

Division(s) affected: *Cowley*

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT

18 JUNE 2026

OXFORD: A4142 EASTERN BY-PASS ROAD – PROPOSED SIDE ROAD ENTRY TREATMENT (SRET) TRAFFIC CALMING FEATURE

Report by Director of Environment and Highways

RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet Member is **RECOMMENDED** to:

- a) **Approve the construction of a new ‘Side Road Entry Treatment’ (SRET) traffic calming feature with associated shared-use foot & cycleway at the Gate 5 access to the BMW Mini Plant, as advertised.**

Executive Summary

1. This report presents comments received to a statutory consultation – and the subsequent response to objections from County Council Officers – on proposals to construct a new Side Road Entry Treatment (SRET) traffic calming feature (full carriageway width, to be 75mm high with 1:15 ramp gradients) with a shared-use foot & cycleway, to be located at the Gate 5 access to the BMW Mini Plant, at its junction with the A4142 Eastern By-Pass Road – as shown in **Annex 1**.
2. The proposals have been put forward as a result of s278 works in relation to the development of adjacent land at the BMW plant, which includes the demolition of existing buildings and the extension of the logistics centre (with provision for a new lorry parking area).

Corporate Policies and Priorities

3. 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

4. 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.
5. 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

6. 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, and any other relevant legislation.
7. The scheme has been promoted by Oxfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority and Traffic Authority under the Highways Act 1980, and the Traffic Management Act 2004.

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 Central’, 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

8. No negative implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of the proposals.

Sustainability Implications

9. The proposals have been put forward to help improve road safety in the area, specifically for the more vulnerable pedestrian & pedal-cycle road users.

Risk Management

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

Formal Consultation

11. 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, Oxford City Council, relevant local City Councillors, Blackbird Leys Parish Council, and the local County Councillor representing the Cowley division.
12. During the course of the formal consultation, 16 responses were received via the online survey, with 14 in support, and two partially supporting/raising concerns.
13. Additionally, a further four emails were received directly – with Thames Valley Police not objecting, Oxford Bus Company raising concerns about the positioning of the cushions within the carriageway, and Oxfordshire Liveable Streets (a not-for-profit campaign organisation) supporting, but raising concerns about the specific form of traffic calming being used on cycle routes.
14. 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

15. The works are being proposed as part of planning obligations, and there are future works also proposed on both Horspath Road and Watlington Road in the vicinity.
16. Officers can confirm that the proposed radii for the corners are 4-metres, and the ramp gradients are being reviewed to be adjusted to 1:12 upon confirmation that there is limited bus use.
17. The Highway Agreements Team have actively pre-consulted when the scheme came forward in 2025. The only comment received relating to Gate 5 from stakeholder groups was a request for buff coloured surfacing. This has been implemented in the detailed design. The segregated cycle lane width is currently 2.5m with separate 2.0m footway. However, the developer is not responsible for the approach paths either side of the access so the priority crossing needs to tie in with what is there currently.

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): Chloe Kirby (Senior Engineer – Highway Agreements Central)
 Julian Richardson (Lead Engineer – Highway Agreements Central)

May 2026



DISCLAIMER NOTES:

- THIS DOCUMENT IS COPYRIGHT OF THE ORIGINATOR AND MUST BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL.
- THIS DOCUMENT MUST NOT BE ALTERED, REPRODUCED OR DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ORIGINATOR.
- DISCREPANCIES ARISING AS A RESULT OF THE ORIGINATOR'S INFORMATION BEING ALTERED BY OTHERS.
- ANY DISCREPANCY MUST BE REPORTED TO THE ORIGINATOR.
- DO NOT SCALE THIS DOCUMENT. USE DIMENSIONS ONLY.
- ALL DIMENSIONS MUST BE CHECKED CAREFULLY PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY RELATED WORKS.
- THIS DOCUMENT MUST BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL APPROPRIATE DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY THE ORIGINATOR AND THEIR PRELIMINARY DRAWINGS.
- THE ORIGINATOR ACCEPTS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THIRD PARTIES. THIS MUST BE TREATED AS A WARNING ONLY.
- USERS OF THIS DOCUMENT ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR CHECKING AND/OR REVISIONS CURRENTLY APPLICABLE TO THE INFORMATION PROVIDED.
- PRELIMINARY STATUS OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IS INDICATED BY THE DRAWINGS FOR REFERENCE PURPOSES ONLY. THE ORIGINATOR WILL ACCEPT NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE COMPLETENESS OF INFORMATION UNDER THIS STATUS.
- THE ORIGINATOR'S DESIGN, RECORDS OR NO DESIGN HAS BEEN PREPARED, INPUT, BASED UPON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY OTHERS WHILE THE INFORMATION BELIEVED TO BE RELIABLE. THE ORIGINATOR ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY OF THIS RECORD OR NO DESIGN PROVIDED FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS THAT HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO IT AS A RESULT OF INCORRECT INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE ORIGINATOR. THOSE RELYING ON THE RECORD OR NO DESIGN DOCUMENT ARE ADVISED TO OBTAIN INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION OF ITS ACCURACY.

- NOTES:**
- ALL SECTION 278 WORKS AND MATERIALS TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE HIGHWAY ENGLAND SPECIFICATION FOR HIGHWAYS.
 - ALL EXISTING AND PROPOSED SERVICES, OR PROTECTION REQUIRED, ARE TO BE LAID WITHIN THE TYPE 1 SUB BASE.
 - THE DEPTH AND TYPE OF RESURFACING TO BE CONFIRMED AFTER FURTHER SITE INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING CARRIAGEWAY CONSTRUCTION AND IS TO BE AGREED WITH OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S SITE ENGINEER.
 - EXTENT OF WHITE LINING TO BE AGREED WITH OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S SITE ENGINEER.

PO2	ISSUED FOR FOLLOWING OCC COMMENTS	20102026	TA	ACB
PO1	ISSUED FOR INFORMATION FOLLOWING OCC COMMENTS	30102025	MH	ACB
REV	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHKD
ORIGINATOR:	www.ridge.co.uk			



PROJECT NUMBER: 5021404



IN ASSOCIATION WITH:

-

PROJECT:

BMW OXFORD

TITLE:

**S278
GATE 5 (EASTERN BY-PASS ROAD)
RAMP ARRANGEMENT FOR CONSULTATION**

DRAWN BY: MH CHECKED BY: ACB APPROVED BY: ACB

SCALE @ A3: 1:250 DATE OF REVIEW: OCTOBER 2025

ISO 19650 STATUS:

S3 - Suitable for Review and Comment

DRAWING No: 5021404-RDG-G5-XX-D-C-000010-PO2.dwg

PROJECT:	ORG:	FUNCTION:	SPATIAL:	FORM:	DISCIPLINE:	NUMBER:	REV:
5021404	RDG	G5	XX	D	C	000010	PO2

A. Email responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(e1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	No objection – but raise one concern. As the priority will be in favour of Pedestrians and Cyclist crossing the entrance is there going to be additional warning (signs /lines) to drivers entering and exiting that they have to give precedent.
(e2) Head of Built Environment and Infrastructure, (Oxford Bus Company)	No objection
(e3) Local group/organisation, (Oxfordshire Liveable Streets)	<p>Support/Object – This scheme will greatly improve safety and comfort for people walking and cycling, by tightening up the junction radii and raising the crossing.</p> <p>We do not understand why the ramp is only 1:15, given that bus operators accept 1:12 gradients on ramps. See the 2025 _Bus Services in New Residential Developments_. 1:15 ramps do too little to slow motor vehicles, as evidenced by the SRETs on St Margarets Rd in North Oxford.</p> <p>We also object to the division of the path into separate walking and cycling sections, despite the width being inadequate for that. Given the absence of any buffer to the carriageway and a 30mph speed limit, most people cycling will (unless passing pedestrians) use the space marked for pedestrians; similarly, people walking side-by-side will use the marked "cycle" space. Given that this is and will continue to be used as shared space, it should be marked and signed as such, in accordance with LTN 1/20. (And if width above 3m is available it should be used first and foremost to provide a buffer to the carriageway.)</p>
(e4) Local group/organisation, (Cyclox)	<p>Support/Concerns – Generally Cyclox supports the general tightening of the gate 5 entrance. Cyclox would like to see steeper ramp gradients (1:12) at the entrance/exit.</p> <p>Detailed response:</p>

	<p>Consultation plan is rather lacking in detail to allow effective consultation. The cycle/pedestrian track widths are not stated, nor are the corner radii or gradient. Only the gradient is stated in the public notice.</p> <p>Ramp gradient is too shallow. They should be 1:12. The local bus companies are happy with these, so no reason not to have 1:12 gradient at this location.</p> <p>Corner radii. These look to be approximately 3 m – 4m radii in the drawing. They should be 3m, LTN 1/20 says the corner radii should be no more than 4m (para 10.5.16).</p> <p>Cycle/pedestrian track widths: If 3m or less at the crossing, then the track should be shared use, not segregated. A 3m segregated rack gives 1.5m each way, which is insufficient for passing oncoming cycles, or for walking side by side (para 8.2.8 LTN 1/20).</p> <p>If funds/project scope extended far enough, the adjoining existing segregated track could be made shared use (or even widened for effective shared use)</p>
--	---

B. Online responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(o1) County Cllr, (Oxford, New Road)	Support – Improves safety on this key route for children cycling to football training at Oxford United, and the stadium, as well as children and adults cycling further. Responding in my capacity as AT champion.
(o2) County Cllr, (Oxford, New Road)	Support – This SRET is likely to make cycling and walking in the area considerably safer as it will slow motor traffic down and make drivers more cautious. It therefore aligns with Vision Zero and I support it.
(o3) Local resident, (Cuddesdon, The Green)	Partially support/concerns – I'm responding as a cyclist living in Cuddesdon. My quickest route into Oxford is past the BMW plant. I've stopped using this route because it has too many man-made hazards, such as the

	<p>unsafe and out-of-date chicanes the other side of Horspath and the two BMW gates, which are particularly dangerous at shift changes. Drivers come out in a rush tail-gating each other. Those turning left frequently only look right, failing to see cyclists coming from the left. Arguably, all assume they have the right of way over cyclists. The signage associated with the scheme needs to make it clear that those leaving the site need to look both ways and are required to give way to cyclists and pedestrians crossing the exit as well as cars.</p> <p>Why are you only proposing to make changes at Gate 5? From my own experience, I would strongly argue that the northern gate into Horspath road is more dangerous at shift changes than Gate 5. The sight lines are very restricted, making it difficult for cars to see cyclists until it's almost too late and there are two lanes of cars leaving, not one. The changes made a few years ago seemed to confirm the view of cars leaving the site that they had priority, contrary to the Highway Code and the Council's policies.</p>
(o4) Local resident, (Oxford, Kennedy Close)	Partially support/concerns – Agree with the side road entry treatment, but it also requires "Give Way" road markings for cars exiting the junction before they reach the ramp. In other words it needs to be crystal clear that the cycles proceeding across the junction have priority.
(o5) Local resident, (Kennington, Simpsons Way)	Support – This junction is somewhat dangerous for both pedestrians and cyclists at present, and any improvement would be a good thing.
(o6) Local resident, (Oxford, Boundary Brook Rd)	Support – Cycling past gate 5 currently feels very dangerous. I whole heartedly support schemes that prioritise cyclists, particularly in this situation where the fence/bush obscures views of cars/cyclists.
(o7) Local resident, (Oxford, Bradmore Road)	Support – While cycling is already really great in Oxford, it can be difficult to navigate traversing beyond the ring road, especially if you're new or don't cycle as often. Any additional infrastructure to support pedestrians and cyclists is always a great thing!
(o8) Member of public, (Oxford, Florence Park Road)	Support – Safety improvement for vulnerable road users.

<p>(o9) Local resident, (Oxford, Iffley Road)</p>	<p>Support – As a cyclist I am pleased with this type of traffic-calming measures. I will feel safer cycling around the ring road at this location.</p>
<p>(o10) Local resident, (Oxford, Leopold St)</p>	<p>Support – The current junction is very open/wide and cars pull out without looking properly. This will make it safer for me cycling to work.</p>
<p>(o11) Member of public, (Oxford, Maidcroft Road)</p>	<p>Support – I often cycle from Cowley to Pony Road industrial estate, and on my return journey, this would improve my safety.</p>
<p>(o12) Local resident, (Oxford, Monmouth Road)</p>	<p>Support – It's a bit hard to see exactly what's going on on the plan because of a lack of legend, but assuming the yellow line is the new pavement edge, and that this reduces the radius of curvature of the turning to slow down traffic, this looks like a good thing.</p>
<p>(o13) Local resident, (Oxford, Norreys Avenue)</p>	<p>Support – It would improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians</p>
<p>(o14) Local resident, (Oxford, Stratford St)</p>	<p>Support – Need for safety. I often cycle that way and it can feel dangerous.</p>
<p>(o15) Local resident, (Wheatley, Littleworth village)</p>	<p>Support – The current road design here is dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians passing the factory. My experience is that when heading towards Horspath / Oxford Road a lot of drivers existing the factory just don't look left so don't see approaching bikes, or pedestrians. On a bike, I've experienced a number of near collisions, so I try not to travel when the factory is having a shift change.</p>
<p>(o16) Local resident, (Wheatley, Templars Close)</p>	<p>Support – I regularly cycle from Wheatley to East Oxford using this route past BMW Cowley. After a couple of early near-misses with vehicles at this junction I subsequently always cut diagonally across the BMW car park (in both directions) rather than risk collision by crossing this entrance junction.</p>

	<p>However the improvements are also required to the east at the Horspath Road/Roman Way junction which has terrible sight lines from the cycle path in both directions.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
--	---