



To: Members of the Transport DECISION COMMITTEE

Notice of a Meeting of the Transport Decisions Committee

Thursday, 3 September 2009 at 10.00 am

County Hall

Joanna Simons

Joanna Simons
Chief Executive

August 2009

Contact Officer: **Graham Warrington**

	Membership
<i>Councillors</i>	
Ian Hudspeth	- <i>Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure</i>
Rodney Rose	- <i>Cabinet Member for Transport Implementation</i>

The Agenda is attached. Decisions taken at the meeting will become effective at the end of the working day on 29 April 2009 unless called in by that date for review by the appropriate Scrutiny Committee. Copies of this Notice, Agenda and supporting papers are circulated to all Members of the County Council.

Date of next meeting: 1 October 2009

Declarations of Interest

This note briefly summarises the position on interests which you must declare at the meeting. Please refer to the Members' Code of Conduct in Section DD of the Constitution for a fuller description.

The duty to declare ...

You must always declare any "personal interest" in a matter under consideration, ie where the matter affects (either positively or negatively):

- (i) any of the financial and other interests which you are required to notify for inclusion in the statutory Register of Members' Interests; or
- (ii) your own well-being or financial position or that of any member of your family or any person with whom you have a close association more than it would affect other people in the County.

Whose interests are included ...

"Member of your family" in (ii) above includes spouses and partners and other relatives' spouses and partners, and extends to the employment and investment interests of relatives and friends and their involvement in other bodies of various descriptions. For a full list of what "relative" covers, please see the Code of Conduct.

When and what to declare ...

The best time to make any declaration is under the agenda item "Declarations of Interest". Under the Code you must declare not later than at the start of the item concerned or (if different) as soon as the interest "becomes apparent".

In making a declaration you must state the nature of the interest.

Taking part if you have an interest ...

Having made a declaration you may still take part in the debate and vote on the matter unless your personal interest is also a "prejudicial" interest.

"Prejudicial" interests ...

A prejudicial interest is one which a member of the public knowing the relevant facts would think so significant as to be likely to affect your judgment of the public interest.

What to do if your interest is prejudicial ...

If you have a prejudicial interest in any matter under consideration, you may remain in the room but only for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the matter under consideration, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, whether under a statutory right or otherwise.

Exceptions ...

There are a few circumstances where you may regard yourself as not having a prejudicial interest or may participate even though you may have one. These, together with other rules about participation in the case of a prejudicial interest, are set out in paragraphs 10 – 12 of the Code.

Seeking Advice ...

It is your responsibility to decide whether any of these provisions apply to you in particular circumstances, but you may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer before the meeting.

If you have any special requirements (such as a large print version of these papers or special access facilities) please contact the officer named on the front page, but please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Declarations of Interest - see guidance note opposite**
3. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 8)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2009 (**TDC3**) and to receive for information any matters arising therefrom.

4. **Petitions and Public Address**
5. **Oxford, Summertown CPZ - Minor Amendments** (Pages 9 - 16)

Forward Plan Ref: 2009/112

Contact: David Tole, Team Leader, Traffic Regulations Orders (01865 815942)

10:00 am

Report by Head of Transport (**TDC5**).

In response to requests from local residents, councillors, and businesses the report considers amendments to parking arrangements in a number of streets in and around Summertown CPZ.

The Committee is RECOMMENDED to approve the proposed changes to the Summertown CPZ and Disabled Persons Parking Places Order as advertised in the Oxfordshire County Council (Summertown) (Controlled Parking Zone and Various Restrictions) (Variation No 7*) Order 200*, and the Oxfordshire County Council (Disabled Persons Parking Places - Oxford (Amendment No 7*) Order 200* and described in the report TCD5.

6. **Disabled Persons Parking Places - Oxford** (Pages 17 - 26)

Forward Plan Ref: 2009/111

Contact: Mike Ruse, Traffic Regulation Orders Team (01865 815978)

10:20 am

Report by Head of Transport (**TDC6**).

The report considers proposed provision of 15 new Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPPs) and formalisation of 12 "advisory" DPPPs.

The Committee is RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) authorise variations to the Oxfordshire County Council (Cherwell District) (Disabled Persons' Parking Places) Order 2007 as amended in this report to provide for:**
 - (i) fourteen new DPPP's as set out in Annex 1 to the report TDC6;**
 - (ii) the formalisation of twelve existing advisory DPPP's as specified in Annex 1 to the report TDC6;**
 - (b) not to proceed with provision of a new DPPP's outside No 38 and 2 Canterbury Close, Westminster Way, Banbury.**
-

TRANSPORT DECISIONS COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on 2 July 2009 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 11.40 am

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Keith Mitchell - in the chair

Councillor Ian Hudspeth

Other Members in Attendance:

Councillor Roz Smith (for Agenda Item 7)

Councillor John Sanders (for Agenda Items 7 and 8)

Councillor Roy Darke (for Agenda Item 7)

Councillor David Turner (for Agenda Item 7)

Officers:

Whole of meeting: G. Warrington (Corporate Core); S. Howell (Environment & Economy)

Part of meeting:

Agenda Item

Officer Attending

4	J. Wright (Environment & Economy)
5	P. Wilson & L. Harrison (Environment & Economy)
6	P. Fermer (Environment & Economy)
7	J. White & C. Baird (Environment & Economy)
8	M. Ruse (Environment & Economy)
9 & 10	P. Wilson & T. Currell (Environment & Economy)

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

1/09 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence and temporary appointments were received as follows:

Apology from

Councillor Rodney Rose

Temporary Appointments

Councillor Keith Mitchell

2/09 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: that Councillor Rodney Rose be elected Chairman for the Council year.

3/09 APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: that Councillor Ian Hudspeth be appointed Vice Chairman for the Council year.

4/09 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

The following requests to address the meeting had been agreed:-

Request from	Agenda Item
Simon Hunt)
Sarah King)
Tony Joyce) 7. London Road Improvements – Osler
Michael Haines) Road to Wharton Road
City Councillor David Rundle)
Matthew Phillips	8. Exclusion of Residential Properties from Headington Central and Headington North East CPZs

5/09 OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (BANBURY) (SPEED LIMITS) ORDER 200*
(Agenda Item 4)

The Committee considered (TDC4) the results of a formal consultation on the consolidation of speed limits in Banbury.

RESOLVED: that the Oxfordshire County Council (Banbury) (Speed Limits) Order be made along with provision for appropriate signing.

6/09 OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (BANBURY, WILDMERE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING) (EXPERIMENTAL) ORDER 2008
(Agenda Item 5)

The Committee considered (TDC5) the results of formal consultation on proposals to restrict parking on the Wildmere Industrial Estate in Banbury.

RESOLVED: subject to removal of Wildmere Close from the final scheme to approve formalisation of the Oxfordshire County Council (Banbury, Wildmere Industrial Estate) (Prohibition of Waiting) (Experimental) Order 2008 as a permanent Order.

7/09 C43 BICESTER ROAD, GOSFORD - BUS LANE ORDER
(Agenda Item 6)

The Committee considered (TDC6) proposals to introduce a bus lane on the easternmost lane on Bicester Road, to tie in with the existing bus lane on the Kidlington roundabout in order to help to improve bus journey times, make travel by bus more reliable, encourage greater bus use and address any known safety issues.

Mr Fermer advised that Gosford & Water Eaton Parish Council had withdrawn its objection on the understanding that there would be adequate monitoring of the proposals.

Councillor Hudspeth appreciated the potential benefits of providing a third lane but that the costs of doing so would be prohibitive. The trials carried out on the proposed bus lane had been important and the proposed scheme represented excellent value.

RESOLVED: to

- (a) to approve implementation of the proposed bus lane scheme, as shown on the plan numbered D&I/A1/0322; and
- (b) that the Oxfordshire County Council (A4260 Kidlington) (Bus Lane) (Variation No 2) Order 200* be made and the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Transport Implementation and Growth & Infrastructure, authorised to resolve any concerns or comments which might arise from the detailed design stage or road safety audit process.

8/09 OXFORD - LONDON ROAD IMPROVEMENTS – OSLER ROAD TO WHARTON ROAD
(Agenda Item 7)

The Committee considered (TDC7) progress made on the design for a scheme for transport improvements on London Road, Oxford between Osler Road and Wharton Road in Headington.

Mr Joyce thanked officers for a genuine consultation exercise which had proved very useful and constructive. It was vital that improvements were made to the centre of Headington in order to maintain its vitality. There were still concerns regarding some of the road crossings and the need to include Windmill Road as part of the scheme.

Simon Hunt (Cyclox) considered that one of the aspirations underpinning consultation on improvements in Headington had been to improve conditions for cyclists. The consensus was that this had not been done and that this phase of the scheme had been considered without general need for cycling conditions.

Sarah King recognised that the intention of the County Council had been to improve and speed traffic flow but she highlighted consequent dangers to residents particularly at the junction of Windmill Road and Old Road. Old High Street seemed to be regarded as a minor road although it was very busy with dangerous turning movements off Old Road.

Michael Haines referred to an earlier 2,500 plus signature petition presented to the County Council supporting retention of Headington subway. The subway was a vital link for the less able bodied and mothers with pushchairs to such an extent that people had said they would not visit Headington if the subway was closed. There had been no reported accidents in the subway but many on the carriage way above. Also the murals were part of local history and should be preserved and the expense of closing it should be redirected to modernising the subway.

City Councillor Rundle thanked County officers for the consultation and he hoped that some changes could still be made such as removal of yellow boxes and a reassessment of planting proposals. He referred to the level of support for retention of the subway and asked what would be gained by its closure. Partnership management (involving all stakeholders) of the scheme was important so that that disruption could be kept to a minimum and he called for a wider remit to include Windmill Road.

Councillor Roz Smith thanked officers for the full consultation but stressed the importance of learning from the problems experienced with Phase 1. There was a strong desire for improvements to and regeneration of Headington Centre and she welcomed provision of signage to and within Headington Centre although no provision seemed to have been made to sign pedestrian and cycling access to Bury Knowle Park.

Councillor Darke referred to the continuing problems the County Council faced in dealing with traffic flows on arterial routes. Supporting earlier comments from the Cyclox representative re the level of importance attached to cycling he called for dedicated cycle routes in the City and the need to give strategic importance to cycling.

Councillor Sanders called for removal of contractor equipment and reinstatement of verges following Phase 1 work. He sought assurances that work would be finished on time with single flows kept to a minimum.

Councillor Turner endorsed the comments made regarding cycling and asked whether the scheme could include both the subway and pelican crossing.

Joy White addressed a number of the issues raised.

Officers would be working closely with parking enforcement teams to minimise illegal parking.

TDC3

It would not be possible to extend the scheme to include Windmill Road within the current budget without diluting the main scheme.

Annex 5 to the report dealt with cycling issues and she confirmed that advanced stop lines could be provided but only at a cost of eroding pavement width. It was intended to undertake a review of the wider cycle network.

Old Road was regarded as a minor road but only in the context of vehicle numbers.

The petition calling for retention of the subway had not made it clear that a crossing was to be provided as an alternative. The cost of the subway works represented a small proportion of the scheme costs but its retention along with provision of a crossing represented an expensive investment in maintenance terms. It was proposed to preserve the subway murals on the web.

Removal of yellow boxes could be trialled.

There would be a full review of signing requirements and clarification would be sought regarding signing for Bury Knowle Park.

She concluded that significant lessons had been learnt from Stage 1 and these would be carried forward to Phase 2.

Mr Baird confirmed that the subway was not compliant with specifications for use by less able people and that significant consultation had been undertaken regarding proposals for the subway with significant comments received from Groups representing disabled and mobility impaired people.

Councillor Hudspeth was confident that lessons learnt from Phase 1 would be carried forward and referred to the improvements carried out in Summertown which he hoped would be replicated in Headington. The scheme was designed to improve bus flow and reduce traffic queues as well as regenerate the Headington area. If the subway were retained there would be major maintenance costs and a need to redesign the whole scheme and it would not just be a simple case of diverting any saving to works on Windmill Road. He supported closure of the subway.

Councillor Mitchell referred to the problems of balancing traffic needs within an ancient street pattern. He had been persuaded that the officer advice was sound and he looked forward to Phase 2 being delivered on time and within budget.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) authorise officers to proceed with the detailed design and implementation of the scheme as consulted on but incorporating the

suggested changes as a result of that consultation as set out in Annex 5 to the report TDC7;

- (b) authorise officers to carry out statutory consultations and make any necessary orders arising from the scheme design subject to any objections being reported back to this Committee as necessary;
- (c) endorse the approach taken by officers with respect to the areas of land in private ownership, as outlined in paragraph 22 of the report TDC7.

9/09 EXCLUSION OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES FROM VARIOUS CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE ORDERS, OXFORD
(Agenda Item 8)

The Committee considered a report (TDC8) which considered the proposed exclusion of properties from residential and visitors parking permits in Headington Central and Headington North-East Controlled Parking Zones as a result of various planning permissions granted by Oxford City Council where the consent had been conditional on the removal of permit eligibility.

Mr Phillips spoke against the proposals for 9 Gathorne Road and asked the Committee to approve residential and visitor permits for number 9 and 9A which was being converted into a separate dwelling for him and his family. He operated a 24 hour emergency electrical call out business and needed to park outside his property.

Councillor Sanders considered that it was against the rules of natural justice to remove these spaces retrospectively. Residents were suffering as a result and such moves discouraged house conversion at a time when property was in demand.

Mr Ruse confirmed that this was as a result of a clear condition imposed by the City Council and residents could appeal to the City Council to vary that condition and that the recommendation before the Committee allowed time for them to do that.

RESOLVED: to agree implementation of proposed revisions to the Headington Central and Headington North-East Traffic Regulation Order as advertised.

10/09 OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (DUCKLINGTON PARISH) (30 MPH SPEED LIMIT) ORDER 200*
(Agenda Item 9)

The Committee considered (TDC9) responses received to a formal consultation on a proposal to extend an existing 30mph speed limit on Standlake Road in Ducklington towards its junction with the A415. The extension would include a new housing development accessed from Standlake Road plus the industrial premises at Ducklington Mill and had been prompted by a request from Ducklington Parish Council

RESOLVED: to approve the making of the Oxfordshire County Council (Ducklington Parish) (30 mph Speed Limit) Order 200* as published the effect of which would be to include all roads through the village subject to appropriate signing.

11/09 OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (SARSDEN PARISH) (30 MPH SPEED LIMIT) ORDER 200*
(Agenda Item 10)

Following a number of requests the Northern Area office promoted proposals for a 30mph speed limit through the village of Sarsden and the Committee were now considering responses to a formal consultation process.

Mr Currell confirmed that discussions would be held with the Parish Council regarding signing.

RESOLVED: to approve the making of the Oxfordshire County Council (Sarsden Parish) (30 mph Speed Limit) Order 200* as published to include all the roads through the village subject to approval of appropriate signage.

.....in the Chair

Date of signing.....2009

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s): Summertown & Wolvercote

TRANSPORT DECISIONS COMMITTEE – 3 SEPTEMBER 2009

SUMMERTOWN CPZ, OXFORD PROPOSED CHANGES TO PARKING

Report by Head of Transport

Introduction

1. This report considers comments and objections received to a formal advertisement and statutory consultation to vary the Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) for the Summertown Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and Disabled Persons Parking Places in Oxford, to amend the parking arrangements in a number of streets in response to requests from local residents, councillors and businesses.

Background

2. Since the introduction of the Summertown CPZ there have been a number of requests for amendments to better reflect the needs of those who live in the area. Some changes were made earlier this year, but further requests have been received. In addition there have been ongoing discussions to resolve problems with loading and disabled parking arrangements adjacent to the recently-completed Summertown shops scheme, as well as a requirement for a developer to relocate a parking bay to meet the conditions of a planning consent. Annex 1 describes the proposed changes.

Public Consultation

3. Informal consultation particularly on suggested changes to waiting and loading restrictions in Summerfield and Mayfield Roads was carried out in March 2009 and the results used to formulate formal proposals which were consulted on between 4 June and 2 July 2009.
4. Letters and plans were sent to all properties in the streets in the vicinity of the proposed changes, notices explaining the proposals placed on site and in the local newspaper and information sent to local Councillors, the emergency services and other formal consultees. A copy of the public notice is attached at Annex 2 and the full legal documents, which were placed on deposit at Summertown Library and at County Hall, are available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre.
5. In total, 12 letters or e-mails were received in response to the advertised proposals. A précis of these together with the observations of the Head of Transport is attached at Annex 3. Copies of all these communications are available in the Members' Resource Centre.

6. The main source of comment relates to the proposal to amend the southern boundary of the CPZ to include additional properties on Marston Ferry Road within the Zone. A number of residents who would become eligible for permits have written in support of the proposal. However, residents of Dorchester Court (which is on Ferry Pool Road and has the nearest available parking for any new permit holders) have objected as they feel it will result in there being nowhere left for them to park.
7. In response to these objections from Dorchester Court, your officers have approached Oxford City Council to see if their public car park at the end of Ferry Pool Road could be made available for Summertown CPZ Permit Holders to use overnight (free of charge); similar arrangements already happen in other parts of Oxford. This proposal will need to be agreed by the relevant Area Committee, but it is understood this should be obtained in September. If agreed, it is considered that the additional space would be a reasonable compensation for any loss of parking experienced by Dorchester Court residents.

Conclusions

8. The majority of the proposals have either been welcomed by respondents or have received no comment. Only the changes to permit eligibility on Marston Ferry Road have received objections but the subsequent proposal to allow permit holders to park in the City Council car park should ameliorate this impact.

How the Project Supports LTP2 Objectives

9. The proposals described in this report comply with the LTP2 objectives of Tackling Congestion (encouraging development that minimises congestion) and improving the Street Environment (better management of parking).

Financial Implications (including Revenue)

10. Funding for the costs of implementing the proposals described in this report, estimated to be around £3000 (including advertising) will be met from existing budgets.

RECOMMENDATION

11. The Committee is **RECOMMENDED** to approve the proposed changes to the **Summertown CPZ and Disabled Persons Parking Places Order as advertised in the Oxfordshire County Council (Summertown) (Controlled Parking Zone and Various Restrictions) (Variation No 7*) Order 200***, and the **Oxfordshire County Council (Disabled Persons Parking Places - Oxford (Amendment No 7*) Order 200*** and described in this report.

STEVE HOWELL
Head of Transport
Environment & Economy

Background papers: Copies of all the letters are available in the Members' Resource room.

Contact Officer: David Tole Tel 01865 815942

July 2009

SUMMERTON CPZ**DESCRIPTION OF EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES****WOODSTOCK ROAD**

Move the boundary of the zone to the western highway boundary to reduce sign clutter on side roads. Property eligibility remains unchanged.

Existing No Waiting (double yellow lines) restrictions are covered in another Order.

LUCERNE ROAD

Remove 3-hour shared use bay near Victoria Road (as required by development of adjacent properties) and relocate on opposite side near Hamilton Road (with consequent reduction of Permit Holders Bay).

ROGERS STREET

Existing 10-minute parking restriction in bay near Banbury Road to become 30-minute parking.

SUMMERFIELD AND MAYFIELD ROADS

Reorder parking bays to provide a Loading Bay outside Marks & Spencer loading area, daytime 'no loading' lengths to prevent parking at the Banbury Road end of Summerfield Road (both sides), introduce a new disabled bay, relocate 30-min parking bay, relocate permit holder parking (including new bay on Mayfield Road).

MARSTON FERRY ROAD

Move the boundary of the zone to west of Ferry Pool Road to allow properties on south side of Marston Ferry Road to have permits. Property eligibility adjusted to include Marston Ferry Road properties, Scholar's Mews and few extra Banbury Road residences.

Existing No Waiting (double yellow lines) restrictions are unchanged.

David Tole
May 2009



OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

**1. THE OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
(SUMMERTOWN) (CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE AND VARIOUS RESTRICTIONS)
(VARIATION NO.7*) ORDER 200***

**2. OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
(DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACES - OXFORD)
(AMENDMENT NO.7*) ORDER 200***

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Oxfordshire County Council proposes to make the above mentioned Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and all other enabling powers.

The effect of the proposal is to amend The Oxfordshire County Council (Summertown) (Controlled Parking Zone and Various Restrictions) Order 2004) Order 2002 (as amended) with a consequential amendment to The Oxfordshire County Council (Disabled Persons Parking Places - Oxford) Order 2007 (as amended).

The limits of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) within which all parking/ waiting is managed, is being extended along part of Marston Ferry Road, and to the western highway boundary of Woodstock Road. Eligibility for parking permits remains unchanged and existing No Waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) are covered in another Order. These changes will also reduce sign clutter on side roads.

The following amendments are proposed:

LUCERNE ROAD Remove 3-hour shared use parking bay near Victoria Road (as required by development of adjacent properties) and relocate to opposite side near Hamilton Road (with consequent reduction of a Permit Holders Bay);

SUMMERFIELD AND MAYFIELD ROADS Reorder parking bays to provide a Loading Bay outside Marks & Spencer loading area; daytime 'no loading' lengths to prevent parking at the Banbury Road end of Summerfield Road (both sides); introduce a new 15m long disabled bay on the north side of Summerfield Road; relocate a 30-min parking bay; relocate permit holder parking (including new bay on Mayfield Road);

MARSTON FERRY ROAD Move the boundary of the CPZ to the west of Ferry Pool Road to allow properties on south side of Marston Ferry Road to have parking permits. Listed properties eligible to apply for permits adjusted to include Marston Ferry Road properties, Scholars Mews and few extra Banbury Road residences.

Existing No Waiting (double yellow lines) restrictions are unchanged;

ROGERS STREET Replace the 10 minute parking places on the south side of the road with 30 minutes.

WOODSTOCK ROAD The limit of the CPZ will be moved to the western highway boundary to reduce sign clutter on side roads. Eligibility for parking permits remains unchanged. Existing No Waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) are covered in another Order.

TDC5

Documents giving more detailed particulars of the proposed Order are available for public inspection at County Hall, New Road, Oxford OX1 1ND from 9.00 am to 4.30 pm Monday to Friday, and at Summertown Library, South Parade, Summertown, Oxford, OX2 7JN Monday & Friday 9.30am – 5.30pm, Tuesday & Thursday 9.30am – 7pm, Saturday 9am – 4.30pm.

Objections to the proposal, specifying the grounds on which they are made, and any other representations, should be sent in writing to the Director for Environment and Economy (ref. DMT/TRO) at the address given below, no later than the 2nd July 2009. The County Council will consider objections and representations received in response to this Notice. They may be disseminated widely for these purposes and made available to the public.

Dated: 4th June 2009

Huw Jones
Director for Environment & Economy
Oxfordshire County Council
Speedwell House
Speedwell Street
Oxford, OX1 1NE.

SUMMERTOWN CPZ, OXFORD – PROPOSED CHANGES TO PARKING
Summary of Public Comments

No.	Commentor's Address	Summary of Objection or Comment	Observations of the Director of Environment & Economy
1.	Thames Valley Police	No objection but raise a concern that the proposed loading bay on Summerfield Road is opposite a private car park access which could cause difficulties for those using the car park	Noted The location of the loading bay matches the ideal position for lorries delivering into the businesses loading bay. Given the low levels of traffic along Summerfield Road, the nature of the car park usage and the infrequent occurrence of large vehicles using the loading bay, it is not considered that this will cause any significant problem
2.	Resident of Dorchester Court, Ferry Pool Road	Has strong objections as it allows too many additional properties to have permits, and will lead to even greater parking problems	The opening up of the City Council car park to permit holders in the evening will provide additional overnight parking which should alleviate this concern
3.	Chairman, Dorchester Court (Summertown) Ltd	Represents approximately 70 residents in 24 flats. Objects to the increased eligibility for permits as there is currently a shortage of parking Wants dispensation for residents to use the City Council car park for free Wants consideration to be given to the introduction of parking bays on Marston Ferry Road and for the bay on Ferry Pool Road to permit holders only at all times	Should the proposals be approved, the parking pattern on Ferry Pool Road will be monitored and if there is an excessive demand we will seek to increase the available space As noted in the report, the City Council have been asked to make the car par available free to permit holders overnight The strategic nature of Marston Ferry Road is such that parking here would not be appropriate. The possibility of extending the operational times of the bay on Ferry Pool Road will be considered in the light of monitoring.
4.	Resident, Marston Ferry Road	Welcomes the proposal to extend permit eligibility which will be of particular benefit to visitors	Noted

5.	Two residents of Marston Ferry Court	Delighted at the proposal	Noted
6.	Two residents of Banbury Road	Very pleased with the proposal – particularly beneficial for visitors	Noted
7.	Resident of Scholars Mews, Marston Ferry Road	Fully supports the initiative	Noted
8.	Resident of Scholars Mews, Marston Ferry Road	Supports the proposed changes as there is currently no visitor parking	Noted
9.	Resident of Scholars Mews, Marston Ferry Road	Supports the proposed changes as there is currently no visitor parking which is particularly difficult for the elderly	Noted
10.	Resident of Scholars Mews, Marston Ferry Road	Supports the proposed changes as there is currently no visitor parking	Noted
11.	Director of Music, Summer Fields School	Wishes the Council to also address the difficulties on Mayfield Road near Banbury Road	Noted – will be kept under review

Division(s): All

TRANSPORT DECISIONS COMMITTEE– 3 SEPTEMBER 2009

DISABLED PERSONS' PARKING PLACES – CHERWELL DISTRICT

Report by Head of Transport

Introduction

1. This report considers the proposed provision of new Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPPs), and the formalisation of existing "advisory" DPPPs in Cherwell following the publication of the draft Oxfordshire County Council (Cherwell District) (Disabled Persons' Parking Places) (Amendment [No.1*]) Order 20**.

Background

2. The increasing demand for parking in Oxfordshire can lead to particular difficulties for disabled people who need to park close to their homes or place of work. The County Council may provide a DPPP on a public road where there is a need.
3. On 7 December 2004 the Executive agreed to rationalise policy with regard to disabled parking which included proposals to adopt a uniform approach to be implemented throughout the County. Previously, in Oxfordshire (as opposed to Oxford City) disabled parking was provided by the use of advisory bays. These bays are marked up on the ground but no disabled sign plate is provided and, as they do not appear in a Traffic Regulation Order, are not enforceable. A review of these DPPPs has been carried out across Oxfordshire to ensure they are still required and those that are, are being formalised. It will then be possible to enforce them. At the same time, new requests for DPPPs are being considered.

Procedure

4. A fact sheet listing the criteria required to qualify for a DPPP is available in the Members' Resource Centre. A primary condition for qualification is that the applicant has to be a Blue Badge holder. Applicants have to complete a detailed application form and provide a copy of their driving licence and vehicle registration documents to prove that both the driver and the vehicle owner are resident at the address where the DPPP is requested.
5. The site is then assessed by a Highways Inspector to see if a DPPP is feasible. If it is, informal consultation is carried out with various authorities, such as the Emergency Services. If no adverse comments are made, formal consultation is commenced. This report considers comments in respect of the DPPPs referred to in paragraph 1 received at the formal stage.

Formal Consultation

6. The Directorate sent a copy of the draft Amendment Order, a Statement of Reasons for the Order and a copy of the Public Notice appearing in the local press to formal Consultees (including local County Councillors) on 7 July, 2009. These documents, together with supporting documentation as required, and plans of all the DPPP's were deposited for public inspection at County Hall, Cherwell District Council offices at Bodicote, and at Banbury, Neithrop (Banbury), Bicester, and Kidlington Libraries. They are also available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre.
7. Separately, the Directorate wrote to local residents in each area where the proposed new and formalised DPPP's would be sited asking for their comments. In addition public notices were displayed at each site and in the Oxford Times. A table showing all the bay proposals is shown at Annex 1.
8. The only formal Consultees to respond were Thames Valley Police, Cherwell District Council, and Banbury Town Council, none of which had any objections to the proposals.
9. Comments were received from local residents in respect of the proposed DPPP's in Cheviot Way, Edinburgh Way, Westminster Way, Woodgreen Avenue, Banbury; Chalvey Road, Bicester and Bellenger Way, Kidlington. Comments were also received in respect of the proposed formalisation of a DPPP at Church Street, Bodicote and Charlbury Close, Kidlington.
10. A synopsis of each comment with an officer response is set out at Annex 2. Copies of the comments can be viewed in the Members' Resource Centre.

Recommended Changes to the Proposals

11. The following is a location where it was proposed to provide a new DPPP but as a result of consultation it is recommended it should not now proceed:-

Proposed new DPPP in Westminster Way, Banbury – after discussions with the applicant and other local residents it has been agreed that the applicant does, in fact, have an adjacent hard-standing which forms part of her property. It is therefore recommended that the DPPP proposal does not proceed.

All the other proposals are recommended to go ahead as advertised.

How the Project supports LTP2 Objectives

12. The introduction of new DPPP's and the formalisation of advisory DPPP's will help in Delivering Accessibility by enabling disabled people to park near to their homes and thus access a wider range of services.

Financial and Staff Implications (including Revenue)

13. The cost of installing the DPPPs is approximately £7,000 and will be met from the existing revenue budget provided for these.

RECOMMENDATION

14. **The Committee is RECOMMENDED to:**

- (a) **authorise variations to the Oxfordshire County Council (Cherwell District) (Disabled Persons' Parking Places) Order 2007 as amended in this report to provide for:**
- (i) **fourteen new DPPPs as set out in Annex 1 to this report;**
 - (ii) **the formalisation of twelve existing advisory DPPPs as specified in Annex 1 to this report;**
- (b) **not to proceed with provision of a new DPPPs outside No 38 and 2 Canterbury Close, Westminster Way, Banbury.**

STEVE HOWELL
Head of Transport
Environment & Economy

Background papers: Consultation documentation

Contact Officer: Mike Ruse, Tel 01865 815978

August 2009

<u>Proposed New Disabled Persons' Parking Places</u>	
Banbury	
1	Balmoral Avenue, outside No 30.
2	Bloxham Road, outside No 18.
3	Cheviot Way, outside No 44.
4	Edinburgh Way, outside No 101.
5	Lennox Gardens, outside No 26.
6	Merton Street, outside No 18.
7	Westminster Way, outside No 38 & 2 Canterbury Close – Not to Proceed
8	Woodfield, 2 bays – outside No's 23 & 63.
9	Woodgreen Avenue, outside No 120.
Bicester	
10	Chalvey Road- extension of existing bay to accommodate 2 vehicles.
11	Kingsclere Road, in lay-by outside No 95.
Fritwell	
12	Fewcott Road, outside No 20.
Kidlington	
13	Bellenger Way, opposite No 33.
14	Charlbury Close, outside No 9.

<u>Proposed Formalisation of Advisory Disabled Persons' Parking Places</u>	
Banbury	
1	Bloxham Road, outside No 16.
2	Bretch Hill, outside No 14.
3	Crouch Hill Road, outside No 27.
4	Edmunds Road, outside No 25.
5	Miller Road, outside No 42.

TDC6

6	Penrhyn Close, outside No 10.
7	Ruscote Avenue, outside No 54.
8	Woodgreen Avenue, outside No 6.
Bloxham	
9	High Street, near Post Office
Bodicote	
10	Church Street, outside No 8A.
Kidlington	
11	Charlbury Close, outside No 15.
12	Oxford Road Service Road, outside No 17.

Comments on the Proposed Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPPs)

	Commentor	Comments	Response	Recommendation
DPPP at Cheviot Way, Banbury				
1	Resident, Cheviot Way	Worried that DPPP would make it difficult to enter and access the garage and hard-standing area opposite. Suggests moving it.	DPPP is on same side of road as cars habitually park. Its location is designed to protect the access way to the west and is diagonally opposite the northern access way so as not to obstruct that.	Proceed.
2	Resident, Cheviot Way	All the residents here including the applicant have garages so DPPP not needed. The DPPP will lose a car space for other residents and also leave half a space between it and the access way on the west side. Other disabled residents here use the parking they have.	The applicant finds it difficult to get in & out of car in the garage which is at the bottom of the garden. The DPPP is positioned so as to prevent cars obstructing the access way behind. It is also diagonally opposite another access way on other side of road so as to minimise any possible impact here. No other resident has requested a DPPP.	Proceed.
DPPP at Edinburgh Way, Banbury				
3	Resident, Edinburgh Way.	Bay is proposed outside his house. Suggests putting bay in Glamis Place where applicant lives. Believes applicant is partially sighted but otherwise can walk normally. Thinks bay would make it difficult for passing traffic if a car parked opposite. Is thinking of getting a car and putting in a hard-standing for this and his visitors.	The Parking areas in Glamis Place are often double parked and wouldn't be suitable for a DPPP. Applicant has current Blue Badge and receives the Higher Rate Disability Living Allowance for Mobility. He cannot be left alone and the DPPP application is specifically supported by his doctor. Cars normally park on the east side here where the DPPP is proposed and there used to be an advisory DPPP in the same place as the proposed DPPP.	Proceed.

DPPP at Westminster Way, Banbury				
4	Resident, Westminster Way	He and 3 other residents object to the proposal because this is where they park. Says the applicant has a "private car parking space" which is closer to front door than the proposed DPPP and she appears to be in good health. They suggest the DPPP should be further to north on the side of the road relevant to the applicant.	After further discussions with the applicant and other residents, the applicant agrees that there is an adjacent hard-standing that is included with the house. As a result she no longer qualifies for a DPPP.	Not to proceed.
5	Resident, Canterbury Close.	Objects to the proposal as she believes the bay would be too close to the road junction with Westminster Way. Also believes the DPPP would be in the same place as the applicant's hard-standing and equally close to her front door.	The DPPP would actually have been in Westminster Way away from the junction and not Canterbury Close. As above.	As above.
6	Resident, Westminster Way	Objects to the proposal as proposed location is near a junction and applicant already has an off-road parking space.	The DPPP would actually have been in Westminster Way away from the junction and not Canterbury Close. As above.	As above.
DPPP at Woodgreen Avenue, Banbury				
7	Resident, Woodgreen Avenue.	Says applicant parks outside his house without difficulty. Doesn't believe he is disabled.	Woodgreen Avenue is normally fairly well parked which becomes heavily parked as the evening approaches. Applicant has a current Blue Badge and receives the Higher Rate Disability Living Allowance for Mobility.	Proceed.
8	Resident, Woodgreen Avenue	Describes various parking difficulties, and thinks OCC	As above. There is a bus stop clearway and double yellow lines immediately	Proceed.

		should have put the proposed DPPP on the end of existing bay not in it. Says the applicant can walk, “do” the garden, and carry shopping from the car to the home. If a DPPP is provided only badge holders can use it and if the applicant is “elsewhere” no other resident could park there.	to the north-west of the end of the parking bay so the proposed DPPP needs to be sited as shown on the plan.	
DPPP at Chalvey Road, Bicester (extension of existing bay to two cars)				
9	Resident, Chalvey Road	Says he needs to park outside his house as he now has arthritis and can't walk far. Says the applicant walks her dog at night and therefore ought to be able to walk a little further to her car.	Social & Community Service confirms this objector is not a Badge Holder. DPPP is planned to cover half his frontage. The objector confirms that his neighbour further away from the bay doesn't drive - so he could still park adjacent to the new bay.	Proceed.
10	Resident, Chalvey Road	Objects to proposal because it would leave only 1 car space outside No's 49 & 51 instead of 2. Says there is less of a parking problem further down the road.	The extended bay would cover half the frontage of No 49. The other option was to propose another separate DPPP but this would take away more vehicle parking space than a combined solution. If there are less problems with parking further down – able bodied drivers could park there.	Proceed.
DPPP at Bellenger Way, Kidlington				
11	Resident, Bellenger Way.	In favour of proposed DPPP – residents in other streets park here as well as carers and visitors. There are no pavements here.	Noted.	Proceed.

12	Son of resident, Bellenger Way	His mother lives at end of pathway and concerned that proposed DPPP will block the access to the path for her wheelchair. There is a tarmac build up here to form a ramp to the kerb & path. Could we do something to protect this area?	Discussed with Highways Inspector – planned DPPP will not cover access to path. If bay approved we will ask contractor to provide a Private Access Protection Marking across the access when they line the bay. The commentor is happy that this resolves the problem.	Proceed.
----	--------------------------------	--	--	----------

Comments on Proposed Formalisation of existing Disabled Persons' Parking Place (DPPP)

	Commentor	Comments	Response	Recommendation
DPPP at Church Street, Bodicote				
1	Resident, Church Street who uses the bay	He understands that bay needs lengthening to the regulation 6.6 metres. Would prefer that it is extended to the south rather than the north to avoid a neighbours access. Also his gas service is under footway here and if a post was installed for the sign plate it must avoid that.	Will arrange to extend bay to south and make sure all utility plans are used before installing any post.	Proceed.
2	Resident, Church Street	Objects to the proposed formalisation because the bay is rarely used to take the disabled person out or back, but is used by the resident able bodied driver and others. Doesn't think it would be dangerous to set	Discussed further with the users of the bay and consulted with Social and Community Service and am satisfied that it would be unsafe to leave the disabled person while the driver parked elsewhere. The disabled person receives the Higher Rate of Disability Living Allowance for Mobility. They are now aware of the correct usage of a formal	Proceed.

		the disabled person down while the driver parked elsewhere.	DPPP.	
3	Resident, Church Street	Believes the DPPP is not required as it has been used purely as a private parking place for the family and rarely to take the Badge Holder out or back. Has never seen a Blue Badge displayed in vehicles parked here.	Discussed further with users of the bay and consulted with Social & Community Service and satisfied that bay is needed. The disabled person receives the Higher Rate Disability Living Allowance for Mobility. The users are aware of the correct use of a formal DPPP and that the Blue Badge needs to be displayed in the car whenever it is in the bay.	Proceed.
DPPP at Charlbury Close, Kidlington				
4	Resident, Charlbury Close	Has used the advisory bay for last 12 years and counts it as her space. Can she still leave her car in the DPPP when she goes out in another vehicle and takes her badge with her – will her tax disc indicating disabled be sufficient?	DPPP can be used by any vehicle correctly displaying a blue badge. The tax disc cannot be used to park in a DPPP. If she goes out in another vehicle with her Blue Badge she should move her car out of DPPP to avoid a possible parking fine and to allow other badge holders to use it.	Proceed.