

## DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Thursday, 12 October 2023 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 1.10 pm

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** – in the Chair

Councillor Andrew Gant  
Councillor Judy Roberts (Item 23)

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillor Ian Middleton (for Agenda Item 7)  
Councillor Sally Povolotsky (for Agenda Item 13)

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting Paul Fermer (Director of Highways & Operations), Jim Whiting (Principal Officer -Parking), Mark Francis (Traffic and Traffic Schemes Technical Officer), Geoff Barrell (Senior Infrastructure Planning), Cameron Rae (Traffic and Traffic Schemes Officer), Emile Rowe (Traffic and Traffic Schemes Officer), Mike Horton (Senior Officer (TRO Schemes)), Mike Wasley (Principal Officer – Traffic Schemes), Sharon Keenlyside (Interim Committee Officer).

Part of meeting Jacqui Cox (Infrastructure Locality Lead (Cherwell)), Mohamed Ilyas (Programme Lead Banbury and Bicester), Alen Chanamoto (Project Manager), Keith Stenning (Head of Network Management), Rosie Wood (Consultant Engineer).

*The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with [a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting ][the following additional documents:] and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports [agenda, reports and schedule/additional documents], copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.*

### 168/22 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

(Agenda No. 1)

Cllr Andrew Gant declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item 23a) and a Non-Pecuniary Interest in items 23b) and 23d). Cllr Judy Roberts, Cabinet Member for

Infrastructure and Development Strategy, was appointed to chair item 23 and make the decision.

## 169/22 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

See published addenda – Questions from County Councillors.

## 170/22 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

The following speakers addressed the meeting:

Item 7	Begbroke – A44 – proposed toucan crossing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Ian Middleton OCC</li> </ul>
Item 9	Didcot – Diamond Drive – Proposed use of ANPR enforcement equipment at bus gate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chris Macdonald-Bradley</li> </ul>
Item 10	Oxford: The Plain Roundabout – proposed use of ANPR equipment to enforce left turn prohibition from B480 Cowley Road entry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Danny Yee, Oxford Liveable Streets (written statement)</li> </ul>
Item 13	West Hendred A417 – proposed 30mph speed limit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Sally Povolotsky (OCC)</li> </ul>
Item 16	Nuneham Courtenay – proposed 20mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edmund Tresham, Thames Travel</li> <li>• Chris Bradley-Macdonald</li> </ul>
Item 17	Newington – proposed 20mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newington Parish Council (written statement)</li> </ul>
Item 18	Drayton (Abingdon) – proposed 20 mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edmund Tresham, Thames Travel</li> </ul>
Item 19	Lyneham – proposed 20mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lyneham Parish Council (written statement)</li> </ul>
Item 20	Littleworth – proposed 20mph speed limits and associated speed limit buffers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tony Woodward, Chair Littleworth Parish Meeting</li> </ul>

--	--	--

NOTE: The agenda items were discussed in the following order to accommodate speakers and Cllr Judy Roberts who chaired item 23:  
Items 1-13, 20, 23, 16, 18, 14–15, 17,19, 21-22.

#### **171/22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

(Agenda No. 4)

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2023 were signed by the Chair as a correct record.

#### **172/22 PROCUREMENT OF REAL TIME PASSENGER INFORMATION SERVICE**

(Agenda No. 5)

The report outlined the proposed procurement of a replacement Real Time Passenger (RTPI) contract.

The Chair commented that the RTPI contract formed part of the Oxfordshire Bus Service Improvement Plan which sought to improve bus services. The contract was to replace the existing contract that was due to end on 29 November 2023.

The Cabinet Member **APPROVED** to:

- a) authorise officers to procure a replacement Real Time Passenger Information System,
- b) delegate the award of the contract to the Corporate Director of Environment and Place,
- c) delegate approval for any contract extension to the Corporate Director of Environment and Place.

#### **173/22 PROCUREMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC SIGNALS - SUPPLY AND MAINTENANCE CONTRACT TO SUPPORT BUS SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN (BSIP)**

(Agenda No. 6)

The report outlined the proposed procurement of an additional Traffic Signals – Supply and Maintenance contract to support the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP).

The Cabinet Member **APPROVED** to:

- a) authorise officers to procure an additional Traffic Signals – Supply and Maintenance contract to support commitments within the Bus Services Improvement Plan,
- b) delegate the award of the contract to the Corporate Director of Environment and Place,
- c) delegate approval for any contract extension to the Corporate Director of Environment and Place

**174/22 BEGBROKE - A44 - PROPOSED TOUCAN CROSSING**

(Agenda No. 7)

The report presented responses to a consultation on a proposal to introduce a 'staggered' Toucan crossing on the A44 Woodstock Road, approximately 60 metres north of its roundabout junction with Spring Hill Road.

The Chair invited Councillor Ian Middleton, Oxfordshire County Council, to address the meeting. Councillor Middleton spoke in favour of the proposal.

The Chair commented that the A44 Woodstock Road was a busy main road and a safety concern for schoolchildren crossing the road.

The Chair noted that there had been a tremendous response to the consultation with 287 responses received and of them, 272 in support of the proposal.

One response raised a concern about the design, in particular on the west side, as there was a tight turn for cyclists mounting and dismounting their bikes. Officers explained that they can overcome the issues in the detail of the design. The Chair asked officers to liaise with Cyclops, a partner organisation; although they had no formal role, they may be able to give some useful input to the design.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** as advertised the 'staggered' Toucan crossing on the A44 Woodstock Road, in Begbroke.

**175/22 WALLINGFORD / CHOLSEY; A4130 BOSLEY WAY - PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF RIGHT TURNS AT NEW BARN FARM ACCESS**

(Agenda No. 8)

The report presented responses to a consultation on a proposal to introduce a 'No Right Turn' restriction for traffic entering and exiting the gravel extraction site adjacent to the A4130 Bosley Way. Traffic leaving the site would be required to turn left only.

The Chair commented that by implementing the turning restriction, heavy goods vehicles would not need to cross over the opposing lane when entering and exiting the site, as stated in paragraph 13 of the report.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** as advertised the 'No Right Turn' restriction on the A4130 Bosley Way, Cholsey/Wallingford.

**176/22 DIDCOT - DIAMOND DRIVE - PROPOSED USE OF ANPR ENFORCEMENT EQUIPMENT AT BUS GATE**

(Agenda No. 9)

The report presented responses to a consultation on a proposal to introduce ANPR camera enforcement equipment at an existing bus gate within the Great Western Park development in Didcot, replacing the current physical automatic bollard.

The Chair invited the registered speaker, Chris Macdonald-Bradley, to address the meeting. Chris Macdonald-Bradley spoke in favour of the proposal.

The Chair thanked the speaker and people who had responded to the consultation.

The Chair commented that the proposal was intended to safeguard the residential streets and people who live there. Radial routes would be used by through traffic and this would make the residential streets safer and cleaner and enable people to use alternative modes of transport should they choose to do so.

The Chair noted that paragraph 3 of the report had the word 'gate' missing after the word 'bus' and paragraph 23 of the report used the word 'assessing' instead of 'accessing'.

The Chair referred to the response from Thames Valley Police and asked for clarity on whether the exemption applied to emergency vehicles on patrol. Officers explained that the consultation was on the proposed use of ANPR and not the traffic order itself. The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) stated that that the exemption was for an emergency only. The Police had been consulted about the TRO at the time and were invited to contact the Council if the wording of the TRO needed changing.

In response to a concern raised in the consultation, the Chair asked if there had been any traffic modelling undertaken. Officers explained that all the modelling was done as part of the planning application and would have considered traffic movement with the bus gate restriction in place.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** as advertised the use of ANPR camera enforcement at the existing bus gate located between Diamond Drive/Birch Close & Larch Drive.

## **177/22 OXFORD THE PLAIN ROUNDABOUT - PROPOSED USE OF ANPR EQUIPMENT TO ENFORCE LEFT TURN PROHIBITION FROM B480 COWLEY ROAD ENTRY**

(Agenda No. 10)

The report presented responses to a consultation on a proposal to introduce ANPR camera enforcement at an existing restriction that prohibits all traffic (excluding pedal cycles) exiting the B480 Cowley Road from making an immediate left turn into the A4158 Iffley Road.

The Chair read out a written statement from Danny Yee, Oxford Liveable Streets, who was in favour of the proposal.

The Chair referred to the response from Thames Valley Police and asked for clarity on whether the exemption applied to emergency vehicles on patrol.

Post meeting note: the order for The Plain banned turn had a general exemption for vehicles being used for police purposes, therefore there was no requirement that they had to be on a call or in response to an emergency.

The Chair commented that the proposal was a safety measure for a dangerous intersection.

The Chair asked officers to respond to concerns about enforcement. Officers explained that the areas being discussed were patrolled regularly by Civil Enforcement Officers. Restrictions were being amended to enable greater enforcement powers and the number of Civil Enforcement Officers were being increased across the county.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** as advertised the use of ANPR camera enforcement at the existing left turn prohibition for traffic exiting the B480 Cowley Road into the A4158 Iffley Road

**178/22 ASCOTT UNDER WYCHWOOD - LONDON LANE PROPOSED 40MPH SPEED LIMIT**

(Agenda No. 11)

The report presented responses to a consultation on a proposal to introduce a 40mph speed limit on London Lane, leading south-eastwards for 300 metres out of Ascott-under-Wychwood.

The Chair commented that the proposal was the result of a previous speed limit change that had been kept under review.

The Chair noted that there had been a good number of responses to the consultation and some requests that the speed limit be lower than 40mph.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** as advertised the 40mph speed limit on London Lane, Ascott-under-Wychwood.

**179/22 BICESTER - A4095 / B4100 BANBURY ROAD ROUNDABOUT IMPROVEMENTS - PROPOSED 30MPH SPEED LIMIT AND RAISED SIDE ROAD ENTRY TREATMENT AT FRINGFORD ROAD**

(Agenda No. 12)

The report presented responses received to a consultation on the proposal to introduce 30mph speed limits on the approaches to the junction, namely: B4100 Banbury Road, B4100 Bicester to Aynho road, A4095 Lords Lane, and A4095 Southwold Lane, 30mph speed limit on Fringford Road, and flat top road hump across Fringford Road at its junction with Southwold Lane.

The Chair read out a question submitted under item 2 of the agenda by Councillor Donna Ford and the response given.

The Chair had received an email from Councillor Damion Maquire, Chair of the Environment Committee, Bicester Town Council and asked officers to respond to a number of points that he made:

- “Lack of buffer zones between the paths and the road in many areas which make cycling and walking safe at the road edges”.  
Officers responded that they had incorporated buffers on the western section. Incorporating buffers on the north-eastern section had been challenging due to ecological and archaeological impacts. Buffers had been applied to the extent to which they had been able to do so.

- “Lack of segregation: While many of the paths are segregated, there is a large area on one corner where cyclists and pedestrians will be forced to share the same space. In general, both pedestrians and cyclists are very much against this”.

Officers explained that a stage 1 safety audit on the design had been completed and a stage 2 safety audit was to be undertaken which would ensure the design was compliant and safe for people to use. There were still some minor details to be reviewed but wherever possible sufficient space had been allowed for users, whether cyclist or pedestrian.

- “Path differentiation: On segregated paths, it is important for vulnerable users to be able to distinguish between the cycle and pedestrian paths. We have a good example of new infrastructure at the former Barrus development on the Launton Road where a gentle kerb has been used to provide a slight level difference between the paths for the two users. It would be good to see similar for this new junction”.

Officers stated that they had provided segregated cyclist routes on the western section and wherever possible. Greater usage had been determined on the western side. The north-eastern corner had shared paths which were compliant with LT120 policy. There were several technical engineering challenges in the north-eastern corner, such as gas mains, electrical cables, and archaeological sensitivity, which had made it difficult to widen the footprint. Budget constraints had also been a factor.

- “Pinch points at the on ramps: There are quite sharp corners on all of the on ramps for cyclists leaving the road and joining the paths. These are likely to be a particular obstacle for cargo bikes. I had understood that these were being addressed following the last planning application, but some further work is needed”.

Officers commented that it was technically possible to do that and was part of the design review.

- “Pinch point for Elmsbrook: The main route for pedestrians and cyclists through this junction will be to and from the Elmsbrook estate and Northwest Bicester. At the consultation, the designer seemed to assume that the path to Elmsbrook would be only a pedestrian path and that cyclists would join the carriageway. It is actually a shared path, and almost all walkers and cyclists will use it. It is therefore far too narrow and will cause all sorts of difficulties for users”.

Officers explained that as part of the design process, cycling and pedestrian movements had been looked at and would continue to be reviewed and amended as part of ongoing work on the design. The cyclists from Elmsbrook would not need to go onto the carriageway.

- “Path to nowhere: the design includes a footpath on the eastern side of the B4100 north. It was pointed out to the designers that this only connected to a bus stop that has now been removed. As a result, this path is no longer required. Given that this path is now redundant, could the road be shifted across to make more space on the Elmsbrook side”

Officers stated that moving roads was major development and not possible.

The Chair had received an email from the Bicester Bike Users Group asking that the pedestrian and cycling paths should be decoupled so that the pedestrians could cross in two stages and the cyclists in a single stage as they did in the Netherlands.

Officers stated that the design that they had put forward was a safe design.

The Chair enquired about Cambridge curbs and officers stated that Cambridge curbs were costly and difficult to implement and there would be a requirement for more space which was not possible with the available footprint.

The Chair thanked everyone who had attended the engagement event and commented that the event was facilitated to provide feedback and understanding of the proposed scheme.

The Chair pointed out that the reduction of speed limit was a requirement of having a raised crossing.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** the following as advertised:

- a) 30mph speed limits on the approaches to the junction, namely: B4100 Banbury Road, B4100 Bicester to Aynho road, A4095 Lords Lane, and A4095 Southwold Lane,
- b) 30mph speed limit on Fringford Road, and
- c) Flat top road hump across Fringford Road at its junction with Southwold Lane

#### **180/22 WEST HENDRED A417 - PROPOSED 30MPH SPEED LIMIT**

(Agenda No. 13)

The report presented responses to a consultation on a proposal to lower part of the 40mph speed limit on the A417 Reading Road. The proposals would see a 30mph speed limit introduced either side of its junction with the Greenway from the current 50mph speed limit west of that junction.

Councillor Sally Povolotsky addressed the meeting and spoke in favour of the scheme.

The Chair noted the large number of responses to the consultation and thanked Councillor Povolotsky, the Parish Council and bus companies for their active support.

Officers informed the Chair that the speed limit could be implemented by the end of the month.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** as advertised the 30mph speed limit on the A417 Reading Road either side of its junction with The Greenway in West Hendred.

#### **181/22 WATCHFIELD - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS**

(Agenda No. 14)

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

Officers informed the Chair that there were several objections to the lower speed limit on Majors Road. As a strategic route with no properties with frontage to the road, it was subsequently left as a 30mph speed limit road.

The Chair noted that this was another example of officers taking into consideration consultation responses and applying policy in a consistent way.

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

## **182/22 TOWERSEY - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS**

(Agenda No. 15)

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

The Chair noted that policy had been consistently applied.

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

## **183/22 NUNEHAM COURTENAY - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS**

(Agenda No. 16)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Nuneham Courtenay.

Edmund Tresham from Thames Travel addressed the meeting and spoke against the proposed 20mph speed limits for Nuneham Courtenay and agenda item 18 Drayton (Abingdon).

Following the speakers' remarks on the inequalities assessment, the Chair asked officers for comments on the impact on bus services. Officers confirmed that the implication in the report was that it would not affect bus services and drew the Chair's attention to paragraph 11 of the report and the results of a seven-day speed survey undertaken in 2022. Officers felt that based on the information available, the impact of a 20mph speed limit on bus services would be minimal.

In response to the speakers' comments on the sustainability assessment, officers explained that the sustainability issue did justify the change in speed limits and Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council had raised concerns over safety. These concerns were in regard to access to properties, pedestrians crossing the road, several footpaths that went from one side of the road to the other and bus stops that required pedestrians to cross the road.

The Chair noted that none of the proposed schemes were considered unless the Parish Council had actively asked for and supported them.

The Chair commented that Oxfordshire County Council did not implement blanket 20mph zones and that officers worked hard on the details of every proposed change of speed limit and in close consultation with the bus companies.

The Chair asked the speaker what the implication on bus services would be if the scheme was approved.

The speaker explained that they may have to remove one of the pairs of stops to balance out the reduction in speed.

The Chair felt that officers had made a convincing and logical argument as to why the proposed scheme was justified.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** the introduction of 20 mph speed limits in Nuneham Courtenay as advertised.

The Chair requested that officers discussed the practical implications of the agreed recommendation and its effect on bus services with the bus companies.

#### **184/22 NEWINGTON - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS**

(Agenda No. 17)

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

The Chair read out a written statement from Newington Paris Council.

Officers informed the Chair that there had been no objections to the proposed scheme.

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

#### **185/22 DRAYTON (ABINGDON) - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS**

(Agenda No. 18)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Drayton (Abingdon).

Chris Macdonald-Bradley addressed the meeting and expressed concern about the public consultation process.

The Chair responded to concerns raised by the speaker and said that the process was correct in law and as set out in the Council's Constitution. The justification for the 20mph scheme was set out in the policy adopted by Full Council and a budget had been allocated to it. The Council, in policy terms, accepted the findings of numerous studies which indicated that 20mph speed limits made communities safer. The policy

was discussed and debated in public with full opportunity for the public to contribute. The Chair went on to say that the consultation process was sound.

Officers stated that the 20mph schemes were only put in place when the local Parish Councils had requested them and where the Parish Council had the general and broad support of the local community.

The Chair referred to paragraph 10 of the report and stated that there had been legitimate concerns from the bus companies to some of the previously proposed 20mph speed limit schemes. In December there had been five schemes deferred after objections from the bus companies. Officers had undertaken a significant programme of re-design of those schemes, in close consultation with the bus companies. The Chair stated that they had been a good example of collaborative working. In this case, officers had put forward a scheme that the bus companies still had objections to.

The Chair referred to paragraph 13 of the officers' report and the officer's response to the bus companies' objections.

The Chair and officers discussed the possibility of reducing the extent of the 20mph speed limit area to consider the concerns of the bus companies.

The Chair thanked the Parish Council and Councillor Webber for their input into bringing the concerns of the residents forward and campaigning for the proposed 20mph speed limit over a long period of time.

The Chair referred to the traffic calming proposals which were part of the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan and commented that these proposals would need to be taken into consideration when deciding the proposed 20mph speed limit.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** the 20mph scheme as outlined in Annexes 3A & 3B excluding the B4017 except on the B4017 between Kiln Lane and Newman Lane.

The Chair stated that approval of the recommendation was intended to be a solution for the present time and requested that the scheme be kept under review with the intention of implementing the full 20 mph scheme in Drayton as soon as possible within the context of the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan traffic calming proposals and wider bus journey time initiatives within Oxford.

## **186/22 LYNEHAM - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS**

(Agenda No. 19)

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

The Chair read out a written statement from Lyneham Parish Council.

Officers informed the Chair that the Parish Council had originally asked for the entire main road to have a 20mph speed limit and officers had informed them that the lower

limit would not be appropriate along all of it. A compromise had been put forward to the Parish Council. However, if the whole of the main road could not have the 20mph limit, the Parish Council would prefer the speed limit to remain at 30mph.

Officers explained that there were no property frontages along the road and advised the Chair that if the Parish Council no longer wanted the reduced speed limit, the main road could remain at 30mph with a loop in the village reduced to 20mph.

The Chair requested that officers clarify with the Parish Council their views on the proposed scheme.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **DEFERRED** the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Lyneham as advertised.

### **187/22 LITTLEWORTH - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS**

(Agenda No. 20)

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

Tony Woodward, Chair of Littleworth Parish meeting, addressed the meeting and spoke in favour of the proposed speed limits.

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

### **188/22 EAST HAGBOURNE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OFF MAIN STREET - PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT**

(Agenda No. 21)

The report presented responses to a statutory consultation on the proposed introduction of a 20mph speed limit in the 'Deanfield Green' residential estate, north of Main Road at the western end of East Hagbourne.

The Chair noted that there were 3 responses.

Officers informed the Chair that it was a new development and a Traffic Regulation Order had been obtained for the signage.

The Cabinet Member for Transport Management **APPROVED** as advertised the 20mph speed limit in the 'Deanfield Green' residential estate, East Hagbourne

### **189/22 BLOXHAM - PROPOSED 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS AND ASSOCIATED SPEED LIMIT BUFFERS**

(Agenda No. 22)

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

The Chair noted the support of the Parish Council and that amendments had been made following consultation with them.

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

**190/22 OXFORD: VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN NORTH OXFORD- PROPOSED PARKING PERMIT ELIGIBILITY AMENDMENTS**

(Agenda No. 23)

The report presented 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.

The Chair confirmed with officers that that the proposals were in line with the new regulations and Blue Badge holders were exempt from the permit restrictions.

The Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Development Strategy **APPROVED** the following proposals in respect of eligibility for parking permits as advertised:

- a) 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,
- b) Jericho – allow No.1 Canal Street to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits,
- c) Cutteslowe - exclude No.37 Templar Road from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits,
- d) North Summertown – exclude the five new dwellings at No.4 Bladon Close from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing .....