

Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management Thursday, 7 September 2023

ADDENDA

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting (Pages 1 - 8)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2023 to be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

This page is intentionally left blank

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 20 July 2023 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 12.00 pm

Present:

Voting Members: – in the Chair

Councillor Andrew Gant
Councillor Pete Sudbury (Item 6)

Officers:

Whole of meeting Paul Fermer (Director of Highways & Operations), Anthony Kirkwood (Principal Engineer - Traffic & Road Safety), Geoff Barrell (Senior Infrastructure Planner) and Jim Whiting (Principal Officer - Parking); Sharon Keenlyside, (Interim Committee Officer)

Part of meeting Jacqui Cox, (Infrastructure Locality Lead (Cherwell); Odele Parsons, (Senior Transport Planner); Ian Connick, (Transport Planner); Paul Whitfield, (Principal Officer (Service Improvement); Dan Merchant, (Support Analyst)

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 as 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.

127/22 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

(Agenda No. 1)

Cllr Andrew Gant declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item 19 b) related to Summertown, namely as resident on one of the roads affected. Cllr Andrew Gant declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest regarding item 19 a) Cowley Central East, namely as trustee of a charity which manages a community space on the same development. Cllr Andrew Gant declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest regarding item 19 d) Cutteslowe and e) North Summertown as the roads affected were within Cllr. Andrew Gant's division.

Cllr Pete Sudbury, Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery and Environment, was appointed to chair item 6 and make the decision.

128/22 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

There were none.

129/22 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

The following speakers addressed the meeting:

Item 5	Banbury Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robin Tucker – Coalition for Healthy Streets & Active Travel. • Paul Bonser – Banbury Active Travel Support Group. • Cllr. Mark Cherry (written submission)
Item 6	Oxford: Barns Road & other locations – proposed parking permit eligibility amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbie Hopkins

NOTE: At the conclusion of item 5, the Chair, Cllr Andrew Gant – Cabinet Minister for Highway Management, considered item 7 followed by the remaining items in order as per the agenda. Item 6 was considered last on the agenda by Cllr Pete Sudbury, Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery and Environment.

130/22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

(Agenda No. 4)

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2023.

131/22 BANBURY LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (LCWIP)

(Agenda No. 5)

The LCWIP report identified a network of walking and cycling routes in and around Banbury and proposed improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure as well as consultation responses.

The Chair invited the speakers, in turn, to address the meeting and responded to points raised.

The Chair read out a written submission from Cllr Mark Cherry who was in support of the scheme.

Officers noted the issues raised regarding the lack of secure parking and concern about the scheme having a negative impact on the town. Officers would make some slight amendments to the scheme and formulate a walking plan for the town centre.

The Chair thanked everyone who had responded to the consultation and commented that every response had been read by officers which had led to significant alterations to the plan.

The Chair thanked the speakers and agreed with their comments, particularly that traffic was 'swamping' the town.

The Chair reiterated the Council's priority for the county was to reclaim space for people to use the environment in a way that was sustainable, good for the environment and better for mental and physical health.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the Banbury Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

132/22 OXFORD: BARNES ROAD & OTHER LOCATIONS - PROPOSED PARKING PERMIT ELIGIBILITY AMENDMENTS

(Agenda No. 6)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed parking permit eligibility amendments in Oxford Barnes Road and other locations.

The Chair invited the speaker to address the meeting and responded to points raised.

The Chair discussed with officers the history of parking permit eligibility in Barnes Road. Officers explained that as part of the planning requirements for the flats at 242a Barnes Road, the dwellings should not have been included in properties eligible to apply for parking permits in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

The Chair highlighted consultation responders' comments on bus services that had been degraded and cycle storage that was not secure.

The Chair confirmed with officers that residents' parking allocations were not restricted if they had a driveway.

The Chair commented that these flats were the lowest cost accommodation in Oxford and houses in the area, owned by wealthier residents, were allocated two car parking permit spaces, regardless of having a driveway. Owners of apartments were not eligible for any parking space.

The Chair also commented that although understanding the need to reduce car usage, there was a need for a just transition and that the proposal was not just on the grounds of wealth, income and age: young, less wealthy people had no car parking; those who could afford a house have 2 + parking spaces. This cemented and even reinforced the strong association of increased wealth and increased access to a car. It would not be fair to exclude the residents and visitors of 242a Barnes Road from having parking permits. There needed to be a review of all parking permits available

and they should be distributed in an equitable way. It was essential for keyworkers to have access to a car.

Officers explained that the Councils policy was to promote car free development. With this development an essential part of obtaining planning permission was that it was car free.

Officers also explained that traffic order changes were not pre-determined, and the Chair had the right to decide to approve or not approve any proposition put forward. In terms of planning, the Council had the right to promote a traffic order to make a development car free, but planning could not mandate it.

Officers recommended that items 6b) – e) were deferred to obtain more background information and to include in the report, the over-arching policy around new developments which would provide key information as to why permits were rescinded and the over-arching reason for doing so. The over-arching policy ultimately sets planning policy and planning decisions as well.

The Chair rejected the officer's recommendation to exclude the car free development at No.242a Barns Road from eligibility to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits, on the grounds:

- that the residents had bought their homes on the basis that there would be parking available,
- that recent changes included the introduction of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ),
- of the degradation of the bus service, which was no longer 24 hours,
- that visitors parking and disabled parking had been sold off,
- that the cycle storage was not secure and bicycles had been stolen,
- that local car parks did not have 24-hour access and were a significant distance away for those with levels of disability not meriting a Blue Badge: this meant that some (especially elderly) residents did not get visitors,
- the "Car Club" had a single vehicle available, often booked weeks in advance,
- the EV charging point had been allocated to a ground floor business and was not available to residents using the car club,
- Car Clubs are ideal for replacing second cars, or for occasional car users, not for regular users,
- that there was social injustice in houses being eligible for 2 parking permits, even with a driveway, and smaller dwellings not eligible for any parking permits,
- younger people and those on low incomes would suffer disproportionately from climate change; they should not also be de facto bearing the burden of traffic reduction measures,
- that there was a long-term trend to making health and care workers mobile and they should not be deprived of low-cost car parking. It may force workers to relocate, worsening both traffic and carbon emissions in other areas,
- that in discussion, it was noted that a house, allocated 2 parking spaces when converted to flats, loses access even to those spaces, thus perversely making more parking spaces for those who could afford to buy houses.

The wider recommendation of the Chair was that eligibility of parking permits be reviewed when new developments came forward, and that car parking spaces be progressively and equitably restricted for all types of dwelling so that there was no preferential victimisation of any generation or social group, including those with disabilities not sufficient to obtain a Blue Badge.

The following proposal in respect of eligibility for parking permits as advertised was **NOT APPROVED** by the Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery and Environment:

- a) **Cowley Central East** – exclude the car free development at No.242a Barns Road from eligibility to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits.

The Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery and Environment **DEFERRED** the following proposals:

- b) **Summertown** – allow Grove House, St James Row, No.3 Grove Street to be eligible for one resident's parking permit and residents' visitors' parking permits,
- c) **Jericho** – allow No.1 Canal Street to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits,
- d) **Cotteslowe** - exclude No.37 Templar Road from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits
- e) **North Summertown** – exclude the five new dwellings at No.4 Bladon Close from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits

133/22 OXFORD: GEORGE STREET - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO LOADING BAY RESTRICTIONS

(Agenda No. 7)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed amendment to loading bay restrictions.

The Chair read out an email received from a resident requesting that the loading bays be used by restaurants for outside dining when not in use and referred to comments from the consultation regarding a wider discussion on the use of George Street. The Chair pointed out that although this was not part of the decision today, the Council was undertaking the Central Oxfordshire Movement and Place Framework which would be considering allocation of road space, connectivity, environment etc.

Officers explained that the no waiting at any time restriction would be replaced by a no waiting restriction between 10am and 6pm and a single yellow line placed within the current loading bay. This would allow enforcement officers to issue tickets outside of loading bay times as the markings would be correct.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposed amendments to waiting restrictions at the loading bays at George Street Oxford:

134/22 LAUNTON - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS

(Agenda No. 8)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed introduction of 20 mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers in Launton.

The Chair used this opportunity to thank Tim Shickle who had been key to delivering the 20 mph speed limit policy.

The Chair remarked that in terms of the policy, it made sense to put a 20 mph speed limit in this location.

There had been 150 responses to the consultation and the Chair thanked all who had taken the trouble to respond.

The Chair requested that residents contact the Council if they felt that there were areas requiring further traffic calming measures.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Launton as advertised.

135/22 DRAYTON (ABINGDON) - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS

(Agenda No. 9)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed introduction of 20 mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers in Drayton (Abingdon).

The Chair and officers had received from Drayton resident's, several emails in the last 24 hours, objecting to the proposal and declaring that they had not been informed about the proposal in time to respond. In addition to this, there were ongoing discussions between the bus company and officers around the precise geographical extent of the 20 mph scheme.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **DEFERRED** this item.

136/22 CROWMARSH GIFFORD - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 10)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed introduction of 20 mph speed limits in Crowmarsh Gifford.

Officers commented that there were not many responses to the consultation but there was overall support for the proposal.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Crowmarsh and North Stoke as advertised.

137/22 CROPREDY - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS

(Agenda No. 11)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed introduction of 20 mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers in Cropredy.

The Chair commented that there was clear geographical justification for the scheme location.

The Chair welcomed the comments from Cherwell District Council and thanked them for engaging in the consultation process and for their detailed comments on where particular speed limits should begin and end. Officers had considered their comments but felt that in the case of Cropredy, the reasons for the proposed location of the speed limits were sound and they had therefore remained unchanged.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Cropredy as advertised.

138/22 CHIPPING NORTON - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 12)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed introduction of 20 mph speed limits in Chipping Norton.

The Chair referred to several responders who had commented on the speed limits on the radial routes in and out of Chipping Norton and asked officers to comment. Officers explained that the project was about 20 mph limits in areas where people live, not further out and restricted to where it was felt that compliance could be achieved. Radial routes were already subject to 30 mph speed limits.

The Chair asked officers to comment on evidence that the 20 mph schemes improve road safety. Officers reported that clear evidence showed that the schemes do improve road safety. Road calming measures are more effective but 20mph speed limits are worthwhile.

In response to comments regarding on call Fire Service response times, officers commented that they had fully consulted with the Fire Service, who would have highlighted any concerns if they had any.

The Chair commented on the positive response from the Chair of Governors of a local school who supported the scheme and stated that it would make the school children's walk to school safer.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Chipping Norton as advertised.

139/22 ASCOTT-UNDER-WYCHWOOD - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS

(Agenda No. 13)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed 20 mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers in Ascott-under-Wychwood.

Officers commented on the concerns of the Parish Council regarding the approach speed on London Lane and informed the Chair that there was currently a 40mph speed buffer being advertised independently of this scheme.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Ascott-under-Wychwood as advertised.

140/22 WROXTON & BALSCOTE - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS

(Agenda No. 14)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed 20 mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers in Wroxton and Balscote.

The Chair commented that the scheme was a clear application of the policies principles and rules for both communities.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Wroxton and Balscote as advertised.

141/22 WARDINGTON - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS

(Agenda No. 15)

The report presented the consultation responses to the proposed introduction of 20 mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers in Wardington.

Officers informed the Chair that Cherwell District Council had responded to the consultation and after considering their comments, officers had decided to continue with the original proposal due to the complexity of having to change signs and posts if the proposed scheme was changed.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Wardington and its hamlet of Williamscot as advertised.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing