 metres of the A423 southern bypass where it runs past housing in Rose Hill and an extra 300 metres of the A4074 where it runs past housing off Heyford Hill Lane and the Littlemore Mental Health Centre.

Some people do cycle on the A4074 -- there are cycle commuters from Oxford to Culham -- and reducing speeds will make them safer. But this is unlikely to make this much more accessible (that will need separate cycling infrastructure), so on this route the focus should be on reducing speeds where people need to cross, especially where there are bus stops with no formal crossings. The Mongwell roundabout and the pair of bus stops south of it might warrant a stretch of 40mph instead of the proposed 50mph.

These details aside, if we don't look at the possibilities for using speed limit changes to abate noise and improve walking and cycling and public transport access, then we won't find them.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Mark Boulle – CMD Transport Management (09/10/25) – A4074 Speed Limit Proposals**

I am an Oxford (Northway) resident and work at Howbery Park in Crowmarsh Gifford. I therefore wish to address the Cabinet about the frankly ludicrous proposals to reduce speed limits on large sections of the A4074, a road I know intimately from using it twice daily for my commute.

I responded to your consultation on this plan with a strong objection and I have since ploughed through 238 pages' worth of published responses - it is only once you get past about page 170 that you start to see any responses partially or totally supporting this scheme. That alone should tell you something. I object, in particular, to two aspects as follows:

A4142 Eastern Bypass - this is a dual carriageway, with barrier separation. The cycle path / pedestrian walkway on one side of it is physically separated from the road. Therefore the only traffic using it is motor traffic. I also know that accidents leading to serious casualties on this stretch of road are vanishingly rare - one, just one, in the last 5 years in fact. I know this from an FOI request I made of Thames Valley Police when objecting to their regular stationing of unmanned camera vehicles in the layby between the Headington roundabout and Horspath Driftway, robotically to police an already excessively low speed limit for this type of road and taking no account of traffic conditions, weather, time of day etc. Their motivation is money, yours in this case appears to be nothing more than a blinkered obsession with this nonsensical idea of Vision Zero. As hundreds of respondents to the consultation said, unless you ban cars from Oxford's highways altogether or have them proceed at walking pace preceded by a red-flag carrier, which is perhaps your ultimate aim, there is no speed limit at which there will never be occasional accidents!! Your consultation on this matter evinces no statistical proof whatsoever that a reduction from 50mph to 40mph on this stretch, doubtless also an increased goldmine for Thames Valley Police, will make the slightest difference - indeed, given the rarity of serious accidents, there is no difference to make.

### **A4074 - Dorchester Bypass**

It would appear that you have already taken detrimental action on this stretch of road during the recent patching project by removing the cross-hatching and forcing vehicles on both sides of the road more into the centre by painting cycle lanes on either side. It appears to have escaped your notice that the A4074 is frequently used by heavy goods and farming vehicles as the stretches of it between settlements are essentially a RURAL ROAD. Already, since that project, I have sat, fuming, multiple times on the Dorchester bypass, unable to overtake very slow moving vehicles of this type, which are unable to trundle much above 40mph, adding minutes I don't have to my journey and making me more likely to have an accident out of frustration. That was, previously, the only part of the A4074 out of the stretch I use where overtaking a slow vehicle was possible - now it all but isn't unless it's very early, very late or you get very lucky. Is the Council's view that, in pursuit of a fictitious 'vision zero' goal, unlucky motorists caught behind a lumbering tractor as they try to get to or from work should simply take the hit to their time and busy schedules and sit behind it for the entirety of this 3.3 km stretch of road...?! The small number of respondents to the consultation who supported this measure in the main object to weekend motorcycle noise, which is unrelated to commuting cars using the road Monday to Friday and, given that the Dorchester bypass is surrounded by fields, is odd to say the least, or they trot out the usual mindless replies that lower speeds 'reduce emissions', which is manifestly not the case, since it is an established fact that modern, efficient vehicles have higher tailpipe emissions when travelling in lower gear / slower / at lower speeds. As per the A4142, you have evinced no proof or statistics whatsoever to show that this change will make the slightest difference to already incredibly low accident rates. It is yet further proof that your overarching desire is to frustrate and force motorists out of their cars at any cost to their livelihoods, lives and well-being. Even Thames Travel, the principal bus company on this

route, have told you in no uncertain terms the idea is madness. If you won't listen to me, listen to them!

**Giles Cattermole – CMD Transport Management (09/10/25) – A4074: Oxford to Caversham – Proposed 40mph & 50mph Speed Limits**

**OCC A4074 Ipsden to Mapledurham [Speed Limits]  
Draft Order 20, Schedule 2**

**Comments**

The 7 mile stretch of the A4074 between Nosworthy Way roundabout, Crowmarsh and the B4526 Goring Road junction is of relatively recent build, generous width, and grading and curving fully suitable for the National Speed Limit.

The track is mostly straight, with good sightlines. The stretch's suitability for NSL traffic is demonstrated by the accident statistics of just 3 Fatal and 15 Serious Accidents over the last 25 years.

I see no justification for reducing the speed limit to 50 mph on safety grounds. Particularly given its importance as a national highway, with daily volumes in the 15,000 to 21,000 range. And the resulting delays and inconvenience to that number of travellers

If the justification for this proposal is therefore political, this should be made clear to the Oxfordshire electorate.

By contrast I support the proposed 40mph limit on the 'Bends of Death' stretch between the B4526 junction and the Berkshire border

The accident statistics also show that there is clear need to improve both safety and traffic flow at a number of intersections between the A4074 and other minor roads, particularly:

- Henley Road, Sandford northbound
- Whitehorse Road/Church Lane, Ipsden – staggered junction
- Main Street/Reading Road Woodcote – staggered junction

I commend these for your attention.

Giles Cattermole

Wallingford

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cllr Dan Levy (Eynsham Division) – CMD Transport Management (09/10/25) – Eynsham, A40, Barnard Gate – Proposed Experimental No Right Turn Restrictions**

Thank you for the opportunity to address you on this item.

I welcome measures to improve safety at this junction. It is too often the scene of collisions, often severe ones. The A40 is extremely busy, and it can take a long time for a gap to appear in the traffic in both directions at the same time. Collisions here not only cause injury, but even more minor RTCs block the key freight, car and bus route to and from the west of Oxford. Banning right turns will reduce the number of incidents.

It is the case that the new junction at Shores Green should reduce the number of people who opt to get onto or off the A40 via a right turn here. There will however still be people who will be tempted by the route, and I would have preferred more physical measures than those proposed. Can I urge this council to monitor the situation, and bring in physical constraints if this experimental sign-only scheme proves unsatisfactory.

There will be a number of residents who are inconvenienced by this ETRO, and I am grateful for their compliance.

Can I urge also an exemption of people on bicycles from the restriction, alongside agricultural vehicles. The “straight ahead” route, technically a right turn, is very popular with people on bikes, as it is a quiet route apart from the A40 crossing, for instance to get from Hanborough to Stanton Harcourt. Unlike for car users, alternative routes involve a significant detour. It would be better not to force people to dismount in order to be legally compliant.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Speech by Cllr Liam Walker – A40 Barnard Gate Junctions Proposal

Thank you, Chair.

As many will know I have long championed improvements to the Barnard Gate junction as when sadly there are incidents at this location there is a negative impact with traffic issues to villages like Hanborough and Freeland.

I want to begin by saying that I absolutely welcome Oxfordshire County Council's recognition that action is needed at the A40 Barnard Gate junctions. This location has been a concern for local residents and road users for a long time, and it's right that it's being addressed as part of the Council's Vision Zero programme.

I also want to acknowledge and welcome the inclusion of extra signage towards Cuckoo Lane in the proposal. This is something we raised during our site visit, as it's vital that we encourage more drivers to use that safer junction when joining the A40. It's good to see that feedback being reflected in these plans.

That said, while I'm pleased to see progress, I remain concerned that the proposal to prohibit right turns out of the Barnard Gate junctions doesn't go far enough to deal with the wider safety issues along this stretch of road.

The right turn into South Leigh from Witney remains a major problem — and it's not being addressed here. There's still no designated space for vehicles to safely make that manoeuvre, and that continues to pose a real danger.

As you will know, £100,000 was allocated in the most recent County Council budget to support safety improvements at this location. That funding must be used wisely — not on short-term fixes or temporary barriers, but to deliver meaningful, long-lasting improvements that genuinely make the road safer.

Looking ahead, I would also urge that future decisions are based on more comprehensive traffic data. The recent traffic survey covered only a 12-hour period, which simply doesn't provide a full picture of how this road is used across different days and times. Collecting data over a longer period would help ensure we base decisions on robust evidence and fully understand the risks and behaviours at play.

So while I do welcome this as a positive step forward — and I want to see something happen here — we must ensure this isn't just a sticking plaster. Let's use this opportunity, and the funding available, to get it right and deliver a lasting solution that genuinely improves safety for everyone using this stretch of the A40.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank



**South Leigh and High Cogges Parish Council – CMD Transport Management  
(09/10/25) – Eynsham, A40, Barnard Gate – Proposed Experimental No Right  
Turn Restrictions**

South Leigh and High Cogges Parish Council support this action wholeheartedly.  
There have been so many accidents caused over at least the last 5 years.

Very few parishioners use the junction as we all realise how da heroes it is and there  
will be no need for anyone to use it once the new Shores Green junction is  
completed

Not only do we hope that you will pass this item but hopefully agree to move it on to  
a permanent closure in due course.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Danny Yee (Oxfordshire Liveable Streets) - CMD Transport Management  
(09/10/25) – Oxford: Rose Hill – Proposed Traffic Calming Measures at Service  
Road Junctions**

The hazard that has prompted this scheme consists of motor vehicles turning into and out of the service road, across people cycling north on Iffley Rd; the injury map suggests the problem is specifically drivers turning left into the south-eastern entry.

The traffic using the service road can be divided into access traffic (A) and "bypass" traffic (B). We have to support (A) in any scheme, as residents and service and delivery vehicles need to be able to reach the properties along the service road. But we would want to discourage (B) even if there were no concern about road danger, as it is effectively a "car prioritisation measure", making cars faster than buses, and undermines the ability of the signals to control traffic (either for bus prioritisation or as part of broader network management).

The problem stems largely from (B) in any case, because that appears to make up the majority of traffic using the service road SE->NW and because people bypassing the lights drive faster, as they need to get to the north-west service road exit before the signals change and their re-entry onto the A4158 is delayed.

In the "hierarchy of controls" for addressing hazards, top place goes to eliminating the hazard. And the officers' report (para 23) is clear that "Creating a one-way street, north to south, would eliminate the turning movement that has caused collisions in the past." There would be no more (B) at all.

The downside is that it would force movements in (A) currently using the SE entry to use the NW entry instead - in particular, it would lead to some vehicles having to make an "awkward left-turn manoeuvre" into the NW entry. But this would be a very small number of movements, so most unlikely to cause traffic delays. A swept path analysis should be done for longer vehicles; if parking is a problem for that then measures could be taken to restrict that.

In contrast, the proposed solution - putting in side road entry treatments - will have a much smaller effect. It will reduce the speeds of traffic turning in, making that less dangerous, but will only "dissuade" some of the vehicles in (B) from making this movement, so it won't remove the hazard.

The proposed Side Road Entry Treatments will not be very useful for pedestrians. They will continue to use the service road and walk in front of the residences instead of along the A4158, because the motivation for doing this is that it is quieter and less polluted, not that it avoids crossing the service road entry and exit. So putting in SRETs seems like an expensive way of partially fixing the problem.

If deferring this scheme to consider other options is not possible, another possibility would be to put in just one SRET, on the SE entry where slowing turning traffic is most critical, and set aside the money that would have been used for the NW SRET in case modal filtering or one-waying of the service road is necessary later.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Forest Hill with Shotover Parish Council – CMD Transport Management  
(09/10/25), A40 London Road (Holton/Wheatley) – Proposed Central  
Reservation Gap Closure**

The Parish Council met last night and discussed the proposal with Cllr Tim Bearder, who also attended part of the meeting.

The Parish Council were concerned that if the gate was permanently locked or closed, there would be no access for Emergency vehicles to Forest Hill. The gate is usually locked. The lock has been cut off when a fire engine needs access but no one relocks the gate and then other vehicles take advantage of the unlocked gate to make a shortcut. If the gate was permanently closed a fire engine from Wheatley would take longer to get to Forest Hill. Cllr Bearder has been assured that OCC will relock the gate if emergency services need to cut the lock. The Parish Council agreed to the gate being permanently locked as long as there is access for emergency services for Forest Hill.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Addresses to Delegated Decisions – Cabinet Member for Transport Management – 9 October 2025**

These comments are from Robin Tucker, Co-Chair of CoHSAT. I will be unavailable for the meeting, so I supply these written addresses. You may view them as multiple addresses for multiple items.

**A44 Bus Lanes** – We support the bus lanes. However, as the Cyclox response notes, the cycle lanes need some work, in particular the staggered crossings which introduce hazards and unnecessary delays into active travel journeys for no perceivable benefit. National guidance has been against these for five years now, so there really should be no excuse. Yet they keep appearing in both developer and county led schemes. They have appeared in A40 plans and physically at Valley Park, Didcot. We are pleased that we have had a productive discussion with officers about the A40 ones. We hope that the elimination of the continuing gap between LTCP ambitions and developer delivery will be a major benefit of a unitary approach across Oxfordshire.

**School Streets** – We support school streets to create a safer space for children and parents around school entrances, and as an encouragement for active travel. It's great to see the positive responses from the school communities and we strongly urge you to make these schemes permanent. We note however that the most effective modal shift we've seen is when school treatments have been accompanied by safe routes for the whole journey such as achieved with a low traffic neighbourhood or the Marston Ferry Road cycle track. It's also great to know that there is another batch of School Streets in consultation.

**Carterton LCWIP** – LCWIPs have emerged as the key first step to securing funding or developer contributions to cycling and walking network development. We're pleased to see two come forward for approval today, and both have had strong community engagement in their development which we are proud to have played a role in enabling. The Carterton plan is a thorough plan including comprehensive measures in the town and extending to nearby villages, somewhat overlapping with the Strategic Active Travel Network. We are happy to support it.

**Thame LCWIP** – The Thame LCWIP is also very good, but we had three comments from our Thame group.

First, they found the plan very technical. In Wantage, a similar approach from the same consultant was praised its detail and comprehensiveness. To some extent this type of plan needs a lot of detail and I see this as a feature not a problem.

Second, they were concerned that the scope did not cover nearby villages, for example Moreton. Some LCWIPs do and some don't, which is an unfortunate inconsistency. The Strategic Active Travel Network naturally focuses on the priority routes on a county basis. Third, they felt that opportunities to use small lanes as cut-throughs in the town had been missed. I haven't been able to check this, but I don't think that it should stop approval of the main plan.

An LCWIP is intended as a 'living document', and for the Thame LCWIP in particular it may be valuable to consider whether routes to villages and these extra routes within the town would be valuable additions to a future version.

**A4074 speed limits** – One of the best bits about this proposal is that it completes the 50mph (or less) on the southern part of the ring road, avoiding the currently wide variations in speed. I can understand why there are large numbers of objections to reducing speed limits - drivers rarely want to go slower, and the A4074 is a very 'open' feeling road for most of its length. Unfortunately, that leads to a lot of unsafe behaviour. From my observation on the A4074 this is speed and dangerous overtaking (and I'm sure that drink and drugs play a role in some). This Council can't stop people exceeding the speed limit or overtaking dangerously, but it can reduce the speed they start from, the speed of vehicles they overtake and the speed of the vehicles coming the other way. You can hope and persuade Thames Valley Police to do some enforcement. The thing that would be transformative on this road is average speed cameras.

**Weston on the Green Speed limits** – Weston on the Green is a village that finds itself unfortunately on a B road and occasional rat run that connects to the A34. It is also on National Cycle Network Route 51 and cyclists and cycling groups quite often come past here and may stop at The Milk Shed cafe. Reducing the speed limit to 30mph for about half a mile would benefit the safety of both residents and visitors to the village and seems like a very minimum concession.

**A40 no right turns onto A40 at Barnard Gate** – This looks sensible as a low cost, easily implemented safety measure given the fast and busy nature of the A40 and the casualty record. Others note that further measures may be required here and in other places – this is a reminder of the constant dangers inherent in motor traffic, which kills five people a day. We're not sure why the police response is more concerned about extra enforcement workload rather than positive to support something that may reduce casualties.

**Rose Hill proposed traffic calming SRET** – I can see both sides of the argument here. I haven't spent enough time looking at the junction to have a strong view on what would happen if you adopted a one-way or filtered approach - I think they would be preferable, but I can see why officers are reluctant. If implementing the SRETs would preclude further measures then I would be concerned, but I don't see why they should, and further plans have not been worked up. So approving the SRETs, seeing how they work, and going from there would be a reasonable approach.



**Holton/Wheatley gap closure** – This appears a very sensible safety measure.

**Witney parallel crossing** – This looks a good design (short of doing more 'arms'). We are astonished by the motonormative comment by the police traffic management officer consultation response, more worried about car shunts on the roundabout, with people protected by 2-tonne metal boxes, than in protecting people from being squashed by 2-tonne metal boxes while trying to cross a roundabout exit where drivers cannot be relied on to signal their direction.

This page is intentionally left blank