

**TRANSPORT DECISIONS COMMITTEE – 1 OCTOBER 2009**

**EAST OXFORD CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE  
REVIEW 2008/09**

**Report by Head of Transport**

**Introduction**

1. On the 18 July 2006 Oxfordshire County Council's Cabinet considered a report on the introduction of Charges for Residents' and Residents' Visitors' Permits. That meeting resolved to instruct officers to start a programme of reviews for the existing Controlled Parking Zones in Oxford and this report is a consequence of that Cabinet resolution.

**Background**

2. A Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) has been in existence in East Oxford for over 20 years and was last reviewed almost ten years ago. This culminated in the current Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which came into force in 2000. Since then only the traffic calming scheme along Cowley Road and some minor variation Orders have been promoted to exclude new residential development in the zone from any entitlement to on-street parking permits.
3. This review proposes to consolidate existing amendments and make changes to some of the residents' parking and waiting controls which were identified by officers and also some that were suggested by residents who have contacted us either before or as part of the preliminary Informal Consultation. This review does not alter any of the existing parking and loading arrangements along Cowley Road.
4. The main aims of the CPZ remain to:
  - Tackle congestion by removing parking places available to commuters who park in the area, either near to their work or to access other forms of transport for onward travel;
  - Deliver accessibility by protecting junctions and narrow streets from inappropriately parked vehicles;
  - Prioritise the remaining parking places for residents or short term visitors to businesses and residents in the area.

**The Review Process (including an Informal Consultation)**

5. Officers reviewed the existing parking arrangements by carrying out daytime and night-time parking surveys, on site measurements and an Informal

Consultation which sought residents' views on the existing scheme by distributing questionnaires to all properties within the existing zone. Copies of the letter and questionnaire can be found in background Document A, which is available in the Members' Resource Centre.

6. Recipients were asked how the existing CPZ could be improved and their opinions were invited on the following issues;
  - (i) Whether or not Permit Holders should be exempt from the time limit in the 2 and 3 hour parking places throughout the zone;
  - (ii) Should the time limits apply at weekends and in the evenings within the time limited parking places;
  - (iii) Whether the existing permit restraint should be reduced from the present two permits per household to one and, if so, should those already with two permits be allowed to continue to apply for both their permits.
7. Before the Informal Consultation, a meeting was held with local members from both Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council to discuss the above issues and find out any additional information that would be useful to the review process.
8. In total 235 responses were received during the Informal Consultation and from the results it was clear that the hours of operation within the time limited parking places should not be extended to cover evenings and Sundays - 65% of those that responded favoured this option. Similarly there was support for making Permit Holders exempt from the time limit in the 2 and 3 hour parking places - a total of 65% either favoured this proposal or did not mind (47% and 18% respectively).
9. The situation regarding permit restraint was not as clear. 44% of respondents wanted the maximum limit to remain at two per dwelling, 35% preferred reducing the number of residents' permits to one per dwelling and 21% preferred limiting the number of residents' permits to one per dwelling, except where two residents already have a permit each. Some of the support for one permit was conditional on other exceptions. Consequently it was felt that there was not enough support to include any change in the formal proposals at this time, but that a separate consultation on the level of permit restraint for the zone would be more appropriate at a later stage.

## **Formal Proposals**

10. The previous review had done much to maximise the amount of on-street parking. However, it was felt by officers that some extra space could be created by rearranging some of the existing restrictions and improving the parking layout. The revised controls and parking layout would also take into account new access requirements as well as protecting Fire Hydrants within the carriageway. Additionally, an amount of extra parking could be made available to residents and their visitors in Cowley Place through the use of

shared-use time limited parking bays in place of the existing general unlimited parking places and some short lengths of extraneous waiting restriction.

11. Overall the proposals provide for approximately 1075 overnight parking spaces throughout the zone. Of these 865 parking spaces would be accessible to permit holders for parking throughout the whole day, an increase of 115.
12. Night-time surveys indicated that the maximum residential on street parking demand is approximately 810. Although the total amount of evening parking appears to suggest that there is a surplus parking provision of approximately 240 spaces, it must be remembered that there is a significant demand for this parking in the area because of the evening economy that exists along Cowley Road and the surrounding area. Therefore this does suggest that the parking demand is close to capacity.
13. A more detailed description of the proposals is contained within the Annexes to this report, listed below:

- Annex 1** Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Zone-wide Issues;
- Annex 2** Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals;
- Annex 3** Details of Street Specific Changes Where No Comments Were Received.

### **Formal Consultation Process (25 June 2009 – 24 July 2009)**

14. Approximately 2400 consultation packs were sent to every property within the existing CPZ. These packs contained a covering letter, a list of proposed changes and other relevant documents which were listed in the covering letter. Information was also sent to 39 formal consultees and documents placed on deposit for public inspection at the Central Library, Cowley Library, County Hall and Speedwell House. Copies of the consultation pack and documents placed on deposit can be found in background Documents A and B respectively, both of which are available in the Members' Resource Centre.
15. Street notices were placed in every road within the zone for the duration of the consultation period and a Public notice published in the Oxford Times on 25 June.
16. 28 responses were received during the statutory consultation. Copies of the letters of comment are contained within Document C which is available in the Members' Resource Centre. A synopsis of each comment and further detailed analysis in relation to the proposed changes is set out in Annex 1 (Zone-wide issues) and Annex 2 (Street-specific issues) to this report. Annex 3 details the proposed changes in streets where no comments were received.

17. There were 9 responses regarding zone-wide issues, 6 of which concerned matters not contained within the proposals. These related to enforcement, charging for residents' permits, reducing the maximum number of permits available to households, allowing unrestricted parking during the evenings and requests for other classes of permit. These are beyond the scope of this review but could be considered in any later review of the parking permit scheme. There were 3 other comments relating to zone-wide issues. It is not proposed to uphold these objections for reasons set out at Annex 1.
18. Of the 19 responses on street-specific issues there are 10 where it is considered that, following detailed investigation of the comments made, some changes to the advertised proposals are desirable; these are discussed below in street order. For the remainder, the reasons for proposing no further change are set out at Annex 2.

### **Boulter Street.**

19. The information sent to residents referred to the retention of a 1 hour parking place near the junction with St Clement's Street. It appears that this was incorrectly signed as Permit Holders Only. Consequently three residents expressed varying levels of concern about the perceived loss of permit holder parking that correcting the signing error would entail.
20. It is therefore recommended that the controls in the scheduled 1 hour parking place be changed to 2 hour parking 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday where permit holders are exempt from the time limit. This would retain some permit holder capacity without the complete loss of short term parking. To this end we have written to properties in the vicinity, seeking views on this change to the proposals. Any responses will be reported orally at the meeting.

### **Cherwell Street.**

21. A resident objected to the additional parking places proposed outside numbers 19 to 25 Cherwell Street. He was concerned that vehicles using these parking places, and others illegally parked, would make turning movements hazardous, prevent street cleansing (which could lead to flooding) and hamper refuse collection since bins are often left at one of the locations.
22. In response, vehicles would be able to continue to use Harpsichord Place for turning, as many currently do, and adequate enforcement should remove the hazard posed by illegally parked cars. However, it is recommended that the part of the proposed Permit Holders Only parking outside number 25 Cherwell Street is abandoned in favour of the existing no waiting at any time as this would facilitate street cleansing operations. The other proposed bays should remain.

### **Cowley Place.**

23. Currently much of the parking in Cowley Place is 24 hour with no return within 8 hours. Observations suggest that these parking places become filled with commuters early on during the day sterilising much needed valuable on-street

parking spaces for use by residents and visitors to the area, which undermines one of the core objectives of the controlled parking zone.

24. Conversion of the 24 hour spaces into 3 hour and Permit Holders' Only parking offers a valuable opportunity to provide much needed parking for residents and their visitors in an area of the zone with little scope for on-street parking. The proposed Parking Without Time Limit at the cul-de-sac end is intended to mitigate the loss of the above 24 hour parking. Such parking would be available to over weight/height vehicles that are ineligible for permits under the scheme.
25. The Bursars of St Hilda's College and Magdalen College School (both with frontages along Cowley Place) expressed concern about the proposed additional parking in the road.
  - (a) They fear the additional parking would block the emergency access to St Hilda's College and obstruct sightlines making it particularly hazardous for cyclists, young people and students alike.
  - (b) They state that the area is used as a drop-off point for those attending the two educational establishments in the road and that there have been a series of near fatalities over the last few years.
  - (c) They also mention that delivery vehicles often need to wait near the turning area until they can gain entry to the college's servicing area.
26. The extent of the proposed additional parking has been designed so that it would not obstruct emergency access or hamper turning manoeuvres. It is considered that this would have little effect on visibility for vehicles leaving St. Hilda's College. Additionally, accident data records show that there have been no recorded injury accidents over the past five years anywhere in Cowley Place.
27. However, in response to the comments regarding the number of cars using the area as a drop-off point and to avoid the potential for localised congestion, it is now proposed that there should be No Waiting Monday to Saturday 8am - 6.30pm in place of the proposed parking without time limit.
28. To this end we have written to both establishments, seeking their views on this change to the proposals. Additionally they have been asked if the proposed hours of operation would need adjusting to coincide with the times their delivery vehicles need to wait in order to gain access to their premises. Any responses will be reported orally at the meeting.

### **Jeune Street.**

29. Following concerns expressed by a resident of the street and Thames Valley Police that vehicle speed may increase as a result of moving parking places to one side of the road for most of its length it is now recommended that this element of the proposals for Jeune Street should be abandoned. The effect of this on the proposed increase in the level of parking will be minimal.

**Princes Street.**

30. We have received a concern that the existing parking place outside 66 Princes Street makes turning in and out of Grants Mews both difficult and hazardous. Additionally a new access-way, provided for 74 Princes Street, will need protecting. This would not leave a sufficiently viable length of parking place.
31. Consequently it is now proposed to remove both Permit Holders Only parking places and replace them with No Waiting at Any Time. To this end we have written to properties in the vicinity, seeking their views on this change to the proposals. Any response will be reported orally at the meeting.

**Temple Street.**

32. An objection was received to the conversion of a length of No Waiting Monday to Saturday 8am – 6.30pm nearest Kingdom Hall, into three additional Permit Holders' parking places. The owners of the Hall believed that the conversion would result in a loss of parking used by their members during meetings on Sundays and in the evenings.
33. Although the proposals for the entire street would lead to five additional car spaces, which their members could use, they still requested that the permit holders' spaces be allocated elsewhere so that the single yellow line could remain for elderly and disabled members of their congregation. They were also concerned that the proximity of the proposed parking place to their access would make its use difficult.
34. Retaining the single yellow line removes an opportunity to provide three car parking places available to residents during the day which cannot be provided elsewhere in the road. However, in recognising the difficulty their elderly members may have and the comments regarding their access the following is recommended:
  - (a) The extent of additional permit holder parking place proposed be reduced by approximately one third in order to provide potentially two parking spaces available to residents;
  - (b) The no waiting at any time protecting their access to be extended over the remaining portion of No Waiting Monday – Saturday 8am – 6.30pm, nearest Kingdom Hall. This would better protect their access-way while enabling any disabled member of their congregation (displaying a blue badge) to park near the Hall.
35. To this end we have written to properties in the vicinity, seeking their views on this change to the proposals. Any response will be reported orally at the meeting.

## **Effects of the Proposed Divinity Road Controlled Parking Zone**

36. The length of Morrell Avenue, between East Avenue and Divinity Road, is not included within the revised East Oxford CPZ and associated permit scheme as it is intended to include it within the proposed Divinity Road Controlled Parking Zone.
37. Should the proposed Divinity Road proposals be deferred or abandoned it will be necessary to amend the East Oxford TRO to ensure consistency of the restrictions over the affected length of Morrell Avenue.

## **Conclusion**

38. The overall response, during both the informal and formal consultation, did indicate a general level of support for a parking review of this zone and for the need of a more flexible approach to be taken with regard to parking provision that considered the wider community. It should also be noted that the proposals do introduce a greater degree of flexibility for non-permit holders as well as for residents. This has been achieved by introducing more general public parking spaces exempting permit holders from the 2 or 3 hour time limited spaces when compared to the present parking arrangement. The conversion of the existing lengths of 24 hour limited parking control in Cowley Place into 3 hour and permit holder parking will prevent their occupation by commuters and open up a much needed parking resource to residents and visitors at this end of the zone where parking is at a premium.

## **How the Project Supports LTP2 Objectives**

39. These proposals are in line with the LTP objective of improving the street environment and reducing traffic congestion on the principal radial routes through the reduction of longer term on-street parking provision.

## **Financial Implications (including Revenue)**

40. The cost of implementing this review is estimated to be around £90,000, which includes an allowance towards upgrading signs and lines to the current national standards. This cost shall be met from the income generated through the purchase of residential and business parking permits.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

41. **The Committee is RECOMMENDED to authorise the making of:**
  - (a) **The Oxfordshire County Council (East Oxford) (Controlled Parking Zone and Waiting Restrictions) Consolidation Order 20\*\* subject to the following amendments:**
    - (i) **Boulter Street – Change the controls in the existing 1 hour parking place, 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday into 2 hour**

- parking where permit holders are exempt from the time limit;
- (ii) **Cherwell Street – Remove the proposed Permit Holders Only Parking outside 25 Cherwell Street and replace with No Waiting at Any Time;**
  - (iii) **Cowley Place – Replace the proposed Parking Places without time limit with No Waiting, 8am – 6.30pm, Monday – Friday;**
  - (iv) **Jeune Street – Change Proposed TRO to reflect the existing layout of permit holders’ only parking;**
  - (v) **Princes Street – Remove the existing parking places outside numbers 66 and 74 Princes Street and replace with No Waiting at Any Time;**
  - (vi) **Temple Street – Reduce the extent of proposed additional permit holder parking place near Kingdom Hall by approximately one third and extend the No Waiting at any time protecting the adjacent access to meet it;**
- (b) **The Committee is RECOMMENDED to authorise the making of the Oxfordshire County Council (Disabled Persons Parking Places - Oxford) (Amendment No.[8]) Order 20\*\* as advertised**

STEVE HOWELL  
Head of Transport  
Environment & Economy

Background papers:            Document A, containing covering letters with information pack associated with both the Informal and Formal Consultations;  
   Document B, containing documents placed on deposit for public inspection;  
   Document C, containing emails and letters of comment associated with the Formal Consultation.

All the above are located in the Member’s Resource Centre.

Contact Officers:            Stephen Axtell,    Tel 01865 815967  
   Peter Egawhary,    Tel 01865 815857

September 2009

Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Zone-wide Issues		
Proposal or Issue	Comments Concerning The Proposals Arising From THE Formal Consultation.	Reason For Proposal And Officer Response.
a) <b>To exempt permit holders from the time limit in all 2 hour time limited parking places throughout the zone.</b>	<p>A resident of Marston Street objected to this as they were concerned that permit holders would occupy all of the time limited spaces. This would make it difficult for their visitors to find a space, and would place a higher demand on what they consider is a scarce supply of visitors permits.</p>	<p>The demand for additional permit parking is such that we need to make more space available. Making the 2 hour spaces shared use is a flexible way of increasing the availability of permit parking in what is currently an under utilised resource during the day.</p> <p>The proposed change only applies to 2 hour parking places and not the 30 minute and 1 hour parking places. Consequently, visitors could still use the 30 minutes or 1 hour parking places without competition from permit holders.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>
b) <b>To continue allowing unrestricted parking in time limited parking places during the evenings and on Sundays.</b>	<p>A prospective resident of Hurst Street would like permit holders only restrictions to apply in the 2 hour parking places during the evenings.</p> <p>Their main concern is that these spaces would be occupied with the overspill from the proposed Magdalen Road zone or by those trying to avoid permit charges from either zone.</p>	<p>The requirement to use permits during the evening leads to a higher demand on what some see as a limited supply of visitors permits.</p> <p>During the informal consultation an alternative solution of extending the 2 hour shared use parking, into the evening was proposed. This would have put less pressure on visitor permits and resulted in much simpler signing. However, this received little support and was not progressed.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>

<b>Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Zone-wide Issues (continued)</b>		
<b>Proposal or Issue</b>	<b>Comments Concerning The Proposals Arising From The Formal Consultation.</b>	<b>Reason For Proposal And Officer Response.</b>
c)	<b>Enforcement.</b>	<p>There were five comments relating to the level of enforcement. These generally requested more or stated that new restrictions should be rigorously enforced.</p> <p>Levels of enforcement are not set out in the TRO and are outside the scope of this consultation. However, the specific issues raised by respondents have been passed to the enforcement contractor for appropriate action.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>
d)	<b>Permit Restraint (One per Household).</b>	<p>Three residents stated that that a reduction to one permit per household was necessary, while one opposed this view.</p> <p>At the informal consultation opinion for change was split with some residents wanting a reduction to one permit per household but with exceptions to the rule which would be impractical to implement. Consequently it was felt prudent not to progress this as part of the current review as objections could jeopardize or delay the other improvements being proposed.</p> <p>It would therefore be advisable to review this at a later date.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>
e)	<b>Short term visitor permits.</b>	<p>A resident requested short term visitor permits in blocks of 2 hours to facilitate short visits without using up a full visitor permit when time limited parking is full.</p> <p>Changes such as this need to be examined as part of a citywide review of permit policy.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>

<b>Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Zone-wide Issues (continued)</b>			
<b>Proposal or Issue</b>		<b>Comments Concerning The Proposals Arising From The Formal Consultation.</b>	<b>Reason For Proposal And Officer Response.</b>
f)	<b>Permits for Hire Cars.</b>	One resident felt that it was not sensible to prevent residents from obtaining permits for hire cars.	<p>This is currently the case for all permit schemes. Consequently it would be better to address this as part of a citywide review of permits policy. Residents do have the option to use their visitor permits for these occasions.</p> <p>In addition there are proposals to enable the introduction of car club bays which could provide an alternative solution for some residents</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>
g)	<b>Student Parking.</b>	Two residents requested some form of sanction to prevent or deter students from obtaining permits.	<p>Sanctions specifically against students could be discriminatory as there is no reliable means of identifying them.</p> <p>However, the proposal to require vehicles to be registered at a zone address may deter students and other transient residents from bringing cars into the area.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>

<b>Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Zone-wide Issues (continued)</b>		
<b>Proposal or Issue</b>	<b>Comments Concerning The Proposals Arising From The Formal Consultation.</b>	<b>Reason For Proposal And Officer Response.</b>
h)	<p><b>The requirement to register vehicles at zone addresses</b></p> <p>a) Three residents were concerned that the requirement to have cars registered at zone addresses would prevent them from having company cars.</p> <p>b) A retired couple objected to the requirement to have cars registered at a zone address since they only stay at their property for part of the year and have a car registered in another EU member state.</p> <p>They also say it would be impractical to re-register the car each time they return to Oxford.</p>	<p>a) It has now been explained that arrangements are already in place for those who have company cars to continue to have permits.</p> <p>b) The requirement to register cars at a zone address has been proposed to mitigate the effect of the transient population of East Oxford.</p> <p>Although the couple say that it would be impractical to re-register each time they came to Oxford, they do not say why they could not register the car permanently at their Oxford address which would remove the problem.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>
i)	<p><b>Charging for Residents' Permits.</b></p> <p>Three residents made comments and suggestions about this aspect despite being told that this would not be part of the review.</p>	<p>The proposals make no changes to the charging regime,</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>

Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals		
Proposal or Comment	Comments Concerning The Proposals.	Officer Response.
<p>a) <b>Alma Place.</b></p> <p>Additional Permit Holders' Only parking to be provided at 2 locations, by extending an existing parking bay near 1 Alma Place and by replacing a length of double yellow line outside 5 Alma Place.</p>	<p>One comment was received supporting this proposal.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>b) <b>Boulter Street.</b></p> <p>5 metres of existing double yellow line to be replaced with No Waiting, 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday (single yellow line)</p>	<p>Concerns were received about the adjacent time limited parking place (which is currently incorrectly signed as permit holders' only parking). Two residents objected to what they thought was a loss of Permit Holders Only parking, although one felt that exempting permit holders from the 1 hour time limit would be acceptable.</p> <p>There were also concerns that vehicles parking on the proposed single yellow line could obstruct emergency service vehicles</p>	<p><b>RECOMMEND: Change the controls in the existing 1 hour parking place, 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday into 2 hour parking where permit holders are exempt from the time limit.</b></p> <p>The extent and location of this restriction is such that a vehicle using it correctly would make little difference to those turning in and out of the road, particularly since traffic flows are much lighter in the evenings and on Sundays.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>

Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals (continued)			
Proposal or Comment		Comments Concerning The Proposals.	Officer Response.
	<b>Boulter Street (continued).</b>	One of the residents was also concerned that those visiting restaurants etc. would occupy the time limited parking and the proposed No Waiting 8am – 6.30, Monday – Saturday single yellow line if there were no evening and weekend permit parking controls.	This is not recommended since it is considered that the proposals represent a balance between business need and the needs of residents.  <b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b>

<b>Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals (continued)</b>			
	<b>Proposal or Comment</b>	<b>Comments Concerning The Proposals</b>	<b>Officer Response.</b>
c)	<p><b>Bullington Road.</b></p> <p>Permit Holders’ Only parking place to be extended outside 76 to 78 Bullington Road to provide additional parking.</p> <p>Existing 1 hour parking places outside 111 to 112 Bullington Road to be replaced with 2 hour parking places (where Permit Holders are exempt from the time limit) on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>Controls within the existing 1 hour parking places on the southeast side near Cowley Road, would be changed to 2 hour parking places (where Permit Holders are exempt from the time limit). This is to provide flexibility for permit holders.</p>	<p>A resident objected to the removal of some No Waiting at Any Time in front of a dropped kerb outside 77 Bullington Road. They consider this restriction should be retained in the event that they should wish to reinstate their off street parking which has been converted into a front garden.</p> <p>An objection was also received from an Oxford College concerning the closure of Bullington Road.</p>	<p>The garden in question appears to be too short to accommodate a vehicle without it overhanging the footway and there is also a step at the rear of the footway. Should there be legitimate off-street parking created in the future, the on-street bay can be removed or modified using an Access Protection Marking. Consequently it is not recommended to uphold this objection.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p> <p>There are no proposals to close Bullington Road as part of this review.</p>

<b>Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals (continued)</b>		
<b>Proposal or Comment</b>	<b>Comments Concerning The Proposals</b>	<b>Officer Response.</b>
<p>d) <b>Cherwell Street.</b></p> <p>An additional Permit Holders' Only parking place is proposed outside 25 Cherwell Street.</p> <p>Controls within the existing 2 hour parking place outside 42 to 46 Cherwell Street is to be changed to Permit Holders' Only Parking.</p> <p>Additional 2 hour parking place outside 19 to 23 Cherwell Street would replace those converted into Permit Holders Only Parking.</p>	<p>An objection was received from a resident concerning the additional parking places proposed outside 19 to 25 Cherwell Street. They are concerned that vehicles using these parking places combined with others illegally parked would make turning movements hazardous.</p> <p>They also believed that vehicles using the spaces would prevent street cleansing which could lead to flooding.</p> <p>They also stated that household refuse bins were placed in the same location for collection as the proposed Permit Holders' only parking place.</p>	<p>Vehicles would still continue to be able to use Harpsichord Place for turning and adequate enforcement should remove any hazard posed by illegally parked cars.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that the proposed bay outside 25 Cherwell Street could interfere with street cleansing operations and should therefore not proceed</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: Removing the proposed Permit Holders Only Parking outside 25 Cherwell Street from the Draft TRO.</b></p>

<b>Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals (continued)</b>			
	<b>Proposal or Comment</b>	<b>Comments Concerning The Proposals.</b>	<b>Officer Response.</b>
e)	<p><b>Cowley Place.</b></p> <p>The existing 24 hour parking and Permit Holder Only parking on the west side to become 3 hour parking.</p> <p>The existing 24 hour parking place on east side to become Permit Holder Only Parking.</p> <p>Two additional parking places without time limit are proposed southwest of entrance to St Hilda’s College.</p>	<p>Objections were received from the College and School concerning the proposed additional parking places at the cul-de-sac end of Cowley Place as it was felt that this could block the emergency access to St Hilda’s College or obstruct sightlines making it particularly hazardous for young people and students alike.</p> <p>It is also stated that the area is used as a drop-off point for those attending the two educational establishments in the road, that cyclists are too often in collision with opening car doors and that there have been a series of near fatalities over the last few years.</p> <p>One of the organizations also states that delivery vehicles often have to wait near the turning area until they can gain entry to the college.</p>	<p>It is considered that the extent and location of the proposed additional parking places are such that they would not obstruct emergency access or hamper turning manoeuvres, and that the overall effect on visibility for vehicles leaving St. Hilda’s College is not adverse.</p> <p>Additionally, accident records show that there have been no recorded injury accidents over the past five years anywhere in Cowley Place.</p> <p>However, comments regarding the number of cars using the area as a “drop off” point suggest that this location becomes quite busy at school start and finish times. To avoid the potential for worsening any localised congestion, it is now considered prudent to prohibit waiting during the day where there were proposed additional parking places without time limit. This will also enable any delivery vehicles to wait.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: Replace the proposed parking places without time limit with No waiting, 8am – 6.30pm, Monday – Friday, subject to any response to this change, which will be reported orally.</b></p>

<b>Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals (continued)</b>		
<b>Proposal or Comment</b>	<b>Comments Concerning The Proposals.</b>	<b>Officer Comment.</b>
<p>f) <b>Cross Street.</b></p> <p>The 2 hour parking places, where it is proposed to exempt Permit Holders' from the time limit, to be relocated partially on the footway on the northern side only.</p> <p>Two additional 2 hour footway parking places (where Permit Holders' are exempt from the time limit) will also be provided on the northern side.</p> <p>Disabled Persons' Parking Place outside 20 Cross Street to be converted to Permit Holders Only Parking.</p>	<p>An objection was received from a resident of Princes Street who felt that footway parking should not be provided.</p> <p>They suggest that the existing parking be replaced with a protected cycle lane along one side of the road.</p>	<p>Footway parking in Cross Street (between its junctions with Princes Street and Rectory Road) would be necessary to meet a minimum access requirement of 3 metres.</p> <p>This location has a particularly wide footway and a minimum of 1.5 metres width would remain clear for pedestrians.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>
<p>g) <b>Dawson Street.</b></p> <p>Controls within the existing 1 hour parking place to be changed into Permit Holders Only parking.</p> <p>Two additional Permit Holders' Only parking places to be provided.</p> <p>The Existing No Waiting (8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday) to be changed to No Waiting at Any Time.</p>	<p>Thames Valley Policed were concerned that there would be insufficient clear running lane width between parking bays on opposite sides of the road.</p>	<p>The existing parking place is marked out as considerably more than the usual 1.8 metre width. This will be adjusted during implementation to provide an adequate clear width on the running lane.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>

<b>Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals (continued)</b>		
<b>Proposal or Comment</b>	<b>Comments Concerning The Proposals.</b>	<b>Officer Comment.</b>
<p>h) <b>Hurst Street.</b></p>	<p>Although there are no proposed changes in this road a prospective resident suggested that footway parking be considered (as a last resort), should the introduction of the Magdalen Road Zone lead to insufficient capacity.</p> <p>They also requested some dedicated motorcycle parking since they believe motorcycles take up a car space when they park within the existing parking bays. They also felt that bikes parked in permit holders parking bays are prone to damage as they are easily knocked over.</p>	<p>Lengths of No Waiting at Any Time currently protecting access-ways and junctions have already necessitated single sided parking over this section of Hurst Street. Consequently, footway parking is unlikely to generate any additional parking.</p> <p>Provisions in the TRO require motorcycles to park perpendicular to the kerb. Consequently they should take up less space than any car.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>
<p>i) <b>Jeune Street.</b></p> <p>Introduce a 1 metre length of no double yellow line to separate Permit Holders Only and Time limited parking places outside 45 to 47 Jeune Street.</p> <p>Permit Holders Only parking places on the west side of the road moved to the east side.</p>	<p>One resident and Thames Valley Police raised concerns about a possible increase in speed as a result of most of the parking being located on the same side of the road.</p>	<p>While the proposals would only increase the length between chicanes by 50% it is recognised that this could lead to some increase in vehicle speed. Consequently it is proposed to amend the proposals to retain the existing layout of permit holders only parking.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: Change Draft TRO to retain the layout of existing Permit Holders Only parking.</b></p>

<b>Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals (continued)</b>		
<b>Proposal or Comment</b>	<b>Comments Concerning The Proposals.</b>	<b>Officer Comment.</b>
j) <b>Marston Street.</b>	A resident of a car free development was disappointed that the proposals did nothing for them as they would remain excluded from having permits even though they needed their car for work.	The property in question was excluded from permit eligibility from construction so that it would not place an additional burden on parking demand in the area which is oversubscribed.  <b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b>
k) <b>Princes Street.</b>  The existing Disabled Persons' Parking Place adjacent to the East Oxford Community Centre to be extended over the adjacent 1 hour parking.  Existing Permit Holders Only parking place, opposite the East Oxford Community Centre, to be extended into adjacent 1 hour parking places.	Concerns were expressed about the difficulty residents of Grants Mews have turning left out of their access, and the lack of visibility, caused by an adjacent parking place outside 66 Princes Street.	In addition to the concerns expressed by the resident of Grants Mews, a new access-way has been constructed outside 74 Princes Street. The remaining length between dropped kerbs is too short for a viable parking place to remain.  <b>RECOMMEND: Remove parking places outside 66 and 73/74 Princes Street, subject to any response to this change, which will be reported orally.</b>
l) <b>Regent Street.</b>  It is proposed that Permit Holders Only parking places on the northern side of the road between 22 to 25 Regent Street, would be moved to eastern side.	Thames Valley Police raised concerns about a possible increase in speed as a result of most of the parking being located on the same side of the road.	The length of parking in question is relatively short and close to the western end of the road. Consequently, it is felt that vehicles will already be slowing as they approach the "T" junction and that there will be no increase in speed.  <b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b>

Details of Proposals and Comments Concerning Street Specific Proposals (continued)		
Proposal or Comment	Comments Concerning The Proposals.	Officer Comment.
<p>m) <b>Temple Street.</b></p> <p>Additional Permit Holders Only parking places to replace No Waiting, Monday – Saturday 8am – 6.30pm, near Kingdom Hall.</p> <p>A new 2 hour parking place is proposed to replace double yellow lines along the side of 61 Iffley Road.</p> <p>The existing 2 hour parking places near the Doctors Surgery to be replaced with Disabled Persons Parking Places, 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday.</p> <p>Evening and weekend Permit Holder Only restrictions in Doctors spaces to be removed.</p>	<p>Objections were received from the Jehovah's Witnesses concerning the three additional Permit Holders' parking places proposed to replace a length of No Waiting Monday – Saturday 8am – 6.30pm (single yellow line) near Kingdom Hall.</p> <p>They request that the single yellow line remain as they do not wish to lose parking used by their members during meetings on Sundays and evenings.</p> <p>Although it has been explained that the proposals would lead to five additional spaces their members could use, they still request that the permit holders' spaces be allocated elsewhere and the single yellow line remain. They are particularly concerned about space being available to elderly and disabled members of their congregation as well as access to their one off-street parking place.</p>	<p>This loss of unrestricted evening and Sunday parking is more than compensated for elsewhere in the road and the rearrangement of controls would also provide an additional five spaces that their members could use.</p> <p>Retaining the single yellow line wastes an opportunity to provide parking places available during the day which cannot be provided elsewhere in the road.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested to amend the proposals so that the No Waiting at any time protecting their access is extended over one of the proposed permit holders' only spaces (this will provide 3 hour parking for any disabled member of their congregation displaying a blue badge) while still retaining two additional permit holders only parking places.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: Change Proposed TRO to extend the No Waiting at any time in front of the access to Kingdom Hall over part of the proposed permit holders' only parking, subject to any response to this change, which will be reported orally.</b></p>

<p>n)</p>	<p><b>Union Street.</b></p> <p>The existing Permit Holders' Only parking to be extended outside 14 to 15 Union Street.</p> <p>An additional 2 hour parking place to be provided on the west side of the road, near 25 Union Street.</p>	<p>A resident believes that the proposed parking layout was the least favourable of several options discussed on site with officers which were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Allow parking on an area of land with hatched markings adjacent to the garages in Union Street;</li> <li>b) A request to reinstate parking, opposite 15 Union Street, lost when a cycleway was constructed.</li> </ul> <p>The resident also objects to the loading restrictions. However, the effect of the proposals is not to change any of these.</p>	<p>Prior to the formal consultation, officers met with the resident and discussed a number of suggestions which the resident made. At the time, it was explained that one of the suggestions would not be possible (as the land was not public highway) while the others could be looked into, but it could not be guaranteed that these would be feasible. In response to the specific points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The land in question is neither Highway Maintainable at Public Expense nor owned by Oxfordshire County Council consequently we are unable to consider this request;</li> <li>b) This is at a location where the cycle track joins Union Street. To reinstate parking would necessitate redesigning the cycle track and adjacent access road to the East Oxford Primary School. Such physical works lie outside the scope of this review.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed parking arrangements are therefore the most cost effective way of introducing additional parking for the area.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND: No Change to the Advertised Draft TRO.</b></p>
-----------	---	--	---

**ANNEX 3**

**East Oxford Controlled Parking Zone Review 2009**  
**Details of Street Specific Changes Where No Comments Were Received**

No comments were received, as part of the formal consultation process, in relation to the following proposals. Consequently no changes are recommended to the draft Traffic Regulation Order.

**a) Ablett Close.**

An additional 3 hour parking place is proposed alongside the rear garden of number 61 East Avenue.

**b) Bath Street.**

The Disabled Persons' parking place, nearest to the junction with St. Clements' Street, would have its hours of operation reduced to 8am – 6.30pm, Monday – Saturday from at all times.

**c) Caroline Street.**

The Disabled Persons' parking place would be changed into a 1 hour parking place and extended slightly.

**d) Cave Street.**

Existing double yellow line, opposite numbers 15 to 17 Cave Street would be replaced with No Waiting, 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday.

**e) Cave Street Turning Area (New Street).**

Approximately 1 car length of existing double yellow line in this, the remaining stub of New Street, would become No Waiting, 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday.

**f) Circus Street.**

The existing 2 hour parking places on the west side would be removed to make way for new 3 hour parking places on the opposite side of the road. Permit Holders' would also be exempt from the time limit.

**g) Cosin Close.**

Residents would become eligible for East Oxford residents' and visitor permits.

The 2 hour parking places, outside number 1 Cosin Close would be extended. Permit Holders' would also become exempt from the time limit.

Additional 2 hour parking places, in which Permit Holders' are exempt from the time limit, would be provided outside numbers 2 and 3 Cosin Close.

**h) Cowley Road.**

A small extension to the Permit Holders' Only Parking Place outside numbers 22 to 24 Cowley Road is proposed. A slight relocation of an existing Bus Stop Clearway will also be required to accommodate this.

**i) Crown Street.**

An additional 2 hour parking place, alongside the Public House on the corner of St. Mary's Road is proposed. Permit Holders' would also be exempt from the time limit.

**j) East Avenue.**

The Disabled Persons' parking place outside numbers 38 to 40 East Avenue would be converted into Permit Holders Only Parking,

The Existing Disabled Persons' Parking place, nearest Cowley Road, would be relocated to the opposite (north-eastern) end of the existing bay.

**k) Glebe Street.**

An additional Permit Holders' only parking place is proposed in the northwest corner.

**l) Harpsichord Place.**

Additional Permit Holders' Only parking places are proposed on the southeast side of the road, opposite the existing Disabled Persons' Parking Place.

It is proposed to remove the redundant Disabled Persons' parking place to make way for the above Permit Holders Only parking.

**m) Iffley Road.**

A new 2 hour parking place to replace the No Waiting 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday outside numbers 103 to 109 Iffley Road is proposed. Permit Holders' would be exempt from the time limit.

Controls within the 1 hour parking place outside numbers 141 to 145 Iffley Road would be changed into Permit Holders Only Parking.

New 1 hour parking place outside numbers 147 to 149 Iffley Road would replace the existing No Waiting 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday.

**n) James Street.**

The Existing No Waiting 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday opposite St Mary's Road junction shortened to enable double yellow line to protect an existing access.

**o) Leon Close.**

An additional 1 hour parking place would be provided near the junction with Cowley Road.

The order will also better define the current parking places without time limit in the road.

**p) Little Brewery Street.**

The Existing double yellow line within parking places would be replaced with white access protection to conform to current Department for Transport signing standards.

**q) Nye Bevan Close.**

Residents would become eligible for residents' and visitor permits.

Existing double yellow lines, outside numbers 2 to 3 Nye Bevan Close, would be replaced with No Waiting, 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday.

Additional 2 hour parking places would be provided outside numbers 9 to 10 and 12 Nye Bevan Close. Permit Holders' would also be exempt from the time limit.

**r) Rectory Road.**

An additional 2 hour parking place would be provided outside 19 to 21 Rectory Road together with a Permit Holders' only parking place outside number 25 Rectory Road. Permit Holders' would be exempt from the time limit in the 2 hour parking place.

The Existing double yellow line outside The Rectory Centre would be replaced with No Waiting, 8am – 6.30pm, Monday – Saturday.

Existing Permit Holders' Only Parking place would be replaced with No Waiting, 8am – 6.30pm, Monday – Saturday outside numbers 52 to 53 Rectory Road.

**s) St. Mary's Road.**

The existing 2 hour parking places alongside James Street Church would be extended. Permit Holders' would be exempt from the time limit.

**t) Stockmore Street.**

The 30 minute parking places, 8am – 6.30pm Monday – Saturday, outside 38 to 44 Stockmore Street, would be changed to 2 hour parking places where Permit Holders' are exempt from the time limit.

The 1 hour parking place alongside number 77 Iffley Road would become a Permit Holders' only parking.

**u) Wingfield Street.**

A single 2 hour parking place, where Permit Holders' are exempt from the time limit, is proposed.