

CMD Transport (18 June 2026) – Proposed 30mph Extension – Langford Lane, Kidlington (Danny Yee)

We support reducing the speed limit on the western half of Langford Lane to 30mph, and welcome the acceptance that sub-standard walking and cycling provision can drive this kind of change. (We would like to see this picked up in the 20mph program and the A and B road speed limit review.) But we are concerned that this is still patching over the problem -- an isolated change doing the minimum necessary in response to a Road Safety Audit.

At the moment walking along Langford Lane is uncomfortable, unpleasant and dangerous, and cycling is even worse. (The absence of cycling injuries here is because very few people dare to cycle here.) Cycling with large volumes of traffic at up to 60mph is hair-raising, while the footway is too narrow for walking, let alone for two-way cycling - much of it is barely one metre wide, and in one place that has to fit in a bus stop as well.

Reducing the speed limit from 60mph to 30mph will only ameliorate this, not fix the underlying problem, especially as compliance with a 30mph speed limit seems likely be poor. Even if the speed limit were reduced to 20mph and enforced with average speed cameras, there would still be too much traffic for inclusively accessible cycling on carriageway and the footway would remain sub-standard. (The road lanes appear to be about 3.4m wide, right in Active Travel England's "do not have lanes this wide when sharing with cycling" zone.)

Stepping backwards, what kind of a road is Langford Lane?

Langford Lane carries high volumes of through motor traffic, and will carry more with developments at Begbroke and Yarnton. The nearest alternatives are Frieze Way 3.5km to the south -- Sandy Lane is almost certainly going to be closed to motor traffic at some point and is hardly suitable for high volumes - or Upper Campsfield Rd a kilometre to the north. So Langford Lane is a key part of the motor traffic network. It would also be a significant part of any comprehensive cycling network, as it is the most direct route between Woodstock and Kidlington. It should, we feel, be reclassified as a B road.

Along with that would come a recognition that it needs proper walking and cycling infrastructure: at a minimum a three metre wide shared use path with a proper buffer from the carriageway. As the report says, this would be a major undertaking, but it should be possible to fit into the highway boundary given the verges on both sides. And if this is set as a clear goal then it could potentially happen - there will be further developments in the area - and if not, it won't.

The broader theme here is, again, the need for a framework into which schemes arising from developments can be fitted. We look forward to seeing the Movement and Place Plan for Kidlington and its surrounds, which should provide a clear plan for the walking, cycling, and motor traffic networks.