

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 18 June 2015 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 10.40 am

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor David Nimmo Smith – in the Chair

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Roz Smith (for Agenda Item 4)
Councillor Steve Curran (for Agenda Item 4)

Officers:

Whole of meeting G. Warrington (Law & Culture); M. Kemp (Environment & Economy)

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
4 & 5	D. Tole (Environment & Economy)
5	M. Ruse (Environment & Economy)

The Cabinet Member for Environment 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.

21/15 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Councillor Roz Smith Councillor Steve Curran	4 – Proposed Changes to On-Street Parking Charges and Residents Permit Charges

22/15 PROPOSED CHANGES TO ON-STREET PARKING CHARGES AND RESIDENTS PERMIT CHARGES

(Agenda No. 4)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered CMDE4 proposed changes to charges for on-street parking (pay & display) and residents and other permits within Oxford, Abingdon and Henley.

Councillor Roz Smith expressed some concern and anger over some of the proposed increases in charges for residents parking. She accepted that pressures did exist in some areas but that was not the case in other areas such as Quarry Road and York Road where restrictions could possibly be relaxed. When CPZs had first been introduced the intention had not been to levy charges but that had now changed and she called for a full review of zones to gauge their effectiveness particularly when in many cases there was no enforcement, which posed the question why have them in the first place. Removing some zones would result in a considerable saving which could then be used to improve enforcement and help keep charges down in those areas where zones had been retained. In some areas restrictions could not be enforced because of inadequate signage and lining.

Councillor Steve Curran asked why charges were being increased as much as they were when there had been a promise to limit any such increase in line with inflation and whether increases could be applied in such a way that the charge for a second car was higher than that for a first. That could help some residents and possibly encourage a limit to the number of cars residents sought to own. Also many people in his division were on low incomes and would find it extremely difficult to budget for this increase and he felt that some of the surplus should be used to consider carefully how these increases would affect people's lives.

Mr Tole confirmed that current traffic orders had allowed for increases to be made to charges every 3 years in line with the retail price index but with no further consultation required. However, that had not happened every 3 years and although the latest increase was above RPI it was more reflective in real terms as increases to charging levels had occurred less often than every 3 years and the current proposed increases merely reinstated the mathematical balance. Revised levels of charges continued to be set using a formula which divided the cost of the scheme by the number of available permits. Resident parking zones were seen as self-financing and had never been related to income, area or vehicle size, although an option relating car size to charging had been looked but it was very unlikely that that could be satisfactorily linked in. With regard to the possibility of price differential on car numbers he thought some further modelling could be done but there were very few permits for third cars and none at all for a fourth. He accepted that in some areas the ability to pay could be problematic but was not sure how accurate figures would be if they were, say, based on income. He confirmed there had been some reviews undertaken, which had indicated some support for the retention of zones, but there was no planned programme to undertake any further review work. He accepted that improvements were needed to signing and lining and confirmed that the authority were considering an option to reduce the amount of lining in order to reduce costs and allow a refocus of funding on recognised hotspots

With regard to the proposals for Abingdon the Cabinet Member noted a late email from Abingdon Town Council in which they had confirmed that they had in fact written to the County Council on 5 March 2015 in response to the notices published in February 2015. That conflicted with paragraph 33 of the report. In their email they reaffirmed that they had some valid and real concerns regarding the proposed charges and were seeking to ensure that their residents were treated in the same manner as those in Henley and Oxford but welcomed proposals to provide new parking machines.

Apologising for any oversight Mr Tole confirmed that the Town Council's email had not, in his view, raised any issues which might justify a change to the recommended proposals. The current charges in Abingdon had not increased since 1994 while parking charges elsewhere had but in the meantime costs had increased considerably.

The Cabinet Member for Environment recognised that while parking zones allowed residents the ability to park that came at a cost and he was satisfied that those costs had been kept to reasonable levels over the years. Therefore, having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above he confirmed his decision as follows:

- (a) to increase the charges for on-street parking in the City of Oxford as described in paragraph 17 of the report CMDE4;
- (b) to increase the charges for on-street parking in Abingdon and Henley as described in paragraphs 21 and 22 of the report CMDE4;
- (c) the replacement of Pay & Display machines as described in paragraph 23 and 35 of the report CMDE4;
- (d) to increase the cost of residents permits in the Oxford area as set out in paragraphs 28 and 30 of the report CMDE4;
- (e) to increase the costs of visitor and contractors permits in the Oxford area as set out in paragraph 31 of the report CMDE4;
- (f) to increase the cost of residents and visitor permits in Abingdon and Henley as set out in paragraph 32 of the report CMDE4.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Dated.....

23/15 PROPOSED DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACES - SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE, VALE OF WHITE HORSE AND WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICTS

(Agenda No. 5)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE5) objections received to a formal consultation on proposals to introduce new disabled persons parking places in

..... Luker Avenue, Henley; Pye Street, Faringdon and Weavers Close, Witney. Other proposals advertised at the same time had been unopposed and had therefore been agreed under delegated authority.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve the proposed new DPPPs namely Luker Avenue, Henley; Pye Street, Faringdon and Weavers Close, Witney as advertised and detailed in the report CMDE5.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Dated

.....