

Division(s) affected: *Kidlington East*

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

21 MAY 2026

KIDLINGTON: BICESTER ROAD – PROPOSED TOUCAN CROSSING, SHARED-USE FOOT & CYCLEWAY, AND BUS STOP CLEARWAYS

Report by Director of Environment and Highways

RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet Member is **RECOMMENDED** to:

Approve the following traffic/highway features on Bicester Road in Kidlington, as advertised:

- a) **New Toucan crossing located north of its roundabout junction with Oxford Road,**
- b) **Conversion of an existing section of footway on the eastern side to a new shared-use foot & cycleway,**
- c) **Two new bus stop Clearways with a ‘No stopping except local buses’ restrictions, north of its roundabout junction with Oxford Road.**

Executive Summary

- d) This report presents comments received to a statutory consultation – and the subsequent response to objections from County Council Officers – on proposals to construct various features on Bicester Road in Kidlington, including: a) a new Toucan Crossing (a signal-controlled crossing for use by both pedestrians and pedal cyclists) located approx. 455 metres north of its roundabout junction with Oxford Road, b) a 126 metre section of shared-use foot & cycleway (in place of the existing footway) on the eastern side, east of the proposed new crossing, and c) two new bus stop Clearways (with a ‘No stopping except local buses’ restriction) on the both sides, north of its junction with Oxford Road– as shown in **Annex 1**.
- e) The proposals have been put forward as a result of s278 works in relation to the development of adjacent land.

Corporate Policies and Priorities

- f) Of the three priorities identified within the newly adopted 'Oxfordshire Strategic Plan 2025-2028' which are listed below, these proposals actively support priority nos.1 & 3:

- (1) Greener Oxfordshire – *“We want our communities to enjoy clean air, access to green space, and safe and sustainable ways to move around. This means reducing traffic congestion and investing in public transport, cycling and walking; protecting our natural environment; and helping Oxfordshire respond and adapt to a changing climate.”*
- (2) Fairer Oxfordshire – *“We want all our residents to benefit from the advantages our county has to offer. This means supporting a local economy that benefits everyone; assisting people who face challenges in finding work; making our services as easy to access as possible; and helping communities in need.”*
- (3) Healthier Oxfordshire – *“We want all our residents to be happy, healthy and safe. This means helping children get the best start in life; creating opportunities for young people to reach their full potential; supporting older people to age well and stay independent for as long as possible; and encouraging everyone to make healthy choices.”*

Financial Implications

- g) Funding for consultation on the proposals has been received directly from the developer, with the relevant agreements in place for them to also fund implementation if approved.
- h) Finance has completed a high-level review of this report. As no financial figures or costings were included, this sign off is limited to confirming that the narrative is reasonable based on the information provided. Service area Officers therefore take responsibility for confirming the funding arrangements, validating the financial position & underlying data independently from Finance.

Comments checked by:

Andrew Price – Interim Business Partnering Accountant

Andrew.Price@Oxfordshire.gov.uk

Legal Implications

- i) The consultation that has been undertaken complies with the consultation requirements for the various elements as required by law including under the Highways Act 1980, the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and any other relevant legislation.

- j) The scheme has been promoted by Oxfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority and Traffic Authority under the Highways Act 1980, and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Comments checked by:

Jennifer Crouch – Principal Solicitor (Regulatory)

Jennifer.Crouch@Oxfordshire.gov.uk

Staff Implications

8. There are no negative staff implications – with the appraisal of the proposals, as well as the consultation process having been undertaken by Officers from the ‘Highway Agreements North’, and ‘TRO & Schemes’ teams as part of their regular day-to-day duties, with no additional or negative impact on capacity expected.

Equality & Inclusion Implications

- k) No negative implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of the proposals.

Sustainability Implications

- l) The proposals have been put forward for road safety reasons, and to help improve active travel routes & choices in the vicinity of the new residential development.

Risk Management

- m) No potential significant health and safety or service provision risks, or potentially significant financial impacts have been identified in these proposals.

Formal Consultation

- n) Formal consultation was carried out between 26 March and 24 April 2026. A notice was published in the Oxford Times newspaper, and an email was sent to statutory consultees & key-stakeholders, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Bus operators, countywide transport/access & disabled peoples user groups, Cherwell District Council, relevant local District Councillors, Kidlington and Gosford & Water Eaton Parish Councils, and the local County Councillor representing the Kidlington East division.

- o) During the course of the formal consultation, 12 responses were received via the online survey, with Officers having identified (only comments were collected) three objections, three partially supporting/raising concerns, four in support, and two non-objections.
- p) Additionally, a further five emails were received directly – with Thames Valley Police not objecting (providing speed monitoring had taken place and design standards had been followed), Oxford Bus Company also raised no objection, Oxfordshire Liveable Streets (a local not-for-profit campaign organisation) supporting, but raising concerns, the Bicester Bike Users' Group raised concerns about the design of the scheme, and Cyclox supported, but felt there was opportunity to further strengthen the wider scheme.
- q) The full responses are shown in **Annex 2**, and copies of the original responses are available for inspection by County Councillors. Any comments received that Officers identify as containing personal abuse and/or other personal information will be redacted as appropriate.

Officer Response to Objections/Concerns

- r) More detailed plans of the scheme could not be provided during the public consultation period because they are still going through the technical audit process – which means they cannot be used in the public domain until they have been approved.
- s) The shared path cannot be extended to the south due to lack of highway boundary, and it would be outside of the developers extend of works. This was agreed at the planning stage.
- t) The highway improvement works were agreed at the planning stage. Officers believe that cyclists travelling north along Bicester Road would use the Toucan Crossing to access the development, and if they are travelling further north on Bicester Road – they would remain on the shared path.
- u) Cyclists traveling south along Bicester Road would already be on the carriageway and can enter the development off Bicester Road. If cyclists are on the shared path, they can either rejoin the carriageway at the puffin crossing or carry onto the Toucan crossing and enter the development using the shared path.
- v) Officers can confirm the hedges along Bicester Road outside the development are being removed, resulting in the shared path achieving a 3-metre width. There are two 3-metre-wide shared paths either side of the carriageway which carry throughout the development for cyclists to continue their journey.

- w) Officers can confirm that the toucan crossing width would be 4-metres, with the developer providing what has been agreed within the Section 106 agreement.
- x) There is a Toucan crossing provided to the south of the puffin crossing. The puffin crossing was agreed at planning, and it is within the Section 106 to be provided.
- y) The proposed signalised crossing has been reviewed by the County Councils Traffic Signals team and will have appropriate timings. Potentially reducing the speed limit in the area was discussed during planning, however it was agreed to not reduce the speed due to the number of HGVs using Bicester Road.
- z) Officers will investigate the condition of the existing shared pedestrian/cycleway along Bicester Road, and ensure any issues identified will be rectified as appropriate.
- aa) The additional signalised crossings are for the future and existing residents of Kidlington, with the crossings enabling residents to cross Bicester Road safely to access the new bus stops on Bicester Road, and the adjacent amenities within the area.
- bb) A segregated cycleway cannot be provided due to the constraints near the proposed access, as there is a ditch on the southern side of Bicester Road with only enough width for a 3-metre shared path.
- cc) Officers feel having a raised table for the access is not appropriate on Bicester Road due to the number of HGVs using the road and there is no continuous cycleway crossing the site access.
- dd) There will be a shared cycleway within the development when the second phase to the north of this access comes forward to provide a shared cycleway to the southern side of Bicester Road. This is for pedestrians and cyclists' safety to ensure they carry on their journey away from Bicester Road within the development. Also, there are crossing points for cyclists within the development away from the access where they can reach the shared path at the site access.
- ee) The County Council's Traffic Signals team have checked the signal design for both the proposed Toucan and Puffin crossings. The detailed design regarding the signalised crossings cannot be provided during the public consultation because they are still going through OCC technical audit. Officers will however review the existing crossings and their responsiveness to turning green.
- ff) Officers will investigate the condition of the existing shared pedestrian & cycleway along Bicester Road, and ensure any issues surfacing will be repaired.

Paul Fermer
Director of Environment and Highways

Annex(es): Annex 1: Consultation plan
 Annex 2: Consultation responses

Background papers: n/a
Other Documents: n/a

Contact Officer(s): Angelo Antenucci (Engineer – Highway Agreements
 North)
 Adam Barrett (Technical Lead Engineer – Highway
 Agreements North)

May 2026

A. Email responses:

| RESPONDENT | COMMENTS |
|---|---|
| (e1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police) | No objection – providing the necessary speed monitoring has taken place and all current design standards have been followed. |
| (e2) Head of Built Environment and Infrastructure, (Oxford Bus Company) | <p>No objection – These proposals reflect an existing planning consent of which we were previously aware. The material demonstrates that the detailed implementation should present no problems, though I should say we do not currently operate along the road in question.</p> <p>We raise no objection. Rather, the additional crossing and pair of stops is necessary for the allocated residential development to be safely and conveniently served by bus. Thus we support the proposals.</p> |
| (e3) Local group/organisation, (Oxfordshire Liveable Streets) | <p>Support/Concerns – We support the provision of crossings here as essential for providing walking, wheeling and cycling connectivity to the new development. However we have a number of concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * It would be good if detailed plans of the proposed crossings had been included, as it is impossible to determine (for example) how wide the proposed shared path is, or what features adjoin it. * The shared path should be extended southwards to the existing crossing, to connect with the path to the roundabout. Otherwise people cycling between the new development and Oxford Parkway (or Oxford itself) will have to cross to the west side of Bicester Rd and then cross back. * It is good that there are crossings on both sides of the development entry, as this is safer than combining a crossing with the junction. However having only one of the crossings as a toucan will force people cycling to back-track when moving between the Bicester Rd (north) and the development. This may result in people cycling on the main carriageway for a short distance and/or treating the puffin crossing as a toucan crossing. It would be better if both crossings were toucans and both had shared path connections to the development entry. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>* Shared paths need to be 3 metres wide, but if there are obstructions on either side then they need to be wider, following Table 5-3 in _Cycle Infrastructure Design_ LTN 1/20. If there is a hedge on one side and lamp posts on the other, for example, a shared path would need to be 4 metres wide.</p> <p>* Consideration needs to be given as to how people cycling on the shared path will safely rejoin the carriageway inside the development. It is unclear from the plans where that is supposed to happen.</p> <p>* While the minimum width of a toucan crossing is 3 metres, the desired width is 4 metres and (as with puffin crossings) much greater widths are allowed. There should be room here to make the toucan crossing 5 metres wide and the puffin crossing could be made 4 metres wide (to retain the option to convert it to a toucan later). Consideration needs to be given to comfortable tracking for cycles, including larger cycles (the LTN 1/20 "design cycle" is 2.8 metres long and 1.2m wide).</p> |
| <p>(e4) Local group/organisation, (Cyclox)</p> | <p>Support – We welcome the inclusion of a signal-controlled toucan crossing and the provision of a wider footway/cycleway, which will improve crossing opportunities and help support active travel along Bicester Road.</p> <p>There is, however, an opportunity to further strengthen the scheme so that it better reflects current best practice and is future-proof. In particular, the use of a shared path could be reconsidered. On a corridor of this nature, with high use in the morning given the proximity to three primary schools and one secondary school (Edward Field, West Kidlington, St Thomas Moore, and Gosford Hill), shared use can lead to conflict and reduced comfort for both pedestrians and cyclists. Guidance in LTN 1/20 recommends avoiding shared use on busier routes and instead providing clearly defined, separate space for walking and cycling wherever feasible.</p> <p>Similarly, the design of the junction with the new access road presents an opportunity for improvement. Introducing a raised table with continuous footway and cycle track across the side road would help reinforce priority for pedestrians and cyclists, while also encouraging lower vehicle speeds. This would align well with LTN 1/20 principles and support a calmer environment and better transition to the 20 mph new neighbourhood. We would like to welcome further detail on the operation of the crossing, particularly the responsiveness of the pedestrian demand unit (PDU). Experience at the existing crossing near Sainsbury's suggests that longer waiting times can discourage use. Minimising delay for pedestrians and cyclists is an important consideration in LTN 1/20, and ensuring that the new crossing responds promptly would make it more attractive and effective.</p> <p>More broadly, it is unfortunate that the consultation does not include the wider development context. Without visibility of the larger plans, it is difficult to assess whether the location of the crossing represents the most direct</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>and convenient route for people walking and cycling to key destinations such as the primary school, high street, football pitches, and scouts/guides facilities. Providing this context would help to ensure that the crossing is optimally placed to support everyday journeys. As entrance to the schools requires cyclists and pedestrians to turn right after the new crossing, the route is not direct. People might be tempted to cross at the entry/exit rather than walking or cycling back to the crossing. This would create unsafe situations.</p> <p>The new crossing connects to the existing shared path along Bicester Road. The new crossing will be as useful as this shared path is usable. It has been deteriorating for years and is in great need of maintenance, and with the new development should be upgraded to a segregated path.</p> <p>In summary, the proposed crossing is a positive addition, and with some refinements—particularly around segregation, side road design, signal responsiveness, and its relationship to the wider development—it could better align with best practice and more fully support safe and attractive active travel.</p> |
| (e5) Local group/organisation, (Bicester Bike Users' Group) | <p>Concerns – We feel this is a poor design for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As this is new provision, it should be segregated, not shared. Shared provision does not work for either pedestrians or cyclists. 2. It is concerning that the plan also shows a proposed pedestrian only crossing to the north connecting to a shared (cycle + pedestrian) path. This is coherent or not policy compliant. 3. To be more responsive to active travel, vehicle speeds should be reduced and the crossing should have fixed timing operation. |

B. Online responses:

| RESPONDENT | COMMENTS |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| (o1) County Cllr, (Oxford, New Road) | Support – I support these interventions as they improve walking, cycling and public transport in line with County Policy and Vision Zero. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| (o2) Member of public, (Bicester, Kestrel Way) | Support – As an Oxford United fan who will be a regular attendee to the new stadium nearby, this plan looks very beneficial to stadium users and should proceed. |
| (o3) Local resident, (Bletchington, Station Road) | Support – This road is so fast (people drive fast despite the speed limit and the speed bumps) and busy - with vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, there is a school and nursery on the road and it's a residential road. Drivers regularly disregard the zebra crossings - even when people are crossing on them. It's so dangerous. As a driver I use this road almost daily and have witnessed many near misses involving adults and children. A toucan crossing would help improve safety so much before some innocent person - likely a child, loses their life in a totally preventable tragedy and parents lose their child. |
| (o4) Local resident, (Kidlington, Flatford Place) | No objection – There should be no parking allowed during school drop off/ pick up hours |
| (o5) Local resident, (Kidlington, mead way) | Concerns – The cycle path is dreadful these days, bumpy and dangerous to ride on |
| (o6) Local resident, (Kidlington, Oxford Road) | Object – My objections are that this is in addition to provision for cyclists on the Oxford road roundabout and seems unnecessarily excessive. I am not clear why an additional crossing point is required. The footpath only requires a defined cycle path to be painted on as it is sufficiently wide enough as a shared route. |
| (o7) Local resident, (Kidlington, The Moors) | Concerns – I welcome the inclusion of a signal-controlled toucan crossing and the provision of a wider footway/cycleway, which will improve crossing opportunities and support active travel along Bicester Road. However, this scheme represents a missed opportunity to deliver high-quality infrastructure. The use of a shared path, rather than providing clear segregation between pedestrians and cyclists, is disappointing. On a busy corridor such as this, shared use is likely to lead to conflict, discomfort, and reduced usability for both groups. This |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>approach is not in line with LTN 1/20, which makes clear that shared use should be avoided on busy roads and that separate, protected provision for cycling should be provided wherever possible.</p> <p>It is also a missed opportunity that the junction with the new access road from Bicester Road does not include a raised table. LTN 1/20 promotes continuous footways and cycle tracks across side roads, with designs that slow turning traffic and give clear priority to pedestrians and cyclists. A raised table would help to reduce speeds to 20 mph, which should be the speed limit in the new neighbourhood, while also providing traffic calming and a continuous, legible route.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the plans provide no information about the responsiveness of the crossing demand button (PDU). At the existing crossing near Sainsbury's, pedestrians and cyclists have to wait more than 20 seconds after pressing the button before receiving a green signal. This level of delay is unacceptable and discourages use, particularly for active travel. LTN 1/20 emphasises the importance of minimising delay for pedestrians and cyclists, and there is no justification for replicating this issue at the new crossing. The new crossing should be designed to respond promptly (like the PDUs at the redesigned roundabout).</p> <p>In summary, while the crossing itself is welcome, the scheme falls short of LTN 1/20 best practice and should be improved to provide segregated facilities, a raised-table side road crossing, and responsive signal timings.</p> |
| (o8) Local resident, (Kidlington, Cromwell Way) | No objection – Restricting parked cars |
| (o9) Local resident, (Kidlington, Marlborough Avenue) | Object – There are enough obstacles on this road already |
| (o10) Local resident, (Kidlington, The Moors) | Support – This is good news for cyclists as it's extremely unsafe to cycle on the parallel Oxford road due to the vast number of pot holes |
| (o11) Local resident, (Oxford, Buckler Road) | Concerns – The section of cycle path as you go across the roundabout and then where it abruptly ends at Sainsburys where cars are coming out from the Petrol station is very dangerous. Cars aren't looking for cyclists at all. This is an accident waiting to happen. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| <p>(o12) Member of public, (Oxford, Wentworth)</p> | <p>Object – This will give a poor experience for cyclists and pedestrians as it doesn't provide a single continuous path on the southern side of the Bicester Road.</p> <p>The shared pedestrian/cycle path on the northern side of the road is in very poor shape. The tarmac is pot-holed and full of tree root damage.</p> <p>As a result, cyclists often ride on the road, which is dangerous, especially as the road is heavily trafficked with cars and buses.</p> <p>It would be preferable to have the northern path for pedestrian use and a dedicated two way cycle path on the entire southern side of the Bicester Road, continuing the two-way cycle path that is at the Sainsbury's roundabout. This separation would ensure safe travel for cyclists, pedestrians and cars, alike.</p> |