Division: Jericho & Osney, Headington

and Quarry, Isis

CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT- 25 JULY 2013

PROPOSED DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACES – OXFORD CITY

Report by Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Commercial)

Introduction

1. This report considers objections received as a result of a formal consultation on proposals to introduce new Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPPs) at various sites in Oxford City.

Background

- 2. The report considers the proposed provision of new disabled persons' parking places (DPPPs) in the following locations:
 - Oxford, Headington Kennett Road location as shown at Annex 2;
 - Oxford, City Centre, Pembroke Square location as shown at Annex 3;
 - Oxford, Iffley Fields, Stratford Street location as shown at Annex 4;
 - Oxford, Iffley Fields, Warwick Street location as shown at Annex 5;

This follows the publication of the draft Oxfordshire County Council - (Disabled Persons Parking Places – Oxford) (Amendment No. 7) Order 20**. These proposals arise as a result of requests by Disabled Badge holders for DPPPs near their homes in the streets listed above. Site visits were made and plans and schedules drawn up.

3. This report considers the outcome of the formal consultation held on the proposals. All other proposals advertised at the same time were unopposed and have therefore been dealt with under my delegated authority to avoid unnecessary delays to applicants.

Formal Consultation

4. Oxfordshire County Council sent a copy of the draft amendment order, statement of reasons and a copy of the public notice appearing in the local press, containing all the proposed DPPP changes to formal consultees on 10 April 2013. These documents, together with supporting documentation as required and plans of all the DPPPs, were deposited for public inspection at County Hall and Cowley and Headington libraries. They are also available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre.

- 5. At the same time, the Council wrote to local residents affected by the proposed restrictions, asking for their comments. Finally, public notices were displayed at each site and in the Oxford Times.
- 6. A total of 10 responses were received regarding the proposal in Kennett Road, 5 in respect of Pembroke Square, 3 in respect of Stratford Street and 1 with regard to Warwick Street. All responses received are summarised at Annex 1.
- 7. Ten residents have objected to the proposed DPPP in Kennett Road, Headington on the grounds that parking space is so scarce in the area that most residents have hard-standings in their gardens with dropped kerb access to the road. They believe the applicant should take this route. It has been stated that the applicant has his own drive and garage off Bateman Street and the proposed DPPP would replace 2 permit holder car spaces. As the road is "one-way" the disabled driver would have to enter and leave the vehicle to/from the road and because of the slope, this would be dangerous due to speed of vehicles/cyclists. Currently, the applicant is out of the country but a letter and email have been sent requesting further information concerning the alleged drive and garage. The result will be reported at the meeting.
- 8. Five people and organisations in Pembroke Square have commented on the proposals which are to remodel the existing 2-space DPPP to be perpendicular to the kerb and thus accommodate three cars. One resident user of the bay is strongly in favour and supports the further proposal to remove the footway and incorporate that space into the proposed new arrangements. St Aldates Church, Oxford Pastoral Housing Association (Commonwealth House) and Pembroke College all support the proposal provided the footway is removed so that the bay would take up less room and allow vehicle movements in the Square more easily. Another regular user of the bay who drives his disabled wife is not in favour of the proposal because it would be difficult to get in and out of it, due to customers of the street traders bay parking opposite on the double yellow lines. He also objects to the loss of part of the footway since it would prevent unimpeded footway access from the Pembroke College on the north side past the Church to St Aldates. The cost of removing the section of footway and incorporating into a level road surface is £4000. It is considered that the proposed DPPP should be installed once the footway works have been completed.
- A small number of responses to the Stratford Street and Warwick Street proposals were received. These comments and responses are included at Annex 1. In these cases it is considered that the proposed DPPP should be installed as proposed.

Financial and Staff Implications (including Revenue)

10. The cost of all the proposed work under consultation, including that described in this report, will be met from the fund set up for this purpose.

RECOMMENDATION

11. The Cabinet Member for Environment is RECOMMENDED to approve the proposed DPPPs as set out in this report.

MARK KEMP

Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Commercial)

Background papers: Consultation documentation

Contact Officers: Jim Daughton 01865 815803

June 2013

RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

RESPONDENT	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Resident of Kennett Road, Headington, and member of New Headington Residents Association	Most of the residents apart from applicant have used their front gardens to provide off-street parking and so should the applicant. The applicant already has a garage and drive accessed from Bateman Street. With such limited parking space on the road the loss of a current two car space in favour of the DPPP would be detrimental to the whole neighbourhood, and the space might be reduced if No 58 extends their drive.	The creation of a hard-standing in a front garden in itself restricts parking opportunities but there are already double yellow lines outside the applicant's frontage so this would not apply. OCC cannot compel the applicant to apply for and fund a hard-standing and dropped kerb. There is still room for a DPPP if No 58 extends drive. The garage and drive mentioned might not be particularly easy for a disabled person to use without adaptations but their existence was not disclosed by the applicant so a letter and email have been sent asking for further information. The applicant is currently
Resident of Kennett Road, and member of New Headington Residents' Association	Suggests the applicant uses his garden for parking as most residents of Kennet Road already have instead of taking up the scarce on road parking bays.	abroad so the result will be reported verbally at the meeting. As above.
Resident of Kennett Road	Concerned about loss of parking – he gave up his car and uses car club vehicles instead. Applicant has a garage.	As above. DfT minimum length regulations require DPPPs to be 6.6 metres or more long. This would leave only half a car space left in the existing bay so would affectively replace all of it.
Two residents of	Apart from losing 2 valuable car parking spaces, concerned	As above. Parking bay already exists and drivers

Kennett Road	about safety. Do OCC visit applicants to assess their needs? Road is one-way and on a hill meaning disabled resident would have to get out and into his car on the road side near a "dangerous" junction. Cyclists speed down the road in the opposite meaning a collision with the disabled resident would be possible.	parked in the bays would be facing cyclists so would see them coming. The junction is such that drivers could not speed around it easily. OCC does visit all applicants; sends out a comprehensive application form and requires copies of driving documents in the first instance. Site inspections are also made to assess the possibility of a DPPP.
Resident of Kennett Road	Suggests applicant builds parking space in their front garden as most other residents have done to free up parking space. Concerned that proposed DPPP will take up the parking space of two small cars.	As above.
Two residents of Kennett Road	Strongly objects to the proposed changes and resultant loss of residents parking. Parking is very limited in the road, partly because so many residents have hard-standings. Suggests putting DPPP in an adjoining road.	As above. Cannot expect the Blue Badge holder to walk to the next street to park in a DPPP – DPPPs need to be near the houses of applicants.
Resident of Kennett Road	Objects to the proposals. Suspects that the applicant has a garage at the end of the garden. Objector lives in Bateman Street and has to park in Kennett Road because parking in Bateman Street is severely limited. Suggests applicant puts hard-standing in front garden.	As above.
Resident of Kennett Road	His application for a DPPP was turned down as he has a hard- standing. Concerned that proposed DPPP would reduce residents & visitors parking.	As above.
Resident of Kennett Road	Would be affected by proposal as it would reduce parking for other residents & visitors. Suggests applicant creates hard-standing in front garden instead. Would like to discuss further with OCC when he returns to this country.	As above. Has not contacted OCC yet.
Resident of Kennett Road	Also has problems walking but installed parking in front garden. Has daily help and carers etc. and all have difficulty parking	

	even though they have visitors permits.	
Disabled resident of Pembroke Street and user of the current DPPP	Supports the DPPP proposals in Pembroke Square and the revised proposal to remove the pavement behind to accommodate this. The pavement ends at the south-eastern entrance to the Church so only used by some.	The south-eastern entrance to the Church is accessible from the other end.
St Aldates Church	Opposes the original proposal as concerned that new arrangements would obstruct traffic movements in the Square, particularly as customers of the Street Trader park on the double yellow lines opposite. However do support revised proposal to remove footway behind and install tarmac level with the camber so revised DPPPs would not extend so far into the Square and be more level.	Street Trader generally trades in the evenings when traffic movements, apart from customers, are less. Revised proposal is safer for disabled drivers as the existing bay is on a cambered surface and it would better facilitate vehicle movement.
Oxford Pastoral Housing Association Commonwealth House Pembroke Street	As above.	As above.
Pembroke College	As above.	As above
The Warden, Commonwealth House	Uses the existing DPPP as his wife is a blue badge holder. Opposes the proposal as it would be ignored by customers of Street Trader who park on the double yellow lines opposite restricting the passage of traffic in the square. Opposes revised proposal as the footway behind the DPPP is used by	The Square has a limited amount of vehicular traffic and most pedestrians use the road as well as the footways without difficulty. Delivery drivers not familiar with the square sometimes drive in and need to turn round in the Square to leave.

	pedestrians walking between the Church and St Aldates.	However, removing the footway behind the DPPP should resolve that.
Resident of Stratford Street	Parking in the street is oversubscribed since the nearby CPZ schemes were implemented. Are the three existing disabled spaces still needed and the current application genuine?	The other three are used by disabled residents and still required. The current applicant drives and has a current valid Blue Badge so is eligible to apply for a DPPP.
Resident of Stratford Street	Her mother is a Blue Badge holder – could she park in the proposed DPPP? Parking in the street is very limited since the nearby CPZ schemes were implemented and believes college students displaced by the CPZs are now parking in the street.	Parking congestion has prompted Blue Badge holders to apply for DPPPs near their homes. There was strong opposition to the CPZ proposed for Iffley Fields and the proposal had to be abandoned.
Resident of Warwick Street	The proposed DPPP would displace two parking spaces and it is likely that the vehicles owned by No's 3 & 3A would then be parked further up, outside her house. Believes the DPPP should be partially on the footway to allow parking opposite. Was the owner of No's 3 & 3A approached about the proposal? Could the adjacent Access Protection Marking (APM) be shortened to facilitate the DPPP?	House frontages are very narrow, but the APM could be shortened and still be effective. Generally partial pavement parking bays are only provided in CPZs where a uniform approach can be made. The owner of the two properties was approached by the applicants and did not object, and despite the consultation letters to residents and street notices provided, made no further comment.







