



Address to Transport CMD – 3 September 2026

[Agenda for Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport on Thursday, 3 September 2026, 10.00 am | Oxfordshire County Council](#)

Proposed Countywide Electric Vehicle Bays

We in the active travel community are concerned by the proposed approach to EV only charging bays.

There are two overarching problems with the approach in this proposal.

First, it does not follow the first policy of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan – which is the prioritisation of pedestrians. In many cases it would create obstacles on pavements. The approach should not be pavement first – it should consider where chargers can be put without causing obstruction to people. And it should follow your own standards which state that minimum widths are 2 metres, and 3 metres in busier places, not reduce them for car user convenience.

Second, there is no strategy guiding the use of some of the most important real estate that you control – the kerbside – the 2 metres or so at the edge of the carriageway. As a result, we are seeing here and in other proposals a piecemeal approach to suggesting what should go in a particular place, without due consideration to its potential uses. Car parking is only one use – the space might be better used for cycle parking, micromobility, a rain garden, a pocket park, a bus stop, or a dozen other possible uses.

We are disappointed in further policies on parking that disadvantage pedestrians on top of previous ones that have missed active travel opportunities. There is a gap between policy and delivery here.

On specifics, some of these schemes are deliverable in an acceptable way because they use carriageways, wide pavements or other spaces. These are:

- (b) Whitehouse Road
- (d) Botley Road
- (f) Berinsfield
- (g) Burford
- (h) Deddington
- (i) The Phelps
- (j) Cuddesdon Way if pavement of 2 metres remains

We also agree with

(k) Hamilton Road as amended

(n) Shrivenham if the four bays are at the widest part

We agree with the deferral or not pursuing

(p) Witney

(q) Carterton

(r) Eynsham.

Sites that should be rejected or deferred to find a better solution are:

(a) Hockmore Street

(b) Water Eaton Road

(e) Cowley Road as it is not consistent with the LCWIP cycle route

(l) Clements Road

(m) Bampton

(o) Latimer Road

Bicester Sheep Street

Bicester Sheep Street used to be in the crazy situation of being a road on the National Cycling Network on which you weren't allowed to cycle. And yet, you were allowed to drive, even a large lorry if you held the right permit.

When this scheme was proposed there were dozens of objections – we were warned that carnage would ensue. But the monitoring data shows that during the trial, things have continued much as they ever did. There has not been a huge influx of racing cyclists. There has not been the bloodshed that some people were rather ridiculously predicting. Just a moderate increase in cycling activity, probably increasing the sales of the cafes.

As the Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel, we are happy to support the sensible improvement to access that has been proven to be beneficial and not problematic.

In addition, we don't see any problem with allowing that access to continue on a Friday. Much like the other six-and-a-half days a week, the concerns raised against cycling for 7 hours on a Friday are a chimera, built on prejudice, not data. They lead to unnecessary complication and street clutter.

We think that the cycling access should be clear and simple, seven days a week. We know it is healthy. It has proven to be safe. Go elsewhere in Europe and in markets you'll find people stuffing their cycle panniers and baskets with produce. Let's not restrict people because of a few unevidenced views.

So please approve this as permanent, with seven days a week access for cycling.

Rose Hill Service Road

With its high casualty record, it is clear that something needs to be done here.

Motorists turning left across cycle traffic is a strong source of danger, more so if they are rat-running and so inherently more interested in speed than safety, and the cycle lane is poorly defined.

Reducing turns for rat-running is a significant contributor to the success of the East Oxford LTNs in reducing road casualties by about ten every year. So, there should be no doubt that reducing turns can reduce casualties here and the question is more about how.

The approach proposed is the minimal one. We are frankly puzzled that the statement in paragraph 12 is that “an “access only” restriction, or just advisory signing ... are considered ... to be ineffectual and not worthy of further evaluation” and yet this is what is proposed.

Experience with the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods has shown that there are some drivers that put their own convenience above the law or the safety of others, and wilfully ignore road casualty impacts to gain places in the queue. The police failed to enforce those causing huge misery to residents, and are unlikely to enforce this. And here, a resident exemption will weaken the restriction further. Like officers, we are concerned that this approach will have limited effect.

Also, it is not combined with physical measures to reduce collisions, such as a side road entry treatment, or even highlighting the cycle track in coloured tarmac – as is increasingly the practice in other cities. We’d like to see at least one of these in place.

This is not some arbitrary design decision, people’s lives are at stake – there have been seven similar collisions in three years, two serious, and any of these could have turned fatal if the dice had fallen differently. We think that stronger measures should be deployed.

Bladon to Long Hanborough 40mph

This short stretch of road has a visible poor safety record, but also an invisible safety problem.

Visibly, there have been seven crashes in only five years, two of them serious. Four of those have been at the Lower Road junction, two at the Cassington Road junction, and one is a single vehicle being overturned on the way out of Hanborough. It's obvious that speed is a factor here – not the only factor, but certainly a factor.

The less visible problem is the healthy travel that this suppresses. An active travel route between Bladon and Hanborough has three options. In daylight, you can take the winding route through Blenheim Palace. You could cycle on the road, but 50mph traffic is a strong deterrent. Or you could walk or cycle on the pavement – but even there cycling next to 50mph traffic with no buffer is a big deterrent, so not many people will.

Reducing the speed limit to 40mph makes both of these options safer and more tolerable, although still not to guidance. The absolute minimum buffer for a 50mph road is 1.5 metres, at 40mph it is 0.5 metres.

So, we support this proposal. It is another sensible step towards Vision Zero, but it does not solve the problem of a 24/7 safe active travel route between Bladon and Hanborough.

20mph speed limits in Great Tew, Westwell and Shepherds Pit Lane

The evidence for the casualty reduction benefits of 20mph speed limits is now overwhelming. As one example, independent research from Imperial College, found that 20mph schemes reduce crashes by 26% and casualties by 23%, and even sign-only schemes reduce crashes by 22% and casualties by 11%¹.

In Oxfordshire, the number of people Killed or Seriously Injured in 20 or 30mph speed limits combined have reduced by 39% since 2022, despite a growing population and more roads in these classifications.

None of these schemes should be controversial among anyone who wants people to live long and happy lives.

Great Tew is a lovely and mostly peaceful village. The three objectors all say there will be no benefit to the speed reduction, and they are proven wrong by the 39% reduction in serious and fatal casualties over the last three years. We support this.

Westwell is a small section near Burford. The study by Imperial College notes the effectiveness in reducing casualties of sign-only schemes. And signs in 20mph speed limits do not need to be lit, enabling potential future savings and de-urbanisation. We support this.

The speed limits for Shepherds Pit Lane need to be considered alongside the coming Quiet Lane proposal. You'll note the huge support from local residents and people looking for safer active travel. There is strong desire to make this a calm and traffic free route, and the speed limits are the first step.

None of the objectors appear to recognise this context. The Police response for example states that this is highly inappropriate, but does not say why 20mph is inappropriate for a Quiet Lane. Active Travel England's Rural Design Guide is very specific: "20mph is the recommended speed limiting on routes that form part of the designated active travel network." With this route becoming a Quiet Lane, it fits that category.

Another objection is a request for a quiet route all the way from Barton to Stanton to St John, we would support that, but we consider this proposal is a building block towards it.

In summary, we support safer roads and so we support the recommendations for all three of these 20mph speed limits.

¹ <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001457525002969>