

In the officers' report, the section on "Corporate Policies and Priorities" fails to even mention Policy 1 in the LTCP, although that must surely be the starting point for the allocation of space between motor vehicles and pedestrians that is a key part of these decisions. Policy 1 is a transport user hierarchy that has walking and wheeling _at the very top_ and "other motorised modes" _at the very bottom_.

The officers' approach is to look at various standards for walking, such as Inclusive Mobility and the Oxfordshire Walking Design Standards, take the most limited provision for pedestrians those allow, and use that as a target, perhaps expanded a little, with the rest of the space assigned to EV charging - ie, to motor traffic. So they target 1.5m for pedestrians on most streets, and 2m on high footfall ones.

That is not how a user hierarchy with pedestrians at the top and private motor vehicles at the bottom works. The starting point for pedestrians should be the _desirable minimums_ in those and other standards - 2m everywhere and 3m on high footfall streets - and every effort should be made to provide better than minimum provision.

So we urge you to take the following actions on individual locations.

a) Parking bays at 7 Hockmore Street, Cowley, Oxford

REJECT this, or DEFER it and ask officers to come back with a scheme with charging infrastructure on-carriageway.

b) Parking spaces at the side of 26 Whitehouse Road, Salter Close, Oxford,
ACCEPT

c) Parking spaces outside 25 Water Eaton Road, Cutteslowe, Oxford,
REJECT this, or DEFER it and ask officers to come back with a scheme with charging infrastructure on-carriageway. The footway is only 2 metres wide.

d) Parking spaces at side of 94 Botley Road, on Binsey Lane, Oxford,
ACCEPT

e) Parking spaces outside 299 Cowley Road, East Oxford,
ACCEPT

f) Parking bays at Green Furlong, Berinsfield,
ACCEPT

g) Parking area on Barns Lane, Burford,
ACCEPT

h) Parking bays at Bull Ring, Deddington,

i) Parking spaces outside 11 The Phelps, Kidlington, pending the Council being unable to find better supported alternative sites in the immediate vicinity via engagement with residents in the Traffic Regulation Order consultation process,

ACCEPT

j) Parking bays outside of 101 to side of 131 Cuddesdon Way, Oxford, pending an alternative off-street site not being deliverable under the same programme.

ACCEPT if the footway can be maintained at 2 metres width, otherwise REJECT or DEFER.

k) Parking bays at side of 68 Hamilton Road, Oxford – amended so that EV charging units are installed on build-outs in the carriageway rather than on the footway,

ACCEPT

l) Parking bays outside 2 Clements Road, Henley-on-Thames – amended to reduce from six to four bays,

REJECT or DEFER and ask officers to come back with a scheme with the chargers on the carriageway (where there is plenty of room).

m) Parking bays at Market Square, Bampton – amended to three bays only (2 x 7kW standard and 1 x 50kW rapid chargers),

DEFER this and ask officers to come back with a scheme with the chargers on carriageway. There is a lot of space here, but it is prime space that should be preserved for people.

n) Parking bays at 26 Shrivenham High Street – amended to four bays only, pending engagement with Shrivenham Parish Council about future plans for Martens Road and Shrivenham Memorial

Hall,

ACCEPT if the four bays are at the eastern end where the footway is widest, otherwise REJECT or DEFER asking for a scheme with on-carriageway chargers.

o) Parking spaces outside of 21 Latimer Road, Headington - amended to four bays, pending the Council being unable to find better supported alternative sites in the immediate vicinity via

engagement with residents in the Traffic Regulation Order consultation process.

REJECT this, or DEFER it and ask officers to come back with a scheme with charging infrastructure on-carriageway.

p) Parking spaces outside Church Green, Witney – defer to consult more fully with Witney Town Council on an amended proposal for four bays (only) in proposed location.
ACCEPT

And we support the abandonment of the schemes in q) and r), both of which we objected to.

I note that no action is proposed for Kings Cross Rd, even though that was one of the sites consulted on. Actual measurements of the proposed location show that the footway is only 1.6m wide, so by the officers' own criteria any EV charging units here would have to be on-carriageway.

We do not believe this would add that much to costs. It also only affects four out of sixteen locations here. And on-carriageway chargers do not need expensive kerb buildouts - bollards will suffice to protect them.

More generally, please make it clear to officers that they should not - with EV charging schemes or otherwise - reduce footway widths below 2 metres, or 3 metres at high footfall locations, unless there is a pressing need and no alternatives are possible.