

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 10 October 2013 commencing at 11.00 am and finishing at 12.06 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor David Nimmo Smith – in the Chair

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor John Sanders
Councillor Roz Smith (for Agenda Item 4)

By Invitation:

Officers:

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

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
4.	D. Tole (Environment & Economy)
5.	I. Connick (Environment & Economy)
6.	M. Wasley (Environment & Economy)
7 & 8	M. Tugwell and P. Day (Environment & Economy)

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

13/13 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Frank McKenna (Highfield Residents Association) County Councillor Roz Smith)) 4. Proposed Removal of Parking Bay – Lime Walk, Headington
Matt Murton (Henley Resident) David Silvester (Henley Town Council))) 5. Reading Road (Henley) Public Transport Infrastructure
Graham Smith (CTC)	6. Abingdon: Wootton Road – Cycle Safety Improvements

14/13 PROPOSED REMOVAL OF PARKING BAY - LIME WALK, HEADINGTON
(Agenda No. 4)

The Cabinet Member for the Environment considered the results of a formal consultation on a proposal to introduce a new parking restriction to remove a parking bay on Lime Walk in the Headington Central CPZ which had been required as a result of an adjacent development site.

Mr McKenna on behalf of the Highfield Residents Association lodged a strong objection. The Residents Association had, in conjunction with the local authority had partially implemented a self-funded traffic management scheme. This area formed a principle part of that and this change could compromise that scheme, traffic safety and present a loss of amenity to local residents. Having looked at the original planning proposal it was not felt necessary to remove the bay or change current arrangements on the street and the status quo should be maintained.

Councillor Roz Smith endorsed the points made by Mr McKenna. Removal of the parking bay completely would mean everyone would lose. Residents currently suffered from speeding traffic at this very busy junction and as parked bays did have some beneficial effect on speeding vehicles that would undoubtedly worsen if this proposal went ahead. Pedestrians would also be able to cross safely and local residents and visitors able to continue to park as there were few houses with off road parking facilities. She suggested provision of a white line to help with the 'blocking in' issue which would allow retention of the parking bay. There were places further down Lime Walk where visitors could park for 2 hours but one bay should at least be retained.

Mr Tole expressed some sympathy with the views expressed but the county council's hands were effectively tied by the terms of the original planning permission retaining a single space. There had been complaints by residents in the new development that they were getting blocked in and the local authority could not allow a situation where an on street space was blocked by an off street space. There could possibly be provision of some replacement measures to allow residents to get in and out and to narrow the road to maintain some kind of traffic calming but with regard to white lining he could not recall a situation where this had been done where residents of a property were unable to park as they didn't have a permit to do so and so the blocking issue could in effect continue.

With regard to traffic calming he confirmed there was currently no funding although it could conceivably form part of a locally funded scheme, work for which was currently ongoing although no formal design had yet been agreed.

Responding to the Cabinet Member he did not believe that one space could be retained.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed his decision as follows:

Defer the proposal to introduce a new parking restriction to remove a parking bay on Lime Walk to enable further consideration to be given and if necessary reconsider at the 21 November meeting.

15/13 READING ROAD (HENLEY) PUBLIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

(Agenda No. 5)

The Cabinet Member for the Environment considered proposals for new and replacement bus stops on Reading Road, Henley using section 106 funding and in the light of a public consultation on the proposals.

Mr Murton was a resident in a ground floor flat at Henley Gate directly behind the proposed shelter which would effectively block the only source of light into his property. His objection was not to do with privacy but a loss of amenity. Alternative sites were available and he suggested a site outside the JET garage some 20 yards down the road which was not outside residential properties.

Henley Town Councillor David Silvester spoke on behalf of Lavinia Smith who lived at 89 Reading Road. There were a number of concerns regarding the proposal to site a stop at the junction of Reading Road and Upton Close. The siting of the stop would seriously impair leftward vision when exiting from the driveway of number 89 making the manoeuvre considerably more dangerous and also from backed up traffic behind buses. There was also a perceived risk from children on bikes. Moving the stop towards Upton Close would not help. Secondly the siting would have a serious negative effect on the value of the property the amenity of the garden. He asked the Cabinet Member to consider alternative locations which would not impact so severely on local residences.

Mr Connick advised that although the majority of sites proposed seemed acceptable the southbound sites had created a number of problems. The Cabinet Member had been petitioned regarding the Upton Close siting and although there might not be adequate space to resite the stop because of adjacent trees further investigations could be carried out to see if that was feasible. The Quebec Road stop had already been withdrawn following further investigations which had been carried out on site following objections received. With regard to the Henley Gate siting the flat now occupied by Mr Murton had been vacant at the time of the surveys but it would be possible to resite the stop to the right of the stop pole, which might help meet some of Mr Murton's concerns bearing in mind there had always been a stop at this site and the current proposal had been made in order to improve what was already there and privacy. A minor objection to the siting at St Marks Road had been resolved.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed his decision as follows:

- (a) defer a decision on the final siting of the stop adjacent to 89 Reading Road to enable further consideration;

- (b) to relocate the shelter at the Henley Gate stop to the right of the existing bus stop pole.

16/13 ABINGDON: WOOTTON ROAD - CYCLE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

(Agenda No. 6)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered a proposed scheme funded wholly by the Department for Transport to address safety issues for cyclists at the Wootton Road/Dunmore Road roundabout in Abingdon. A number of representations had been received to a public consultation.

Also tabled were two late objections. One from the cyclists touring club stated that the scheme offered no improvement in safety for cyclists who wished to remain on the highway and questioned the amount of focus given to improving off road cycle provision. The Oxonian cycle club stated that the proposed scheme would make cycling less safe, less desirable and cause more delays for cyclists while acknowledging some positive aspects of the scheme.

Officers advised that the scheme only focussed on the one arm where records had shown accidents were concentrated. The scheme would reduce the overall speed around the roundabout through the use of imprint around the central island, along with the tightening of the radius from Dunmore Road to Wootton Road, increasing the deflection, reducing entry speeds from Dunmore Road allowing more time for motorists to see cyclists. Both objections question the width of the off road shared use paths, which were to be 2.5 metres wide, other than the preferred minimum of 3.0 metres. This was primarily to keep the scheme within budget, but should the detailed design process result in savings, the paths could be widened to 3.0 metres where possible. Further issues raised were common with other objections and addressed in annex 2 to the report CMDE.

Graham Smith (CTC) questioned the integrity of the scheme which he considered inadequate and dangerous. The plan attached to the report was difficult to read and he tabled a new plan. He stressed a calmer stream of traffic was essential and the most effective way of achieving that was by reducing traffic speed. This scheme failed to do that. It proposed installation of unprotected entries and he considered the toucan crossing would be largely ignored and represented expenditure which could be better spent elsewhere on the scheme. He was also concerned regarding the pedestrian deterrent pavement. The scheme needed a complete redesign.

Mr Wasley undertook to address some of the technical and minor issues with the cycling organisations. In the meantime he considered the scheme addressed the brief given and catered for both experienced and inexperienced cyclists. The width of the scheme had been reduced in order to meet the budget available and a series of compromises had been necessary to keep within budget which itself was time constrained. He felt the scheme as proposed best met the requirements given.

Councillor Sanders had some concerns regarding the siting of the new toucan crossing and whether that might encourage users to go straight across.

Mr Wasley advised that the pedestrian deterrent paving should prevent that.

Mr Kemp advised that the scheme could be delayed slightly without putting at risk the available grant which would allow time to look at the scheme in a bit more detail.

The Cabinet Member considered this was an opportunity to improve things but was happy to delay slightly in order to reconsider with the cycling organisations some aspects of the scheme and see if a compromise could be reached so having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above he confirmed his decision as follows:

To agree the Abingdon Wootton Road Cycle Improvement Scheme in principle pending further discussions between county officers and representatives of cycling organisations to try and agree a compromise on certain elements of the scheme design.

17/13 UPDATED NATIONAL WASTE PLANNING POLICY - PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT - CONSULTATION RESPONSES

(Agenda No. 7)

The Cabinet Member for the Environment was asked to confirm a draft response which had previously been submitted to the Department for Communities and Local Government on the updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste management July 2013 in order to comply with a deadline for comment of 23 September 2013

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

to confirm the draft response at Annex 1 to the report CMDE7 as submitted to the Department for Communities and Local Government consultation on updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste management July 2013.

18/13 OXFORDSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE MONITORING REPORT 2012

(Agenda No. 8)

The Cabinet Member for the Environment considered the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report 2012 prepared as a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

- (a) to approve the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report 2012 annexed to the report CMDE8;

-
- (b) To authorise the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning) to carry out any necessary final editing of the Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report 2012 for publication on the County Council website.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing