

**Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for
Transport Management
Thursday, 26 February 2026**

ADDENDA

3. Petitions and Public Address (Pages 3 - 22)

Written statements attached.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3/26

We have returned from a holiday to open an email and read that there is an amendment to the residents permit only parking on Foscoote Rise. We had no prior knowledge of this as there has been no formal written correspondence to ourselves, even though the proposal directly affects our property.

Therefore, I am writing to formally object to the recently amended parking proposal for Foscoote Rise, specifically the introduction of two-hour free parking bays with a one-hour no- return period available to the public and hospital patients, directly outside of our property on this residential road.

While we were made aware of the resident permit fee and had come to terms with that element of the scheme, this new amendment significantly changes the impact the proposal will have on us.

We have lived at our property for 40 years and, until the increasingly parking pressures associated with the hospital, we have never experienced difficulties parking. Although I understand the need to manage parking demand, allocating bays for short-term public use will inevitably increase turnover and competition for spaces directly outside our house. It is highly likely that these bays will be heavily used by hospital visitors and patients, making it far more difficult for ourselves and our family to park close by.

We are a two-car household, and while we have a driveway, it accommodates only one vehicle, this means we rely on on-street parking for our second car. The introduction of short-stay public bays will significantly affect our day-to day routine and accessibility.

In addition, we have family members who travel from outside the area to visit us. We also have two newborn grandchildren, and practical access to family vehicles is extremely important for providing support and responding to any urgent situations. The likelihood of bays being occupied by hospital users will make visits and family support considerably more difficult.

After four decades of living here without parking issues, it is deeply upsetting that we are now facing increased disruption due to external parking pressures. We are also concerned about the longer-term impact this will have on the desirability and value of our property, We respectfully urge the council to reconsider this amendment of which we had no prior knowledge. We expect this email to be read out to the committee before Thursday's meeting.

We look forward to your response.

This page is intentionally left blank

I do not understand why a communal disabled parking bay would be put outside another residence property when the applicant for the disabled parking bay chooses to park in the opposite lay-by which has minimal if no distance between the proposed bay and there property.

I also do not feel it is necessary to have a communal parking bay at the entrance of Ludbridge close, rather than central to other residents so they and visitors are also able to use it. It would make far more sense if the bay was put where the resident chooses to currently park. Being it's just as close to there property and easier for others to access.

I would like to also state that I park where the proposed bay has been allocated and I have parked there for many years due to having a child with autism who lacks road safety. I had permission from SOHA (my housing association) that due to his needs and practicality, I can in fact park there. With this being said I would therefore be left with having to find another parking space that will leave my child with a greater safety risk with crossing the road to get to my property.

I would also like to state that the applicant has adequate space at the side of there property that can be made into off street parking which would make far more sense for them to have.

There is always enough parking for the applicant to park close enough to the property. There is an extreme lack of demand for parking and more than acceptable parking can be found. The applicant, her partners and visitors all use the lay-by since moving to the property and they all choose to park there instead of using their own two allocated parking bays. This is an example of the lack of demand for parking. Otherwise partners and visitors would use the residence own bays.

I therefore strongly object to this application for the proposed disabled parking bay. It is most definitely not needed or necessary at all.

This page is intentionally left blank

I am writing to formally support Dr. Maria Roznovcova's Objection 35 (submitted today) and to reaffirm our joint Annex 34 objection from 56 Coulings Close.

Critical new evidence requiring immediate consideration (before 26 February):

- Vale of White Horse have verbally confirmed our dropped kerb is approved in principle – we're currently waiting for OCC approval and confirmation of our construction start date.
- The proposed DPPP location (Annex 9) sits directly over our future driveway access, creating an unavoidable physical conflict.
- This would block our lawful freehold right to off-street parking, which would otherwise help ease on-street parking pressures.

The current officer recommendation overlooks:

- Our established highway access priority over a proposed parking bay.
- Five formal objections and one stated concern showing this location fails the community test.
- The decrease in property value is due to a public decision that affects private land rights.

Dr. Roznovcova's policy analysis is entirely correct – the proposal breaches DPPP guidance and paradoxically reduces shared parking capacity (from 4 to 3 spaces) while other nearby driveways remain underused.

Request: Please reject or relocate this proposed bay to a compliant nearby position, and kindly confirm the decision today so that corrective action can proceed without delay.

This page is intentionally left blank

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

I am addressing you in my capacity as a Director of the Management Company for Ludbridge Close, representing residents of Ludbridge Close and the associated SOHA housing within the estate affected by this proposal.

We support appropriate accessibility provision where it is necessary. Our concern is not about the principle of disabled parking, but about whether the introduction of a legally enforceable Traffic Regulation Order in this instance is necessary and proportionate.

The dwelling benefits from two allocated off-street parking bays within the associated SOHA housing parking area. This reflects the wider layout of the SOHA housing within the estate, where properties were designed with two allocated bays per dwelling. These bays are exclusively allocated to the property, numbered, and available at all times to that household. They are approximately 50 metres from the front entrance and approximately 30 metres from the rear gate, with a level and well-lit route.

We understand that this allocated provision was not part of the information available at the time of the officer assessment and was therefore not comparatively evaluated. In addition, there are two existing on-street parking areas serving this section of the road. One accommodates approximately four to five vehicles and is typically used at a distance of approximately 20 to 30 metres from the property. The other accommodates approximately three vehicles and is located approximately 10 to 20 metres from the front entrance — this being the location proposed for the TRO. The proposal would therefore convert one of these general-use spaces into a permanently restricted bay for the exclusive use of one household.

This is not the creation of additional parking provision, but the reallocation of shared highway capacity. You are therefore being asked to introduce a permanent and enforceable legal restriction removing unrestricted public use of part of that capacity, despite the dwelling already benefiting from guaranteed allocated off-street provision within 30 to 50 metres.

We respectfully submit that you should be satisfied that such permanent reallocation of highway space is necessary and proportionate before approving a Traffic Regulation Order.

If you are not satisfied that the full parking context has been comparatively assessed, we would ask that the matter be revisited prior to approval

This page is intentionally left blank

I realise it is very close to tomorrow's delegated decision meeting on Item 9/26: Proposed Disabled Persons Parking Place (DPPP), Coulings Close, East Hendred (South and Vale 2025 programme), and I sincerely apologise for the short notice. As one of the objectors (Objection 35, submitted during consultation), alongside four other objections and one concern from Coulings Close residents, I respectfully urge you to refuse this proposal at the specified location or defer the decision until the issues below are addressed. I would be grateful if these points could be raised with the Cabinet Member ahead of or during the meeting.

1. Disproportionate Impact on Limited Parking and Property Rights

Coulings Close is a short residential cul-de-sac where four properties currently share four on-street spaces under a stable, informal arrangement that has worked for years without conflict. The proposed DPPP - with its required markings and 1.2m clearance zones - would reduce usable capacity to three spaces, displacing vehicles further down the road and exacerbating pressure for multi-car households. Furthermore, **several residents in the cul-de-sac are Blue Badge holders, and introducing a single DPPP that reduces the number of available spaces would in practice impair, rather than improve, their ability to park close to their homes.**

Critically, the bay sits directly outside our freehold property (the only one in the immediate area), blocking our pending dropped-kerb application (submitted to highways, and now approved by the local council). This frustrates our efforts to create off-street parking, penalising us severely while effectively gifting a dedicated space to one household. Several nearby homes have unused driveways yet park on-street, compounding the unfairness.

2. Questionable Policy Fit and Limited Public Benefit

Oxfordshire's DPPP policy requires evidence of "genuine difficulty" parking near home, with no suitable off-street alternative, and bays must serve all Blue Badge holders as public infrastructure, not function as de facto reserved spaces. Here, the **applicant has no apparent access barriers** (e.g., easy vehicle entry/exit). Coulings Close has no shops, services, or through-traffic, so demand is negligible beyond immediate residents. This proposal delivers no wider public benefit, risks perceptions of bias (one household gains at others' expense), and undermines the council's equality duties under the Equalities Act 2010.

3. Wasteful Use of Resources and Community Harm

Installing signage, markings, and road works (amid needed full resurfacing) represents poor value for taxpayers when alternatives exist. **Formalising the bay would disrupt our cooperative community**, risking unrest in an area with existing disabled residents who manage without dedicated bays.

We fully support accessibility but request:

- Refusal at this location, or
- Deferral pending an officer review of alternative sites nearby that spread impact fairly.

Thank you for raising these points despite the timing. I am available to provide photos, plans, or further detail.

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee – Minster Lovell Speed Limits

We support these speed limit reductions and suggest they should, if anything, go further.

The 60mph National Speed Limit should only be retained where there is a proper central median, clear visibility, no side entries, no pedestrian or cycling crossing demand, and fully separated walking and cycling provision, either along the road or parallelling it.

So we support the NSL changes, but feel 50mph is still too high in some places. The 200 metres of the B4047 approaching Minster Lovell from the west should be reduced to 40mph to limit noise reaching the housing in the village. There is a significant cluster of road injuries on the B4047 between Minster Lovell and Witney and while their aetiology is unknown it would seem a sensible precautionary measure to make this 40mph. And the stretch approaching Witney, where the bridleway is a very narrow path directly adjacent to the road, should be 30mph.

And it is not part of this scheme, but a good argument could be made for making the B4047 through Minster Lovell itself 20mph instead of 30mph: there are several side streets and a number of driveway accesses, and the housing north of the road as well as the two sets of bus stops will generate pedestrian crossing demand.

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee – Proposed 20mph (Upper Milton)

It is good to see a relaxation of the "built up area" requirement for 20mph speed limits, and we hope this will set a precedent for some roads elsewhere in the county. In particular, we would like to see 20mph limits considered on stretches of road that are key walking and/or cycling routes but lack either footways or cycling infrastructure.

This page is intentionally left blank

Danny Yee – Proposed ETRO (One-Way Street – Nelson St, Thame)

We are glad to see that our suggestion that contra-flow cycling be allowed has been taken on board, and are happy to support this scheme.

We assume the five signs shown in the diagram in Annex 1 ("no entry", "no through road", and "one-way signs) will be modified (with "Except Cycles" additions or to "one-way with contra-flow cycling" signs).

The one minor concern we have is with the use of a planter to mark the transition between two-way and one-way with contraflow cycling. The Telraam suggests that peak motor traffic flows on Nelson St can be quite high (likely around 200mv/hour even after one-waying), which means that there is a reasonably high chance of people cycling contraflow encountering vehicles going the other way at the planter. So its size and positioning (and planting) should be chosen so as to minimise potential risks, and in particular to ensure that good visibility is maintained between participants in any such interaction.

This page is intentionally left blank

We are glad to see the originally proposed puffin crossings have been changed to toucan crossings, as requested in our consultation response. We now support this scheme, but have a few concerns and some suggestions as to improvements. (The diagrams provided are low quality and zoomed out too far for key details to be ascertainable.)

At both crossings, and indeed at all toucan crossings, it is important to have the call-buttons set back far enough from the carriageway that they can safely be used by people riding larger cycles that extend forwards - most cargo cycles and some tandems - without having to stick onto the road. See <https://cityinfinity.co.uk/2024/05/19/better-toucan-crossings/>

At the A4130 crossing (Annex 1) it is unclear exactly where the "proposed staggered pedestrian guard railing" is proposed to go or what purpose it would serve, but in general we are sceptical about barriers on cycle routes. The resident response e5 seems well informed about the specific problems this might create.

We suggest that bollards be put in to prevent motor vehicle access to the "stub" area of Halse Way in between the carriageway and the existing bollards. This would stop motor vehicles being parked so as to obstruct the route, and would protect people walking and cycling from traffic. If this were done, the crossing could then be angled slightly to keep people walking and cycling on the desire line (which they are likely to stay on anyway).

This shows the space in question: some kind of place-making might also be possible.

At the B4016 / Lady Grove crossing (Annex 2), the "stub" of Cow Lane should similarly be protected from motor traffic using bollards. And the crossing could again be angled slightly to keep it closer to the desire line for people walking and cycling.

An alternative to angling these crossings would be to make them wider. On the plans they look like they are about 4 metres wide, but toucan crossings can be up to 10 metres wide. This would make trips along the route more direct, allowing people walking and cycling to stay closer to the desire line, and would reduce potential conflicts on the shared space area by avoiding sharp and awkward cycle turns.

The shared paths throughout are shown at 3 metres width. While this is consistent with LTN 1/20 "Cycle Infrastructure Design", that assumes no vertical obstacles higher than 60mm on either side of the path and no vegetation encroach. If possible, it would be good to build these paths to 3.5m, to allow for the full width of the path not necessarily being usable. (It is probably outside the scope of this scheme, but the shared path shown at the Lady Grove crossing has fairly abrupt right-angle turns that don't appear to follow the geometric design guidance in LTN 1/20.)

We would be happy to participate in co-production to discuss the detailed design and implementation of these crossings.

This page is intentionally left blank

Address to Delegated Decisions – Cabinet Member for Transport – 26 February 2026

These comments are from Robin Tucker, Co-Chair of CoHSAT. I am unfortunately unable to attend on 26 February

10/26. Proposed Speed Limit Amendments B4047 Minster Lovell

We support these as a means to improve safety on an increasingly busy road.

Reading the consultation and paper, description of increasing traffic, and people crossing the road, we do not consider this as arbitrary.

Even 50mph is high for some parts of this country road.

11/26 Proposed 20mph Upper Milton

We support this extension to the 20mph speed limits at Upper Milton, as part of the countywide 20mph programme. The evidence for how 20mph speed limits reduce casualties is very strong.

12/26 Proposed ETRO Nelson Street, Thame – One Way Street

We support the proposal to make Nelson Street one way, with a cycling contra-flow. The street is narrow, so difficult for motor vehicles to pass – hence the need for one-way. There is a one-way street in the opposite to the direction proposed 70 metres away in Rooks Lane.

There is enough space for contraflow cycling because the parked cars provide shelter. For cyclists, there is essentially no change from the current situation, except the southbound cyclists will not be in a flow of motor traffic.

So this proposal should reduce conflicts in traffic flow, but also improve usability for cyclists, in line with the Council's transport strategy.

13/26 Proposed Pedestrian Crossings - Ladygrove, Didcot

We support these crossings on what will become an important active travel route through a rapidly expanding Didcot.

We are glad that the initial description as a 'puffin' was a simple error and that has been resolved – toucans are appropriate.

We note the comment that 'Staggered barriers are now advised against' – it is not completely clear, but we hope that this means that there will not be obstructive barriers, and the plans will be updated to be inclusive for mobility aids and cargo cycles.

That covers this crossing.

The plans here expose a wider problem however. These are all shared use paths. Since 2020 and LTN 1/20, national guidance has set a guiding principle that cycling should be separated from walking as well as from motor traffic. Shared paths cause problems for people who want to walk, wheel or cycle. We should not still be seeing them emerge in new plans.