

Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport

Thursday, 3 September 2026

ADDENDA

3. Petitions and Public Address (Pages 3 - 30)

Written statements attached.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Correspondence Received by City Cllr Chris Smowton – EV Charging Points

One practical suggestion I have that could be worth pursuing via the engagement with residents is finding a limited amount of new space for non EV parking in the vicinity to mitigate the loss of spaces to EV charging. I have looked carefully and I am convinced that there is space for one extra car at the north end of Latimer Road on the east side just south of the Latimer Rd access road. Then space for one car on the west end of the bay on the south side of the Latimer Road access road, east of the junction with Latimer Road. And one space at the east end of the western most parking bay on All Saints Road next to where the EV car club bay used to be. Those three bays could be promoted as part of the Headington West CPZ review and would mitigate the loss of the 4 spaces to EV bays. And to move the existing car club bay to be one of the 4 EV bays outside 21 Latimer Road. It was moved to its current location to be an EV car club car but hasn't been used as such for a couple of years due to technology failure.

I saw today that the notice put on the lamppost next to [the All Saints Road EV club car bay] a while ago says:

"This EV charger will be taken out of service in the week beginning 23 March 2026, when Oxford City Council's contract with Ubitricity comes to an end.

Oxfordshire County Council will be working with Connected Kerb to install a number of brand-new EV chargers in this area in summer 2026 to replace this one and continue to meet the needs of local residents"

Actually, it hadn't worked for months and months! But anyway, the notice seems to suggest that the way is paved for this bay to be moved to outside 21 Latimer Rd as one of the 4. My neighbour who has the car club bay outside his house has complained about it a fair bit apparently (there've been a few issues) and is frustrated that so far nothing has happened in response. So it'd be a win if it could move and be part of the 4 elsewhere. And if we could add even only 2 extra normal parking bays I suggest in my previous email, that'd almost completely mitigate the impact of the 4 bays.

This page is intentionally left blank

In the officers' report, the section on "Corporate Policies and Priorities" fails to even mention Policy 1 in the LTCP, although that must surely be the starting point for the allocation of space between motor vehicles and pedestrians that is a key part of these decisions. Policy 1 is a transport user hierarchy that has walking and wheeling _at the very top_ and "other motorised modes" _at the very bottom_.

The officers' approach is to look at various standards for walking, such as Inclusive Mobility and the Oxfordshire Walking Design Standards, take the most limited provision for pedestrians those allow, and use that as a target, perhaps expanded a little, with the rest of the space assigned to EV charging - ie, to motor traffic. So they target 1.5m for pedestrians on most streets, and 2m on high footfall ones.

That is not how a user hierarchy with pedestrians at the top and private motor vehicles at the bottom works. The starting point for pedestrians should be the _desirable minimums_ in those and other standards - 2m everywhere and 3m on high footfall streets - and every effort should be made to provide better than minimum provision.

So we urge you to take the following actions on individual locations.

a) Parking bays at 7 Hockmore Street, Cowley, Oxford

REJECT this, or DEFER it and ask officers to come back with a scheme with charging infrastructure on-carriageway.

b) Parking spaces at the side of 26 Whitehouse Road, Salter Close, Oxford,
ACCEPT

c) Parking spaces outside 25 Water Eaton Road, Cutteslowe, Oxford,
REJECT this, or DEFER it and ask officers to come back with a scheme with charging infrastructure on-carriageway. The footway is only 2 metres wide.

d) Parking spaces at side of 94 Botley Road, on Binsey Lane, Oxford,
ACCEPT

e) Parking spaces outside 299 Cowley Road, East Oxford,
ACCEPT

f) Parking bays at Green Furlong, Berinsfield,
ACCEPT

g) Parking area on Barns Lane, Burford,
ACCEPT

h) Parking bays at Bull Ring, Deddington,

i) Parking spaces outside 11 The Phelps, Kidlington, pending the Council being unable to find better supported alternative sites in the immediate vicinity via engagement with residents in the Traffic Regulation Order consultation process,

ACCEPT

j) Parking bays outside of 101 to side of 131 Cuddesdon Way, Oxford, pending an alternative off-street site not being deliverable under the same programme.

ACCEPT if the footway can be maintained at 2 metres width, otherwise REJECT or DEFER.

k) Parking bays at side of 68 Hamilton Road, Oxford – amended so that EV charging units are installed on build-outs in the carriageway rather than on the footway,

ACCEPT

l) Parking bays outside 2 Clements Road, Henley-on-Thames – amended to reduce from six to four bays,

REJECT or DEFER and ask officers to come back with a scheme with the chargers on the carriageway (where there is plenty of room).

m) Parking bays at Market Square, Bampton – amended to three bays only (2 x 7kW standard and 1 x 50kW rapid chargers),

DEFER this and ask officers to come back with a scheme with the chargers on carriageway. There is a lot of space here, but it is prime space that should be preserved for people.

n) Parking bays at 26 Shrivenham High Street – amended to four bays only, pending engagement with Shrivenham Parish Council about future plans for Martens Road and Shrivenham Memorial

Hall,

ACCEPT if the four bays are at the eastern end where the footway is widest, otherwise REJECT or DEFER asking for a scheme with on-carriageway chargers.

o) Parking spaces outside of 21 Latimer Road, Headington - amended to four bays, pending the Council being unable to find better supported alternative sites in the immediate vicinity via

engagement with residents in the Traffic Regulation Order consultation process.

REJECT this, or DEFER it and ask officers to come back with a scheme with charging infrastructure on-carriageway.

p) Parking spaces outside Church Green, Witney – defer to consult more fully with Witney Town Council on an amended proposal for four bays (only) in proposed location.
ACCEPT

And we support the abandonment of the schemes in q) and r), both of which we objected to.

I note that no action is proposed for Kings Cross Rd, even though that was one of the sites consulted on. Actual measurements of the proposed location show that the footway is only 1.6m wide, so by the officers' own criteria any EV charging units here would have to be on-carriageway.

We do not believe this would add that much to costs. It also only affects four out of sixteen locations here. And on-carriageway chargers do not need expensive kerb buildouts - bollards will suffice to protect them.

More generally, please make it clear to officers that they should not - with EV charging schemes or otherwise - reduce footway widths below 2 metres, or 3 metres at high footfall locations, unless there is a pressing need and no alternatives are possible.

This page is intentionally left blank

Re: Proposed Installation of EV station in The Phelps, Kidlington
Melanie Greene: 10 The Phelps, Kidlington

I have read the various documents provided. With the 936 page survey summary, I downloaded it and searched for The Phelps. The following is based on this.

Document CMDT03092026 - Countywide EV Bays Annex 21.pdf

- It states 20 people support the installation in The Phelps, 6 partially support it, 39 object and 20 No objection/No opinion.
- I noticed a flaw in your survey in that during my search for references to The Phelps, I noticed that 95% or more of the people who supported or partially supported the installation of EVs in The Phelps, did not even live in Kidlington, and supported the installation of EVs across the whole county.
- When I completed the survey I only focussed on what was happening in The Phelps. As it is none of my business what happens elsewhere. Surely the analysis of the survey needs to take this into account.

In the Report by Director of Environment and Highways it states that there are 476 properties within a 5 minute walk of The Phelps which don't have driveways and:

If feedback gathered on alternative locations using the TRO process is not more supportive than that received for this location (The Phelps) the Council will commit to delivering this site as proposed.

Have you surveyed the 476 properties as to whether they have an EV car or will have one in next 5 years. The current survey shows that local people do not support this.

From local residents' feedback who will be directly affected by the 50% reduction in our parking.

- In the evenings and at weekends there is not enough parking for everyone in this part of The Phelps. Because we are adjacent to the mini roundabout it means that there are 5 houses where they are unable to park outside their houses, and therefore need these bays to park in.
- Nobody here owns an EV vehicle and as stated in the survey the cost of EVs as the reason they will not be buying one in the near future, not the lack of charging points.

Underutilisation of EV charging in Kidlington

- I observed on a number of occasions at weekends, daytime and evenings the underutilisation of EV charging in the Kidlington car park, therefore do we need more charging points at the moment?

Possible ways forward:

- Start with EV charging for one vehicle, see if there is the take up for this, and monitor the disruption to the residents parking.
- Have EV charging with specified daytime slots which I have noticed is proposed elsewhere. With residents still able to park there at other times.

This page is intentionally left blank

Proposed “Electric Vehicle Charging Only” Parking Bays in Bampton.

Objection on behalf of the Management Committee of Bampton Village Hall.

The committee is the Management Committee for the Bampton Village Hall Charity, Charity No. 291659. The committee understands the need for charging points in the Village but objects to the loss of any parking spaces in the Market Place. The Management Committee wishes to maintain its objection to the revised allocation of electric vehicle charging spaces as this proposal will still see a reduction of much needed parking spaces.

Bampton is identified as a Tier 2 Service Centre in WODC Local Plans. Many of these services are close to or in the Market Square including; the Village Hall, Coop Supermarket, Post Office, Hotel/Restaurant, 2 pubs, 2 coffee shops, 3 hair/beauty salons, Bampton Charity Shop, a Barber, a solicitor and West Ox Art.

Apart from on street parking, other parking facilities in the village are limited to the Market Square, which has a 4 hour parking restriction, and Lavender Square (unrestricted). There is a regular turnover of cars coming and going making good use of the limited parking spaces available. The loss of parking spaces to accommodate the proposed 3 Charging Only Bays would jeopardise the success of these services and raise questions of the future viability of some of the businesses and charities.

The last accounts for Bampton Village Hall, Charity No. 291659---show a deficit of £1169 for the year ending 31st December 2025. The rental income no longer matches the increased running costs of the Hall and the loss of any regular income would be a serious blow to the long-term finances of the Charity. The Village Hall is an important centre for the community and surrounding area and on average is used for around 20 hours per week. Regular users include: Age Concern Fitness, Bampton Singers, Ballet and Yoga Classes, Cinema Club, W.I., Bingo, Badminton, Aunt Sally, Scottish Dancing and Gardening Club. In addition, there are regular sales, private hiring for children's parties and other social events. We are told by users that parking is, at times, already difficult. Many local people walk to the hall but those running activities, less mobile residents and many others coming from outside the village need parking spaces.

The Village Hall Committee recognise the need for charging points in the Village but taking valuable parking spaces would be detrimental to the Charity, amongst other interests. We know that alternative sites have been suggested by various parties and request that OCC consider all sites around the Village in conjunction with the Parish Council and all those who will be seriously affected by the current proposal.

Richard Smith

Treasurer and Trustee, Bampton Village Hall

This page is intentionally left blank

EV Charging Points

My name is Ben Josephs and I am the owner of 4 The Phelps Grovelands Kidlington .

I have been living in Kidlington for over 30 years and been living in a community that built a lot of trust and understanding, and especially in our residential area . I have come to know that there is a chance of our area of the Phelps may have EV chargers installed which will be causing so many problems

Here are some key problems that will cause in our area:

1. As parking is already problematic due to high number of vehicles that are residing in our area
2. The roads are already damaged which the council is spending meaningless expense on EV chargers.
3. Traffic will build up in a residential area
4. As a community not a lot of residents benefit from EV chargers as we don't have electric cars , and it would make more sense if each house home whom needs electric chargers should opt in on their property's

I do not approve for this EV charger as I have mentioned from the above

Thank you for your time

This page is intentionally left blank

Cllr Matt Webb – Sheep Street Cycling Proposals

Further to the recent meeting regarding changes around Bicester.

I wanted to raise an issue that I am increasingly concerned about in Bicester town centre: the use of electric scooters and, particularly, electric bikes in pedestrian areas.

I am receiving concerns about the speed and manner in which some of these vehicles are being ridden around the town centre, and the potential risk this poses to pedestrians, particularly older and more vulnerable residents.

Would you be willing, on behalf of the Council, to write formally to Thames Valley Police to ask what they are currently doing to monitor and manage this issue in Bicester?

It would be useful to understand the level of enforcement currently taking place, whether TVP has seen an increase in incidents or complaints involving e-scooters and e-bikes locally, and whether any further targeted action is planned.

I think some clarity from TVP on their approach, and how the Council might work with them to address the problem, would be very helpful.

This page is intentionally left blank

A4905 (Bladon to Long Hanborough) Speed Limit Reduction – Local Resident

While I support the council's proposal to reduce the speed limit, I must highlight that the A4905 junction with Lower Road is an extremely dangerous blind spot that requires more effective safety measures. As a resident of Ox Close having lived directly next to this junction for 18 years, I have unparalleled daily experience of the severe danger here and I ask that the council consider the following points:

- **Constant Near Misses and unrecorded accidents:** I hear car horns blaring and tyres screeching multiple times a day, which is a constant reminder of how frequently drivers are forced into emergency braking maneuvers. The recorded accident statistics do not take these near misses and frequent minor accidents into account.
- **Severe Visibility Issues:** Drivers approaching from Long Hanborough see this T-junction very late due to the sharp bend in the road. Drivers emerging from Lower Road are forced into making last minute decisions to pull out, due to the poor visibility caused by the bend. The recent addition of a second filtering lane approaching the junction from Lower Road has resulted in more significant blind spots, further compromising visibility for drivers in both lanes emerging into the path of oncoming A4905 traffic. Drivers on the main road cannot now see cars pulling out until it's too late, because they are obscured by the second lane of traffic.
- **Bottlenecks and Tailbacks:** Lower Road has become a heavily used corridor and the difficulty of turning safely out of Lower Road onto the A4905 creates long vehicle tailbacks, driver impatience, and highly risky maneuvers.
- **History of Serious Incidents:** This specific junction is one of the most significant accident black spots on the A4905 with a documented history of collisions - many of them have been serious and resulted in injuries.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

Simply changing the signage on the A4905 between Bladon and Long Hanborough to 40mph will not alleviate the real dangers faced by the public. Furthermore, I question the disparity in speed limits along the A4905 from Bladon, with a long 20mph stretch extending onto the straight section of road to the west of Bladon and a similar stretch at 30mph to the west of Hanborough. Surely, the most dangerous part of the road that has the most accidents should be subject to at least the same measures, which could most easily be implemented by extending the 30mph limit from the east end of Long Hanborough to include the junction with Lower Road.

To genuinely achieve Vision Zero goals and prevent future serious injuries, I strongly feel the T junction should be replaced by a roundabout, which would also help traffic flow and reduce tailbacks on Lower Road. I understand that this requires investment and more crucially a significant portion of land to build it on. As the owner of the land to the south west of the junction, I would be open to discussions about donating land to enable such a project and I urge Oxfordshire County Council to reevaluate their options and consider implementing physical safety enhancements that will actually alleviate the danger at this location. Thank you for taking my feedback into account during this consultation.

Jo Doyle – Bladon to Long Hanborough Speed Limit Proposals

I would like to set out this statement to be submitted for the meeting on Thursday, 3rd September, and I am happy for it to be read out.

Currently the speed limit from Long Hanborough towards Bladon changes from 30mph to 50mph when you pass through the white gates at the BMW Mini Garage.

I would propose that the 30mph remains in place until you have gone past the junction with Lower Road. There was a serious 3 car crash at this accident blackspot last week, and I feel that if the 30mph speed limit simply continues from Long Hanborough then it would be easy for drivers to understand the change and much fewer accidents would happen.

Apart from the more serious reported accidents, there are also weekly minor accidents at this location. It seems ridiculous that there is a 50mph speed limit on a sharp bend leading down to a junction especially when you look at the current speed limits through Bladon and past Freeland, which is very open with very good visibility.

This page is intentionally left blank

FARINGDON TOWN COUNCIL

The Pump House, 5 Market Place FARINGDON, Oxfordshire, SN7 7HL

Telephone 01367 240281

office@faringdowntowncouncil.gov.uk

www.faringdowntowncouncil.gov.uk

Clerk: Katherine Doughty



Oxfordshire County Council
County Hall
New Road
Oxford
OX1 1ND

Emailed to – Jack Ahier – committeesdemocraticservices@oxfordshire.gov.uk

25 August 2026

Dear Jack

**Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport Meeting - Thursday, 3 September 2026
10.00 am – Agenda item CONSULTATION – A417 Lechlade Road (Faringdon) Proposed Traffic Calming Amendment**

Faringdon Town Council wish to make the following representation at the above forthcoming meeting:-

Faringdon Town Council responded to the A417 Lechlade Road, Faringdon consultation supporting the proposed scheme and suggested the works are undertaken during the night and for one lane to remain open at a time (if at all possible) to avoid disruption in the area.

The Council has more recently received representation by Lechlade Road residents who observe the ineffectiveness of the current speed cushions with traffic continuing to speed in both directions. It is therefore recommended that a build-out is installed at a suitable point in this area rather than change the speed cushions for the following reasons:-

1. The volume of vehicles recorded at this location (c.3000 according to OCC's Annual Average Daily Traffic Map online);
2. Residents' observations;
3. Other existing local highway users accessing the Lechlade Road (ie Faringdon Allotments, residents of Lechlade Road, Canada Lane and Woodview);
4. New users of local highway (ie students, staff and visitors to the new Artemis Academy).

Installation of build-outs at the other locations where the 20mph speed limit commences, will be recommended to OCC in due course.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'K. Doughty'.

Mrs Katherine Doughty BA (Hons), FSLCC
Town Clerk/RFO

CC - Christian Mauz – christian.mauz@oxfordshire.gov.uk

C/Cllr Bethia Thomas – bethia.thomas@oxfordshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Sarah Jones – Priory Road Parking Permits Proposals

My husband and I have lived in Vicar's Row since 1991. We have one, small, car (which I drive). We both work on irregular zero hours contracts outside Wantage and are not wealthy.

We used to have a parking permit for the Undercroft off Mill St. But it became unaffordable when it rose from £250 to £1,000 PA. Since then, I have parked in Priory or Ormond Roads without difficulty.

If residents' permits are to be introduced, it is unfair to exclude residents of the Square, Alfred St. and Vicar's Row.

If the scheme goes ahead as proposed, it will not reduce car use. I need my car and will have to drive around looking for a space and increasing emissions. Neighbours have said that they will do the same.

This page is intentionally left blank

For the Public Meeting on Thursday September 3rd, 2026

I speak on behalf of the St John Street Area Residents' Association to oppose the extension of eligibility for residents' visitors permits to student rooms in the St John St and Pusey Lane properties. This is a matter of great concern to residents as many of us have no off-street parking and so depend entirely on spaces on the street. The allocation of 25 (or potentially 50) permits to each of 70 or so student rooms would completely overwhelm the available on-street spaces and make the situation impossible for us.

In addition:

- there is evidently an online market for surplus visitors permits, and any not used by the students themselves will very likely be sold on in this way.
- The availability of on-street parking in St John Street is already compromised by contractors/trades vehicles associated with the university and the local colleges; so that a recent exercise to replace lamp standards in the street was able to access only two of the scheduled six, notwithstanding residents having moved their own vehicles as requested.
- It has not been policy to extend eligibility to rooms in College/University student accommodation. If this policy is to change, given that there must be some 10,000 such across the city (plus many more at Brookes), the result would be complete chaos.

John Landers
Chair, St John St Areas Residents' Association

This page is intentionally left blank

Address to Transport CMD – 3 September 2026

[Agenda for Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport on Thursday, 3 September 2026, 10.00 am | Oxfordshire County Council](#)

Proposed Countywide Electric Vehicle Bays

We in the active travel community are concerned by the proposed approach to EV only charging bays.

There are two overarching problems with the approach in this proposal.

First, it does not follow the first policy of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan – which is the prioritisation of pedestrians. In many cases it would create obstacles on pavements. The approach should not be pavement first – it should consider where chargers can be put without causing obstruction to people. And it should follow your own standards which state that minimum widths are 2 metres, and 3 metres in busier places, not reduce them for car user convenience.

Second, there is no strategy guiding the use of some of the most important real estate that you control – the kerbside – the 2 metres or so at the edge of the carriageway. As a result, we are seeing here and in other proposals a piecemeal approach to suggesting what should go in a particular place, without due consideration to its potential uses. Car parking is only one use – the space might be better used for cycle parking, micromobility, a rain garden, a pocket park, a bus stop, or a dozen other possible uses.

We are disappointed in further policies on parking that disadvantage pedestrians on top of previous ones that have missed active travel opportunities. There is a gap between policy and delivery here.

On specifics, some of these schemes are deliverable in an acceptable way because they use carriageways, wide pavements or other spaces. These are:

- (b) Whitehouse Road
- (d) Botley Road
- (f) Berinsfield
- (g) Burford
- (h) Deddington
- (i) The Phelps
- (j) Cuddesdon Way if pavement of 2 metres remains

We also agree with

(k) Hamilton Road as amended

(n) Shrivenham if the four bays are at the widest part

We agree with the deferral or not pursuing

(p) Witney

(q) Carterton

(r) Eynsham.

Sites that should be rejected or deferred to find a better solution are:

(a) Hockmore Street

(b) Water Eaton Road

(e) Cowley Road as it is not consistent with the LCWIP cycle route

(l) Clements Road

(m) Bampton

(o) Latimer Road

Bicester Sheep Street

Bicester Sheep Street used to be in the crazy situation of being a road on the National Cycling Network on which you weren't allowed to cycle. And yet, you were allowed to drive, even a large lorry if you held the right permit.

When this scheme was proposed there were dozens of objections – we were warned that carnage would ensue. But the monitoring data shows that during the trial, things have continued much as they ever did. There has not been a huge influx of racing cyclists. There has not been the bloodshed that some people were rather ridiculously predicting. Just a moderate increase in cycling activity, probably increasing the sales of the cafes.

As the Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel, we are happy to support the sensible improvement to access that has been proven to be beneficial and not problematic.

In addition, we don't see any problem with allowing that access to continue on a Friday. Much like the other six-and-a-half days a week, the concerns raised against cycling for 7 hours on a Friday are a chimera, built on prejudice, not data. They lead to unnecessary complication and street clutter.

We think that the cycling access should be clear and simple, seven days a week. We know it is healthy. It has proven to be safe. Go elsewhere in Europe and in markets you'll find people stuffing their cycle panniers and baskets with produce. Let's not restrict people because of a few unevidenced views.

So please approve this as permanent, with seven days a week access for cycling.

Rose Hill Service Road

With its high casualty record, it is clear that something needs to be done here.

Motorists turning left across cycle traffic is a strong source of danger, more so if they are rat-running and so inherently more interested in speed than safety, and the cycle lane is poorly defined.

Reducing turns for rat-running is a significant contributor to the success of the East Oxford LTNs in reducing road casualties by about ten every year. So, there should be no doubt that reducing turns can reduce casualties here and the question is more about how.

The approach proposed is the minimal one. We are frankly puzzled that the statement in paragraph 12 is that “an “access only” restriction, or just advisory signing ... are considered ... to be ineffectual and not worthy of further evaluation” and yet this is what is proposed.

Experience with the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods has shown that there are some drivers that put their own convenience above the law or the safety of others, and wilfully ignore road casualty impacts to gain places in the queue. The police failed to enforce those causing huge misery to residents, and are unlikely to enforce this. And here, a resident exemption will weaken the restriction further. Like officers, we are concerned that this approach will have limited effect.

Also, it is not combined with physical measures to reduce collisions, such as a side road entry treatment, or even highlighting the cycle track in coloured tarmac – as is increasingly the practice in other cities. We’d like to see at least one of these in place.

This is not some arbitrary design decision, people’s lives are at stake – there have been seven similar collisions in three years, two serious, and any of these could have turned fatal if the dice had fallen differently. We think that stronger measures should be deployed.

Bladon to Long Hanborough 40mph

This short stretch of road has a visible poor safety record, but also an invisible safety problem.

Visibly, there have been seven crashes in only five years, two of them serious. Four of those have been at the Lower Road junction, two at the Cassington Road junction, and one is a single vehicle being overturned on the way out of Hanborough. It's obvious that speed is a factor here – not the only factor, but certainly a factor.

The less visible problem is the healthy travel that this suppresses. An active travel route between Bladon and Hanborough has three options. In daylight, you can take the winding route through Blenheim Palace. You could cycle on the road, but 50mph traffic is a strong deterrent. Or you could walk or cycle on the pavement – but even there cycling next to 50mph traffic with no buffer is a big deterrent, so not many people will.

Reducing the speed limit to 40mph makes both of these options safer and more tolerable, although still not to guidance. The absolute minimum buffer for a 50mph road is 1.5 metres, at 40mph it is 0.5 metres.

So, we support this proposal. It is another sensible step towards Vision Zero, but it does not solve the problem of a 24/7 safe active travel route between Bladon and Hanborough.

20mph speed limits in Great Tew, Westwell and Shepherds Pit Lane

The evidence for the casualty reduction benefits of 20mph speed limits is now overwhelming. As one example, independent research from Imperial College, found that 20mph schemes reduce crashes by 26% and casualties by 23%, and even sign-only schemes reduce crashes by 22% and casualties by 11%¹.

In Oxfordshire, the number of people Killed or Seriously Injured in 20 or 30mph speed limits combined have reduced by 39% since 2022, despite a growing population and more roads in these classifications.

None of these schemes should be controversial among anyone who wants people to live long and happy lives.

Great Tew is a lovely and mostly peaceful village. The three objectors all say there will be no benefit to the speed reduction, and they are proven wrong by the 39% reduction in serious and fatal casualties over the last three years. We support this.

Westwell is a small section near Burford. The study by Imperial College notes the effectiveness in reducing casualties of sign-only schemes. And signs in 20mph speed limits do not need to be lit, enabling potential future savings and de-urbanisation. We support this.

The speed limits for Shepherds Pit Lane need to be considered alongside the coming Quiet Lane proposal. You'll note the huge support from local residents and people looking for safer active travel. There is strong desire to make this a calm and traffic free route, and the speed limits are the first step.

None of the objectors appear to recognise this context. The Police response for example states that this is highly inappropriate, but does not say why 20mph is inappropriate for a Quiet Lane. Active Travel England's Rural Design Guide is very specific: "20mph is the recommended speed limiting on routes that form part of the designated active travel network." With this route becoming a Quiet Lane, it fits that category.

Another objection is a request for a quiet route all the way from Barton to Stanton to St John, we would support that, but we consider this proposal is a building block towards it.

In summary, we support safer roads and so we support the recommendations for all three of these 20mph speed limits.

¹ <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001457525002969>