

A. Email responses

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(e1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	<p>Concerns – Thames Valley Police welcome the opportunity to engage on plans for road safety improvement and acknowledge that 20mph limits can be a useful tool in road safety. There are other reasons 20mph limits may be desirable for communities, such as environmental concerns, and creating a shared space environment to encourage greater diversity of road users.</p> <p>Compliance with 20mph limits is a challenging issue as there is a difference between the achievable results of the various available schemes. For example a sign-only scheme will only have a limited effect on the mean speeds, as opposed to other schemes that influence the road environment, which is recognised as being key to achieving compliance. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the vulnerable road user being less safe. It can also cause a dis-proportionate number of drivers to criminalise themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute.</p> <p>Thames Valley Police have no policy to enforce based on arbitrary speed limits alone but will enforce based on threat of harm, risk and resourcing. 20mph limits are not excluded from this and will be enforced where appropriate. There should be no expectation that the police would be able to provide regular enforcement if a speed limit is set too low as this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources and there are no additional resources available to support extra enforcement. Messages from partners that police will not enforce need to be discouraged. Such messaging can encourage non-compliance and should be avoided.</p> <p>The policy of Thames Valley Police is to use sound practical and realistic criteria (Setting local speed limits - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)) when responding to Highway Authorities in an effort to promote consistency and to reduce the burden of constant and unnecessary enforcement. The advice shown in Circular Roads 1/2013 states.</p> <p>The key factors that should be taken into account in any decisions on local speed limits are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • history of collisions • road geometry and engineering • road function

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • composition of road users (including existing and potential levels of vulnerable road users) • existing traffic speeds (No data provided) • road environment <p>However I recognise Oxfordshire County Council now have their own Policy for Setting Speed Limits and I expect full compliance of that policy going forward in relation to both monitoring , future engineering and self-enforcement through Community Speed Watch .</p> <p>Our stance remains that primarily 20 mph speed limits and zones should be self-enforcing</p> <p>Speed limits should be considered as part of a package of measures to manage vehicle speeds and improve road safety. Changes to the highway (for example through narrowing, providing vertical traffic calming or re-aligning the road) may be required to encourage lower speeds in addition to any change in speed limit. Though these may be more expensive, they are more likely to be successful in the long term in achieving lower speeds without the need for increased Police enforcement to penalise a substantial number of motorists.</p>
(e2) Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel	<p>Partially support – The Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel (CoHSAT) is a group of 25 voluntary and campaigning organisations working across Oxfordshire to create attractive, accessible and people-friendly streets. We do this by encouraging efficient, active, low carbon and sustainable travel, which will reduce traffic, air pollution and noise, and enable healthy and thriving communities.</p> <p>We are pleased to see proposals coming forward for 20mph speed limits in Bicester.</p> <p>CoHSAT supports the overall plan for 20mph streets in Bicester as in other towns, as it will reduce vehicle speeds and reduce casualties, ad create more attractive environment for people to walk, wheel and cycle. By doing this it makes contributions to the private car journey reduction, cycling journey increase and Vision Zero targets of LTCP.</p> <p>It is not simply not ethical to ignore the additional injuries and deaths caused by higher speeds on our roads. As study after study has demonstrated, 20mph speed limits save lives, and reduce fatalities and serious injuries by 20-30%, with co-benefits in reduced emissions and reduced congestion - as demonstrated in the most thorough meta-analysis that we are aware of, an analysis of 70 studies across 40 city-wide 20mph and 30kph schemes https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/16/11/4382</p>

For Bicester, in addition to the streets marked on the consultation plan, we see a need to designate the following streets as 20mph.

- London Road from the centre to at least the Mallards Way roundabout, as London Road is a key access route to Bicester Village station, workplaces and housing, and has no cycling infrastructure. Ideally, this should extend to the ring road for connectivity as this covers the housing and employment sites, and cycling and pedestrian infrastructure is poor.
- Talisman Road – a short access route into employment sites.
- Launton Road – certainly from Bicester Children and Family Services, past Courtyard Pre-School and Child First Nursery to cover the entrance of Aldi, as this will cover many popular routes for families, and the limited 'share a pavement' facilities are not good for either people walking or cycling. Ideally, this should extend to the ring road for connectivity as this covers the housing and employment sites, and cycling and pedestrian infrastructure is poor.
- Lambourne Crescent. A residential cul-de-sac that seems clearly more suited to 20mph than 30mph.
- Churchill Drive off Launton Road should be 20mph throughout, as it remains an important route for walking and cycling.
- Buckingham Road should be 20mph until it is re-engineered with cycle tracks, for which there is space on much of its length. A reasonable compromise would be to extend 20mph limits from the centre to the extent of residential frontages on both sides – 133 Buckingham Road. This would also cover Bicester North station and 'Town Walk' walk/cycle route.
- On Banbury Road, 20mph speed limits should cover to where the separated walking/cycling path begins, just north of the railway bridge.
- On Bucknell Road, the 20mph limit should extend at the least to the junction with George Street, as it is residential, with frontages, and has no cycling provision in this area. Even north of this 30mph is marginal as the provision is sub-standard painted lanes. (The cycle lanes are less than a metre wide, but there is a hatched area in the middle of the carriageway – this could be reallocated for the benefit of slowing traffic and giving cyclists slightly more space.)
- Queens Avenue/Kings End/Oxford Road, is a busy route for pedestrian and cycle crossings and some cycle journeys. It should be 20mph for safety of users. It is close to the centre, so speeds will (and should) rarely exceed

	<p>this. This is exactly the type of central road that a person was killed on in Banbury in 2023, when the speed limit was 30mph: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c77rjp2l6j3o .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St John Street should be included as 20mph for the same reasons. • Middleton Stoney Road has no frontages, and some cycling infrastructure, although this gets poor fairly quickly as you move away from the centre of Bicester. 20mph should cover at least the toucan crossing that serves Pingle Brook Play Area, 150 metres from Kings End. • Shakespeare Drive, a residential distributor linking to Middleton Stoney road should be 20mph throughout to form a consistent experience and enable safe walking and cycling trips to schools. <p>We note that these proposals all put 20mph limits 'where the people are'. Most people are happy to have 20mph 'near schools' – we consider a 15 minute walk to be a reasonable definition of 'near a school' – about 1100 metres at average pace. The map below shows 1000 metre circles around some of the schools in Bicester. All of the town is covered. All of the town is 'near a school'. There is a good case that all of the town should be 20mph.</p>
(e3) Oxfordshire Liveable Streets	<p>Partially support – We support the changes to 20mph, but object to key routes being excluded: we ask that all of the roads within Bicester be made 20mph, with no exceptions.</p> <p>If the county is serious about its Vision Zero and cycling trip share targets, it needs to take those into account when setting speed limits. The excluded routes include those with the highest densities of injuries and those that are most important for cycling connectivity. Lower speed limits on these routes would also be consistent with Local Transport and Connectivity Plan policies 1 (the user hierarchy), 2 (cycling and walking networks), and 8 (healthy streets).</p> <p>The omitted routes effectively cut Bicester into segments, inhibiting movement both into the centre and around the town. These routes have people crossing them at locations all along their lengths but few formal crossings, and almost no cycling infrastructure at all. Lower speed limits will make walking across them safer and more accessible (one of the major gains from the 20mph speed limits on the A4158 and B480 in East Oxford has been in better driver compliance with both signal and zebra crossings). And making these routes 20mph will not make cycling inclusively accessible or obviate the need for cycling infrastructure -- traffic volumes will remain too high for most people to be willing to cycle mixed with motor traffic -- but lower speed limits would improve safety for those people who do cycle, and make these routes accessible to more people.</p>

	<p>If making the whole of Bicester 20mph is not possible, we urge that the scheme be expanded to include at least London Rd and the B4100 between its junctions with the A41 and Buckingham Rd. These sections of road have the highest density of injuries and, being so central, do the most damage to community connectivity.</p>
(e4) Bicester Bike Users' Group	<p>Partially support – We strongly support the measures in Bicester, but are disappointed that they do not go further. Detailed comments on individual roads are set out below.</p> <p>1. London Road by station to Talisman We strongly advise that the 20mph zone on the London Road be extended from Bicester Village station to south of the Talisman junction. We understand that the OCC officers responsible for delivering the new pedestrian and cycle paths along the London Road (@Bentley, Owen - Oxfordshire County Council and @Stewart, Duncan - Oxfordshire County Council) also support this and will be writing separately.</p> <p>The rationale is that this stretch is a crucial one for pedestrians and cyclists crossing to and from the station and town centre and New and Old Langford which they do at numerous points, both where there are formal crossing points and where there are not. However, drivers driving in vehicles travelling at 30mph pose a far higher danger to pedestrians and cyclists than vehicles travelling at 20mph. This risk discourages walking and cycling significantly, particularly for vulnerable users.</p> <p>In addition, drivers travelling at 20mph are much more likely to stop and give way than drivers travelling at 30mph. This is particularly relevant for the Talisman junction, which is the key access for New and Old Langford. OCC are planning to deliver a new controlled (parallel) crossing over the entrance to the Talisman estate, but there are insufficient funds to deliver controlled crossings over the two busiest arms, the north and south of the London Road which will only have uncontrolled crossings. To encourage drivers to give way, the uncontrolled crossings will be set back 5m to allow a gap between queueing vehicles. However, this would work optimally if the 20mph zone was extended to just south of the Talisman junction.</p> <p>From the perspective of drivers, there is little benefit to this area remaining a 30mph zone as average speeds here are well below 20mph. Extending the zone would simply reduce the risk of the occasional driver who travels at a much higher speed.</p> <p>2. Churchill Road and Shakespeare Drive We recommend that the Churchill Road and Shakespeare Drives be consistently 20mph. While the rest of these roads have been recommended to be 20mph on the basis that these are outside schools, it is important to bear in mind that</p>

	<p>children cycle to school from all over Bicester. These roads are crucial links in the network that will be used by vulnerable children, so ought to be 20mph.</p> <p>We also consider that it is confusing for drivers to have roads of a similar nature having different speeds at different points. It would be preferable for a consistent 20mph speed along the whole length of these roads.</p> <p>3. Peregrine Way, Langford We strongly support the proposal for Peregrine Way to be 20mph. There is a primary school there and children and parents access the school via a number of pedestrian and cycle paths that cross Peregrine Way at numerous uncontrolled crossing points. It is essential that these crossing points are made safe for vulnerable road users.</p> <p>4. St John Street St John Street is an extremely busy road with high traffic levels. Average speeds are very slow, but with the occasional driver driving at excessive speeds. For consistency, we would strongly recommend that this also be encompassed within the 20mph zone.</p> <p>5. Arterial Roads Most of the arterial roads are key cycling routes, but do not have consistent protected cycle paths (Middleton Stoney Road, Bucknell Road, Banbury Road, Bucknell Road, Launton Road, Gavray Drive, London Road, A41). Average speeds are generally below 20mph for almost all of their length other than very close to the ring road. It would be sensible for these to be 20mph zones, particularly in the very centre of town where routes are heavily used by vulnerable cyclists.</p>
(e5) Local resident, (Bicester)	<p>Object – I strongly object to this totally unnecessary 20mph proposal. I have lived in Bicester nearly 25 years and have never felt unsafe due to the current 30mph limit. Improved environment arguments are complete nonsense, the "pollution" difference between 20mph and 30mph is small and Electric vehicles will still have to do 20mph and they don't pollute at all. Where are the accident statistics in Bicester that show the 30mph limit was the direct cause of the accident. I have worked as an automotive engineer specialising in vehicle safety for over 20years and the advances in active safety (the ability for the car to stop before it hits a car, pedestrian or cyclist) have improved incredibly over the last decade. Vehicle manufacturers have spent millions over the years to reduce the possibility of a collision at 30mph. I suggest looking at the Euro NCAP website for proof of accident avoidance. Do you ever consult with experts in other fields (that don't have an agenda) about this subject?</p>

	<p>Have councils not learned anything from the public uproar at the Welsh governments blanket 20mph limit. 20mph is not required, a better use of the Council Budget would be safety initiatives at all the local schools teaching pupils about road safety, how to look before crossing the road and not be distracted by mobile phone use. I would also prefer the council spend the money on fixing the pothole strewn roads in and around Bicester.</p> <p>A crack down on the illegal use of electric scooters and e bikes would be more appropriate than a blanket 20mph limit.</p> <p>There is a complete lack of transparency from the Council.</p> <p>What are the results of the consultation ?? Where are the accident statics for Bicester ?? Where are the accident "hot spots" ??</p> <p>If an area that is currently 30mph has no accidents there is no need to reduce the speed to 20mph.</p> <p>Bicester has grown and become more prosperous because of the car and the roads that link it to the M40, A34 etc. Residents (we moved here because of the excellent link roads) and visitors to Bicester (to spend money) shouldn't have to crawl their way in and out of the area because of an unnecessary council vanity project.</p> <p>The council is penalising the majority to keep the noisy minority happy and are using tenuous arguments about improving the environment and safety (where is the data) on already safe roads to push it through.</p>
(e6) Email response, (unknown)	<p>Object – Your case centres around removing cars. All I see is extra pollution from slower vehicles . 20 mph limits should be placed in which could be deemed dangerous area's, to make safer . Cutting speed on straight road from 30 to 20 is not safer , cycleist have more power than a car and overstep the line. The pedestrian too give way not clear, as now pedestrians work their phone thinking have right of way and step into road. A motorist we are spending more time looking for signs than looking at the road, you are making conditions more dangerous.</p> <p>You are closing roads down causing grid lock . You are causing heavy expense by slowing all and sundries down. Limit white vans , who also drive private roads think their right.</p> <p>You have done enough , we are driving on edge looking what the next enforcement ,so many a shambles. Your gain is to remove vehicles , and seek more revenue from fines.</p>

	<p>It's not pollution., if so attack mentioned area's, Cruise Ships with Cargo Ships , Trucking Coaches, areoplanes,Industrial heavy machines . you introduce blue lines etc you expect people to walk ,we can remove Council employees car parking , cut back on Council vans trucking two trucks to empty bins, no mistakes save van use. Cater think old. people who started work with HR departmens the advent of health safety yes more mobile . War Babies and up to 50s no . Bodies fatigued worn ,most joints, lungs , etc. No consideration at all just 20 mph , your think tank is too narrow minded , think world not just Bicester.</p>
(e7) Email response, (unknown)	<p>Object – As a direct result of the newly imposed 20mph speed limits, inconvenience accurately describes my driving experience, and I know this is a reality for many others. With my car registering these limits as parking speed, it has become apparent to me that our vehicles are not designed to operate optimally at these slow speeds for elongated periods.</p> <p>It's not just a personal inconvenience, but a concern from an engineering standpoint. Cars, especially those with automatic transmission, are designed to shift to higher gears as speed increases, working within optimal performance parameters typically at speeds over 30mph. Insisting on traveling in low gears for extended periods puts stress on the engine, leading to increased fuel consumption and potential long-term damage (Automobile Association, 2016).</p> <p>There are plenty of recreational areas in Bicester for the residents to enjoy without reducing speed limits.</p>
(e8) Email response, (unknown)	<p>Object – I will say that I do not support the proposal. I do feel there is a good argument in town centres and near schools, but my arguments against are below:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 20 mph areas do definitely create frustration for drivers. 2. The implementation of 20 mph areas is pretty much never enforced. (Take Wales as an example, the police will only prosecute if a speed is in excess of 26 mph) 3. Because of the lack of enforcement, many drivers ignore the limit. This leaves law abiding drivers to be hassled by those who have no regard. 4. I will cite Witney as an example of " over the top " restriction. Taking the 20mph limit right out to the town limits is pretty stupid. This only leads to frustration, so many drivers just ignore it once out of the town centre and bus drivers pay no heed anyway. (I go to Witney regularly). 5. I go through Launton every day. The road surface is so bad, that for me 20 mph works well. However, that doesn't put off many drivers from ignoring the limit. (In the Summer, I was overtaken by an impatient driver who wanted to do

	<p>at least 40 mph. Of course he got held up by a stream of vehicles sticking to 20 mph). But again, bus drivers have no regard for the limit.</p> <p>I feel that the only way to reduce speeds is with traffic calming measures. There is no doubt that speed humps do work. I accept that the only problem with humps is the effect on emergency vehicles. Unless speed limits are enforced, a 20 mph blanket is pointless.</p>
(e9) Email response, (unknown)	<p>Object – I am curious were the council is finding the money for all these 20mph signs,when it doesnt have the money to mend the pot holes in the roads which i find to be more dangerous.</p> <p>Also will the council be imposing a speed limit of 5mph for cyclist in Bicester sheep street pedestrian area to protect pedestrians,now that they have gone ahead with allowing cycling through there,even though the majority of people objected to it.</p>
(e10) Local resident, (Bicester, Queens Avenue)	<p>Partially support – IMO All roads from ring road, ie Bucknell rd, Banbury Rd, Buckingham Rd and Queens Ave should all be 20mph, this may deter some of the Bicester Village traffic. Also would it help if every junction around the ring road towards town said Local Traffic Only?</p> <p>Living on Queens Ave I know how bad the air quality is!</p>
(e11) Local resident, (Bicester, Bure Park)	<p>Partially support – As a resident on Bure Park who uses the Banbury Rd, Field Street, London Road etc. daily for my journey across to the A41 towards Aylesbury this proposal impacts on me directly.</p> <p>To be honest the issue is not the many responsible drivers who currently do 30mph, but those who drive at ridiculous speeds with zero regard for the speed limit. I cannot see their behaviour changing. What is needed is more active enforcement of existing limits. Doing 20mph for quite significant distances is not practical or necessary e.g at quiet periods.</p> <p>These 20mph limits would be far more effective if used only in key places e.g. outside all schools. Where they are already in place they are rarely adhered to and attempting to do 20mph myself usually means I am either tailgated or overtaken! Both of these are more dangerous than observing a 30mph limit.</p>

	<p>This proposal comes at a time when residents have been massively inconvenienced by the Banbury Road junction works (which we all said at consultation was a total waste of money!!) and are facing the closure of the London Road. It is just yet another kick in the teeth for motorists.</p> <p>Travelling to my place of work by public transport is impossible because it is not on a bus or train route. I rely on my car and now, yet again, I am to be penalised and inconvenienced.</p> <p>To be honest I am rapidly losing patience with Oxfordshire County Council and their ability to manage traffic. It seems that cyclists are always given priority, at huge expense, whether in Oxford or elsewhere in the county. Many cyclists are inept and have very poor road awareness and escooters are a total menace.</p> <p>I am unable to find anything positive to say about this proposal, except for suggesting targeted 20mph zones in essential, high risk areas.</p> <p>Having reread the document (which is a little confusing and very lengthy) I think that the Banbury Rd and Field Street are not affected? Queens Avenue is also unaffected and yet is heavily used by pedestrians as there are several schools placed along or very close to the road. Logic would dictate that 20mph along here would be sensible, especially near the appallingly badly lit zebra crossing near the police station.</p> <p>I can only hope that common sense will prevail, but given the recent history of residents being totally ignored, despite consultations making their opinions very clear, I doubt it!</p> <p>Money needs to go into maintenance of roads and cycle paths, not on yet another unnecessary scheme.</p>
(e12) Email response, (unknown)	<p>Support – I agree with all of the proposals to reduce the speed limit within Bicester to 20mph.</p> <p>I would also add the following : Middleton Stoney Road. How can speed bumps be compatible with a 30 mph limit ? If I do 20mph, to avoid damaging my car - I have had to have two new springs, quite expensive - I get tailgated. So either remove the speed bumps (which themselves frequently contain potholes) or reduce the speed limit to 20mph.</p> <p>Secondly, the Kingsmere estate should be 20 mph. Has the council no powers to enforce this ? My biggest annoyance is that the main dual carriageway with trees in the middle - very scenic - is unsuitable for cyclists as white van drivers, under time constraints, try to squeeze past - ouch !</p>

(e13) Email response, (unknown)	<p>Support – I would confirm that I am very much in favour of 20mph limits on all estate and residential roads and near schools.</p> <p>My biggest safety worry is the increase in e-scooter and e-bikes which are becoming a real danger on pavements and along Town walk. Additionally the exit of town walk onto Balliol Road between nos 43 and 41 is not protected by a chicane type barrier as it is on the Buckingham Road end. I have seen several very near misses with these shooting out onto the road and almost colliding with pedestrians and vehicles. Can something please be done about this?</p>
(e14) Email response, (unknown)	<p>Support – The proposed plans seem ok to me.</p>

B. Online responses

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(o1) Local resident, (Bicester)	<p>Object – there are more important road improvements that could be done to reduce accidents and improve peoples use of the areas</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o2) Local resident, (Bicester, A4421)	<p>Object – Not enforceable.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o3) Local resident, (Bicester, All roads the drawing is un clear for every road)	<p>Object – The drawing you have submitted is not clear and needs to be re submitted allowing all people to review it that have previously commented, how can the see what roads are effect with hundreds of small black squares over the PDF.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o4) Local resident, (Bicester, All roads, as someone who uses all of these roads)	<p>Object – No recorded accidents on these roads, no gov or DT report to prove it will be safer at lower speeds, no enforcement will be provided on housing estates or other roads. It is just an attempt to absolve the authorities of its obligation to maintain these roads. Add more road crossings to make roads safer. It is a waste of money, who actually asked for this and why?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o5) Member of public, (Bicester, Almond Road)	<p>Object – My responses are hardest on having dealt with road traffic in a professional capacity in the past combined with many years of motoring in all weathers, Road types and areas. Firstly a blanket limit of 20 mph especially on long straight sections of road are extremely difficult for motorists to maintain even with limiters applied because most</p>

	<p>motorists have never used limiters. It adds up to the travel time needed to get from point A to B with the consequence of motorists becoming frustrated and exceeding the limit anyway. What information concludes this will add to road safety ie. What areas in the location have incidents involving car/pedestrian collisions involving injury. Who's to police this low speed limit which will be viewed as nothing more than a cash cow against motorists in general, Police already have other more serious issues to investigate and such low speed would not be considered priority, Speed cameras are soon known and people adjust to that limit for short duration, they are costly to install and subject to vandalism, mobile cameras are also a short term measure..The roads in and around Bicester are in a third world state many with potholes or road surfaces that are rough uneven and subject to extremely poor repairs having been carried out making travel at or above 20 mph now extremely uncomfortable. The one method of keeping to 20 mph is for 2nd gear to be engaged and for the engine revs to rise, the consequence is that noise pollution and engine pollutants will rise as a result therefore become self defeating. It is a poor idea that OCC have forwarded as it is virtually unenforceable, will largely be ignored cannot adequately be policed either by police or speed cameras unless at considerable cost weighed up against injury collisions, their locations and frequency. It was always instilled upon me that a speed limit only works if it is in keeping with the type of road it is set for. Whatever is forwarded regarding limits on roads will always be viewed with derision when the limit is lowered for no really good reason other than to appease anti motoring groups. Lastly 20 mph can easily be exceeded by bicycles so what is there in place to limit them and or fine for exceeding such a limit, it must apply to them as much as vehicular traffic or it falls into disrepute straight away.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o6) Local resident, (Bicester, Ashdene Road)	<p>Object – I understand 20mph at schools and shopping areas but they cause more problems than there worth elsewhere as vehicles produce more pollution as they have to engage a lower gear. Most people ignore the limit and pressure those who do to go faster and often road-rage occurs and dangerous driving thus making the areas less safe. One's attention is taken off the road trying to keep the vehicle under 20mph and modern cars struggle to maintain this and many car limiters don't work under 30mph. There are longer tailbacks and journey times are increased. Bicester needs more roads to cope with the growing number of vehicles not stupid 20mph restrictions which help no one.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o7) Local resident, (Bicester, Aunt ems)	<p>Object – Speed limit is currently fine. Money should be used to fix the roads and potholes.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o8) Local resident, (Bicester, Avocet Way)	<p>Object – As a direct result of the newly imposed 20mph speed limits, inconvenience accurately describes my driving experience, and I know this is a reality for many others. With my car registering these limits as parking speed, it has become apparent to me that our vehicles are not designed to operate optimally at these slow speeds for elongated periods.</p> <p>It's not just a personal inconvenience, but a concern from an engineering standpoint. Cars, especially those with automatic transmission, are designed to shift to higher gears as speed increases, working within optimal performance parameters typically at speeds over 30mph. Insisting on traveling in low gears for extended periods puts stress on the engine, leading to increased fuel consumption and potential long-term damage (Automobile Association, 2016). There are plenty of recreational areas in Bicester for the residents to enjoy without reducing speed limits.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o9) Local resident, (Bicester, Avocet Way)	<p>Object – Not needed</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o10) Local resident, (Bicester, Avon Crescent)	<p>Object – enforce the present limits.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o11) Local resident, (Bicester, Avon crescent)	<p>Object – Will cause to much traffic and not required</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o12) Local resident, (Bicester, Banbury Road)	<p>Object – No need to slow down the already bad traffic</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o13) Local resident, (Bicester, Banbury Road)	<p>Object – The unnecessary so called “improvements” /destruction of the the Banbury Road roundabouts which 90% of Bicester objected to, has added a massively inconvenient and unnecessary delays to everybody. The ridiculous restriction between the M40 and the park and ride is also impractical going from 60/50/20 is ludicrous and dangerous. Please please stop destroying Bicester!!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o14) Local resident, (Bicester, Barclay Close)	<p>Object – 1. Cars running at 20 run in a lower gear and higher RPM thus producing more CO2. This proposed is bad for the environment. 2. How much will it cost to replace all the signage? that money would be better spent on pothole repair.</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>Avoid the area and thus have an impact on businesses that operate in bicester.</p>
(o15) Local resident, (Bicester, Barry Avenue)	<p>Object – The traffic and emissions from vehicles having to go at slower speeds for longer will only increase. It will stop bus companies from wanting to service areas due to time. There are also so many other issues with roads around Bicester such as pot holes and the pointless year long works turning the roundabout to a cross roads.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o16) Local resident, (Bicester, Barry Avenue)	<p>Object – I believe that the money that will be spent on altering the speed limits would be better suited elsewhere, such as repairs to our road network.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o17) Local resident, (Bicester, Bartsia road)	<p>Object – Longer journey times Increasing air pollution</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o18) Local resident, (Bicester, Beckdale Close)	<p>Object – 20mph speed limits provide no benefit to the areas proposed. Just keeping traffic in the area for longer whilst still producing emissions. Has there been any speed related incidents to warrant the change or just another way to waste money on replacing signs around the town?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o19) Local resident, (Bicester, Benson close)	<p>Object – STOP WITH THIS MADNESS! Replacing the 30mph with 20 mph is utterly preposterous. It currently takes me more time to get across Bicester in the morning than it does get up the a34 to Oxford, 20 mph will create more time on the road therefore more pollution being emitted, How about spending the money fixing the roads not making things even worse</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o20) Local resident, (Bicester, Blythe Place)	<p>Object – Who will police these 20mph zones, complete waste of our council tax money yet again, just like the roundabout on the Banbury road (in fact was supposed to be complete 3 moths ago and yet has developed some big potholes already for a new build).</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o21) Local resident, (Bicester, Bolero Gardens)	<p>Object – I totally agree with 20 mph limits around schools, but it is absolutely unnecessary for the rest of Bicester and the speed limit should stay at 30 mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(o22) As a business, (Bicester, Bolero gdns)</p>	<p>Object – Urban speed limits have been 30mph for probably 80 years so why change them to 20mph now? Why not make it 5mph with a man with a red flag in front again? 30mph is just fine!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o23) Local resident, (Bicester, Brashfield Road)</p>	<p>Object – There is too much traffic already sitting outside our house going into Bicester village and beyond. Restricting the speed further might cause a 'safe environment' for cyclists etc but will cause additional pollution and traffic on roads that will take longer to clear.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o24) Local resident, (Bicester, Bristol road)</p>	<p>Object – Total waste of money, changing signs, Better spent fixing damaged roads !!!!!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o25) Local resident, (Bicester, Browning Drive)</p>	<p>Object – It would be a huge waste of money and resources to erect signage over the entire town to display the 20mph limit. Through most housing estates, there are already so many parked cars, that it would be very difficult to exceed the 20mph as it is.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o26) Local resident, (Bicester, Buckingham road)</p>	<p>Object – 20 speed could be implemented on accident prone areas but not in the entire town area. 20 speed would literally mean vehicles go on nail pace speed which would literally halt traffic and will consume more travel time. Drivers are usually careful when driving inside town and average 20 to 25 anyways. This proposal is being opposed . Thank you</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(o27) Local resident, (Bicester, Buckingham road)</p>	<p>Object – Increase the speed on ringroad so people who need to go in another side of town do not cut thru center.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o28) Member of public, (Bicester, Bucknell Road)</p>	<p>Object – Your proposed roll out of 20mph in most of the town is inconsiderate to the residents and the commuter town that Bicester is. As with Oxford and elsewhere the scheme is largely ignored by motorists where the speed is changed without reason or qualification; regardless of your blinkered quest to using other modes of transport. Forcing the public has an opposite affect to that envisioned. Any amendment should take into account the majorities response, not the usual Cllr Gant "does what he will damn well please regardless of what anyone else thinks" mentality.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o29) Local resident, (Bicester, Bucknell Road)</p>	<p>Object – I feel it is unnecessary and a waste of money on signage and (if any) enforcement. It will make travelling around more tedious and less efficient, and won't stop anyone who currently speeds from continuing to speed.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o30) Local resident, (Bicester, Bucknell Road)</p>	<p>Object – I strongly disagree with the proposal. It is unnecessary and will not stop those who speed, merely inconvenience those who follow the Highway Code. It will lead to increased journey times and pollution and further stress to motorists. I wholeheartedly oppose this proposal</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o31) Local resident, (Bicester, Bucknell Road)</p>	<p>Object – Ridiculous spending all that money in changing speed limits when it's only the law abiding people that will follow it anyway. Spend the money on sorting potholes, road markings, lighting, parking infringements, pavements, cycleways, etc.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o32) Local resident, (Bicester, Burdock Close)	<p>Object – Unnecessary. It's just a back door way of being able to raise money by fining motorists.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o33) Local resident, (Bicester, Burns Crescent)	<p>Object – Blanket 20mph limits have very little to no effect at all in my experience, if they were thoughtfully placed in areas where there is an obvious reason people would be more likely to take note and abide by them. Most people treat them all the same ie ignore them, as there is not one, even tenuous reason, for most of them, and for 99% of them their placement makes no difference at all as there is no risk difference whether it's 20mph or 30mph. All most people see is a 20mph limit and if nearly all the time there is no obvious reason then all they will ever see is the sign and probably treat them all, even the rational ones, with contempt. Use them properly and I don't object, the current system is just an absolute waste of peoples time and council money. I could go on as my day job is driver training for full licence holders, which focusses on the psychometric side of drivers behaviours and attitudes. This council has obviously never employed such a figure or researched this issue hence the absolute waste of time implementation it continues to push on everyone. The main reason I shan't continue is because not one consultation that has ever gone against the council's diktat has made any difference. I just see a load of show boating, band wagon jumping, ego massaging, self serving ignoramuses who are going to do whatever they like irrespective of the opinions of the actual people who'll be putting up with this farce. Democracy - where are you????</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o34) Local resident, (Bicester, Camp Road)	<p>Object – 20mph is ridiculous</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o35) Local resident, (Bicester, Catterick Road)	<p>Object – 20mph is too slow for most areas</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o36) Local resident, (Bicester, Catterick Road)	<p>Object – The limit makes no meaningful difference to people switching mode of transport. You have law abiding citizens in a position where they are worried that they will get fined and points on their license for going over the</p>

	<p>20mph limit at 24mph, which is very easy to do given how painfully difficult it is to go at 20mph, and you also get stressed by people behind you bumper to bumper who will continue to do 30mph and expect you to do the same. Ridiculous policy idea.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o37) Local resident, (Bicester, Celandine close)	<p>Object – 30 mph is fine there is no need to change this.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o38) Local resident, (Bicester, Chaffinch Road)	<p>Object – I believe there is no need to waste tax payer money to reduce the speed limit to 20mph. If there have been no reported accidents or issues with the current speed limit then making a change is useless</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o39) Local resident, (Bicester, Charlotte Avenue)	<p>Object – To make the streets safer for cyclists extend and improve cycle paths - I don't want to be hit by a car even doing 20mph. There are already pavements for pedestrians. 20mph just causes drivers to be impatient - not a good frame of mind to drive in.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o40) Local resident, (Bicester, Cherwell close)	<p>Object – 20 mph is too slow modern technology has improved vastly since speed limits were set so there is no need to reduce it further.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o41) Local resident, (Bicester, Cherwood House Care Centre)	<p>Object – Just not necessary as the majority of people drive carefully at 30MPH</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o42) Local resident, (Bicester, Chester Roa)	<p>Object – It needs to be the solution to a problem. Please describe the problem first and all the solutions you consider. Otherwise, it is at best a knee jerk reaction, at worst a demagogic, political move.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o43) Local resident, (Bicester, Churchill Road)	<p>Object – Vehicle emissions will go up,as commercial vehicles will need to be in a lower gear to maintain a lower speed.Safety to pedestrians will not be improved by this,as modern vehicles are designed to protect them.It also damage diesel vehicles as the low speed will block DPF's.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o44) Local resident, (Bicester, Coopers green)	<p>Object – A blanket 20mph limit serves only to criminalise drivers. Where it has been put in place elsewhere, the majority of drivers ignore it.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o45) Local resident, (Bicester, Coopers Green)	<p>Object – 30mph works fine in Bicester. 20mph is ridiculous, it will cause more accidents because people won't stick to it.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o46) Local resident, (Bicester, Corncrake Way)	<p>Object – You're wasting money and it's not necessarily environmentally friendly with drivers needing to drive in lower gears at higher revs. The money would be better spent on improving pot holes, public transport and stopping the closure of the level crossing.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o47) Local resident, (Bicester, Corncrake Way)	

	<p>Object – It seems that the 20 mph limits are being proposed as a safety initiative but with no data to support these claims. The limits unfairly target motorists and increase journey times and congestion. If trying to promote other forms of transport then these options should be improved rather than causing additional inconvenience to local residents.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o48) Local resident, (Bicester, Cranesbill)	<p>Object – 20mph zones should be applied around schools to protect the safety of our children. You can hardly drive fast around many roads in estates anyway. Save the money for funding else where, like filling potholes, putting zebra crossings and making a bridge for London Rd when the trains start from Oxford to Cambridge.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o49) Local resident, (Bicester, Cranesbill drive)	<p>Object – Cost</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o50) Local resident, (Bicester, Cranesbill drive)	<p>Object – In the 11 years I have been a Bicester resident I have never seen a problem with inappropriate use of speed, I feel we already have the balance needed with the 20mph zone in the town, I consider the proposed change to be a poor use of money, at a time that money is so restricted</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o51) Local resident, (Bicester, Danes road)	<p>Object – There is no need to lower the speed limit within the town, it is a completely ridiculous idea</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o52) Member of public, (Bicester, Derwin Road)	<p>Object – 20mph will never be adhered to. It does not promote people to use alternative transport as people live too far away to walk/cycle to their place of employment.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o53) Local resident, (Bicester, Dickens Close)	<p>Object – Whilst I appreciate we need to be mindful of speed and its consequences, I strongly object to this proposal. As a motorist we have seen change after change in and around Bicester's roads, people who think we are already at a 20 mph speed limit will now treat the no proposed limit like 10-15 mph!! Enough is enough..... I am assuming that this is for pedestrians and cyclists, come on create paths wide enough to accommodate them and leave the roads alone!!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o54) Local resident, (Bicester, Dickens Close)	<p>Object – It will cause traffic jams and additional pollution. What about the repair of the road, why are we paying our road tax's for. Cyclist should wear a helmet and pay something towards the roads as they use it.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o55) Local resident, (Bicester, Dove Green)	<p>Object – I would much prefer money spent on enforcement and new signage to be used to fix road surfaces and finally reposition Howes Lane</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o56) Local resident, (Bicester, Dunnock Close)	<p>Object – 30 is fine on all roads</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o57) Local resident, (Bicester, East Circular Road)	<p>Object – Absolute waste of time</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o58) Local resident, (Bicester, Every road in Bicester)	<p>Object – 1. No evidence that this will have any safety benefits locally, 2. Accident statistics do not demonstrate sufficient risk to take this draconian action. 3. The massive expense of tax payer money should be spend on projects that actually benefit our communities, schools, road safety training, cycling proficiency. 4. I do not agree that criminalising the motorist is the way to deal with whatever issues OCC woke councillors think there might be. 5. I am sick and tired of local tax payers being ignored by OCC so called leadership. Is democracy now dead in favour of an authoritarian dictatorship? , I hope not. 6. Cycling and walking is great, but it remains and should remain that we the voting public have the right to choose the mode of transportation we use and when, with the freedom to move about on the roads at appropriate speed in a timely manor without the Nanny Council dictating/enforcing their fantasy notions of 'of the greater good'. I am an individual (I sense the current woke councillors don't actually f.....g care about public opinion) 7. Not in my name. 8. Travelling at the ridiculously low speed of 20 mph, has a detrimental and adverse affect on many motorists vehicles such as dpf filters clogging, increased pollution of the very road users you suggest you are trying to protect, a decrease in fuel efficiency costing motorist more, creating frustration of some motorists thus increasing risks as this boils over.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o59) Local resident, (Bicester, Fair Close)	<p>Object – The main roads through Bicester need to remain 30mph in order to keep traffic moving. Reducing the speed on almost all the roads will have a significant negative impact. As roads get busy, the speed automatically drops, most cases even below 20mph. But during less busy times, keeping the 30mph reduce the build up of traffic. On smaller residential roads, it is a complete waste of money as those roads can only be safely done at 20mph or less on most of them.</p> <p>If safety is the reason for moving to 20mph, then there are other much more effective solutions. Repair roads, improve signage and road lighting. Enforce current restrictions, including that on cyclists and e-scooters not adhearing to current regulations (like wearing basic lighting). Instead of slower accidents, why not aim to avoid them completely. By spending money on improving the current infrastructure instead of placing more restrictions (which ion most cases can't be enforced) it will be significantly more beneficial in the reduction of accidents.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o60) Local resident, (Bicester, Fair Close)	<p>Object – It is not green as slowing traffic only result in more queues with car journeys taking longer. Changing limits from 30 to 20 will not encourage people to stop using their cars. It will only make those journeys more frustrating. Providing better and more affordable public transport options will be much more effective.</p> <p>Changing from 20 to 30 does not reduce accidents (it may reduce the severity). Instead, spending the money on improving road conditions like better lighting especially around pedestrian crossings (active lights within road surface that flash whenever pedestrians come close to crossing), fixing potholes so cyclists don't have to swerve out to avoid coming off the bike or car drivers concentrating more on avoiding potholes and figuring out confusing signage that on their overall surroundings.</p> <p>The money can be much better spend, delivering much better results, than spending it on more 20mph signs where most of the areas can't be enforced or where traffic will never realistically reach that limit in any case.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o61) Local resident, (Bicester, Fair close)	<p>Object – Due to Bicester Village, the traffic is already bad and slowing things down is just going to increase congestion and produce more carbon emissions, countering the reason for your original reasoning. Lowering the speed limit isn't going to stop tourists and people passing through bicester for work to stop driving, it's just going to have the opposite desired effect. Think about it this way by lowering the speed limit through the centre, if there is no traffic the lowered speed limit will only increase the journey length by maximum 5 minutes, which is still faster than walking and potentially cycling. People driving is going to be inevitable and I can see why you've proposed the idea and I appreciate it I just belive there are better ways to go about it for example encourage cycling schemes, make ares more scenic to walk through, fix the current problems that people are complaining about.</p> <p>Anyways have. Great day Kind regards</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o62) Local resident, (Bicester, Fair close)	<p>Object – I believe the speed limit should stay as it is. Decreasing to 20 mph is unnecessary and will not improve traffic, infact it could increase congestion and potential road rage</p>

	Travel change: No
(o63) Local resident, (Bicester, Fair close)	<p>Object – Think there us no need to implement this on every road. Perhaps around schools would be sensible It already takes way too long to travel around town as traffic is heavier. Reducing speed limit will bring the town to an almost standstill and increase emissions from cars as its going to take even longer to get around. Many cars struggle to be driven consistently at this speed I would end up just driving in 2nd gear which will increase fuel consumption a d more queues of traffic. I feel this will impact on emergency vehicles trying to get around and also buses. I don't see what there is to gain from reducing speed limit other than accident black spots.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o64) Local resident, (Bicester, Fair Close)	<p>Object – What is the reason for this?? What is the problem you are trying to fix? I'm pretty certain it's not road accidents in Bicester. This feels like you are imposing a restriction to discourage driving rather than anything else (to solve the congestion issues you're creating with closing roads etc!) There is no other obvious reason for it. These 20mph restrictions are ridiculous. I'm all for 20mph outside school areas (restrictions applied during school drop off / pick up time) but other than that absolutely no. I feel that the council should justify their need for the change, rather than the public needing to justify the other way round! You come up with a 'new' idea (or bandwagon!) with no genuine explanation of the problem you're solving and we have to try and defend our existing rights against this! Absolutely bonkers!!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o65) Rather not say, (Bicester, Fair Close)	<p>Object – It's 2 slow and unnessesary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o66) Member of public, (Bicester, Fair Close)	<p>Object – Causes congestion, hard to enforce leading to lower respect for the law, eliminates fuel efficiency from constant breaking and speeding up, increases journey time which in turn causes more congestion</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o67) Local resident, (Bicester, Fairfield Close)	<p>Object – 20mph zones make drivers more focused on looking at their speedometer rather than focusing on risks and potential accidents.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o68) Local resident, (Bicester, Fairford Way)	<p>Object – Absolute waste of money. There are many people using their phones, speeding in 30mph areas and even seen people go wrong way round roundabout by Hundred Acres pub on Glory Farm which aren't policed so who will enforce plus as a driver 20 means watching the speedo, not the road ahead.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o69) Local resident, (Bicester, Field Street)	<p>Object – The 30mph is enough. If that was followed policed more regularly then there would be no need for further reduction. I live on Field Street which is not included in the planned area. Arguably one of the roads that would actually benefit from less traffic and more restrictions/policing. I just don't understand who is proposing this, for what reason and why it seems to have been missed from any local election pledges?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o70) Local resident, (Bicester, Flanders Close)	<p>Object – There is absolutely no need to reduce the speed limit down to 20mph. There is more traffic than ever with Bicester Bullage and all the new shops etc. The traffic won't move and the town will grind to a halt.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o71) Local resident, (Bicester, Gaverty Drive)	<p>Object – People don't go 30mph, so they definitely won't go 20mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o72) Local resident, (Bicester, Gentian Close)	<p>Object – I believe in slow, safe driving but 20mph is just too slow. I find it hard and painful to go that slow. Thirty mph is plenty slow and safe enough as long people abide by it. When the limit is 30, We'll be driving at about 28mph and can easily see and stop if needed. Not sure why it needs to change. Any environmental benefits to be gained by going slower would be lost by the extended length of the journey.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o73) Local resident, (Bicester, George St)	<p>Object – OCC have a habit of doing blanket speed limits. Many of which affect through routes. The majority of vehicles are most efficient at ~50mph... now this is of course unsafe for built up areas, so vehicles have been geared to sit well at 30mph, I drive through local villages which have changed from 40/30 down to 20... and get about 30% less MPG meaning increased emissions. Adding to that a 40 -> 20 doubles the journey time (therefore double the congestion and further increase to pollution)</p> <p>It is much better to do small scale 20mph routes around specific housing areas and schools where supported and appropriate.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o74) Local resident, (Bicester, George street)	<p>Object – It is excessively risk averse, it increases journey times by 50%, creates huge traffic jams for no reason, increases emissions as cars are not geared to run at 20, hampers economic growth due to time lost. All while cars have never been safer. I'm not aware of any instances of deaths on the 30 roads and think the people who crash will still speed anyway. It is an insane policy to pursue.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o75) Local resident, (Bicester, Germander Way)	<p>Object – More congestion and pollution without any benefits. Responsible drivers will always drive with care while irresponsible drivers will always ignore the regulations. From past records, there were very few accidents around</p>

	<p>Bicester due to speed and most were due to irresponsible or careless driving. Spending needless money on proposals is a waste and will add to the financial burden of the residents.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o76) Local resident, (Bicester, Goldcrest way)	<p>Object – Makes journeys slower unnecessarily. Bicester is already very safe with drivers going safely at 30mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o77) Local resident, (Bicester, Goldcrest Way)	<p>Object – I strongly object to this totally unnecessary 20mph proposal. I have lived in Bicester nearly 25 years and have never felt unsafe due to the current 30mph limit. Improved environment arguments are complete nonsense, the "pollution" difference between 20mph and 30mph is small and Electric vehicles will still have to do 20mph and they don't pollute at all. Where are the accident statistics in Bicester that show the 30mph limit was the direct cause of the accident. I have worked as an automotive engineer specialising in vehicle safety for over 20years and the advances in active safety (the ability for the car to stop before it hits a car, pedestrian or cyclist) have improved incredibly over the last decade. Vehicle manufacturers have spent millions over the years to reduce the possibility of a collision at 30mph. I suggest looking at the Euro NCAP website for proof of accident avoidance. Do you ever consult with experts in other fields (that don't have an agenda) about this subject?</p> <p>Have councils not learned anything from the public uproar at the Welsh governments blanket 20mph limit. 20mph is not required, a better use of the Council Budget would be safety initiatives at all the local schools teaching pupils about road safety, how to look before crossing the road and not be distracted by mobile phone use. I would also prefer the council spend the money on fixing the pothole strewn roads in and around Bicester.</p> <p>A crack down on the illegal use of electric scooters and e bikes would be more appropriate than a blanket 20mph limit. There is a complete lack of transparency from the Council.</p> <p>What are the results of the consultation ??</p> <p>Where are the accident statistics for Bicester ??</p> <p>Where are the accident "hot spots" ??</p> <p>If an area that is currently 30mph has no accidents there is no need to reduce the speed to 20mph.</p> <p>Bicester has grown and become more prosperous because of the car and the roads that link it to the M40, A34 etc. Residents (we moved here because of the excellent link roads) and visitors to Bicester (to spend money) shouldn't have to crawl their way in and out of the area because of an unnecessary council vanity project.</p> <p>The council is penalising the majority to keep the noisy minority happy and are using tenuous arguments about improving the environment and safety (where is the data) on already safe roads to push it through.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o78) Local resident, (Bicester, Goldfinch Close)	Object – I do not accept the reduction in speed limit. It is a waste of public money to implement the signage which could be better spent elsewhere where. Travel change: No
(o79) Local resident, (bicester, graham)	Object – not needed or wanted,it just creates congestion and fumes! Travel change: No
(o80) Local resident, (Bicester, Grebe Road)	Object – It's unnecessary and would likely create more traffic Travel change: No
(o81) Local resident, (Bicester, Grebe Road)	Object – Unnecessary and disruptive. Cars are not meant to drive at that speed. Travel change: No
(o82) Local resident, (Bicester, Grebe Road)	Object – It is not needed and just adds to congestion and prolonged air pollution Travel change: No
(o83) Local resident, (Bicester, Hambleside)	Object – I believe the only thing these changes will acheive is frustration for law abiding motorists. if this was for safety reasons outside a school during drop off and pick up times that would make sense these proposals do not. As has been shown in wales reduced speed limits do not have a positive impact in reducing emissions from vehicles passing through a particular area.

	Travel change: No
(o84) Local resident, (Bicester, Hamilton Close)	<p>Object – Traffic is already problematic around Bicester. Making traffic even slower basically makes the roads unusable and traps many residents inside the town.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o85) Local resident, (Bicester, Hampden Close)	<p>Object – The Police cannot police 30 MPH, what chance for 20 MPH. Boston Road is a Race Track and an accident waiting to happen</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o86) Local resident, (bicester, Harebell way)	<p>Object – Longer journey times causing more pollution and more frustrated drivers</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o87) Local resident, (Bicester, Harrier way)	<p>Object – Building traffic around Bicester and creating more pollution,</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o88) Local resident, (Bicester, Hawksmead)	<p>Object – I walk my dog in Bicester every day, mainly on paths next to both 30 and 20 Mph roads. The percentage of drivers currently adhering to the 20Mph limit around the town centre is well below 50%, I would guess at somewhere around 25 % if I had to. The drivers in 30Mph speed limit areas are better, but again, I would guess only 75% are sticking to the limit. What is CRUCIAL is HOW the council will enforce the new limits. It is COMPLETELY pointless spending money on this project is no one is going to monitor and enforce the limit. 20 Mph only works if people drive at 20Mph, just putting the signs up will make very little difference, and should you decide to go ahead with this, and lets face it Mr Gant wont pay any attention to what the people of Bicester want and do whatever he wants to , as per usual, I request a full and detailed breakdown from you on how this will be enforced. And I will not let this go until I have it.</p>

	<p>I am happy for the limit to be reduced to 20Mph, only if you ensure people do it.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o89) Local resident, (Bicester, Hawksmead)	<p>Object – Too onerous for all drivers, create frustration and more likely for distracted drivers to use phones etc</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o90) Local resident, (Bicester, haydock)	<p>Object – we wont need a speed limit with the closing of the level crossing it will cause a gridlock and we will be lucky to overtake a snail</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o91) Local resident, (Bicester, Hemingway Drive)	<p>Object – It's madness all because you think that reducing speed limit will get people out of their cars and walking or cycling. You are deluded</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o92) Local resident, (Bicester, Herald Way)	<p>Object – Dear Council Members,</p> <p>The rationale behind the proposed 20 MPH speed limits is to enhance travel safety. However, I remain unconvinced until the council provides comprehensive data on accidents, injury severity, and root causes. The implementation of these speed limits should be contingent upon such data supporting the need, or a risk identified through thorough analysis, such as in school zones where it is justifiable.</p> <p>While I support the promotion of cycling and walking through the introduction of more pedestrian and cycle lanes where feasible, and acknowledge the recent updates to the highway code to improve cyclist safety, I believe reducing the speed limit to 20 MPH will only exacerbate traffic congestion and increase motorist frustration.</p> <p>The Bicester community chat on Facebook is rife with objections and widespread discontent regarding the delays and congestion caused by the new roundabout at Banbury Road. Positive feedback, including support for widened cycle paths, is vastly outnumbered by opposing views. The council might argue that the frustration caused by the Banbury Road roundabout is temporary, albeit lasting over a year, but the proposed 20 MPH speed limit is permanent, and so will be the frustration.</p>

	<p>Furthermore, I question how long it will be before speed cameras are installed and the revenue from fines begins to flow into the Government's Consolidated Fund. This raises concerns that the primary motive behind this proposal is financial gain, disguised under the guise of promoting a slower and safer pace of life.</p> <p>I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and base any decisions on transparent, data-driven evidence that genuinely supports the need for such measures.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o93) Local resident, (Bicester, Herald Way)	<p>Object – They are a blanket limit - not a limit for individual locations</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o94) Local resident, (Bicester, Honeysuckle close)	<p>Object – It will cause more pollution in the town</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o95) Local resident, (Bicester, Isis Ave)	<p>Object – It's dangerous and does not make the roads safer</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o96) Local resident, (Bicester, Isis Avenue)	<p>Object – Unnecessary except outside schools in term time</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o97) Local resident, (Bicester, Jay close)	<p>Object – Too widespread and expensive... 20 mph by schools and shops is fine.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o98) Local resident, (Bicester, Kempton close)	<p>Object – 20mph is nuts, it's people's driving skills especially the orientals , that need altering</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o99) Local resident, (Bicester, Kestrel way)	<p>Object – Little significant evidence to prove that it's required for safety. I work on ambulances and I've been to 1 crash (put foot on accelerator and not break at a round about) & heard of 3ish more (pulled off to fast & knocked a cyclist, and two reversing into pedestrians) attended by colleagues in 12 years of working in this area. Langford village in particular have shown no issues related to speed for 5+ish years at all with evidence from there speed camera and reports from police etc</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o100) Local resident, (Bicester, Kingfisher Way)	<p>Object – Reducing the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph in Bicester Village could exacerbate existing traffic congestion rather than alleviate it. The area already experiences heavy traffic, even on weekdays not to mention weekends and special events being held in Bicester, and a reduction in speed could lead to further delays as vehicles would need to travel even more slowly, increasing overall journey times. With the already extremely poor road layout around Bicester, reducing the speed limit will only encourage more dangerous driving. We do not need this speed limit change.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o101) Local resident, (Bicester, Kingfisher Way)	<p>Object – Keeping to 20mph means constantly checking your speed, taking uour eye off the road for a seconds. 30mph is still safe if needed to react and stop.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o102) Member of public, (Bicester, Kings End)	<p>Object – Bicester already has tremendous traffic problems, generating noise and pollution in the town for the majority of the day. Further bottlenecks caused by a reduced speed limit will only exacerbate this issue to the detriment of the residents' health</p>

	Travel change: No
(o103) Local resident, (Bicester, Kingsclere Road)	<p>Object – I personally think that there is nothing wrong with the speed limits as they are right now. The only places where 20mph speed limits would be understandable in my opinion are by schools during hours where children will be entering and leaving school.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o104) Local resident, (Bicester, Kingsmere)	<p>Object – The blank proposal is a lazy way of making changes to the roads safer and usable for the residents. A more thorough survey would require to assess whether the proposal should be carried out as a blank policy, it's not necessary to reduce the speed limit in certain roads.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o105) Local resident, (Bicester, Lancaster Close)	<p>Object – Given the reconsideration by the Welsh parliament on reducing the number of 20 Mph zones owing to the public outcry, any further rollout of these zones should be considered in line with the health and safety benefits and environmental factors. So far, independent reviews have only shown fuel consumption to decrease in 1.3 mpg. From a safety standpoint, with all the best will in the world, drivers going at 20 mph will be overtaken by drivers becoming impatient. Not to mention that cyclists average between 15-20 mph, there will be undoubtedly more traffic collisions.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o106) Local resident, (Bicester, Lancaster Close)	<p>Object – One of the reasons given for the proposed change is to encourage bike riders to use the roads. This is not going to happen unless they are banned from cycling on pavements! I have observed times when the Churchill road has been devoid of cars and bikes have still barged past me on the pavements. You can't drive through Bicester at the best of times and I would have thought it would have made more sense to sort out the issue of the Level Crossing on London Road before dealing with speed limits. I question the choice of priorities.</p> <p>I also question how this is going to be enforced. Why not re activate the speed cameras that are already in place on Buckingham, Churchill and Launton Roads.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o107) Local resident, (Bicester, Langford)	<p>Object – Bicester is already congested with families that have moved into the town. You are trying to prevent pollution and congestion. 20 miles per hour will only make the town polluted and congested</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o108) Local resident, (Bicester, Langford Village)	<p>Object – There is no reason for our local area to have a 20mph limit. Also, if the ludicrous suggestion to close the level crossing to traffic goes ahead it will significantly increase the time to move through Bicester - this and a speed reduction in general is something which some will tire of quickly and speed, and overtake introducing risk.</p> <p>Travel change: Other I still stop buying from local businesses and move to online.</p>
(o109) Member of public, (Bicester, Langford Village)	<p>Object – The statistics show no need for this measure. It is unenforceable and will be widely disliked by the public that the County Council serves.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o110) Local resident, (Bicester, Lapwing Close)	<p>Object – 20mph is too slow. 80% of residents drive at a safe speed in the 30mph areas. The remaining 20% will ignore 20mph signs.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o111) Local resident, (Bicester, Lapwing Close)	<p>Object – Having a 20mph speed limit is not going to solve the safety problems in Bicester, you are out of touch with what Bicester needs. You come up with statements like 'We want to make our towns and villages safer and more attractive places to walk and cycle' and yet fail to address problems like Bicester villages workers (from other countries who have a different road etiquette), cycling on the path of London Road in the rush hour when people with mobility</p>

	<p>scooters are trying to use the same paths. A 20mph speed limit is not going to solve this - improved policing is what we need. If cyclist force pedestrians into the road in the 30mph or a 20mph, an elderly person is still going to be hurt. You say you want to change to have an attractive place to walk and cycle, yet you do nothing when cyclist have arrived at their destination. If you have secure places for cyclist in the centre then people will feel safe leaving the cycles when shopping, but instead you come up with pointless ideas like painting a cycle lane thru the centre of Bicester. The cyclist clubs were against this, there is no policing of this, eg, people or market traders wandering into the cycle lane (suspending on market days adds even more confusion for the public). This idea is just another of example of you being out of touch and wasting money on bad ideas.</p> <p>In other countries I've seen, they have ideas like raised cycle lines in the road to stop traffic wandering into the cycle lanes (the car wheels are bounced off the lines pushing the car back into the road). Also, secure parking spaces for cycles. These are the things that will make cyclists want to cycle into Bicester and stop them cycling on the paths and NOT a 20mph speed limit.</p> <p>Also, more cameras or police to enforce traffic stopping at pedestrians crossings in Bicester. A number of times I've almost been hit when crossing at a pedestrian cross, and when I speak to the Police, I'm told they will not do anything unless a have a video recording of the incident on a phone. Without proper enforcement, drivers will break these laws regardless of 30mph or 20mph. The drivers were not paying attention in a 30, so why will they pay more attention on a 20?</p> <p>Lowering the speed limit will mean drivers are paying less attention to the roads and there is even more potential for accidents, eg, like drivers not paying attention to pedestrians on a crossing above.</p> <p>You need to look deeper into the problems in Bicester, like eScooters riding in the wrong direction through Sheep St. or on the path, and having a proper deterrent for escooters when caught. They should be confiscated and crushed as soon as they are caught on the road/path, and not the softly, softly smack on the wrist policy that is in place at the moment.</p> <p>In summary, changing to 20mph is an ill thought out idea that is not addressing the problems in Bicester, it's an easy thing to do and tries to give the impression that the council are addressing the problems, when this is just a sticking plaster solution and not a long term strategy. As I've mentioned above, there are many problems with safety on the roads around Bicester and as a resident I can see that you are missing the real issues and blindly following the media stories and the likes of Wales in trying to implement a policy which does not address our local issues.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o112) Local resident, (Bicester, Launton Road)	<p>Object – There is no reason for the speed limits to be reduced on all road in Bicester i would accept stretches of roads around schools or leisure centres but to blanket entire roads in 20mph where there are not any incident ever is unnecessary and and waste of council money for no discernible benefit</p>

	Travel change: No
(o113) Local resident, (Bicester, Lawrence Way)	<p>Object – The proposal to reduce speed limits shows utter contempt for the residents. Surely the Welsh petition has made very clear how little support there is among most people for such measures. It is appalling that these measures are being pushed through on the basis of fewer than a hundred votes.</p> <p>The cost in time should be offset against the reduction in accidents. I calculated that for proposed similar measures in Scotland the cost in people's free time v the cost of time lost to being injured killed then the cost of reducing speed limits only made sense if people spend on average less than 24 minutes per year on roads at 20 mph when they would previously have been at 30 mph. So about 7 seconds per day. I doubt that it will be less than 15 seconds which is equivalent to doubling the number of road deaths in terms of time lost.</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>What about cycle less? Far safer for cyclists when cars going at 30 mph than at 20 mph when motorists will be far more restricted in when they can choose to safely overtake. I overtake pedestrians and in most situations cyclists while ensuring that what</p>
(o114) Local resident, (Bicester, Lerwick Croft)	<p>Object – With the closing of London road due to rail way line crossing it is going to make getting around Bicester's even more difficult and more congestion. To add in 20mph speed limits is just going to cause more issues and more and more frustration. Making the town and other facilities undesirable to get too which I turn will push trade away from Bicester to surrounding towns how is that a benefit to the town. Also some e-bikes and scooters can be doing faster than 20mph which will again cause issues.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o115) Local resident, (Bicester, Lily Close)	<p>Object – I do not think that this is a high priority, rather than waste money on this plan, it could and should be put to better use, namely repairing and improving the diabolical roads that we are forced to put up with currently. Driving as part of my job you get to see how often drivers are forced to take action to avoid dangers on the road, also to witness how unacceptable things have become, lack of maintenance and poor quality repairs that barely last.</p> <p>The Bicester ring road, roads into the town centre (from all directions) and almost all interconnecting roads are full of pot holes, collapsing drains and manhole covers. Uneven surfaces which collect and hold rain water, creating hazards for drivers.</p>

	<p>When is the poor standard of our roads going to be made a priority???? Rather than changing speed limits. If you want to make roads safer, (20 mph will not do this alone) repair them, maintain them correctly. This will allow drivers to concentrate correctly on the situation ahead, prevent erratic actions trying to avoid pot holes, drain covers, standing water by the verge, in turn improving the standards of driving.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o116) Local resident, (Bicester, Lodge Close)	<p>Object – There is no need to change the limits. Wales tried it and are reverting back now. The 30mph has been in place for a long time and the rules well established with signs and lampposts indicating the zone. 30mph is the default urban speed in the Highway Code. The lack of repeaters in 20mph zones is non-sensical</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o117) Local resident, (Bicester, London Road)	<p>Object – I object to the proposals. The reduction of the speed limit to 20mph conflicts with the natural flow of traffic and will create unnecessary congestion and therefore pollution in such residential areas. Consequently, my personal experience is that such unreasonable speed limits cause frustration for drivers, leading to a complete disregard for the speed limit, thus having the opposite effect of making these areas "safer".</p> <p>Furthermore, I question the requirement for such a reduction. I note in the Statement of Case that the primary reason to reduce the speed limit is to reduce road casualties. Have the residential areas, where speed reductions are proposed, experienced an unreasonable level of casualties? Has thorough traffic analysis been conducted on each road you are proposing to reduce the speed limit on? Has a casualty assessment of these roads been conducted? In the instances where casualties were an unfortunate occurrence, was the driver driving at or under 30mph? In areas where the speed limit has already been reduced, do you have data analytics that the casualties caused by people driving at the speed limit have been reduced?</p> <p>If the above questions cannot be answered, or the answers are "no", then I would argue that it should be completely out of the question to reduce the speed limit in these areas further.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to express my disappointment in the council for wasting public money on such a scheme, when the money could be spent on improving road quality, which would do far more good for public safety.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o118) Local resident, (Bicester, Lucerne ave)	<p>Object – I cycle regularly, I do not have a issue with the speed of cars I cycle with, I would prefer money to be spent on somewhere safe to leave my cycle when in the town, I will sometime use my car due to cycle theft</p> <p>Travel change: Other No, I cycle already, for me to use my cycle more, I need somewhere safe to leave my cycle in town, I would expect this is a common issue, due to cycle theft</p>
(o119) Local resident, (Bicester, Ludlow road)	<p>Object – The traffic is already deadlocked around the town. Reduced the speed limit could have knocked on effect to the flow of the traffic.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Electric scooter</p>
(o120) Local resident, (Bicester, Lyneham Road)	<p>Object – 20mph in some zone is sensible but cars have become safer with advancements in technology and the proposal is excessive. We are looking to make the roads slower than they were nearly 100 years ago when the 30mph zone were introduced in 1934. Even as a cyclist in Bicester I don't think the 20mph would be an improvement as drivers will be spending less time looking at the road and more time trying to keep to the speed limit and looking at their speedo.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o121) Local resident, (Bicester, Lyneham Road)	<p>Object – Not necessary.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o122) Local resident, (Bicester, Mallards Way)	<p>Object – There is no need to reduce the existing 30mph limit within Langford Village area, since the Langford Village Community Association speed camera has proven there is almost no speeding in Old Langford at present. Furthermore the LVCA has hard evidence from a year of monitoring traffic speeds at various times of day outside the primary school, proving that there is no speeding outside the school during school hours. On the contrary, if the limit was reduced to 20mph then this would actually create a new speeding problem, as many drivers would exceed 20mph</p>

	<p>and potentially overtake drivers that would be keeping to the limit. Over the last five years there have only been 3 reported collisions in Langford, and it is unclear whether any of these involved speeding. On this basis I object to any reduction in the speed limit in this area. The funds to install any road furniture would be better spent mending the potholes on the town's roads, in particular Launton Road.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o123) Local resident, (Bicester, Maple road, often grid locked due to parents using it as a carpark for longfields school.)</p>	<p>Object – I don't think they are necessary. People who choose to speed will continue to do so. Most people don't speed because they drive according to the road conditions. In Bicester this largely means grid lock! Especially on the roads that are deemed to stay at 30 miles an hour. I think this is a waste of time and money and disrespectful to those who do drive sensibly. Where is the evidence that Bicester has issues with people speeding on local roads? All this will do is increase pollution by forcing people to drive slower and creating more emissions. Life is frustrating enough already for people trying to drive around Bicester.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o124) Local resident, (Bicester, Martin Close)</p>	<p>Object – Will cause even more congestion within the proposed 20 mph zone</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o125) Local resident, (Bicester, Martin close)</p>	<p>Object – Better to have time specific 20mph zones under flashing light control around schools etc</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o126) Local resident, (Bicester, Martin Close)</p>	<p>Object – the traffic around bicester is already reaching unsustainable levels with existing works underway, the likely closure of the level crossing at Bicester village will only add to the number of vehicles on the roads slowing everyone down will only increase the number of cars on the roads at peak times.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o127) Local resident, (Bicester, Martin Close)	<p>Object – I believe 20mph limits have their place outside schools but that's it. I think other traffic calming measures are better for slowing vehicles in danger areas/hotspots that work better than an unpoliced/unenforced restriction. Reducing enforced traffic signs 'blanket' only increases traffic congestion, bad and aggressive driver behaviour and can lead to more accidents.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o128) Local resident, (Bicester, Medina Gardens)	<p>Object – Restricting speed limits to 20mph does not reduce road traffic collisions, casualties, or driver speed</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o129) Local resident, (Bicester, Meredith close)	<p>Object – Bicester has a lot of traffic going through it and I strongly believe we need a higher speed ring road or bypass road. My concern with increased 20mph areas is more a concern that a lower speed limit combined with a high (and increasing over time with more housing being built etc) volume of traffic will result in more frequent congestion and increased air pollution. If we had reliable higher speed routes to channel the higher volumes of traffic on rush hour etc, I would support 20mph more widely, but as it stands we have some residential roads (IE shakespeare drive) that see a high volume of traffic in peak times with limited alternative routes for cars to take.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o130) Local resident, (Bicester, Merganser Drive)	<p>Object – These speed limits are ridiculous</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o131) Local resident, (Bicester, Merlin Way)	<p>Object – You tell me the benefits. It's not road safety. It causes more frustration and adds even more time to journeys. Completely ridiculous.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o132) Local resident, (Bicester, Merlin Way)	<p>Object – The roads have been fine at the speeds that have been set currently, with no accidents due to speed.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Probably won't drive around Bicester as can't get anywhere in short amount of time I might as well travel elsewhere for my needs rather than Bicester with council proposing road closures and speed reductions to speeds bike and runners can overtake cars</p>
(o133) Local resident, (Bicester, Merlin Way)	<p>Object – I regularly drive around a 20mph zone in grater London, and the number of cars that flout the limit is surprising. When driving at 20, there is nearly always someone tailgating or trying to overtake unsafely. Looking at the crash/accident statistics for Bicester (from 2020 and before - the latest I could see online) The trend of accidents is already going down. Is there a target reduction for accidents, and how is this and the effectiveness of the scheme going to be monitored?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o134) Local resident, (Bicester, Moor Pond close)	<p>Object – Traffic in Bicester moves slowly as it is, owing to the volume cars on the main roads. In this scheme these congested main roads have been left at 30 miles per hour. We need a suitable scheme to resolve this congestion issue rather than wasting money on 20 miles per hour zones on the local housing estates.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o135) Local resident, (Bicester, Mulberry Drive)	<p>Object – I strongly object the proposals because it is not the right solution for the problem. Regarding the safety "benefit", there needs to be an education program for pedestrians - there is an ever increasing number of people crossing roads, whether at junctions or crossings, who just walk straight out without looking and assume that cars will just stop. Bad driving makes this worse and slowing cars down will cause drivers to be more distracted as they are crawling and will be more likely to sightsee or look at their phones/radio. Regarding congestion, I'm guessing the research (which is not linked) is based on congested cities where the speed traffic moves is already 20mph so the limit makes no difference. It will in Bicester and saying it will improve adoption of alternative transport is a lie - I can</p>

	<p>drive to the other side in less than 5 minutes, or I can wait 30+ mins for a bus and have to change twice to get where I want, or I can walk and it take over 30mins. Public transport works in Central London, but cars are needed when time is pressured - for context, I primarily walk or cycle for short distances anyway but know this is not possible for disabled, elderly, people with children, or generally less mobile people. The proposals are just following an ill conceived conclusion to a problem. Cars are being demonised for problems caused by either irresponsible pedestrians or bad driving standards that reducing the speed to 20 will not address.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o136) Local resident, (Bicester, Mulberry Drive)	<p>Object – Objecting as it is not necessary. If work needs to be done on improving traffic it would be to fix the potholes and not get rid of the Banbury Road roundabout.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Less reluctant to stay in Bicester.</p>
(o137) Local resident, (Bicester, N/A)	<p>Object – I object to the blanket reduction of speed limits from 30mph to 20mph on all roads in Bicester. While safety is important, a uniform reduction across all roads may not be proportionate or effective. Many roads are already safe with the current 30mph limit, and reducing speeds further could lead to increased congestion, longer travel times, and reduced efficiency for local businesses and services. Speed reductions should be targeted only in high-risk zones such as areas around schools, where there is a clear and justifiable need for enhanced safety measures, rather than applying a county-wide policy indiscriminately.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o138) Local resident, (Bicester, N/A - I'm not giving you that info)	<p>Object – It seems that the council would rather pay for signs lowering the speed limit than actually maintain the roads. To hear rationale about it being safer or pushing people into other modes of transport is a joke.... How much money is generated by motorist through taxation?? Take us out of the cars and where the loss of tax revenue coming from??? You're literally driving the country deeper into debt...</p> <p>Travel change: Other No & I'll continue to drive to the previous speed limit</p>

(o139) Local resident, (Bicester, No)	<p>Object – Increase in emissions from cars being at high revs in lower gears. Increase in commuting times, when Bicester is currently perfect for commuters.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o140) Local resident, (Bicester, No?)	<p>Object – This in no way would make the towns and villages safer or more attractive in anyway but just annoy commuters and families, or encourage me to bike/scooter or otherwise walk.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o141) Local resident, (Bicester, None of your business)	<p>Object – Absolutely no need for it-</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o142) Local resident, (Bicester, None of your business)	<p>Object – I don't believe that a universal lowering of the speed limit is at all necessary. 100 yds either side of a school would be acceptable.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o143) Local resident, (Bicester, Nuffield close)	<p>Object – It's fine outside schools but has shown not to work in other places that have introduced it and will just be a money making exercise with speed cameras in the future</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o144) Local resident, (Bicester, Orpine Close)	<p>Object – I think it will make a very limited improvement to safety, if any.</p> <p>As a cyclist (I cycled 1400 miles last year, commuting to/from work once per week by bicycle), I feel less safe in 20mph limits than 30mph limits, as I'm travelling at almost the same speed as cars. Either I'm following a car, or a car is following me. Neither is particularly safe. In a 30mph limit, a car can safely overtake me and then it's gone, and I'm back with a safe space around me.</p>

	<p>Also the cost of implementing signage would be better spend elsewhere, eg fixing potholes where would have a much bigger positive impact on road safety.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o145) Local resident, (Bicester, Osprey Close)	<p>Object – Data shows there is no correlation between speed and accidents in Bicester. If you are going to spend hundreds of thousands of pounds on something, and annoy local residents, there needs to be a solid evidence base to support the proposal. We supposedly live in a democratic society and you say you will not implement the proposals if the community doesn't want it. Have have an online referendum on the proposal!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o146) Local resident, (Bicester, Osprey close)	<p>Object – I agree some roads could drop to 20, notably outside schools fir safety but I'd rather see more parking restrictions around those to stop the traffic buildup. Along with the closure of the London road crossing it just seems more reasons to not go into the town centre. Yes, i do walk into town but i won't be doing my main shopping there any more if it becomes so difficult to get in.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o147) Local resident, (Bicester, Oxlipleyes)	<p>Object – It's not good for the environment as more co2 will be produced. No significant statistical study in Bicester shows that might improve safety. We have the chaotic seen on the areas where this 20 mile spread limit implemented (Oxford as example). Business will be affected by traffic congestion. Roads will be strangled even where the proposed speed limit not implemented as chain reaction. Money could have spent it in better project for face lift and make better environment for residents and specifically children.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – scoot more</p>
(o148) Local resident, (Bicester, Parklands Place)	<p>Object – It was trialled in wales and failed. Then reversed Speeding drivers will always speed even if the speed limit was 10 miles per hour pointless exercise, a waste of money and waste of peoples time.</p>

	<p>If the council has time and money to waste, then it should be spent on housing, the homeless schools, hospitals doctors, improving infrastructure for the needy that are suffering, not wasting it on some public relations exercise</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o149) Local resident, (Bicester, Peregrine way)	<p>Object – I regularly travel through 20mph zones and am often dangerously overtaken by other vehicles or passed by cyclists particularly on downhill slopes. The cost is phenomenal of all the road furniture and downright dangerous on they routes. The emissions are higher at low revs and I cannot see any benefit except outside schools where parking is atrocious. DO NOT DO THIS. If people can't do 30, they are not going to do 20. Those are the people you should be targetting</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o150) Local resident, (Bicester, Peregrine way)	<p>Object – Ridiculous. If 30 isn't managed 20 won't. It will cost a fortune to implement. Do not go down this route. There is no logical argument for it</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o151) Local resident, (Bicester, Pipits Croft)	<p>Object – I object because I think that speed limits should only be reduced where evidence shows it is needed to tackle harms (eg. safety, noise) but no evidence has been presented that this proposal will reduce harm.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o152) Local resident, (Bicester, Plumpton Road)	<p>Object – The blanket proposal is a poor solution. It's unenforceable due to resource issues and so motorists will continue to drive at speeds exceeding 20mph. It encourages pedestrians to take more risks around moving vehicles. It's detrimental to the environment as it will result in vehicles travelling at lower speed, where they are less fuel efficient, for longer periods of time. The increase in journey times will frustrate drivers and they will ignore the speed restrictions.</p> <p>A better approach would be to limit the new speed limits to discrete zones around schools, community buildings and children's play areas.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o153) Local resident, (Bicester, Pontefract road)	Object – Nobody wants this! Travel change: No
(o154) Local resident, (Bicester, Ravencroft)	Object – It is ridiculous, there is no thought for anyone who is not able to walk or cycle the town is slowly dying. Travel change: Other I will find somewhere else to live, it is no longer a pleasure to live in Bicester and this is just another negative.
(o155) Local resident, (Bicester, Ravencroft)	Object – In my opinion you are too focused on the speedometer rather than the road and potential hazards and dangers. Travel change: No
(o156) Local resident, (Bicester, Ravencroft)	Object – There is no need to extend the 20mph speed limit to areas outside Bicester town centre. There are plenty of pedestrian crossings in Bicester where people can safely cross the road. I have walked around Bicester for years in perfect safety - all it needs is an awareness of other road users and common sense. I am concerned that a 20mph speed limit will mean that car drivers will spend more time watching their speed, rather than the road. Also, modern cars are not designed to travel in 3rd gear for any length of time and doing so will increase emissions, which I believed Oxfordshire County Council was trying to reduce. Travel change: No
(o157) Local resident, (Bicester, Ravencroft)	Object – The general populace of Langford Village are responsible drivers who regulate their speeds at 30mph at most but far less in areas such as the school and shopping area. I really don't think there's any need for a 20mph limit, which will also likely be broken at that point by numerous cyclists whom are poorly lit and rarely obey the given traffic laws anyway.

	Travel change: No
(o158) Local resident, (Bicester, Ravencroft)	Object – Not necessary Travel change: No
(o159) Local resident, (Bicester, Redcar road)	Object – I feel it is not necessary and also am concerned it will make journeys longer. It is already incredibly frustrating driving around Bicester as the traffic is terrible, we don't need this. I don't think safety will be increased at all. Travel change: No
(o160) Local resident, (Bicester, Redwing Close)	Object – It is unnecessary. The current 30mph speed limits are sufficient for our town. Cars are continuing to become safer over and less dangerous as technology develops, so there is no need for a blanket heavy handed ban on anyone travelling at 30mph on many streets outside the town centre Travel change: Other No but it will make many existing drivers impatient and lead to dangerous overtaking. Cars being overtaken by cyclists is particularly risky and likely to lead to accidents
(o161) Local resident, (Bicester, Reedmace Road)	Object – The councils obsession with 20mph limits are way out of control and are being used as an excuse to not maintain and upkeep the roads to that of a 30mph speed limit road. You are alienating the general public and seem unable to tackle the issues the local residents want solving. Fix the pot holes first. Sort out the derelict town centre and get traffic moving. Travel change: No

(o162) Local resident, (Bicester, Rookery Way)	<p>Object – 20mph will cause more congestion causing more pollution! Also driving at 20mph is worse for the environment as it causes more pollution. Also will have an impact on the economy as companies miss target times for deliveries. Slower roads will also cause more stress on vehicles as they are not meant to be built for slower speeds. This is a step backwards soon you want the little man walking in front of cars with a red flag. Plus its a waste of money which could be used for resurfacing the roads!!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o163) Local resident, (Bicester, Ruskin Walk)	<p>Object – I believe this is a total waste of money, time and resources. Being an expat from the usa where most states have a 25 mph speed limit in built up residential areas that seems to work. We already have virtually 20 mph limit on most roads to to poor infrastructure and congestion. I also don't feel that the local alternative transportation is right for most people.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o164) Local resident, (Bicester, Saffron Close)	<p>Object – A 20mph limit can be justified in a few cases, including outside schools, hospitals but in general it is not required. As with many of these proposed changes, they are a waste of our time, money & offer no measurable benefits.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o165) As a business, (Bicester, Saffron Close)	<p>Object – A waste of time, money and all for no measurable benefit. This notion of a 15min town will make it impossible to do business.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o166) Local resident, (Bicester, Salisbury Walk)	<p>Object – Leads to increased traffic because of reduced throughput. Inconsistency amongst drivers making it more dangerous than reducing the limit (tailgating, overtaking into oncoming traffic, undue hesitation and dangerously slow speeds).</p>

	<p>Awful environmentally. Trips are longer, cars are not built to be travelling 20 MPH, necessitating journeys in lower gears that burn off fuel.</p> <p>This scheme is an expensive gimmick. It's spending money local government not only doesn't have but can't afford. Neither can central government. In essence government is bankrupt as they'll never pay back even a decent percentage of its debt, never mind all of it. The economy will crash when they default on our lifetime - it will happen, it has to, it's set in stone.</p> <p>Worst still, it will be reversed as soon as you're all kicked out of office as it's ignored county wide and you're universally hated for what you've done to Oxfordshire roads. You've money for endless signs, but not to fix potholes??? I'm sure you'll say it's someone else's responsibility.</p> <p>Surveys like this are hidden away, and not mentioned anywhere as you'll know they'll be heavy objections. You know it, we all know it. Time and again I hear people say they didn't know and would have had a say. It's anti-democratic to hide these things away on purpose. There shouldn't be any action without a reasonable response rate.</p> <p>Lastly, the busy bodies continually proposing these gimmicks need to get in the real world. Any pedestrian hit by a car in these areas will be at 30 MPH or higher as those who ignore road signs and markings are those that won't react fast enough, or drive well enough to not hit anyone, any car, any cyclist or any bollard. What if there's insufficient time to stop you say? Brakes today are far more efficient and effective at stopping in short distances than when the limits were set to 30. Then brakes and stopping distances were far longer, but long enough for 30 to be manageable with driving at an acceptable level.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o167) Local resident, (Bicester, Sandpiper Close)	<p>Object – Totally Unnecessary !</p> <p>A waste of taxpayers money that could and should be used on the pressing issues such as road conditions. I strongly suspect that this anti motorist council establishment will presss ahead regardless of public opinion and the "consultations" are nothing more than a tick box process.</p> <p>Listen to the people for once and divert the funding to where it's actually needed!</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>It's more likely to be "when" implemented rather than "if" implemented.</p> <p>Listen to the people for once</p>

<p>(o168) Local resident, (Bicester, Scampton Close)</p>	<p>Object – I understand the proposals are being put forward following road safety concerns raised by the Town Council. Apparently the 20mph limit is to improve safety and promote more walking and cycling. This is utter madness. Travel in Bicester is not currently "unsafe". How many casualties have there been on 30mph roads in Bicester over the last 10 years ? Really, how many ? To where do the "Town Council" or OCC believe residents are going to walk or cycle, more than present ? To work, to Tesco, to Bicester Village? We drive, because it is not practical to walk or cycle. Do the council honestly think that we are going to walk 5 or 10 miles to work in the rain, or cycle back from Tesco in the freezing cold with a weekly shop ? And how do they expect the elderly to do this ? Get real ! Reducing vehicles to 20mph will do NOTHING to improve safety, (because it's not unsafe now) or encourage walking and cycling (we live and work where we do BECAUSE of the car).</p> <p>What is it with you Council personnel who believe you know best ? You don't. How are you qualified to know best ? This proposal smacks of nothing more than a deluded quest to exert some sense of power, authority, or control, in an unnecessary safety box-ticking exercise.</p> <p>You will of course not take a blind bit of notice of residents wishes, because it doesn't fit with your agenda, and undermines your authority. Just like the complete waste of tax-payers money that is the Banbury Road roundabout redesign, for which Councillors are culpable.</p> <p>For the record 20mph is actually less safe - drivers spend more time looking at their speedometer rather than on the road.</p> <p>And how is it going to be enforced ? How can the Council support the Police who will no doubt find resources to deploy officers to catch motorists travelling 25mph in a 20mph limit, while 95% of burglaries and thefts go unsolved - because they apparently don't have the resources for those !!</p> <p>The Council should be focusing on other priorities like schools, recycling, fixing potholes and the Police should be focusing on solving serious crime, not generating revenue by trying to nick motorists on the Launton Road. In the greater scheme of life in Bicester and indeed Oxfordshire, this 20 mph proposal is quite pathetic and is yet another example of how this country is going to hell in a hand cart.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o169) Local resident, (Bicester, Severn)</p>	<p>Object – There is absolutely no point to this other than around schools. Who will enforce it? How much will cost when the pot holes are taking over and money would be better spent on filling them in. Or the money going to much needed services like social services or maybe having some youth workers in the town. Ridiculous. Cyclists will be zooming past cars. No lights 20 mph ridiculous.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o170) Local resident, (Bicester, Severn)	Object – It has failed in Wales and other places. It is a waste of money. When money could be spent in other areas. Travel change: No
(o171) Local resident, (Bicester, Severn Close)	Object – I agree to 20mph around schools. If drivers are doing 30mph and aware of the road (and not looking at their phones), and the roads were properly maintained there is no need for 20mph. If the 30mph speed limits were enforced then again there is no need for 20mph limits. The money for the 20mph should be invested in repairing roads and pavements. Travel change: No
(o172) Local resident, (Bicester, shakespear road)	Object – You are to lazy to fix the roads so by reducing the speed limit means you don't have to fix them Travel change: No
(o173) Local resident, (Bicester, Shakespeare Drive)	Object – More hot air and wasted money. You can't do more than 20mph in estate areas anyway, so we don't need signs telling us to do so, and who is going to police it anyway. Hands off our town - it's road system has been ruined already by people who don't know it or use it! Travel change: Other Use rat runs and other areas to avoid the hold-ups.
(o174) Local resident, (Bicester, Shakespeare drive)	Object – Stop building so many houses in Bicester as its reaching saturation point and not everyone is able to cycle/walk everywhere. Plus bus service in town from dome areas not good enough finishing too early for working people!! Travel change: No

(o175) Local resident, (Bicester, Shakespeare Drive/Thames Avenue)	<p>Object – I do not think 20mph limits are useful outside of the very inner town centre (and by schools).</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o176) Local resident, (Bicester, Shannon Road)	<p>Object – Cars are soo much more capable now and introducing a 30 mph speed limit is a step back in time when cars were not able to stop like they can now. Also traffic is bad enough around Bicester with out making everyone drive slower it's just going to create more road rage and accidents</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o177) Local resident, (Bicester, Shearwater Drive)	<p>Object – It is an unnecessary waste of money - Spend the money fixing the roads!!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o178) Local resident, (Bicester, Shearwater drive)	<p>Object – I would support 20mph around schools but any other areas I would strongly object. Look at Wales as an example</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o179) Local resident, (Bicester, Shearwater Drive)	<p>Object – Most road users adhere to the existing speed limits. There have been very few accidents that I am aware of, so doing this on the grounds of increased safety makes no sense to me. I believe the funds would be better spent maintaining existing roads, which is clearly required in some areas.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o180) Local resident, (Bicester, Sheep Street)	<p>Object – Understand near shops and schools but it will just cause more congestion in Bicester. Another brainless idea like the cycling through Sheep Street.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o181) Local resident, (Bicester, Somerville Drive)	<p>Object – Complete waste of our money. What is it going to cost to enforce it? Do the Police have the personal to enforce it.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o182) Local resident, (Bicester, Somerville Drive)	<p>Object – I object to this as it appears it is being proposed just as an exercise to let the council feel they are doing something for safety and environmental reasons. As there hasn't been any noticeable accidents in Bicester, how will you measure the success of a 20mph restriction? Cars will need to drive in a lower gear which will have an adverse effect on the environment. There will be more traffic build up which will also harm the environment. You will also get impatient drivers that do not want to stick to these limits trying to overtake cars that will follow them, this could actually lead to accidents. I have been checking on other areas that have implemented these speed restrictions and they have reported it has made no difference other than giving children a false sense that cars are going slower they don't have to be as vigilant.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o183) Local resident, (Bicester, Somerville Drive)	<p>Object – My automatic car will have to be driven with foot on brake constantly! Just not do-able and ridiculous. It will just encourage more bad behaviour crossing roads ...Churchill is ridiculous now with school children paying no attention. They should be taught to be responsible, rather than us penalised for their not being taught responsibility for their own actions - a good life lesson!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(o184) Local resident, (Bicester, Somerville Drive)</p>	<p>Object – I cannot drive my automatic car at 20mph without having my foot on the brake constantly - ruining the brakes and tyres prematurely. My car runs auto at about 25 mph. Children, who already are not sufficiently taught responsibility for their own actions, will be encouraged to be careless - especially near schools. Churchill Road is already filled with students not using the crossing with lights (which was originally placed there for their benefit) but criss-crossing the road willy-nilly with little thought for the traffic. 20mph will just encourage this behaviour. They need to be taught basic safety rules when crossing ANY road - not that some are "less dangerous" than others - and certainly not be pandered to in this manner.</p> <p>It will also be near impossible to ascertain what road has what limit if this particularly dangerous idea is adopted, leading to more attention to what speed one is driving at - to the detriment of attention to the road ahead itself! It will only cause road rage to increase - speeds in higher zones to increase to make up for lost time and in general make roads far more dangerous!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o185) Local resident, (Bicester, Spitfire close)</p>	<p>Object – Funds should be spent repairing the roads and improving the local infrastructure. There is plenty of evidence to show that they don't work and are ignored.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o186) Local resident, (Bicester, Springfield Road)</p>	<p>Object –</p> <p>I am formally objecting to the proposed reduction of the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph in Bicester. While I understand the intent behind this proposal is to enhance safety and reduce accidents, I believe that such a drastic change may have several unintended negative consequences that outweigh the potential benefits.</p> <p>1. **Increased Traffic Congestion:**</p> <p>Reducing the speed limit to 20mph will likely result in longer travel times for residents and visitors alike. This can lead to increased traffic congestion, particularly during peak hours, as vehicles move more slowly through the town. The longer commute times can also negatively impact local businesses and the overall efficiency of transportation within Bicester.</p> <p>2. **Economic Impact:**</p> <p>Slower traffic flow can deter potential customers from visiting local shops and businesses, especially those who rely on quick and convenient access. This can have a detrimental effect on the local economy, as reduced footfall may lead to decreased sales and revenue for businesses that are already struggling in the current economic climate.</p>

	<p>3. **Questionable Safety Benefits:** While the intention of reducing the speed limit is to enhance safety, it is important to consider whether a 20mph limit is the most effective solution. Studies have shown mixed results regarding the impact of lower speed limits on accident rates. Additionally, the difference in stopping distances between 30mph and 20mph may not be significant enough to justify such a reduction.</p> <p>4. **Driver Frustration and Non-compliance:** Drastically lowering the speed limit can lead to frustration among drivers, particularly those who are accustomed to the existing 30mph limit. This frustration can result in non-compliance with the new speed limit, leading to inconsistent speeds and potentially more hazardous driving conditions. It is also important to consider the enforcement challenges that come with monitoring and maintaining compliance with a lower speed limit.</p> <p>5. **Impact on Emergency Services:** Emergency vehicles, such as ambulances and fire engines, may face increased response times due to the slower speed limit. In critical situations, every second counts, and the delay caused by a lower speed limit could have serious implications for emergency response effectiveness and overall public safety.</p> <p>In conclusion, while the goal of enhancing safety is commendable, I believe that lowering the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph in Bicester may have several unintended negative consequences. I urge the council to reconsider this proposal and explore alternative measures to improve road safety without imposing such a significant change to the speed limit.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my objection.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o187) Local resident, (Bicester, Spruce drive)	<p>Object – I would rather see any money available spent on repairing the roads, not on reducing the speed limits.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o188) Local resident, (Bicester, St Peters Crescent)	<p>Object – Speed limits are safe at the moment and don't need changing. More speed traps to ensure existing speed limits are enforced would be a more effective use of resources.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(o189) Local resident, (Bicester, Sterling Close)</p>	<p>Object – Car drivers should always be aware of the areas that are more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists [such as schools] and this applies what ever the speed limit is The reduction in speed limit will be ignored by the vary drivers that do not recognise the part of driving refering to "take good care and attention!.</p> <p>Impementing a 20mph limit will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost extra for the erection of warniing signs. 2. Compromise Bus timetables. 3 Increase the cost of Taxi fares. 4. Add time and therefore cost to the cost of deliveries. 5. Prevent the free flow of traffic by causing bottle necks in traffic flow <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o190) Local resident, (Bicester, Swallow Close)</p>	<p>Object – Bicester is congested and parked cars everywhere so current 30 speed limit is perfectly fine. People should be watching the road not having to keep checking speedometer. And the minority who speed will continue to do so whatever the speed limit sign says.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o191) Local resident, (Bicester, Swansfield)</p>	<p>Object – What is needed is better enforcement of existing speed limits. Lower speed limits will only inconvenience law abiding citizens and be ignored by those who ignore current speed limits. There are many roads in Bicester where 20 mph will be completely inappropriate. What a waste of tax payer money replacing road signs. The roads would be far safer if existing speed limits were enforced. At next local elections my vote will go to whoever pro.ises to scrap this nonsense.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o192) Local resident, (Bicester, Swansfield)</p>	<p>Object – I object it as traffic is already bad as it is and in 13 years it is already a lot worse. Lower speed limit will result in more traffic with more pollution. SO NO THANKS.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o193) Local resident, (Bicester, Swansfield)	<p>Object – The existing limits are fine and don't need changing. Bad enough that you are shutting the London Road crossing and cutting town in half. We will never get anywhere if reduced to 20mph. Look at Wales they are reinstating old limits costing even more money to reverse.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o194) Local resident, (Bicester, Swansfield)	<p>Object – The use of blanket 20 mph limits is wholly inappropriate and should not be done</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o195) Local resident, (Bicester, Swansfield)	<p>Object – 20 mph seems inappropriate for many of the roads that will be covered. I agree a 20 mph near Schools, Health centres, Hospitals would be beneficial. However, the restrictions will apply to many roads with very little pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o196) Local resident, (Bicester, Tangmere Close)	<p>Object – This battle that local governments are having with motorists is ridiculous. You've only to look at Wales to see the ludicrous outcome of 20 mph speed limits . The vast majority of residents are totally against these actions, so what will you do go against democracy and bring into play. Well I say if you do shame on you for going against your electorate.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o197) Local resident, (Bicester, Tangmere Close)	<p>Object – Roads turned to 20 often harbours drivers driving to the previously enlisted speed limit. I have seldom seen anyone stick to 20 unless there is an enforced way of sticking to it (ie speed camera). As a local driver I drive to the Highway Code and if that means driving at 20, I do, but I am often met by angry drivers who do not want me to drive at 20</p>

	Travel change: No
(o198) Local resident, (Bicester, Tangmere Close)	<p>Object – I've never felt the 30mph to constitute a risk for pedestrian and cyclist in Bicester roads, especially as most people respect it, going at speeds around 25mph. Reducing the limit to 20mph would see the time spent from going from A to B in Bicester increase, given people will travel at 15mph. It takes me already enough to go from one end of town to the opposite. This also means that, given the RPM of the engines will broadly stay the same (people will use a lower gear), and spend more time on the same trait of road, pollution per area will increase.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Will possibly use the already congested ring road more</p>
(o199) Local resident, (Bicester, The Bramblings)	<p>Object – Objection due to speed limits being fine as they are, unnecessary spending which should be used to fill potholes instead</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o200) Local resident, (Bicester, The buntings)	<p>Object – There is nothing wrong with the 30mph speed limit. I would only support outside schools. There is no real history with pedestrians being hit by cars in Bicester, so why do this. Another example of Oxford forcing its small minded philosophy's on Bicester.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o201) As a business, (Bicester, The Causeway)	<p>Object – Another unnecassary restriction</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o202) Local resident, (Bicester, The Grates)	<p>Object – I don't want here next Oxford. Now 20mph and later close streets like there? It's already hard to drive due to traffic and BV etc</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o203) Local resident, (Bicester, Titchener Close)	<p>Object – They are unnecessary and unwelcome. Absent enforcement action 20mph limits enjoy poor compliance levels and simply criminalise the reasonable actions of reasonable people. They create frustration and conflict where there need be none.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o204) Local resident, (Bicester, Turnberry Close)	<p>Object – To travel at 20 MPH across Bicester is going to be detrimental to Bicester particularly businesses, shops and services. Travelling around Bicester and getting out of Bicester is already difficult enough with the number of roadworks, which are often not required and wasted money, this is another money wasting scheme where money could be spent on what is really needed like repairing roads and putting traffic lights on roundabouts that really need it, by Bicester Park and Ride. The scheme will not encourage more cyclists and the use of public transport will be slowed down even further and will discourage users. The S5 already takes time to reach Oxford with the volume of transport on the A41, A34 and traffic in Oxford and to have to travel at 20 MPH will simply create an inefficient service. There is no valid reason given to why this has to be initiated or no statistics to prove it is needed. Absolutely waste of time and money for all roads in Bicester, the 20MPH roads are not manned already, and noone will monitor the speed and if they are by Police will simply be money orientated. 20MPH zones are only needed in areas outside of schools and educational establishments and medical.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o205) Local resident, (Bicester, Turnberry Close)	<p>Object – The only areas 20mph should be introduced are outside schools. Everywhere else should stay the same. The council have already changed the ring road from 50mph to 40mph which discourages people to use the ring road</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o206) Local resident, (Bicester, Turnberry close)	<p>Object – I agree that 20 zones should be enforced around schools, villages and high street zones. Out if these zones just causes confliction with drivers that respect their licence abd the rules, therefore obey 20mph, vs the majority of other drivers that choose to tailgate, ovetake and intimate you to go faster. These new slower limits only work if they are policed and they are not.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o207) Local resident, (Bicester, Turnberry close)	<p>Object – The cost could be used better elsewhere and does show any improvement on safety. Cars are also designed environmentally to be driven at certain speeds which 20mph is not one of them</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o208) Local resident, (Bicester, Turnberry Close)	<p>Object – Keeping a car at 20mph is really hard, I would be constantly checking my speed and not fully paying attention to the road. Also it would take longer to do the journey, so causing more pollution.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o209) Local resident, (Bicester, Victoria Road [and it should be 20mph throughout])	<p>Object – Quite clearly, the list has not been compiled by residents of Bicester. Some roads marked for 30mph should be at reduced speed, and vice versa; many roads marked for 20mph should be 30mph. When cyclists are ludicrously permitted to cycle throughout the likes of a pedestrianised Sheep Street at whatever speed they choose Oxfordshire Council are not looking out for the welfare of Bicester residents. Not everywhere requires a speed of 20mph to be safe.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o210) Local resident, (Bicester, Vulcan View)	<p>Object – Stupid and incompetent waste of our tax. It doesn't act as a deterrent to speeding, the police cannot enforce it (their words) and it increases travel times and emissions. Gant, you will be voted out in May.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o211) Local resident, (bicester, vulcan view)	<p>Object – 20 mph limita are overkill and not necessary. Traffic is already very slow and reducing the limit will just make comuting even longer. 20 mph outside schools obviouly yes but not everywhere. Would rather council but thier energy into fixing potholes. This has been tried in Wales and everyone hated this. Cars being overtaken by bikes. Why are you intent on making peoples life a misery?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o212) Local resident, (Bicester, Wansbeck Drive)	<p>Object – The proposal to introduce 20mph speed limits across Bicester is entirely unacceptable. It will unnecessarily disrupt traffic flow, increase journey times, and create frustration for residents and commuters. Modern vehicles are designed to operate efficiently at 30mph, and lowering speed limits across the board will lead to reduced fuel efficiency and increased emissions, contradicting environmental goals. There is no clear evidence that blanket 20mph limits significantly enhance safety in areas like Bicester, where road design and current infrastructure already support safe driving at 30mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o213) Local resident, (Bicester, Waveney Close)	<p>Object – The proposal is far too far reaching and is inappropriate. 20 in narrow residential streets with parked cars and childern is fine - but not for other roads. EG: Wansbeck drive is a link road on an estate with virtually no houses and should be left at 30 - and there are many other roads in Bicester like this which really should be left at 30. The current proposal is so inappropriate that it will upset so many people that a large percentage of drivers are likely to ignore it - if safety is the reason, then the plan needs a complete rethink to make it properly appropriate for the town. The Middleton Stonet Road, for example, is a main road with no houses - this road really needs to be raised to 40 with the speed-humps removed. This is appropriate for the road. The plan has , so obviously, been made by someone who does not know the town. So - please - give this a re-think. Keep the 20 limits for the little and windy residential roads that really need it. and keep the roads that have no (or few) houses at 30 so that drivers will really see the 20 limits as appropriate and are more likely to obey them.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o214) Local resident, (Bicester, Welland Croft)	<p>Object – A 20mph speed limit will make no difference to road safety or make Bicester "a more attractive place to walk and cycle". What would work are proper cycle lanes that separate bicycles from traffic and are not just painted lines on an already narrow road e.g. Middleton Stoney Road. It would be great if some common sense could be applied to this instead of jumping on the band wagon. It has been tried elsewhere, caused all sorts of issues and does not work. This is a complete waste of money.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o215) Local resident, (Bicester, Welland Croft)	<p>Object – A lot of them aren't needed to be a 20</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o216) Local resident, (Bicester, Wellington Close)	<p>Object – Existing 20ph zones sufficient</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o217) Local resident, (Bicester, Wensum Crescent)	<p>Object – Unnecessary, causes more congestion on the roads, cars are less efficient running at 20mph than 30mph and finally 20mph is not enforceable through static speed cameras so a lot of people will exceed 20mph anyway which makes it more dangerous than if everyone on the road was doing 30mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o218) Local resident, (Bicester, Wensum Crescent)	<p>Object – I think the focus should be on those who are not respecting the existing 30 mph limits, more resource in preventing this would have more impact on safety than slowing down the law-abiding drivers.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(o219) Local resident, (Bicester, Whimbrel Close)</p>	<p>Object – 20 outside school on Langford village to protect all, not necessary elsewhere, 30 is fine for other areas.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o220) Local resident, (Bicester, Whitelands Way)</p>	<p>Object – 20mph is distracting to drivers who spend more time looking at their speedometers over watching the road ahead; 20mph increases accident rates. 20mph produces more noise and environmental emissions.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o221) Local resident, (Bicester, Whitelands way)</p>	<p>Object – Most idiotic idea in the world, learn kids that road is for cars and problem solved.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Will still drive 30 miles</p>
<p>(o222) Local resident, (Bicester, Whitley Crescent)</p>	<p>Object – An unnecessary action that comes with an uneconomic cost</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o223) Local resident, (Bicester, willow)</p>	<p>Object – I understand 20mph limits outside schools, but this is it. People spend a lot of money to learn to drive and past the test to a good standard of driving. Those who are law abiding will keep to the relivant speed limit set for the road they are on. Those who are not law abiding will continue to drive at a speed above what is set. In my mind, this will lead to non law abiding drivers to take more dangerous manoeuvres in order to not drive at 20mph. Most are willing to keep to the standard/ current speed limits without any many dangerous manoeuvres. I don't see that reducing speed limits lower than 30 is the correct move.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o224) Local resident, (Bicester, Willow Drive)	<p>Object – Bicester is clogged up enough without reducing the speed limit. I am happy for housing estates to be reduced to 20mph but not the whole of Bicester.</p> <p>Travel change: Other I'll leave Bicester.</p>
(o225) Local resident, (Bicester, Windmill avenue)	<p>Object – No need for 20mph only around schools or elderly care homes</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o226) Local resident, (Bicester, Windmill Avenue)	<p>Object – Wales have shown us that 20mph speed limits do nothing other than cause problems. There is nothing wrong with the current speed limits</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o227) Local resident, (Bicester, Wisbech Road)	<p>Object – It appears to me that 20mph would aggravate the traffic jam within and/or even extend beyond Bicester district, particularly there will be an increasing number of people work and live here in the near future.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o228) Local resident, (Bicester, Woodfield)	<p>Object – It is not necessary. It will cause more frustration than good. Why buy cars anymore at this point?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o229) Local resident, (Bicester, Benson close)	<p>Object – Not needed</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o230) Member of public, (Bicester, A41)	<p>Object – Already the traffic is hectic in the area. Now slowing it even down further will only make the problems worse as is evident in Central Oxford. Please don't do this.</p> <p>Travel change: Other It just means we get stuck in traffic in a car more because that is the only available mode of transport from the area for my work.</p>
(o231) Local resident, (Bicester, Ambrosden)	<p>Object – It does not improve anything in any way and will cause more disgruntled drivers to drive more carelessly.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Will set up petitions/campaign to overrule.</p>
(o232) Local resident, (Bicester, Avocet Way)	<p>Object – Too many 20 mph speed limits being put everywhere. Should just be outside schools and other places it is necessary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o233) Local resident, (Bicester, Avocet Way)	<p>Object – Not required due to low incidence of road traffic collisions in area. No concern with dangerous roads in Langford.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o234) Local resident, (Bicester, Balliol)	<p>Object – Where is the KSI data (Stats19) to suggest these sections of road have a poor safety record. I would suspect these sections have had little to no serious injury collision recorded so one person in town council saying it is unsafe is making a false claim.</p> <p>There is also the decline in economic growth on the town/county/country that these bring.</p> <p>The environmental impact is questionable too as far as my knowledge of such things.</p> <p>20mph in school zones I agree with but OCC disregarding public opinion for individual/party political gains is an abuse of office.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o235) Local resident, (Bicester, Balliol road)	<p>Object – I do not believe that there is a need for 33% decrease in the speed limit</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o236) Local resident, (Bicester, Banbury Road)	<p>Object – It is hard to exceed 20mph on mostly of these roads. The money for extra signage etc should be used for cleaning out drains and filling potholes. In a lot of places it is hard to walk down the road without getting splashed after the lightest of showers</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o237) Local resident, (Bicester, Banbury road)	<p>Object – 20mph speed limit is too low for drivers to keep proper attention to the road. At that speed driver starts looking around, falling asleep and lacks attention. The money that will need to be spend on new road signs are better be spent on road repairs. The roads in Bicester are in a terrible condition with pot holes everywhere. This is what causes the most danger on the roads. Drivers swinging around pot holes trying to avoid them. Roads condition is absolutely unacceptable and that's where you need to focus your money and attention. Closing pot holes patching them just a waste of money as they open again and get even bigger. Please spend money on road proper resurfacing instead of unnecessary low speed limits which only frustrate drivers and most of people don't follow these too low limits.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o238) Local resident, (Bicester, Barry Avenue)	<p>Object – This is a ridiculous idea, all that will be achieved is frustrating drivers further leading to reckless overtaking and an increase in accidents. It will increase journey times and traffic will produce more pollution. Add to this the huge cost in signage, total waste of OUR money for a political idea. If the council was serious about road safety, then fix the poor condition of the county's roads.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o239) Local resident, (Bicester, Bassett Ave)	<p>Object – Increase pollution. Increase congestion Increase road rage</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o240) Local resident, (Bicester, Bassett Avenue)	<p>Object – What a complete waste of money and yet again purely anti car. The speeding in Bicester where I live is relentless, there is no police presence around this issue and there will not be so whether the limit is 20 or 30 it does not matter one iota.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o241) Local resident, (Bicester, Bassett Avenue)	<p>Object – If cyclists use the road instead of the path it will naturally reduce the speed of traffic at busy times. Therefore at quieter times cars could safely drive at 30mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o242) Local resident, (Bicester, Bassett Avenue)	<p>Object – It will ultimately increase waiting time, increase pollution and create more angry drivers</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o243) Local resident, (Bicester, Beaufort close)	<p>Object – Changing the speed limit will not make any reduction in accidents. Realistically you can't do more than 20mph in residential areas anyway. Instead of wasting tax payers money on new signage put it towards fixing the appalling road conditions or Police. With the current budgets there is no way of policing the new limits anyway.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o244) Local resident, (Bicester, Bernwood Road)	<p>Object – Slower speeds mean lower gears higher engine revs and longer journey times, hence more pollution, therefore this is counter productive. As for the safety aspect, these ridiculously slow speed limits cause a great deal of frustration which in turn makes driver's make bad decisions.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o245) Local resident, (Bicester, Bernwood Road)	Object – How much more pollution can you have hanging over Bicester? Travel change: No
(o246) Local resident, (Bicester, Bernwood Road)	Object – Because getting to work is a nightmare in itself without making it even worse to fulfill Gant's vanity monopoly. We can't all live in cuttleslowe and trot to work The 20 mph is a myth and even gant admits it's about driving speeds down to nearer 30 and so I obey 30 as it is. Travel change: No
(o247) Local resident, (Bicester, Beverley Gardens)	Object – Waste of money, something that cannot and will not ever be enforced therefore rendering it useless. There are far better things the extortionate amount of money that this will cost be spent on, such a repairing failing roads, increasing crossing points or crossing safety Alongside other traffic calming measures that will actually result in a reduced speed limit. This is a vanity project of the Lib Dem's and Greens alliance with no real benefit it outcome. Simply put the money is needed elsewhere and should be spent elsewhere Travel change: No
(o248) Local resident, (Bicester, Bisley close)	Object – Please don't impose 20mph on Bicester, the town is already a safe place to cycle and walk and this seems to being imposed just for false reasons and not because it will help. This will penalise those of bad health who struggle to walk far. Apart from commuting the roads are good, the commuting would be better served by upping the ring road speed limit to encourage more use. Travel change: No

(o249) Local resident, (Bicester, Blake Road)	<p>Object – I object to the 20mph speed limit proposals on the grounds that it has not been shown that there is a significant problem relating to the speed of motor vehicles in Bicester</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o250) Local resident, (Bicester, Bluebell Close)	<p>Object – I support the existing 30 mph speed limits. I support enforcement of the existing 30 mph speed limits. When conforming to 20 mph speed limits elsewhere in Oxfordshire I have been aggressively tailgated by following motorists who want to proceed faster.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o251) Local resident, (Bicester, Boston)	<p>Object – Motorists don't stick to the 30mph limit so won't bother with 20mph. Also 20mph is really hard to maintain in modern vehicles.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o252) Local resident, (Bicester, Boston Road)	<p>Object – I've never felt unsafe in Bicester when on bicycle or foot so deem this unnecessary. Stop punishing people who live in these areas and making their daily life harder, no one wants their commute, school run or grocery trip to be any longer than needed. Stop wasting my tax money on thing you "claim" will help resident and makes no difference, instead spend it on maintenance around the town. The roads and paths are in shocking condition.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o253) Local resident, (Bicester, Brashfield Road)	<p>Object – I have seen the damage inflicted upon local residents by slow traffic and the increased pollution that this causes elsewhere in the country. All that happens is that the limit is ignored where it is appropriate because the "blanket" imposition on roads where it is inappropriate causes drivers to ignore it everywhere. By increasing the 20mph areas you effectively make it meaningless where it matters.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o254) Local resident, (Bicester, Brent Close)	<p>Object – There are a number of roads that should ALWAYS be 20mph or lower - particularly those near schools, medical centres, care homes etc. However in the three years I've been a resident NO ACTION WHATSOEVER have been made by the LA to improve road safety in the areas it is most needed. Currently on Kingsmere for example, Whitelands and St Edburg's schoolchildren are constantly put at risk by an absence of speed-reduction measures and recognised crossings.</p> <p>Introducing blanket 20mph restrictions did not work in Wales and clearly they are unrealistic along roads that have no mitigating need and can actually cause collisions.</p> <p>Rather than spend taxpayers money on unqualified measures the funding would be better spent on improving healthcare facilities, reinvigorating the retail sector (and NOT by closing off the much-needed Market Square) and whatever is available for road safety on repairing the many potholes and the installation of speed cameras.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o255) Local resident, (Bicester, Browning Drive)	<p>Object – Unless there is compelling evidence of recent speed related offending and consequential accidents, there is no justification for such an imposition. The ruination of the road networks for the driving masses is an ideological travesty</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o256) Local resident, (Bicester, Bucknell)	<p>Object – For what reason ??? I can't understand why money is being spent to change road speed limits when there is not an issue with the current speed limits m. There is definitely an issue with Bicester residents going hungry, going cold, needing medical attention, Lack of facilities, small business struggling, the high street collapsing (which is a life line to many).</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(o257) Local resident, (Bicester, Chantenay close)</p>	<p>Object – Other than outside schools we don't need traffic slowed down anymore, traffic is already bad enough around Bicester</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o258) Local resident, (Bicester, Chervil Grove)</p>	<p>Object – Problems haven't been faced before regarding past speed limits such as 30+, a further reduction to 20mph is ridiculous and makes driving anywhere incredibly inconvenient to those who have to.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o259) Member of public, (Bicester, Churchill road)</p>	<p>Object – I believe it's unenforceable. The new 20mph limits across Oxfordshire are widely ignored by motorists, I would much prefer the police spend their precious time enforcing 30mph limits instead.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o260) Local resident, (Bicester, Churchill road)</p>	<p>Object – This will not benefit the local community and will cause more hassle for residents, it is wasting tax payers money.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o261) Local resident, (Bicester, Cranesbill Drive)</p>	<p>Object – The proposal is at the expense of the tax paying car user. Cycle lanes and pedestrian crosses are already provided where needed at the very most I would support 20 outside schools at school drop off and pick up times only. I find no real evidence (external review) that supports reducing speed limits for increased safety for pedestrians. This seems to be a council tick the box to say we've done it initiative without any real thought regarding the need or want for reduced speed limits</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o262) Local resident, (Bicester, Danes Road)	<p>Object – Bicester village shopping</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o263) Local resident, (Bicester, Derwent)	<p>Object – Waste of money. Money should be well spent on getting the roads back to what they should be like with no potholes etc..... The roads around Bicester are absolutely disgusting.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o264) Local resident, (bicester, dickens close)	<p>Object – I don't think the 20mph across all steas stated is a good idea, the cost to implement the new signs will be alot more than the saving made from reducing the speed in the areas, I agree with 20mph by schools, eg by Shakespeare drive. but having a blanket speed across bicester is pointless, waste of money and idiotic, but you probably won't listen to the people anyway, and just do it, because you can.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o265) Local resident, (Bicester, Dove green)	<p>Object – 20 is too slow and causes more issues. As I see it 30 hasn't been an issue in Bicester</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>Move back to my home town</p>
(o266) Local resident, (Bicester, Duxford Close)	<p>Object – 20 is ok near schools but on other roads no personally I think it causes more pollution and eyes are on the speedo more than the road so you don't go above 20</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o267) Local resident, (Bicester, Fair Close)	<p>Object – Being a pensioner, there is no way I will resort to walking more or using a bicycle now. I will therefore use my car just as much when necessary but will have to drive in a lower gear and so create MORE co2 etc. so where is the logic in that. To date, I have not knocked anybody over or off their bicycle.</p>

	<p>Please leave it alone.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o268) Local resident, (bicester, fallowfields)	<p>Object – because commute times are already much too long. also 20 requires a lower gear to be selected i believe this is detrimental to the environment. 20 feels ridiculously slow and unnecessary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o269) Local resident, (Bicester, Glory farm)	<p>Object – Bicester was a medieval town. Instead of making town lower speed limits try doing: Raised zebra crossing, this will natural slow cars. Make the ring road a proper bypass with 40 speed limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o270) Local resident, (Bicester, Hardmead)	<p>Object – It is unnecessary to cover such a large area in an already over congested town. Slowing speed down increases carbon emissions as it doesn't allow the flow of traffic to pass through areas instead making more traffic congested and built up in one area longer. The state of the roads is shocking..I recently hit a pothole that snapped my coil spring on my car and seriously endangered my passengers life, my own and other road users. I was driving (15 mph!) this is not a priority to lower speed limits in this area. Instead fixing state of the roads is and money should be allocated to this. I am lucky I am here to make this comment after the neglect on the roads by Oxfordshire county council</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o271) Local resident, (Bicester, Heather Road)	<p>Object – As a Bicester resident, this will increase the traffic volume which is already very prominent around Bicester town and surrounding areas. Due to this, traffic jams can increase pollution from the cars being in stand still with engines on. Traffic jams can increase the likelihood of accidents. Drivers may become impatient, engage in risky behaviors, or fail to react appropriately in stop-and-go situations. Stress and Health Issues: Being stuck in traffic can lead to increased stress levels, which can contribute to mental health issues</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o272) Local resident, (Bicester, Heron Drive)	<p>Object – I have not seen any evidence to suggest this is necessary and if implemented would cause more congestion and more pollution from stationary vehicles waiting at junctions and roundabouts.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o273) Local resident, (Bicester, Heron drive)	<p>Object – Ridiculous. Just drive safely within the conditions. Bowing to the health and safety lobby. People in Launton hate 20 mph. More dangerous as people dodge round slow drivers. Just another scheme by the police to get more fines NOTHING to do with safety. Those reckless drivers ignore anyway</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o274) Local resident, (Bicester, Hertford Close)	<p>Object – 20 mph around a school is fine, but blanket is ridiculous. Instead of spending money replacing signs and slowing Bicester down further, maybe work on resolving the horrendous traffic issues at rush hour?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o275) Member of public, (Bicester, Heyford Park)	<p>Object – Waste the tax payers money on improving the condition of the roads, after all we're the ones paying tax on our road tax and then being taxed on the cost of a new tyre and then taxed again on the repair of the vehicle. Complete waste of time</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o276) Local resident, (Bicester, Huntingdon Road)	<p>Object – Not required</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o277) Local resident, (Bicester, Juniper Gardens)	<p>Object – There is no need for it at all. The roads are safe at 30 unless passing a school then 20 but only during school hours. Waste of money for new signs when money could be used for things that really need attention like pot holes.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o278) Local resident, (Bicester, Keble Road)	<p>Object – The traffic in Bicester is a nightmare and is a crawl most of the time anyway. To change all the signs is a complete waste of taxpayers money when the roads themselves are riddled with potholes. You say the police will enforce it. I would rather the police focus on crime and anti social behaviour as a priority. Let's just reflect at how popular this was in Wales and learn from their poor judgement.</p> <p>If you really want to help with pollution then properly enforcing the yellow lines would be a start. The congestion of traffic due to the blocking of traffic flow and the parking of vehicles on pavements would be widely supported. Pedestrians and cyclists are hampered by this overt law breaking. We also have so much sign pollution anyway. How much wasted money went on signs to tell locals how far and long it would take to get into town or to the train station. The council should spend money more wisely even when coming from central government.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o279) Local resident, (Bicester, Kennedy Road)	<p>Object – Will cause more traffic chaos money better spent on repairs of potholes and access from roads to pavements for wheelchair users and mobility scooters</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o280) Local resident, (Bicester, Kingsclere road)	<p>Object – Waste of time and money better use of public funds - like pot holes - reducing limits to 20 reduces the councils likely responsibility for pot hole damage - ie - it's cheaper to reduce the damage claims than actually repair / resurface our roads - 20 by schools / city centre / hospitals - completely agree</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o281) Local resident, (Bicester, Kingsclere road)	<p>Object – Money can be better spent elsewhere such as fixing the roads!</p>

	Travel change: No
(o282) Local resident, (Bicester, Langford)	<p>Object – I can cycle faster than 20 mph lol Is this to stop global warming As will make f all difference</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o283) Local resident, (Bicester, Lawrence Way)	<p>Object – All Bicester roads are in such a bad state that it is almost impossible to drive above 20 miles an hour anyway. Fix the roads properly by resurfacing not wasting money on poorly filled potholes over and over again.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o284) Local resident, (Bicester, Leach road.)	<p>Object – Spending money on pointless speed adjustments which only seem to be chasing money via fines instead of saving environment on emissions. Lower speed requires lower gears meaning high revs. Maybe instead of spending money on the pointless stuff. Maybe try fixing the roads we have to drive and ride on which are in dangerously poor conditions. Especially for motorcyclists like myself.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o285) Local resident, (Bicester, Lime crescent)	<p>Object – This proposal is totally unnecessary and will not do anything to encourage the use of other form of transportation. It will also serve to make bus routes slower and certain communities less attractive to serve for bus companies</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o286) Local resident, (Bicester, Lingfield Road)	<p>Object – 20mph is very slow and difficult to overtake cyclists. 30mph is fine.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o287) Local resident, (Bicester, Lodge Close)	<p>Object – 30 miles an hour is the recognised standard speed limit for the country. It allows people to move around safely, at a reasonable speed and reducing this to 20 miles an hour will promote frustration road rage. If you ever need to see an example of how this has failed miserably. Look at Wales who are in the process of reversing their 30 miles an hour speed limits! It's unnecessary and another example of how OCC is trying to frustrate and annoy motorists. Instead of reducing the speed limit and the costs that would be associated with changing the signs etc. why don't you invest in the roads which are an absolute disgrace.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o288) Local resident, (Bicester, Lucerne Avenue)	<p>Object – People who ignore the current 30mph limit will continue to ignore a 20mph limit. With parked cars, potholes and chicanes on most roads you are lucky to even reach 30mph. It would be better spending the money on repairing the roads instead.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o289) Local resident, (Bicester, Ludlow Road)	<p>Object – Totally unnecessary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o290) Local resident, (Bicester, Lyneham)	<p>Object – There is no need for 20mph, 30 is good and safe enough</p> <p>Travel change: Other Won't stop people for doing 30</p>

(o291) Local resident, (Bicester, Manzel rd)	<p>Object – 30mph is adequate, no need for 20mph at all</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o292) Local resident, (Bicester, Medina Gardens)	<p>Object – There is no need to make them 20mph. The roads are small enough as it is. There's no need to change the speed limits.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o293) Local resident, (Bicester, Merganser drive)	<p>Object – Because we are being driven to 15 minute zones, how about fixing roads before you drop speed limits</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o294) Local resident, (Bicester, Merlin Way)	<p>Object – not needed, money could be spent elsewhere. I have previously been a fully qualified driving instructor, I drive and cycle, i dont like cars slowly passing me on a bike or trying to pass bikes doing around 15mph in a car. People should be able to use there common sence and drive to the conditions, as taught in there lessons to pass there driving test.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o295) Local resident, (Bicester, Merlin way)	<p>Object – In my experience driving in the London borough of Richmond upon Thames where there has been a limit of 20 mph for several years it has just encouraged dangerous over taking. Drivers get frustrated with those sticking to the limit and over take in extremely dangerous places. In my view it has made driving in Richmond more dangerous not less.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o296) Local resident, (Bicester, Mulberry Drive)	<p>Object – Traffic speed limit for all roads should stay at 30 mph speed limit, keeps traffic moving and there are NO safety issues if drivers adhere to this.</p>

	<p>I have no objection for the town centre</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o297) Local resident, (Bicester, Orchard way)	<p>Object – It been proved it more harmfull to environment, creates more fumes as driving lower gears</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o298) Local resident, (Bicester, Oxlip Leyes)	<p>Object – It's not needed. Absolutely ridiculous idea. Traffic barely gets above that speed anyway because of all the congestion. This would only add to the frustration and congestion.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o299) Local resident, (Bicester, Pipits croft)	<p>Object – It won't make the roads safer and will make traffic worse. Many residents need to use their cars to commute and making road journeys more stressful won't deter them</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o300) Local resident, (Bicester, Priory Road)	<p>Object – Makes no difference as not policed. Bigger issues to spend money on - London road crossing.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o301) Local resident, (Bicester, Queens Avenue)	<p>Object – It promotes crashes as people overtake , it causes increased emissions, it has no impact on road safety except for an absolute minimal reduction.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o302) Local resident, (Bicester, Ravencroft)	<p>Object – 20MPH Zones are more about catching drivers speeding, generating income than they are for safety. This will simply encourage shoppers etc to go elsewhere.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o303) Local resident, (Bicester, Raymond)	<p>Object – Due to the horrendous volume of traffic that comes through Bicester, due to Bicester Village, the continued road works, and will get worse when the train crossing gets closed, it's virtually impossible to get above 10/15 miles anyway! Its about time you stopped wasting money on things that don't need doing! What idiots sit in meetings declaring how to run towns that you don't actually live in? Like allowing bikes to pedal down sheep street. The kids on bikes who ride without holding the handlebars, I've nearly been knocked over twice now!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o304) Local resident, (Bicester, Read this lace)	<p>Object – I object, as reducing to 20 mph will only aggravate drivers further. It is the responsibility of cyclists & children to use due care. The speed limit has been 30 mph for well over 70 years without many problems.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o305) Local resident, (Bicester, Reedmace)	<p>Object – I do not see any point in reducing the speed limit to 20mph when the 30mph is not enforced, the only people to obey the new restriction would be the drivers that obey the limit now which would increase congestion and emissions.</p> <p>Please just enforce the laws we currently have!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o306) Local resident, (Bicester, Restharrow mead)	<p>Object – You state it is to encourage other forms of transport. In the cold and wet people will still drive. It continues to lower productivity and people spend longer travelling.</p> <p>In the meantime Bicester Heritage continues to grow, bringing large amounts of highly polluting cars to our town, whilst we are expected to walk everywhere.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o307) Local resident, (Bicester, Restharrow Mead)	Object – Waste of money. So many other issues in Bicester like poor road quality or no buses for people who live at the north end of bure park. The estates are so narrow, I'd be surprised if anyone can do over 20 most of the time. Travel change: No
(o308) Local resident, (Bicester, Roberts Drive)	Object – 20mph causes frustration with drivers, potential accidents with drivers trying to keep to 20mph, congestion on roads, increased journey times and impacts the air quality with slower moving vehicles polluting the air. Travel change: No
(o309) Local resident, (Bicester, Sandpiper close)	Object – 30mph is an appropriate speed. Travel change: No
(o310) Local resident, (Bicester, Shae)	Object – Ridiculous beyond ridiculous! As if there aren't already enough hold ups and traffic issues without deliberately making it worse. Yes outside schools, doctors etc but main thoroughfare come on engage the brain! Travel change: No
(o311) Local resident, (Bicester, Shakespeare Drive)	Object – At 20mph I tend to spend more time watching the speedo than the road. Gear boxes struggle to “decide” which gear to use. 25mph I'd more achievable. Travel change: No

(o312) Local resident, (Bicester, Shearwater drive)	Object – No traffic collision data to support, no wider science to support 20 is more environmentally friendly Travel change: No
(o313) Local resident, (Bicester, Shearwater drive)	Object – It isn't required based on crash data, no science to support it makes an environmental difference Travel change: No
(o314) Local resident, (Bicester, Somerville)	Object – More wasted money Travel change: No
(o315) Local resident, (Bicester, Somerville Drive)	Object – Vehicles exceed the speed limit all the time on the Buckingham road and Churchill road and nothing is done about it. Lowering the speed limit in Bicester will have no effect without enforcement. Travel change: No
(o316) Local resident, (Bicester, Southwold Area)	Object – Quite simply it's isn't necessary and there's no evidence to support any benefit. I would only support a reduction outside schools etc but the roads proposed do not see many pedestrians/cyclists to justify such an impact to drivers. Bicester is full of commuters and their needs should be considered if the council doesn't want to see those people move to alternative areas. This is not good use of funds - please reallocate to something more important. I hope residents are listened to as I've seen lately that such surveys are ignored - please do not remove the voices of the people you are working with. Travel change: No
(o317) Local resident, (Bicester, Speedwell Croft)	Object – We already have a great deal of congestion and this will lead to more.

	Travel change: No
(o318) Local resident, (Bicester, Spruce Drive)	<p>Object – I support 20 mph on estate roads or near schools. Main roads through town should stay at 30 mph and the ring road 50 mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o319) Local resident, (Bicester, Sunderland)	<p>Object – It is already impossible to achieve the speed limit as it stands due to the state of the road surfaces on most roads ..</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o320) Local resident, (Bicester, Swallow Close)	<p>Object – Cost of changing speed limits when there is little or no evidence that it is safer, nor is it more environmentally friendly. It only causes frustration for drivers which is dangerous.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o321) Local resident, (Bicester, Swallow Close)	<p>Object – The drop to 20mph speed limits is pointless. They will be ignored and make zero difference to emissions. All they do is cause frustration to all drivers. The arrogant councillors in charge of this need to remember they are not permanent employees.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o322) Local resident, (Bicester, Swallow Close)	<p>Object – Complete waste of money. Most people ignore the 20 mph limits anyway. Money better spent fixing the numerous potholes surrounding Bicester. 20 mph speed limits cause more pollution, more annoyance causing potential accidents and slow up journeys increasing traffic hold ups which causes increased pollution as well. It is clear that those suggesting these speed limit changes do not drive, or if they do drive are one of many incompetent drivers who shouldn't be on the road let alone making decisions on what happens on them.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o323) Local resident, (Bicester, Swansfield)	Object – The speed limit of 30mph is good enough and should not be lower Travel change: No
(o324) Local resident, (Bicester, Truemper Grove)	Object – It is a waste of tax payers money. It is not needed, there is no evidence to support the requirement for this to be implemented. I understand the need near shops,schools/doctors surgeries but just point blank we are doing the whole of bicester is not proportionate or necessary and will waste money that could be use to improve the town, ie fix the pot holes and footpaths that currently are in immediate need of repair. Travel change: No
(o325) Local resident, (Bicester, Tubb close)	Object – Roads are desperate to done first they are absolute disgrace Travel change: No
(o326) Local resident, (Bicester, Turnberry close)	Object – I object to the proposed implementation of a blanket 20mph speed limit across the roads in Bicester. While I understand the importance of road safety, I believe this measure is excessive and may lead to unintended consequences that outweigh the potential benefits. Certain residential areas and school zones may indeed benefit from reduced speed limits, This seems unnecessary. This one-size-fits-all approach could result in increased congestion and frustration for drivers without significantly improving safety. Additionally, research suggests that overly restrictive speed limits, when perceived as unreasonable, may lead to non-compliance, diminishing respect for speed regulations overall. Effective enforcement of a widespread 20mph limit could also strain local resources. Finally, I worry that the reduced speed limit may have economic repercussions, particularly for businesses reliant on efficient transportation. Delivery times could be impacted, and longer journey times might deter visitors or shoppers from coming into town. While I support efforts to improve safety and livability in our community, I feel this is unnessasary.

	Travel change: No
(o327) Local resident, (Bicester, Turnberry close)	<p>Object – Additional travelling times, traffic backing up as proven around the town area. With the likely closure of London Road you are forcing more cars to go on diversions which cannot handle the volume of traffic as it stands and a slower speed limit will pack this up even more</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o328) Local resident, (Bicester, Turnberry Close)	<p>Object – I see no benefit in a 20mph zone across Bicester. of course there is a need for 20mph zones and in agreement of zones outside of schools and medical facilities. The 20mph zone will discourage people using what is on offer in Bicester and will not encourage visitors to the Town. The money to implement this scheme would be better used to improve the P&R roundabout by adding traffic lights, and fixing potholes</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o329) Local resident, (Bicester, Westacott Road)	<p>Object – In the Bicester areas concerned there would appear to be no records to show there is a problem with deaths / injuries caused or made worse by cars travelling at 30 mph. There will always be occasional problems with vehicles going at ridiculous speeds (ie 40mph+), changing the speed limit to 20mph will not prevent these drivers from doing so. Better enforcement of the 30mph limit would be a better way of spending the money and be much better value for money.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o330) Local resident, (Bicester, Whitelands way)	<p>Object – It isn't necessary and there are no benefits to doing it. And has failed on other areas, who have gone back to 30</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(o331) Local resident, (Bicester, Windmill Avenue)</p>	<p>Object – Productivity is one of the main reasons the UK economy isn't growing. I fail to see how increasing time taken to travel through the areas proposed to speed limit cuts by 33% is going to help. As I said before, cars are safer, brakes better, collision warning systems more advanced than ever before. This tilts the balance between risk to cyclists/pedestrians and need for drivers to get where they need to in a reasonable time too far against drivers. I say this as both a parent of three children and as driver</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o332) Local resident, (Bicester, Windmill Avenue)</p>	<p>Object – 20mph is ridiculous when cars have never been better technologically with excellent brakes and warning systems. There is a balance to be struck between risk and convenience and reducing the limits as per this consultation swing the balance to far from convenience. I have 3 children so I'm very concerned for their safety but I'm also a motorist living in Bicester and this is a step too far</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o333) Local resident, (Bicester, Woodfield)</p>	<p>Object – There is a place for 20mph in specific areas E.g. schools, shops, sports grounds etc. But there is no justification in the tremendous expenses involved to make it in all the proposed areas, especially when councils are pleading no funds for more important public facilities. To make main road through Bicester 20mph is just ridiculous. Just look what's happening in Witney where it's already been done, on some road it just causes unnecessary driver frustration, myself and others I know of now avoid it, even though the shopping there is fantastic compared to Bicester .</p> <p>Travel change: Other As I live in a proposed affected area I would be unable to avoid it.</p>
<p>(o334) Local resident, (Bicester - Graven Hill, Graven Hill Road)</p>	<p>Object – The objective appears to be road safety and to encourage people to walk/cycle more. I live on Graven Hill and walk into town, but the paths along the London Road for the last six years have been in increasing poor repair and are not fit for purpose (hardly wide enough for two people) and are only on one side of the road. If pedestrian safety is an objective, raising the speed limit to nation 60mph between the Rodney House roundabout and the next roundabout towards Tesco encourages poor driving - please keep this at 40mph throughout and consider replacing the metal pedestrian barriers that have been demolished through numerous accidents due to the road markings on the</p>

	<p>roundabout being unclear, leading to confusion between people turning right to Graven Hill and two lanes racing to get in front for the A41 to Aylesbury. Awfully dangerous.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o335) Local resident, (Bicester - Langford village, Merganser Drive)	<p>Object – Frankly I do not think imposing 20 limits will make much difference aside from annoying motorists, it will NOT stop drivers who habitually break the speed limit. How many people have been injured in Bicester due to the existing speed limits?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o336) Local resident, (Bicester - New Langford village., Woodpecker close.)	<p>Object – Realistically you can't drive at 30mph through Langford due to bad parking by most residents. 20 mph will be hard to enforce and most drive through at 20 - 25mph anyway.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o337) Local resident, (Bicester (Langford Village), Pipits Croft)	<p>Object – I personally don't see the need for 20mph speed restrictions & feel the money could be better spent in the area! Given the amount of cars around Langford it is near impossible to get over 25mph anyway! The mobile speed monitors that have been put up around Langford seem to work well too. We are lucky to have a lolly pop lady outside of the school on a daily basis to help with busy periods, I believe this also held with cars taking extra care at school drop off & pick up. I don't feel speed limit changes are necessary here!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o338) Local resident, (Bicester central, Churchill Road)	<p>Object – Absolutely not</p> <p>Travel change: Other Yes - Speed more</p>

<p>(o339) Local resident, (Bicester Langford Village, Avocet Way)</p>	<p>Object – 20mph isn't safe. It gives a driver too much time for their mind to wander and lose concentration on the road. It bunches up traffic and causes long queues and therefore more pollution. It also causes a lot of frustration as it's far too slow. In any case none of the speed limits in Bicester are ever kept to and nobody polices the traffic. I live in Langford village. The bypass was changed down to 40 from 50mph and nobody takes any notice especially the motorbikes</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o340) , (Bicester Langford village, Kingfisher way)</p>	<p>Object – The wider larger issue surrounding Langford is parking surrounding school times, whereby vehicles block junctions, making this dangerous for pedestrians. There has been no serious incidents regarding speeding.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o341) Local resident, (Bicester new Langford, Grebe Road)</p>	<p>Object – New and old Langford do not have a safety issue. The speed of vehicles mainly are self regulated by parked cars and road layout, and already nearer 20 than 30. The cost of signage would be a total waste of Council resources. In 20 years I have witnessed two examples of recklessness in this area one an illegal e scooter and one a cyclist. Most of the time in new Langford the roads are effectively virtually empty particularly during the day.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o342) Local resident, (Bicester SE, Kingfisher Way)</p>	<p>Object – I fully agree with 20mph zones within locality of schools and local amenity areas but do not feel 20mph is necessary on the remainder of roads within the town.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o343) Local resident, (Bicester South, West Circular Road)</p>	<p>Object – It's a complete waste of money to make new signs to change speed limit from 30mph to 20mph. There is simply no significant problem with the current speed limit. The impediment to other modes of travel is purely the lack of quality provision eg Rodney House Roundabout vis London road to town centre lacks a proper cycle route and quality walking path. I do not have concerns with the current speed limits along that route as it's plenty wide enough such that everyone feel safe apart from the poor quality of the pedestrian path and lack of segregated cycle lane.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o344) Local resident, (Bicester, kings meadow, Byron Way)	<p>Object – I feel strongly that 20 mph speed limit will have a negative effect on Bicester, it is already congested and further impedement to the traffic flow is un necessary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o345) Local resident, (Bicester, Langford, Langford)	<p>Object – Will cause too much build up and congestion on the roads which Bicester already struggles with in 30 mph zones.</p> <p>Travel change: Other It will mean I will have to get up even earlier to go to work as the traffic will be hectic in Bicester because of 20mph</p>
(o346) Local resident, (Bicester, Langford village, Partridge chase)	<p>Object – 30mph has never been an issue by the locals, if it changed to 20mph it will be ignored as it will not be policed</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o347) Local resident, (Bicester, North Ward, Rowan Road)	<p>Object – No doubt for those in a county council ivory tower that have probably visited Bicester once in 2003, twenty miles per hour sounds safe and reasonable. For those who don't have to live with it, it's a little pat on the back that they've made somewhere 'safer'. Perhaps it is, in extremely icy conditions in a residential estate, or near a primary school. But to blanket the entire town with a twenty mile per hour limit is nothing short of total madness. No doubt the police will be grateful - more income from motorists driving twenty four miles per hour to fatten their wallets whilst violent crime soars. I digress. It's amusing to think that one could drive thirty miles per hour at the best of times given Bicester's traffic situation, thanks to the tone deaf road developments and complete lack of joined up thinking from the council. But on those Tuesday evenings nigh on eight PM, when the summer sun is high and the conditions are clear, one might be able to travel consistently at thirty miles per hour, and it's totally safe to do so. To force this arbitrary, virtue signalling, box ticking exercise on the people of Bicester is unfair. It is over zealous enough in some of the villages, and certainly takes away from the ones that actually do need the twenty limit in force. (Launton and Bucknell come to mind, but I'd be surprised if the council were able to locate those villages on a map.)</p>

	<p>Either way, the thinking is flawed. There is an easy chance of reduced business activity as a result of customers perceiving travel time to be excessive. Slower speeds for delivery drivers increase costs on customers - these factors all add up at the end of the day. Bicester on a bad day of traffic, which admittedly is most days, would be able to claim the title of the biggest car park in England once a blanket twenty mile per hour speed limit comes into force. Drivers should be trusted to adjust their speed limit according to the conditions, within the reasonable law of course, there is no guarantee that twenty miles per hour doesn't create a sense of false security - people driving less cautiously just because they are travelling slower. I could go further on about driver autonomy and the increased congestion of stop start driving, but I will leave it at that - as once again the views of local residents will likely be ignored - just like with the ridiculous Banbury Road roundabout. Since Oxfordshire are applying to delay their elections and subvert democracy - perhaps I can pay in kind and delay my council tax payments?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o348) Local resident, (Bicester. Langford, Kestrel way)	<p>Object – No need to reduce the speed limit , look at the figures , might be better to ban reversing as more accidents happen doing that</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o349) Local resident, (Bicester/Langford Village, Nuthatch Way)	<p>Object – That is massively excessive, and the money that would have to be spent on signage for it all is better spent elsewhere. It will surely make council tax bills go up and those are excessive already! 20mph zones are just a waste of time for everyone, specially if these are not policed. People just need to be sensible and use their common sense, at this point you would be better off just getting out of the car and push it yourself. Let's not talk about the amount of pollution 20pmh zones will cause, because of the gearbox etc etc... anyway, the whole notion it's just ridiculous but I guess monkey see monkey do hey?!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o350) Local resident, (Bicester, Field street)	<p>Object – I live on field street and it's a very busy rd. A 20 limit would mean they would take longer to pass by</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o351) Member of public, (Adderbury, Sydenham Close)	<p>Object – I believe that congestion will increase and that the 30mph limit is sufficient in the majority of areas.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o352) Local resident, (Ambrosden, Ash Lane)	<p>Object – Enforcing a 20mph speed limit is a lesson in futility. It will not be enforced, and people don't adhere to it because they cannot see the point - on a clear road with no-one in sight trying to drive 20mph just annoys everyone around you. In fact it is more dangerous because of trying to keep a constant eye on a speedo rather than on the road ahead; it is not an easy speed to maintain in modern cars. Where there is valid reason, e.g. a school (but only during school hours), hospital etc then yes. But having some areas with 20, some roads which are half 20/half 30, some 30 or 40 is just confusing and dangerous. I'm not sure where this arbitrary 20mph came from, but maybe more money spent on managing potholes, road safety for kids and less cluttered signage would be a better use of money.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o353) Local resident, (Ambrosden, Bolero Gardens)	<p>Object – This is an unnecessary proposal based on the minimal saving of lives and injury to pedestrians. How about we teach children and adults some self preservation when crossing a road?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o354) Local resident, (Ambrosden, Chapel Drive)	<p>Object – It's ridiculously slow a speed limit. A waste of money vanity project.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o355) Local resident, (Ambrosden, East Hawthorn Road)	<p>Object – It is an unnecessary waste of time and finances. Money has been put into improving the infrastructure whilst very little improvement to existing. Only worth doing to the sections around schools. Otherwise leave as is</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o356) Local resident, (Ambrosden, None of your business)	<p>Object – There is a 20mph on the road leading past 5 acres school. This is not enforced and drivers trigger the 30mph speed sign on regular occasions. What is the point of spending money on something people neither want or comply with. If you are so short of money in the council just how much will you waste on changing road signs.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Yes I will not comply</p>
(o357) Local resident, (Ambrosden, Chapel)	<p>Object – I believe there have been various studies that show reducing the speed limit to 20mph has little to no affect on road safety. These areas require traffic to flow smoothly and installing 20mph signage will cause more traffic chaos.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o358) Local resident, (Ardley, Astle fields)	<p>Object – Ridiculous we are going back in time what's next walk in front of the car with a red flag 🚩</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o359) Local resident, (Ardley, Castle Fields)	<p>Object – 30pmh speed limit is more than sufficient for all roads in Bicester. Can you let me know the numbers of accidents or fatality in the last 10 years. Also pedestrian, cyclists, motorbikes, should be made to answer for their actions. If the action is for the environment I honestly believe it makes it worse doing 20mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o360) Local resident, (Arncott, Green lane)	<p>Object – There is no need to paralyse the town further with ridiculously slow speeds</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o361) Local resident, (Arncott, The Village Close)	<p>Object – Unnecessary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o362) Local resident, (Arncott, Woodpiece)	<p>Object – The areas around school should of course be 20s but the villages surrounding have limited car falls and it is incredibly inconvenient. The recent 20 in Ambrosden is not only ignored but creates long queues which is more disruptive than going 30mph. 30mph and then 20mph when it is school run time is a perfect compromise. If anything needs to be looked at it is the state of the roads in the villages, potholes in Ambrosden Arncott and roads towards Oxford are very dangerous.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o363) Local resident, (Arncott, Woodpiece road)	<p>Object – Where needed I understand, but every road doesn't need to be 20mph! I don't feel it would stop people driving, it would just increase the frustration on the road - therefore making riskier and more dangerous decision.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o364) Local resident, (Arncott, Banbury Road, Buckingham Road, Queens Avenue)	<p>Object – There is no need to reduce the speed further, 30 is adequate to maintain decent traffic flow, avoid accidents associated with going too slow for the road, not appropriate to lower speed limits unless around schools (in school times) and longer journeys increase the CO2 emissions</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o365) Local resident, (Arncott, Mill Lane)	<p>Object – I don't object to targeted, short 20 limits in appropriate places (past schools for example) but blanket ones are nonsense.</p> <p>As a cyclist, far from encouraging me to cycle, 20 limits just bring cars and bikes into conflict, travelling at around the same speed rather than cars just moving safely past me as I make progress. I'll get stuck behind them, they'll get annoyed if I try to overtake (bikes of course are not subject to speed limits).</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o366) Local resident, (Arncott, Norris Road)	<p>Object – With the proposed closure of the London Road rail crossing Bicester will come to a standstill at 20 mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o367) Local resident, (Arncott, Teale Close)	<p>Object – Whilst the intention behind 20mph speed limits is to increase safety for residents, evidence from zones across Oxfordshire suggests unintended consequences that can undermine these benefits. Reduced speed limits often lead to driver frustration, which can result in unsafe behaviours like tailgating, dangerous overtaking, and erratic acceleration and braking. Such behaviours not only negate the intended safety improvements but can also increase the risk of accidents.</p> <p>Additionally, 20mph zones frequently disrupt traffic flow, particularly in areas with high volumes of vehicles. This leads to congestion, higher emissions from idling vehicles, and inefficiencies for residents, businesses, and emergency services. The frustration caused by these impacts often exacerbates the safety issues these zones aim to address. Rather than relying solely on reduced speed limits, greater focus should be placed on improving infrastructure, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians. Dedicated cycle lanes, safer pedestrian crossings, and better public transport options would create genuinely safer and more efficient travel conditions for all road users. Addressing infrastructure gaps alongside targeted speed measures would have a more meaningful and balanced impact on safety and congestion.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o368) Local resident, (Arncott but I work in Bicester, Buchanan road)	<p>Object – It's more dangerous and frustrating for drivers to go 20mph when 30mph is just as safe. It's not as economical for drivers and its just not nessesary either.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o369) Member of public, (Aylesbury, Paradise orchard)	<p>Object – As a regular driver in Bicester the existing speed limits appear perfectly appropriate as they are. Reducing the limits is a waste of tax payers money, makes driving much more difficult and stressful (as most cars are engineered for higher limits, and drivers become too focused on their Speedo rather than the hazards on the road).</p>

	<p>The increase in journey times is a ludicrous step in the wrong direction, costing the economy and reducing productivity.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o370) Local resident, (Blackthorn, Station rd)	<p>Object – I live on a 20 mph road, people still speed along the road, many exceeding the previous 30 limit. The cyclists that use the road are 95 % clubs who again, ignore the limit. Promoting alternative means of transport is simply an excuse, few people cycle instead of driving and those that do rarely use the expensive cycle paths that have been installed! I support 20 limits where there is a real need, next to schools and other areas known to be a high risk to pedestrians but not a blanket imposition .</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o371) Member of public, (brackley, manor road)	<p>Object – Once the East/ West rail line is fully operational we will be lucky to move at 20mph in Bicester</p> <p>Travel change: Other try and avoid</p>
(o372) Local resident, (Bucknell, Manor view)	<p>Object – Nothing to do with Safety. Everything to do with Control and raping us with more taxes.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o373) Local resident, (Bure Park, Trefoil Drive)	<p>Object – Difficult to maintain 20mph speed limit. Vehicles create more emissions when going slower. People don't stick to 20mph when in them. Only necessary outside schools or pedestrian crossings</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o374) Local resident, (Caverfield, Harmon Close)	<p>Object – Waste of time, resources and finances</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o375) Local resident, (Caversfield, Old Scool Close)	<p>Object – Bicester has long suffered from traffic congestion, bad road surfaces/pot holes and traffic calming measures that make no sense. Reducing the speed limit to 20mpt when we do not have a history of collisions or injuries would be the last straw in making Bicester a pleasant and easy place to travel around.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o376) Local resident, (Caversfield, Springfield Road)	<p>Object – I currently commute for family reasons to/from south Wales. The imposed 20mph speed limit across Wales has had a massive impact on local and national businesses. This has also resulted in increased penalties or fines for drivers due to the difficulty in terrain and maintaining the limit and other concerns such as gradients which have not been considered by Welsh Transport. Also what has not been proven is the safety need which has been mooted by the Welsh Government.</p> <p>I opposed due to lack of any credible evidence for safety, environmental reasons and also for the reasons highlighted above in relation to Wales restrictions.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o377) Local resident, (Caversfield, Skimmingdish Lane)	<p>Object – It is utterly unnecessary and another waste of tax payers money it actually causes more issues than the non issue it solves it makes drivers far more angry and does not reduce casualties as there are hardly any to resolve those that drive at excessive speed do so regardless of whatever speed limit is proposed. Spens the money fixing potholes which cause accidents to cyclists and damage a disruption to cars. My front tyre burst and caused me to have an accident thanks to lack of maintenance of the road. Please please stop wasting my hard earned money on silly scheme like this.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o378) Local resident, (Caversfield, Trenchard lane)	<p>Object – 20mph limits cause more problems as people do not stick to the limits and drive more dangerously to try and get round those sticking to the limits</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o379) Local resident, (Caversfield, Truemper grove)	<p>Object – The reduced speed is unlikely to improve safety, personally I am paying more attention to the road when I'm not having to check my speedo every 5 seconds to make sure I haven't accidentally rolled over the low speed limit. As a delivery driver, reducing travelling speed by a third will mean deliveries will be delayed or even missed, not good for the elderly or disabled who rely on our service</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o380) Local resident, (Chesterton, Maunde Close)	<p>Object – Completely unnecessary waste of money. Fix our potholes!!!!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o381) Local resident, (Chesterton, Alchester rd)	<p>Object – It's a ridiculous waste of tax payers money.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o382) Local resident, (Chesterton, Bicester, Home Farm Close)	<p>Object – This is a blunt tool - a blanket imposition of an arbitrary speed limit. It is not evidence-based i.e. focussed on areas which have a higher accident rate. it is an excess of the nanny state. The driver is always responsible for safe driving and so driving standards should be the focus of road safety -not excessively low speed limits which are so absurd that they will routinely be flouted by many drivers.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o383) Local resident, (Deddington, High street)	<p>Object – Bicester is a busy working town and keeping traffic flowing on routes around and through the town is essential to ensure businesses are effective. I support 20mph limits around schools and on residential streets, but on main roads and key arteries 30 and 40mph limits should be maintained.</p> <p>If there are areas of genuine safety concerns then alternative measures should be used, such as cycle lanes, pedestrian barriers etc.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o384) Local resident, (Elmsbrook bicester, lemongrass road)	<p>Object – There is no benefit to anyone; it doesn't help cyclists because there are not enough dedicated cycle paths, and cyclists will also put other road users in dangerous situations by undertaking if this speed limit is imposed... The council have demonstrated only complete incompetence when planning and making these types of suggestions in the past, which is already having detrimental effects on road users and environmental pollution, such as the clear example of switching from a roundabout to traffic lights and still not incorporating correct basic cycle lanes.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o385) Local resident, (Fringford, Main street)	<p>Object – 20 mph limits make sense past schools and in villages where there is no pavement- the rest of the time it just causes traffic problems.</p> <p>Maintaining the speed of 20 is difficult and distracting. Bicester already suffers with congestion- this in turn increases pollution. Reducing the speed around the ring road just encourages cars to be shoehorned through the middle of town. It already takes me 20 minutes to drive 4 miles to work- reducing the speed limits will increase this time further. I had to make my start time later when they started the Banbury road development- this is money I'm losing.</p> <p>This proposal seems excessive and simply a box ticking exercise. Not truly what the people of Bicester want- but when are we ever listened to?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o386) Local resident, (Fringford, Main Street)	<p>Object – 20mph limits cause severe negative impact on the lives of ALL road users. Their efficacy in reducing accidents and environmental impact is unproven and may well be negative. There is no popular mandate - this proposal is driven by political ideology</p>

	Travel change: No
(o387) Local resident, (Fringford, Main street)	<p>Object – 20mph limits cause severe negative impact on the lives of ALL road users. Their efficacy in reducing accidents and environmental impact is unproven and may well be negative. There is no popular mandate - this proposal is driven by political ideology</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o388) Local resident, (Fringford, Main street)	<p>Object – 20mph limits cause severe negative impact on the lives of ALL road users. Their efficacy in reducing accidents and environmental impact is unproven and may well be negative. There is no popular mandate - this proposal is driven by political ideology</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o389) Local resident, (Gravenhill, Bicester, East Circular Road)	<p>Object – Slowing the commuters is slowing the economy. In this day and, where the technology built into the vehicles is so advanced, we should be looking to speed up, rather than slow down.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o390) Local resident, (Greenwood, Shakespeare Drive and Middleton Stoney Road)	<p>Object – The 20 mph should be only around schools (around the school timings) or large business spaces (during general business hours) for those sections alone and not the entire road. The other times and other roads should still have 30mph limit in place as its reasonable and won't pose a significant risk to all road users. Implementation of the 20 mph on all road could be a challenge and would encourage users to exceed the limit (even if the argument that behavioural change is slow could be made, it still is a risk not worth the attempt). The spending planned on this exercise should instead be utilized to repair pothole ridden roads and provide adequate lighting along sections of roads that are know to be risk/accident prone. Also, the existing traffic cushions along all roads should be maintained or repaired. Further, please consider widening roads where possible as the increased housing projects are going to place greater pressure on the road infrastructure in the foreseeable future.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o391) Local resident, (Greenwood, Isis avenue)	<p>Object – Will create so much traffic when it's already bad at times. When im walking as a pedestrian I also dont think it's necessary for cars to be going that slow. This will help no one but create issues when traffic is already such a big issue in this town!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o392) Local resident, (Heyford Park (live) - Bicester (work), Hart Walk (live) - Pingle Dr (work))	<p>Object – 20mph is very low</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o393) Local resident, (Heyford Park, Bicester, Hart Walk)	<p>Object – there is no need to change to 20mph, and spend money on changing the signs when it could be spent on making the roads better</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o394) Local resident, (Heyford Park, Bicesyer, Hart Walk)	<p>Object – I object to this because 20mph speed is absolutely ridiculous. It is actually more dangerous than 30mph. There was absolutely no need to make the change from 30mph to 20mph, the roads were safe already.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o395) Member of public, (Kidlington, Edinburgh Drive)	<p>Object – 20mph places far too much restriction on legal motoring. Better to work harder at segregating pedestrians & vehicles and allowing each to go about their journeys.</p> <p>Travel change: Other I will reduce my visit(s) to Bicester and take my business elsewhere.</p>

(o396) Member of public, (Kidlington, Edinburgh drive)	<p>Object – This proposal would only contribute to already existing traffic congestion, delays and pollution. With ever increasing housing and population, we need wider/more roads , not cutting further speed limits!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o397) Member of public, (Kidlington, Oxford Road)	<p>Object – 20mph speed limits on most roads are ridiculous, I would agree to them on roads near schools</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>I will not be answering this question. I'd also like to add you should not be implementing them</p>
(o398) , (Kidlington, Oxford Road)	<p>Object – My wife and I are objecting to of the proposed 20mph speed limit within Bicester due to the following environmental reasons. Slower speeds of both Diesel and Petrol cars will have a negative impact on the environment, because of an increased CO2 emission. The majority of modern car engines are designed to operate more fuel efficiently at 30 mph in a higher gear, then at 20 mph in a much lower gear. Slower speeds will cause more traffic congestion especially at peak times and also have a negative impact on local trade.</p> <p>20 mph speed limits should only be applied in areas of high risk, such as outside schools, hospitals, and care homes. There is no justification of implementing a general decrease in speeds that is not popular with the majority of the motoring public. The negative public outcry in Wales of the imposed blanket 20 mph, is an example of the rejection of draconian type legislation.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o399) Local resident, (Kingsmere, Morpeth Close)	<p>Object – Drivers should adjust their speed to the road condition accordingly</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o400) Local resident, (Kingsmere, Selby Drive)	<p>Object – 20mph will not make the road safer but cause the traffic problem, and there is no any problem for current 30mph now. In addition, the experiment at Wales has proven 20mph is fail, I don't know why County government want to create problem.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o401) Local resident, (Kingsmere Bicester, Ascot Way)	<p>Object – There are enough 20mg zone win Bicester without adding more. I would support it to be 20mg outside schools but to drop most of the main roads in town to 20 is plain stupid.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o402) Local resident, (Kingsmere, Bicester, Middleton Stoney Road)	<p>Object – The new speed limit will suffocate the normal and especially business activities in Bicester. In rush hour, the speed of the traffic is already below 20mph in week day and most Saturday. Besides, according to the experience in Oxford city centre, the speed limit had no positive impact to the community.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o403) Local resident, (Kingsmere, Bicester, Newmarket Street)	<p>Object – The town has plenty of cycling paths and pedestrian only areas which if used correctly should reduce any incidents.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o404) Local resident, (Kingsmere, Bicester, Ripon Close)	<p>Object – Completely unnecessary. 20 MPH limits are a nonsense.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o405) Local resident, (Kirtlington, Heyford Road)	<p>Object – A total waste of money without enforcement.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o406) Local resident, (Langfird Village Bicester, Shearwater Drive)	<p>Object – I object strongly to this proposal, there is no evidence that there is a speeding issue on Langford Village Bicester. Peregrine Way is the main estate road and is perfectly safe at 30mph. I have lived here for nearly 29years and never known any speeding accidents. The stats from the last 6 years provided by OCC back this up. There is a lot of feedback from 20pmh areas that it doesn't work . Locally Launton report cars are overtaking people doing 20mph, making the road more dangerous. The LVCA community Association have shared the stats from the speed awareness camera on the estate which again proves Langfotd Village does not have a speeding issue. This law was to be used in areas where there were speeding issues and with the approval of the local community. Is your blanket proposal for Bicester actually legal as it is not in the spirit of the law? There are many more important road issues in Bicester, the horrendous state of Gavray Drive, potholes around Bicester, the state of Rodneyhouse roundabout where any money would be much better spent. This 20mph is a waste of money</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o407) Local resident, (langford, Avocet Way)	<p>Object – hardly any shared spaces 20mph zone completly unnesacary.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o408) Local resident, (Langford, Goldcrest way)	<p>Object – Data from speed monitoring shows speeding not an issue in my area, Langford. 30mph mostly respected. Money would be better spent permanently fixing road at gavray drive. Fixing rodneyhouse roundabout and keeping London Road open, putting gantry signs on the A41 for BV, town and Aylesbury guidance and changing traffic timings on hamburger roundabout by BV so people don't block exits. If worried about speeding and accidents enforce the 30mph more, don't reduce it. 20 is a ludicrous limit and will not fix the problem areas mentioned above. It hurts the people of Bicester and leaves areas in need of attention untouched.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o409) Local resident, (Langford, Lapwing Close)	<p>Object – I agree with a 20 mph speed limit around schools but for main roads in and out of estates it is totally unnecessary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o410) Local resident, (Langford, Lapwing Close)	<p>Object – A 20 mph speed limit by schools I would support but on other roads such as main roads in and out of estates it is totally unnecessary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o411) Local resident, (Langford, No)	<p>Object – With data from the speed sign, it shows Langford overall doesn't have a speeding problem. The parking at school drop off and pick up is so bad, you can barely do 10mph. Our roads need repairing before speed limits changed. They're impossible to enforce also</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o412) Local resident, (Langford, Osprey Close)	<p>Object – How will this be enforced?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o413) Local resident, (Langford, Perigrine)	<p>Object – 30 slow enough</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o414) Local resident, (Langford, Ravencroft)	<p>Object – Regrettably I don't think you'll listen to the feedback and push ahead regardless because that's what certain people want.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o415) Local resident, (Langford, Ravencroft)	<p>Object – The area is very safe with no accidents it will just grid lock the area and cause more pollution.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o416) Local resident, (Langford, Grebe)	<p>Object – It's just not necessary</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o417) Local resident, (Langford, Kestrel Way)	<p>Object – There is no evidence to support there being a safety issue with 30 mph limit. Reducing to 20 mph only increases frustration on drivers when they're overtaken by cyclists.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o418) Local resident, (Langford, Kestrel Way)	<p>Object – Traffic is already bad enough without it getting backed up with slower moving traffic, no safety issues and no major incidents in the area to warrant a 20mph limit permanently. If anything make peregrine way a 20mph zone when lights flash (during school start/end times ie 8am-9:30am and 2:30pm -4pm).</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o419) Local resident, (Langford, Nuthatch way)	<p>Object – Cause all of the traffic will be slowed down which will take the CO2 high at peak time of the day</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o420) Local resident, (Langford, Osprey)	<p>Object – 30 has been proved to be a safe speed. Often due to traffic speeds are usually 20-30. I object due to the cost, and that drivers will not likely adhere to 20.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o421) Local resident, (Langford, Ravencroft)	<p>Object – 30 is fine.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o422) Local resident, (Langford, Ravencroft)	<p>Object – I think 20 mph by schools makes sense, but not all roads need a speed limit that low. We also have no way of enforcing the speed & I feel that people will just get frustrated & driver quicker.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o423) Local resident, (Langford, Shearwater Drive)	<p>Object – It us unnecessary, costly, and a waste of time. Outside the school, fine otherwise nonsense</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o424) Local resident, (Langford Bicester, Jay Close)	<p>Object – Its not required. I'm a pedestrian, cyclist and car driver. The current 30mph limit is appropriate. There are far bigger issues for pedestrians and cyclists e.g. paths not being maintained, cyclist and pedestrians expected to share a half meter wide segment on London Road and London Road Level crossing issues. We should be campaigning for more active travel with any budget rather than using it to reduce 30>20 mph as this increases benefits to all. At one point Bicester was supposedly a Healthy Town.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o425) Local resident, (Langford Bicester, Merganser Drive)	<p>Object – It takes long enough to get anywhere these days at 30 mph and it will get worse when station road is closed without reducing the speed limit.</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>Move to somewhere that is not controlled by people with silly ideas that don't match up with local planning</p>
(o426) Local resident, (Langford Bicester, Sanderling)	<p>Object – Not necessary to have 20 mph roads</p>

	Travel change: No
(o427) Local resident, (Langford Village, Goldcrest Way)	<p>Object – With the advancements in car technology and automation, vehicle can brake and slow automatically. The 30mph speed limit means less time travelling. Placing 20mph speed limits on roads such as Gavray, where there are no house directly on the road seems odd, and the inconsistencies in doing 20 or 30 when there are houses on the street or not seems strange.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o428) Local resident, (Langford Village, Heron Drive)	<p>Object – There have been 0 incidents necessitating the need for a change to 20mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o429) Local resident, (Langford Village, Jay Close)	<p>Object – I don't believe in blanket lowering of the speed limits works when it is rolled out like this. More localised lower speed limits is more effective, like outside schools or shops.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o430) Local resident, (Langford Village, Jay Close)	<p>Object – We only need 20mph outside schools. People who can't stick to 30 will not stick to 20 and still drive at 40 so unless it's enforced 30 with cameras then no point making it slower. Also I object to the ring road being 40.. what was wrong with 50?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o431) Local resident, (Langford village, Shearwater drive)	<p>Object – Fix the pot holes first then worry about roads signs. You can make it a 20 when school is open.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o432) Local resident, (Langford Village, Shearwater Drive)	Object – No evidence to support proposal. Travel change: No
(o433) Local resident, (Langford village, Siskin Road)	Object – These speed limit changes are not needed. There's no data available showing accidents or injuries due to car speed. There is an additional cost for changes to signage. This money is needed elsewhere. The waste of time and money spent on this already is disappointing. Travel change: No
(o434) Local resident, (Langford village, Avocet Way)	Object – It is. It good for the environment! Travel change: No
(o435) Local resident, (Langford Village, Kestrel way)	Object – Unsafe as people get impatient and overtake causing more of an issue Travel change: No
(o436) Local resident, (Langford village, Shearwater drive)	Object – Over used . Should just be for school areas . Travel change: No
(o437) Local resident, (Langford Village - Bicester, Merlin Way)	Object – 30 mph has been safe for years, there is no data to warrant a change in speed majority of accidents are not related to speed a lot due to bad design of road systems and delaying drivers Travel change: Other Horse and cart

<p>(o438) Local resident, (Langford Village Bicester, Hawksmead)</p>	<p>Object – Objecting to the 20mph as limited pedestrians during the day. Residents are respectful of the 3mph as shown in the data collected by the radar on Pelegrine road. Justification of 20mph is not clear to me for this point in time as no accidents or high risks occasions have been reported (to my knowledge).</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o439) Local resident, (Langford village Bicester, Lapwing Close)</p>	<p>Object – It's not necessary and a waste of precious funds.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o440) As part of a group/organisation, (Langford Village Community Association Bicester, Nightingale Place, Langford Village, Bicester)</p>	<p>Object – LVCA (Langford Village Community Association) Bicester object strongly to the proposal for blanket 20mph on all estates in Bicester and in particular to Langford Village. LVCA are an elected body who represent the residents (5,500) of Langford Village Bicester We have looked at the evidence and facts regarding speed in Langford Village and as such our reasons for our objection are as follows: There is no evidence to warrant a reduction in the speed limit for Langford Village, therefore we are opposing the proposal on the facts below and our concerns we could create an issue with cars overtaking those doing 20mph making the estate roads more dangerous. The money could be better spent on repairing the road surfaces in particular Gavray Drive., which vehicles are again using the wrong side of the road to avoid the horrendous bumps that are back. FACT 1: After two years' worth of data collected from our speed awareness camera, Langford Village does not have a speeding problem. There are only 14.5% above 30mph compared to a national average of 50%, the 14.5% breaks down to 12% between 30 and 35mph, 2% 35 to 40mph and 0.5% above mph. The above 50mph tends to be late at night or early hours of the morning. FACT 2: There is not a speeding issue outside school at drop off/ pick up times, again verified by the speed awareness camera. Due to the large number of vehicles parked, it is not possible to drive at any speed along Peregrine Way FACT3: Accident figures from OCC for the last 6 years - 2019 to 2024 show a total of 4 accidents in 6 years, none involving speeding, and no reported accidents on New Langford.</p>

	<p>2019: one accident <input type="checkbox"/> a car turning into a parking area in the dark, hit a pedestrian, slight injury 2020: no accidents 2021: no accidents 2022: two accidents <input type="checkbox"/> a goods vehicle reversed into a pedestrian causing serious injury <input type="checkbox"/> A car and bike both turning left car caught bike, slight injury 2023: no accidents 2024 one accident <input type="checkbox"/> a car reversed into a pedestrian, slight injury Anecdotal Feedback: Launton which now has 20mph speed limit, say it has made the road more dangerous as impatient drivers are now overtaking cars doing 20mph. Langford Village Community Association</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o441) Local resident, (Langford Village, Bicester, Lapwing Close)	<p>Object – To arbitrary and clearly not thought through. Safety and air quality would be better served by solutions that are curated based on targeted surveys of a given area. Blanket 20mph will be ignored by most drivers, Physical traffic calming solutions that are well targeted will have a FAR greater effect.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o442) Local resident, (Langford Village, Bicester, Merlin Way)	<p>Object – Living in Langford Village, there is no evidence to support the change to 20mph based on the speed monitors and the amount of cars parked make it impossible to exceed that speed anyway!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o443) Local resident, (Langford Village, Bicester, Ravencroft)	<p>Object – Not required Waste of taxpayers money to change the signs Nothing wrong with safety or emissions concerns with the 30mph zones</p>

	<p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>Would not travel anywhere into Bicester to shop anymore</p>
<p>(o444) Local resident, (Langford Village, Bicester, Ravencroft)</p>	<p>Object – I live on Langford Village - Peregrine Way side. There are speed awareness signs that work well in slowing traffic so money would be better spent on other initiatives. The signs that notify speed work much better than a sign. Speeding is not enforced. The biggest risk to someone getting knocked down or causing an accident is the selfish and abandoned cars parked by parents outside the school and between the two roundabouts on Peregrine Way. They don't control children getting in and out of the cars. They park across junctions, blocking visibility. They park in the zig zag zone outside the school. The parking is not monitored by the school or any public body. The cars block the view of the School Patrol Crossing lady. It seems futile to reduce the speed limit without controlling the dangerous parking.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o445) Local resident, (Langford Village, Bicester, Ravencroft)</p>	<p>Object – I have just moved here from west London where we have had a 20mph speed limit for the last 2-3 years. It causes more traffic and pollution as well as no adherence from most drivers as it is difficult to maintain that speed in today's modern vehicles. It is not necessary and the drivers who break the law should be the ones penalised not everyone for the few</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o446) Local resident, (Langford Village, Bicester, The Buntings)</p>	<p>Object – As it's been proved there isn't an issue of speeding problems around Langford village and reports of others areas, I think 20 mph is not needed. I agree outside schools during school hours it should be implemented.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o447) Local resident, (Langford Village, Bicester, Turnstone Green)	<p>Object – Traffic travels safely in the estate with the limit at 30. A limit of 20 will encourage impatience. Data recorded shows no accidents on the estate due to excess speed.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o448) Local resident, (Langford village, Bicester, Whimbrel Close)	<p>Object – 30 is appropriate [20 outside school] keeps car at efficient performance, can slow down if need to, safer as not constantly looking at speedo.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o449) Local resident, (Langford Village, Bicester, Osprey Close)	<p>Object – Should remain 30mph with exception of outside schools and hospital. 20mph is too slow, causes more congestion than needed.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o450) Local resident, (Langford, Bicester, Partridge chase)	<p>Object – Currently speed limits are adequate. 20mph speed limit will increase congestion on Bicester's already congested roads. I walk into town whenever possible. Sometimes I don't have time to walk into town so I drive. A 20mph speed limit won't make me walk into the town centre more. It will mean I'll have to go to a shop on the way to work like Tesco, meaning even less business for the shops struggling in the town centre</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o451) Local resident, (Langford, Bicester, Jay Close)	<p>Object – Not necessary. 30mph is fine if drivers stick to it. 20mph could cause more hazards. Impatient drivers overtaking or ‘tailgating/hassling’ other drivers.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o452) Local resident, (Launton, Bicester road)	<p>Object – I don’t feel there is a need to reduce the speed limits further causing frustration when the traffic issues are already difficult within the area</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o453) Local resident, (Launton, Blackthorn Road)	<p>Object – Unrealistic speed limits are disrespected and therefore routinely ignored, thus making the situation more dangerous. Additionally, the obsession with slowing everything down is symptomatic of a society going nowhere.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o454) Local resident, (Launton, Sherwood Close)	<p>Object – It’s an unnecessary waste of money at a time when government and councils are looking to save as much money as possible. Most of the roads identified are almost impossible to drive at 30mph due to their width and parked cars. I live in Launton alongside Bicester, having lived in Bicester for 14 years previously and a 20 mph limit was imposed here over a year ago and when I walk my dog twice a day I can honestly say that barely 30% of vehicles adhere to the limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o455) Local resident, (Launton, Station)	<p>Object – If speed limits were set using the correct procedure, there would be less criticism of cameras, etc. Unfortunately far too many roads now have lower limits, set arbitrarily by councils in the misguided belief that they are safer and/or better environmentally. Data has shown for many years that the safest limit for almost any road is the 85th percentile. That value also minimises congestion.</p> <p>The second basic fault is that the proven concept of the Three E's of road safety have been ignored widely. This is a basic protocol applied to roads where there is a higher than average number of incidents and is:</p> <p>First, Education - teach road users why a location is problematic and how best to approach it</p>

	<p>Second, Engineering - where education either doesn't or can't prove the answer, re-engineer the section of road to eliminate the hazard</p> <p>Third, Enforcement - only if education and engineering don't work</p> <p>Unfortunately too many reach for the last tool, Enforcement, first. This is especially so when a speed limit is reduced without justification or benefit.</p> <p>Until these basic failings are addressed, the problems cannot be resolved.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o456) Local resident, (Launton, station Road)	<p>Object – Driving too slowly causing frustration and don't believe there is a need for this blanket approach</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o457) County Cllr, (Launton, Bicester road)	<p>Object – Andrew Gant is a massive cunt</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>No, why the fuck would i choose a more uncomfortable, slower and more impractical method of transport</p>
(o458) Local resident, (Launton, Sycamore Road)	<p>Object – Traffic already congested and speed on most roads nearer to 20mph than 30. Lowering speed will add to congestion rather than reduce.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o459) Local resident, (Marsh Gibbon, Styles Close)	<p>Object – It's just not necessary. Estates have cars parked all along the sides of the roads, making it barely possible to do more than 20mph anyway. Not a helpful spend of money</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o460) Local resident, (Middleton Stoney, Bicester Road)	

	<p>Object – 20 mph is painfully slow and should only apply outside schools, playgroups and other places where there are children or elderly people crossing. No one should have an issue with those places but a blanket restriction would unnecessarily prolong journeys.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o461) Local resident, (New Langford, Goldfinch Close)	<p>Object – There is little point in wasting the money on this, as speeding around Langford is negligible. Many areas, because of parked cars and other obstacles prevent doing above 20 anyway. Spend the money on improving the roads or fining all those parking on pavements or verges and damaging them, or causing other issues.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o462) Local resident, (New Langford, The Bramblings)	<p>Object – The evidence gathered by LVCA traffic camera already shows that the number of drivers who exceed the current limit is minimal, especially when compared to the national average. Those who break a 30 limit will not suddenly abide by a 20 limit. Accident data for Langford village also shows 4 accidents in 6 years, none involving speeding. Invoking a 20 limit appears to me to be a pointless waste of time resources and money that could be better spent on items such as repairing the roads, such as Gavray drive.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o463) Local resident, (Old Langford, Kestrel way)	<p>Object – Outside schools etc agreed. Bicester is a trough town and have the traffic spend longer in the town is not helpful.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o464) Local resident, (Old Langford, Jay Close)	<p>Object – I don't think it is necessary in Langford as mos drivers adhere to 30 and adjust speed accordingly when needed. I find it just makes those who speed even more prone to over take causing further danger.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(o465) Member of public, (Oxford, Arncott and Bicester, Cowley Road, Murcott Road)</p>	<p>Object – There is no clear need for the speed limit to be lowered nor has the council has explained the need. I understand adopt a Northamptonshire approach by having mandatory or advisory speed limits near high risk areas I.e schools. However most 20 mph limits are unnecessary especially at night and clear open road . Most drivers find it more difficult to stay focused and become easily distracted as well as frustrated, I have some more risky behaviours by other motorists overtaking slower cars. cars are not built to going at such a low speed. There are articles that support these claims. 20 MPH speed limits should be used in short parts of the road where there is a clear need for extra attention from the driver for a limited time and be able to return to a 30MPH speed limit when the hazards has been cleared.</p> <p>Travel change: Other My driving behaviour will not change.</p>
<p>(o466) Local resident, (Poundon, Main Street)</p>	<p>Object – It doesn't work - nobody adheres to it as its a barely moving speed that means you have to constantly have your eyes off the road checking your speed to make sure you're not going above the difficult to adhere to limit as its ridiculously slow. Its been the most complained about limit all over the country in the places its been enforced.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o467) Local resident, (Prefer not to say, N/A)</p>	<p>Object – Traveling at 30 miles per hour is generally considered safe in most locations. However, reducing the speed to 20 miles per hour would only exacerbate traffic congestion and contribute to air pollution in the vicinity of local residents, without providing any tangible benefits to road safety. To effectively address road safety concerns, the most effective approach involves educating the public about the importance of cautious road crossings and ensuring the utilization of designated road crossing facilities, such as zebra crossings, whenever available. Additionally, jaywalking should be strictly avoided unless it is absolutely necessary.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o468) Local resident, (Sothwold, bicester, Sycamore drive)</p>	<p>Object – Whilst a few drivers observe the 20 limit it is my experience that the drivers following tend to show their frustration by taking actions like Tailgating or dangerous overtaking manoeuvres. Also as far as the environment is</p>

	<p>concerned my small family car will do 30mph in 4th gear at 1500 rpm. To do 20 mph i need to be in 3rd gear still doing 1500rpm i.e. same ammount of polution for 50% extra time. Therefore no benefit to air polution. On fact the reverse. According to the Crash Map there have been 6 Serious oncedents in a 5 year period and no Fatal incedents on the road designated to be changed to 20mph limit. Whilst the vast majority of incedents are Minor and occur on the roads that will not be changed. Therefore I can see very little benefit and ppossible disadvantages to the proposal. It definately isnt worth the expenditure and inconvenience.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o469) Local resident, (Southwold, Holm way)	<p>Object – Fix the roads instead of lowering the speed limit... Lowering the speed limit does not make the roads any more car worthy.. go and spend that money on something actually useful</p> <p>Travel change: Other I will still drive 30mph</p>
(o470) Local resident, (Southworld, Willow drive)	<p>Object – Sufficient speed restrictions around the town. Look at launton. More people speed faster through there now more than when it was 30. 20 is too slow and wont be adhered too. Stop spendin money on useless changes. How many accidents have there been reported at those locations. Will this cause a reduction ? No. Spend the money better.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o471) Local resident, (Steeple Aston, Fir Lane)	<p>Object – I understand that there is no evidence that much a limit has a material effect on local road safety and outcomes. All the thinking I have seen is at best theoretical and unsound. Reliable evidence should be provided to justify the inconvenience and cost this proposal would engender.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o472) Member of public, (Steeple Aston, Heyford Rd)	<p>Object – Already queues of traffic in Bicester, 20 mph will made them worse. Vehicles will have to use a lower gear for 20 mph, which will cause more pollution from petrol and diesel.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o473) Local resident, (Stratton Audley, Stratton Audley Road)	<p>Object – In my opinion I feel that the 20mph speed limit should be enforced around schools, but implementing this across the majority of roads currently set at 30mph will create yet more traffic in and around Bicester. This could (and most probably will) increase the length of time a person is within & using their car on a set journey thus increasing more fuel being used.</p> <p>If this is supposed to create a 'greener/safer' town it could potentially have the opposite effect with more cars in slower moving traffic producing emissions & drivers becoming increasingly frustrated.</p> <p>If the council are doing this to try to push people into using public transport, this would not help the likes of myself living in a village, where there are no direct bus services into town, no lights nor footpaths so I have to use the car to get my basic essentials of food etc as we have no village shop available to us.</p> <p>I do not feel that every 30mph road within Bicester needs to be reduced to the proposed 20mph limit for safety/greener environment when the 30mph limit works!</p> <p>I also feel that the funds used to replace all of the signage (signs & labour time) which would have to be carried out if this was to be implemented, would be better placed elsewhere to replace damaged roads with ludicrously dangerous pot holes/road surfaces & to keep the street lighting switched on for safety, be that of road users and/or pedestrians.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o474) Local resident, (Stratton Audley, The Limes)	<p>Object – No need to impose this. No consequences for going over anyway. 30 is fine if people stick to it</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o475) Member of public, (Uffington, Green Lane)	<p>Object – I believe that spending money on implementing 20mph restrictions is the wrong priority for road safety. £8m is a large sum of money which could have been and should be spent on other projects. The 20mph scheme is an example of something that is being prioritised because it can be rather than because it should be.</p> <p>Large sections of the Bicester proposal will mean signed 20mph restrictions in locations where speeds above 20mph are difficult to achieve. On the other hand locations where 20mph is perfectly safe at certain times of day will now have restrictions that mean driving at an appropriate speed is illegal.</p> <p>I note the recent change of position from Thames Valley Police that they will enforce the 20mph restrictions despite what was said previously. Of course the Police always could enforce these restrictions. I fear that this recent</p>

	<p>announcement will mean the Police being told to prioritise enforcement at the expense of more productive police activity on more important issues.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o476) Local resident, (Upper Armcott, Murcott Road)	<p>Object – We already have slow moving traffic in main areas - especially around Bicester Village. with the proposed closure of Bicester Village Crossing and possible changes to Market Square, reduced bus services in surrounding villages - such decisions make journey times more costly, lengthy and increase pollution. It will be impossible for some residents to travel into Bicester.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Unlikely - surrounding villages of Bicester have reduced bus services and it is too dangerous to cycle and it is perhaps too far to walk especially for those with mobility issues.</p>
(o477) Local resident, (Upper Heyford, Carswell Circle)	<p>Object – The proposed limit is to slow the 30 limit is fine if adhered to</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o478) Local resident, (Upper Heyford, Hampden Square)	<p>Object – The recent speed reductions around Middleton Stoney have done nothing except increase traffic. There is more waiting traffic at the junction lights. This has lead to an increase in air pollution from waiting vehicles whilst they idle and also I have witnessed an increase of vehicles speeding up at the amber lights as the queues are now so long with then20 mile reduction. This has led to an increasing amount of traffic buildup within the 20mph zones and not a decrease. It does not motivate the public into alternative forms of transport. Putting bicester into a 20mph, along with the proposed train line closure and market square pedestrianisation will only lead to an increase of pollution within the bicester town.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o479) Local resident, (Upper heyford, Lacey drive)	<p>Object – I object as the 20mph should be limited to areas where there is a school also bus routes and times will increase withe the current shortage of bus drivers on limited pay</p>

	Travel change: No
(o480) Member of public, (Upper Heyford, Upper Campsfield Road)	<p>Object – These 20mph limits should only apply next to schools. If you really wanted to prevent death and injury due to the speed of motor vehicles then the limit all over the country on every road should be 4mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o481) Local resident, (Upper Heyford, Wellington Road)	<p>Object – Illogical and unwarranted. Existing speed limits suffice and no need for these draconian reduced speed limits.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o482) Local resident, (Upper Heyford, Hampden Square)	<p>Object – 20mph is too slow. It creates additional traffic buildup, which increases pollution for those living in properties nearby, which will cause increased health issues.</p> <p>Traffic lights need reprogramming once speed has been reduced, too long to wait at traffic lights since 20mph reductions already in place. Vehicles speed up on amber to cross the signal so they do not get delayed further, increased risk to other road users.</p> <p>I'd love to see what evidence supports increased uptake of alternative transport in Bicester when the existing speed limits have had no impact.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o483) Local resident, (Upper Heyford, Bicester, Camp Road)	<p>Object – Waste of time. Slows people down further and encourages people to overtake and drive more dangerously.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o484) Local resident, (Wendlebury, St Giles Close)	<p>Object – Where is the evidence that 20mph speed limits actually solve any problems apart from highly pedestrianised areas? Modern cars produce lower emissions. The accident numbers on the Bicester roads around Bicester are often</p>

	<p>at junctions or on roundabouts where there are too many cars and flow is restricted. The focus should be on improving flow not reducing speed especially around the Tesco, Graven Hill areas where traffic volume is high.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o485) Rather not say, (,)	<p>Object – waste of money, slower traffic more co2</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – scoot more</p>
(o486) Local resident, (Ambrosden, Merton Road)	<p>Partially support – A 20mph speed limit should only be applied on residential side streets and in other areas where either the highway is extremely narrow (as it is by Garth Park). It should not be applied on main routes. The A4095 eastbound out of Witney is a textbook example of a misapplied 20mph speed limit. To be respected and to be observed, speed limits need to be logical and realistic, not the arbitrary result of ideological dogma.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o487) Local resident, (Arncott, Norris Road)	<p>Partially support – 20mph speed limits reduce potential for harm, but the lack of enforcement reduces that impact. Visible avg speed cameras are needed 20mph limits have not been shown to persuade people to choose different modes of transport except where there are already a range of comprehensive alternatives. Those alternatives are less available the further out of central Bicester you go. Public transport to some nearby villages is practically useless.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o488) Local resident, (Arncott, Woodpiece Road)	<p>Partially support – I think around schools there should be 20 mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o489) Local resident, (Bicestee, Longfields)	<p>Partially support – I think the proposals could go further and include queens avenue between St John's road and the causeway</p>

	<p>Otherwise in full support</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
<p>(o490) Local resident, (Bicestee, Medina Gardens)</p>	<p>Partially support – 20mph makes sense on narrower roads and outside schools etc., however, bad or residential parking seems to be sufficient to slow traffic on those roads. The current 30mph limits are ignored on wider estate roads by many drivers, especially those who are using estate roads as rat runs to avoid the traffic chaos caused by Bicester Village. The police openly admit that they don't have the capacity to enforce current limits on estate roads. I am tired of being tail gated and overtaken by other drivers while trying to observe the 20mph on entering or leaving Middleton Stoney which has made the road more dangerous. I see no reason to believe it would be different elsewhere. E-bikes and electric scooters are doing more than 20mph on pavements and I've seen police cars drive past them doing it so I think the money would be better spent elsewhere.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o491) Local resident, (Bicester, Acacia walk)</p>	<p>Partially support – 20mph limits not necessary in all th zones suggested. Traffic flow will be slowed down where there is no need.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o492) Local resident, (Bicester, Avocet Way)</p>	<p>Partially support – While I don't in principal object to 20mph limits in residential areas, near schools and in narrow village streets etc, they appear to have been introduced in far too many areas around Oxfordshire. Other counties appear to have introduced them far more sensibly. As a result they are becoming less effective as people are disregarding them where they are not suitable (same applies where limits have been reduced on the ring road for example - stick to 40 and you get overtaken). The people who disregard 30 limits will disregard 20. Far too many people now watching their speedometer rather than the road ahead! And as for reducing pollution? Don't get me started.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o493) Local resident, (Bicester, Banbury Road)	<p>Partially support – There is no use putting these into place without enforcement. The Police are already stretched and cannot possibly enforce all of these speed limits. Totally unnecessary on extate roads as they are already built to reduce the speeds of vehicles</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o494) Local Cllr (i.e. Town/Parish/District), (Bicester, Barry Avenue)	<p>Partially support – Sweeping implementation without consideration of the public's view will not be welcomed nor adhered in many cases. This project should be carefully thought out and be realistic in its approach.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o495) Local resident, (Bicester, Barry Avenue)	<p>Partially support – Since there is currently no apparent policing of any speed limits or compliance with road signs I cannot see it working</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o496) Local resident, (Bicester, Beckdale Close)	<p>Partially support – I agree that outside schools AT ARRIVAL & HOME TIME 20mph is not unreasonable, however, slowing the traffic down on all roads is unnecessary and environmentally unsafe, holding traffic in areas for longer increases the emissions in that area defeating the objective of reducing the pollution, traffic in Bicester flows well with few issues other than the ones caused by ill thought out plans from the Council (Buckingham Road Works)</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o497) Local resident, (Bicester, Beckdale Close)	<p>Partially support – Only necessary around schools. Increases pollution as vehicles are being kept longer in the area and maintaining 20mph whilst keeping vigilant on the road and surrounding areas is more of a hazard</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o498) Local resident, (Bicester, Beckdale Close)	<p>Partially support – I have been to other areas that have this scheme and it is too slow, it's ok near schools. It makes people frustrated and they have it for too long after leaving the area.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o499) Local resident, (Bicester, Blythe Place)	<p>Partially support – Near schools is sensible but I feel it is unnecessary on every road. Our estate (Greenwood) has been carefully designed so that all driveways face into a cul-de-sac and not onto the roads passing through. No-one goes fast in a cul-de-sac as it's too short! Middleton Stoney Road has speed bumps so I can't see why even slower speeds are necessary. Bicester already has poor air quality and to increase emissions by making cars run inefficiently at 20mph (which is between gears 2 and 3) instead of being driven at 30mph (which is just right in 3rd gear) seems ludicrous. I also find people drive very close to each other in 20mph zones and that will increase the chance of rear-end bumps if you have to stop quickly</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o500) Local resident, (Bicester, Buckingham road)	<p>Partially support – Should be selected some important road to speed limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o501) Local resident, (Bicester, Buckingham Road)	<p>Partially support – I support a reduction to 20mph but I do not support Buckingham Road remaining at 30mph. It also needs to be 20mph. It's congested in rush hours and every weekend there are traffic jams polluting what remains a largely residential road. I fear that the speed reduction in surrounding roads but not in Buckingham Road will just make the traffic and pollution worse. Few cars seem to use the ring road to circle round the town - preferring to follow their SatNav that takes traffic through the town. Please do something to have more traffic use the ring road and not cut through the middle of the town.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o502) Local resident, (Bicester, Bucknell Road)	<p>Partially support – I support the proposal but I don't think it goes far enough. All roads currently 30mph should be changed to 20mph. I don't support the 30mph being kept along Bucknell Road. Once drivers are heading out from</p>

	<p>the town area of the road going towards Bucknell they speed up as soon as the road becomes a bit clearer. This makes it dangerous for those crossing and living within the middle part of Bucknell Road from the Oval junction towards the Bridge. Therefore I believe the whole road should be changed to 20mph as there are various corners and areas that are not clearly visible. As soon as drivers get past the Oval they speed up as the road becomes a bit clearer, and the same the other way they speed along until they head towards the Oval area as that is where more cars are parked along Bucknell Road and slows them down. Please reconsider making the whole of Bucknell Road 20mph, it is a very busy road for pedestrians and cyclists and children walking to school.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o503) Local resident, (Bicester, Corncrake Way)	<p>Partially support – 'This is a great proposal, but falls short of the intended goals. The Statement of Reasons says, "A wide range of people choosing to walk, and cycle will help to improve public health, reduce road noise, improve air quality and make local areas more relaxing". It's difficult to see how this will be achieved if the speed limit is not reduced in the entire central part of town. This would send a very clear and strong message to road users. I highlight two odd decisions close to the area where I live:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - London Road to the roundabout with Mallards Way is a busy area with many people crossing the road on their way to the station. I object to the current proposal for this to remain a 30mph zone - it needs a 20mph limit. - The town-end of Launton Road is busy with pedestrians and cyclists who cross the railway footbridge and use the north-eastern Garth Park exit. The area also includes the Child First Nursery. This is a badly missed opportunity to calm traffic in this area by implementing a reduced speed limit (further, why is Lambourne Crescent not even a proposed 20mph zone?). I object to the current proposals for this stretch of road to remain 30mph - it needs a 20mph limit. <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o504) Local resident, (Bicester, Corncrake Way)	<p>Partially support – I generally support the proposals, but there could be additional areas covered. These are the stretch of London Road between the Langford Village roundabout and the town (encompassing the area outside the railway station) and Launton Road north as far as the railway bridge near the Wickes Store. The railway station area is busy and it is sometimes dangerous crossing the road from the railway station. The stretch of Launton road near the pedestrian railway bridge and the Aldi and Wickes stores is also dangerous and difficult to cross at times, therefore this would benefit from a reduction in the speed limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o505) Local resident, (Bicester, Crockwell Close)	<p>Partially support – I think it is only appropriate near schools etc, and then it should be school hours only</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o506) Local Cllr (i.e. Town/Parish/District), (Bicester, Danes road)	<p>Partially support – Estates and around schools 20MPH is good but on the main roads such as queens ave ect not so much</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o507) Local resident, (Bicester, Derwent Rd)	<p>Partially support – 20mph out side schools 100% just leave the rest of the the limits alone</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o508) Local resident, (Bicester, Fair Close)	<p>Partially support – Whilst I am wholly supportive of a 20mph speed limit in many of the residential areas of Bicester (e.g. side streets, roads passing schools?), a blanket 20mph will only serve to add to the frustration of most drivers on roads where 20mph is not really necessary. A blanket approach seems to be an overkill (ref. Wales?). Many of the roads would benefit more from, perhaps, a 25mph speed limit, which would slow down traffic yet release some of the frustration, and traffic queues, that many drivers suffer from in a 20mph limit area. I believe that a blanket 20mph limit on some of the Bicester roads can only be seen as a 'knee jerk' reaction to safety, Whilst road users (including the 'illegal' e-scooters and mobility scooters, which are seen more frequently on our roads) have a duty to pedestrians, pedestrians also have a duty to other road users in general safety. Maybe a 25mph in suitable areas would be seen as more sensible, and set a precedent other councils could follow. More acceptable to both pedestrians and other road users?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o509) Local resident, (Bicester, Fircroft)	<p>Partially support – Some areas fine for 20mph, field street for instance is always gridlocked so being able to make it up to 20mph would be a dream, but seriously, the entire length of Middleton stoney road, a major route with existing speed humps, this is insane. I know OcC would prefer us to all hand our cars back but come on, 20mph to this degree is not acceptable. Outside schools for instance I understand but to enforce a limit across what would be the whole town is not acceptable.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o510) Local resident, (Bicester, Forsythia Close)	<p>Partially support – I have no objection to the reduction of speed limits to 20 in housing estates; however, this is a complete waste of money since it is impossible to drive faster than 20 mph on most of these roads - at least without being open to prosecution for dangerous driving.</p> <p>The reduction to 20 on Churchill Rd and Shakespeare Drive is excessive since these are principal throughfares.</p> <p>The reduction to 30 on Banbury Road is unnecessary since no houses back on to the road from Bure Farm northwards.</p> <p>And generally, although not part of this consultation, the reduction of speed on the ring road from 50 to 40 was a poor idea since it has made driving through the centre of town more attractive to through traffic.</p> <p>And finally, there was an "informal consultation" about these plans 2 years ago. It is now closed but no results have been published. Why?</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o511) Local resident, (Bicester, Graham Road)	<p>Partially support – A great idea for outside schools. I really don't understand why the current speed limits in place need to change otherwise. This is ludicrous and a waste of time outside of the aforementioned education establishments.</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>No! I have. I option as I have mobility issues.</p>
(o512) Local resident, (Bicester, Graven Hill)	<p>Partially support – It makes sense around schools and other heavily child sensitive areas. It does not make sense on the main roads, where slower traffic is likely to cause higher emissions etc.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o513) Local resident, (Bicester, Haydock Road)	<p>Partially support – Because chopping and changing from 30mph to 20 mph will cause confusion about which section drivers are in - and the following traffic will get annoyed with drivers doing 20 in 30 section. Plus - there will no doubt be cameras to cost us money</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o514) Local resident, (Bicester, Heron Drive)	<p>Partially support – Agree with 20mph outside schools and on some smaller side roads but not all roads currently 30mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o515) Local resident, (Bicester, Hunt Close)	<p>Partially support – Manorsfield Road is a good option for 20mph speed limit as many people cross this road. As a motorist i do get the feeling that the 20mph speed limit is being over subscribed and motorist are beginning to ignore the speed limit and also ive found that when you are at the speed limit you regularly get intimidated by other motorist wanting to go at faster. I fully support 20mph speed limit in venerable areas such as schools and old people homes etc</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o516) Local resident, (Bicester, Isis)	<p>Partially support – Just near schools</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o517) Local resident, (Bicester, Kestrel Way)	<p>Partially support – Not all areas, but certainly near schools and high-residential zones</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o518) Local resident, (Bicester, Kestrel Way)	<p>Partially support – I would only support the proposal for 20mph limits on roads close to schools or roads in residential areas where there are no raised pavements</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o519) Local resident, (Bicester, Kingfisher Way)	<p>Partially support – I'm concerned that a blanket one-factor approach is not necessarily the most cost-effective way of achieving increased road safety. As a pedestrian, cyclist and car driver I would like to see a more targeted approach based on existing and forecast safety 'blackspots' and also on safety issues caused by factors other than speed (such as poor visibility at junctions, confusing road and cycle lane layout). Also, I'm in favour of trialling solutions.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o520) Local resident, (Bicester, Lancaster)	<p>Partially support – Some rds need to be kept to 30mph. I think it will encourage lots of people to speed as they'll be frustrated at going down slow.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Possibly</p>
(o521) Local resident, (Bicester, London Road)	<p>Partially support – I strongly disagree with the decision not to consider reducing the speed limit on London Road from 40 mph due to several pressing reasons. Firstly, significant development in the area, particularly the housing estate opposite Langford Park and the Graven Hill development, has substantially increased foot traffic, making road crossings particularly dangerous. Additionally, with plans to close the London Road crossing over the railway, it is sensible to anticipate even more pedestrians in the vicinity. The noise pollution generated by a 40 mph road is also a concern, as increased traffic and nearby residences lead to greater disturbance for residents. Moreover, the lack of a continuous footpath along London Road and the absence of safe crossing points heighten the risks for pedestrians. While there may not have been recent casualties, this should not be a reason to ignore potential dangers; it's essential to take preventive measures.</p> <p>Finally, if London Road were to be developed today, given the current conditions and developments, there would be little justification for maintaining a 40 mph speed limit. It is crucial for the safety and well-being of the community that we reevaluate this speed limit in light of these developments and risks.</p>

	Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more
(o522) Local resident, (Bicester, London Road)	<p>Partially support – I would strongly agree with the decision of reducing the speed limits within ALL of the ring road, however i would question why the London Road speed limit from 40 mph sign is not being changed to a 20mph from the traffic lights on the graven hill roundabout and up to the Station crossing.</p> <p>In recent years there have been significant development in this area, particularly the housing estate opposite Langford Park and the Graven Hill development, has substantially increased foot traffic, making road crossings particularly dangerous.</p> <p>With the plans to close the London Road crossing over the railway, it is sensible to anticipate even more pedestrians in the vicinity. The noise pollution generated by a 40 mph road is also a concern, as increased traffic and nearby residences lead to greater disturbance for residents. Moreover, the lack of a continuous footpath along London Road and the absence of safe crossing points heightens the risks for pedestrians.</p> <p>While there may not have been recent casualties, this should not be a reason to ignore potential dangers; it's essential to take preventive measures.</p> <p>There were plans to add a cycle and footpath to both sides of the carriage way up to the roundabout on talisman way with crossing points. What has happened here?</p> <p>If London Road were to be developed today, given the current conditions and developments, there would be little justification for maintaining a 40 mph speed limit. It is crucial for the safety and well-being of the community that we reevaluate this speed limit considering these developments and risks</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o523) Local resident, (Bicester, Lyneham Road)	<p>Partially support – I understand to be more cautious near schools, nurseries , gp practices but electric bikes/scooters going above that speed limit - what are the methods to enforce that? In Oxford nobody gives a dime if a pedestrian is hit by a cyclist , and a car going 30 mph for sure will stop faster than a cyclist and also will deter cyclists going faster .</p> <p>For residential areas I guess all motorists are using common sense (except delivery drivers - don't expect for them to follow speed rules)</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o524) Local resident, (Bicester, Manston Close)	<p>Partially support – No this is ridiculous and will not be adhered to!! As it is not currently in Launton and Chesterton. Beside schools then yes, make the speed limit 20, but everywhere else then no! Use the money to make our roads useable for cars and cyclists, there is more danger currently from the huge number of potholes and disgraceful state of our roads! Stop penalising drivers who can't get anywhere in a timely manner already due to ridiculous and unnecessary road works and unusable roads. This is a waste of money and time as drivers will not stick to this limit, myself included!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o525) Local resident, (bicester, maple road)	<p>Partially support – I am happy about reducing speed limit to 20mph near schools, shops and other areas where there are vulnerable pedestrians. I would not particularly support extending the limit to all residential areas as I do not feel it necessary. In my experience it takes a lot of driver concentration to keep ones speeds this low and it is tempting as a driver to spend more time looking at the speedometer than what is happening outside. I am also very concerned that any speed limit should include cyclists, e cyclists and e scooters who often cycle on the road -or pavement -at faster speeds that 20mph and are more dangerous than cars given that their vehicles are quieter and less visible (especially if they don't have lights).</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o526) Local resident, (Bicester, Market end way)	<p>Partially support – As a local delivery driver it's difficult enough normally reducing speed areas near schools is great and most of the housing estates is good but the wider town does not need further reduction.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o527) Local resident, (Bicester, Martin close)	<p>Partially support – I support 20mph in areas around schools and GP surgeries. I do not support it in the wider residential area where it cannot be policed and will reduce the air quality due to cars being in the area for longer as they go slower. People are more likely to adhere to 30mph than 20mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o528) Local resident, (Bicester, Mulberry)	<p>Partially support – 20mph is suitable for school areas and immediate town Center. Do not think the whole road system needs to be 20mph internal to the ring road.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o529) Local resident, (Bicester, Mullein)	<p>Partially support – I support it around housing estates.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o530) Local resident, (Bicester, Oxlip Leyes)	<p>Partially support – Insufficient evidence provided by council to justify changes.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o531) Local resident, (Bicester, Peregrine Way)	<p>Partially support – Not all roads listed require 20mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o532) Local resident, (Bicester, Poppylands)	<p>Partially support – I think Lucerne Avenue requires a 20mph limit. With the introduction of the Banbury Road / ringroad junction traffic lights and resulting queues (which are in existence and will continue after completion of the junction) a significant number of drivers are using Lucerne as a rat run. Firm enforcement of a 20mph limit is required to mitigate risk to pedestrians and collisions with cars exiting driveways.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o533) Local resident, (Bicester, Reedmace Road)	<p>Partially support – Most of the proposals are sensible although the majority of the roads affected are not safe for speeds above 20mph anyway.</p> <p>The critical thing is enforcement; traffic enforcement generally in Bicester is very poor, both in respect of speed limits and other safety aspects such as illegal and pavement parking. For example I regularly see cars driving up Banbury</p>

	<p>Road at 40-50mph, in an existing 30mph area. Changing limits will achieve nothing without proper enforcement; indeed lower limits are likely to increase incidents of unsafe driving e.g. impatience, tailgating etc. - something I have experienced in similar areas with 20mph limits elsewhere.</p> <p>I disagree with the 20mph areas in Shakespeare Drive and Churchill Road. It is inconsistent having two speed limits on the same road, not compatible with the important linking function that they perform and is unlikely to be observed in practice.</p> <p>I also disagree with the 20mph limit in Manorsfield Road which is not necessary and could well encourage unsafe pedestrian behaviour trying to cross the road away from the designated places.</p> <p>The proposal for the north end of Manorsfield Road and St John's Street is unclear as it is blacked out so I am unable to comment on this area.</p> <p>As a general comment, I would also note that speed limits on the ring road are a mess. They were supposedly reduced to 40mph to achieve consistency, but there are now seven different sections with different limits which causes confusion and undermines compliance and safe driving.</p> <p>I disagree in principle with using speed limits to try to force modal shift. Speed limits should be set for safety reasons based on the characteristics of the road, and using them for other purposes undermines their credibility and breeds resentment. Modal shift will occur when the alternatives to the car are more viable and cost effective than they currently are.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o534) Local resident, (Bicester, Shakespeare Drive)	<p>Partially support – In built up areas near shops etc</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o535) Local resident, (Bicester, Sheep street)	<p>Partially support – I agree with 20 miles an hour around schools on school times but that is it. 30 MPH is a good safe speed and keep things flowing.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o536) Local resident, (Bicester, Silibaravi Drive)	<p>Partially support – If we reduce most of bicester town to 30mph then the fly over between Rodney house roundabout and the Tesco roundabout needs to be reduced to 40mph in line with the rest of the ring road. I'm not aware of any accidents happening when the speed limit is 30 but I know of a few recent accidents on that fly over at 60mph.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o537) Local resident, (Bicester, Somerville Drive)	<p>Partially support – Bicester gridlocked most of the time as always roadworks somewhere. Bicester Village traffic needs re-directing plus EWR issues need resolving</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o538) Local resident, (Bicester, Walpole Close)	<p>Partially support – Drivers should drive to conditions, a blanket 20mph is not needed, but as people don't exhibit restraint maybe 20mph outside schools is necessary, elsewhere it's pointless just as a rule on its own, without addressing the type of road and likely issues with other road users etc</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o539) Local resident, (Bicester, Wear Road)	<p>Partially support – It should be 20 by a school but 30 elsewhere. 20 is way too slow. Cars are built to drive at 20. It's too slow. Car owners can't all change to walking and cycling. It's just not possible. People lead busy lives. Travelling to work, working and juggling work, kids and home, so need to drop kids off and go to work. Some people need their car for work. Such as cleaners and carers. They too have children they need to drop off and collect from school. What about after school clubs and activities? What about older people? People in villages? It's not the 1960s where Mum's were at home all day and walked the kids to school, did the shopping and walked home. Gone are the days when teachers lived locally. GP's used to live locally but not anymore. The council is trying to take us back in time to when there were less cars but it's not possible these days and never will be</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o540) Local resident, (Bicester, Whitelands way)	<p>Partially support – Agree in principle but to further alleviate traffic travelling from Buckingham to Bicester Village, the Ring Road around Bicester needs to go back to 50 so that satnav will push people around the Ring Road rather than through the centre of town</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o541) Local resident, (Bicester, Willow Drive)	<p>Partially support – The proposal to introduce 20mph zones outside schools and within housing estates makes perfect sense. The proposal to make bicester a 20mph zone in, almost, its entirety does not.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o542) Local resident, (Bicester, Woodpecker Close)	<p>Partially support – I support the reduction in areas where there are schools/shops as there is an increased risk of children/adults stepping into the street without looking however I do not think it is necessary everywhere. I would prefer that the 30 mph limit was monitored more strictly, and the dangerous bad parking which happens in all residential areas of Bicester was addressed to make roads safer. I would also add that 20mph is incredibly difficult to stick to in most cars.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o543) Local resident, (Bicester, Acacia walk)	<p>Partially support – This idea that occ have about 20mph everywhere being great is utterly ridiculous, it is terrible it does nothing but clog roads and increase pollution and aggravate drivers which will cause more road rage, i can understand it in heavy pedestrian areas and just outside schools but other than that it is a complete waist of time and money, bicester is fine as it is PLEASE! just leave it alone and all the other places you are trying to ruin for people just so a few people can walk about.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o544) Local resident, (Bicester, Almond Rdix26)	<p>Partially support – 20mph near schools is good idea ,other places not necessary .Waste of time and money .Make more sense to repair the badly neglected roads which are a major hazard</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o545) Local resident, (Bicester, Andover close)	<p>Partially support – Very good scheme but only if speed limit is policed, how many times have we all been overtaken while driving in a 40mph or 20mph speed limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o546) Local resident, (Bicester, Avon Crescent)	<p>Partially support – Whilst I support a 20mph speed limit in areas around schools & care homes I feel in other areas it will be detrimental. Traffic congestion will be increased and as a result pollution levels higher which could potentially have health impacts on vulnerable residents. The cost of implementing the new speed limits could better be used in my opinion. Repairs the many potholes for example. I also doubt TVP will have the resources to implement.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o547) Local resident, (Bicester, Bucknell Rd)	<p>Partially support – 20mph is too slow on the main roads into and out of town. I absolutely support the restrictions in principle, but nothing is currently done to enforce restrictions to 30mph on Bicester's roads, who's going enforce a 20? The drivers that are mindful of speed and safety will adjust their driving, those currently whipping up the Bucknell Rd at 40mph are NOT going to switch to 20. Will there be cameras now on all the main routes with a 20mph limit? (A money making exercise....). Enforce it or don't bother!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o548) Local resident, (Bicester, Bucknell Road)	<p>Partially support – Why only Part 20mph on Bucknell Road, should start from the bend where the houses start. There should be better traffic calming measures too. The junctions at Graham Road and The Oval should have Yellow Lines it's very dangerous at these places.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o549) Local resident, (Bicester, Bucknell Road)	<p>Partially support – Most of it makes sense You can't do above 20mph on most estates anyway with cars parked anywhere Only objection is Bucknell Rd Why is it not 20mph all the way</p>

	<p>Its a residential area and at certain times of day a rat run No one takes notice of 30mph as it is Not until they reach shops and have to slow because of parked cars</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o550) Local resident, (Bicester, Charbridge way)	<p>Partially support – 20mph is too low for modern car. As a professional driver mu say it difficult to maintain speed of 20. Although in some areas like strictly housing estates 20mph is right. Roads thought estates should have speed limit of 25mph. 25 Its uncommon sign to see but I belive community will appreciate it.</p> <p>Travel change: Other Speed limit won't change people minds to use other method of transportation. Making road narrower, introducing new speed limits and making 15 minutes cities will only cause more pollution.</p>
(o551) Local resident, (Bicester, Fair Close)	<p>Partially support – Agree that 20mph round schools should be mandatory but in terms of road safety for cyclists it would be better use of money to make our road surface better quality and get rid of potholes. Road surface quality in Bicester is nothing to be proud of.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o552) Local resident, (Bicester, Gavray drive)	<p>Partially support – I think 20mph should be put into the busier parts of Bicester, eg does Gavray road really need a 20mph zone when it's not really congested like other parts of Bicester</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o553) Local resident, (Bicester, Goldfinch close)	<p>Partially support – I can see why you'd want it and why not as it's a major positive for safety but roads like gavrey should not be a 20 as you can comfortably and safely do 30 up it only needing to slow over the bump going down the road new Langford should be a 20 as the double parking is atrocious and you can't go any faster as right of way sometimes does not seem to apply there but a majority of estates you can safely do 30 on if your paying attention</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o554) Local resident, (Bicester, Grebe road)	<p>Partially support – Certain roads - Bucknell Road- near schools should be a 20. Gavray drive and other roads where there are no houses directly onto the road should not be 20.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o555) Local resident, (Bicester, Kestrel way)	<p>Partially support – 20 mph around schools is what is required not a blanket rule</p> <p>Travel change: Other I am disabled, I cannot walk or ride a bicycle</p>
(o556) Local resident, (Bicester, Kestrel Way)	<p>Partially support – I understand that 20mph would be good around the Schools, but it's not needed anywhere else. I would be happier at 25mph in built up areas but not 20mph...its far too slow.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o557) Local resident, (Bicester, Leach)	<p>Partially support – Alot of Kings end the roads are to small and packed with cars to be a 30 area anywhere near schools should be 20</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o558) Local resident, (Bicester, Lingfield Road)	<p>Partially support – Only if it saves lives</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o559) Local resident, (Bicester, No)	<p>Partially support – I think it's important for 20mph outside the schools etc, but besides that 30mph</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o560) Local resident, (Bicester, Osprey Close)	<p>Partially support – A large number of new 20mph speed limit areas are not adhered to. A form of soft deterrence is needed.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o561) Local resident, (Bicester, Osprey Close)	<p>Partially support – I support a 20mph speed restriction on all roads that have a school on that road. I would also support a no parking and no waiting on these roads too. However I do object to restricting all other major traffic routes that currently have a 30mph limit being reduced to a maximum speed limit of 20mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o562) Local resident, (Bicester, Saffron Close)	<p>Partially support – I agree that areas past schools and significant public areas of congregation could be reduced to 20mph. I cannot see why every other road in the areas needs to have this money spent. What are the actual incident statistics and where are they focused in Bicester. There are other areas in Bicester that I believe are more urgently needed. Traffic management at the A41 Park and Ride roundabout is screaming out for traffic lights on it. You say TV Police will be expected to police it - how! Who pays for that ultimately too? Motorists have enough to look out for on our roads, adding a 20mph limit in my personal experience means the driver is also now spending more time looking at the speedometer than the road ahead.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o563) Local resident, (Bicester, St Peter's Crescent)	<p>Partially support – When 20mph speed limit is imposed inappropriately it is hugely frustrating for drivers and extends journey, including bus journeys by unnecessary lengths of time.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o564) Local resident, (Bicester, Sunderland road)	<p>Partially support – Around schools yes but other than that don't see the need</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o565) Local resident, (Bicester, Swansfield)	<p>Partially support – 20mph should be considered on roads outside of schools but I object to the blanket reduction of speed limits on all roads within the town</p> <p>Travel change: Other I'm a community nurse so I have to drive as part of my job!!!</p>
(o566) Local resident, (Bicester, Withington Road)	<p>Partially support – Would support for 20mph only for town centre not other roads as Bicester it is overcrowded and reducing the speed on main roads would only increase the traffic and pollution as it's seen on busy days round Bicester village</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o567) Local resident, (Bicester - Langford Village, Hawksmead)	<p>Partially support – I believe that small residential roads should be 20mph but roads that have a big enough road should stay 30. For example peregrine way or mallards way.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o568) Local resident, (Bicester / Langford, Ravencroft)	<p>Partially support – Current 30mph rarely complied with at the moment. Area around school should be 20mph with far more yellow lines added to stop the ridiculous parking during school times.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o569) Local resident, (Bicester town, Fairford Way)	<p>Partially support – I feel that the more major roads in housing developments may benefit from retaining a 30 mph limit - roads such as Peregrine Way (Langford Village), Willow Drive (Southwold), Boston Road (Glory Farm) and</p>

	<p>Whitelands Way (Elmsbrook). I feel through-traffic and deliveries would be expedited. However, if this might be at the cost of road user or pedestrian safety, then I would demurr.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o570) Local resident, (Bicester town centre, Chapel street)	<p>Partially support – Bicester is gridlocked at the best of times. Reduced speed limits will only add to this. By all means put them near schools because of inattentive children but nowhere else.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o571) Local resident, (Bicester/ arncott, Woodpiece)	<p>Partially support – I agree when it comes to schools, nurseries, doctors , nursing/ residential homes due to potential vulnerability of people there.</p> <p>But otherwise no start fixing the roads so drivers can concentrate on what is ahead rather than what hole damages their car next and what it's going to cost. And we all need to teach our young drivers better driving skills ie pay attention ahead and not the habit they pick up from us now to avoid damage on roads</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o572) Local resident, (Bicester/Langford Village, Kingfisher Way)	<p>Partially support – I strongly support the move to make more of the roads 20 mph zones. I have chosen 'partially support' because I think that the plans are lacking in places.</p> <p>I'm a pedestrian living in Langford village and I frequently see cars coming off the ring road onto Peregrine Way still going at 35+ mph, even though there's children and people walking dogs approaching the road using the pedestrian walkways. (As a side note, I think there should be zebra crossings at those points where the walkways meet the road).</p> <p>It really detracts from the otherwise safe walking environment in the area. I previously lived in London, and I feel that crossing some of the roads here is less safe than it was in London, due to the speed cars drive at here.</p> <p>I would, however, want to question why the 20 mph zones aren't more extensive - retaining the 30mph zone for the area of Launton Road and Lambourne Crescent (which seems to be a change since the last consultation) seems an odd choice, given there's a preschool, a nursery and a park on that stretch of road.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>

<p>(o573) Local resident, (Bicestetr, Buckingham Road)</p>	<p>Partially support – I'm in favour of reducing to a 20mph limit in built-up residential areas. But you're leaving out key roads. I live on Buckingham Road, between Bicester North Station and the Plough pub. I would like to see the 20mph speed limit introduced on our road as well. Cars drive by at excessive speeds, upwards of 50mph at times. It is very challenging for residents to get in/out of driveways. Cars don't slow down. Cars blare horns when you indicate to turn into your driveway. They tailgate because they are driving too fast. There needs to be much more road signage on our stretch of road. Especially coming up to the roundabout. Cars don't slow down for the roundabout. We witness near misses daily. I'm in favour of reducing to a 20mph limit in built-up residential areas.</p> <p>Travel change: Other No. We walk already where we can (e.g. school run, into town).</p>
<p>(o574) , (Brackley, Heron Drive)</p>	<p>Partially support – Agree that 20mph outside of pub, shops, GP and school is needed, but the remainder of Peregrine Way remain 30mph. All other roads on the estate would also benefit from 20mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o575) Local resident, (Fringford, Rectory Lane)</p>	<p>Partially support – I cycle through Bicester regularly.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
<p>(o576) Local resident, (Graven Hill, Wood Crescent)</p>	<p>Partially support – Only support the proposal for residential minor roads, with temporary restrictions in front of schools.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o577) Local resident, (Langford Village, Avocet Way)</p>	<p>Partially support – I think 20mph should be implemented around schools. However I think this limit is too low for all other roads and should remain at 30mph. At 20mph I believe there will be more congestion and air pollution.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o578) Local resident, (Langford Village, Swallow Close)	<p>Partially support – 20 only needed outside school</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o579) Local resident, (Old Langford Village, Bicester, Heron Drive)	<p>Partially support – Penalising good drivers who abide by the speed limits will not deter the bad drivers who will drive at speed regardless. The world is going mad with ridiculous and unnecessary highway interventions and ill thought out schemes. 20mph would be appropriate outside a school setting but not EVERYWHERE else. More attention should be paid to the current state of some of the local roads such as Gavray Drive, the dangers (with prior accidents) turning from Peregrine Way onto the main road, potholes, cracks and overgrown hedging along pathways throughout Langford Village.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o580) Local resident, (Stratton Audley, Cherry Street)	<p>Partially support – Sensible application instead of a blanket 20mph - areas where there are schools, old people, ranks of shops and community hubs</p> <p>Travel change: Other</p> <p>If there was a decent village bus service into Bicester I would happily use it. There isn't so I drive. I also need to drive to clients as a self employed person.</p>
(o581) Local resident, (Wendlebury, Main street)	<p>Partially support – Living in Wendlebury is a 20mph limit totally unmonitored and not followed. No chance of enforcement in Bicester if you cannot control a little village.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o582) Local resident, (Adderbury, Round Close Road)	<p>Support – For the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>

(o583) Member of public, (Arncott village, Murcott Road)	<p>Support – To many people speeding</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o584) Local resident, (Banbury, Broughton Road)	<p>Support – A 20mph speed limit will make the roads safer and more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists. Many people say they would consider cycling if the roads were safer. Cycling and walking are good for the environment and our health.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o585) Local resident, (Bicester, Almond Road)	<p>Support – would like to see slower traffic especially around schools and busy walking/cycling areas</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o586) Local resident, (Bicester, Andover close)	<p>Support – I grew up in an area where it was 20mph, it worked well. I know a few children who were hit by cars being silly walking home from school. All walked away with a few cuts a bruises. None of the roads that are marked need to be driven at 30 mph! I have small children who attend a school close to our house so we walk. I would feel much happier if the roads were 20mph, knowing that if they were to run into the road there is a higher chance of the car stopping and injury being lesser, also as it's a straight road to the school and I know people can reach speeds of 40mph during drop off and pick up as I've seen it.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o587) Local resident, (Bicester, Avon crescent)	<p>Support – Safer for all....but will need active monitoring. Would like to see Shakespeare Drive included I'm 20mphshops and school</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>

(o588) Local resident, (Bicester, Barry Avenue)	<p>Support – It will be great to see Bicester adopting this following successful schemes in other parts of the UK. Our housing estates, especially, are not suited for any speed above 20mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o589) Local resident, (Bicester, Bucknell road)	<p>Support – Safer driving</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o590) Local resident, (Bicester, Burns Crescent)	<p>Support – Fully support on residential estate roads</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o591) Local resident, (Bicester, Charlotte Avenue)	<p>Support – Fully support the proposal, slower traffic is a must for urban areas</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o592) Local resident, (Bicester, Chester Road)	<p>Support – 20 for roads that people would only be on to get to people's houses. 30 for other roads. Eg 20 for Chester Road, 30 for Whitelands Way</p> <p>Travel change: Other I already walk or cycle instead of drive, and I support anything that would discourage people from driving</p>
(o593) Local resident, (Bicester, Church street)	<p>Support – We already live in a 20mph road which is no problem for us and makes crossing the roads easier and safer - but we finally a lot of people do not stick to the speed limit.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o594) Local resident, (Bicester, Coopers Green)	Support – Pedestrian safety Travel change: No
(o595) Local resident, (Bicester, Durham Close)	Support – Safety Travel change: No
(o596) Local resident, (Bicester, Fallowfields)	Support – Generally will be safer, particularly given the routes proposed are largely residential and often have roadside parking. Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more
(o597) Local resident, (Bicester, Fircroft)	Support – Slower traffic speeds make roads safer for pedestrians, cyclists and cats, lowers emissions and noise, reduces dominance of vehicles making area more liveable and pet friendly Travel change: No
(o598) Local resident, (Bicester, Fontwell Road)	Support – A 20mph speed limit would make moving about town safer for pedestrians and cyclists with very little impact on car drivers. We should be doing everything we can to encourage people to make more journeys on foot and by bike. Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more
(o599) Local resident, (Bicester, Foxglove Close)	Support – I would like to see more cycling and walking within the town boundaries and a reduction in traffic. Travel change: Yes - cycle more

(o600) Local resident, (Bicester, Germander Way)	<p>Support – Fully support move to 20mph within residential roads for safety reasons. Agree arterial routes should remain at 30/40mph as appropriate.</p> <p>While changes are happening, HGV access via Howes Lane and Lords Lane should also be controlled, this is an unsuitable route when an alternative is available around the eastern ringroad of Bicester and causes noise/vibrations affecting local residents. HGV traffic has increased exponentially on this route over the last few years.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o601) Local resident, (Bicester, Heron Drive)	<p>Support – 20 mph should be the default speed limit for roads in urban areas.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o602) Local resident, (Bicester, Isis Avenue)	<p>Support – Slower traffic speeds make roads safer for pedestrians and cyclists, lowers emissions and noise, reduces dominance of vehicles making area more liveable and family friendly</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o603) Local resident, (Bicester, Kestrel Way)	<p>Support – The proposal will make the residential areas of Bicester safer</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o604) Local resident, (Bicester, Kestrel Way)	<p>Support – I live in Langford and cross Peregrine Way with my young children to and from the primary school and too often experience vehicles travelling too fast. A 20mph limit with possible speed calming measures seems essential to reduce the possibility of a serious incident near the school</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o605) Local resident, (Bicester, Longfields)	

	<p>Support – Overall inconvenience to drivers low, adding few minutes at most to journeys - but multiple benefits; lower emissions, reduced injury and fatality, increased confidence to cycle or walk with all associated health benefits that come with that</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o606) Local resident, (Bicester, Lucerne Avenue)	<p>Support – No need for fast driving on residential roads. Speed Kills. Delighted with the proposals. Reside on a road which has become a cut through for some wishing to avoid the Banbury Road roundabout works. It's been very upsetting the speed at which some vehicles have been driven.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o607) Local resident, (Bicester, Mallards way)	<p>Support – Cars drive too fast currently</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o608) Local resident, (Bicester, Martin close)	<p>Support – I support any action that reduces traffic speed. I believe some irresponsible drivers will still speed but to a lesser extent than they would if 30mph limits is still in place. However this proposal needs proper signage to avoid confusion</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o609) Local resident, (Bicester, Merlin way)	<p>Support – I support the 20mph in built up estates. I think the main reason is the benefit of a reduction in noise and air pollution. The increased safety is also a benefit. I see no realistic negatives to a change to the speed limit on built up residential roads on our estates. In reality, 20mph is often the appropriate and achievable speed on these roads already and so making them 20 will ensure all users are aware of what an appropriate and safe speed on these roads conditions already are.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o610) Local resident, (Bicester, Nuthatch Way)	<p>Support – Safer for me and my young children when walking and cycling. Also safer when driving. Adds almost no time to trips. Makes us more likely to use active travel.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o611) Local resident, (Bicester, Poppylands)	<p>Support – We support the proposal as there is evidence from Wales where the speed limit in built-up areas was reduced from 30mph to 20mph in 2023, that deaths and serious injuries due to traffic accidents was reduced by 15% (the Economist 1 Feb, p19). We are both cyclists and would like more people to feel confident cycling on the road in Bicester. We are disappointed that King's End is to remain at 30 mph, as it passes through heavily residential areas as well as being a thoroughfare, and fast driving makes a dangerous road to cross</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o612) Local resident, (Bicester, Purslane Drive)	<p>Support – This will make Bicester safer and more pleasant to live in. I agree with the roads you have said should not go down to 20 mph such as the B4100 and Churchhill road. These need faster moving traffic. All other roads should not be 30 mph.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o613) Local resident, (Bicester, Purslane Dtive)	<p>Support – Too many cars using the local estates as rat runs and driving without due care and attention</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o614) Local resident, (Bicester, Ravencroft)	<p>Support – It can be difficult to cross residential roads because of the speed cars drive at. Also intimidating for young cyclists.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>

(o615) Local resident, (Bicester, Ravencroft)	<p>Support – Too many people driving too fast on housing estates.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o616) Local resident, (Bicester, Ravencroft)	<p>Support – 20mph is the only acceptable speed limit in a residential zone such as Langford. It will also make the roads safer for cyclists which may encourage people out of their cars, or walk for shorter journeys.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o617) Local resident, (Bicester, Reedmace Road)	<p>Support – Residential streets, like in Bure Park (where I live) do not support 30mph anyway.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o618) Local resident, (Bicester, Rowan Road)	<p>Support – Improve road safety Lower pollution</p> <p>Travel change: Other Continue walking - but with greater safety as pedestrian</p>
(o619) Local resident, (Bicester, Rowan Road)	<p>Support – despite the appalling volume of traffic there are many who ignore the current 30mph limits even when using housing estates as rat runs.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o620) Local resident, (Bicester, Severn Close)	<p>Support – Support for safety reasons</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o621) Local resident, (Bicester, Silibaravi Drive)	<p>Support – The increases in pedestrian and cyclist safety are key to improving the active travel goals of the county council and improving the town of Bicester to live in.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o622) Local resident, (Bicester, Siskin rd)	<p>Support – Safer roads to walk and ride a bike.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o623) Local resident, (Bicester, Swansfield)	<p>Support – 20mph on Langford Village only because of number of pedestrians in the vicinity of the school and shopping areas. Due to small area travel times won't be affected</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o624) Local resident, (Bicester, Wear Road)	<p>Support – I find that most people already travel at about 20mph on the residential roads in Bicester so it will be little hardship to make it official.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o625) Local resident, (Bicester, Westacott Road)	<p>Support – Certainly, the London Road should be made 20mph.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o626) Local resident, (Bicester, Whitelands Way)	<p>Support – Bicester is a busy town full of families who should be confident to walk/cycle in and around the town. I think that 20 mph is a sufficient speed through any areas of housing and past schools. I already travel at 20 mph through kingsmere as its the appropriate speed regardless of the current 30 mph limit.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>

(o627) Local resident, (Bicester, Withington Road)	<p>Support – I fully support the 20mph zone, and would like to see it enforced with fines. Living near town, people zoom by at high speeds, especially considering parking on one side of the road.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o628) Local resident, (Bicester, Woodruff Close)	<p>Support – Lucerne Ave has been a cut through because of the roadworks. Many are driving too fast for the type of roads</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o629) Local resident, (Bicester, Ashdene Road)	<p>Support – What is the difference in Question 2 between No Objection and Support? If drivers kept to the existing 30 mph speed limits there would be no need for 20mph zones, speed bumps, chicanes and other traffic calming measures. Drivers only have themselves to blame.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o630) Local resident, (Bicester, Bluebell close)	<p>Support – Bicester roads very busy and often difficult to cross due to speed of traffic.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o631) Local resident, (Bicester, Burns Crescent)	<p>Support – Particularly needed in areas around schools</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o632) Local resident, (Bicester, Chalvey Road)	<p>Support – I live on Chalvey Road which is frequently used as a cut through and the congestion and speed drivers go at is not compatible with the type of road it is. I have been asking local councillors about a 20 mph speed limit for some time so am delighted to hear Chalvey Road is on the plan.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o633) Local resident, (Bicester, Church Street)	<p>Support – I would even support Oxford Road, Kings End and Queens Avenue becoming part of the 20 mph zone to encourage alternative transport means or alternative routes to reduce the rush hour traffic.</p> <p>Travel change: Other For local journeys, I usually try to walk where possible. For commuting, I work a 30 min drive from Bicester. I would need the public transport to improve from the 2 hours each way and £20 per day price tag to not use my car for this.</p>
(o634) Local resident, (Bicester, Churchill Road)	<p>Support – Churchill Road is like a racetrack and speed limits totally ignored.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o635) Local resident, (Bicester, Coopers Green)	<p>Support – Needs to be enforced. Please remove the speed bumps on Buckingham road and Banbury road. These are causing people to drive dangerously.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o636) Local resident, (Bicester, Cranesbill Drive)	<p>Support – Safety</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o637) Local resident, (Bicester, Danes road)	<p>Support – A sensible speed limit for urban roads where people are living in close proximity to roads.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o638) Local resident, (Bicester, Epsom way)	<p>Support – There are lots of kids in Bicester.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o639) Local resident, (Bicester, George street)	<p>Support – All housing estates should be subject of 20mph speed limit</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o640) Local resident, (Bicester, Heron Drive)	<p>Support – I support a 20 mph speed limit on roads where there are pedestrians and other vulnerable road users.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o641) Local resident, (Bicester, Hopcroft Avenue)	<p>Support – In built up areas 20mph is so much safer, especially as we are in a phase of large expansion.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o642) Local resident, (Bicester, Isis Ave)	<p>Support – Mother of a child and witness as a young person to children killed in road traffic accidents</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o643) Local resident, (Bicester, Jasmine Place)	<p>Support – With many residential areas now overpopulated with vehicles parking on the roadside/partly on the footpath it is becoming more risky/dangerous for road users if travelling at speed on those roads. Any maximum MPH can be and often is exceeded so making 30mph even more risky/dangerous. On estates such as Bure and Southwold there are numerous pedestrian crossings which on Bure where near a school or local amenity centre have Pedestrian Priority signs which do help in reducing the vehicle speed on approaching such areas. Southwold have no such signs and definitely need them on the crossing at Holm Square leading to Tesco Express, school and community centre as drivers can be unsighted by the hedges and shrubs regardless of the speed they are travelling so creating an accident waiting to happen environment.</p>

	Travel change: No
(o644) Local resident, (Bicester, Kings End)	Support – 20 mph is sensible and a terrific idea. Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more
(o645) Local resident, (Bicester, May Tree Close)	Support – Promote safer to roads for residents Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more
(o646) Local resident, (Bicester, Rochford)	Support – Kids Travel change: No
(o647) Local resident, (Bicester, Siskin Road)	Support – Roads through and around Bicester are not large enough for the volume of traffic using them. Lower speeds will help to reduce accidents. It might also encourage more people to walk where possible, as journeys by car will take longer. This would be better for the environment. Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more
(o648) Local resident, (Bicester, Siskin Road)	Support – Bicester does not have good roads. Some are quite narrow and there are many parked cars. 20 mph is fast enough and it would make driving around and through the town and the estates safer Travel change: No
(o649) Local resident, (Bicester, The Bramblings)	Support – 30mph is too fast round New Langford and similar areas. The number of parked cars makes visibility poor. Travel change: No

(o650) Local resident, (Bicester, The Parade off Skimmingdish Lane)	<p>Support – It shouldn't just be the affluent villages that get the 20 mph limit ie Launton Kirtlington</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o651) Local resident, (Bicester, Whitelands way)	<p>Support – We live in kingsmere, it's dangerous for even adults to cross the road near co-op and it's difficult to let my year 5 kid walk to school trusting that they will be able to cross safely. It's very important the residential roads are safe for anyone. Thank you</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o652) Local resident, (Bicester, Winterbourne Close)	<p>Support – I think it will help to make our residential areas far more safer places to live. The problem is that nowadays we have parked cars taking up every available bit of space on our housing estates. Having to negate pathways and cross roads by squeezing between parked cars, which restrict the view for approaching cars and the pedestrian, is dangerous. Especially when these cars are approaching at 30mph. 20mph does give both parties more time to respond and does also reduce injury should an incident occur. And how many kids look before dashing out when they are larking about? 20mph will go a little way to claiming our streets back from the car centricity that has come to dominate us</p> <p>Travel change: Other I already only walk, cycle or use public transport. But it would make me feel safer</p>
(o653) Local resident, (Bicester- Bure Park, Lily Close)	<p>Support – The ring road is only 10pm faster than small estate roads. Worried about my children walking and cycling to school, friends, activities.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>

(o654) Local resident, (bicester, bure park, germander way)	<p>Support – safer for everyone around the estates people go way to fast down there so need a limit lower in place.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o655) Local resident, (Bicester/ Langford village, Mallards Way)	<p>Support – As a resident on Mallards way in Langford. As a family we would feel securer with 20mph restriction. And also it would enhance observation skills as opposed to 30mph speedlimit. It would also reduce noise pollution too.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o656) Local resident, (Bicestet, Avocet Way)	<p>Support – I think this makes sense on the estates though I do wonder how it will be enforced.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o657) Local resident, (Bure park, bicester, Lucerne avenue)	<p>Support – The large number of cars now driving through Bicester will only increase with the planned closure of the London road crossing. The huge number of visitors to the village add a huge risk to road safety in the town with increased volume, lack of awareness of the road layout.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o658) Local resident, (Caversfield, Old School Close)	<p>Support – Less noise, less pollution, lower rates of collision and injury</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o659) Local resident, (Caversfield and Bicester, Old school close)	<p>Support – 20mph limit is safer. Lower risk of fatal injury. Lower risk of collisions. As a driver and pedestrian I want this. The minor increase in travelling time is irrelevant. Set off 2 minutes earlier.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o660) Local resident, (Elmsbrook, Charlotte Avenue)	<p>Support – To slow traffic down making it safer for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o661) Local resident, (Elmsbrook, Haricot Vale)	<p>Support – Reduce sound pollution and co2 whilst making roads safer for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly children and the elderly, as well as reducing risk to wildlife and animals. There is a very high number of cat, deer, badger and hedgehog deaths on roads in Bicester and hedgehog are in serious decline. The actual impact on travel time by reducing speed to 20 mph is minimal and well worth it to reduce the above risks.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o662) Local resident, (Graven Hill, Austin Way)	<p>Support – Safety</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o663) Local resident, (Graven Hill, Foundation Square)	<p>Support – Support, but disappointed that the arterial roads are not 20 too. Average speeds are less than 20 and it is much safer, particularly as vulnerable users have to use these arterial roads to get around.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o664) Local resident, (Graven hill, Friend way)	<p>Support – I am aware that slower speeds reduces possibility of injury or death</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o665) Local resident, (Graven Hill in Bicester, Graven Hill)	<p>Support – I support the 20mph proposed speed limit for Bicester to hopefully limit the number of accidents</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o666) Local resident, (Graven Hill Village, Graven Hill Road)	Support – I am in favour of the proposed speed limit because I believe it will make our community safer Travel change: No
(o667) Local resident, (Hethe, Main street)	Support – 20 mph is the correct maximum speed in built up residential areas. Most villages are now 20 mph and that has worked well. It therefore makes sense to implement this in Bicester as well. Fully support. Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more
(o668) Local resident, (Kingsmere, Bath Crescent)	Support – Cars drive too fast round residential areas. The main thoroughfares through Bicester should stay at 30mph. Travel change: No
(o669) Local resident, (Langford, Falcon Mead)	Support – Safer for all road users including pedestrians, children, school arrivals etc. Travel change: No
(o670) Local resident, (Langford, Shearwater)	Support – People drive too quickly. Travel change: No
(o671) Local resident, (Langford Village, Heron Drive)	Support – With the ring road reduced to 40 housing estates off the ring road should be significantly lower. Travel change: No
(o672) Local resident, (Langford Village, Redwing Close)	Support – Safety reasons in residential area Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more

(o673) Local resident, (Langford village, Swansfield Langford)	<p>Support – Im a parent i want my child to feel safe walking to school crossing roads.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o674) Local resident, (Langford Village Bicester, Merlin Way)	<p>Support – I am in favour of 20mph , especially around schools, local shops and estates in general. I do question why Garry Drive is only partly 20mph given that it is really part of the estate and shouldn't be seen as a feeder route given how many youngsters and families use the cycle path as well as the blue line for exercise . It is used too often as a race track by residents and other locals wanting to test their cars out!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o675) Local resident, (Langford village Bicester, Heron drive)	<p>Support – In the built up areas 20mph is quite adequate.However, unless it is properly policed, which at the moment no speed limits are,it becomes pointless.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o676) Local resident, (Launton, Bicester Road)	<p>Support – Road safety</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o677) Local resident, (Merton, Main Street)	<p>Support – As a pedestrian, a cyclist and a driver, I fully support measures that stand to make our cities, towns and villages safe and healthy places for human beings, rather than having human safety and health subordinated to the convenience of motorists, many of whom do not actually live in the places that they drive through. As well as increasing safety for other road users, a 20mph limit reduces noise and pollution, and makes our streets much more pleasant places to be.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>

(o678) Local resident, (Piddington, Thame Road)	<p>Support – Less accidents. Safer for cats. Deter cutting through. Will annoy impatient people. Safer for cyclists.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o679) Local resident, (Bicester, Withington Road)	<p>No objection – Because I'm a resident of withington road and the school is down the road and cars and motorcycles go far too fast down the road we've already had several accidents in the street but someone will get killed on day !!!</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o680) Local resident, (Bicester, Avocet way)	<p>No objection – Make roads and areas safer</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o681) Local resident, (Bicester, Conifer Drive)	<p>No objection – I don't think it'll make any difference. There is so much traffic it'll hardly make a difference.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o682) Local resident, (Bicester, Coopers Green)	<p>No objection – I sincerely hope there will be a reduction to the speed limits at the out of town ends of roads heading into Bicester such as Buckingham Road and Banbury road where the limit is still 40 mph. I walk my dog in this area a few times a day and 40 mph is way too fast. There should also be a proper pedestrian crossing in the middle of Banbury Road. The traffic calming restriction on Buckingham Road, just past Coopers Green also causes very dangerous and aggressive driving all day every day - this should be removed along with a speed limit reduction.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

(o683) Local resident, (Bicester, Coopers green)	<p>No objection – It makes no sense</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o684) Local resident, (Bicester, Fairhaven road)	<p>No objection – Traffic is bad enough without lowering the speed limits in the wrong areas eg kings end is still staying at 30 but I think roads like that in high residential areas should be lowered</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o685) Local resident, (Bicester, Hertford close)	<p>No objection – People drive too fast in built-up areas</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o686) Local resident, (Bicester, Lyneham Rd)	<p>No objection – Volume and speed of traffic has been increasing over time. Effects of impact accidents on humans decreases . Why would you not? Safety first</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o687) Local resident, (Bicester, North Street)	<p>No objection – As a pedestrian in Bicester, people go so fast they can't often stop in time safely for the pedestrian crossings etc. This would make Bicester much safer</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o688) Local resident, (Bicester, Priory Road)	<p>No objection – It's a step to producing a less car focused town. And I support that.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>

(o689) Local resident, (Bicester, Rick Keene close)	<p>No objection – Better to put signs on roads and areas saying children playing and also put zebra crossing on busy roads.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o690) Local resident, (Bicester, Saffron Close)	<p>No objection – I fully support the 20mph plan to safeguard my children getting to and from school and bring us in line with other towns on Oxon.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o691) Local resident, (Bicester, Thames Avenue)	<p>No objection – Within the housing estate yes, not easy on some to do more than 20mph. But the ring road back to 50mph.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o692) Local resident, (Bicester, Victoria)	<p>No objection – Speeding around estates are a real issue. Queen's avenue would benefit from 20 mph as vehicles travel too fast and very often don't stop for pedestrians on the zebra crossing. However, if/when the London Road crossing is permanently closed the town roads are likely to become gridlocked at times</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o693) Local resident, (Bicester, Woodfield)	<p>No objection – I fully support the 20pmh on residential / housing estate roads, I think it will make the area safer and much more pleasant to drive, cycle and walk around, especially with children.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o694) Local resident, (Bicester, Mallards way)	<p>No objection – Cars drive too fast on our road</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>

(o695) Local resident, (Bicester, Mallards way)	<p>No objection – Cars drive to fast around Bicester and through our estate and don't adhere to existing limits. Our road was originally designed and planned as 20 mph but this has never been enforced and there is no signage to indicate this. Cars need to be slowed down to make safer for pedestrians and cyclists. I can't drive due to a neurological condition but can cycle and find roads too scary and shared cycle and pedestrian pathways are often not wide enough to use safely. I had a bad accident on my bike in the summer when a pedestrian walked out across pavement in front of me on a shared pathway. Slower traffic would give me more confidence to cycle on the road rather than being restricted to shared cycle and pedestrian footpaths.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o696) Local resident, (Bicester, Mullein Road)	<p>No objection – Seems quite a sensible plan</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
(o697) Local resident, (Bicester, Spruce Drive)	<p>No objection – Perfectly sensible proposal, for safety reasons. The sooner the better.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
(o698) Local resident, (Bicester, Spruce Drive)	<p>No objection – Because it's SAFER, QUIETER AND LESS POLLUTING</p> <p>Travel change: Yes – walk/wheel more</p>
(o699) Local resident, (Bicester, Withington Road)	<p>No objection – Drivers go far too fast in built up areas</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>

<p>(o700) Local resident, (Bicester old Langford Village, Merganser Drive)</p>	<p>No objection – I understand why they want to put it as 20 but it's not necessarily but put it a 30. I know it's a safety and all that stuff but reality put it to 30 I'm 24 years old and in the end people don't really do it these days! And if you're gonna start putting it around Bicester it is really not necessary especially for Oxford</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o701) Local resident, (Bicester, Langford village estate, Mallards way)</p>	<p>No objection – I live in mallards way, Langford village and cars whizz faster than 30 even though the estate was originally designated and designed to be 20mph. Sadly too many irresponsible drivers. I agree with 20 mph on ALL residential estates. I'd be happy with ring roads and other roads being reduced to 30, not 20 as this would create a traffic flow issues.</p> <p>Travel change: Yes - cycle more</p>
<p>(o702) Local resident, (Caversfield, Turnpike Road)</p>	<p>No objection – I have children who will be walking to school</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o703) Local resident, (Langford, Avocet Way)</p>	<p>No objection – People drive too fast. Not sure speed limits will stop them, more education required.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>
<p>(o704) Local resident, (Langford village, bicester, Jay Close)</p>	<p>No objection – Cars travel far too fast around the schools and local area where children cycle and play.</p> <p>Travel change: No</p>