

#### **ITEM 4: OXFORD – QUICKWAYS, QUIETWAY & 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT**

##### **DANNY YEE**

Continuity is essential for safe and accessible cycling provision, so the removal of parking in the Quickways schemes is essential. The proposed schemes will need to be improved on when more funding is available -- especially at junctions, and in providing separation -- but even as they are they will be a clear improvement on the current situation.

The Quickways approach uses speed limit reduction, visual narrowing of the carriageway, and removal of centrelines. I urge that these measures be used together, not separately, and that they be supplemented by additional measures. The cycle lanes should be coloured, to provide clear demarcation of space, to mark priority across side entries, and to help make the carriageway feel narrower. (If resurfacing is going to be done anyway, colouring is not that much more expensive). Additional zebra crossings should be provided, and pelican crossings switched to "instant change" -- this will make walking safer and more accessible but will also help reduce speeds. And the county should seek a commitment from Thames Valley Police to at least in principle enforcement of the new 20mph limits.

**END**

##### **AMELIA ADCROFT**

Hello, and thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Amelia Adcroft, I'm a student at Wadham College of the University of Oxford, and I'm here to express strong support for the Quickways scheme to improve cycle routes, on behalf of myself and other Wadham students. Wadham houses 130 students on Iffley Road, near Donnington Bridge and another hundred in Summertown. We need to commute to the city centre, for lectures, tutorials, and library access, for which most of us rely on bicycles. But most of us also know somebody who's been in a bicycle accident in Oxford. I sometimes get off my bike and walk it around the roundabout at the Plain, or cycle down Donnington Bridge Road and along the river to avoid the roundabout entirely, having seen photos of another student after she was hit cycling there in my first year. The proposed cycle routes will make all our journeys safer.

In a recent poll of our college's Facebook group, all 37 students who responded wanted improved cycle lanes on Iffley Road; 21 on Cowley Road; 12 on Banbury Road, 9 on Parks Road, and 4 on Donnington Bridge Road. Cycling home along Iffley Road from the city centre, the lines of cars parked along the side mean we are repeatedly forced into traffic. At rush hour, with a line of cars waiting for the lights at the Donnington Bridge intersection, we get completely pinned between parked cars on one side and cars stopped in traffic on the other. I've also heard worries from other students that the edges of roads are poorly maintained, and swerving to avoid potholes means, again, moving dangerously far into fast traffic in the middle of the road. We will be much safer with reductions in on-street parking and reduced speed limits along these roads.

Wadham is only one of the many colleges with student accommodation outside of the city centre, and many students rent houses in these areas privately. Improving cycle infrastructure on Iffley, Cowley, Banbury, Parks and Donnington Bridge roads will all

benefit Wadham students, and other Oxford students, commuting from different areas of the city. Thank you again for proposing these improvements and allowing us to speak in favour of them, and we look forward to cycling around the city more safely in the near future.

**END**

### **DR ALISON HILL, CHAIR OF CYCLOX**

We are overall supportive of Quickways on the understanding they are only an interim/temporary measure before junction redesign and traffic reduction measures such as Connecting Oxford traffic control points are introduced. There are some gains to be had from these proposals, particularly the removal of parking, but overall, we do not believe that they will increase cycling rates in the city without other radical measures. If the Quickways are intended to be the only long-term solution/provision, we do not support them.

These proposals will not encourage more people to cycle unless they are accompanied by radical traffic reduction measures, in particular Connecting Oxford and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. LTN 1/20 is clear that roads with over 4000 vehicles are unlikely to attract new cyclists without protected space and most of these Quickways roads have daily traffic flows on 15,000 and over. Traffic flows of 4,000 or less on these roads seems unachievable.

Quickways have been described as suitable for the more confident cyclist, with less confident cyclists using quieter adjoining streets. Cyclox does not accept this. Main roads are busy because they lead to where people want to go. The designs should be inclusive, suitable for all ages and all abilities. All groups should be provided for along these major roads.

The plans do not do enough at junctions. It is junctions where most collisions occur, and these proposals do not result in improvements of most junctions.

We are concerned that there is insufficient physical protection in the Quickways plans.

**END**

### **DR ANDREW SOLTAN**

In the proposal "Quickways and Quietways cycle routes", the County Council propose changes to major road routes that connect Oxford city with the surrounding region and localities within the city. I express major concerns regarding the proposal, highlighting areas where further data is needed to show i) the need for, ii) proposed benefits of, and iii) quantitative and qualitative assessment of harms the proposed changes would carry.

#### Background:

The proposal states the intended benefits being to "improve accessibility, air quality, health and well-being, road safety", however no evidence is put forwards to quantitatively describe air quality and accessibility within the included localities. Consequently, the public might ask 'is there a problem with air quality in these areas, such that these potentially expensive and disruptive changes are required to improve it?'

What specific evidence does the council present to demonstrate that there are problems with accessibility and air quality specifically in the affected localities of St Giles, Cowley, Iffley, Marston, Morrell Avenue and St Clements? Quantitative analysis of the problem which is intended to be solved is mandatory.

Impact:

What evidence does the council present to support their view that the proposed changes (for example, reduced speed limits) would improve accessibility, air quality, health and well-being and road safety? To justify the expense and disruption associated with introduction of these measures, well-designed studies are needed to show that these policies do indeed derive benefit. With specific reference to the affected localities, many of the highlighted routes contain an existing off-road cycling provision (such as the Marston road). What methodology has been used to ascertain that these proposals would meet the council's aims of improving air quality? For example, published modelling would be helpful.

Potential harms and discriminative impact:

What research has been conducted into potential harms of the proposed interventions? The negative impacts of 20mph speed limits and road interruptions on air-quality are well described. What assessment has the council performed to quantitatively assess the negative impacts (for example, of increased road congestion, junction gridlock, increased accidents associated with bus stop clearway, and the temporary effects of prolonged road works), and to show that the proposals' benefits might exceed these?

With specific regards to junctions within the affected localities, what evidence does the council present that these changes would not worsen congestion (and thereby worsen air quality)? Has the council arranged for and published appropriate modelling, and how can the public access the results of this?

Measures to reduce road mobility by car (such as those set out in this proposal) are shown to increase journey times both within the city and between surrounding regions and the city; including commuting travel time to work. An inevitable consequence is reduction of the region's housing stock that falls within the city's commuter-belt, and consequent increase in the cost of housing in the city. What evaluation has the council performed to assess the impact of reduced car mobility on social inequality? Can the council show that the effects would not be disproportionately greater on the bottom quintile of households by income, who are least able to afford property within Oxford and therefore most dependent on car commuting from the wider region? Where households support vital services by shift/anti-social hours working, can the council show that reducing car travel is not specifically discriminatory to these key workers?

Has the council properly assessed the impact of policies that reduce car-travel to show that these are not discriminatory by other protected characteristics, such as gender? For example, has the council assessed the impact of car-limiting policies on those seeking to work while caring for children or elderly relatives, where this would not be logistically possible by bicycle or bus?

In its current form, the proposal and proposed changes require further evidence to demonstrate that there is a) need for the proposals, b) potential benefits that justify the

expense and disruption of the proposals, and c) that harms have been both quantitatively and qualitatively considered and shown to exceed benefits. Specifically, the points above regarding potential to discriminate by key worker status, gender, and income must be addressed. Pending this evidence, it is regrettably necessary to oppose the proposal, and the county council should be invited to revise and resubmit the proposal addressing the evidence gaps.

**END**

## **RICHARD PARNHAM**

The recommendation for the quickways / quietways proposal is to “approve implementation...as advertised”. I take issue with the words “as advertised” – because the current scope of this scheme is not clear, due to multiple OCC failures throughout the previous consultation process. During this process, at least two entire roads were omitted from various consultation documents, a new road was added to the scheme without any clear warning, and the scale of the scheme on another road was increased considerably, rendering it far more extensive than consulted upon.

I therefore suggest OCC cannot authorise the scheme at this point in time “as advertised”, because there is no single source of truth about what quickways scheme actually comprises of.

To offer several illustrative examples:

- On page 24 of this document bundle is a copy of a flyer summarising roads “that could be affected” by the quickways scheme. This flyer was widely distributed to Oxford residents as part of the informal consultation. Notably missing from this summary is Warneford Lane – a road also not mentioned in the informal consultation itself (see document bundle, page 51, for verification). Furthermore, Warneford Lane is also missing from the “public notice”, produced as part of the formal consultation. I understand that this public notice was circulated to 13,000 Oxford residents, and also attached to dozens of lampposts across the city. Additionally, Warneford Lane is not listed as being affected on the various draft Traffic Regulation Orders listed on the formal quickways consultation website. In light of all of the above, can Warneford Lane (lawfully) be included in the quickways scheme at this time?
- Marston Road. The informal consultation map, the detailed plans (on both consultations) and all of the draft Traffic Regulations, consistently show that only three (short) sections of Marson Road would be affected by the quickways proposals. However, the public notice circulated to residents, and placed on lamp posts, goes far further than any of these proposals. Instead, the public notice proposes to introduce “no waiting” restrictions along most of Marson Road, on both sides – including on sections of the road that already have dedicated, segregated off-road cycle lanes. This begs the question: which quickways scheme is OCC hoping to approve in relation to Marson Road – the scheme as actually consulted on, or the scheme proposed on the seemingly “rogue” public notice?
- The public notice indicates new restrictions on Florence Park Road. Florence Park Road was never clearly identified as being affected by the quickways scheme, in

either the formal or informal consultations. So is Florence Park Road included in the quickways scheme – or not?

- The initial consultation was clear that both Cowley AND Oxford Road would have new quickways restrictions introduced on them. However, most of the formal quickways consultation website (including the consultation itself, please see document bundle page 249 for verification) only refers to Cowley Road as being affected, but NOT Oxford Road. Moreover, the draft Traffic Regulation Orders on the official quickways consultation website do not mention Oxford Road, despite mentioning Cowley Road. Finally, the public notice for this scheme is ambiguous: the public notice headline only mentions “Cowley Road” as being affected, but its body copy hints that Oxford Road is affected too. So, what is being proposed? The quickways scheme relating to Cowley Road, Oxford Road - or both?

In summary, the entire quickways consultation process has been a catalogue of errors – to such an extent that this scheme is now subject to multiple official complaints about its fairness, including at least one complaint that is currently pending before the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (reference number 72141). In light of this, I suggest that OCC should **not** authorise this scheme today. Instead, OCC should defer the decision, reflect on the numerous mistakes it has made, and fix them. Only after it has done so should OCC bring forward new quickways proposals that are procedurally fair, as well as sensible in their own right. However, if OCC insists on authorising the quickways scheme today, then yet more complaints about the scheme will be filed – this time focusing on whether the scheme can be lawfully approved, in light of all of the documentation omissions, additions and uncertainties indicated above (and several more besides).

**END**

## **AERON BUCHANAN**

I am a long-time resident of Oxford and a very keen and active cyclist and I would like to question the council on the proposed “Quickway” scheme’s impact on Morrell Avenue and Warneford Lane specifically.

Concerns are threefold:

Firstly, road safety – on Morrell Avenue the proposal is a configuration which research shows is the worst possible: cars will go faster, veer away from the faster oncoming traffic because of the lack of centre line certainty, and towards cyclists due to the confidence given by the legally useless advisory markings. The 20mph speed limit is already regularly and frequently broken because of inadequate policing and this will only get worse. Sadly, the ill-advised LTN scheme will add more traffic, exacerbating this danger even further.

Secondly, wellbeing – the government rightly promotes green space following research showing the outsized benefits of trees, plants, and grass, which around Morrell Avenue (an area on the Heritage Asset Register) clearly benefits residents, commuters, and visitors alike. Removing the on-street parking here will destroy this increasingly vital feature by a) preventing visitors from conveniently accessing South Park, b) forcing contractors to park on the green verges in greater numbers than they do now, seemingly with impunity, and c) encouraging even more residents to pave

over their front gardens and turning the public grass verges to mud. Furthermore, we already see vehicles blocking the pavement for pedestrians, again with seeming impunity, and this will only get worse.

Thirdly, forsaken residents – the many residents here rely on visitors and carers in their day-to-day lives who in turn need parking. Even worse, displacing on street parking to neighbouring roads, which are already nearly full and where the council demands that cars park on the pavements themselves, will only go to further the degradation of the pedestrian environment, particularly for wheelchair users and parents with buggies.

I'm surprised that the money behind this is being spread so thinly across the whole of Oxford when it feels obvious that it should be used to elevate particular areas to an improved level of cycle infrastructure, rather than making it worse.

Why is the council forsaking so many people, with a scheme that, on Morrell Avenue and Warneford Lane at least, only compounds existing problems with no benefit, including to those people highlighted by the scheme itself, when multiple other alternatives exist?

**END**

#### **COUNCILLOR MICHAEL O'CONNOR**

I would like to begin by saying that I very much welcome the improvement of Oxford's cycle routes, especially that along Iffley road, which has long been one of the most dangerous in the UK along with Botley Road and Cowley Road. However, I note that several routes are being cut even though they were explicitly included in the original bid for government funding. This is very disappointing and seems to be another example of what the Cabinet Member for Finance has described as optimism bias, with too many promises made that cannot be delivered. Second, I would like to argue for the retention of as many routes as possible. The paper does not mention the proposed quickway routes on Donnington Bridge Road and St Clements, nor the quietway on Parks Road. I represent a division heavily populated by students. They make up a quarter of the population of this city and are among the heaviest users of cycle routes. Over the past weeks, I have received numerous from students who, despite all the odds, have somehow heard out about these schemes. A lot of them were deeply disappointed by the dropping of these routes. Donnington Bridge Road allows you to avoid the Plain, which was ranked the second most dangerous in the UK in 2017 and hasn't improved much since. Indeed, there were more serious accidents 2015-19 than 2009-15–55 to be precise, according to Crash Map. St Clements is used by many on their way to the hospitals; if it is used less that it could be, that is partly because of the sheer danger of the Plain. I'd urge the Cabinet member to find the money to get these cycle routes installed and to consider improving provision along other roads.

**END**