

**CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT – 26 MARCH 2020**  
**OXFORD – HOLLOW WAY NORTH – PROPOSED CONTROLLED**  
**PARKING ZONE**

**Report by Interim Director of Community Operations**

**Recommendation**

1. The Cabinet Member for the Environment is RECOMMENDED to approve the proposals as advertised for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Hollow Way North area, but to review specific suggestions for minor adjustments as raised in the consultation responses as noted in paragraphs 11 and 17.

**Executive summary**

2. Following approval by the Cabinet Member for Environment in June 2018 and April 2019 of a programme of new CPZs in Oxford, this report presents the responses to a formal consultation on a new CPZ in the Hollow Way North area.

**Introduction**

3. New Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) are being proposed across Oxford to address parking pressures for residents due to commuter parking. In addition to the difficulties residents face in finding a parking place, such excess parking demand can result in the roads (in particular near junctions), footways and accesses being obstructed by parked vehicles to the detriment of road safety and the movement of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users including the emergency services.

**Background**

4. Proposals for a CPZ in this area were included in a programme of new CPZs in Oxford, approved by the Cabinet Member for Environment in June 2018 and in April 2019, using capital funding, together with contributions secured from development to deliver the programme. Formal consultation was carried out in September and October 2019 but, at the request of the local member and following feedback from residents in the roads closest to the new Parade Green Student accommodation, it was agreed to amend the scheme in respect of these roads to help ensure that parking pressures arising from this accommodation were adequately managed and also to propose a limit of two vehicle permits per property (with the initial consultation, no limit on the number of permits per property was set, although the cost of a third and subsequent permits did increase). In view of this the consultation responses were not reported to the Cabinet Member for Environment for a decision.

## Formal Consultation

5. Formal consultation on the revised proposals as shown at Annex 1 was carried out between 6 February and 6 March 2020. A public notice was placed in the Oxford Times newspaper and emails sent to statutory consultees, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Oxford City Council, the local County Councillor. A letter was sent directly to approximately 1,100 properties in the area which included the formal notice of the proposals providing details on permit eligibility and costs. Additionally, street notices were placed on site in and around the area.
6. Thirty-nine responses were received during the formal consultation and these are summarised in the tables below:

Response to CPZ	Businesses / other organisations	Residents	Overall Percentage
Object	-	19	49%
Support	3	13	41%
Neither/Concerns	2	2	10%
No Opinion	-	-	0%
<i>Total</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>

Response to Parking Restrictions	Businesses and other organisations	Residents	Overall Percentage
Object	-	12	31%
Support	3	19	56%
Neither/Concerns	2	1	8%
No Opinion	-	2	5%
<i>Total</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>100</i>

7. The above table is based on the option chosen by the respondent (Object, support etc.) but it should be noted that on reviewing the detail of the responses, in a number of cases a respondent expressing support for the proposal had some qualifications/concerns and similarly some of the objections related to specific details of the scheme, including the roads not being included in the current proposals, but were otherwise in support.

## Summary of responses of members for the public by road

Road	Object	Support	Neither / No opinion	Total
Burton Place	1	-	-	1
Cranmer Road	3	2	1	6
Craufurd Road	2	-	-	2
East Field Close	1	1	-	2
Fern Hill Road	1	-	-	1
Fletcher Road	-	2	-	2
Hollow Way	2	1	1	4
Horspath Road	3	-	-	3
Hunter Close	-	2	-	2
Kennedy Close	-	4	-	4
Meyseys Close	2	-	-	2
Reliance Way	1	-	-	1
Troy Close	3	1	-	4
<i>Based Elsewhere</i>	-	3	2	5
Total	19	16	4	39

8. The table summarises the main issues raised by members of the public expressing an objection, an undecided opinion or qualified support; as respondents in several cases cited more than one concern. The totals are greater than the number of such respondents:
9. The individual responses are summarised at Annex 2 with copies of the full responses available for inspection by County Councillors.
10. Thames Valley Police expressed no objection to the proposals.
11. The Oxford City Council Transformation Project Manager expressed concerns about the inclusion of on street parking places in St Francis Court due to the potential obstruction of accesses and also numbers 226 to 238 Hollow Way being included in this new CPZ, rather than in the adjacent Lye Valley CPZ. Noting the above, a review will be carried out in respect of numbers 226 to 238 and a further local consultation carried out as part of this. In respect of the potential for the obstruction of St Francis Court by parked vehicles, it should be noted that no marked parking bays are proposed, and so – as at present – any driver of a vehicle parking in the road will need to ensure that their vehicle does not cause obstruction.








12. The Oxford Pedestrian Association expressed support in principle for CPZs but noted that these should not regularise pavement parking to the detriment of pedestrians.
13. Oxford Brookes University expressed support for the proposal though suggested that a limit of three vehicle permits per property would be more appropriate than the currently proposed limit of two permits taking account of the number of houses in multiple occupation.
14. Unite Student accommodation expressed support for the proposals, noting that while the tenancy agreements for their residents required the latter not to have a vehicle, it was not possible for them to enforce this and, mindful of the parking pressures so caused and the potential for conflict with other residents, they would welcome the implementation of the CPZ as quickly as possible. It should be noted that part of the funding for the scheme was secured from the development of the Unite Student's Parade Green accommodation.
15. The remaining responses were from members of the public. Those expressing an objection cited concerns over the cost of the permits, the limit of two vehicle permits per property (mostly on the grounds that this was too restrictive), though some respondents considered that properties should only be eligible for one vehicle permit) and the visitor permit allocation. While accepting that these will impact on some residents more than others depending on their specific circumstances – and noting in particular concerns raised by occupants of properties currently with more than 2 vehicles – the permit costs and visitor permit allocation are as apply in all other CPZs in Oxford and, in respect of the proposed limit of 2 vehicle permits per property, this is consistent with many other CPZs.
16. The objections also cited concerns that the parking pressures in the area are not especially severe and that the scheme would cause unnecessary inconvenience and expense for existing residents and businesses and their customers.
17. Objections and concerns were also raised in respect of the proposed double yellow lines, including in Cranmer Road. While officers will review the scope to make minor amendments to accommodate the suggested changes, it will be important to ensure that junctions are kept clear of parked vehicles.
18. Some objections and concerns were in respect of the omission of Horspath Road from the proposed scheme. In response to this it is confirmed that the adjacent roads to the south of the current proposal are intended to be included in the Hollow Way South CPZ, though noting that scheme is currently unfunded.

### **Monitoring and evaluation**

19. It is suggested that a review of the scheme is carried out approximately 12 months after the implementation of the CPZ should it be approved.

### **How the Project supports LTP4 Objectives**



Drawing No.		Revision 0		
<b>Key</b>				
		Zone boundary		
		Proposed 'No Waiting at Anytime' (double yellow lines)		
		Proposed 30 minute parking, 8.00am - 4.00pm, Mon-Fri and 2hr parking 4.00pm - 6.30pm Mon-Fri. 2hr parking 8.00am - 6.30pm Sat-Sun. Resident and visitor permit holders exempt from the time limit. Permit holders 6.30pm - 8.00am.		
		Proposed 2hr shared parking 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday. Resident and visitor permit holders exempt from the time limit		
		Proposed 2 hours shared parking, 8.00am - 6.30pm, Mon-Sun and Permit Holders Only parking 6.30pm - 8.00am. Resident and visitor permit holders exempt from the time limit		
		Existing 'No Waiting at Anytime' (double yellow lines)		
<small>Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright, and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Oxfordshire County Council Licence No LA078895</small>				
Rev.	Date	Purpose of revision	Drawn	Checked/Approved
 <b>OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL</b> Owen Jenkins Director for Infrastructure Delivery Communities Oxfordshire County Council County Hall Oxford OX1 1ND Tel: 0345 310 11 11 Fax: (01865) 241577				
Project title				
HOLLOW WAY NORTH				
Drawing title				
PROPOSED RESTRICTIONS				
Drawing Status				
Scale @ A3	Drawn by	JaC	Checked by	Approved by
N.T.S.	Date drawn	09/19	Date checked	Date approved
Oxfordshire Project No. & File Ref				
Drawing No.		Revision 0		



P.14 - Improvement\_Schemes/Traffic and Road Safety/ProjectsA - Oxford Hollow Way North CPZ (21.11.19).dwg



RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	<p><b>No objection</b> – These restrictions place no burden upon Thames Valley Police in terms of enforcement as they fall within an area of Civil Parking Enforcement .</p>
(2) Transformation Project Manager, (Oxford City Council)	<p><b>Concerns</b> – I have now had some more time to review the proposal and published plans. There are some further flaws and irregularities.</p> <p>St Francis Court is a small close/dead end that provides access to the rear parking spaces for the houses at 226-238 Hollow Way. This close also provides access to the elderly housing and a few dedicated parking spaces for them. AT the moment there are no restrictions and some of the old folks as well as residents of 226-238 park along the St Francis Court section of the road. However this currently does prevent the residents from actually using their dedicated parking (as set out in the original planning permissions from 30 years ago, and noted in the conditions/covenants of the title deeds. Therefore there should not be any designated parking in this area that would prevent from residents actually getting in/out of their rear Garden parking spaces. Which would also mean that there really is no adequate space for any off-street parking.</p> <p>A further issues arises from the proposed and existing CPZ boundaries. St Francis Court has no actual access to any of the other roads, and access is from Hollow Way. This part of Hollow Way however is part of Lye valley. According to the existing and proposed boundaries, 226-238 Hollow Way and the pub would not be in any CPZ. The parking restrictions to the front of 226-238 Hollow Way is part of Lye Valley, and now you propose St Francis to be Hollow Way North. However residents of the above addresses are the only ones with the elder neighbours to use this land. But as things stand would not be eligible to park outside their houses in either area, not have access to their parking on their land due to existing parking behaviours.</p> <p>The most sensible solution would be to include St Francis and 226-238 Hollow Way and the pub as part of Lye Valley due to the physical location and connection, and the front of the houses are part of Lye Valley anyway.</p> <p>If St Francis is included in North Hollow way, those few residents should become eligible to get permits for either the new CPZ or Lye Valley.</p>

	226-238 Hollow Way would be most suitable to the Lye valley CPZ or eligibility for both CPZ's.
(3) Local Group, (Oxford Pedestrians Association)	<p><b>Support</b> - OxPA is generally in favour of CPZs because they regularise and control car parking so supports all three proposals; however we do not support and have been disappointed by the painting of lines on pavements to regularise vehicle parking on footways or on part of footways as CPZs are brought in. This has been done to date in many CPZs and has led to much reduced pavement space for walkers and wheelchair users, without room for two wheelchair users to pass one another. (Given also that vehicles cross over the lines, and that vegetation hangs into pavements from gardens, the space is often less than the minimal amount thought to have been allowed.) And also, the practice of pavement parking should not be regularised because it supports the idea that parking means getting two wheels onto a footway, prioritising the needs of drivers over non-drivers, which can be seen widely in Oxford. Looking at the maps we cannot see the detail of what is proposed, so wish to have our thoughts about pavement parking taken into account when the CPZs are being decided on. Given that the County's policy is to put the needs of pedestrians at the top of the hierarchy of road users, we hope to see this policy put into practice by ending the slicing of footways into parking places and unfriendly narrow single-file walking spaces.</p>
(4) Oxford Brookes University	<p><b>Support</b> – At Oxford Brookes University, we were pleased to hear about the Oxfordshire County Council's proposal to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) within the Hollow Way North area.</p> <p>We regularly receive concerns from local residents regarding vehicles parked within their street and the implementation of CPZs in other areas has made a huge difference to residents.</p> <p>We would support the introduction of a CPZ in Hollow Way North, as we have been made aware of concerns regarding the number of vehicles parked in this area. However, the information on the consultation website indicates that resident permits will be limited to one per resident with a maximum of two permits per property. Due to the number of Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in the area (many of them housing local workers), we would suggest that it may be more appropriate for each property to be allocated up to a maximum of three parking permits, rather than two.</p>
(5) Unite Students	<p><b>Support</b> – I am writing to express our support for the above scheme and to stress the urgency of its introduction.</p> <p>As you will be aware, Unite Students own and operate the recently opened student accommodation buildings at Parade Green, Cowley.</p>



	<p>Unite Students paid a contribution of £46,500 towards the CPZ to Oxford County Council as part of the S278 prior to our S106 with Oxford City Council.</p> <p>Whilst our tenancy agreements clearly set out that our customers are not allowed to bring a car into the city of Oxford, our staff lack the authority to effectively enforce this condition. The perceived increase in student vehicles in the area and the delay to the introduction of the zone has been a source of frustration for longstanding residents, whose complaints have fallen at our door.</p> <p>Occasionally, disputes have resulted in conflict and even vandalism which is affecting both students and longstanding residents alike.</p> <p>We are doing our utmost to educate students and to discourage inconsiderate parking in residential areas and we are using the powers at our disposal to penalise breaches of tenancy agreements where they can be proven. However, without the effective regulation and monitoring of parking in areas surrounding our property, it is highly likely that this conflict will continue, negatively impacting the wellbeing of all residents in the area.</p> <p>We, therefore, urge you to introduce the proposed scheme as soon as possible.</p>
(6) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - The principle of a CPZ is OK, but the associated additional annual costs for residents is exploitative and unnecessary. Certainly too expensive.</p> <p>The result of an imposed CPZ will mean that more green front garden space will be lost to residents creating off-street parking. This is considerably bad for the environment, and is a contributory factor to flooding and pollution. There should be 1 annual residents permit at no cost, and an additional one could cost more than £65 if necessary. A total of 50 visitor permits should be free for each property. This only amounts to approx 1 visitor per week.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> - They are unnecessary. The problem of congestion and car parking is mainly caused by the high number of students in the area. OCC planners approved student residential developments without due consideration of the resulting effects on the area.</p> <p>Responsibility for patrols, fines and penalties for students bringing cars to Oxford should belong to Oxford Brookes, and OCC should impose penalties upon them if they fail to do so.</p>

<p>(7) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - 1. Now that you have now changed other roads near Parade Green halls (eg. James Wolfe Road etc) to 24/7 residents parking, then all the students are now going to park in Cranmer Road overnight. There are already students parking overnight in Cranmer Road. If they cannot park overnight in James Wolfe Road etc anymore, then there will be even more trying to park in Cranmer Road.</p> <p>I think these new proposals are going to make problems in Cranmer Road worse. Please can you change Cranmer Road to have the same restrictions. ie. permit holders only overnight.</p> <p>2. It is also going to be chaos in Cranmer Road at the weekends when it is student arrivals/departures weekends in Sept/May. Your proposals will not help with this. Cranmer Road should be 9am-5pm weekends as well. There should also not be any 2 hour time limited spaces either, otherwise it will become a car park for students and their visitors coming and going non-stop all day.</p> <p>2. The proposals include this text 'The development of Controlled Parking Zones) CPZs is a key element of the County Council's Parking Strategy, and forms part of action plans to tackle the problems of congestion identified for Oxford, as well as to improve air quality and the street environment. CPZs restrict the availability of commuter parking in residential streets and encourage commuters to find alternative means of transport both into and within the City. '</p> <p>Thus the CPZ is not primarily for the benefit of specific residents, it is part of a Council ideological strategy for the benefit of all citizens. Therefore, the scheme including residents permits should be paid for entirely from the general Council tax funds and not by specific individuals.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> - The double yellow lines extend too far into Cranmer Road and will encourage people to obstruct and/or park very close to my driveway. This means I cannot see when pulling out of my driveway. I have to pullout blind sometimes. This is even more dangerous when cars come around the corner too fast from Hollow Way. The yellow lines will allow cars to come around the corner even faster as there will no obstructions.</p>
<p>(8) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> – No comments.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p>
<p>(9) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - I believe that this measure is not for the benefit of the residents; it is just another way for the council to collect money from the residents via annual parking permits. I think that we pay already enough council tax to have to</p>

	<p>pay an additional £65 per annum.</p> <p>Again, as in my previous response in November, I would be really interested to see the results of this round of consultation. I did not see the results of the first (informal) consultation, even if I asked.</p> <p>In any case, I am certain that the CPZ measures will be applied regardless of the residents' views. Like I said above, this is only aimed at extra revenue for the Council and we, the citizens, cannot do much about it, can we?</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> – <i>See comments above.</i></p>
<p>(10) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - I remain in strong opposition to these proposals. I do not believe that such a scheme is necessary in our area, and further believe that it would be detrimental to residents. The most recent, seemingly rushed revisions have done nothing to assuage my concerns.</p> <p>The intended limit of two permits per property further compounds my previous concerns: that this limit unfairly penalises residents living in HMOs, which, thanks to the state of the property market in Oxford, includes a substantial number of professionals who under these proposals would be unable to keep their vehicle near their house - many of whom would need their vehicle for commuting. I do not believe that residents should be further penalised for needing to share accommodation due to the excessive house and rent prices in the city. What exactly does the council propose they do with their vehicles?</p> <p>While on the subject of the charging structure - Article 29 (3) (b) appears to discriminate on the basis of age with no justification given (but was presumably inserted after receiving feedback in the original consultation from those who stand to benefit). What must I do to secure a similar exception for my own age group? Had this point been worded in terms of <u>_need_</u> or <u>_ability to pay_</u> it would not have needed defending.</p> <p>I also feel that students - in particular, those students of Oxford Brookes living in Paul Kent Hall and Parade Green - are being unfairly scapegoated for the introduction of this scheme. It is disingenuous to imply, as I have heard from one councillor, that we should expect a large number of these students to break the terms of their leases by bringing cars to Oxford and park where they're not allowed. I wonder if there has been any evidence gathered to substantiate these claims; and if not, they most certainly should not be used as justification to impose parking permits in the area!</p> <p>The irony remains that one of the justifications given in the "statement of reasons" is "we need a CPZ to deal with the</p>

	<p>problems caused by introducing a neighbouring CPZ". Perhaps nobody responsible sees the circular logic here?</p> <p>In general the drafting of the documentation remains poor; from the aforementioned contradiction, to a number of typographical errors (for example, conflating "residents", "resident's" and "residents'") and at times the grammar leaves the text apparently meaningless ("save for the avoidance of doubt this prohibition does not apply to...").</p> <p>Is the wording of Article 15 (3) intended to prevent drivers from parking partially on the pavement so as to leave the carriageway unobstructed? While parking in such a way as to block the pavement for pedestrian users (especially wheelchair users) is clearly unwelcome, in many places it is possible to park in such a way that the pavement remains unobstructed, and so too the carriageway, even with another vehicle parked opposite. To enforce such a restriction would effectively cut in half the available spaces for parking, which surely cannot be the intention.</p> <p>Further, I have concerns over the enforcement of these restrictions, especially given the sporadic and unreliable nature of enforcement in other parts of the city (as a walk along St Aldates on a Sunday afternoon will demonstrate). I have not received any assurances about frequency and consistency of enforcement in this zone.</p> <p>I wonder, too, how many residents will be pushed to decide to drive to work rather than use public transport, in order to not leave their car in a road covered by these new restrictions? Or how many front gardens will now become de facto driveways instead of green spaces?</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - It's nice that you included the correct area in the consultation this time.</p>
(11) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - Why should residents be put at a financial disadvantage due to Brooke's university inability to carry out their NO CAR policy, as requested by the council in the planning approval of Parade green! Double yellow lines on the corners of these roads would be a solution rather than a CPZ!</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - This is a far better solution than a CPZ</p>
(12) Online Respondent, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - All that will happen is the traffic will be displaced to area where they don't have to use a permit. So in effect the problem will be moved from one area to another within the city limits.</p> <p>1. I would like to know how much additional revenue will be generated by the requirements of residents being forced to purchase a parking permit for their own area?</p>

	<p>2. What will be the cost of enforcing the CPZ?  3. Will this remaining revenue be used to repair damaged roads in Oxford city that have been neglected?  4. Does the council have the intention of making the length of hollow way (from its junction of the B480 up to the slade) a no parking area at anytime?  5. How does the council enforce parking on double yellow lines?</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p>
(13) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - cannot understand why Horspath Road is not part of the proposed controlled parking zone,this road is getting more dangerous everyday with vehicles parked either side of road and on pavements and it's making harder for residents to get in and out of there drives.then you get the congestion when vehicles are banked up because the way the vehicles are parked.the restrictions proposed are only going to lead to more inconsiderate parking and making the road even more dangerous.it would be nice for a county official to come and see for themselves.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> - cannot understand why Horspath Road is not part of the proposed controlled parking zone,this road is getting more dangerous everyday with vehicles parked either side of road and on pavements and it's making harder for residents to get in and out of there drives when vehicles are parked directly outside or blocking drives.you get the congestion when vehicles are banked up because the way the vehicles are parked.the restrictions proposed are only going to lead to more inconsiderate parking and making the road even more dangerous.it would be nice for a county official to come and see for themselves.</p>
(14) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - There is not problem on my street and not problems in the streets around, i live here for more than 5 years and we never had issues, always there is a free space for me/my family and neighbours to park, including visitors, I hardly oppose to this, the costs of living in Oxford are already expensive this will top up ever more in the living costs, everywhere where we go in Oxford we need to pay for parking, i don't want to pay for parking in my own house</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> - Not necessary, I drive through those streets on daily basis and there is no problem as they are at the moment, I don't want my tax contribution spent on this, and if someone ever need to park in those locations I believe that is valid and does not disturb anyone, also in general cars parked adds a extra layer of safety as the other drivers won't drive too fast so is better for protect the kids</p>

<p>(15) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - The controls do not go far enough in some areas where there should be restricted parking at all times. Also, is there a plan for proposed road markings that take into consideration of off road parking?</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - Double yellow lines should be introduced where they were covered up by new road surfaces at road junctions as per Highway Code.</p>
<p>(16) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - The proposed parking spaces on the road in St Frances Court will prevent me from being able to access the rear of my property by car. My house backs onto St Francis Court where i have a dropped curb and gates to park my car in my back garden. If you allow cars to park directly behind this then you will be blocking my access. Please could someone offer to do a site visit so i can explain further?</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>No opinion</b> – No comments.</p>
<p>(17) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - This is nothing but a robbery against the residents. There are NO issues with parking on Craufurd Road during these times you propose. You will not get a penny out of me to park my car on the street where I live. Corruption at its finest.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> – No comments.</p>
<p>(18) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - If the CPZ is enforced in the streets specified, it will encourage more people to park in Fern Hill Road. I don't object to that in itself but parking restrictions need to be enforced in Fern Hill Road otherwise the whole street will be lined with cars parked on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p>
<p>(19) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> – No comments.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> – No comments.</p>

<p>(20) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - The proposals for restricting parking on the roads surrounding Horspath Road will increase pressure on uncontrolled parking on the top end of Horspath Road, which is already pressured by parking on both sides of the road. Double decker buses using Horspath Road are hindered by the uncontrolled parking. The new CPZ will put extra parking pressures on Horspath Road, as it is not included in the proposed plans. ,</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>No opinion</b> – No commnets.</p>
<p>(21) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> – No comments.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> – No comments.</p>
<p>(22) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - There are multiple properties on Troy Close and surrounding streets that are HMO and therefore have a number of tenants living in them. Our own property has 5 tenants with 4 of those owning cars that are vital for their commutes to work. We're concerned that limiting properties to 2 permits won't allow us to park our cars on our own residential streets. Most of us travel long distances to get to work, including Milton Keynes, therefore it's not possible to not have our cars with us. We ask that the number of permits per house is increased.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> – <i>See comments above.</i></p>
<p>(23) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> - I have been a resident at Meyseys Close for 4 years now and have never had any problems with parking. I own a car and work day and night shifts and never had to park on double yellow lines or other residential areas so far. This proposal offers a solution to residents at a cost for the same residents, which I personally find not fair and somehow disrespectful. As a resident we should be entitled to free parking permits. When I rented my flat 4 years ago with a2dominion I was offered free parking, obviously with the proposed CPZ fee that's not the case anymore. When I contacted the agency/landlord a2dominion they are not even aware of such CPZ propositions by the Council. I should also say that I have contacted Oxfordshire County Council regarding the implementation of protected bike sheds around our residential area before and I got no feedback so far. Working and living around Oxford City we are encouraged to cycle to work and reduce the amount of air pollution / cars around the town, however when questioned about proposed sheds / safe bicycle storage around residential areas we get no response and are obliged to leave our bicycles exposed to natural elements such as rain and snow that obviously have a extreme damage effect on it, exposed to thieves and vandalism and make our houses / flat entrances look less presentable / ugly. I would like to hear from Oxfordshire County</p>

	<p>Council on the above situations.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - No parking should ever be allowed at double yellow lines. So I agree with the above for double yellow lines restrictions.</p>
(24) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Object</b> – I responded to the Council’s formal consultation of October 2019 and to the informal consultation at the end of 2018. On both occasions I objected to the introduction of a CPZ in East Field Close. I wish again to object to the proposals in the Council’s current formal consultation.</p> <p>I have read the Statement of Reasons and the Public Notice. I have examined the draft Order. Can I repeat what I said in my earlier responses. All properties in East Field Close and the two roads leading off it either have off-street parking or have use of off-street parking courts. There (continues to be) minimal long-term non-residential parking in the Close that is not associated with houses in the Close. Any such parking when it does occur is addressed by our informal Neighbourhood Watch.</p> <p>RPZ’s were originally introduced in Oxford in 1972-74 in pursuance of the City Council’s Balanced Transport Policy. They were introduced to tackle large-scale non-residential parking in the residential areas surrounding the City centre (ie. South, West and East Oxford and Jericho). There was no charge for residents’ parking permits then. RPZs were later extended to cover areas where there was a demonstrable need for such controls (eg. around central Headington and Summertown). These areas were attractive to non-residential car users because they could park there free of charge and commute into Oxford and to London (for Headington) and for work locally and in the City centre (for Summertown). This ‘stick’ approach to traffic and parking was coupled with the ‘carrot’ of park and ride provision on the edge of the City (Red Bridge first and then Seacourt).</p> <p>In contrast to the challenges of the past as described in the previous paragraph, there is no ‘demonstrable need’ for residents’ priority parking in East Field Close. RPZ’s were not and should not be now, used as a blanket tool of traffic management where minimal non-residential parking occurs, nor in situations where it is felt it might occur in the future (eg. the reference in the Statement to hospital developments). The Universities and the hospitals, through the planning process, must address the parking needs of their employees in ways that do not result in adverse financial consequences for local residents.</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons refers to a ‘very large new student accommodation project’ in James Wolfe Road. That development, and the Slade Park Hall development in Horspath Driftway each have a planning condition attached that relates to students having a clause in their tenancy agreement not to bring cars to Oxford. Indeed, this requirement on students is displayed on publicly viewable notices on the Paul Kent Hall wall in James Wolfe Road. If such planning</p>



conditions cannot be enforced then that is an issue for, eg Brookes, and the consequences (of any unenforceability) should not fall upon local residents.

Turning now to the detail of the advertised scheme, the Statement of Reasons does not explain how the various proposed charges are justified. The purpose of the Statement is to enable those affected to decide whether and on what grounds to object. The amount of the charges is a component part of the Order and should be justified in the Statement. Lack of justification might lead people to think that they are set as a revenue-raising exercise. That of course would be contrary to the provisions of the 1984 Act.

Neither the Statement, nor the Public Notice refers to the proposal to introduce a hotel and guest house permit scheme Part VIII of the Order contains these details. Members of the public have therefore not been consulted upon this element. Clearly therefore, this element cannot be introduced without consultation.

I have not seen any research or survey findings on parking levels, conducted before the advertisement of the Order, to support the introduction of a CPZ. I would expect such work to have been carried out otherwise you cannot say that the policy is supported by evidence.

Can I please repeat what I have said in my two previous letters, namely the alternative ways in which the Section 1 (1) Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 objectives might be met. I reproduce the relevant part of my letters below:-

The funding to which the (County Council's informal) consultation letter refers is presumably Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money. I am aware that £2million CIL has been secured from the BT development (Parade Green). I think this money should be used for wider benefit. Here are two suggestions. First, it should be used to improve The Slade/Hollow Way/Horspath Driftway roundabout. There is insufficient/no interweaving space on the roundabout. And there is no speed deterrence on the Horspath Driftway approach to the roundabout. Entry to the roundabout is a matter of nerve as well as judgement. Both these issues (most importantly the second) should be addressed using the CIL funds. Second, the money should be used to improve traffic flow for buses in the narrow stretch of Hollow Way south of Horspath Road. Bus users are frequently held up by the lack of capacity and phasing of the traffic signals at the south end of Hollow Way. This causes traffic back-up, at peak times along the entire length of the narrow part of Hollow Way.

Finally, there are two drafting errors that I have seen in the draft Order. In Schedule 2 there is a reference to East Field Road. Presumably this should be a reference to East Field Close. In Schedule 3A there is a reference to Meyseys Road. Presumably this should be a reference to Meyseys Close.

So, in summary:-

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am not in favour of a residents' parking scheme in East Field Close.</li> <li>• There is minimal parking in East Field Close at present that is not associated with the properties in the Close and this position has not changed as a result of the Parade Green development.</li> <li>• Residents' parking schemes should be used where there is a demonstrable current need for such measures to be introduced. There is no such current need in East Field Close.</li> <li>• The consequences of development should fall upon the occupiers of developments to address. They should not fall upon local residents.</li> <li>• Monies available to spend in the area should be spent for the benefit of the wider community, for example to address the issues referred earlier in this letter.</li> </ul> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> – <i>See comments above.</i></p>
(25) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Neither</b> - For the sake of the theory of this- I support. However, under the current proposed roads that are included in this CPZ, I currently object. Our small cul-de-sac, which is public and NOT private, seems to have been left out of the plannings for CPZ.</p> <p>I implore you to please include us. Our road is already oversubscribed for parking- to have all the roads around us zoned and with our tiny road to be forgotten would cause hell for us residents of the cul-de-sac to park.</p> <p>I fore-see the residents of the surrounding, soon to be CPZ area, using our tiny road as a dumping ground for their extra vehicles/ vans/ taxis/ student cars etc. We have already had problems with cars being dumped by non-residents and students parking up without moving vehicles for most of the term time.</p> <p>We need to be included to avoid problems going forward.</p> <p>Our specific location- we are the small cul-de-sac off Hollow Way (yet still addressed as Hollow Way) opposite Barracks Lane, opposite the golf course.</p> <p>Please do not let our little residential road become a dumping ground for the overflow of vehicles.</p>

	<p>I am trusting of yourselves, as the council to which I happily pay my taxes to, to ensure that we are all included in this CPZ enforcement.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> - I object the small amount of yellow lines proposed to the top of our cul-de-sac. We are already stretched for residents parking, and also have commuters and weekend shoppers parking in our tiny road. I would prefer to see the proposal showing our road as CPZ rather than part double-yellows.</p> <p>I raised this as an issue on your previous consultation. Please do not ignore our concerns at this late stage- WE NEED THE PARKING CPZ TOO!</p>
(26) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Neither</b> - Cranmer Road has students parking there evening, overnight and weekends. Cranmer Road needs to have permit holders only evenings, nighttime and weekends like James Wolfe Road. Family and friends can't visit as there is no where safe for them to park because students park there in the way.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Neither</b> – No comments.</p>
(27) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> - This really needs to go ahead ASAP as parking is ridiculous In this area</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - Needs to go ahead ASAP with it being controlled at the same time</p>
(28) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> - The sooner this starts the better,to many student, contract building firms ,and residents from streets with restriction.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> – <i>See comments above.</i></p>
(29) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - Yellow lines are essential at the entrance/exit to East Field Close from Horspath Driftway as the line of cars parked outside the flats doesn't allow for two-way traffic at this point</p>

<p>(30) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - Please implement as soon as possible!</p>
<p>(31) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> - Absolutely support the proposed plans only issue is in Hunter Close there is a large green opposite our house and adjacent to the fence of the driving test centre, whilst the construction of Parade green and indeed now students have moved in when the Close is full many cars park on the green, if cars park on the green will this be permitted with or without a permit (we hope maybe bollards could be in place to stop cars parking on the green).Also we have cars mainly at the weekend who we believe are visitors to parade green, they park on both sides of the close on the side with houses half on path half on the road and it makes getting in or out of the close hazardous our concern is that if was an emergency vehicle they would not fit through the gap, we were hoping that on the house side maybe double yellow lines could be In place.Thank you for listening to the residents and devising a very good plan.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p>
<p>(32) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> - Yes please, ASAP.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - Please make sure there are some on the corners on Kennedy Close and James Wolfe Road.</p>
<p>(33) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p>
<p>(34) Local Resident, (Oxford)</p>	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> - It's about time when brooks was building the student new flats we had all the builders parking now we've got the students parking plus we have people that work in the hospitals parking here and getting on the bus to work and I have talk to the local councillor and was told I it's not our fault ?????? Well it's not the people that's lives around here fault so it's about time something should be don the sooner the better</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p>

(35) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - Although I 100% support the double yellow lines I do have one concern regarding access to my driveway.</p> <p>I live on Cranmer Road and i have a dropped kerb. My next door neighbour also has a dropped kerb and who also lives on the corner of Ridley Road. Between both dropped kerbs, at the point where the dropped kerbs rise, the space is 9 foot, 3 kerb stone width.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines from Ridley Road extend around the corner into Cranmer Road and over my neighbours driveway, stopping immediately after the kerb rises.</p> <p>When someone parks a small vehicle like a Toyota Yaris, which is 12 foot in length, they encroach over both properties driveways by approximately 1.6 foot, normally over the dropped slop of the driveway. If the vehicle is any bigger, and most are, they encroach further over our driveways.</p> <p>Due to the yellow lines stopping immediately past my neighbours driveway this will leave no space for parking for even the smallest of cars without them further encroaching over my driveway. This will mean that the smallest car parking just short of the double yellow lines will be approximately 3 foot over my drive.</p> <p>I would like this to be recognized and action taken to extend the double yellow lines to the end of my driveway in order to prevent the above.</p> <p>I strongly feel if no action is taken, then as a result, these double yellow lines will undoubtedly affect, not only our access to our property, but our view to the right when exiting our property, which will be a major safety concern, especially with vehicles entering Cranmer Road from Ridley Road.</p>
(36) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> - I propose permit holders only starts 5:30pm. Otherwise residents who arrive home would have to wait till 6:30 for a free space.</p>

	<p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Object</b> - Double yellow near the junction is good.</p> <p>James Wolfe: I object to double yellow the length of the road. It would not deter student-related parking. Rather, the likely effect would be to push cars (I counted 17 this morning) into the remaining space, so most space in the surrounding roads would be full most of the time. The inconvenience of driving currently along James Wolfe is better than having to fight for space in front of your house.</p>
(37) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> - 887 students moved into Parade Green, the cost is £163.44 per week for 42 weeks.</p> <p>UNITE / Brookes are now making £6,088,793.76 per year from Parade Green. 241 students moved into Paul Kent Hall, the cost is £140.00 per week for 38 weeks. UNITE / Brookes are making £1,282,120.00 per year from Paul Kent Hall.</p> <p>I support the CPZ but I would like some confirmation that UNITE / Brookes are contributing to this and the cost is not solely coming out of the council's budget.</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> - Are UNITE / Brookes contributing to pay for more traffic wardens to enforce this?</p>
(38) Local Resident, (Oxford)	<p>CPZ - <b>Support</b> - The dynamic of living in the area is changing and I am in complete support of the proposed CPZ area. I have 2 reasons for the proposal I am seeking .The proposal is that Fletcher Road, Yates Close and Burton Place are included in the amendment for James Wolf Road ,Hunter Close ,Kennedy Close and Lambton Close and also Hundred Acre Close .This would stop the domino effect of car owners finding the nearest alternative if they cant find a parking space.</p> <p>Reason 1./This is because to deter students and other private motorists from parking in the areas designated for most of the day and causing congestion in what is a Cul De Sac.</p> <p>Reason 2./This is also to deter motorists in general to parking vehicles in Fletcher Road ,Yates Close and Burton Place whilst they go shopping in Homebase, Aldi , Costa Coffee .Also their is a proposal to utilise the vacant building which was formerly Carpet Right into a Gymnasium ,fitness club. Even though their is a ample car park on the retail premises and these retail units are open 7 days a week .</p> <p>Parking Restrictions - <b>Support</b> – No comments.</p>

(39) Local Resident,  
(Oxford)

CPZ - **Support** – No comments.

Parking Restrictions - **Support** - I would like to increase the number of visitors passes that we receive.