



Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport

***Thursday, 22 April 2010 at 10.00 am
County Hall***

Items for Decision

The items for decision under individual Cabinet Members' delegated powers are listed overleaf, with indicative timings, and the related reports are attached. Decisions taken will become effective at the end of the working day on 30 April 2010 unless called in by that date for review by the appropriate Scrutiny Committee.

Copies of the reports are circulated (by e-mail) to all members of the County Council.

These proceedings are open to the public

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tony Cloke".

Tony Cloke
Assistant Head of Legal & Democratic Services

April 2010

Contact Officer: **Graham Warrington**
Tel: (01865) 815321; E-Mail:
graham.warrington@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Note: Date of next meeting: 3 June 2010

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.

Items for Decision

- 1. Declarations of Interest**
- 2. Questions from County Councillors**

Any county councillor may, by giving notice to the Proper Officer by 9 am on the working day before the meeting, ask a question on any matter in respect of the Cabinet Member's delegated powers.

The number of questions which may be asked by any councillor at any one meeting is limited to two (or one question with notice and a supplementary question at the meeting) and the time for questions will be limited to 30 minutes in total. As with questions at Council, any questions which remain unanswered at the end of this item will receive a written response.

Questions submitted prior to the agenda being despatched are shown below and will be the subject of a response from the appropriate Cabinet Member or such other councillor or officer as is determined by the Cabinet Member, and shall not be the subject of further debate at this meeting. Questions received after the despatch of the agenda, but before the deadline, will be shown on the Schedule of Addenda circulated at the meeting, together with any written response which is available at that time.

- 3. Petitions and Public Address**
- 4. Oxford, Marston Area - Parking Restrictions** (Pages 1 - 8)

Forward Plan Ref: 2009/115

Contact: David Tole, Leader, Traffic Regulation (01865 815942)

10:05 am

Report by Head of Transport (**TDC4**)

- 5. Disabled Persons' Parking Places - South Oxfordshire** (Pages 9 - 20)

Forward Plan Ref: 2010/025

Contact officer: Mike Ruse, Traffic Regulation Officer (01865 815978)

10.20am

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

Division(s): Headington & Marston

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT – 22 APRIL 2010

PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS MARSTON AREA, OXFORD

Report by Head of Transport

Introduction

1. This report considers comments and objections received to a formal advertisement and statutory consultation to introduce parking restrictions in parts of Marston (Oxford) not covered by existing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs).

Background

2. There have been complaints that some of the roads just outside the boundary of the Marston South CPZ have become affected by daytime parking by non-residents, resulting in difficulties for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. Separately, there have been complaints about parking, particularly at school start/finish times, in roads in the vicinity of St Nicholas School.
3. In 2007/08 a feasibility study was undertaken to look at the potential for introducing new CPZs in a number of areas, including this part of Marston. However, it was concluded that across the whole area the level of identified problems was low and that the introduction of area-wide restrictions had low priority.
4. Following ongoing concerns expressed via local councillors, the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Action Group, further surveys were carried out which showed that the parking problems are concentrated in Rippington and Mortimer Drives (between Oxford Road and Lewell Avenue) and on Beechey Avenue near the Oxford Road junction.
5. In late 2009 informal consultation took place on some initial ideas for restrictions to deal with these problems. The results of this were used to draw up formal proposals which have now been advertised and consulted upon.

Formal Consultation

6. Formal consultation on the proposals for parking restrictions took place in February 2010. Letters and plans were sent to all properties likely to be directly or indirectly affected and notices explaining the proposals were placed adjacent to the sites and in the local newspaper. Information was also sent to local Councillors, the Parish Council, the emergency services and other formal consultees. A copy of the public notice and other legal documents,

which were placed on deposit at Old Marston Library and at County Hall, are available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre.

7. In total, 26 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 1. Copies of all these communications are available in the Members' Resource Centre.
8. Thames Valley Police have no objections. Old Marston Parish Council consider the proposals to be sensible and broadly support them but are concerned that if implemented they may result in the parking problem moving further into the estate. The Oxford Bus Company support the planned restrictions on Oxford Road but are concerned that there may be displacement of commuter parking which affects other bus stops. No other formal consultees responded
9. The majority of respondents accept that the proposals will address some of the parking problems, but many are concerned that the restrictions will simply move the commuter parking to different parts of the area and cause new problems as a result. A number of respondents have asked for the introduction of a residents parking scheme into the area. There are no proposals to extend this type of control into this area.
10. It is acknowledged that the problem of commuter parking could spread and if the proposed restrictions are approved, further parking surveys will be carried out both before and after implementation to see what displacement effect they have had. Action to deal with the new situations will be proposed if required.

Conclusions

11. With the undertakings set out in the report to carry out additional before and after surveys to assess the displacement effects of the new restrictions, and to take appropriate action to deal with any problems which arise, it is considered that the concerns of objectors have been addressed.

How the Project Supports LTP2 Objectives

12. 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)

13. Funding for the costs of implementing the proposals described in this report, estimated to be around £2500 (including advertising) will be met from existing budgets.

RECOMMENDATION

14. **The Cabinet Member for Transport is RECOMMENDED to approve the introduction of parking restrictions in the Marston Area (Oxford) as advertised.**

STEVE HOWELL
Head of Transport
Environment & Economy

Background papers: Copies of all the legal documents plus letters and emails received in response are available in the Members' Resource room.

Contact Officer: David Tole Tel: 01865 815942

April 2010

PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS – OLD MARSTON AREA, OXFORD
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	Noted
2.	Old Marston Parish Council	Consider the proposals to be sensible and broadly supports them Note that once these restrictions are implemented the problem is likely to move deeper into the Estate	Noted The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required
3.	Oxford Bus Company	Supports planned restrictions on Oxford Road but concerned that there may be displacement to other bus stops in the Marston Area Concerned that the restrictions should be signed and marked correctly so they can be enforced	Noted The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required This will be done
4.	A Resident, Oxford Road	Thinks the proposals will be a slight help but concerned that the introduction of the restrictions will increase parking over drives/entrances etc. Strongly in favour of a Residents Parking scheme	Noted. The proposals did include the offer of access protection markings beyond the proposed restrictions to deal with this issue There are no proposals to introduce a Residents Parking Scheme in this area.
5.	A Resident, Oxford Road	Concerned that the proposals do not address the problem of overspill from the Milham Ford site. Requests that additional No Waiting restrictions be introduced on Oxford Road to assist buses getting into stops and also drivers egressing Rylands and Gordon Close.	The proposals are designed to deal with parking by commuter parking whatever its source Proposals have already been agreed to introduce a Bus Stop Clearway at the most congested location on Oxford Road and similar action will be taken elsewhere if required
6.	A Resident, Oxford Road	Requests additional No Waiting restrictions alongside the central reserve as there is already occasional parking and considers this will get worse once the proposed restrictions are implemented	The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required

CMDT

7.	Owner of a property, Oxford Road	Agrees with the introduction of restrictions at junctions but requests removal of some of the proposed double yellow lines on Oxford Road outside his property	The restrictions on this part of Oxford Road are required to reduce danger and congestion at junctions. Parking will still be available in adjacent areas
8.	A Resident, Oxford Road	Concerned that the proposals do not restrict parking at the northern end of Oxford Road which has problems with commuter and school-time parking Would welcome a Residents Parking scheme	The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required There are no proposals to introduce a Residents Parking Scheme in this area
9.	A Resident, Oxford Road	Concerned that the proposals will make things worse for residents as non-residents currently parking on streets where restrictions are to be introduced will instead park on the sections of Oxford Road and the service road where no restrictions are proposed. A lot of properties have shared driveways which adds to the difficulties Suggests a Residents Parking scheme	The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required There are no proposals to introduce a Residents Parking Scheme in this area
10.	Two Residents, Oxford Road	Have seen the parking problems increase over the last 5 years and understand the need for the restrictions that are proposed. However they are concerned that this will simply move the problem to other areas, including outside their house Feels that a Residents Parking scheme is the solution, providing it does not penalise residents in any way	Noted The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required There are no proposals to introduce a Residents Parking Scheme in this area
11.	A Resident, Oxford Road	Agrees that something needs to be done but concerned that the proposals will make it more difficult to park outside own property. Have considered installing a driveway to assist. Suggests a Residents Parking scheme	Noted. The proposals did include the offer of access protection markings beyond the proposed restrictions to deal with this issue There are no proposals to introduce a Residents Parking Scheme in this area
12.	A Resident, Oxford Road	Would like the proposed restrictions to be extended to cover her/neighbour's drives to improve visibility	Noted Will be dealt with separately

CMDT

13.	A Resident, Oxford Road	<p>Recognises there is a parking problem but doesn't think it is serious enough to merit these changes</p> <p>Concerned that the proposals will make the situation worse not better. The proposed double yellow lines at junctions will push commuters deeper into the residential areas, as will the 2-hour parking which will also disbenefit residents. The suggestion of providing white access protection across driveways will not work as intended as many houses have shared drives and are too narrow for modern cars, so they cannot be used for parking.</p> <p>If the aim is to reduce parking by non-residents it would be better to extend the Residents Parking Zone</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required</p> <p>There are no proposals to introduce a Residents Parking Scheme in this area</p>
14.	A Resident, Oxford Road	<p>Concerned that the proposed No Waiting at the southern end of Oxford Road, plus the 2-hour limited parking on Beechey Avenue, will make it very difficult for visitors to park nearby.</p> <p>Notes that parking is allowed for permit holders on the adjacent section of Old Marston Road and suggests a similar approach in Oxford Road</p> <p>Suggests that the problem is caused by lack of parking at the hospital and the current proposals don't deal with that but yet penalise local residents</p>	<p>The 2-hour parking, which will only apply from 10am to 4pm Monday to Friday, has been designed to provide some convenient parking for visitors</p> <p>There are no proposals to introduce a Residents Parking Scheme in this area</p> <p>Noted</p>
15.	Two Residents, Beechey Avenue	<p>Proposed 2-hour restriction on Beechey Ave should be extended further into the road</p> <p>Concerned that the 2-hour restriction will be abused and not enforced</p>	<p>The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required</p> <p>Appropriate levels of enforcement will be undertaken</p>

CMDT

16.	Two Residents, Beechey Avenue	Agree that there is a parking problem caused by lack of parking provision by Brookes University and by the introduction of the Marston South CPZ Agree that there should be double yellow lines on Oxford Road and at the junctions as proposed Cannot agree to the proposed 2-hour limited waiting (10am – 4pm) on Beechey Avenue and requests that it be changed to be 2-hour (8am – 5pm) with permit holders exempt to avoid having to move their car every 2 hours. Proposed restriction would prevent attendance at church related activities at their house,, particularly by elderly people	Noted Such a proposal could only be as part of a Residents Parking Scheme and there are currently no plans to introduce one in this area The 2-hour parking, which will only apply from 10am to 4pm Monday to Friday, has been designed to provide some convenient parking for visitors
17.	A Resident, Beechey Avenue	Concerned that proposals will simply push the parking problem further into the road Requests Residents Parking scheme	The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required. There are no proposals to introduce a Residents Parking Scheme in this area
18.	Two Residents, Beechey Avenue	Pleased that something is being done to address the problems but expect that the problem will simply move to other parts of the street/area. Trusts that the situation will be monitored	The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required.
19.	A Resident, Raymund Road	Requests an amendment to the proposed No Waiting restrictions on Raymund Road so they don't cover his driveway	Noted A minor amendment will be made to meet this request
20.	A Resident, Raymund Road	Requests proposed No Waiting 3pm-4pm be No waiting At Any time to keep that side of the road clear of parked cars to avoid danger to schoolchildren	The proposed restrictions are designed to give the maximum improvement to congestion near the school whilst minimising the disruption to local residents
21.	A Resident, Raymund Road	Objects strongly to the proposed restrictions on Raymund Road as the problems only exist for a short part of the school year and rarely cause her any inconvenience. Challenges the need for the restrictions to apply in school holidays as this could cause greater	The proposed restrictions are designed to give the maximum improvement to congestion near the school whilst minimising the disruption to local residents It is not permitted to apply parking restrictions on schooldays only

CMDT

		inconvenience for residents Doesn't think the restrictions will have any effect on parking, and considers that the existence of parked cars slow down traffic using Raymund Road.	
22.	Two Residents, Raymund Road	Requests a rethink of the proposals for restrictions near the school entrance	The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required.
23.	A Resident, Lewell Avenue	Would like additional restrictions at the Lewell Ave/Rippington Drive junction to deal with displaced parking Would like Access Protection marking as egress from driveway can be difficult	The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required. Noted
24.	Two Residents, Haynes Road	Concerned that the proposed restrictions will increase commuter parking problems in other parts of the estate, including Haynes Road, where there are already difficulties for elderly and disabled residents	The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required.
25.	A Resident, Arlington Drive	Requests that the proposed No Waiting restrictions on Arlington Drive be extended further along the road Wants action taken against drivers who park on the footway	The situation will be kept under review and action proposed if required. Footway parking can be dealt with by the Neighbourhood Police
26.	A student attending Brookes University (Milham Ford site)	Lives in Banbury and commutes by car to attend her course. Annoyed at how unfair the proposals are to students as this is one of the only places left to park without a permit. Suggests that a car park be provided for students at Milham Ford site as public transport and Park & Ride are unreliable and cannot be used Introducing these restrictions will prevent some students from attending their course/exams	Noted

Division(s): All

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT- 22 APRIL 2010

DISABLED PERSONS' PARKING PLACES – SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE

Report by Head of Transport

Introduction

1. This report considers the proposed provision of new Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPPs), the formalisation of existing "advisory" DPPPs, and the removal of DPPPs no longer required in South Oxfordshire. This follows the publication of the draft Oxfordshire County Council (South Oxfordshire District) (Disabled Persons' Parking Places) (Amendment [No.4]) 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, they 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 9 February, 2010. These documents, together with supporting documentation as required, and plans of all the DPPP's were deposited for public inspection at County Hall, South Oxfordshire District Council offices at Crowmarsh, and at Didcot, Henley, Thame, and Wallingford 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, as well as the locations where it is proposed to remove existing DPPP's, 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 formal Consultees to respond were Thames Valley Police, South Oxfordshire District Council, Thame Town Council, and Benson Parish Council, none of which had any objections to the proposals. Dorchester Parish Council objected to the proposed removal of a DPPP in the High Street and that is dealt with at item 15.
9. Comments were received from local residents in respect of the proposed DPPP's in Hamble Road, Didcot; Luker Avenue, New Street and Northfield End, Henley; and Horton Avenue and Park Street, Thame. Comments were received concerning the proposed formalisation of a DPPP at Hop Gardens, Henley. Comments were also received in respect of the proposed removals of DPPP's at Greys Hill, Henley and High Street, Dorchester.
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. **Proposed new DPPP in Hamble Road, Didcot** – after further contact 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. The applicant therefore does not qualify for a DPPP and it is recommended that the DPPP proposal should not proceed.
12. **Proposed new DPPP in Horton Avenue, Thame** – as a result of comments, from residents in the road, and subsequent site visits (one at night) it is agreed that the normal parking pattern on street at night is on the south-west side and therefore the DPPP as originally proposed to be on the opposite side would disrupt this and cause an obstruction to passing traffic. A second consultation has now been carried out with local residents regarding a proposal to provide a DPPP on the south-west side (outside No's 7 & 9) and it is recommended that this revised proposal be approved.

13. **Proposed formalisation of advisory DPPP in Hop Gardens, Henley** – the disabled resident who uses the bay has advised that she will give up driving due to ill health when the vehicle tax disc expires in October 2010. In the circumstances she does not now want the DPPP to be formalised, therefore it is recommended that this proposal should not proceed.
14. **Proposed new DPPP in Park Street, Thame** – the disabled resident and his neighbour were concerned that the proposed site of the DPPP would leave a short gap between the end of the DPPP and the neighbour’s off-street access. Vehicles might park here and obstruct that access. As the road here is heavily parked at all times a new location is proposed with the agreement of both parties for the bay to start adjacent to the “KEEP CLEAR” marking – a shift of approximately 3.5 metres. No other frontages are affected and no other comments have been received. It is recommended that the new proposal be approved.
15. **Proposed removal of DPPP in High Street, Dorchester** – although the disabled resident here has died, both the local County Councillor and the Parish Council have asked that the bay be retained, to continue facilitating disabled visitors to Dorchester Abbey and the adjacent Public House. The Parish Council advises that the property the bay fronts has private off-road parking at the rear so will not be adversely affected. No other comments have been received. It is therefore recommended that the proposed removal should not proceed.

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

How the Project supports LTP2 Objectives

16. The introduction of new DPPPs and the formalisation of advisory DPPPs 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)

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

RECOMMENDATION

18. **The Cabinet Member for Transport is RECOMMENDED to authorise variations to the Oxfordshire County Council (South Oxfordshire District) (Disabled Persons’ Parking Places) Order 2006 as amended in this report to provide for:**

- (a) **thirteen new DPPPs as set out in Annex 1 to this report;**

- (b) the formalisation of five existing advisory DPPPs as set out in Annex 1 to this report;**
- (c) the removal of two existing DPPPs, as set out in Annex 1 to this report.**

STEVE HOWELL
Head of Transport
Environment & Economy

Background papers: Consultation documentation

Contact Officer: Mike Ruse, Tel 01865 815978

March 2010

ANNEX 1**Proposed New Disabled Persons' Parking Places****Berinsfield**

1	Fane Drive, outside No 172.
---	-----------------------------

Cholsey

2	Cross Road, outside 1 Chequers Place.
---	---------------------------------------

Crowmarsh

3	Park View, outside No 58.
---	---------------------------

Didcot

4	Hamble Road, outside No 8 * now recommended not to proceed.
---	---

5	North Road, outside No 34.
---	----------------------------

Henley

6	Luker Avenue, outside No 60.
---	------------------------------

7	New Street, outside No 25.
---	----------------------------

8	Northfield End, outside Pyt Cottage.
---	--------------------------------------

9	Station Road, opposite No's 47-49 (development site).
---	---

Sonning Common

10	Ashford Avenue, outside No 13.
----	--------------------------------

11	Pages Orchard, opposite No 30.
----	--------------------------------

Thame

12	Horton Avenue, outside No 8 * now proposed outside No's 7 & 9 instead.
----	--

13	North Street, two bays (1 outside No 3 – site of new library) (2 opposite No 59).
----	---

14	Park Street, outside No 25 * now proposed outside No's 25 & 26.
----	---

Proposed Formalisation of Advisory Disabled Persons' Parking Places	
Benson	
1	High Street adjacent to No 29 (parade of shops).
Berinsfield	
2	Colwell Road, outside No 12.
3	Fane Drive in parking bays outside No 21 (parade of shops).
Chinnor	
4	Church Road, in parking bays outside No 20 (parade of shops).
Didcot	
5	Fairacres Road, outside No's 45 & 47.
Henley	
6	Hop Gardens, outside No 16 * now recommended not to proceed.

Proposed Removal of DPPPs no longer required	
Dorchester	
1	High Street, outside No 11 * now recommended not to proceed.
Henley	
1	Greys Hill, outside No 74.
Sonning Common	
1	Lea Road, outside No's 34/36/38/40.

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

	Commentor	Comments	Response	Recommendation
DPPP at High Street, Benson – proposed formalisation				
1	Benson Parish Council	No objections.	Noted.	Proceed
DPPP at Hamble Road, Didcot				
2	Resident, Hamble Road	Does not object to the provision of a DPPP but advises that in the evenings, residents park on the opposite side and as road is not wide enough for parking both sides this could cause difficulties for through traffic. Suggests locating proposed DPPP on opposite side.	Highways inspector has now verified that the applicant has a hard-standing big enough for two cars nearby that forms part of the property so the applicant no longer qualifies for a DPPP. The applicant has been notified by letter and has not appealed.	Recommended not to proceed.
DPPP at Luker Avenue, Henley				
3	Resident, Luker Avenue.	Approves of proposal.	Noted	Proceed.
DPPP at New Street, Henley				
4	Resident, New Street	Objects to proposal because there are already 2 DPPPs in the road which are often left empty. The proposed DPPP would take away a residents' only space and these are usually the only places residents can park. Non-residents and staff at the theatre take up the shared spaces. If the new DPPP goes ahead, could it be done at the same time as the proposed extra residents parking "down the road?"	The existing DPPPs are used by 3 disabled residents with blue badges. The proposed bay is for another badge holder resident here who already parks in the street. The proposed changes to parking arrangements in New Street were authorised by the former Transport Decisions Committee on 10 February so should be implemented before the DPPP is approved.	Proceed.

DPPP at Northfield End, Henley				
5	Business in Northfield End	Objects to any more DPPPs because too many are provided already, especially in car parks. Believes it is now too easy to obtain a Blue Badge. Believes position of proposed bay will block passing traffic.	Proposed DPPP is for a disabled resident. Car Parks are not usually public highway and subject to different guidance on the provision of disabled bays. Cannot comment on Blue Badge provision. Highways Inspector does not consider proposed DPPP will block passing traffic.	Proceed.
DPPP at Horton Avenue, Thame				
6	Resident, Horton Avenue	No objection to proposed DPPP but believes it should be located on opposite side of road because this is the side residents park, otherwise they would lose 3 car spaces to enable passing traffic to manoeuvre round the DPPP.	Further site visits including at night verify this statement is correct. New 2 week consultation carried out on revised position of DPPP on opposite side outside No's 7 & 9. No further comment from this resident.	Proceed with revised proposal.
7	Resident, Horton Avenue	No objection to proposed DPPP but believes it should be sited on other side of road, where people park on street otherwise would lose 2/3 on-street parking spaces.	As above.	As above.
8	Resident, Horton Avenue.	Does not object to proposal but as vehicles park on other side of road, thinks proposed DPPP should be on that side.	As above.	As above.
9	Resident, Horton Avenue	Does not object to DPPP in its original proposed position. Would object to it if it were re-located. Expects OCC to install parking restrictions opposite	As above. There are no plans to provide parking restrictions opposite the proposed DPPP. Thames Valley Police advise it would be an offence to park opposite a formal DPPP if this prevented	As above.

		<p>the proposed bay. Also wants OCC to re-instate the grass verge and install drainage to address flooding problems.</p> <p>Objects to the revised proposal (as slightly modified as a result of his telephone comments) and expects OCC to advise the other residents of the minor repositioning of DPPP. Says DPPP should be outside applicant's home as no parking restrictions to prevent this. Expects OCC to provide parking restrictions on opposite side of road to proposed DPPP to prevent obstructive parking. Says residents choose to park close to their houses and proposed DPPP would not prevent this. Expects OCC to provide a dropped kerb and tarmac the adjacent grass verge to conform to "Government legal guidelines for DPPP's to allow for wheelchair access." Failure to do so would deem the DPPP, non-compliant."</p>	<p>vehicles passing. Re-instatement of grass verges and drainage issues passed to Area Office to deal.</p> <p>As above. Legal Services advise the modification is minor and does not adversely affect the other residents therefore no need to re-consult or notify them. The current parking practice in this part of the road is to park on the south-west side and the re-positioning of the proposed DPPP is to reflect that practice. Department for Transport (DfT) regulations do not require road authorities to provide dropped kerbs or tarmac grassed areas adjacent to on-street DPPPs therefore this is not proposed.</p>	
DPPPs at North Street, Thame				
10	Resident, North Street	Why are the 2 proposed DPPP's separate? Why not level off area on the	One of the DPPPs is to serve visitors to the new Library – the other one is for a disabled resident	Proceed.

		Wellington Street side and put parking bays there with one disabled bay? Various other comments unrelated to DPPP.	living further up North Street. Disabled resident did not want DPPP on his side because the ground slopes here and he wouldn't be able to use it. He is happy with the location of proposed DPPP. All other comments referred to Area office to respond.	
DPPP at Park Street, Thame				
11	Resident, Park Street.	Supports proposal but could the bay be located a metre or so to the south-east so it sits next to the "Keep Clear" marking which protects his drive. Otherwise cars will squeeze in between the two markings to park and partially block them.	Further inspection and revised location agreed with both disabled resident and his neighbour.	Proceed with revised location.

Comments on Proposed Formalisations of Advisory Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPP)

	Commentator	Comments	Response	Recommendation
Advisory DPPP at Hop Gardens, Henley				
1	Resident, Hop Gardens	Uses the bay and will be giving up car in October 2010. Won't need DPPP.	DPPP no longer required.	Not to proceed with formalisation.

Comments on Proposed Removal of existing Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPP)

	Commentator	Comments	Response	Recommendation
DPPP at High Street, Dorchester				
1	Dorchester Parish Council	Objects to proposal to remove DPPP outside 11 High Street – although	Noted – happy to recommend that DPPP stays.	Not to proceed with removal.

CMDT6

		the disabled resident has died, the bay is also of use to visitors to the adjacent Public House as well as Dorchester Abbey. No 11 has off-street parking at rear. It is one of only 4 DPPPs in Dorchester.		
2	Local County Councillor	Thinks proposal is unnecessary.	As above.	As above.
DPPP at Greys Hill, Henley				
3	Resident, Greys Hill	Has no objection to removal of DPPP	Noted.	Proceed.
4	Resident, Greys Hill	Confirms the bay is no longer required.	Noted.	Proceed.
5	Resident, Greys Hill	Supports proposal. Bay no longer needed.	Noted.	Proceed.

This page is intentionally left blank