

Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport

Thursday, 18 June 2026

ADDENDA

2. Petitions and Public Address (Pages 3 - 20)

Written statements attached.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 2

CMD Transport (18 June 2026) – Car Parking at County Hall (Danny Yee)

We support this policy. The one minor change we might make in it is to more consistently specify `_car_ parking`. (We hope that one day, at least in central Oxford, "parking" will default to meaning "cycle parking".)

This is a simple policy, arguably even a blunt one, but that is good. The county is leading by example and setting a clear model for other employers. If we could get the other major employers in Oxford to follow suit, that would largely solve the city's traffic problems.

With improved park and ride bus services, employees shouldn't need to drive into the city centre. Unless they need a car to carry out their job, are (or are transporting) blue badge holders, or have some kind of medical or health reason that makes public transport impractical. All the exceptions listed in this policy.

We also urge that this policy be put somewhere prominent on the county web site, along with data showing the transport modes which staff and members use to get to county hall. People regularly attack the council, and councillors and officers, for bringing in policies that don't affect them, for having privileged access to car parking, and for talking about cycling and public transport but not using them. It would be good to have a web page that can be used to comprehensively rebut such claims. And this would also set a model for other employers: transparency about staff commuting might encourage action by laggards.

This page is intentionally left blank

CMD Transport (18 June 2026) –Micromobility Contract (Danny Yee)

We are pleased to see the new micromobility contract coming forward and happy that many of our suggestions have been taken on board.

Better management of parking will be most welcome: more bays and restriction of parking to those, capping and monitoring of them, and shifting them off footways and onto the carriageway wherever possible. These changes should largely remove the problems arising from floating cycle parking and greatly reduce the problems from poorly sited or overflowing bays.

This will improve the pedestrian experience in many places, but these measures should also, if properly done, improve the experience for micromobility users, making it easier to reliably find a scooter or bike to start a trip and easier to leave it when finishing one.

For this to work, however, the county -- and supportive private landowners such as the universities and NHS trusts -- need to provide enough parking bays, in the right places. We look forward to working with the county on this, taking advantage of the local knowledge of our members and supporters.

It is also good to see the scheme being expanded to include Kennington and Botley and Kidlington -- and presumably all the Park and Rides. This will help provide options for people affected by the traffic filters.

And we look forward to the trials in Bicester and Science Vale starting next year. We are also hoping to see a dramatic increase in fleet size -- we think Oxford could support a combined fleet of over two thousand e-scooters and e-bikes. It would be good to have more data transparency, so we can track how trip numbers are changing over time, track problem locations, and so forth.

This page is intentionally left blank

CMD Transport (18 June 2026) City Cllr Katherine Miles - Proposed Crossings, Traffic Calming and Cycleways - Abingdon Road, Culham

I speak with multiple hats on. I am primarily here as a parent of children at Europa School. But I also as a Councillor have families in my ward who attend the school given its large catchment area. I am also a Lib Dem Councillor in Oxford and committed to the policies that the party seeks to implement through its county highways decisions, such as Vision Zero and the LCTP.

I strongly support the proposals for the crossing and side road entry treatment. First, the context for this crossing and side road entry treatment is that it's just immediately next to Europa school - a state school with children from 4-18 and also a nursery school on site. Its multi-nodal catchment area means children travel not only from nearby villages but also Oxford, Didcot and elsewhere. Many rely on the extensive school bus network but those nearest to the school often still drive due to the lack of safe active travel infrastructure connecting the school to nearby settlements. This creates congestion at peak school drop off pick up times and large numbers of vehicle movements at this crossing and junction. Currently the lack of safe crossing of the busy road means many children that could independently walk or cycle to the school, including those living less than a mile away, do not.

But some do and risk their lives in the process as they dash across the junction, without a lack of a dropped curb which is tricky to navigate with a pushchair and holding the hands of young children. The island is insufficient in size for cyclists, especially with trailers or cargo bikes which are needed to carry younger children to nursery and primary school. There have already been collisions and without action it's not a question if, it's when others will happen.

On the proposals for the Toucan crossing, I support the proposed measures but several minor adjustments need to be made.

Firstly, the proposed 3 m width of the shared path should be 3.5 m to ensure there is a buffer between the road and the shared path. This is because at its peak there will be people cycling in both directions and walking - and no one wants to be walking with young children so near to speeding vehicles in an area where we know current speed limits are not adhered to. Also this will ensure that those waiting to use the crossing will not block others using the path to travel to Abingdon or in the direction of the school and Culham campus.

Secondly, for the people cycling back via Tollgate road, there needs to be a wide dropped curb to enable those using the crossing, rejoining the carriageway can do so safely but also it is wide enough as many parents will have their child cycling next to them rather than behind them.

On the STRET measures, I support this proposal. Currently there is no dropped curb to enter Thame lane with a pushchair, and no pavement for pedestrians who need to walk down the lane to access the back gate to Europa school, which is the primary school entrance. Extending the pavement should also be considered.

Finally on the traffic speeds around this junction, based on the feedback you have received during this consultation. I call on you to consider speed reduction measures - a school zone - outside the school to 20mph during school drop off and pick up times.

As a Lib Dem - our policies support active travel and independent travel to schools by children, and we aim for vision zero. These measures are aligned to these policies. But they are just the start as more needs to be done and I hope this is the start of a journey towards improved infrastructure around this school site.

CMD Transport (18 June 2026) – Proposed Crossings, Traffic Calming and Cycleways – Abingdon Rd, Culham (Danny Yee)

We support these schemes, but have some concerns about their implementation.

With the shared path alongside the A415, we ask that LTN 1/20 _Cycle Infrastructure Design_ be followed in the design. In particular, because the A415 is 40mph, there must be a buffer between the shared path and the carriageway of 1m "desirable minimum" but at an "absolute minimum" 0.5m (Table 6-1). And if there are vertical features on the edge of the path then Table 5-3 requires an extra 0.5m width for the path. This may require narrowing the carriageway - which will also help to keep speeds down.

We wholeheartedly support the provision of a crossing of the A415. There seems to be some confusion as to what kind of crossing is proposed, however. The headline recommendation refers to a toucan crossing, but paragraph 3 and the diagram in Annex 1 still refer to a sparrow crossing. As we suggested in our consultation response, a toucan makes sense here as the provision on both sides consists of shared paths without separation between walking and cycling.

We - along with at least eleven other respondents (o9, o11, o12, o13, o15, o19, o20, o80, o90, o91, o92) - raised concerns in the consultation about what happens on the south side of the crossing, about how people cycling southwards get onto Tollgate Lane, and about the lack of cycling provision there (the very narrow footway is not a shared path, even if some people use it as such). This is an example of a stretch of road we feel should be dropped to 20mph despite not being built up, because it is an essential link - lower speeds wouldn't make it inclusively accessible, but would make it less hostile for people walking and safer for people cycling.

The reason for the poor integration of this scheme into broader networks is of course that these measures have been brought forward as part of a development, the boundary of which presumably stops at the A415. This is, as you will discover, a recurring theme in developer-driven highways schemes. I hope that the Local Government Reorganisation will help with this, but we also need proper Movement and Place Plans - we need a vision for what a walking and cycling network connecting Abingdon and Culham and Sutton Courtenay and Europa School would look like, so Transport Development Management can make sure the right pieces are put in, in the right places, in schemes like this.

This page is intentionally left blank

CMD Transport (18 June 2026) – Proposed Traffic Calming – Eastern Bypass Rd, Oxford (Danny Yee)

We support this scheme. It will make it safer for people walking or cycling past this entrance. However we have two concerns: one about the design of this scheme and one more general.

It is not shown on the plan in Annex 1, but paragraph 17 of the report says that "a request for buff coloured surfacing... has been implemented in the detailed design". But it is not clear whether it is the cycle or the pedestrian section of the path that is proposed to be surfaced buff.

Elsewhere buff surfacing is mostly used to mark pedestrian crossing points, so we suggest that, for consistency, the _pedestrian_ part of the crossing be given a buff surface. We also urge that the county standardise on a _different_ colour to mark space for cycling - something distinctive like red or green - and start using it on sections of cycle track like this where they pass entrances (and in other locations of potential confusion, such as parallel crossings).

A second concern is that this scheme is not integrated into a broader plan for the paths on either side of the entrance. As the report states: "the developer is not responsible for the approach paths either side of the access so the priority crossing needs to tie in with what is there currently"

We need to have plans for these routes so that when developers bring forward schemes like this there is a clear understanding of how they will fit into the broader plan for the area and for walking and cycling networks. Transport Development Management and the Highway Agreements Team do not have the time or resourcing to do this and need to be able to consult an up to date Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (Oxford's is seven years old and showing its age) or a comprehensive Movement and Place Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

CMD Transport (18 June 2026) – Headington Market TRO's (Written Statement)

I am here to formally support the proposed removal of the parking bay outside my property. Rather than a simple highway modification, approving my concurrent dropped kerb application creates a Triple-Win for the Council, the neighbourhood, and the environment

As a taxi driver operating within Oxford City Council's jurisdiction, I understand the local authority is exploring enhanced support mechanisms for taxi drivers transitioning to electric vehicles (EVs) within the city. Establishing appropriate infrastructure, such as charging points, would significantly facilitate the transition of my vehicle and enable convenient at-home charging as required.

As a hybrid owner preparing for a full EV transition, this driveway is a permanent infrastructure improvement. It directly supports the Oxfordshire Net Zero Strategy and the Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) goals

Our household is currently trapped in a classic permit deadlock. Because one of our vehicles is a lease vehicle registered in my name, but driven daily by my son who lives at the same address, the strict administrative criteria for multi-car permits creates constant friction

Creating this driveway completely resolves this administrative conflict. By transitioning our parking off-road, our household will no longer require ANY on-street permits. This eliminates a long-term administrative burden for Oxfordshire County Council

This isn't a loss of community parking; it is a net-gain. By removing just one marked bay, we are moving two household cars permanently off the road. We are effectively handing a public street parking space back to our neighbour's, easing the bottleneck on a road residents explicitly note is 'quite narrow when fully parked.

This page is intentionally left blank

CMD Transport (18 June 2026) – Shrivenham Parking Review 2026

In this statement, we wish to clarify why we have requested to speak at this meeting.

The restrictions in Shrivenham High Street which were imposed in February 2025 had a significant and immediate impact on our parking in Manor Lane. Being the only residents in Manor Lane who have no off-road parking, we were no longer able to guarantee that we could park in close proximity of our home. If we left the lane and returned later on in the day, it would be impossible to park without a significant walk to our property, often with heavy shopping or young grandchildren. This has been exacerbated by the aforementioned restrictions which means that people who work in Shrivenham now have to park in the surrounding residential roads and lanes.

We were very concerned to receive notice of the further parking restrictions to be enforced in Manor Lane with the use of double yellow lines. This, coupled with the fact that the owners of Elm Tree House in the High Street have made a further entrance to their land in Manor Lane, taking up the equivalent of three parked cars, means that we have even less reasonable likelihood of being able to park near to our property.

We have and will continue to request for the inclusion of two 'residents only' parking spaces in Manor Lane, closely adjacent to our property which we are prepared to pay for. We also find ourselves having to object to any additional double yellow lines proposed in Manor Lane as this reduces our parking opportunities even more. Our request is measured and fair and we hope you will consider our request favourably.

This page is intentionally left blank

CMD Transport (18 June 2026) – Proposed 30mph Extension – Langford Lane, Kidlington (Danny Yee)

We support reducing the speed limit on the western half of Langford Lane to 30mph, and welcome the acceptance that sub-standard walking and cycling provision can drive this kind of change. (We would like to see this picked up in the 20mph program and the A and B road speed limit review.) But we are concerned that this is still patching over the problem -- an isolated change doing the minimum necessary in response to a Road Safety Audit.

At the moment walking along Langford Lane is uncomfortable, unpleasant and dangerous, and cycling is even worse. (The absence of cycling injuries here is because very few people dare to cycle here.) Cycling with large volumes of traffic at up to 60mph is hair-raising, while the footway is too narrow for walking, let alone for two-way cycling - much of it is barely one metre wide, and in one place that has to fit in a bus stop as well.

Reducing the speed limit from 60mph to 30mph will only ameliorate this, not fix the underlying problem, especially as compliance with a 30mph speed limit seems likely to be poor. Even if the speed limit were reduced to 20mph and enforced with average speed cameras, there would still be too much traffic for inclusively accessible cycling on carriageway and the footway would remain sub-standard. (The road lanes appear to be about 3.4m wide, right in Active Travel England's "do not have lanes this wide when sharing with cycling" zone.)

Stepping backwards, what kind of a road is Langford Lane?

Langford Lane carries high volumes of through motor traffic, and will carry more with developments at Begbroke and Yarnton. The nearest alternatives are Frieze Way 3.5km to the south -- Sandy Lane is almost certainly going to be closed to motor traffic at some point and is hardly suitable for high volumes - or Upper Campsfield Rd a kilometre to the north. So Langford Lane is a key part of the motor traffic network. It would also be a significant part of any comprehensive cycling network, as it is the most direct route between Woodstock and Kidlington. It should, we feel, be reclassified as a B road.

Along with that would come a recognition that it needs proper walking and cycling infrastructure: at a minimum a three metre wide shared use path with a proper buffer from the carriageway. As the report says, this would be a major undertaking, but it should be possible to fit into the highway boundary given the verges on both sides. And if this is set as a clear goal then it could potentially happen - there will be further developments in the area - and if not, it won't.

The broader theme here is, again, the need for a framework into which schemes arising from developments can be fitted. We look forward to seeing the Movement and Place Plan for Kidlington and its surrounds, which should provide a clear plan for the walking, cycling, and motor traffic networks.

This page is intentionally left blank

Address to Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport – 18 June 2026

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

Proposed Crossings, Traffic Calming and Cycleways - Abingdon Road, Culham

The junction of the A415 with Tollgate Road has been a problem for many years. Nearby residents must cross the busy road to bring their children to the Europa School. There is also a well-used shared path, used for cycling and walking to the school, Culham Campus and beyond.

But until now there has been no good provision for crossing the A415 and the shared path crossing of Thame Lane has been sub-standard.

The proposed improvements address these problems, and we have been part of a campaign that has included residents, parents, teachers, and workers at the science campus – a real multi-disciplinary effort. You'll notice the enormous levels of support in the consultation. We know it's not a referendum, but we note the few objections do not identify any problems with the proposals.

We're glad to see these measures come to decision, and we support the recommendation to proceed with a toucan rather than a sparrow crossing, and with review of details such as signalling.

The route south into Culham should be improved for cycling as well as walking, as this is often used and there is demand for more. This should be included in the junction design. There is limited space on Tollgate road, so the remaining 100 metres to the village should be regraded to a 20mph speed limit.

The bigger question here is the whole route from Abingdon to Culham. It is part footway and part shared path, but almost everyone cycles the footway despite its own dangers because the road is well beyond safe cycling levels of traffic speeds and volumes, with frequent illegal speeding. This was not tackled as part of HIF1, which will load more traffic onto it. Designs are included in the Culham No 1 site planning documents, but can we really wait many years for such an important route?

Three Proposed 20mph Speed Limits: Compton Beauchamp; Hardwick Hill, Banbury; Fordwells

The three 20mph speed limit proposals are different from each other, but they are based on the same principle. At 30mph, a road collision is most likely to kill you. At 20mph, you are most likely to stay alive. Academic, peer reviewed meta analysis of 20mph schemes has found they reduce serious casualties by 20 to 40%¹, they also reduce pollution, fuel consumption, congestion and noise.

Evidence also shows that the schemes reduce casualties with previous levels of enforcement, and have benefits even without enforcement².

On the specific schemes, I know Compton Beauchamp from cycling trips to the Uffington White Horse. The scheme is designed to protect village residents from traffic danger. It is 20 where the people are. Almost all the responses are in favour. The objector who notes that “cars are built to protect people at 30mph” seems to have forgotten that people exist outside cars, and 30mph is most likely to kill them.

Hardwick Hill is a new residential estate in Banbury, so densely populated. 20mph should be the norm here, as recommended in Manual for Streets and OCC’s Design Guide. The objections are a mix of false claims about pollution or congestion, claims that traffic is already slow so it won’t make any difference, claims that drivers will continue to drive fast, so it won’t make any difference – all disproved by several sets of academic analysis, and other whataboutery. Most residents do of course want slower, and safer streets.

Fordwells, with a little bit of Asthall Leigh, is another village scheme. Respondents are 100% in support, and the only concerns are that there should be more 20mph speed limit to fill the gap.

It’s very clear that people want 20mph for safer streets where they live. Most people will recognise that this means that they will also have to be patient when they are driving through places that other people live. For those who don’t, the sooner we take them off the road, the safer we’ll be.

We’re glad that the Thames Valley Police Traffic Officer now seems to agree this. Their new line on these schemes of simply ‘No objection’ is perhaps their way of recognising their life-saving benefits. We hope you will approve all three.

¹ [Review of City-Wide 30 km/h Speed Limit Benefits in Europe](#) (Table 4 summarises the results)

² [Evaluating the safety and speed impacts of the 20mph speed limit in the UK: Evidence and insights - ScienceDirect](#)