



## **Address to Delegated Decisions – Cabinet Member for Transport – 22 January 2026**

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

### **5. Woodstock Road Bus Lane ETRO**

On the bus lanes, we have no problem. For walking, wheeling and cycling the reversal is neutral.

The problem with Woodstock Road is that, apart from the cyclists face two poor choices. Either share a poorly surfaced and undulating pavement with pedestrians and the risk of being hit by a car reversing out of a driveway. Or, share the smooth carriageway with motorists who can be impatient and think you should be on the pavement. I have been honked at by a driver, who passed me and I then caught and passed him using the bus lane while he was in the queue for the roundabout.

This poor provision should not be viewed as a long-term solution.

### **6. Eynsham LCWIP**

An LCWIP is a crucial document in the development of a town's walking and cycling networks. It sets out the vision for a complete and coherent network, and the individual improvement that are required to achieve it. It's a vital step towards gaining funding towards these schemes.

We are pleased that the development of the Eynsham LCWIP has involved local stakeholders including active travel and sustainability groups, and the Parish Council. We reviewed the cycle routes in and around Eynsham with our Active Travel Champion in developing the Oxfordshire Online Cycle Map, which maps the current state, and this plan appears to cover the issues for improvement that we spotted. BikeSafe the local group and CoHSAT members offer praise for the thoroughness of the process and surveys.

Reading the plan and the consultation responses, we note three themes.

1. The B4044 path. Whenever Eynsham is mentioned the need for this connection comes up. It's still needed.

2. Despite the importance of the B4044, there's a huge opportunity for walking and cycling within Eynsham. Nowhere is Eynsham more than a mile from the centre – a 20-minute walk, or 5-minute cycle. Yet few children cycle to school and few adults walk or ride around town. Eynsham is growing fast. The need and the opportunity are clear.

3. Read the consultation responses and the call for speed of delivery is clear. We know that this depends on resource and funding, and this Council is not made of money. But please note and take these responses, common across many LCWIPs, to our MPs and Ministers to emphasise the call for better funding for this highly valued, and high return infrastructure.

## 7. Sheep Street ETRO

There are several words missing from the Officer's Report on the Sheep Street ETRO. When the cycling permission for Sheep Street, was approved, some consultation responses predicted 'chaos', they said people could be 'hurt', 'knocked down', and even 'gangs will happen'.

Well, none of this has happened. Collisions, let alone gangs, are not mentioned once in the report.

What the report does describe is how in the vast majority of interactions, cyclists give way to pedestrians, and this will not count the journeys that pass without any interaction.

Looking at the disabled persons aspect of the scheme, we support the intent, but we are concerned about the practicalities. Disabled people face enough barriers without having to prove their disabilities and have an extra form of ID for a vehicle of such low impact as a cycle. Signage may be sufficient.

## 8. East Oxford CPZ and 9. Headington CPZ

The Council's actions should relate to its policies. The East Oxford and Headington CPZ items reference health, wellbeing, the climate emergency and an inclusive, integrated and sustainable transport. But they do not reference the two key policy documents, the County's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan or the Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan.

They should, and they should therefore note the LTCP targets, all eight of which are underpinned by reducing private car traffic and three reference it specifically. Yet at present, since Covid, car traffic has been climbing back towards the 2019 baseline, not falling towards the target.

The LTCP has an explicit policy to reduce car parking to reflect this. The Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan has an action to reduce public parking provision to deliver this.

If you create more parking, you will allow more cars into the streets and create more car journeys it is as simple as that. The increased car parking aspects of these proposals should not proceed, because they are counter to your policies, and will bring additional congestion, pollution and casualties onto our roads.

At the same time, in most of Oxford there is a dearth of good cycle parking. 59% of adults in Oxford cycle, but most only occasionally, and cycle storage is one of the biggest barriers. The very limited cycle hangar trial in Jericho has proved hugely over-subscribed, and there are people all over Oxford clamouring for similar safe storage.

A hangar holds 6 bikes. If just 10% of car parking spaces were converted to cycle hangars, the total parking capacity of the bays would be increased by 50%. **Car Club spaces would also be more beneficial than regular parking.** This is the way to the inclusive, integrated and sustainable transport system that the LTCP describes.

To reiterate. The agreed policy of this council is not to be balanced. It is to reduce car travel and increase cycling. We support the cycle parking in the East Oxford proposal, but none of the car parking bay or usage extensions. The Headington proposals are almost all contra to policy and should be reviewed in full.

[Footnote: the calculation of 50% may appear to equate one cycle to one car, but a 6-cycle hangar is 2578mm x 2030mm, so two fit in most car parking bays, equating two bikes to one car.]

## 11. Abingdon Centre East

As we have already noted today, the LTCP, the guiding strategy for transport in Oxfordshire sets out targets and policies to reduce private car journeys and increase active travel and public transport.

These proposals for Abingdon Centre East do that, with measured extensions to no waiting areas that will improve bus journeys and reduce road danger.

Knowing Abingdon well, I know the changes on Radley Road will have a particular benefit. Buses and other wider vehicles are often delayed here due to the inability to pass. It will also make the road safer for cycling by removing the car door hazard and taking the route out of the 3 to 4 metre width zone that encourages dangerous close passes.

## 12. Abingdon Town Centre

This proposal has several elements to address.

- Drayton Road, we support formalisation of the No Loading restrictions to address occasional problems.

- Abingdon Bridge, I don't understand why this is not pursued. Loading causes traffic disruption and is dangerous to navigate for people cycling to Culham or Europa School, or in to Abingdon. The only employment sites on the bridge are the café and a pub – the café has off-street parking, the pub could surely arrange delivery out of peak hours. There are no schools on the bridge. The need for taxis mentioned is not shown. There is one comment from the 'Abingdon Bridge area' concerned about care visits, but this is vague and not identified to the bridge itself. There is a large car park 100m from the houses on the bridge.
- West St Helen Street, the removal of the existing paid parking and addition of the new limited waiting bay opposite seems reasonable. There is an issue for another time about the bus stop here being abused for general parking.
- St. Edmunds Lane. We oppose the addition of this parking, because it increases traffic and all of the other problems that go with it.
- St. Helen's Wharf. This area is currently unrestricted, so we support parking controls being brought into place.
- Manor Court. These are for limited waiting bays and no residential parking rights were noted in the consultation. The consultation mentioned visitors and local businesses, combined with our local knowledge we expect these would be mostly used by visitors to the retirement homes in Cygnet Court and Mill Stream Court. We do not object.

However, there is no cycle parking at these properties as I noted when delivering medicines during the pandemic. If they are to benefit from the public providing land for parking, could they provide some spaces for parking? For retired people it is one of the most healthy and accessible activities available, and the benefits are highest for those currently least active

### **13. Abingdon Twelve Acre Drive Pedestrian Crossing and Bus Stops**

This proposal is excellent and we fully support it. The nearest bus stops round the ring road are 600 metres away.

The toucan will join up to a path that partly exists and partly will be created from a muddy track by development funding. The shared path will then run from Abingdon North new housing across the Ring Road to Peachcroft shops, community centre and playground, and then connect to other routes through the town.

### **14. Ambrosden Traffic calming**

This is simple, sensible traffic calming and we support it. We note many of the concerns are that the speed limit should be slower.