

Divisions affected: *Churchill & Lye Valley, Cowley, Headington & Quarry, Iffley Fields & St Mary's, St Clements & Cowley Marsh, Rose Hill & Littlemore.*

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT – 21 JULY 2022**

### **OXFORD: VARIOUS LOCATIONS – PROPOSED EXCLUSION AND AMENDMENTS TO ELIGIBILITY FOR PARKING PERMITS**

Report by Corporate Director, Environment and Place

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. The Cabinet Member for the Environment is RECOMMENDED to approve the following proposals in respect of eligibility for parking permits:
  - a) **Cotteslowe** - exclude Nos.18 & 18A Harbord Road from eligibility to apply for residents permits,
  - b) **Divinity Road** - exclude new dwelling between Nos.45 & 51 Hill Top Road from eligibility to apply for residents & visitor permits,
  - c) **Girdlestone Road** - exclude No.61 Warren Crescent from eligibility to apply for residents & visitor permits,
  - d) **Headington Central** - exclude a) new properties at 4 Lime Walk from eligibility to apply for residents & visitor permits, and b) Nos.14A & 14B Holyoake Road from eligibility to apply for residents & visitor permits
  - e) **Hollow Way North** – limit residents of No.22 Meyseys Close to be eligible to apply for a maximum of 2 residents permits only and accompanying number of visitor permits.
  - f) **Florence Park** - enable property Nos.1a-35 (odd Nos only) Rose Hill to apply for residents & visitor permits,
  - g) **Iffley Fields** - enable property Nos.1-9 Meadow Lane to apply for residents & visitor permits,
  - h) **Cowley Central East** - amendment to show that Nos.147-169 odd & 156-166 even Oxford Road are eligible for permits,
  - i) **Headington West** - amendment to correctly identify the zonal designations for permits and parking as HA and HB.

#### **Executive summary**

2. This report presents responses received to a statutory consultation on proposed amendments to existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) orders in respect of eligibility for parking permits as a result of the development of properties for residential purposes, and the associated conditions within the planning permissions granted by Oxford City Council. With additional minor amendments to the legal documentation to rectify administrative matters.

## **Financial Implications**

3. Funding for consultation on the proposals has been provided by the developers of the properties in question.

## **Equality and Inclusion Implications**

4. No implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of the proposals.

## **Sustainability Implications**

5. The proposals would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and support the use of sustainable and active travel modes.

## **Consultation**

6. The Formal consultation was carried out between 03 March and 01 April 2022. A notice was published in the Oxford Times newspaper, and an email sent to statutory consultees, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Oxford City Council, the local County Councillors, and the local Oxford City Councillors. Additionally, letters were sent to approximately 305 properties in the immediate vicinity of the various properties.
7. Five responses were received during the formal consultation: with 2 objections, 2 in support (including one citing concerns) and 1 non-objection.
8. The responses are shown at **Annex 1**, and copies of the original responses are available for inspection by County Councillors.

## **Officer response to objections/concerns**

9. Thames Valley Police expressed no objections to the proposals.
10. The one objection in relation to No. 22 Meyseys Close stated that current residents had held a valid permit since the scheme's implementation in September 2020, and felt that this should remain the case. In order to prevent the development resulting in additional demand for on-street parking as a result of the removal of the garage parking space and the potential increase in residents at the property, Officers feel that by limiting the property to a maximum of 2 residents parking permits (as per currently active) this would be effectively managed.
11. The objection concerning Nos. 1-9 Meadow Lane felt that the amendment wasn't required as properties have access to off-street parking and garages.



RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	<b>No Objection</b>
(2) Member of public, (Oxford, Stratford Street)	<p><b>Object</b> – Nos.1-9 Meadow Lane</p> <p>Nos.1-9 Meadow Lane already have off-street parking and garages. Residents permits seems superfluous. I would have no objection to visitor permits.</p> <p>There is already parking congestion on Stratford Street (the only adjacent street). For example it is rarely possible to park after work on an evening shift. More cars - trying to park at the Jackdaw Lane end of Stratford Street where there is already a problem with people staying on the double yellows - is likely to cause a lot more congestion.</p>
(3) Member of public, (Oxford, Meyseys Close)	<p><b>Object</b> – No. 22 Meyseys Close</p> <p>I object to this proposal. live at this address and have done so for c. 8.5 years, relying on a car for site based/incident response (environmental and flooding incidents) work throughout Oxfordshire, Wiltshire, Gloucestershire and Berkshire. I have held a parking permit since the CPZs introduction without issue. To prevent me applying for a permit would stop me from undertaking my work and force me to find a new home.</p>
(4) Member of public, (Oxford, Rose Hill/Church Cowley Road)	<p><b>Support</b> – Nos.1a-35 Rose Hill &amp; Nos.1-9 Meadow Lane <b>Concerns</b></p> <p>Concerned at anyone having constraints placed on their ability to park where they live and pay tax. And any difficulty presented to their visitors.</p> <p>Support the need for those impacted by new restrictions (which are completely unnecessary anyway!) to be able to park near where they live and pay taxes. And the need for their visitors to be able to park.</p>

	All should be FREE, not paid for permits
(5) Member of public, (Oxford, Rose Hill)	<b>Support</b> – Nos.1a-35 Rose Hill  We would like our visitors to be able to park on Church Cowley Road. They have babies and need to park close. Across the road is always taken with residents who live there. If someone is working on the lane I have to park my car on the road and Church Cowley Road is the closest place.