

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 21 March 2013 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 12.10 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Rodney Rose – in the Chair

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Jean Fooks (for Agenda Item 4)

Officers:

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

Part of meeting

Agenda Item

4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11

6

9

13E, 14E

Officer Attending

D. Tole (Environment & Economy)

A. Warren (Environment & Economy)

M. Ruse (Environment & Economy)

A. Pau and T. Darch (Environment & Economy)

The Deputy Leader of the Council 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 and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

19/13 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

Petitions

Two petitions were presented:

Zebra Crossing for Morrell Avenue, Oxford (119 Signatures)

The petition called for provision of a pedestrian crossing on Morrell Avenue. On behalf of the petitioners City Councillor Bev Clack and Jemila Azad understood that the County Council were considering undertaking a review of residents parking and other related road issues in this area and felt that presented an opportunity to

consider such a scheme, particularly given its proximity to local schools – nursery, primary and secondary and the Hub. There were insufficient crossing points in this area and the fact that Morrell Avenue was on a hill only exacerbated the speed of traffic and the problems pedestrians faced from speeding motorists. Residents in this area included elderly people and families with small children and crossing between the streets of east Oxford and the park presented an extremely hazardous experience for many. Over the last few months residents had been canvassed on this issue which had resulted in this petition asking for a crossing as a matter of urgency.

Ms Azad referred to a serious accident 2 days before which had involved a cyclist and motor vehicle.

Receiving the petition the Deputy Leader of the Council referred it to the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Commercial and Delivery) to consider and respond.

Cut Traffic Speeds in Cutteslowe (51 signatures)

The petition presented by County Councillor Jean Fooks and Emma Parsons (Parent/School Governor) called on the County Council to investigate provision of speed-reducing measures in the roads approaching Cutteslowe Primary School. Observed speeds in the area were well over the 20 mph limit and physical measures such as speed cushions were required to reduce the risk to children and residents in these roads.

Councillor Fooks explained that the school had and continued to expand which increased the potential for conflict. The only way of reducing that risk seemed to be to introduce physical measures to reduce vehicle speeds.

Emma Parsons referred to the expansion at the school which had drawn children in from other parts of the City and stressed the dangers to pedestrians. The perception seemed to be that some drivers were not aware that a school was there.

Receiving the petition the Deputy Leader of the Council referred it to the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Commercial and Delivery) to consider and respond.

Speakers

The following requests to address the meeting had been agreed:

<i>Request</i>	<i>Item</i>
Huw Edmunds (Resident)) 4. Proposed residents parking –) Cutteslowe
Hossein Moghaddam (Resident)	
Debbie Spencer (Resident)	
Don Manley (Resident)	
Mark Golding (Summertown Stars FC)	

Councillor Jean Fooks (Local County Councillor))))
Nicola Lewis (Resident)	6. Ardley – Proposed Pedestrian Crossing and Associated Enhancements
Joseph Shields (Resident)	7. Proposed Prohibition of Vehicles – Thorpe Way/Alma Road Banbury

20/13 PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME - CUTTESLOWE AREA

(Agenda No. 4)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered proposals to introduce new parking restrictions in the Cutteslowe and Five Mile Drive areas of north Oxford in the light of objections received to a public consultation.

Hossein Moghaddan was a resident of Linkside Avenue. Roads in this area were already congested and staff from the BMW garage frequently parked in this area blocking the entrance and exit to Linkside Avenue and sight lines. If the scheme went ahead it would exacerbate this situation and as a council tax payer he expected to enjoy freedom to move in and out of the area unhindered by parked cars. He supported that element of the scheme which would allow resident parking with permits available.

Debbie Spencer had submitted a petition on behalf of residents of Pennywell Drive who supported provision for permit holders but who felt that 10 am to 4 pm was insufficient. The area was busy in the evenings and if paying for permits then residents felt these should be available for a longer period. Not all residents had driveways but those that did quite often found them blocked and she requested extra long white lines to protect accesses.

Don Manley resided in Harbord Road and considered that a 2 hour maximum period for non-permit holders would cause problems. Supporting the original proposals as set out in the Director for Environment & Economy's letter of 5 February he felt the amended proposals were draconian and should be abandoned and the original 1 hour scheme taken forward.

Mark Golding speaking on behalf of the Summertown Stars AFC a voluntary club run by parents was aware that his views would be unpopular with residents but with up to 12 teams attending at the Park at weekends with a 100 or so cars it was inevitable that they would contribute to parking problems in the area. This was largely unavoidable because the Cutteslowe Park car park itself could only accommodate 80 vehicles and it was unavoidable that some cars would park in adjoining streets. For

their members it was impractical to limit parking on Harbord Road to 2 hours and it was inevitable that cars would cruise to find alternative space. The club also felt that advice given in the report was unlawful due to the improper consultation undertaken on Annex 4. This was not a practical solution.

Huw Edmunds resided near Cutteslowe Park and currently had no real issue with parking but that could change if the scheme was introduced. He advised that none of the residents in Bourne Close were in favour of the proposals.

Councillor Fooks referred to problems at Cutteslowe Park car park which had not been helped by parking charges. The limited parking available created problems for users at the park and consequently for residents in adjoining streets. The west side of the area experienced considerable problems during the week from commuter parking and safeguards such as a 1 hour time limit period would need to be put in place to protect the east side from displaced parking. Residents near Cutteslowe park experienced problems hence the calls for extended periods beyond 10am to 4 pm. She suggested white line protection measures and possibly 1 hour bays nearest the park. The east side would benefit from improved parking in the Park itself and the City Council should be pressed to improve levels for overflow parking.

The Deputy Leader of the Council supported calls for the City Council to improve parking levels in the Park.

Mr Tole explained that the scheme had started as a means of dealing with very local and specific issues but because of problems elsewhere it was recognised that something more comprehensive was required. Initially officers had looked at a minimum impact zone and in February had consulted on such a scheme. That had worked elsewhere but it became clear that that scheme had missed a number of issues and so an alternative option had been drawn up. That option had prompted 250 responses from 1200 properties.

He then addressed issues raised by the speakers. With regard to Pennywell Drive he did not consider that an extension to the permit period would make any difference if residents had permits but agreed that access protection markings would help.

With regard to Harbord Road he did not consider that a 1 hour scheme as opposed to the proposed 2 hour would deal with the concerns of residents. A lot of Park users parked in this area to avoid the 50p charge at the car park. He did not agree that the proposals were unfair as democratically there was an obligation to try and help everyone.

Option C would mean that visitors to the Park would need to use the Park's car park. He accepted there would be a great deal of pressure on space but if the overflow car park could be improved so that it could be used in poor weather and available at all times that would help satisfy needs although the charge element would remain. If the proposals did not apply on Saturdays or extended to 3 hours then there would be no benefit to residents in Harbord Road.

With regard to concerns regarding the appropriateness of dealing with this issue today he accepted that there had not been a 21 day consultation period but

responses received up until the date of the meeting were being considered and could stand.

He confirmed Bourne Close was not proposed for inclusion.

It was proposed to include Linkside Avenue in the controlled parking zone 10 am to 4 pm as on the west side of Banbury Road.

Responding to questions from the Deputy Leader of the Council he confirmed that access protection white lines would not be legally enforceable and therefore purely advisable,. However, they were generally well observed and could be provided within the costs of the scheme.

With regard to the legality of considering the proposal now the County Council's legal advisers had confirmed that it was appropriate to do so.

The Deputy Leader of the Council highlighted the principles behind the localism initiative and the need to take into the account the views of the local councillor. He was also happy to request the City Council to consider the issues of surfacing the overflow car park at Cutteslowe Car Park.

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 Deputy Leader of the Council then confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

- (a) to approve the parking restrictions advertised as the Oxfordshire County Council (Oxford-Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive Area)(Controlled parking Zone and Waiting |Restrictions) Order 201* and amended as set out in the report CMDL4;
- (b) request the City Council to consider the issue of improvements to the surface of the overflow car park at Cutteslowe Park in order to increase parking capacity.

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....

21/13 PROPOSED RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME - ELMS ROAD, BOTLEY
(Agenda No. 5)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered proposals to introduce a residents parking scheme in Elms Road, Botley in the light of objections received to a public consultation and additional written representations from County Councillor Janet Godden who supported the proposal and a proposed amendment to it to include two flats in West Way adjacent to Elms Close as set out in the report.

Mr Tole also advised that the headteacher of the local school supported the scheme.

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 Deputy Leader of the Council then confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

to approve a residents parking scheme for Elms Road, Botley as advertised but with the addition of extended permit eligibility to 64/64A West Way as described in the report CMDDL5.

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....

22/13 ARDLEY - PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING AND ASSOCIATED ENHANCEMENTS

(Agenda No. 6)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered a proposal to install a puffing crossing on the B430 Station Road, Ardley in the light of responses received to a public consultation.

Nicola Lewis a resident of Fritwell Road spoke in support. The need for a crossing here had long been recognised by the parish council and Councillor Mrs Fulljames the local County Councillor. Recent development meant that 23 children now had to cross the road in order to access amenities and school transport. Speed checks had revealed a vehicle every 4.5 seconds and when repeated on a Sunday 622 vehicles were found to be exceeding the limit. That the situation would undoubtedly get worse when the Ardley energy from waste plant was in operation.

She confirmed that surveys had been carried out by the Bicester traffic management unit.

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 Deputy Leader of the Council then confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

- (a) approve the installation of a puffing crossing on the B430 Station Road, Ardley north of its junction with Somerton Road for delivery in 2013/14;
- (b) delegate authority to the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Commercial and Delivery) in consultation with the Deputy Leader of the Council to deal with any specific matters relating to detailed design.

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....

23/13 PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES - THORPE WAY/ALMA ROAD, BANBURY

(Agenda No. 7)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered a proposal to install a puffing crossing on the B430 Station Road, Ardley in the light of responses received to a public consultation.

Joseph Shields, a resident of Verney Road expressed concern that the County Council might not reach the right conclusion based on the response evidence before it. 85% of respondents had objected and yet the recommendation to proceed seemed to suggest that a no response could be interpreted as support. He argued that there was no evidence to support closure and referred to the points raised in paragraph 9 relating to Higham Way. At the very least there was not in his view enough information available to make a reasonable judgement and current conditions should be taken into account.

Mr Tole then read out an email from Frances Bridgeman who had been unable to attend and speak personally. She had expressed dismay that despite an 87% response against the proposals it was still intended to proceed. She appreciated that only 30 responses had been received but were weighted 7:1 against the proposal. She questioned the adequacy of proposals for monitoring and the likely success of limiting on road parking on Merton Street where residents had no off street parking. Parking would only be required for visitors to the Banbury mosque where off site parking was inadequate.

Mr Tole advised that it had never been the original intention for a link through to Thorpe Way to be open to traffic, whereas the original plan had been for 2 accesses through Alma Road and Higham Way. The road at the proposed closure point was adopted but the rest was not. When that happened the Merton Street junction could be dealt with. The County Council were trying to balance the needs of all and, whilst accepting that there would be difficulties, were putting into place what had been formally proposed for the Cattlemarket Site. It had to be accepted that the current practice had evolved but it was never intended for that to happen and subsequent development on Thorpe Way had exacerbated the situation.

He confirmed that when Higham Way was upgraded there would be a proper route from the southern end of Alma Road through to Higham Way and the closure of Thorpe Road would only take effect when the new link provided by Higham Way had been provided.

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 Deputy Leader of the Council then confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

to approve the proposed prohibition of motor vehicles in Thorpe Way/Alma Road, Banbury as advertised in the Oxfordshire County Council (Banbury, Thorpe Way) (Prohibition of Motor vehicles – Except Motor Cycles) Order 20** to take effect once the new link provided by Higham Way was in place.

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....

24/13 PROPOSED PERMANENT CLOSURE TO MOTOR VEHICLES OF TOLLGATE COTTAGE ROAD AT THE JUNCTION WITH THE A361 AT WILLIAMSCOTT

(Agenda No. 8)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered a proposal for a permanent closure to motor vehicles of the junction of Tollgate Cottage Road with the A361 at Williamscot in the light of responses received to a public consultation.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him the Deputy Leader of the Council then confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

to approve the closure of Tollgate Cottage Road to motor vehicles at its junction with the A361 as advertised.

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....

25/13 PROPOSED DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACES - SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE, WEST OXFORDSHIRE AND THE VALE OF WHITE HORSE DISTRICTS

(Agenda No. 9)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered proposals to introduce new Disabled Persons' Parking Places at various locations in South Oxfordshire, West Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse districts in the light of responses received to a public consultation. He noted the revised officer recommendation to withdraw proposals for The Close, Henley-on-Thames.

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 Deputy Leader of the Council then confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

to approve the proposed Disabled Persons parking Places as set out in the report CMDDL9 subject to not proceeding with the proposals for The Close, Henley-on-Thames.

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....

26/13 PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS - STATION ROAD, CHINNOR
(Agenda No. 10)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered a proposal to introduce new parking on parts of Station Road in Chinnor in the light of responses received to a formal consultation.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him the Deputy Leader of the Council confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

to approve the advertised parking restrictions on Station Road, Chinnor as amended in the report CMDL10 and shown in Annex 3 to that report.

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....

27/13 PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS ROCKHILL FARM COURT, CHIPPING NORTON
(Agenda No. 11)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered proposals to introduce new parking restrictions in Rockhill Farm Court, Chipping Norton in the light of responses received to a formal consultation.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him the Deputy Leader of the Council then confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

to approve the restrictions as advertised in the Oxfordshire County Council (Various Roads – West Oxfordshire) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Permitted Parking)(Variation No. 2) Order 20**.

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....

28/13 EXEMPT ITEMS

(Agenda No. 12)

RESOLVED: that the public be excluded for the duration of items 13E and 14E since it was likely that if they were present during the items there would be disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and specified below in relation to both items and since it was considered that, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information on the grounds set out in both items.

The information in both reports was exempt in that it fell within the following prescribed category:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (Including the authority holding that information)

29/13 BUS SERVICE SUBSIDIES REVIEW: BICESTER, BANBURY, ASHBURY, LEWKNOR AND GORING

(Agenda No. 13)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered a review of subsidised bus services in the Bicester and Banbury areas together with some services in the Ashbury, Lewknor and Goring areas which were also due for review.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him the Deputy Leader of the Council then confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

- (a) to agree subsidies for services described in the report CMDDL13E on the basis of the tender prices (and the periods of time) as set out in the Supplementray Exempt Annex to the report and as set out in the schedule of decisions;
- (b) confirm that those decisions were urgent in that any delay likely to be caused by the call in process would result in service discontinuity and in accordance with the requirements of Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17(b) those decisions should not be subject to the call in process;
- (c) authorise the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Commercial and Delivery) to enter into a contract with Swindon Borough Council as set out in paragraph 28 of the report CMDDL13E.

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....

30/13 RE-TENDER OF EMERGENCY CONTRACTS FOR SUBSIDISED BUS SERVICES FORMERLY OPERATED BY RH TRANSPORT

(Agenda No. 14)

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered a retender of emergency contracts that had been issued until June 2013 to guarantee on-going short-term coverage of services formerly operated by RH Transport before they entered administration in October 2012.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him the Deputy Leader of the Council then confirmed his decisions on this matter as follows:

- (d) to agree subsidies for services described in the report CMDDL14E on the basis of the tender prices (and the periods of time) as set out in the Supplementray Exempt Annex to the report and in the schedule of decisions;
- (e) confirm that those decisions were urgent in that any delay likely to be caused by the call in process would result in service discontinuity and in accordance with the requirements of Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17(b) those decisions should not be subject to the call in process;

Signed.....
Deputy Leader of the Council

Date.....