

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 13 October 2016 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 11.25 am

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor David Nimmo Smith – in the Chair

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Nick Hards (for Agenda Item 2)
Councillor Steve Curran

Officers:

Whole of meeting G. Warrington; C. McCarthy & D. Tole (Environment & Economy)

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
5	D. Gildea (Environment & Economy)
6	M. Wasley (Environment & Economy)
10	V. Fletcher & S. Halliwell (Environment & Economy)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

82/15 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

Councillor Nick Hards

"The draft "Outline Planning Master Plan" for the proposed Didcot Technology Park includes a Location Plan which shows the Science Bridge and associated link road. Given that the funding for the Science Bridge has not yet been secured, and that the A4130 Northern Perimeter Road suffers from severe congestion at the morning and evening peak times, can the Cabinet Member for Environment please explain what steps are being taken to ensure that the impacts of the proposed development will be acceptable before a Local Development Order is granted under Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework?"

Response from Cabinet Member for Environment

“Informal liaison between the Didcot Technology Park developers and OCC officers is just starting, as nothing has formally been submitted to OCC. Given the sites location on the network we will request that the applicant model its transport impact both with and without the major planned infrastructure in the area - to ascertain its impact on the local road network. This is what we did for the Didcot A site next door. If their modelling shows a severe impact on any of the local junctions we would need to work with the Vale of White Horse, as the planning authority, to secure mitigation works – either through a S106 attached to the LDO and/or through agreement with the Vale that the EZ Business Rate return can be utilised for that purpose.

As you are aware we are undertaking work to establish the route the new river crossing would take. One of the two preferred options would go through the technology park site. We will get the developers to assess the impact their development would have on both river crossing options. We will request that the applicant safeguard the route through their site, to ensure that as we progress with the option assessments we retain a deliverable route.”

Supplementary question From Councillor Hards

“Will further mitigation measures be carried out if traffic modelling shows they are required whether the science bridge is built or not.”

Response by the Cabinet Member

“They will cover whatever is required or needed.”

83/15 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

Petition

Link road at Foxwell Drive.

Mr Nicholas Fell presented a petition containing 56 signatures in the following terms:

“Due to so many laws having been broken, we, the representatives of Northway Residents Group, want, and we are seeking, and asking for, and the residents of Northway more widely, now demand, nothing less than a public enquiry, to ensure that the land is restored back, to its previous condition.”

He advised that the number of signatories was a clear indication of the level of local support for restoration and was confident that there more to come. That he hoped would persuade the County Council to act in a more positive way.

The Cabinet Member for Environment received the petition and asked officers to respond.

Public Address

<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Item</i>
Leslie Tomkins, Local Resident Patrick Heritage, Resident Steve Dawe, Chair Bullingdon Community Association)) 5. CPZ – Lye Valley, Headington)))
David Baldwin, Stonesfield Parish Council	8. Traffic calming amendments – Woodstock Road, Stonesfield

84/15 PROPOSED TOUCAN CROSSING - A423 SOUTHAM ROAD, BANBURY

(Agenda No. 4)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE4) a report presenting an objection and comments received in the course of a statutory consultation on a proposal to install a toucan crossing on the A423 Southam Road approximately 100 metres north of its junction with Dukes Meadow Drive, Banbury to help improve pedestrian and pedal cyclist safety in light of a development of adjacent land for residential purposes.

Mr Tole advised that the crossing was required as part of the permission for the development but that every effort would be made to make the crossing as unobtrusive as possible. He confirmed that it was also intended to provide a footway on the west side.

The Cabinet Member advised that having visited the site he was aware of the geometry of the area and welcomed the confirmation that a footway was to be provided on the west side. Accepting that all alternatives had been looked at and having regard to the arguments and options set out in the report he confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve implementation of the proposal as advertised and described in the report CMDE4.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Dated.....

85/15 PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE - LYE VALLEY AREA, HEADINGTON, OXFORD

(Agenda No. 5)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE5) a report presenting comments received in the course of a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce a new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and Resident Permit Parking scheme in the Lye Valley Area of Headington in Oxford.

Leslie Tomkins called for designated parking spaces. A resident of Dene Road he wanted to see a secure route for through traffic to enable a safer passage for emergency vehicles and pedestrians, many of whom had to walk in the road because of random pavement parking.

Patrick Heritage questioned the need for a CPZ at all. A resident of Dene Road and a local businessman he advised that between 9 am and 5 pm Dene Road was invariably free of parked vehicles and he tabled photographs illustrating that point. He also felt that further restrictions on vehicle size were too restrictive.

Steve Dawe spoke on behalf of the Bullingdon Community Association in support of a CPZ scheme but against the minimum impact element. Without a system of marked bays the current proposal simply would not work nor address many of the problems such as blocked driveways and parking on pavements and road humps. Peat Moors was particularly difficult to negotiate. It was also conceivable that residents would refuse to pay for permits for a zone and system which wasn't working and the Community Association along with other residents' associations would continue to raise these issues.

Mr Tole advised that it was the Council's rationale to address pressure in a particular area by using the TRO process to restrict opportunities for commuter parking by minimising competition for space. Whereas a traditional CPZ with marked bays and signs considerably altered the environment of an area the scheme proposed here because of the self-contained nature of the Lye Valley area offered a level of adequate control without being too prescriptive about where residents could park and park sensibly. This was the first zone in the city to offer flexibility of short term parking or permit parking throughout a minimum impact zone. He was confident that removing commuters would achieve more space for residents and that contractor or visitor permits would not be compromised. Further development expected in Headington would inevitably lead to further parking pressures and it seemed sensible to be prepared for that. Officers considered this a good scheme but he suggested that a review could be undertaken after 6 months operation to gauge how the scheme was working and to make any variations if necessary. It was important to produce a scheme that worked for local people.

Responding to a question from the Cabinet Member regarding protection of driveways he advised that a review could look at that issue but in the meantime advisory white lines could be offered. However, a charge for that would need to be levied.

Also the narrow point of Dene Road near Bulan Road would need to be monitored to address potential issues of pavement parking.

Acknowledging the representations which had been made to him and the concerns raised the Cabinet Member however considered that the current situation allied with expected increased pressure from proposed further development in the area meant that doing nothing was not a realistic option. Therefore having regard to the arguments and options set out in the report and the representations made to him he confirmed his decision as follows:

- (a) approve the implementation of the Lye Valley CPZ proposals as advertised and amended as set out in the report CMDE5;
- (b) ask officers to undertake a 6 month review of the scheme and to make any adjustments that might be required following proper consultation and if necessary further approval by the Cabinet Member for Environment.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Dated.....

86/15 PROPOSED PUFFIN CROSSING - CUMNOR HILL, CUMNOR
(Agenda No. 6)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE6) a report which considered responses received to a consultation on the proposal for a new Puffin crossing on Cumnor Hill designed to serve and funded by a development of 192 houses on the former Timbmet site on Cumnor Hill. He also noted comments received from the local member Councillor Janet Godden which had been tabled in the addenda.

In response to the comments by Councillor Godden Mr Wasley confirmed that vegetation would be cleared and the existing pedestrian refuge retained initially but kept under review once the crossing was in operation.

Acknowledging the support of the parish council and local member and having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to him the Cabinet Member confirmed his decisions as follows:

to approve implementation of the proposal as advertised and described in the report CMDE6

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Dated.....

87/15 PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT - BRIGHTWELL-CUM-SOTWELL VILLAGE

(Agenda No. 7)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE7) a report presenting objections and comments received in the course of a statutory consultation on a proposal funded by the Brightwell-cum-Sotwell parish council to replace the existing 30mph speed limit throughout the village south of High Road with a 20mph speed limit.

He also noted the comments in support received from the local member Councillor Lynda Atkins which had been tabled in the addenda sheet.

Mr Tole outlined the proposal and although Thames Valley police and one resident had objected there was a lot of local support for what was considered a good local initiative to promote driving in an appropriate manner.

Accepting that the proposal reflected local conditions and acknowledging the support from the local member and that the scheme was being funded by the parish council the Cabinet Member having regard to the information set out in the report and the representations made to him confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve implementation of the proposal as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Dated.....

88/15 PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING AMENDMENTS - WOODSTOCK ROAD, STONESFIELD

(Agenda No. 8)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE8) a report presenting objections and comments received in the course of a statutory consultation on a proposal to amend the existing traffic calming feature on the Woodstock Road, at the eastern entrance to Stonesfield village.

David Baldwin for Stonesfield parish council explained that Stonesfield was a medium sized village which experienced a great deal of rat running and significant through traffic. The current system worked well with no accidents recorded over the last 5 years but these proposals to amend the existing traffic calming feature on Woodstock Road would encourage traffic to speed and had prompted a great deal of local concern. He referred to paragraph 20 of the report which had indicated that it would be unlikely that a footpath could be provided as a charge on the development. Without that the situation created by faster moving traffic would worsen.

Mr Tole advised that the consultation had been on a proposal from the developer to reduce by ½ the size of the chicane and to install a speed cushion to enable egress from the site. It was a straight road but it was felt that drivers would slow down in order to line up with the cushion. A speed survey carried out in October had indicated the 85th percentile speed in both directions less than 34 mph with a mean average speed of 28 mph. He recognised the concerns regarding the straight road but pointed out that most facilities were accessed from the north side where the footway existed. The highway authority had been faced with facilitating a new vehicle access for an approved residential development of 37 houses which unfortunately was not large enough to fund much of what had been suggested. However, if other development was being considered in the village that could possibly help to secure what was requested but in the meantime it was felt that vehicle activated signing and the proposed change of character around the development including provision of two street lights would encourage reasonable speeds to be maintained.

Responding to the Cabinet Member he advised that a full road hump as opposed to a cushion represented a substantial build and would need to include drainage works to avoid standing water.

Accepting the point made earlier regarding opportunities to be gained from further developments in the village the Cabinet Member considered the proposal a good compromise. Therefore having regard to the information and options set out in the report and the representations made to him at the meeting he confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve implementation of the proposal as advertised and described in the report CMDE8 noting that opportunities to review traffic arrangements and deliver some further measures in Stonesfield could arise if and when further developments were proposed in the village.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Dated.....

89/15 PROPOSED 30MPH SPEED LIMIT EXTENSION - A361 BURFORD ROAD, CHIPPING NORTON

(Agenda No. 9)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE9) a report presenting objections and comments received in the course of a statutory consultation on a proposal to extend the 30mph limit on the A361 Burford Road, southwards from its current terminal point to replace part of the existing 40mph speed limit. The amendment to the speed limit here had been proposed for road safety reasons as a result of a new junction on the A361 which would be created by a residential development of land adjacent to the A361 Burford Road, at the southern end of Chipping Norton.

He also noted comments received from the local member Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles which had been tabled in the addenda sheet.

Mr Tole explained that the changes which had been introduced by the development would alter the nature of this part of the A361. Explaining the rationale for not extending the 30 restriction down to the sports complex he advised that the length of the restriction as proposed ran alongside the length of the new development which, as a consequence, would become more urbanised while the rest of the road down to the sports complex would remain an undeveloped open area of land. The situation would however be kept under review in the light of other developments in Chipping Norton.

The Cabinet Member understood the concerns of the local member regarding extension of the speed limit to the sports complex but on the basis of the arguments and options set out in the report and the representations made to him felt that at this time the proposal was appropriate and confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve implementation of the proposal as advertised.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Dated.....

90/15 OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL INTERNAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2015 - 2020

(Agenda No. 10)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE10) the County Council's Internal Energy Management Strategy 2015-2020 which set out a framework in which to manage energy use in all areas across the County's estate and activities in order to meet the following objectives:

- Maintain corporate energy costs at or below 2014/15 levels by reducing energy use and purchasing energy effectively.
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from county properties and activities by 3% year on year, on average, in line with the Oxfordshire 2030 Sustainable Community Strategy commitment.
- Make use of renewables and innovative new technologies where economically viable to reduce risk of supply, reduce costs and generate income.

Presenting the report Victoria Fletcher highlighted the benefits of the strategy to the County Council and the environment.

Recognising that a lot of what was in the Strategy also fell within the portfolio for the Cabinet Member for property he had taken the opportunity to discuss it with her. Both were happy to support it and so having regard to the information set out in the report he confirmed his decision as follows:

.....

to support the objectives and principles set out in the Oxfordshire County Council Internal Energy Strategy 2015-2020 document.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Dated.....

.....