

Public Document Pack

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 26 January 2023 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 2.00 pm

Present: – in the Chair
Councillor Andrew Gant

100/22 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

(Agenda No. 1)

There were none.

101/22 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

There were no questions from County Councillors.

102/22 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

The following speakers addressed the meeting:

(All speakers on all the items have 3 minutes except for County Councillors representing the relevant division who have 5 minutes).

Statements submitted for 26th January 2023

Item	Speakers
5. Banbury - Town Centre - West - proposed residents parking scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jack Mullins (Written Statement)• Alexandra Tyson (Written Statement)
6. Oxford: Donnington area - proposed Controlled Parking Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cllr Brad Baines (Teams 5 mins)• Danny Yee (3 Mins)• Jo Freer (Written Statement)• John Marsh (Written Statement)
7. Oxford: Lower Wolvercote area - proposed Controlled Parking Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cllr Jo Sandelson (Oxford City) (3 Mins)

9. Thame: Central area proposed parking measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stuart Blayney (Teams 3 mins) • Cllr Kate Gregory (5 mins)
12. Woodstock: town centre - proposed arrangements for the issue of hotel and guest house visitor parking permits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharone Parnes (Teams 3 Mins) • Cllr Andy Graham (Teams 5 Mins) • Cllr Julian Cooper (West Ox Council) (3 mins)
13. Chadlington - A361 and Chipping Norton Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Liz Leffman (5 mins)
14. Oxford: St Michael's Street - proposed permanent closure to all vehicles of eastern end of road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danny Yee (3 Mins)
16. Berrick Salome: Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robin Tucker – CoHSAT (3 mins) (MS Teams)

103/22 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

(Agenda No. 4)

Cllr Andrew Gant approved the minutes of the meeting from 17th November 2022 subject to the following amendments:

61/22 DECLARATION OF INTEREST (Agenda No. 1)

There were no declarations of interest as it was proposed to defer Item 21 to a later meeting. *Cllr Andrew Gant declared a prejudicial interest on Item 21 (OXFORD- A40 JUNCTION WITH BLANDFORD AVENUE AND DAVENANT ROAD – PROPOSED ACCESS RESTRICTIONS AND TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES) due to his involvement with the residents of those roads on the scheme, and the Leader of the Council had appointed Councillor and Cabinet Member Duncan Enright to chair that item and make the decision. However, Councillor Enright was unwell and unable to attend.*

81/22 Oxford- A40 junction with Blandford Avenue and Davenant Road – proposed access restrictions and traffic calming measures (Agenda No. 21)

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management agreed to defer this item *due to his involvement with the residents of those roads on the scheme, and he was unable to arrange for another member of the Cabinet to take the Chair to make a decision on this item.*

Cllr Andrew Gant approved the minutes of the meeting from 8th December 2022 subject to the following amendment:

83/22 DECLARATION OF INTEREST (Agenda No. 1)

Cllr Andrew Gant *declared a prejudicial interest on Item 21 (OXFORD- A40 JUNCTION WITH BLANDFORD AVENUE AND DAVENANT ROAD – PROPOSED ACCESS RESTRICTIONS AND TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES) due to his involvement with the residents of those roads on the scheme*, and the Leader of the Council had appointed Councillor and Cabinet Member Duncan Enright to chair that item and make the decision.

104/22 BANBURY - TOWN CENTRE - WEST - PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME

(Agenda No. 5)

Following the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement across Cherwell, South Oxfordshire and The Vale of the White Horse districts in November 2021, many requests have been received to review existing parking restrictions. One of these requests was received from Councillor Reeves, member for Banbury Calthorpe division, to cover residential streets to the west of Banbury Town Centre. Councillor Reeves has funded the necessary consultation and advertisement costs to design and consult upon these proposals.

This report presents the consultation responses to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for a proposed scheme.

Cllr Gant invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made in their statements.

Cllr Gant pointed out to officers' responses to objectors to the scheme (as per report) and added that officers had proposed that a review of the scheme could be carried out approximately 12 months after implementation of the scheme, should it be approved.

Cllr Gant agreed with officers' view that the proposals would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and alleviate parking stress in the area, and also would encourage the use of sustainable transport modes and help support the delivery of wider transport initiatives.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **APPROVED** the proposals as advertised for parking measures at Beargarden Road, Crouch Street, Monument Street, New Road, West Bar Street and Westbeech Court.

105/22 OXFORD: DONNINGTON AREA - PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

(Agenda No. 6)

This report presents the consultation responses to the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) proposals for the Donnington area of Oxford as part of the approved programme for introducing CPZs in the city.

Measures to restrict and control car parking availability, including use of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), form part of the county's emerging Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan (COTP) as well as recently adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (adopted in 2022) and also Oxford City Council's Local Plan (adopted in 2020). Much of Oxford is already covered by CPZs, with further CPZs planned and which are required to support several local transport and planning objectives.

Cllr Gant invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made in their statements.

Cllr Gant welcomed the aims of the scheme in terms of transport management (to remove free on-street commuter and other non-residential car parking spaces from the city, thereby reducing traffic levels and helping boost use of non-car modes), development management (to support the city and county councils' policies to limit the number of car parking spaces provided as part of new developments by ensuring restricted off-street provision does not lead to overspill parking in surrounding streets) and for protecting residential streets (by removing intrusive or obstructive non-residential on-street car parking and, where necessary, limiting the number of on-street spaces occupied per dwelling by residential and visitor parking).

Officers' suggestion was that a review of the scheme could be carried out approximately 12 months after the implementation of the CPZ, should it be approved.

Cllr Gant went through consultation responses and officers' comments to objections.

Cllr Gant felt that these CPZs would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and alleviate parking stress, with a CPZ in Donnington aimed at tackling existing on street parking issues and to also help encourage the use of sustainable transport modes.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to:

- 1) Approve the proposals as advertised for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Donnington area.
- 2) Include Ferry House, Meadow Lane within the list of eligible properties able to apply for resident & visitor permits.
- 3) Include residential moorings on the Oxford Canal in the vicinity of the new zone, being included for eligibility for resident and visitor permits.

106/22 OXFORD: LOWER WOLVERCOTE AREA - PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

(Agenda No. 7)

This report presents the consultation responses to the CPZ proposals for the Lower Wolvercote area of Oxford as part of the approved programme for introducing CPZs

in the city. Measures to restrict and control car parking availability, including use of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), form part of the county's emerging Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan (COTP) as well as recently adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (adopted in 2022) and also Oxford City Council's Local Plan (adopted in 2020). Much of Oxford is already covered by CPZs, with further CPZs planned and which are required to support several local transport and planning objectives.

Cllr Gant invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made in their statements.

Cllr Gant felt that proposed CPZ details, as presented in the report, would not serve in the best interest of residents of Lower Wolvercote area and informed the meeting that he would defer a decision on this matter so the officers could explore an impact of the proposed CPZ would have on parking in the area.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management agreed to **DEFER** a decision on the proposal as advertised for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Lower Wolvercote area so officers could explore an impact that this CPZ would have on parking in the area.

107/22 OXFORD: UPPER WOLVERCOTE AREA - PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

(Agenda No. 8)

This report presents the consultation responses to the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) proposals for the Upper Wolvercote area of Oxford as part of the approved programme for introducing CPZs in the city.

Measures to restrict and control car parking availability, including use of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), form part of the county's emerging Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan (COTP) as well as recently adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (adopted in 2022) and also Oxford City Council's Local Plan (adopted in 2020). Much of Oxford is already covered by CPZs, with further CPZs planned and which are required to support several local transport and planning objectives.

Cllr Gant went through the proposals and responses to the consultation including officers' feedback on objections. Cllr Gant added that he would agree with a review of the scheme is carried out approximately 12 months after the implementation of the CPZ should it be approved.

Cllr Gant felt that the CPZs would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and alleviate parking stress, with a CPZ in Upper Wolvercote particularly aimed at ensuring parking from Oxford North did not just displace in the area, and to also help encourage the use of sustainable transport modes. CPZs were also identified as one of several action in the county's emerging Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan that were required to support wider transport policies within the county council's Local Transport Connectivity Plan (adopted July 2022).

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to:

- 1) Approve the proposals as advertised for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Upper Wolvercote area.
- 2) Include properties located on Osborne Close and Church Lane within the list of eligible properties able to apply for resident & visitor permits.

108/22 THAME: CENTRAL AREA PROPOSED PARKING MEASURES

(Agenda No. 9)

In November 2021, the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions transferred from Thames Valley Police to Oxfordshire County Council. At launch, a number of local concerns were made about enforcement of historic restrictions which did not cater for the needs of local residents and businesses.

In response, officers committed with Councillors to undertake a review of the existing restrictions in the centre of Thame, alongside wider plans to introduce areas of paid parking to support the operation and funding of the civil enforcement operations.

The county council's parking team have worked closely with local councillors and the town council to bring forward a package of proposals to rationalise existing restrictions and introduce new measures which will help increase the turnover of parking whilst giving options for residential parking.

The proposals subject to the public consultation include:

- Introduction of Pay and Display Bays on High Street, Cornmarket and Upper High Street to allow for more effective enforcement and encourage the turnover of parking spaces. 1st 30 mins in any 24-hour period would be free and the paid parking does not include the main car parks on High Street and Upper High Street which would remain free of charges.
- Introduction of permit holder only bays on Lower High Street, North Street, sections of Upper High Street and Park Street.
- Removal of waiting restrictions on North Street (west side) to allow informal parking arrangements to remain.
- New Street Trader bay in Upper High Street car park and extension of taxi bays on High Street

Cllr Gant invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made in their statements.

Cllr Gant considered consultation responses as well as officers' feedback on objections raised and concluded that the proposals would help facilitate walking and cycling and the safe movement of traffic.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to:

- 1) Approve the proposals as advertised proposals for changes to no waiting restrictions, taxi bays, street trader bays and trader permits.

- 2) Approve amendment of the proposals for permit holder bays as follows:
 - a. Park Street, Nelson Street and North Street (except outside the Library) – are introduced as permit holder only bays.
 - b. Current plans for permit holder bays or Pay and Display and permit holders are amended for High Street (plan 1), Upper High Street (including outside the war memorial) – to be introduced as dual purpose bays – retaining the current 2-hour limit (non-permit holders) and including exemptions for permit holders.

- 3) Approve to put ON HOLD proposals for the introduction of Paid parking bays in central Thame to allow further work on linking plans with emerging transport and movement strategies. To be undertaken in discussion with the Town Council and be completed within a 6-month period.

- 4) Approve inclusion of properties No.80, 81, 81a and 83 in permit eligibility for the Thame central area.

109/22 WALLINGFORD - VARIOUS LOCATIONS - PROPOSED PARKING PERMIT AREAS AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS

(Agenda No. 10)

In October 2021, The Council, carried out extensive advertising that Civil Enforcement would be undertaken in the District of South Oxfordshire Horse from 1 November 2021.

Once enforcement commenced a number of comments were received in Wallingford from residents who had been receiving PCNs for parking near their homes due to historic waiting restrictions that did not meet the needs of residents.

A review of the area was undertaken in 2022 along with some other requests received in roads within the town. The County Council has worked with the town mayor and local councillor to develop proposals (as shown in **Annex 1**), which aim to better manage the demand for parking in parts of Wallingford.

This report presents responses received to a statutory consultation on the proposals to introduce changes in Wantage, which include the provision for:

- Shared Use Parking (resident Permits and limited Waiting – Reading Road and Castle Street to allow residents to park without time limit and provide short term parking for visitor to the town.
- Removal of single yellow lines – Croft Road and St Johns Road
- Removal of double yellow lines – St Johns Road
- No waiting at any Time – St Johns Road, Croft Road and Castle Street

Cllr Gant observed comments from the consultees and officers' responses to objectors of the scheme. Cllr Gant added that a review of the scheme would be carried out approximately 12 months after the implementation of the proposals.

Cllr Gant observed officers' responses to objection and agreed that the proposals would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and alleviate parking stress in the

area, and would also help encourage the use of sustainable transport modes and help support the delivery of wider transport initiatives.

The Cabinet Member for the Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the following measures as advertised:

- 1) The proposed 'Resident Permit & Shared-Use Parking' on Castle Street & Reading Road,
- 2) The proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' (Double Yellow Lines) on Castle Street, Croft Road, and St Johns Road,
- 3) The removal of existing 'No Waiting at Any Time' (Double Yellow Lines) on St Johns Road,
- 4) The removal of existing 'No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm' (Single Yellow Lines) on Croft Road, and St Johns Road, and
- 5) Include Walters Barn, Bear Lane and Morven, Reading Road within the list of eligible properties able to apply for resident & visitor permits

110/22 WANTAGE - VARIOUS LOCATIONS - PROPOSED PARKING PERMIT AREAS AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND TAXI RANK

(Agenda No. 11)

In October 2021, The Council, carried out extensive advertising that Civil Enforcement would be undertaken in the District of Vale of White Horse from 1 November 2021.

Once enforcement commenced in November it became apparent that residents in Grove Street were being issued with PCNs for parking near their homes. Grove Street and Stirlings Road are subject no waiting at any time and a single yellow line that operates Monday to Saturday 9am to 5pm. As a result, enforcement of the single yellow lines was suspended until a review could be undertaken.

A review of the area was undertaken in 2022 along with some other requests received in roads within the town. The County Council has worked with the town council and local councillors to develop proposals, which aim to better manage the demand for retail and residential parking in the centre of Wantage.

This report presents responses received to a statutory consultation on the proposals to introduce changes in Wantage, which include the provision for:

- Resident Permit Parking Area
- Limited Waiting
- Disabled Parking Places
- Taxi Bay

Cllr Gant observed responses to the consultation as well officers' comments to objections. Cllr Gant agreed with officers' recommendation that a review of the scheme should be carried out approximately 6 months after implementation.

Cllr Gant felt that the proposals would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and alleviate parking stress in the area, and would also help encourage the use of sustainable transport modes and help support the delivery of wider transport initiatives.

The Cabinet Member for the Highway Management **AGREED** to remove the proposed Taxi Bay in Newbury Street and to **APPROVE** the remaining measures as advertised:

- 1) the proposed 'Resident Permit Parking Areas' in Grove Street & Stirlings Road,
- 2) the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' (Double Yellow Lines) on Grove Street, Church Street, Maryfield, Mill Street, Portway, Stirlings Road, and Post Office Lane,
- 3) the proposed 'Limited Waiting' parking on Church Street, Mill Street, and Wallingford Street, and
- 4) the proposed 'Disabled Persons Parking Bay' on Wallingford Street.

111/22 WOODSTOCK: TOWN CENTRE - PROPOSED ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ISSUE OF HOTEL AND GUEST HOUSE VISITOR PARKING PERMITS

(Agenda No. 12)

In November 2019, West Oxfordshire District Council in coordination with Woodstock Town Council carried out a consultation with residents and businesses regarding parking usage and demands within the centre of Woodstock.

Following on from this consultation, the County Council worked with the town councillors and the local county councillor, to develop proposals which aimed to better manage the demand for retail and residential parking in the centre of Woodstock, whilst also generating revenue to fund the scheme and provide effective enforcement.

In March/ April 2022, the proposals were subject to an extensive public engagement exercise, with the outcome presented to Cabinet Member Decisions (CMD) in May 2022. The approved scheme (appendix 1) included the provision for:

- Paid Parking Bays with exemptions for permit holders.
- Ultra-short stay parking areas (max stay 30 minutes)
- Permit holder only parking areas
- New sections of 3 hour bays
- New cycle parking areas in the Centre of Woodstock

Under the approved scheme, a commitment was given that further assessment by officers would be undertaken to consider the introduction of permits for visitors to Guest Houses, Hotels and Holiday Lets within the scheme.

A further proposal includes an amendment to the original scheme to reconsult on changes to the restrictions in Park Lane, Woodstock to bring them in line with the wider offer of paid parking bays in the centre of Woodstock.

The purpose of this report is to report on the recent consultation on new policies for hotel and guest house permits to be incorporated as part of the originally approved parking scheme for Woodstock.

Cllr Gant invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made in their statements. In response to one of the statements, Cllr Gant assured the meeting that he did not come to decision making meeting, such as this one, with a predetermined mind.

Cllr Gant invited officers to explain their rationale for proposals as outlined in the report.

Cllr Gant felt also considered comments from the statutory consultees as well as 14 other consultation responses.

Cllr Gant supported officers' recommendations by saying that the proposals would help facilitate walking and cycling and the safe movement of traffic.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management is **AGREED** to:

- 1) Approve the officer recommendations for a new guesthouse/hotel visitor permit scheme to be incorporated into the proposed parking scheme for Woodstock approved at CMD on 26th May 2022.
- 2) Approve the officer recommendations to introduce paid parking bays in adjacent to No's 7-11 and No.12 Park Lane, Woodstock.

112/22 CHADLINGTON - A361 AND CHIPPING NORTON ROAD

(Agenda No. 13)

This report presents responses received to a statutory consultation on the proposed the proposal to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the Chipping Norton Road and also on the A361 by the Chipping Norton Road junction to facilitate the safe passage of traffic and also to improve the safety of pedestrians currently parking on the verge to then access adjacent retail premises. Chipping Norton Road also facilitates the X9 bus service between Chipping Norton and Witney.

Cllr Gant invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made in their statements.

Cllr Gant informed the meeting that recommendation 2 would be amended to read *'Approval of the as advertised 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions at the A361 and Chipping Norton Road at Chadlington to be implemented at an appropriate time with the decision to implement delegated to the Director for Highway Operations in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highway Management.'* as it wasn't quite clear in the original recommendation what that process might look like.

Cllr Gant added that the report had a lot of detail on matters that have already happened and those that might needed to happen going forward. Nevertheless, Cllr

Gant agreed with officers' recommendations, as amended, citing that current situation was not satisfactory and the proposals would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve:

- 1) Continued working with West Oxfordshire District Council, Thames Valley Police and Owner of Diddly Squat Farm to find a resolution to the challenges faced. Either through a reduction in visitors by car or suitable off-carriage way provision for parking.
- 2) Approval of the as advertised 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions at the A361 and Chipping Norton Road at Chadlington to be implemented at an appropriate time with the decision to implement delegated to the Director for Highway Operations in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highway Management.

113/22 OXFORD: ST MICHAEL'S STREET - PROPOSED PERMANENT CLOSURE TO ALL VEHICLES OF EASTERN END OF ROAD

(Agenda No. 14)

This report presents responses received during the statutory consultation phase of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) which prohibits all vehicles at the East end of St Michael's Street.

Cllr Gant invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made in their statements.

Cllr Gant said that the ETRO had continued the provisions of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (made under the Department for Transport COVID regulations) which had prohibited all vehicles from using the 50-metre length of St Michael's Street west of its junction with Cornmarket Street to enable outdoor seating to be provided for the adjacent hospitality businesses. A proposal to make the ETRO permanent has been received from Oxford City Council's Business Liaison Officer at the request of the adjacent businesses.

Cllr Gant noted that whilst assisting local businesses as a result of enabling tables and chairs to be placed on the carriageway, the proposals has raised issues for cyclists who were required to dismount when using this east end of St Michael's Street. Cllr Gant acknowledged that the section where cyclists had to dismount was relatively short and an alternative route East-West through the city centre was available where dismounting was not necessary – New Inn Hall Street, George Street, Broad Street, albeit on roads used by a greater number of vehicles.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the making of the order to prohibit all vehicles at the East end of St Michael's Street.

114/22 YARNTON - CASSINGTON ROAD - PROPOSED RAISED PARALLEL CROSSING

(Agenda No. 15)

This report presents responses received to a statutory consultation on a proposal to introduce a raised parallel crossing on Cassington Road just west of its roundabout junction with the A44 Oxford to Woodstock Road.

Cllr Gant reflected on consultation outcomes by agreeing with officers' responses to objectors to the scheme as well as on those raising concerns on whether the crossing met the current design requirements, with regards to drainage at the road hump location and vehicles backing up through the roundabout when the crossing was in use.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve as advertised a raised parallel crossing (a zebra type crossing for pedestrians and pedal cyclists) on Cassington Road, just west of its roundabout junction with the A44 Oxford to Woodstock Road

115/22 BERRICK SALOME: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 16)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Berrick Salome.

Cllr Gant invited speakers to address the meeting and responded to the points made in their statements.

Cllr Gant agreed with officers' responses to objectors on the scheme by saying that a lower limit on the link to the village at Rokemarsh has formed part of the Benson consultation where it was proposed that the 50 mph limit on the B4009 would replace the national speed limit on that link. The connecting link at Roke was longer and the existing rural limit was deemed appropriate.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

116/22 BLETCHINGDON: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 17)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Bletchingdon.

Cllr Gant acknowledged responses from statutory consultees and agreed with officers' response to a single objection on this scheme.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

117/22 BOURTON (FARINGDON): PROPOSED 20 MPH AND 30 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 18)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on proposals for 20mph and 30 mph speed limits in Bourton.

Cllr Gant noted responses from statutory consultees as well as individual comments from members of the public, and agreed with officers' response that neither of the objections for the 20mph and 30mph speed limit proposals were considered of sufficient merit to warrant a change to the current proposals.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph and 30mph speed limits as advertised.

118/22 FIFIELD: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 19)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Fifield.

Cllr Gant commented that no objections were received and that the main purpose of the scheme was to improve road safety and to encourage greater use of active travel by reducing speeds which would reduce accidents.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

119/22 GARSINGTON: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 20)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Garsington.

Cllr Gant reflected to responses in the consultation and agreed with officers' observations and their responses. Cllr Gant had also noted comments and objections from statutory consultees.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

120/22 GORING - PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT

(Agenda No. 21)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Goring-on-Thames.

Thames Valley Police re-iterated their views on OCC's policy and practice regarding 20mph speed limits; they consider their response as 'having concerns' rather than an outright objection.

Cllr Gant agreed with officers' views that all objections were similar to those expressed and considered in earlier similar schemes and were then not deemed to warrant a change in the proposals.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

121/22 LITTLE COXWELL - PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT

(Agenda No. 22)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph limits in Little Coxwell village and a short section of 40mph limit on Fernham Road.

All objections to the 20mph speed limit proposals were similar to those expressed and considered in earlier similar schemes and were then not deemed to warrant a change in the proposals.

Cllr Gant agreed with officers' responses to objections to this scheme.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph and 40mph speed limits as advertised.

122/22 LITTLE MILTON: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 23)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Little Milton. The proposals would help encourage walking and cycling within Little Milton by making them safer and more attractive.

Cllr Gant agreed with the officers' responses to consultation where the main purpose of the scheme was to improve road safety and to encourage greater use of active travel by reducing speeds which would also reduce accidents. This formed part of a countywide programme of works that sought out to deliver 'a safer place with a safer pace'.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

123/22 NETTLEBED: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 24)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Nettlebed. The proposals would help encourage walking and cycling within Nettlebed by making them safer and more attractive.

Cllr Gant welcomed the recommendation by saying that the aim of reducing speed limits was to change driver’s mindsets to make speeding socially unacceptable and make more environmentally friendly modes of travel such as walking and cycling more attractive, and also reduce the Counties carbon footprint.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

124/22 PYRTON: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 25)

The report presents responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Pyrton. Thames Valley Police re-iterated their views on OCC’s policy and practice regarding 20mph speed limits; they consider their response as ‘having concerns’ rather than an outright objection. Stagecoach Bus Company responded but had no objection or comments to make. The local member also expressed support.

Cllr Gant welcomed the recommendation by saying that the aim of reducing speed limits was to change driver’s mindsets to make speeding socially unacceptable and make more environmentally friendly modes of travel such as walking and cycling more attractive, and also reduce the Counties carbon footprint.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

125/22 SOMERTON: PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS

(Agenda No. 26)

This report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Somerton. Thames Valley Police re-iterated their views on OCC’s policy and practice regarding 20mph speed limits; they consider their response as ‘having concerns’ rather than an outright objection. A local district or parish councillor who appeared to respond on behalf of their Council also voiced support.

Cllr Gant expressed his support for the recommendations as the proposal would help facilitate walking and cycling within the village and the safe movement of traffic.

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management **AGREED** to approve the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits as advertised.

..... in the Chair

.....
Date of signing

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

26 January 2023

SPEAKERS

WRITTEN SPEECHES RECEIVED

Statements received

Item 5

Jack Mullins

I am a resident of Crouch Street and would like to provide a written statement ahead of this meeting in view of the objections raised against the scheme. Based on the response rate to the consultation, i.e. 46 responses from 425 households (950 people if a household is assumed to consist of two people), the vast majority of affected residents seem not to oppose the scheme. Rather, those who have not responded are likely to be in favour, and the few opposing responses received could be seen as an example of negativity bias. Arguably, the 18 responses in opposition to the scheme represent a vocal minority of residents, primarily those of Beargarden Road with access to off-road parking, and should not be taken as representative of the broader feeling towards the scheme in the areas affected. Furthermore, the proposal offers significant benefits in a range of areas, as set out below.

Available spaces: Currently, the number of cars attempting to park on Crouch Street and Beargarden Road regularly exceeds the number of available spaces. This issue is twofold – firstly there is a lack of spaces for those that live on these roads, and secondly the roads are used by non-residents visiting the town centre for work or leisure. The proposal addresses both of these concerns by increasing the number of available spaces and restricting use of the spaces to residents. This measure will greatly benefit the vast majority of residents. While some consider that the number of spaces will reduce as residents will no longer be able to park across their drives, the total number of spaces overall will not be reduced. Rather, a space that can currently only be used by a single household with off-road parking will be replaced by one or more spaces on the opposite side of the road that are available to all residents, to the overall benefit of the majority of residents.

Enforcement: The proposal indicates that the introduction of the scheme will be supported by enforcement of the new parking restrictions. At present, no enforcement is carried out, leading to cars parking not only in the restricted bays, but also on double yellow lines, as well as non-residents blocking driveways with impunity. This causes safety issues as well as broader disputes. By introducing enforcement as part of the scheme, parking of this nature can be prevented, to the benefit of all residents, including both those with and without off-road parking.

Safety: Several concerns were raised around the safety of moving the parking spaces from the South West to the North East side of Beargarden Road. It is agreed that the introduction of additional speed measures such as speed bumps or chicanes on this road and on Crouch Street would be beneficial. However, in the absence of this, enforcement of the double yellow lines at the junction of these two roads and moving traffic on Beargarden to the far side of the junction may at least reduce the potential for collisions at the junction itself.

Cost: At present there is no enforcement of parking restrictions. However, if the scheme were not to proceed and the existing restrictions be imposed, residents currently using on-

street parking would have to pay to park elsewhere (e.g., on South Bar Street) or be fined. The cost of this would be significantly higher than the £66 annual charge for a permit under the proposed scheme. Although it is appreciated that this price could be subject to increase in the future, this would also be the case for other paid parking. The proposed scheme is likely to be the lowest cost option for residents if enforcement is resumed in any capacity.

If, despite these benefits, a view is taken that some residents of Beargarden Road are sufficiently negatively impacted by the proposal to prevent its implementation on Beargarden Road, one option could be to only implement the scheme on the other roads. However, in this case, it would seem reasonable to issue parking permits solely to residents of the roads where permit parking will actually be introduced, as well as those of Beargarden Road who do not have use of off-road parking. In this way, the situation for those affected by the current lack of parking can be improved, while avoiding any perceived negative impacts on Beargarden Road residents who currently have access to off-road parking.

In summary, I believe that the overall impact of the scheme would be positive for the residents of the affected roads as a whole, and implore the Cabinet Member for Highway Management to approve the proposal for the wider benefit of the majority of affected residents.

Alexandra Tyson

I am a resident of Beargarden Road and would like to submit the following comments in support of the proposed permit parking scheme. I understand that residents from 34 houses on Beargarden Road have raised objections/signed a petition against the scheme. A significant majority of the objectors live on the south west side of the road and have private driveways. Most of the objections seem to primarily stem from the fact that these residents would lose guaranteed parking across their driveways for the third (or even fourth) vehicle of the household. I note that a number of responses assert that the scheme proposes an effective reduction in the number of available parking spaces in the road. I, however, agree with the Council's assessment that the number of spaces will increase. I live on the north east side of the road and do not have a driveway, so parking on the road is my only option. There are, at present, only 10 spaces in the road, where I could park. Of these spaces, some are almost permanently reserved by households with more cars than driveway spaces. Some households rotate their cars between their driveway and nearby road spaces to ensure that, if multiple cars are in use, the driveway is left empty and only the road space is used. This essentially makes that road space a semi-private parking space for that household. Thus, when I return home from work, more often than not there are no vacant spaces in Beargarden Road. A number of the objections express concern for the loss of parking space for visitors. In my opinion, the availability of parking for residents who use the spaces every day should be prioritised over the irregular or infrequent need of visitors. Furthermore, should the number of visitors permits provided be exceeded, South Bar (only 4 minutes walk away) provides very affordable parking, starting at only £1.10 per hour (up to £5.00 per day) between 8 am and 6 pm Monday-Saturday. My visitors do not have any qualms about incurring these costs, if necessary, when visiting me. To speak to the concerns regarding safety, I agree that a reduction in the speed limit on the road to 20 mph would be beneficial. However, absent these measures, enforcement of the double yellow lines at either side of the junction between Crouch Street and Beargarden Road may reduce collisions. At present, there appears to be no enforcement of the no parking zone at this junction and cars often park all the way to the end of Crouch Street. It is my belief that implementation of the parking scheme, in conjunction with the enforcement of restrictions, will improve safety. I understand that, to many people the principle of paying to park on their

residential street may be unpalatable. However, at present I regularly have to pay to park on South Bar at an extrapolated cost that far exceeds the £66 a year for a permit. I have even contemplated whether it would be more cost-effective for me to pay for a season ticket to park on South Bar at a rate of £270 per quarter. I think this further illustrates the lack of equity provided by the current parking situation. My greatest concern is the possibility that the permit scheme might be approved for Crouch Street but not for Beargarden Road. This will mean that all those non-residents who currently use Crouch Street/ Beargarden Road to park temporarily, (e.g. to go to work, to the doctors or shopping) will instead only be able to park on Beargarden Road, significantly increasing the competition for the public parking spaces on the road that are regularly used by residents who, like me, have no off-road parking. It would also remove Crouch Street as a possible place for me to park when I cannot find a space on Beargarden Road. Furthermore, I consider this situation would also negatively impact residents on the south west side of the road, as I believe it will increase the incidence of people parking across and blocking driveways temporarily in order to attend the doctors' surgery or pharmacy (a problem that already exists as outlined by respondent number 8 who objected to the scheme). In summary, I sincerely believe the parking permit scheme would provide a more equitable parking situation for all residents who require parking on the road (whether due to lack of a driveway, or because they have more cars than the number of spaces on their driveways).

Item 6

Jo Freer

As follow-up to reference (55) Member of public, (Oxford, Howard Street), I wish to submit the following queries in writing, to be addressed at the OCC Decisions / Cabinet for Highway Management meeting on 26 January.

Why can't affected Howard Street residents (i.e. those with private parking off Boundary Brook Road) be eligible for the Donnington CPZ, instead of the Magdalen South CPZ? Why would it not be possible to offer these residents a choice over which CPZ best suits their needs? Surely something could be put in place to prevent abuse of this system, e.g. automatic rejection of an application from an address if residents already hold a permit for the other zone? If this isn't possible to implement, it would be helpful to know exactly why.

Connected to this, has any analysis been done around the impact of additional Magdalen South CPZ applications from these Howard Street residents? Parking in this area is already practically at capacity. Adding cars from around 36 extra houses (i.e. approximate Howard Street residences affected by the proposal) poses a very real risk of creating new parking issues.

For Howard Street residents who enjoy private parking at the rear of their property, what measures will the Council take to prevent parking abuses from those who park on their land? This is already an issue, with cars blocking garages and residents' access by parking along this side of the road. Can the Council provide any reassurances to residents around this valid concern, as well as examples of tangible actions they will take to prevent this from happening?

We do not have a Magdalen South CPZ permit. Currently, if we arrive home to discover a car blocking our drive, we can park on Boundary Brook Road without issue, and then move the car back to our driveway as soon as possible. In the future, with the plans as currently proposed, doing this would incur a fine. What action would the Council recommend for us

when this happens – both immediately and in the longer term? We do not feel purchasing a Magdalen South CPZ permit is an appropriate solution. Driving from the back of our house to park on Howard Street represents a 1km journey minimum (and a 1.5km round trip). At a time when residents of the city are being strongly encouraged to reduce travel by car, this seems counterintuitive.

Can you state with confidence that Howard Street residents directly affected by this proposal have been adequately consulted about the proposed CPZ? Unlike the recent School Streets initiative, affected residents were not consulted in writing about these plans. Though notices were displayed on the street, these could easily have been missed. That the official consultation report contains so few responses from Howard Street residents suggests limited awareness, which is of concern given the significant impact it may have on them.

John Marsh

I'm grateful the OXFORD – DONNINGTON: PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ) report recognises the concerns of some Howard St residents whose properties have driveways and garages on Boundary Brook Rd. However, I do not see how it has addressed them. I would like to raise these issues again and hope that the meeting on 26 January may generate more ideas, or encourage the Committee to reflect on the issue differently. I have outlined extracts from the report in **bold** below.

A few residents with properties on Howard Street raised the issue of their private parking (in front of garages) is accessed off Boundary Brook Road, within the proposed CPZ. The concerns raised were that their parking arrangements may be affected by the introduction of the new zone and residents of Howard Street should be given the option to join the new Donnington CPZ.

Our concern is that having a private parking area we require no permit. But if drivers block our drive, we will be forced to park on the public highway where a permit is needed to avoid a fine. Please could the council instruct us on what to do in this instance? Despite leaving notes on offending cars, drivers can block our drive for days. The Thames Valley Police website says to contact your local council to help people in these situations. Will the council help, or would we be issued with a fine for being forced onto the public highway?

In response, Howard Street is currently within the Magdalen South CPZ, and residents have the option to apply for permits to park in this zone.

Because of the location of our drive, and one-way streets. To drive to Magdalen South CPZ and park there is 1km away along 5 different roads. Once the offending vehicle had been moved, and we can reclaim our drive, it's 0.5km drive back to the driveway (see below). We are committed to reducing car journeys and do not want to purchase a permit in order to do more driving. If Howard Street residents with garages (36 or so) were allowed to park on boundary brook rd, they would only have to drive to the side of the road opposite their driveway/garage. Fewer cars on the road, doing fewer miles and much more convenient for residents. This is the goal.

We currently don't have any arrangements in Oxford City where a resident can apply for permits in multiple zones, as would be difficult to manage and would be open to abuse.

Would the Oxford city council be willing to try, in order to limit car journeys and better serve residents? No other arrangements in Oxford City would mean there are fewer requests to manage. Just 36 or so. Might those attempting to abuse the system be spotted, because

they would be the ones applying for two CPZ zones, that don't live at one of the 36 addresses.

Are there any CPZ arrangements in the city where residents with driveways are not eligible for a CPZ connected to their driveway. But have to leave their driveway and drive away from their house for 1KM to reach an CPZ they do qualify for.

Where private parking areas are not part of the public highway, they would not be part of the zone and therefore enforcement.

This applies to residents. However, it also applies to anyone who wishes to park on boundary brook rd for a while without a permit, and not face a fine. It is an incentive to block the garages, and park on driveways. This currently happens so it will continue to do so.

Item 16

Robin Tucker, Co-Chair, CoHSAT

The private motor vehicle has brought great convenience to people who can afford it, but only those directly affected stop to think about the social costs. Five people every day are killed by motor vehicle collisions in the UK, and 50 seriously injured. This sits on top of a bigger, less visible toll from air pollution and physical inactivity. The benefits of using a private vehicle are to its user, but the damage affects all society, so reducing that damage is a basic act of fairness.

Reducing speed limits is one way that a Transport Authority can reduce the damage caused by traffic, and we are pleased that Oxfordshire has established itself as a leader in England's move to safer speed limits. At last year's 20s Plenty Conference we heard from Wales, where 20 is now the default for restricted roads. This is estimated to save £100 million in the first year alone in reduced deaths and injuries, and reduces the load on the health service. We saw graphically the difference between a collision at 30 and a collision at 20. The myth that slower speeds cause more pollution was dispelled. And they reduce speeds and injuries even without enforcement.

Today, we will hear several recommendations where local communities have put forward requests for lower speed limits. These are Parish and Town Councils where the residents feel threatened by the dangers of motor vehicles, and they would like something done about it. They know that this will add to journey times. Indeed, as locals, they will be affected by it more than anyone. But they want their communities to be aligned to the needs of keeping people alive, rather than speeding through in metal boxes.

We urge you to approve these speed limit reductions.

Robin Tucker

Co-Chair

CoHSAT

This page is intentionally left blank