

Divisions affected: *Barton, Cowley, Iffley Fields & St Mary's, Isis, Jericho & Osney, Leys, Rose Hill & Littlemore, Sandhills & Risinghurst, St Clement's & Cowley Marsh, University Parks, Wolvercote & Summertown, Churchill & Lye Valley*

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT – 26 MAY 2022

OXFORD - VARIOUS LOCATIONS: PROPOSED DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACES

Report by Corporate Director, Environment and Place

Recommendation

The Cabinet Member for the Environment is RECOMMENDED to approve:

- (a) the proposed removal of Disabled Persons Parking Places (DPPP) at: Oxford – Bracegirdle Road, Elmthorpe Road, Sandy Lane, Slade Close, Winchester Road and Wood Farm Road.
- (b) the proposed provision of DPPP at: Barns Hay, Barns Road, Beaumont Buildings Bonar Road, Boults Close, Boundary Brook Road, Brampton Road, Charles Street, Comfrey Road, Dashwood Road, Farmer Place, Field Avenue, Heather Place, Kestrel Crescent (2 bays), Knights Road, Napier Road, Northfield Close, Peel Place, Pegasus Road and Warren Crescent.
- (c) the proposed relocation of DPPP at: Alma Place, Bayswater Road and Observatory Street.
- (d) the proposed relocation of DPPP at: Spindleberry Close following a local consultation to extend the bay subject to the result.
- (e) the proposed reduction in the hours of Operation from at all times to Monday - Friday 8am – 6.30pm within the DPPP in Junction Road.
- (f) But to defer approval of the proposals at the following locations pending further investigations: Oxford – Birchfield Close, Giles Road, Malford Road, Southfield Road.

Executive summary

1. The provision of Disabled Persons Parking Places is reviewed when requested by members of the public, Councillors or following observations made by officers. Specific proposals are assessed applying national regulations and guidance on the suitability of providing new bays or amending or removing existing ones. Together with a view to make the most efficient use of space while reducing sign clutter.

Financial Implications

2. Funding for the proposed changes has been provided from the County Council's revenue budget.

Equalities and Inclusion Implications

3. The provision of disabled persons parking places assists those with a mobility impairment.

Sustainability implications

4. The proposals would help facilitate the mobility of disabled persons in the vicinity of their places of residence or work.

Introduction

5. This report presents comments received in the course of the statutory consultation on the proposals to remove, amend and introduce disabled persons parking places (DPPP's) at various locations in Oxford.

Background

6. The above proposals have been put forward following requests from residents, including – where a new place has been requested - an assessment of eligibility, applying the national guidelines on the provision part of such parking places. A summary of the consultation responses is given in Annex 1.

Consultation

7. The formal consultation on the proposal was carried out between 10 March and 8 April 2022. A notice was placed in the Oxford Times newspaper and emails sent to statutory consultees, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Oxford City Council and the local County Councillors. Notices were placed on site and letters sent directly to properties in the immediate vicinity, adjacent to the proposals.

Thames Valley Police responded expressing no objection.

8. 31 responses were received from different members of the public during the course of the consultation, with some commenting on more than one proposal. These are summarised in the tables below:

Bay Removals:

Location	Support	Object	Concerns
Bracegirdle Road		1	
Elmthorpe Road		1	
Sandy Lane		1	
Slade Close		1	

Winchester Road		1	
Wood Farm Road		1	

New Bays or Extensions:

Location	Support	Object	Concerns
Barns Hay	1		1
Barns Road		1	
Beaumont Buildings	2		4.
Birchfield Close	1	1	
Bonar Road	1		1
Boults Close	2		
Boundary Brook Road	1		
Brampton Road	1		
Charles Street	1		
Comfrey Road	1		
Dashwood Road	1		
Farmer Place	1	1	
Field Avenue	2	1	
Giles Road	1	1	
Heather Place	1	2	
Kestrel Crescent	1	1	
Knights Road	1		
Malford Road	1	1	
Napier Road	1		
Northfield Close	1	2	1
Peel Place	1		
Pegasus Road	1		
Southfield Road	1	1	2
Warren Crescent	2		

Bay Relocations:

Location	Support	Object	Concerns
Alma Place	2	1	
Bayswater Road	1	1	
Observatory Street	1	2	
Spindleberry Close	1		1

Reduction in Hours of Operation:

Location	Support	Object	Concerns
Junction Road		1	3

9. The responses are recorded in **Annex 1**, and copies of the full responses are available for inspection by County Councillors

Response to objections and other comments

10. Comments and recommendations are provided in response to the concerns and objections in respect of each of the proposed site in the following paragraphs.

Bracegirdle Road, Elmthorpe Road, Sandy Lane, Slade Close, Winchester Road & Wood Farm Road – proposed removal of bays:

11. One general objection was received for each from a non-resident because as many disabled parking spaces need to be kept as possible. However, it is recommended that the proposed removal is approved since they are not used.

Barns Hay – proposed new bay:

12. One expression of support received. However, concerns were raised on the basis that there was already a DPPP, residents have spaces outside their houses, some residents have more than one car, the ability of delivery vehicles to pass and the effect that future housing developments would have on traffic flow; it is recommended that this proposal is approved since there is no DPPP in the road, the location of the bay will not affect turning manoeuvres since double yellow lines have recently been installed to protect these and the proposed space is close to the applicants home.

Barns Road – proposed new bay:

13. An objection was received on the basis that this was not the solution since there was a high demand on parking and those using the bays could walk better than them; it is recommended this proposal is approved since the applicant meets the disability criteria and already parks in the area, so would not add to the overall demand.

Beaumont Buildings – proposed new bay:

14. Two expressions of support received, and four concerns raised regarding the loss of permit holders parking, the size of disabled bay and suggestions for alternative locations for the DPPP or residents/visitors parking; it is recommended that this proposal is. Approved as there is no scope for additional parking, however, the double yellow lines at one suggested location for a permit holders bay, do protect the location for deliveries to load/unload which was one of the concerns. The DPPP proposed is the minimum length allowed by the Department for Transport (DfT) and the is conveniently located for the applicant.

Birchfield Close – proposed extension to bay:

15. One general expressions of support received, and one concerns raised on the basis that there were already two bays in the road (one not shown on the plan) and that the person using the other had recently died; The other bay not shown on the plan was removed from the TRO when the applicant died but work on site

does not appear to have been carried out. It is hoped to rectify this as part of this year's DPPP programme. However, it is recommended that the proposed extension is deferred until the next batch of DPPP when a more convenient location for the DPPP can be explored.

Bonar Road – proposed new bay:

16. One general expressions of support received, and one concerns raised on the basis that a City Council off-street parking scheme has been postponed and that this was needed since the current DPPPs are on the wrong side of the road for the applicant; it is therefore recommended that the proposal is approved since the proposed DPPP meet the needs of the applicant and we understand there are no current plans for off-street parking.

Boults Close – proposed new bay:

17. Two expressions of support received; it is recommended that this proposal is approved.

Boundary Brook Road, Brampton Road, Charles Street, Comfrey Road, Dashwood Road, Knights Road, Napier Road, Peel Place, Pegasus Road – proposed new bays:

18. One expressions of support received for each; it is recommended that these proposals are approved.

Farmer Place – proposed new bay:

19. One general expressions of support received and one objection because they are thinking of having a dropped kerb. They suggest the DPPP should be moved closer to the applicant or that off street parking should be constructed for them; it is recommended that this proposal is approved since no application for a dropped kerb has been received and the proposed location of the DPPP maximizes the remaining parking. The construction of off-road parking is beyond the scope of the Disabled persons Parking Place programme.

Field Avenue – proposed new bay:

20. Two expressions of support received, with one objection. The latter from a person with MS who already parks there; it is recommended that this proposal is approved since the proposed DPPP is in the best place for the applicant. Should the person with MS qualify for a DPPP there may be a possibility of extending the bay at a future review.

Giles Road – proposed new bay:

21. One general expressions of support received with one objection on the basis that the person opposite would have difficulty exiting their drive; it is recommended that this proposal is deferred.

Heather Place – proposed new bay:

22. One general expressions of support received and two objections because parking is already oversubscribed. They suggest additional parking should be built on the grass area and one says there are no blue badge holders that drive in the close; it is recommended that this proposal is approved since the applicant's vehicle already parks in the area, so would not add to the overall demand. The construction of off-road parking is beyond the scope of the Disabled persons Parking Place programme. Blue badge holders are not necessarily drivers.

Kestrel Crescent – two proposed new bays:

23. One general expressions of support received, and one objection raised because parking is in high demand, although it has not been possible to establish for certain which of the two proposed DPPPs these refer to. However, it is recommended that this proposal is approved since, in both cases the applicants already park in the area, so would not add to the overall demand.

Malford Road – proposed new bay:

24. The need for the DPPP has been the subject of challenge and further investigation is needed; in view this it is recommended to defer a decision on this proposal.

Northfield Close – proposed new bay:

25. One general expressions of support received, two objections raised either because there were already two disabled bays in the road (not shown on the plan) or there was nobody disabled enough to warrant it and that the disabled bay takes up too much room. Concern was expressed by the applicant that another blue badge holder might use the proposed DPPP. The applicant meets the criteria for a DPPP and they already park in the area, so would not add to the overall demand. The length of the proposed DPPP is intended to prevent vehicles parked alongside or at the end from blocking it in. The two DPPP not shown on the plan are in a private off street parking area and some distance away from the applicant. Another DPPP could be considered in the future should demand be high. It is therefore recommended that this proposal is approved.

Southfield Road – proposed new bay:

26. One general expressions of support received together with one objection because it would prevent deliveries and parking for the resident adjacent to the DPPP and two concerns that having a double space was unfair and that it would be better to locate the bay elsewhere in the street. It is recommended that this proposal is deferred since attempts to contact the applicant to see why they are unable to use the existing bay have not yielded a reply

Warren Crescent – proposed new bay:

27. Two expressions of support received; it is recommended that this proposal is approved.

Alma Place – proposed relocation of bay:

28. One expressions of support received from the applicant; it is recommended that this proposal is approved.

Bayswater Road – proposed relocation of bay:

29. One general expressions of support and one general objection was received. The latter on the basis that this was not the solution since there was a high demand on parking and those using the bays could walk better than them; it is recommended this proposal is approved since the applicant meets the disability criteria and relocating the bay will improve access to off street parking.

Observatory Street – proposed relocation of bay:

30. One objection was received; on the basis that the current layout worked well as there would be less room for parking on their side of the relocated bay than at present. This was partly due to the presence of bolts in the road for a motorcycle which made parking difficult. They also suggest making the bay smaller as a solution. It is recommended that this proposal is approved since the proposed relocation of the bay is more convenient for the person using it so retaining the bay outside number 28 would not meet their requirements. Also shortening the bay would take it below the minimum length specified by the DfT.
31. The bolts in the road have been reported for removal to the City Council which should help to improve the situation.

Spindleberry Close – proposed relocation of bay:

32. One comment was received over the cost of the works as they believe it to be unnecessary as the applicant for the new DPPP had started using the redundant one and that the new combined bay might not be long enough for a possible future ramp for their vehicle. The redundant DPPP is not in a convenient location for the applicant. Consequently, the proposed layout was derived after an informal consultation with all residents in the close and represents a compromise solution which makes the best use of kerb space.
33. The current layout cannot be retained since one of the parking places has been marked in the wrong location; It is therefore recommended that Officers are approved to carry out a local consultation with a view to extending the proposed DPPP by 1 metre to allow for the possible access ramp. Should this additional length not be supported officers would be approved to install the DPPP as originally advertised.

Junction Road – proposed reduction in hours of operation:

34. Two comments were received saying the DPPP was no longer required because the original applicant had dies and it was no longer used by a person with disabilities. Consequently, they would like it removed so that residents were able to park, particularly in the evening when parking pressure was at its highest. Alternatively, the DPPP could be moved to somewhere more useful to disabled people.

35. The proposal is being made as a previous attempt at removing the bay revealed it to be used as a workplace parking place. It is therefore recommended that this proposal is approved as it represents a compromise between the needs of a disabled worker during the working day and residents in the evenings and at weekends.

Sustainability implications

36. The proposals would help facilitate the mobility of disabled persons in the vicinity of their places of residence.

Bill Cotton
Corporate Director, Environment and Place

Annexes: Annex 1: Consultation responses

Contact Officers:	Tim Shickle	07920 591545
	Stephen Axtell	07776 996 909

May 2022

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	No objection
<i>Bracegirdle Road (Oxford) - Bay Removal</i>	
Private individual (01)	Objection: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Elmthorpe Road (Oxford) - Bay Removal</i>	
Private individual (01)	Objection: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Sandy Lane (Oxford) - Bay Removal</i>	
Private individual (01)	Objection: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Slade Close (Oxford) - Bay Removal</i>	
Private individual (01)	Objection: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Winchester Road (Oxford) - Bay Removal</i>	
Private individual (01)	Objection: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Wood Farm Road (Oxford) - Bay Removal</i>	
Private individual (01)	Objection: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Barns Hay (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (02)	Comment: They say that there are 10 homes with residents already parking outside their own homes. 3 of the homes have 2 cars and there is already disabled parking place. Delivery Lorries need to be very careful when entering/leaving the Close. They are concerned about additional housing proposals in the area and ask for the council to look into the impact.
Barns Road Resident (03)	Objection: The space for so many people is already reduced and they don't think this is the solution. They say person who is supposedly is disabled walks better than them
<i>Barns Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Barns Road Resident (03)	Objection: The space for so many people is already reduced, and they don't think this is the solution. They say person who is supposedly is disabled walks better than them

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Beaumont Buildings (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Applicant (04)	Support: The proposed bay is in the ideal place for them. Although generally kept clear by the other residents others often park there so the DPPP would make all the difference as they cannot walk to the DPPP in St Johns Street.
Local Resident (05)	<p>Comment: They always park in St. John Street, where parking is plentiful, and take no issue with the principle of providing a disabled space.</p> <p>They say a disabled resident has an agreement with other residents not to park there in the location. However, only 2 bays for 18 houses is insufficient for tradespeople. It is not tenable for there to be only.</p> <p>They would like an additional permit holders' only space to be provided in Beaumont Place to make up for the loss of parking to allow access for tradespeople or other visitors with limited mobility.</p>
Local Resident (06)	Comment: They say the proposed DPPP would extinguish one and a half of 3 residents' parking spaces for 20 houses in Beaumont Buildings. They request that the DPPP be located somewhere else in the street, or that additional residents' parking be provided in the street. If this is not possible could the proposed DPPP be made shorter
Local Resident (07)	Comment: They say there are only 3 parking spaces for 20 houses in Beaumont Buildings which are always occupied by residents' cars. They request an alternative location in Beaumont Place where the bay would be visible from St John Street. Alternatively make the Disabled space shorter.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Beaumont Buildings (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP (continued)</i>	
Local Resident (08)	Comment: They say there are only 3 parking spaces for 20 houses in Beaumont Buildings which means many have to go further afield to park as off-street parking is expensive to rent. The current arrangement allows for visitors to park during the day. They request an alternative location in Beaumont Place in a bay. Alternatively provide additional residents parking to compensate for the disabled bay.
<i>Birchfield Close (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (09)	Objection: They report there are already two DPPP in the close, but one was not shown on the plan and a third would make the existing parking situation worse. They also state that the car using the one we propose to extend hasn't moved for years and the owner had recently died so this bay may soon become available as the spouse does not drive.
<i>Bonar Road Hay (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (10)	Comment: They are very disappointed that the (an alleged off-street proposal*) disabled parking bays are being postponed as they are aware of the need since the existing parking bays on the road opposite would be unsuitable.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Boults Close (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (11)	Support: Providing a specific disabled person remains in the Close
<i>Boundary Brook Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Brampton Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Charles Street (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Comfrey Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Dashwood Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Farmer Place (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (12)	Objection: as they are considering applying for a vehicle access and believes that the DPPP should be placed closest to the applicant's home or that a driveway be constructed for applicant.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Field Avenue (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (13)	Objection: Person with MS says the parking area is already oversubscribed and they currently use the space as it is closest to their home and have walking issues from time to time. They did not know disabled people could apply for disabled parking bays and also complain about buses being unable to get through.
Relative of Applicant (14)	Support: states that the applicant would benefit greatly by having the opportunity to park closer to their home.
<i>Giles Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (15)	Objection: They say the bay opposite would make it difficult for them to use their drive opposite and suggest relocating it outside number 45.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Heather Place (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (16)	They say parking is oversubscribed so they have to park in Croft Road but think it would be a good idea if none of the existing permit bays were used and request a parking area be constructed on the grass area.
Local Resident (17)	They say parking is oversubscribed and there is no one in the Close that drives a vehicle who has a disabled badge. They request a parking area be constructed on the grass area.
<i>Kestrel Crescent (Oxford) - Two Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (18)	<p>Objection: since there is only 12 parking places between 15 houses which leads to parking on the footway. They say that this was also made worse when the City Council built a wooden fence to stop people parking on the grass without giving an alternative.</p> <p>Although they agree places are needed for disabled people, they feel Councils needs to build additional parking spaces on the adjacent grass.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Knights Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Malford Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (19)	Objection: Disputes the need for the DPPP
<i>Napier Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Northfield Close (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Applicant (20)	Comment: They are concerned that another blue badge holder will prevent them from using the DPPP and suggest that two bays are needed
Local Resident (21)	<p>Objection: Parking is already oversubscribed particularly as some households have more than one car and residents do not park tidily. They do not understand why a DPPP is needed in that particular location as they do not believe there is anyone disabled enough to warrant it although they have blue badges.</p> <p>Where you are planning to put the disabled space will be taking up 2 parking spaces which are very much in need.</p>
Local Resident (22)	Northfield Close already have 2 disabled parking bays (on private land*) not shown on the plan. Parking is already oversubscribed and adding another disabled bay will create more problems.
<i>Peel Place (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Pegasus Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
<i>Southfield Road (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (23)	Comment: They feel it is unfair to extend the existing disabled space thereby reducing available permit holders space in the immediate area. Better to site further up the road, where other disabled residents can make use of it.
Local Resident (24)	Comment: They feel it is unfair to extend the existing disabled space thereby reducing available permit holders space in the immediate area. Better to site further up the road, where other disabled residents can make use of it.
Local Resident (25)	Objection: They feel providing additional disabled parking outside their property would limit the ability for them, deliveries and workmen to park nearby

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Warren Crescent (Oxford) - Proposed new DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Applicant (26)	Support: The disabled parking place would help them significantly especially after work when all parking places are taken up.
<i>Alma Place (Oxford) - Proposed relocation of DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Barns Road Resident (03)	Objection: The space for so many people is already reduced, and they don't think this is the solution. They say person who is supposedly disabled walks better than them
Applicant (27)	Support: They are grateful that the bay could be relocated to a more convenient location.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Bayswater Road (Oxford) - Proposed relocation of DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Barns Road Resident (03)	Objection: The space for so many people is already reduced, and they don't think this is the solution. They say person who is supposedly is disabled walks better than them
<i>Observatory Street (Oxford) - Proposed relocation of DPPP and one removal</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Barns Road Resident (03)	Objection: The space for so many people is already reduced, and they don't think this is the solution. They say person who is supposedly is disabled walks better than them
Local Resident (28)	<p>Objection: They believe the current layout works well as there is more space outside numbers 28-31 whereas 27-23 is very cramped which is made worse by bolts inserted into the carriageway outside 24/23 for motorcycles to be lock to. The bolts could damage tyres and are difficult to avoid.</p> <p>They suggest shortening the existing disabled bay slightly outside 28 as it would not affect access for their neighbour in 27 and be much less disruptive and believe further restrictions on parking outside their house will affect the ability for elderly immobile visitors to their home.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Spindleberry Close (Oxford) - Proposed relocation of DPPP</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Local Resident (29)	<p>Comment: They feel that the current layout works well and do not see any point in making any changes as the disabled person at number 3 has started to use the redundant space outside number 7 because a non-disabled driver has got a car which parks opposite number 3.</p> <p>They feel that a combined bay would leave little room for the ramp at the back of the car.</p> <p>They also believe changing the bays into one single bay is an unnecessary and waste of money.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARISED COMMENTS
<i>Junction Road (Oxford) - Proposed reduction in hours of operation from at all times to Monday – Friday 8am – 6.30pm</i>	
Private individual (01)	Support: We need to keep as many disabled parking spaces as possible and not limit the hours of use. This will cause hardship and confuse people.
Barns Road Resident (03)	Objection: The space for so many people is already reduced, and they don't think this is the solution. They say person who is supposedly is disabled walks better than them
Local Resident (30)	<p>Comment: They say that the original applicant passed away several years ago and they do not believe it has been used by someone with a disability for a very long time. They query why the space has been left for so long and feel it would be better to relocate it to where such a place would actually benefit people with disabilities.</p> <p>They mention that commuter parking has reduced since the LTN was reduced and there is plenty of space during the working week but is heavily subscribed in the evening and weekend and would like the disabled parking bay removed to create a more useable parking space.</p> <p>They support the proposed permit holders' scheme in the area as it will remove quite a few cars that seem to be there stationary for very long periods of time that may belong to students.</p>
Local Resident (31)	<p>Comment: They say that there is no longer a need for this DPPP since they believe that the person using it during the day as a workplace space with a standard length car does not meet the criteria for a blue badge and would like the bay removed.</p> <p>They say if the bay were removed extra space would be created (since a disabled bay is longer than a conventional one and that the badge holder could park anywhere in the Permit Parking Area.</p>