

Reference: CM/12.6. 100/P0356

Response to Proposed Parking Restrictions on the Unrestricted Side of the 110m Section of Radley Road (submitted via email 12-12-2025)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal to introduce waiting restrictions along the *entire* length of the currently unrestricted (southern) side of the 110-metre section of Radley Road.

Earlier consultation:

OCC senior parking officer stated in email of 11-12-2025 received in response to my enquiry as to the nature and content of the consultation that has fed into the current proposal:

“Specifically, the proposals for Radley Road were drawn up in response to requests from the local County Councillors for the area (Councillor Fawcett and Councillor Greenaway), who advised that the specific suggestion of stopping parking on Radley Road came up in the stakeholder meetings we had with the bus companies when we were negotiating the 20mph scheme for Abingdon. Further to their request, officers reached out the bus company operating in the area to ask whether they experience delays and they confirmed they do and they would benefit from restrictions.”

The proposal letter of 12-11-2025 refers to “*addressing issues arising from obstructive parking on currently unrestricted sections of the highway*”, although this was not referred to in the above note from the senior parking officer. The proposal letter of 12-11-2025 also refers to “*informal consultation with residents carried out in November 2024*” although no information has been shared with me to inform my response. I do see that a post on Facebook stressed

After reviewing the available consultation material, the current street layout, and the issues cited as justification, I would like to submit the following response.

1. The proposed full-length restriction is disproportionate for the section of Radley Road given the limited parking available and the limitations to the scope for off-road parking

Department for Transport statutory guidance and the common practice of county councils both emphasise that: **waiting restrictions must be the least-restrictive measure necessary to resolve a proven problem.**

On a short road such as this one, removing parking across the entire 110 metres would:

- eliminate virtually all legal parking available to residents, visitors and tradespeople,
- cause displacement onto nearby streets already under pressure, and
- have a far greater negative impact than would be proportionate for a problem that is only occasional.

1.a The proposal refers to the approximately 110 metre length of Radley Road (southern side) between the two mini roundabouts.

However, the length of the road that is currently unrestricted is roughly 104 metres. There are two sub sections, an initial section running alongside the two buildings that make up the Farriers Court development which has parking spaces for about 5 or 6 cars, and a longer section of around 77

metres adjacent to the row of older semi-detached houses Nos 6-24. Using the OCC's own design guidelines of 6m bays, this stretch would provide just under 13 spaces.

Of the approximately 77m section of unrestricted parking between the end of the current DYLs outside No.4 and No.24, the last house in the row, there are a number of dropped kerbs and driveways, including a recently implemented Keep Clear section, which further reduce the available space to around 48 to 50 metres, providing for up to 8 vehicles (these are approximate measurements).

I appreciate that parking spaces on the highway are not allocated to individual houses and residents do share the road with visitors, tradesmen and other vehicle users.

Because of the very short length of this section of Radley road, and the already limited parking availability, even small reductions in parking will have large consequences. A blanket restriction is therefore excessive. I think the County Council should consider much more precise and low-impact interventions – if they are proven to be necessary in the first place.

Below is a table that shows the current usage pattern of the section of Radley Road Nos 2-24, based on my experience and understanding as a long-term resident:

House number	Off street parking spaces	Off street parking used	On street parking directly outside property?	Who uses it?	Road markings	Notes
2	2	2	0	-	Double yellow	No on parking at all but the largest off-road parking space on this section of the road, front wall removed
4	1	1	0	-	Double yellow	Recently restored front garden - one car family, sometimes parked on street close by
6	1*	1	1	No.4 Others	None	One car family usually parked off road *would struggle to park two cars in the space without removing/remodelling wall
8	1	0	1	No.8 Carers/Family	None	No car, family visiting who park outside
10	1	1	1	No.10 mainly	None	2 cars, 1 off, 1 on road In constant use, some overhang
12	1*	0	0	No.12 on occasion, otherwise not used	Keep Clear (from 8/23)	1 car. Restricted space (depth) front garden, *drive too narrow [under 3m] for modern cars (even small hatches) would be difficult to create two parking spaces. Cannot

						park outside house due to Keep Clear markings
14	1	1	0	No.14 family/carer on occasion	Keep Clear (from 8/23)	Remodelled, wall removed, space for one car some overhang, Carer/family parking required but restricted due to Keep Clear markings
16	1*	0	1	No.14 family/carer on occasion	None	No car, *drive too narrow for modern cars [under 3m] (even small hatches) – I often use this space overnight.
18	2	TBC	1	Various	None	Recently sold, single unit now. No front wall, no dropped kerb, was no car now up to two more, front garden removed, no border wall with pavement
20	1	1	1	No.20	None	2 cars, 1 off, 1 on road
22	1*	1	1	No.22	None	
24	2	2	1	No.24	None	No.24= 1 in front, 1 to side
Totals	15	10 TBC	8			
Farriers Court	Internal parking TBC	Not checked	5-6	Not sure	None	One regular van parked outside overnight assume resident

1.b Limited capacity to increase off-road parking

Please bear in mind that the depth of the front gardens varies. The semis opposite the OLA school entrance (i.e. from Nos 10-16) have the shallowest front gardens. This does not allow for parking of more than one car on their drives.

For example, the distance from the bottom of my bay window to the garden side of my front wall is 3.5m and allowing for a 20cm surround, it means that most modern cars of 4.5m plus, if parked perpendicular to the house, will overhang the pavement. The width of the side of the house leading to the back garden in my house is approximately 2m - I would not be able to park a car and get out.

The depth of my front garden drive section is 4m maximum so I would either have to be ok with overhanging the pavement or remove the front garden completely and park the car sideways/diagonally across the front of the house. Even then, if the car is an estate, or an SUV, it is still likely to overhang the pavement. This is the case with several of the cars parked on the drives of houses in the street now.

It will also mean that the view from the bay window could be of the side of my car. It means that visitors and delivery drivers will have to weave around my car to reach the front door - generally reducing the functionality of building access for people and lowering the quality of the experience of living at the property.

1.c The proposal is inconsistent with existing parking restrictions applied to adjacent sections of Radley Road

Further along the road, crossing over the mini-roundabout and heading north in the Radley Village direction, there is a long stretch of older terraced houses running from the northern side of Radley Road opposite the OLA sports grounds up to the local primary schools. There is similarly long stretch of unrestricted parking opposite this terraced section of the road. It is not clear to me why this section has not been included in the proposal. Many of the terraced houses have been able to accommodate quite deep perpendicular parking for 2 or even 3 cars, but there are also narrow stretches of road where the adjacent off road parking places that have been introduced over the years are extremely cramped.

2. The obstruction described is occasional and largely caused by tradespeople performing essential work

2.a Given the age of the houses from no.2-24, I think it's reasonable to make allowance for tradespeople to park their vehicles - as other residents may well need to have work done on their property over time.

For example, No.18 has recently been sold and converted back from flats into a single dwelling. This meant that up to a couple of vans were regularly parked outside for a period of weeks over the summer while works were underway. However, as the property was vacant, there was no extra pressure on parking - one van was parked off road, while the other was on the road when working on the house. I think people are prepared to show a bit of give and take in these situations.

I had my windows replaced a couple of years ago and neighbours understood that vans had to come and go during the day for the work to go ahead.

Tradespeople need to park their vans near the work they are undertaking in the street, and given the age of the properties, I think most people understand that the need for access is likely to be both necessary and ongoing.

2.b I have lived at number █ Radley road since █. It is true that there are occasions when vehicles other than those belonging to residents have been left for periods of time, but I think that is relatively rare. From experience, I would say two or three times a year at the most.

It is annoying when it happens, but I think better enforcement is the answer and by making residents aware of how they can alert the Council (or Police, if necessary) the problem can be reduced - but as I say, I don't think it is significant enough on Radley Road to justify the inconvenience and reduction in the quality of life that the proposed blanket restrictions will impose on its residents

2.c When Our Lady's (OLA) school was open, there were also times when a very small number of parents/carers would wait temporarily on double yellow lines around the Penlon place entrance and leading up to No.2 Radley Road but that issue was addressed a couple of years ago by the school in its communications with parents, and when the school opened up a pick up and drop off location at their training grounds at the top of Audlett Drive. I assume that if the school re-opens, the option of using the Audlett Drive pick-up and drop off facility will be restored.

2.d I have rarely, if ever, had a vehicle parked across the dropped kerb to my property.

2.e The other occasions when there is an increase in unwanted parking is during the annual town fair, but that is really part of living in Abingdon!

2.f The earlier consultation indicated that the local bus companies expressed concern about delays around the time of the introduction the 20mph speed limit in town. I think we have all moved on from that period and have adapted our driving speeds accordingly. Please bear in mind that there was also a prolonged spike in congestion when the temporary traffic lights were in operation over the bridge in town and that may well have had an influence on the bus companies at the time.

2.g I would say that post pandemic, and with more people working from home or having more flexible working rotas, there is markedly less traffic, particularly on Fridays. Conversely, there is more demand for parking during the day while people are WFH.

In conclusion, I believe a permanent, full-length restriction penalises all users for an issue that is neither continuous nor structural.

3. Targeted interventions would be a more appropriate and proportionate solution

This 110-metre stretch already contains:

- **DYLs** along the entire northern side;
- an additional **10-metre advisory keep-clear section** installed on the northern and southern sides **without prior consultation**;
- dropped kerbs (approximately 38ms in total length)
- **DYLs** on the approach and exits of the southern section of the road

Given this context, best practice would favour **precise, minimal adjustments** rather than removing all parking.

Appropriate targeted measures could include a **small short-stay/service bay and resident parking zone**

These measures would resolve any objectively identified issues without imposing significant restrictions on residents who already have very limited on street parking.

4. The advisory “keep clear” marking was installed without consultation; further loss of parking would compound this

The installation of a 10-metre advisory keep-clear area took place without consultation in August 2023, introducing full restrictions on the southern side would **double that loss**, leaving no usable kerbside parking for the street. This would be a disproportionate measure to take and would reduce the quality of life for the residents of the street.

5. Full-length restrictions on both sides would increase vehicle speeds at the approach to the town centre

If the council places continuous double yellow lines along the entire southern side, both sides of this 110-metre section would become permanently free of parked vehicles.

5.a This has a predictable and well-documented effect: **drivers increase speed when a road feels wider and less constrained.**

This is particularly problematic here because:

- Schoolchildren and their carers from the two primary schools further up Radley Road use the route in and out of town on a daily basis, and their safety, particularly during the darker winter days, should be a priority.
- this section of the road leads directly to a tight cornered mini roundabout **into the town centre**, and also Oxford road where vehicle speeds should be moderated; the small adjacent traffic island is often used by pedestrians. Please bear in mind that there are no pedestrian crossings over this section of Radley Road (or traffic calming measures) and I think having a line of parked cars actually helps in discouraging drivers to go too fast.
- increased speeds created by an absence of parking at a town-centre gateway such as this undermines pedestrian safety and local accessibility objectives.
- parked cars currently provide natural traffic calming;
- removing parking on both sides creates the visual impression of a wide, clear carriageway, encouraging higher speeds;

In short: blanket restrictions would likely **create a new safety risk** by increasing traffic speed—exactly where slower speeds are desirable.

5.b We want large vehicles in particular, to be approaching this section of Radley Road at a safe speed – this includes buses as well as HGVs. The bus companies should bear in mind that the other sections of Radley Road are narrow and involve drivers giving way to oncoming vehicles as there is a long line of unrestricted parking just over the Audlett drive mini roundabout – it would therefore seem illogical to implement a measure that would have the effect of speeding up traffic for a very limited section the Radley Road.

5.c The proposal would lead to increased risks of accidents with pedestrians and vehicles as all residents with cars would have to drive them over the pavement into the road. It is true that some residents reverse into their drives when returning home, but a lot don't and that will mean reversing over the pavement into the path of potentially faster oncoming traffic (as a result of the restrictions), and potentially being distracted and missing pedestrians and cyclists while they focus on finding a gap in the traffic.

5.d The ever-increasing length of modern cars means that they will overhang the relatively narrow pavement, obstructing pedestrians.

6. Damage to the street landscape

The part of Radley Road in question is made up of a row of Edwardian semi-detached houses, which are comparatively rare in this part of the town (there are a limited number of larger semis from this period at the end of St John's road) but most late Victorian/Edwardian era houses in this part of Abingdon are terraced.

Originally each of the houses would have had a walled front garden. Unfortunately, in my opinion, many of the properties have been adapted for off street parking, either by constructing a smaller wall or by removing the garden wall completely - this has included removing the attractive sloped dividing walls as well on two of the buildings (see table), leaving ugly parking-lot type spaces adjoining the pavement.

The cumulative visual impact is an irregular pattern of drives and replacement walls, of different shapes and sizes. Some owners have attempted to preserve a foot path to their respective front

doors, with a shortened wall between the front gate and car entrance. Most have no gates on the drive. Cars are parked either diagonally alongside the bay windows or perpendicular to the houses, with some overhang, and restricted access to the front door.

A couple of the houses have older remodelled walls (such as no.12 and 16) but their drives are too narrow to accommodate the size of modern hatchback (let alone SUVs). My front garden wall to the road is made of the original wall but with a driveway adapted to the width of cars in the 1960s - i.e. Ford Popular. Even a small hatchback would be too wide to get into the drive so it would have to be rebuilt at considerable expense and inconvenience.

7. Potential damage to property values

7.a I have referred to the parking spaces outside No. 6-24 as I know them best, and believe that they were bought on the tacit understanding that the adjacent on road parking was a valuable and intrinsic feature of the properties - I think people do appreciate that parking restrictions can change, and that parking is not allocated, but I think it would be very high handed to loftily dismiss concerns about the effect on property values without reflecting on the impact this proposal could have on the local residents.

7.b There is no doubt that a total restriction comprising DYL on this section of the Radley Road, and in the wider central east area, as proposed, would create a *considerable* problem of displacement leading to stress and anxiety for many of the residents and reducing the accessibility of the town centre, with consequent impact on the sustainability of local businesses. I am concerned that there are no mitigation measures referred to in the proposal.

Summary

The proposal does not meet the proportionality or “least-restrictive” tests required in TRO decision-making

Local authorities must:

- balance safety with amenity,
- consider displacement effects,
- retain essential parking wherever feasible,
- and use only the minimum restriction necessary to address the problem.

A full-length restriction on the southern side fails these tests because:

- the issue is not persistent or daily,
- micro-measures can fully resolve the problem,
- the impacts on residents and the functioning of the street would be severe,
- the loss of natural traffic calming introduces new risks.

Potential alternative measures:

A balanced, best-practice solution would include:

1. **One or two short stay/service bays** to accommodate tradespeople safely;
2. **Operational management and targeted enforcement** for the occasional problem – I would not be averse to the implementation of a **resident parking zone** after appropriate consultation

3. **Retention of the majority of the existing kerbside parking**, which is vital and proportionate.

This package of measures would address the stated concerns **without** the negative effects of a full parking ban.

Conclusion

For the short section of Radley Road where obstruction is occasional, where one side is already fully restricted, and where a keep-clear zone has already reduced capacity, the proposal for full-length waiting restrictions on the remaining side is disproportionate and contrary to established best practice.

I have serious concerns about the effect that the proposal will most likely have on the speed of traffic heading into Abingdon, and the safety implications that this would have for all road users and pedestrians.

A targeted, proportionate approach will resolve the issue effectively while protecting safety, local amenity and the character of the approach into the town centre.

For these reasons, I hope that OCC will significantly revise the proposed restrictions

I therefore oppose the proposed full-length restriction and request that the council instead adopt the targeted measures set out above.

Thank you for considering this response.

Radley Road
Abingdon

12-12-2025