

Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport Management

Thursday, 22 January 2026

ADDENDA

3. Petitions and Public Address (Pages 3 - 42)

Written statements attached.

5. Woodstock Road Bus Lane Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) and St Giles' Waiting Restrictions ETRO (Pages 43 - 48)

Updated annex to reflect missing information due to technical error when published.

This page is intentionally left blank

Thank you for letting speak at your committee meeting. Before starting I'd like to introduce myself. I am an energy and climate change consultant of 30 years, advising on national NZ policy, now at the Energy Systems Catapult, a NFP body set up by the Government. I pride myself on being impartial and unbiased. I have won Cabinet Office awards, and last year my work was short listed for an industry leadership award. My family have lived in North Oxford for generations, known for being builders, circa 100 years ago my great great uncle was Lord Mayor. I therefore have an enduring love for the place we are caretakers of. As a resident of Woodstock Road, I have followed the ETRO debate and reading the paper for this session I found it to be biased and inaccurate leading to me to write. The results of the trial are stark and show no overall success. The consultation results are clear, 70-77% of respondents objected to the ETRO bus lane amendment. And evidence indicates it has not delivered the original objectives either, air quality is worse, times of journeys are worse in the morning, making only a marginal change in the evening, and above all the road is more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. There are also inaccuracies in the paper submitted including:

1. No work has been done to improve the cycle route: Cylcox 's original response declared the scheme dangerous, particularly the upper part of the Woodstock Road, where there is no longer a cycle route, only a shared pedestrian pavement. The paper mentions mitigation changes implemented, however I can reassure you there are none to the visible eye. Danger is particularly acute on the eastern side of the road by first turn, where Cherwell and Wolvercote school pupils cross the road, cyclists are at full pelt, and there is a bus stop.

2. The paper suggests there have been no accidents, however the residents have witnessed many accidents and near misses. To highlight a few, in the first week a car was abandoned by first turn bus stop for several days after a collision. 24th September 2025 there were two collisions in 1 day, a cyclist was hit in the morning road closed, buses stopped, and subsequently two cars collided in the afternoon. Mr Gant is aware of this as a residents met with him the same week and highlighted the incidents. 4th December 2025 the road was closed due to a serious scooter and car incident, buses stopped and passengers on foot.

3. First Turn Traffic has increased substantially. There is little mention of increased morning traffic at First Turn, by Wolvercote school and Mere Road, with a degradation in air quality, specifically where small children are heading to school.

Further down the Woodstock Road, the junction "improvements" have not addressed the rainwater drainage issues, which are now exacerbated by the higher junction points. Making it all the more dangerous for bike users and pedestrians. Climate change is likely to increase intense rainfall, and yet the opportunity has been missed to prepare ourselves, indeed the road is now less able to cope.

Finally, the argument posed that the budget is not available to undo the ETRO trail is poor, as with any temporary scheme the decision for the trial should not have been taken without the budget allocated for undoing it OR understanding of where the budget was coming from. I also note a suggested budget of £350k is required, however my freedom of information request stated that £284k was spent setting the scheme up. Either inflation is substantial or your officers provided misinformation in your FOI request.

Despite all this evidence, or lack of, if you do insist on keeping the scheme I would suggest that you consider some remedial works which will reduce the levels of danger, including improving the road surface, making it 20mph and installing speed cameras both ways, traffic lights to manage traffic at first turn, and something to limit danger at the first turn pedestrian traffic lights. But of course, you might find resolving these externalities created requires a bigger budget than simply reverting to the original road layout.

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee – Woodstock Rd ETRO

The bus lane reversal seems to have worked as predicted. It is hard to tell from the county monitoring data, but one assumes the overall effect on bus services is positive, given the support from Oxford Bus Company. It would have been good if OBC and Stagecoach (which didn't respond to the consultation) had provided more information about this to supplement the county data.

The cycling provision on Woodstock Rd remains terrible.

Cyclox objected to this scheme because it added 200 metres more of execrable 1990s-style "shared path", southbound from the Wolvercote roundabout to Blandford Avenue. That path is still laid out exactly as it was before this scheme - as a footway - with the addition of signs authorising cycling and no more. No improvements were made to that path to make it suitable for cycling, nor has any attempt been made to make the crossings of Blandford Ave and Davenant Rd safe.

If the county is at all serious about its support for cycling, let alone the LTCP cycling trip target, we have to stop putting in third-rate cycling infrastructure like this.

There is not a single main road in Oxford that has fully adequate cycling infrastructure, apart from the Marston Ferry Rd cycle track - and even that hasn't been resurfaced in fifty years - but the Woodstock Rd remains among the worst.

It has a completely incoherent mix of too narrow cycle lanes, bus lanes, on-footway "cycle tracks" or shared paths full of obstructions and with no continuity across side streets, and sections with no cycling provision at all. It is a standout illustration of the woes of "dual provision", where people cycling are offered two bad options instead of one good one.

Given the poor quality of the cycling infrastructure along Woodstock Rd, with many people cycling mixed with motor traffic, and the large amount of both pedestrian and cycle "exchange" across Woodstock Rd, we feel it should be made 20mph as a matter of urgency.

We then need 1) measures to reduce car traffic - the traffic filters, the ZEZ and the WPL, but also direct measures to reduce car parking in the city centre and Summertown - to a point where we can 2) reallocate the bus lanes and use that space to 3) put in continuous cycle lanes (with separation where possible) the length of Woodstock Rd. And then, if we can ever find the money, we need 4) a full corridor rebuild with proper cycle tracks, along the lines of the 2021 plans. But speed limit reductions can and should be brought in now.

This page is intentionally left blank

I live on the Woodstock Road in the ETRO zone and represent the views of many residents and neighbours. Additionally, for the past 3 years my wife has been Head of Governors at a Primary School on the road.

When this ETRO was approved at a meeting on Thursday, 18 July 2024 chaired by Cllr Roberts, meeting reports and statements in support of the proposal contained significant factual inaccuracies.

Specifically, with regard to public consultation, it was stated that 42% “supported or strongly supported” the proposed changes, while 30% were “opposed or strongly opposed”. These statistics were entirely false and totally at odds with responses published in detail at the time. Strong opposition has remained consistent in subsequent consultations in which:

- 70% of all respondents objected the introduction of the bus lane Northbound
- 77% of all respondents objected to the removal of the bus lane Southbound

With regard to the ETRO’s impact it was stated that “modelling undertaken suggests that the reversal of the bus lane would be strongly beneficial” giving the entirely false impression that the bus lane “reversal” (both directions) had been modelled at all. It was later confirmed by Officers that (I quote):

“CMD report does not include any forecasts of the impact of the bus lane changes, since the version of the scheme recommended (at CMD) has never been modelled” [SOURCE: Kraftl Martin RE: ETRO Experimental Bus Lane Reversals \[email\]. - 24 July 2024.](#)

Putting to one side that the ETRO decision meeting in 2024 was presented with materially misleading information, the ETRO itself has been every bit as dangerous as almost everyone consulted warned it would be. I cannot describe in 3 minutes, the chaos on our road in the morning rush hour as frequent bus and P&R services into town block the main traffic flow causing gridlock on surrounding streets and serious jeopardy at junctions.

Regarding road safety near misses and accidents usually go unreported unless a 999 response is requested. We see more accidents and narrowly avoided collisions daily as cyclists (*many of them primary school children*) mix with cars, vans and HGV’s because this ETRO has removed the relative safety of a Southbound bus lane leaving only very narrow pavements (in terrible condition) described by your department as “*totally inadequate for mixed pedestrian and cycle use*”. Where you have introduced a new bus lane on the opposite side of the road, there is an existing, wide and continuous off-road cycle lane. Even *Cycloxx* have objected to this ETRO on safety grounds.

Morning southbound bus journeys are demonstrably slower through the ETRO area. *What for?* So Northbound buses pass through the zone marginally faster, at best.

Air pollution - *to which young children walking and cycling to school are known to be especially vulnerable* - has also increased where measured at sites on the affected route.

Feedback from residents across Wolvercote, Five Mile Drive, Lakeside, Southerland Ave, Woodstock Rd, Woodstock, Kidlington, Blandford Ave, Davenant Road, Middle Way – all states the same thing - this ETRO has resulted in more danger to pedestrians and cyclists, longer bus commutes, fewer actual bus stops, a pot-holed road surface and increased air pollution.

Yet officers conclude that there is no issue. No problem. Everything is better. Such conclusions are devoid of reality. This experiment has demonstrably failed. To make the failure *permanent* would be utterly absurd and irresponsible. I urge you to return the road to its original layout for the sake of commuters, residents and above all school children and parents who you have encouraged to cycle and walk to school on a road now more dangerous than before this ill-conceived ETRO went ahead.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

Address to Delegated Decisions – Cabinet Member for Transport – 22 January 2026

These comments are from Robin Tucker, Co-Chair of CoHSAT.

5. Woodstock Road Bus Lane ETRO

On the bus lanes, we have no problem. For walking, wheeling and cycling the reversal is neutral.

The problem with Woodstock Road is that, apart from the cyclists face two poor choices. Either share a poorly surfaced and undulating pavement with pedestrians and the risk of being hit by a car reversing out of a driveway. Or, share the smooth carriageway with motorists who can be impatient and think you should be on the pavement. I have been honked at by a driver, who passed me and I then caught and passed him using the bus lane while he was in the queue for the roundabout.

This poor provision should not be viewed as a long-term solution.

6. Eynsham LCWIP

An LCWIP is a crucial document in the development of a town's walking and cycling networks. It sets out the vision for a complete and coherent network, and the individual improvement that are required to achieve it. It's a vital step towards gaining funding towards these schemes.

We are pleased that the development of the Eynsham LCWIP has involved local stakeholders including active travel and sustainability groups, and the Parish Council. We reviewed the cycle routes in and around Eynsham with our Active Travel Champion in developing the Oxfordshire Online Cycle Map, which maps the current state, and this plan appears to cover the issues for improvement that we spotted. BikeSafe the local group and CoHSAT members offer praise for the thoroughness of the process and surveys.

Reading the plan and the consultation responses, we note three themes.

1. The B4044 path. Whenever Eynsham is mentioned the need for this connection comes up. It's still needed.

2. Despite the importance of the B4044, there's a huge opportunity for walking and cycling within Eynsham. Nowhere is Eynsham more than a mile from the centre – a 20-minute walk, or 5-minute cycle. Yet few children cycle to school and few adults walk or ride around town. Eynsham is growing fast. The need and the opportunity are clear.

3. Read the consultation responses and the call for speed of delivery is clear. We know that this depends on resource and funding, and this Council is not made of money. But please note and take these responses, common across many LCWIPs, to our MPs and Ministers to emphasise the call for better funding for this highly valued, and high return infrastructure.

7. Sheep Street ETRO

There are several words missing from the Officer's Report on the Sheep Street ETRO. When the cycling permission for Sheep Street, was approved, some consultation responses predicted 'chaos', they said people could be 'hurt', 'knocked down', and even 'gangs will happen'.

Well, none of this has happened. Collisions, let alone gangs, are not mentioned once in the report.

What the report does describe is how in the vast majority of interactions, cyclists give way to pedestrians, and this will not count the journeys that pass without any interaction.

Looking at the disabled persons aspect of the scheme, we support the intent, but we are concerned about the practicalities. Disabled people face enough barriers without having to prove their disabilities and have an extra form of ID for a vehicle of such low impact as a cycle. Signage may be sufficient.

8. East Oxford CPZ and 9. Headington CPZ

The Council's actions should relate to its policies. The East Oxford and Headington CPZ items reference health, wellbeing, the climate emergency and an inclusive, integrated and sustainable transport. But they do not reference the two key policy documents, the County's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan or the Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan.

They should, and they should therefore note the LTCP targets, all eight of which are underpinned by reducing private car traffic and three reference it specifically. Yet at present, since Covid, car traffic has been climbing back towards the 2019 baseline, not falling towards the target.

The LTCP has an explicit policy to reduce car parking to reflect this. The Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan has an action to reduce public parking provision to deliver this.

If you create more parking, you will allow more cars into the streets and create more car journeys it is as simple as that. The increased car parking aspects of these proposals should not proceed, because they are counter to your policies, and will bring additional congestion, pollution and casualties onto our roads.

At the same time, in most of Oxford there is a dearth of good cycle parking. 59% of adults in Oxford cycle, but most only occasionally, and cycle storage is one of the biggest barriers. The very limited cycle hangar trial in Jericho has proved hugely over-subscribed, and there are people all over Oxford clamouring for similar safe storage.

A hangar holds 6 bikes. If just 10% of car parking spaces were converted to cycle hangars, the total parking capacity of the bays would be increased by 50%. **Car Club spaces would also be more beneficial than regular parking.** This is the way to the inclusive, integrated and sustainable transport system that the LTCP describes.

To reiterate. The agreed policy of this council is not to be balanced. It is to reduce car travel and increase cycling. We support the cycle parking in the East Oxford proposal, but none of the car parking bay or usage extensions. The Headington proposals are almost all contra to policy and should be reviewed in full.

[Footnote: the calculation of 50% may appear to equate one cycle to one car, but a 6-cycle hangar is 2578mm x 2030mm, so two fit in most car parking bays, equating two bikes to one car.]

11. Abingdon Centre East

As we have already noted today, the LTCP, the guiding strategy for transport in Oxfordshire sets out targets and policies to reduce private car journeys and increase active travel and public transport.

These proposals for Abingdon Centre East do that, with measured extensions to no waiting areas that will improve bus journeys and reduce road danger.

Knowing Abingdon well, I know the changes on Radley Road will have a particular benefit. Buses and other wider vehicles are often delayed here due to the inability to pass. It will also make the road safer for cycling by removing the car door hazard and taking the route out of the 3 to 4 metre width zone that encourages dangerous close passes.

12. Abingdon Town Centre

This proposal has several elements to address.

- Drayton Road, we support formalisation of the No Loading restrictions to address occasional problems.

- Abingdon Bridge, I don't understand why this is not pursued. Loading causes traffic disruption and is dangerous to navigate for people cycling to Culham or Europa School, or in to Abingdon. The only employment sites on the bridge are the café and a pub – the café has off-street parking, the pub could surely arrange delivery out of peak hours. There are no schools on the bridge. The need for taxis mentioned is not shown. There is one comment from the 'Abingdon Bridge area' concerned about care visits, but this is vague and not identified to the bridge itself. There is a large car park 100m from the houses on the bridge.
- West St Helen Street, the removal of the existing paid parking and addition of the new limited waiting bay opposite seems reasonable. There is an issue for another time about the bus stop here being abused for general parking.
- St. Edmunds Lane. We oppose the addition of this parking, because it increases traffic and all of the other problems that go with it.
- St. Helen's Wharf. This area is currently unrestricted, so we support parking controls being brought into place.
- Manor Court. These are for limited waiting bays and no residential parking rights were noted in the consultation. The consultation mentioned visitors and local businesses, combined with our local knowledge we expect these would be mostly used by visitors to the retirement homes in Cygnet Court and Mill Stream Court. We do not object.

However, there is no cycle parking at these properties as I noted when delivering medicines during the pandemic. If they are to benefit from the public providing land for parking, could they provide some spaces for parking? For retired people it is one of the most healthy and accessible activities available, and the benefits are highest for those currently least active

13. Abingdon Twelve Acre Drive Pedestrian Crossing and Bus Stops

This proposal is excellent and we fully support it. The nearest bus stops round the ring road are 600 metres away.

The toucan will join up to a path that partly exists and partly will be created from a muddy track by development funding. The shared path will then run from Abingdon North new housing across the Ring Road to Peachcroft shops, community centre and playground, and then connect to other routes through the town.

14. Ambrosden Traffic calming

This is simple, sensible traffic calming and we support it. We note many of the concerns are that the speed limit should be slower.

Danny Yee – Eynsham LCWIP

We support the adoption of the Eynsham LCWIP. It is a solid and comprehensive piece of work, which will lay the foundation for some real improvements to walking and cycling in the village and its environs.

Our major concern remains that this, like other Oxfordshire LCWIPs, does not consider the possibility of circulation schemes. The report says, in response to our consultation submission, that "A more comprehensive review of traffic flow in Eynsham will be considered as part of a complimentary piece of work to the LCWIP" and, in another response.

"Traffic routing in the village centre will be considered as part of the Eynsham Village Centre project – a complimentary project to the LCWIP that considers traffic flow and routing in the village centre, alongside public realm and placemaking improvements."

But there is no timeline for this project and logically planning for motor traffic needs to precede or accompany planning of a cycle network. Any cycle network could be undermined by increases in motor traffic - perhaps from new developments - making streets too hostile for people to cycle on. And a removal or reduction of motor traffic could open up new routes for cycling.

Managing motor traffic is absolutely central to enabling walking and especially cycling. It isn't so explicit in LTN 1/20, but the draft Active Travel England _Rural Design Guide_ says "Where cyclists are on-carriageway, traffic volumes may be up to 2000 pcu/day or 200 pcu/hour but should desirably be less." This needs to be central to any planning for cycling, as the vast bulk of cycling will continue to involve sharing the carriageway with motor traffic.

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee – Sheep Street ETRO

While creating a special status for disabled cyclists is a good idea, this is not something that any other local authority in the UK has done and it is unclear how it could effectively be implemented. We suggest that officers be asked to explore the options for such a scheme, but that creating one not be a requirement for either continuing the ETRO or making it permanent.

It may be relatively straightforward to issue permits to people with disabilities who are reliant on cycling and request an exemption, but how would such a permit be used and displayed? Since, unlike a blue badge, it would authorise movement rather than parking, it would need to be attached to a moving cycle in such a way as to be clearly visible to people from all directions.

And would such a token or permit be understood and recognised by people? Blue badges are managed by local authorities but are used nationally -- and are still not universally understood.

My fear is that this will create a situation where some people with disabilities are authorised to cycle but where that authorisation is not recognised or understood, leading to abuse and hostility being directed at them. Being subsequently able to show a permit is hardly a satisfactory resolution of that. So if disabled cycling permits are introduced, the county would need to run an outreach/education program to explain them.

One option, either in conjunction with a permit scheme or independently, would be to put up "cyclists dismount unless a mobility aid" signs, though combining that with time restrictions would make for a complicated message.

However implemented, any such scheme would only address part of the problem. It would do nothing, for example, to help people who are pregnant and can cycle but not easily walk, or anyone with a tricycle or cargo cycle that can't easily be pushed.

One of the respondents said "Allowing cycling on some days and not others is confusing for people" and others made similar comments. It would seem simpler to just allow cycling on Sheep St at all times of the week and let the high density of people on market days control their behaviour. Both my own experience and studies suggest that pedestrian-cycle conflicts are rare when a space is very crowded, because people cycling have no choice but to slow down and give way, or dismount.

More generally, I would like to commend officers on their robust monitoring and evaluation of this scheme.

This page is intentionally left blank

Mobility Aids in Sheep Street on Market Days - Transport Decisions 22.01.26

I read in the Clarion that OCC is considering a permit scheme to allow Disabled cyclists to access Sheep Street on Fridays.

Being allowed to use Sheep Street to cycle to and from the station for the past 10 months has been pleasant and stress-free. But for me, Friday isn't about getting to the station, it's about getting to the shops and stalls in Sheep Street.

My wife and I shop on a Friday because it fits with our schedules and the weekly market. I take my electric trike to carry the shopping and prior to the ETRO we would regularly stop at the bread stall, flower stall, cheese stall and fish van, as well as Bicester Green at one end of the street and Holland & Barrett at the other. I would cycle my trike while my wife pushed her bike from place to place. We did this for the best part of three years.

Ironically, post ETRO, that became unpleasant to the point that now I only cycle there with my hand-cycle on Fridays. I can't carry very much on my hand-bike though, let alone a week's shopping and some flowering plants, so shopping there doesn't include me when it comes to Sheep Street. Consequently, my wife doesn't go there as often either, sticking to Sainsburys.

From my experience people don't have a problem with a Disabled person cycling when it's made obvious, like when I'm riding my hand-cycle. What would really help is a general understanding that many Disabled people make the best of their constraints by using other cycles as mobility aids too, and that if someone is cycling slowly and carefully in a place where most people wouldn't, they likely have a good reason for doing so. A person's impairment isn't always obvious, especially when cycling.

This proposal recognises that, and it's heartening to see a transport authority thinking beyond blue badge parking when it comes to Disabled people's mobility. The problem I see is, how best to foster that awareness among people generally in Bicester and beyond? What's reasonable and what isn't in a space like Sheep Street?

Personally I would apply for a permit if they were introduced, but such a scheme raises issues of its own when it comes to accessibility and enforcement.

During temporary roadworks in London recently, two local authorities chose exemption rather than permission. For schemes in Wandsworth and Greenwich, signs telling cyclists to dismount unless their cycle is a mobility aid were used, recognising that to dismount and push a cycle through such works isn't possible or safe for some people to do. In addition, Marshalls managing the works were given advice on how to enforce the cycling restriction in a way that was friendly but firm.

Also, the government's current consultation on changing the law regulating mobility aids could have a bearing on this, and the Council might like to participate in that debate to help shape a workable outcome that is reasonable for all of us.

Kevin Hickman, Bicester.

This page is intentionally left blank

I'm speaking here qua Active Travel Champion. There's much to really welcome in this CMD, I'm delighted to see the Eynsham LCWIP and the Abingdon pedestrian crossing as well as the DYs in Woodstock and the Blackthorn road amendments; the parking changes in Abingdon appear sensible as does the shift on Sheep Street.

Onto the CPZs, items 8 (EO) and 9 (Headington).

On Item 8, East Oxford, I believe the cabinet member should accept officer recommendations for 8a, c, f, g, h, i, j, k and reject recommendations for 8 d, e, and b. If it is possible to defer the decision on b (Cave St) as has been done for h (Boulter St cycle parking), in order to consider it as cycle / micromobility parking instead, then I would propose this instead of rejecting outright.

On item 9, Headington, I believe the cabinet member should accept officer recommendations for 9b, e, f, g, j, l, m, and n. And reject those for a, c, d, h, i, and k. As above, if it is possible to defer the decision on item L, Gardinier Street, as has been done for item M, that should be done instead.

Firstly, I just want to outline that I know that a lot of work has gone into these CPZ reviews and I welcome the officers' innovative thinking especially on micromobility and cycle parking. I think a huge amount in them has improved from the original proposals, however I believe they are still not compliant - which is why I have made the recommendations above.

The most important reason for my objections are that increasing parking is not policy compliant. LTCP Policy 33 is quite explicit: Take measures to reduce and restrict car parking availability. And privileging those who can afford to own private cars over bus users, cyclists, and pedestrians goes against other goals of the LTCP and goals of the council despite what is asserted in the report in paragraph 42 / 43 (EO); 41 / 42 (H) It also goes against the corporate policies laid out in the report (paragraph 13 in both). For EO, I call your attention to paragraph 37, which also states that the majority of survey respondents oppose it "overall opinions mostly opposed increased car parking in East Oxford."

I am concerned that paragraph 46 EO/44 Headington is inaccurate - we know from 2021 census data that only 38% of Oxford commuters drive cars, and I would ask officers to validate their contrary claim.

I very much welcome the micromobility & car-share initiatives in paragraphs 47, 48, 49 (EO); 45, 46, 47 (Headington).

Paragraph 57 & 58 in EO appear inaccurate, it de facto states that the reason we need to go against all corporate policy and add 16 spaces to EO is because women might feel safer at night. First, there is not one response from the consultation which raises this issue. Second, there is no data provided by TVP or indeed any other data. Third, my division is full of women who don't own cars - more than 30% of households do not own cars. We know from ONS data that there's a direct correlation between richer people and car ownership, so privileging those who can afford private cars over those who need to rely on buses and cycling seems extremely regressive. Additionally, in EO, we have a significant number of students

who do not own cars at all and I would argue they are among those most likely to be using the night time economy.

I believe there may be some very exceptional circumstances where we should “balance”, i.e. go against, our own transport hierarchy. However for me this is in occasionally prioritising bus users over cyclists on key bus routes, or taking into account business needs, and possibly being flexible where we have a lot of data or responses from vulnerable residents. None of those is true in this case and I advise the Cabinet Member to throw out the rationale in paragraphs 57 & 58 as they are speculative and no evidence is provided. I remind the Cabinet Member that there are already a lot of parking spaces - 737 - in East Oxford, and very few for cyclists, so rebalancing that should be an urgent priority.

Fundamentally, item C in EO (and item L in Headington) proposes converting DYLS to parking spaces on the grounds that they might be later converted to cycling spaces. We should be converting them directly now, not making the private car parking spaces first. This is why I propose you delay the decisions on these two items.

Siobhann Mansel-Pleydell – CPZ's

First, I want to pan back and give huge credit to OCC. Oxfordshire has one of the most ambitious Local Transport and Connectivity Plans in the country, and there are many talented, hard-working people here genuinely committed to delivering a greener, fairer, healthier Oxfordshire.

On this side of the fence, you've also got civil society, pulling in the same direction, equally committed and hardworking staff and volunteers, slogging away after work and at weekends to further the agenda.

And yet, we're hitting some repeat themes here: decisions that feel disconnected from the ambition and intent of country-leading strategy and policy. The recurring issue isn't lack of strategy. It's translating good policy into consistent practice.

Because a parking proposal isn't just a parking proposal.
It's a traffic decision, at a time when we're trying to reduce congestion.
It's a pollution decision, when we're trying to improve air quality.
It's a carbon decision, when we're aiming for net zero.
It's an equity decision, when spatial justice has to be taken seriously.
It's a kerbside decision, when we want to make active travel easier.

And it's a safety decision, when we need to create conditions for safety for everyone, especially the most vulnerable. Small changes add up. Incremental decisions and structural changes are how systems shift, little by little, with ripple effects on behaviour and social change, in the right direction, or the wrong one.

Colleagues and coalition partners have already called for the rejection of the CPZ proposals, and I endorse that. But I'm also here to make a plea for a change in how decisions are made.

Contradictions like this shouldn't reach Cabinet members. They should be caught upstream. Here are a few suggestions.

First: if a proposal or report doesn't explicitly refer to the LTCP and the Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan, it's a sign we're not using our own policies as the decision filter. Let's make that non-negotiable: every CPZ and kerbside proposal should state, up front, how it advances LTCP/COTP targets — or it pauses.

Second: understandably, people can't carry deep expertise across every directorate. So let's design for interconnection: make Active Travel, Public Health and Road Safety formal internal consultees for CPZ and kerbside schemes, with a clear sign-off step.

Third - this is exactly why we need a kerbside strategy: to pull through our priorities across policy areas, build in equity and spatial justice, and set clear decision gates on who signs off changes to the kerbside

And finally - this is also about sanity preservation as much as it is about shifting complex systems. Coming up against the same issues, making the same points, about similar problems is as demoralizing as it is sisyphian for everyone in this room.

We can do better than that. Not by working harder, but by working differently: tighter alignment to strategy and policy, clearer gateways, and joined-up sign-off. If we prioritise that now, we'll save time, reduce friction, and get better outcomes on the street and for people - which is what we're all here for.

This page is intentionally left blank

I'm the County Councillor for Parks and I was elected with a mandate for improving active travel and sustainable transport in my division.

I welcome most of the recommendations here, particularly for increased cycle parking. Thank you to the officers for the time they've spent on these proposals, consultations and report writing.

I have had residents contact me asking for more cycle parking so that they could safely store a cargo bike to transport children. No resident to date has contacted me to ask for _more_ car parking spaces. There are bikes tied to road signs across my division in the absence of suitably placed or enough cycle parking. I am therefore surprised to see some recommendations for increased car parking.

For East Oxford item 8, I ask the cabinet member to accept officer recommendations for 8a, c, f, g, h, i, j, k and reject recommendations for 8 b, d and e.

I agree with my Green colleague and Active Travel Champion, Emily Kerr that if it is at all possible, defer the decision on b (Cave St) as has been done for h (Boulter St cycle parking), in order to re-consider using it for cycle and micro-mobility parking instead - rather than rejecting it outright.

I have particular concerns about paragraphs 57 & 58 in the East Oxford Report which claims we need more car parking spaces to make women, disabled people, the elderly and children safer without any supporting evidence.

We know that women are less likely to have a full driving license (1) and drive fewer miles than men, though they make more car trips (2). Children of course - cannot drive at all until aged 17 and driving lessons are prohibitively expensive for many (3).

Women also travel more miles and make more trips by bus than men - we should be prioritising more frequent buses to improve travel for women - not increasing car parking spaces.

"Evidence indicates that many women and vulnerable individuals may avoid sustainable modes such as cycling or walking, especially after dark, due to inadequate lighting, lack of secure infrastructure"

Well, the County Council should be looking to provide adequate lighting and secure cycling and walking infrastructure to make active travel more accessible to everyone. We should not exacerbate the problem by providing car parking spaces, which encourages more car trips and therefore discourages cycling. There are many, many more car parking spaces than cycling spaces on residential streets already and people using their bikes deserve to have convenient bike parking, whether during the day or night.

Transport is the highest emitting sector of greenhouse gases in the UK. We have a responsibility to present and future generations to decarbonise travel as soon as possible. This means fewer car trips and more public and active transport. This will also bring so many benefits to public health from improved air quality to enabling people to take more exercise safely. Research has found reducing car parking spaces in cities is the second most effective way to reduce the number of cars in cities, second behind introducing a congestion charge (5).

I appreciate there will sometimes be circumstances where more car parking spaces may be needed, but I think the thresholds for that should be very high and are not met here.

Let's not undermine the effects of the congestion charge by bringing in more car parking spaces that there is little demand for.

1. <https://www.apteco.com/insights/blog/whos-behind-wheel-driving-licence-trends-and-penalty-points-across-uk> (men: 22.7 million; women: 19.7 million)
2. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2024/nts-2024-household-car-availability-and-trends-in-car-trips>
3. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c7vnp4j2811o>
4. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2023/nts-2023-trends-in-public-transport-use-and-multi-modal-public-transport-trips>
5. <https://theconversation.com/12-best-ways-to-get-cars-out-of-cities-ranked-by-new-research-180642>

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee – East Oxford CPZ

Cave St has half a dozen terrace houses which open directly onto the street and would hugely benefit from on-street cycle parking. And there is no cycle parking provision for visitors either. So I urge you to either reject (b) or send it back to have this space allocated as cycle parking instead.

The two proposed parking locations on Nye Bevan Close are directly on junctions which should be kept clear to ensure visibility; the parking bays on Leon Close are opposite right-angle off-street parking. So please reject (d) and (e). These spaces could more safely be used for either micro-mobility bays or cycle parking.

Both Cowley Rd and St Clements have terrible injury records, especially for people cycling, and car movements in and out of side streets are a major contributor to that. So we should not be adding short-stay parking on the side street stubs here, but should try to keep visitor car parking, other than loading and disabled parking, localised to the Union St and St Clements car parks. And all car parking in these areas should be charged for, here and anywhere where demand exceeds supply.

On Bath St, the cycle parking should be in the space closest to St Clements, so as to be more useful for visitors to the shops there. And we oppose the conversion of permit parking bays to shared use bays, both here and on Boulter St. If there are more resident parking spaces on these streets than are needed, then the spare space should be reallocated to cycle parking, not converted to shared use bays. Streets can have both general cycle parking and micro-mobility parking. Please modify (a) and reject (g).

The officers' report talks a lot about the need for balance, but on most residential streets this appears to mean allocating 100% of the available kerbside space to either car parking or access for off-street car parking. I do not see how this can possibly be considered balanced.

My daughter has just turned thirteen and is now cycling independently around Oxford, to visit friends or go to after-school activities. In winter that often involves cycling in the dark, and one of the challenges she faces is finding parking at destinations, where she often has to hunt around to find a fence or post to lock her bike to. So I was flabbergasted to find the officers' report talking about women and vulnerable people and the problems they face cycling because of poor infrastructure, but then using that as an argument for more car parking and against putting in cycle parking. Why is safety for drivers - adults who are protected in cars - being prioritised over safety for children and adults who cycle?

The absence of proper cycle parking also results in cycles obstructing footways, which creates problems for people using wheelchairs, mobility scooters, and buggies. A lack of cycle parking is part of our infrastructure problem, and one we have the power to address in schemes like these.

Lambeth, which has lower cycling rates than Oxford, has a goal of having cycle parking every fifty metres on residential streets. Even without an explicit goal like that, we have to provide something for people cycling and not just address the needs of people driving. And it's good that we are planning more car club bays and thinking about micro-mobility, but if we want a comprehensive city-wide hire e-bike scheme then we are going to need to reallocate significantly more kerbside space for micro-mobility. And we should be at least thinking about seating, parklets, street trees, bike hangers, and rain gardens.

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee – Headington Central CPZ

In my consultation response for Cyclox and OLS I raised what I consider serious safety concerns about the proposed parking bays on Lime Walk. These concerns were not considered at all in the officers' report. Even if the safety issues are not deemed significant, these spaces should be used for cycle parking for the pub and the shops on London Rd and homes. Please reject (d) or modify it to cycle parking instead.

There is no cycle parking provision of any kind on the 400 metres of New High St, even though it has many terrace houses with no front yards and no possibility for off-street cycle parking. So why, when a little bit of space is found, is it being used to increase the already extensive car parking provision? Similarly, the only cycle parking on 250 metres of Kennett Rd is on the footway at the London Rd end; every spare metre of kerb space has been given over to car parking. How is this a fair allocation of space? On All Saints Rd and Gardiner Rd there is, again, no cycle parking anywhere to be seen. Where are people who cycle to the church supposed to park?

I urge you to reject (k), (a), (c) and (i) and ask officers to use the spare space in these locations for cycle parking instead of car parking.

Arguing that providing more car parking is necessary to stop illegal parking makes no sense. The number of people who might want to park cars around Headington centre vastly exceeds any possible provision for them, so adding more car parking is not going to reduce illegal parking, or the need for enforcement.

These schemes will involve "an increase of 2% in residential parking provision". That is not small: a 2% increase in peak hour traffic would make congestion significantly worse, undermining the traffic filters and other schemes in the Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan. And given the LTCP target is a 25% reduction in car trips by 2030, it's a step in the wrong direction. The officers' report refers to "a desire to remove [sic] vehicle numbers on Oxfordshire roads", but that is not just a "desire" but the headline goal in the LTCP.

I often urge the county to change its policies, but LTCP policy 33 is already quite explicit. "Take measures to reduce and restrict car parking availability" and "Ensure the parking requirements of all modes of transport are considered, in line with our transport user hierarchy". We need a proper kerbside strategy, but we also need to take existing policy seriously.

Lambeth has committed to using 25% of its kerbside space sustainably. That may be too ambitious for us, but we should mandate something here - even a 5% target would be better than the current zero.

This page is intentionally left blank

Good morning, I'm from Headington Liveable Streets addressing the Headington Central CPZ proposals.

The key point is that the proposals to add car parking spaces are an egregious breach of Council policy and should never have made it this far.

The parking team seems to be actively working against Council policies, wasting resources on plans that sabotage the aims of the LTCP, COTP and Safer Roads scheme.

The Council has many progressive policies on transport and use of public space, but so far we've seen few examples of these being realised on our streets, because many of its proposals run counter to, or just ignore, the applicable policies.

Some of today's proposals will help deliver on these policies, but increasing car parking in Headington isn't one of them.

The proposal seems blind to how parking spaces generate car trips:

The report refers⁽²¹⁾ to providing "additional parking capacity for up to 16 vehicles". This is patently incorrect. It's 16 **spaces** that will be used by **multiple** vehicles each day. Typical usage of the 9 new spaces on Lime Walk and New High Street could easily produce 300 extra car trips each day¹.

Yet reducing car parking is the most effective way to reduce car trips. Parking management can be a powerful tool to re-shape the traffic balance on our roads, but the parking team seems unaware of its role in reducing car trips or how to apply the "decide and provide" model to its work.

The Council's goal to remove 25% of car trips won't happen without a significant reduction in car parking.

Headington is incredibly hostile for people cycling, walking and using mobility devices, due to the dominant presence of cars, both moving and parked.

The hierarchy of safety controls says the most effective way to protect people is to remove the hazard – in this case, cars.

So reducing car parking is critical to achieving the Safer Roads scheme goals. Any additional spaces will prevent the scheme delivering meaningful safety improvements.

It shouldn't be down to campaign groups and residents to explain how the Council's proposals contravene its own policies. Something is clearly going very wrong in the Council, preventing translation of good policy into good practice.

I think the report's claims that women's safety will be improved by adding car parking spaces is highly dubious^(53, 54). For example, it ignores how cars enable men to commit crimes against women, from kerb-crawling and verbal harassment, to abduction and sex trafficking. Much of the predatory behaviour women and girls in Headington are subjected to is from men in or near their cars.

Transport management **can** be used to improve safety for women and girls, but adding car parking spaces isn't the answer.

I urge you to reject the addition of car parking spaces in this CPZ proposal.

We must also ensure that such proposals aren't repeated in the future. To address this, I suggest delivering training on the relevant policies and making the Active Travel Team an internal consultee with a veto to prevent any proposals that go against Council transport policy.

¹ Assuming an average 20-minute parking period over 12 hours.

I am writing to register my **strong objection** to the approved parking bay proposed directly outside my home at **York Road, Oxford**. This proposal represents a clear deterioration in safety, access, health, and residential amenity, and it introduces serious problems in a location where **no such issues currently exist**.

Safety and Access

The proposed parking bay would be positioned immediately outside my front door, creating a high risk of obstruction to my household entrance. This would fundamentally change my ability to safely enter and leave my home on a daily basis. Even short-term obstruction would cause significant difficulty for residents, visitors, deliveries, and most critically emergency access. York Road is a narrow residential street. At present, the street functions without blocking entrances or creating conflict between parked vehicles and residents. Formalising a parking bay at this specific location would intensify congestion, reduce visibility, and significantly increase the risk of accidents involving pedestrians and passing vehicles.

Disproportionate Impact on Residents

The proposal would not merely inconvenience one household; it would negatively affect **at least three neighbouring properties**, concentrating the impact of this scheme on a small number of residents who are currently unaffected. This creates a clear issue of fairness and proportionality. A scheme intended to manage parking should not do so by transferring risk and disruption onto a limited number of homes.

Health and Residential Amenity

Locating a parking bay directly outside a residential entrance raises serious health concerns. Increased exposure to vehicle fumes, idling engines, and noise directly outside my front door would significantly harm the quality of the living environment. This is incompatible with the principles of healthy streets and the duty to protect residential wellbeing.

Conflict with Transport and Environmental Objectives

It is difficult to reconcile this proposal with wider transport policies aimed at reducing car dominance, improving air quality, and promoting safer residential streets. Increasing formal parking provision in a constrained residential location directly undermines these objectives and sends a contradictory message to residents.

Absence of Justification

Most importantly, there is **no existing problem at this location that warrants intervention**. The current parking arrangement operates without blocking entrances, causing safety concerns, or generating complaints. Introducing a parking bay here would not resolve an issue it would **create one**.

Conclusion

This proposal would:

- Compromise **safety and access**,
- Harm **health and residential amenity**,
- Disproportionately affect **multiple households**,
- Conflict with stated **transport and environmental policies**,
- Introduce problems where **none currently exist**

For these reasons, I respectfully but firmly request that the decision to approve the parking bay outside **York Road** be **reconsidered** and that the existing arrangement be retained.

Yours sincerely,
Resident, York Road

This page is intentionally left blank

Parking Issues in Woodstock WTC meeting Tuesday 13th January 2026

Since the parking charges were introduced in Woodstock Town Centre areas the displaced parking has been causing great difficulty for the streets on the outer part of Woodstock.

Although there has been a great many complaints, it seems OCC have chosen not to take any notice of the plea for a full and proper review of the parking as a whole in Woodstock.

There is no doubt that some of the problem comes from visitor to Blenheim for the purpose of avoid car park charges actually within Blenheim grounds but by no means all. The parking issues for fulltime and part time employees plus the voluntary sector has become a big problem as the paid parking times do not accommodate the need.

Hensington Road Car Park

Original Proposals

Changing 101 parking bays from 12 hour maximum parking stay to:-

Only 35 x 12 hour maximum stay

66 x 4 hour maximum stay

The correspondence received below seems to only change the 12 hour max stay parking time to 10 hours.

From: Parking Manager WODC

Sent: 19 December 2025 09:06

A meeting was held on the 3rd December 2025 where all feedback from the consultation was considered.

The West Oxfordshire Parking Survey data demonstrates high demand for spaces in three of the districts' car parks. There are competing demands for spaces for different users and the data indicates a mixture of long and short stay spaces at these car parks will better meet customer demand in Woodstock, Burford and Charlbury.

A public consultation took place in October and November 2025 to introduce a number of short stay parking spaces at each of the three car parks. The proposal included a reduction in the 12-hour maximum stay to discourage commuter parking and protect spaces for local workers in the area.

All comments, concerns and supporting feedback was discussed, and as a result the proposals have been adjusted to address these.

The feedback included concerns and comments around the proposed long stay of 8 hours for Charlbury as this was not considered sufficient for many local workers. The decision was made to change the long stay at each of the three car parks to 10 hours.

The feedback also included concerns that the proposed changes did not retain a sufficient number of long stay spaces to accommodate local workers and others at each location particularly Charlbury and Woodstock. The decision was to create a fair balance between short and long stay restrictions. The number of long stay spaces to be retained at Charlbury and Woodstock was therefore increased. The balance at Burford was considered however, the comprehensive data gathered at this site strongly supports that 60% of users stay less than 4 hours.

There will be increased enforcement of the three car parks which will include monitoring of use.

The Notice of Making will be made in the New Year; we will formally write to you when the new order has been adopted.

M Wheatley
Parking Manager

Although the decision by WODC is received with great relief this doesn't address the problem for all fulltime workers. Once the Hensington Road Car Park is full (often very early in the day with workers purposely arriving early to secure a parking place) the streets on the outskirts of Woodstock such as Glyme Close, Brook Hill, Green Lane and Barn Piece

Estate in Old Woodstock that to say nothing of the recent practice of parking in Manor Road on the A44 are crammed with parked cars

The claim seems to be that not enough of the residents have complained. This should not be the case as Councillors are voted in to be the voice of the Town many Councillors have been approached by residents regarding Parking issues and should be listened to not informed they have no proof. Why would Councilors make things up? Despite carrying out 2 parking survey and submitting them to OCC they chose to ignore them claiming these Surveys were not carried out under OCC

With the prospect of a new Drs Surgery being sited on the redundant Owen Mumford site and the claim of Cllr Graham he will oversee feasibility and access with regard to traffic volume and accommodating possible public transport access surely now it the time for a full traffic survey to be carried out and not just piecemeal action. The volume of need for parking and control is upper most for the success of a happy community all of whom pay taxes and should be treated equally.

Unfortunately there has been no action regarding unacceptable parking such as over or very close to residents access from their property, parking with half the vehicle on a public path, (causing no disability access or push chairs access) opposite road junction, on corners, grass verges and even across access to Thames Water facilities for should something go wrong they have no chance of immediate access.

In November 2021 at a Woodstock Council meeting Cllr Grahm stated ‘The new Town Centre Parking Proposal will not work without enforcement’ never a truer word spoke except the enforcement has not covered all areas of Woodstock nor does Woodstock benefit from any revenue generated by the parking charges.

Motion: Proposed by Cllr Grant Seconded by Cllr

- a) WTC calls for Oxfordshire Council to carry out a full parking survey together with face to face consultation with residents at times to suit work timetable so accessible to as many residents as possible and to use the outcome to relieve the unacceptable pressure of displaced parking causing unacceptable congestion and inconvenience to all who are involved.*
- b) Alternatively to give guidance to how they would like the information collected by WTC and give Assurance that the findings will be given full consideration to improve all parking issues in Woodstock*

Recent Information to date

Woodstock Town Council meeting Tuesday 9th December 2025

Item 7. To receive an oral report from Cllr Andy Graham

Cadogan Park: I have been working with the residents a considerable amount of time, you will remember that were a lot of complaints about Blenheim Events and particularly the Christmas Events which were impacting on that area particularly. At the moment there has been some arrangements but they are not enforceable but they look enforceable but at the moment it does state there is no parking and it seems to be working.

If the proves not to work then there is another set of proposals that will come forward if this not the case. The other thing the parking generally down there, there are some public safety issues, particularly in Princes Ride and onto Flemings Road, bends around there are very dangerous people are parking on those corners and it makes it very difficult to navigate, the bus going round there overtaking parked cars on a bend is just not acceptable and a consultation that was done with the residents there is a scheme hat s coming forward in January 2026 as a result of that.

Its not going to be everything for everyone but the most important thing is that if you address **some of the public safety issues** and is overall an improvement, I’m all for it, but having said that lets not get complacent because there may still be issues that we may need to look at again. I think it is progress.

Cllr Grant: said I know you said to me that you had seen the letter WTC are going to talk about later, and you mentioned just now public safety issues, most of Brook Hill has not got a footpath and neither has Green Lane it’s a public hazard with all the cars that park there.

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 25/12/09 WTC | Double Yellow Line Consultation To receive a report from Cllr Parnes Motion: Proposed by: Cllr S Parnes <i>a) Woodstock Town Council RESOLVES to request Oxfordshire County Council suspend the closing date of the open consultation on double yellow lines depicted as for being for the Cadogan Park estate (which is mis-depicted and not commonly recognised in the town), and requests that OCC subsequently extend or restart the consultation after addressing the perceived consultation flaws described in the 10 bullet points of the attached paper (to be provided to OCC for public response) and rectifying the consultation and its associated public materials accordingly.</i> Councillor Grant suggested the following amendment <i>b) For a full parking review for the whole of Woodstock especially concerning the problem with displaced parking causing public hazards</i> Cllr Parnes agreed the amendment. The full motion was put to the vote The Council unanimously agreed the full motion |
|-------------------------|---|

From: Civil Parking Enforcement Enquiries <cpeenquiries@oxfordshire.gov.uk>

Date: 8 December 2025 at 16:49:59 GMT

Subject: RE: Unacceptable situation in Woodstock

Reply to Resident of Green Lanes Letter from

Jim Whiting

Parking Schemes and Traffic Orders Team Leader MCIHT

Copied in were OCC Cllr Andy Graham, D CCllr Julian Cooper

Thank you for sharing your concerns with us. Your local county councillor has sent your complaint to our team, and we're looking into the issues you raised. We'll do our best to answer your questions and suggest possible solutions.

You will be aware that following a public consultation exercise, new parking controls were introduced in the centre of Woodstock in the summer of 2023. Concerns regarding displacement were raised at the time and as part of the scheme residents parking controls were introduced in some of the surrounding roads.

Prior to the schemes introduction the County Council conducted parking beat surveys to establish a baseline and repeated these surveys after the scheme was in place. The comparative analysis revealed a measurable increase in parking activity on sections of Brook Lane, while other areas did not experience significant changes which including Glyme Close and Green Lane. At the time, the changes did not pose concerns around safety or access, over and above what would normally take place in a rural village location. Also to note, these surveys were taken over the summer months and their maybe seasonal variations where there is more demand for parking.

The County Council maintains a responsive approach to resident complaints, investigating issues as they arise. However, since the scheme's introduction, there have been relatively few complaints from residents in Brook Lane, Glyme Close, or Green Lane. This suggests that, overall; the scheme has not generated widespread dissatisfaction in these areas.

The use of resident's surveys and engagement exercises can be useful to gauge local views on an issue, but we have found that often the initial complaints we receive, don't always translate to a consensus view across an area on what should the solutions.

The surveys recently undertaken on the Cadogan Park are a good example of this, where following persistent complaints and at the request of the local County Councillor, we did carry out a survey of residents living on the Cadogan Park estate. The feedback from the majority of residents was that they didn't support any changes or the introduction formal parking restrictions on the residential roads (e.g. residents parking). The only restrictions that are being taken forward are mainly on the access road to the estate, where parking for residents is not directly impacted.

We are currently working on the provision list of potential schemes for 2026/27, and we will include the areas mentioned in your email for further investigation. Please note that our ability to take forward any consultations or proposals is subject to budgets being agreed and resources available.

With regards your points around obstruction of driveways, you are correct that there are laws around this, and the police do have powers to enforce wilful obstruction of the highway. Under civil powers, at present the County Council does not enforce dropped kerb obstructions, but we will pass your comments on to the parking team. One option could be the use of access protection markings, which takes the form a white line. More information is available on our website: <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/transport-and-travel/street-maintenance-z/private-access-markings>. These act as a deterrent for motorists parking in the vicinity of private accesses.

In addition, councils don't currently have powers to enforce footway/ verge parking and parking at a junction unless there is a traffic regulation order, signage and road markings in place. To introduce formal restrictions there first must be a public consultation exercise and as mentioned public consensus on these types of measures is not always straightforward, especially where it impacts on residential parking.

With regards to the events management for events at Blenheim Palace, each year our Network Management team works with the estates department at Blenheim to agree the traffic management arrangements for activities throughout the year. We can confirm that these do not currently extent to any kind of temporary permits systems for residents as we are limited in what can be undertaken under a Temporary Traffic Regulation order. However, we will pass on your concerns to team liaising with the palace so your feedback can be taken on board.

Once again, thank you for reporting these issues to us. We will continue to work with Cllr Graham on the local issues in your area and as mentioned the roads highlighted in your correspondence will be included for consideration as part of a future review of the area.

If you remain dissatisfied with this response, more information is available on our website on how to raise a complaint:

<https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/council/about-your-council/have-your-say-about-council-services/complaints-about-oxfordshire-county-council/complaints-and-comments>

Regards

Jim Whiting
Parking Schemes and Traffic Orders Team Leader MCIHT

[Original Letter from resident presented at the Meeting 09.12.25 and deferred to January 2026](#)

I am writing to raise a formal complaint regarding the worsening parking situation affecting residents in Brook Hill, Green Lane, and Glyme Close. The introduction of residents-only parking zones in the town centre has displaced a significant volume of vehicles into the surrounding non-residents areas, creating serious safety issues, access problems, and substantial inconvenience for residents.

1. Obstruction of Driveways and Dropped Kerbs

Residents are frequently being blocked into their own driveways, as vehicles park across dropped kerbs.

This is a clear contravention of:

- Highway Code Rule 243, which states that drivers must not park where the kerb has been lowered to facilitate access.
- Traffic Management Act 2004, under which parking across a dropped kerb used for access is a civil enforcement penalty.
- Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which empowers the council to regulate and restrict dangerous or obstructive parking.

Despite these legal protections, little to no enforcement is occurring in these streets.

2. Road Safety Concerns

Due to displaced parking:

- Long stretches of road have effectively become one-way, preventing safe two-way traffic flow.
- Cars are routinely parking opposite junctions, on corners, and on verges—damaging green space and creating blind spots that put pedestrians and drivers at risk.
- Verges along Brook Hill, Green Lane, and the surrounding area are being churned up by vehicles mounting the kerb, worsening visual amenity and causing avoidable maintenance costs.

This contravenes general safety obligations under the Highway Code (Rules 242–247) and defeats the purpose of the council’s duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 s.16 to ensure “the expeditious movement of traffic” and maintain safety for all road users.

3. Seasonal Parking Pressures (Blenheim Palace Christmas Events)

The situation is significantly exacerbated during Blenheim Palace’s Christmas season, which now runs for nearly three months.

When on-site parking is chargeable, the town experiences a surge in visitors seeking free parking. This directly impacts the streets mentioned above, yet only the Hensington Gate area has been offered any mitigation—temporary residents-only signage and a consultation for permanent residents’ parking zones.

4. Inequitable Treatment of Neighbouring Residential Streets

It is unacceptable that only one area (Hensington Gate) has received support and consideration, while the residential streets—equally affected—have been completely overlooked. Residents in Brook Hill, Green Lane, and Glyme Close are enduring the same or worse problems with no consultation, no temporary measures, and no enforcement presence.

This unequal treatment does not align with the council’s obligations under the Local Government Act 1972 and Equality Act 2010, which require fair and consistent service provision across communities.

Requested Actions

I am requesting the council urgently:

1. Extends temporary residents-only restrictions (or other effective protective measures) to
 - Brook Hill
 - Green Lane
 - Glyme Close
 - And any other streets experiencing displacement.
2. Initiates a formal proactive consultation for residents-only parking zones in these streets, not just Hensington Gate.
3. Increases parking enforcement, specifically targeting dropped-kerb obstruction, corner parking, and verge parking.
4. Reviews seasonal parking arrangements with Blenheim Palace to prevent chronic displacement every winter.

The current situation is unsafe, unsustainable, and unfair, and it requires immediate intervention.

I look forward to your prompt response and to seeing urgent action taken to address these issues.

END

AG January 2026

Appendix 1

Woodstock Town Council Meeting of 9 December 2025

Report by Cllr Sharone Parnes

Perceived Potential Flaws of OCC Parking Restrictions Consultation Survey

A paper (attached as Appendix to this paper) was tabled for Noting at the November 25th town council budget meeting, in respect of an Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) launch of a “consultation survey (available online since 13 2025, 06:08 AM at https://letstalk.oxfordshire.gov.uk/woodstock_cadoganpark_parking2025) . “

Several categories of perceived flaws have been noted and no further clarifications or corrections appear to have been notified or published by OCC.

Motion: Proposed by Cllr S Parnes

Woodstock Town Council RESOLVES to request Oxfordshire County Council suspend the closing date of the open consultation on double yellow lines depicted as for being for the Cadogan Park estate (which is mis-depicted and not commonly recognised in the town), and requests that OCC subsequently extend or restart the consultation after addressing the perceived consultation flaws described in the 10 bullet points of the attached paper (to be provided to OCC for public response) and rectifying the consultation and its associated public materials accordingly.

#

Woodstock Town Council (“Budget” meeting) of 25 Nov 2025

Report by Cllr Sharone Parnes

Perceived Potential Flaws of OCC Parking Restrictions Consultation Survey

Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) has launched a consultation survey (available online since 13 Nov 2025, 06:08 AM at https://letstalk.oxfordshire.gov.uk/woodstock_cadoganpark_parking2025) .

The opening page online states “Please read the detailed information provided on this consultation, and take the time to complete the survey as your views and opinions matter. Your response should be completed and returned by **5pm on Friday 12 December 2025**.” The survey is titled "Woodstock: Cadogan Park - proposed parking restrictions".

Early review of the draft documents highlights several potential weaknesses and possible fundamental flaws in the consultation:

- The **Statement of Reasons** is minimal, citing only resident complaints and asserting safety improvements, without evidence, consideration of alternatives, or assessment of likely effects or causes, whether displacement from the most recent implementations of parking charge and resident/hotel permit holder areas, or from events which effects may be ameliorated.
- The **consultation survey** publication text refers to “detailed information provided” but the contents are not detailed (per above bullet point) and does not allow residents to comment meaningfully on the proposals or their wider impacts.
- Prospects of further **Parking displacement** to neighbouring streets and the adjacent bowls and tennis club car park is not acknowledged.
- The consultation **does not indicate how the works and/or enforcement will be funded**, limiting residents’ understanding of feasibility.
- The consultation **title is misleading**, as it does not reflect that additional streets may be included.
- The **Town Council was not consulted in advance** to provide local knowledge, input or possible support.
- There is no indication of consideration or consultation involving the Bowls and Tennis Club in Cadogan Park, which has its own car park.
- While the **Draft TRO text** seems standard, its lawfulness depends on the adequacy of accompanying materials.
- The consultation may not fully comply with **the Gunning Principles**, which require sufficient information for consultees to give an informed response, including foreseeable effects and consequences.
- Oxfordshire County Council refers to the consultation being about new double yellow lines on parts of the Cadogan Park estate; yet there is no contemporary community recognition or common references to any area in the Town as “Cadogan Park estate.”

The Council is advised to note this Report and the issues listed above, and monitor whether OCC addresses them or restarts the consultation to disclose foreseeable impacts, funding, scope, and alternatives to ensure the consultation meets legal fairness standards. The Council is encouraged to consider any further follow-up or decision that it considers appropriate.

#

Radley Road Parking Restrictions – Saturday Control

A4 Summary statement for Cabinet Member consideration at 22-01-2026 meeting

Purpose

To request a proportionate amendment so that the proposed “No Waiting” restriction on Radley Road applies **Monday to Friday only**, removing Saturday, in line with the evidence and the Council’s own policy tests.

Context

Following consultation, officers have amended the original proposal from Double Yellow Lines to Single Yellow Lines operating **Monday–Saturday 8am–6pm**. This is welcomed and shows that the Council has listened to residents and applied the “least restrictive” principle by recognising that a full-time ban would be disproportionate. However, the inclusion of Saturday is not supported by Radley-Road-specific evidence.

Evidence in the report

- Bus operators state that parked vehicles “regularly cause delays ... particularly around the Our Lady’s Abingdon area,” but do **not** specify days or hours.
- The only time-specific reference describes issues occurring during “**peak weekday periods.**”
- There is **no Radley-Road-specific evidence** of Saturday congestion, Saturday bus delay data, or weekend safety issues.
- The report does not assess the impact of the recently introduced **Keep Clear** markings opposite OLA, nor does it consider the forthcoming **A34 Lodge Hill interchange**, which is intended to improve congestion and bus reliability for Abingdon, and which will certainly reduce the number of HGVs using Radley Road.

Policy alignment and proportionality

The LTCP commits the Council to place-based, evidence-led and proportionate intervention. Moving away from double yellow lines demonstrates that this principle has been applied. Extending the restriction to Saturdays without local evidence conflicts with that same test and risks applying a generic policy control window rather than a locally justified measure.

Overall, the shared objective should be to **reduce vehicle speeds and improve safety**, not to risk increasing speeds on a short residential stretch of Radley Road. Much of Radley Road already operates at a slower pace, the northern side of this section already has double yellow lines, and a targeted **Keep Clear** zone has recently been installed. Against this context, imposing a broad Mon–Sat daytime restriction on the remaining section appears disproportionate and risks undermining the wider safety goal of encouraging slower, calmer traffic.

The Road Safety Team acknowledges that vehicle speeds will increase but consider that the overall risk will reduce but do not provide any evidence. This trade-off with increased bus speed/reliability is not analysed or mitigated in the proposal. In addition, the Road Safety Team advice does not appear to have considered the safety risks created when residents are forced to reverse across a narrow pavement and into live traffic to access off-street parking once on-street parking is removed, increasing conflict with pedestrians, particularly children, older residents and people with disabilities. I note that no Radley-Road-specific collision data has been referred to justify Saturday restrictions.

Request

I respectfully ask that the Cabinet Member amend the recommendation so that the Radley Road restriction applies **Monday to Friday only**, or at minimum make the inclusion of Saturday subject to further monitoring and evidence-gathering. This would retain the benefits for weekday bus reliability and traffic flow while ensuring the final decision remains proportionate, evidence-led and fair to residents.

Oxfordshire County Council
Annex 2: Data Monitoring

A4144 Woodstock Road Experimental Bus Lane

December 2025

1. Bus journey times

A comparison of bus journey time data from on-bus trackers

- prior to the bus lane ETRO (but post Botley Road closure) Nov 2023
- after the bus lane ETRO (Nov 24)
- post temporary congestion charge (Nov 2025) - Source CitySwift

| Direction | From | To | Change (seconds) in stop to stop runtime | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | 07:00-09:00 | | | 15:00-18:00 | | | 00:00-23:59 | | |
| | | | 01/11/2023 3 - 30/11/23 | 01/11/2024 4 - 30/11/24 | 01/11/2025 5 - 30/11/25 | 01/11/2023 3 - 30/11/23 | 01/11/2024 4 - 30/11/24 | 01/11/2025 5 - 30/11/25 | 01/11/2023 3 - 30/11/23 | 01/11/2024 4 - 30/11/24 | 01/11/2025 5 - 30/11/25 |
| Southbound | Wolvercote Rbt | First Turn | 42 | 63 | 76 | 36 | 46 | 40 | 33 | 41 | 39 |
| | First Turn | Woodstock Close | 40 | 43 | 47 | 34 | 38 | 39 | 34 | 37 | 37 |
| | Woodstock Close | Squitchey Lane West | 48 | 53 | 57 | 40 | 43 | 45 | 39 | 43 | 42 |
| | Squitchey Lane West | Osberton Road | 36 | 35 | 36 | 29 | 29 | 30 | 29 | 29 | 30 |
| | Osberton Road | South Parade west | 44 | 44 | 44 | 36 | 38 | 39 | 36 | 38 | 39 |
| | South Parade west | Canterbury Road | 180 | 181 | 179 | 175 | 179 | 186 | 161 | 166 | 168 |
| | Canterbury Road | Radcliffe Observatory Quarter | 92 | 97 | 99 | 89 | 96 | 101 | 87 | 94 | 95 |
| Total | | | 482 | 516 | 538 | 439 | 469 | 480 | 419 | 448 | 450 |
| Northbound | Radcliffe Observatory Quarter | Canterbury Road | 72 | 76 | 79 | 75 | 85 | 85 | 71 | 77 | 79 |
| | Canterbury Rd | South Parade West | 167 | 177 | 162 | 222 | 241 | 218 | 174 | 188 | 176 |
| | South Parade | Osberton Road | 25 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 28 | 31 | 25 | 25 | 26 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | West | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Osberton Road | Squitchey Lane west | 49 | 50 | 49 | 58 | 59 | 65 | 48 | 50 | 50 |
| | Squitchey Lane West | Woodstock Close | 27 | 24 | 25 | 36 | 31 | 34 | 29 | 27 | 28 |
| | Woodstock Close | First Turn | 36 | 32 | 32 | 50 | 41 | 41 | 38 | 34 | 34 |
| <i>Total</i> | | | 376 | 384 | 373 | 469 | 485 | 474 | 385 | 401 | 393 |

2. Collisions

Collision reports from Thames Valley Police have been analysed over the period 28/09/24 (when the bus lane ETRO was implemented) to 30/09/25. There have been no reported collisions over the period since the Bus Lane ETRO has been implemented. The monitoring period is too short to draw conclusions about any overall effect of the scheme on collision rates and 2025 data is still provision. By comparison in the five-year period Sept. '19 to Aug. '24, there were four slight, and two serious, injury collisions over the length of the bus lane reversal.

3. General traffic journey times (congestion)

Analysis of Inrix data (which comes from in-car navigation systems and mobile phones)

- prior to the bus lane ETRO (but post Botley Road closure) Nov 2023
- after the bus lane ETRO (Nov 24)
- post temporary congestion charge (Nov 2025) (Source; Inrix)

| Road | | From | To | Average travel time (seconds) (Mon - Fri) | | | | | |
|------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | 08:00 | | | 16:00 | | |
| | | | | 01/11/2023 - 30/11/23 | 01/11/2024 - 30/11/24 | 01/11/2025 - 30/11/25 | 01/11/2023 - 30/11/23 | 01/11/2024 - 30/11/24 | 01/11/2025 - 30/11/25 |
| Northbound | Woodstock RD | Wyndham Way | Wolvercote Rbt | 86 | 86 | 90 | 115 | 120 | 140 |
| | Woodstock RD | Moreton Rd | Wyndham Way | 198 | 198 | 207 | 264 | 277 | 321 |
| | Woodstock RD | St Giles | Wolvetcote Rbt | 515 | 535 | 534 | 710 | 775 | 809 |
| Southbound | Woodstock RD | Wolvercote Rbt | Field House Drive | 197 | 176 | 184 | 92 | 103 | 104 |
| | Woodstock RD | Field House Drive | Moreton Rd | 273 | 249 | 257 | 140 | 158 | 161 |
| | Woodstock RD | Wolvetcote Rbt | St Giles | 735 | 717 | 722 | 487 | 536 | 530 |

4. Air Quality

Provisional air quality data was provided by Oxford City Council. Several factors affect air quality (including weather and vehicle fleet renewal) therefore we cannot directly attribute these changes to the scheme. Several factors that likely influenced concentrations during the study period or the analysis:

- Bus Electrification – Electric buses under the ZEBRA scheme began gradual introduction in Oxford from November 2023 onwards, with the vast majority being introduced in late 2024.
- Weather Variability – Different weather conditions across years strongly affect measured concentrations (e.g., colder months typically show higher NO₂ levels).
- Other Local Traffic Changes – Roadworks, construction sites, temporary closures, and new traffic lights can alter traffic flows and impact concentrations measured.
- Data Adjustment for 2025 – The 2025 data has not yet been fully ratified, as this can only be done at year-end. For now, I applied the same bias adjustment factor used for 2024 due to the lack of a more up-to-date factor. This 2025 data is therefore provisional only and so this should be noted in the analysis.

The two sites were located at 306 Woodstock Road and 51 Sunderland Avenue

| | Mean annual concentration of nitrogen dioxide measured at monitoring locations (µg/m ³) | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| | 306 Woodstock Road | 306 Woodstock Road (Bias adjusted) | Wolvercote 51 Sunderland Av | Wolvercote 51 Sunderland Av bias adjusted |
| October 2023 - September 2024 (pre bus lane ETRO) | 17 | 13 | 25 | 19 |
| October 2024 - September 2025 (post bus lane ETRO) | 18 | 14 | 23 | 18 |
| Change | 1 µg/m ³ | 1 µg/m ³ | -2 µg/m ³ | - 1 µg/m ³ |

5. Traffic and cycle flows

Traffic flows for the Woodstock Road area have been obtained from permanent traffic counter located just south of Blandf avenue for;

- prior to the bus lane ETRO (but post Botley Road closure) March '24
- after the bus lane ETRO March '25
- post temporary congestion charge (Nov 2025)

| | Average Daily flow (00:00-23:59 - Mon-Fri) | |
|---------------|---|-------------------|
| | Motor traffic (A4144 Woodstock Rd south of Blandford Avenue) | |
| | Southbound | Northbound |
| Mar-24 | 8373 | 7946 |
| Mar-25 | 8388 | 8911 |
| Nov-25 | 8290 | 8561 |