

Division(s) affected: *Wolvercote and Summertown*

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT – 26 JANUARY 2023

OXFORD – UPPER WOLVERCOTE: PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ)

Report by Corporate Director, Environment and Place

Recommendation

1. The Cabinet Member for the Highway Management is RECOMMENDED to:
 - a. approve the proposals as advertised for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Upper Wolvercote area.
 - b. include properties located on Osborne Close and Church Lane within the list of eligible properties able to apply for resident & visitor permits.

Executive summary

2. This report presents the consultation responses to the CPZ proposals for the Upper Wolvercote area of Oxford as part of the approved programme for introducing CPZs in the city.
3. Measures to restrict and control car parking availability, including use of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), form part of the county's emerging Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan (COTP) as well as recently adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (adopted in 2022) and also Oxford City Council's Local Plan (adopted in 2020). Much of Oxford is already covered by CPZs, with further CPZs planned and which are required to support several local transport and planning objectives.

Introduction

4. Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) are being implemented across Oxford to address numerous local issues, along with helping to support the delivery of wider transport and planning policies. The proposals aim to do this in three main ways:
 - Transport management – to remove free on-street commuter and other non-residential car parking spaces from the city, thereby reducing traffic levels and helping boost use of non-car modes.

- Development management – to support the city and county councils’ policies to limit the number of car parking spaces provided as part of new developments by ensuring restricted off-street provision does not lead to overspill parking in surrounding streets.
 - Protecting residential streets – by removing intrusive or obstructive non-residential on-street car parking and, where necessary, limiting the number of on-street spaces occupied per dwelling by residential and visitor parking.
5. The introduction of a CPZ in Upper Wolvercote is identified as one of several measures needed to mitigate development at Oxford North, a large mixed-use development which has already secured approval by the Local Planning Authority (Oxford City Council) to begin phase one works including highway infrastructure, housing, workspaces and a new public park. A CPZ in Upper Wolvercote will prevent those coming to Oxford North from parking in nearby residential areas and then walking or travelling by cycle or bus to the site. Preventing such overspill parking will also control the number of vehicle movements to Oxford North, restricting this to the number of car parking spaces on site (which were set at a lower standard compared to the Local Plan at the time to encourage greater use of sustainable modes). Under the funding agreement with Oxford North a contribution has been secured to fund implementation of CPZs and parking controls in the local area including in Lower Wolvercote.
 6. To help deliver the county council’s Local Transport Connectivity Plan (adopted July 2022) vision and policies, the county’s emerging Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan includes 22 actions to support a more sustainable and reliable transport system across the central Oxfordshire area. This includes further CPZs to help with parking management and support outcomes including improved road safety, reducing the impact of private vehicles on congestion and delivering more inclusive and carbon neutral transport.

Sustainability Implications

7. CPZs help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and alleviate parking stress, with a CPZ in Upper Wolvercote particularly aimed at ensuring parking from Oxford North does not just displace in the area, and to also help encourage the use of sustainable transport modes. CPZs are also identified as one of several action in the county’s emerging Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan that are required to support wider transport policies within the county council’s Local Transport Connectivity Plan (adopted July 2022).

Financial and Staff Implications (including Revenue)

8. Funding to implement CPZs in Oxford is being secured from various sources including the County Council’s own Capital Programme, developer contributions and the City Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

9. Ongoing revenue implications including administration and enforcement of CPZs, once implemented, are recovered through parking permit charges.

Equalities and Inclusion Implications

10. A full equality impact assessment has been undertaken and can be viewed in **Annex 3**. No implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of the proposals.

Formal Consultation

11. The formal consultation on the proposals - as shown in Annex 1 - was carried out between 3 November and 2 December 2022. A notice was published in the Oxford Times newspaper and an email sent to statutory consultees, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Bus operators, countywide transport, access & disabled peoples user groups, Oxford City Council, local Oxford City Councillors, and the local County Councillors representing the Wolvercote & Summertown, and North Hinksey divisions.
12. A letter was sent directly to approximately 580 properties in the area which included the formal notice of the proposals, as well as details on permit eligibility and costs. Additionally, street notices were placed on site in and around the immediate vicinity.
13. 73 responses were received via the online consultation survey during the course of the formal consultation, and these are summarised in the tables below:

| CPZ | Businesses / Other | Residents | Overall Total (Percentage) |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| Object | - | 37 | 37 (51%) |
| Support | 1 | 20 | 21 (29%) |
| Neither/Concerns | 2 | 13 | 15 (20%) |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>70</i> | <i>73</i> |

| Parking Restrictions | Businesses / Other | Residents | Overall Total (Percentage) |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| Object | - | 22 | 22 (30%) |
| Support | 1 | 16 | 17 (23%) |
| Neither/Concerns | 2 | 32 | 34 (47%) |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>3</i> | <i>70</i> | <i>73</i> |

14. The above tables are based on the option chosen by the respondent (Object, support etc.) but it should be noted that on reviewing the detail of the responses, in a number of cases a respondent expressing support for the proposal had some qualifications / concerns, and similarly some of the objections related to specific details of the scheme, including the roads not being included in the current proposals, but were otherwise in support.

Summary of responses for CPZ from Oxford residents by road:

| Road | Object | Support | Concerns | Total |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Church Lane | 1 | - | 2 | 3 |
| Collett Drive | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Cowley Road | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Cyprus Terrace | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Dove House Close | 2 | - | 1 | 3 |
| Elmthorpe Road | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Fairlawn End | - | 2 | - | 2 |
| First Turn | 4 | - | 1 | 5 |
| Goose Green Close | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Kimmeridge Road | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Marriott Close | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| mere road | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Millway Close | 9 | 3 | 1 | 13 |
| Pixey Place | - | 3 | - | 3 |
| Rawson close | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Rosamund Road | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Rowland Close | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| St Peters Road | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Ulfgar Road | 6 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| Upper Close | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| Webbs close | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Wolvercote Green | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| Oxford Total | 37 | 20 | 13 | 70 |

15. Additionally, a further Ten emails were received, with Thames Valley Police & Stagecoach Bus Company not objecting, Oxford Preservation Trust supporting, and two members of the public objecting, three raising concerns, and two supporting.

16. The individual responses are shown in **Annex 2**; copies of the original responses are available for inspection by County Councillors.

Officer response to objections/concerns






17. Thames Valley Police expressed no objection to the proposals.
18. The most common reason for objecting to the proposals was a general perception that the scheme was not needed. Residents did not currently have a parking problem or saw the need for controls to be introduced. Concerns were raised that the limits on permits would impact on properties with more than 2 vehicles, and the council hasn't adequately explained through the consultation the rationale for the scheme.
19. The second most common reason for objecting was a belief that the scheme was simply a way for the council to generate more revenue from residents, at a time when many were struggling financially.
20. A number of residents living in Church Lane and Osborne Close raised concerns that their roads had been excluded from the scheme, including for permit eligibility. Some were aware that these roads are not adopted but requested that they are included in the scheme so parking displacement into the close does not occur. They also requested the ability to be able to apply for a permit.
21. Representatives of Wolvercote Village Hall and St. Peters Church raised similar concerns about their events and daily activities being effected by the proposals. They explained that in many cases 2 hours would not be long enough for users of their organisations and the limits on business permits would not cater for the different staff and clergy who require parking for longer periods.
22. To counter the objections, a number of representations were received that supported the proposed permit area. Reasons given were due to problems with obstruction and commuter parking, especially in Millway Close, Fairway End and Pixey Place.
23. In general the proposed waiting restrictions, were not commented on. However some objections were received based on concerns around loss of residential/business parking, fears of displacement and on the basis that they were not needed. There were some comments in support stating the introduction of further yellow lines would tackle issues with obstructions and make it safer for pedestrians including children.

Officer comments

24. The proposals have been developed in discussions with local members as part of wider objectives outlined in the introductory section of this report. This also explains that the proposed CPZ is also one of several measures needed to mitigate development at Oxford North, a large mixed-use development which has already secured approval by the Local Planning Authority (Oxford City Council) to begin phase one works including highway infrastructure, housing, workspaces and a new public park. A CPZ in Upper Wolvercote will prevent those coming to Oxford North from parking in nearby residential areas

Drawing No. UW/CPZ/2022/001 Revision v2

Key

-  Zone Boundary
-  Existing 'No waiting at any time' restrictions (double yellow lines)
-  Proposed 'No waiting at any time' restriction (double yellow lines)
-  Proposed removal of 'No waiting Mon - Fri 10am - 11am' restrictions (single yellow lines)
-  Permit holders (Zone addresses's) between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday and non-permit holders restricted to 2 hour parking between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday with no return within 2 hours

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright, and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Oxfordshire County Council Licence No LA078605

| Rev. | Date | Purpose of revision | Drawn | Checked | Approved |
|------|-------|---------------------|-------|---------|----------|
| V2 | 10/22 | Additional DYL's | VN | JW | JW |
| V1 | 04/22 | Original | VN | JW | JW |

 **OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

Paul Former
 Director of
 Highways and Operations
 Environment and Place
 Oxfordshire County Council
 County Hall
 Oxford
 OX1 1ND
 Tel: 0345 310 11 11

Project title
UPPER WOLVERCOTE PERMIT PARKING AREA (PPA)

Drawing title
PROPOSED PERMIT PARKING AREA UPPER WOLVERCOTE

Drawing Status

| Scale @ A3 | Drawn by | Checked by | Approved by |
|------------|------------|--------------|---------------|
| 1:3000 | JaC | JW | JW |
| | Date drawn | Date checked | Date approved |
| | 10/22 | JW | |

Oxfordshire Project No. & File Ref

Drawing No. UW CPZ/2022/001 Revision v2



| RESPONDENT | COMMENTS |
|---|--|
| (1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police) | No objection |
| (2) Head of Strategic Development and the Built Environment, (Stagecoach Bus Company) | <p>No objection – Stagecoach has no substantive comments to make on these proposals.</p> <p>Stagecoach is not operating services in this locality. However, Oxford Bus Company does operate services through the area subject to the proposals and you can expect a response from them , I trust.</p> |
| (3) Oxford Preservation Trust | <p>Support – Oxford Preservation Trust owns a number of areas of land around the proposed CPZ zones for the above areas. We are generally glad to see these parking measures put in place which will heighten the enjoyment of recreational walks through OPT land, away from the busyness of the city. However, OPT would like to make a number of specific comments in relation to our land. These are set out below.</p> <p>OPT own land at Wolvercote Lakes, which is open for public access, and is located directly east of the CPZ at Lower Wolvercote. We note that the section of Godstow Road which boundaries the entrance to the Lakes, and which is the connecting road between the two proposed CPZs is not included in either of the plans and thus is left open to unregulated parking 24/7. Whilst this provides constant access to the lakes for visitors, we fear it will more likely be constantly full from residents or commuters. We ask whether it would be better to have a 2 hour no return restriction on this stretch to prevent commuters/locals long term parking here, whilst still providing visitor access to the lakes.</p> |
| (4) Wolvercote Village Hall | <p>Concerns – The management committee of Wolvercote Village Hall discussed your council’s plans to introduce a controlled parking zone in Wolvercote and has asked me to pass on their views.</p> <p>You don’t appear to have taken into account the massive impact this will have on public buildings in the village.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Hirers - and parents and staff of the Montessori nursery which uses the building daily during the week - of our hall have to rely on on-street parking to access the building.</p> <p>Your plan could have a serious effect on our future finances as people look elsewhere to hold their meetings and events.</p> <p>It was also pointed out that it will also have a serious impact on mourners wishing to attend funerals and memorial services at St Peters Church.</p> <p>You will also be aware that your so-called 'informal' consultation in 2021 resulted in 64% of those responding being against the idea. You appear to have ignored that result.</p> <p>Generally, it appears to our committee that you are attempting to solve a problem that doesn't exist.</p> |
| <p>(5) Member of public, (Oxford. Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object Oxford has more than enough parking restricted areas.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object two hours isn't long enough for a visit of for doing any work required at Millway Close.</p> |
| <p>(6) Member of public, (Oxford, Church Lane)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object As we noted previously in our response to the informal consultation, living at Birchdale, Church Lane, we thought it important to bring it to your attention once again that the unmade section of both Church Lane and Osborne Close is currently unadopted and not currently recorded on the 'List of Streets' as roads maintainable at the public expense. This is separate to the tarmacked footway which is recorded on the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way as Oxford City Footpath 101.</p> <p>Whilst we currently fail to see the need for a CPZ in either Upper or Lower Wolvercote as a whole, we have serious concerns over the disproportionate impact any CPZ will have specifically on the residents of Church Lane and Osborne Close. Currently, we only get the occasional vehicle parking when Wolvercote Green is particularly busy – for example when there is a large gathering at the nearby Church, Pub or Village Hall – this rarely causes a problem and is usually very short lived. However, if a CPZ is installed it is our understanding that any vehicle</p> |

EITHER belonging to a resident not eligible for, or without, a CPZ residents' pass may still park on this unadopted section.

If this is the case, Church Lane in particular, will become totally parked up with all sorts of vehicles that seldom move (if you walk around Godstow Road and Wolvercote Green now there are a number of 'converted vans, campervans and other vehicles which will move 'somewhere') they will find us and the impact will therefore be intolerable and unworkable for the residents of Church Lane and Osborne Close, making navigating the lane near impossible for everyone, whether on foot or in a vehicle, and totally impassable for deliveries, refuse collection and emergency vehicles.

In a practical sense, we would urge you to include Church Lane within the CPZ so that if the afore mentioned 'non-residents vehicles' do park on Church Lane the CPZ legal order is fully enforceable as needed. The affected properties will also need to be eligible to apply for residents passes if they so wish.

Indeed, if it makes any CPZ more straightforward we would welcome the Church Lane section to be adopted as Public Highway.

We would therefore urge you, through this consultation, to give specific thought to the impact of your proposals on, particularly the Lane (which is used by many as the primary walking route to the church, school, and village hall) and identify a way that, if the CPZ is taken forward, its impact is not contrary to your council's 'Active Travel Objectives' or disproportionate to path users and the specific residents of this area.

We would appreciate your consideration in the matter as I hope you can see; we wouldn't wish to experience a significant detrimental effect from the installation of any such CPZ as everything works well as it is at the moment.

We hope this helps clarify and would appreciate an acknowledgement of the email so that, in bringing this matter to your attention, once again, your team can include Church Lane within the proposals, should this project go forward.

Parking restrictions – **Object**
As above

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(7) Member of public, (Oxford, Kimmeridge Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object There is suitable and adequate parking within the village already and the proposed CPZ is not necessary to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. There is ample residential parking and parking for visitors. The proposed CPZ is not necessary. Neither is there a need for a new CPZ in Upper Wolvercote to address traffic overspill from an existing CPZ. The report of the informal consultation recognises that the proposed CPZ in Wolvercote is not popular, but that the survey was undertaken post-Covid; suggesting that the lack of popularity would have been based on a period of time when we wouldn't have experienced such high commuter levels in the village. Actually, the CPZ adjacent to Upper Wolvercote have been in place for some time, and long before COVID. The survey responses were made on the basis of a good understanding of the normal traffic levels, including parking demand. Arguably, as a result of COVID Wolvercote had its biggest traffic influx ever, onto Port Meadow for access to the river. At no point did it become necessary to have a CPZ to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. The period of traffic influx was very short lived. There is no evidence that a CPZ is required in Upper Wolvercote in order to to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. There is ample residential parking and parking for visitors. The proposed CPZ is not necessary.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion Provided above.</p> |
| <p>(8) Member of public, (Oxford, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object Wolvercote is a vibrant area that is peaceful and supportive to each one. Restricting and charging anyone for using their road in a way the residents want is just a money making scheme and to further council's ill conceived political agenda of movement restrictions. What exactly do you want to achieve?</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns Let them use for whatever time they want to park.</p> |
| <p>(9) Member of public, (Oxford, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object As a resident of Millway Close, the CPZ would mean I had to pay to have a car at my place of residence as there is no provision for parking at the property (blocks of flats) except for a small number of flat-owners who have one of the very limited number of garages belonging to the property.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion Waiting restrictions would have an adverse effect to the Village Hall, but I have no other comment to make.</p> |
| <p>(10) Member of public, (Oxford, St Peters Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object Unnecessary. No current problem. Should leave alone unless there proves to be a problem later caused by other traffic schemes. Excessive and expensive bureaucracy. Difficult for those without printout facility to obtain permits. Creates strong unpopularity for County Council locally and for Andrew Gant personally in his local area. Such unpopularity impedes smooth functioning of local government.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object Unnecessary. Existing restrictions sufficient.</p> |
| <p>(11) Member of public, (Oxford, Cowley Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object Parking restrictions – Object</p> |
| <p>(12) Member of public, (Oxford, Ulfgar Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object There is no problem parking in the day which does not warrant having to pay for a permit. The only issues arise when there is something on at Wolvercote Young People's club which is usually in the early evening. Ulfgar Road where I live does not need the restricted parking.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object We do not need to pay for a permit as there are no issues in Ulfgar Road. The street is virtually empty in the daytime so why pay for a permit.</p> |
| <p>(13) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Dove House Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object I am happy with the status quo as regards parking in Upper Wolvercote. I find it outrageous that the County Council should propose to charge residents, some of whom have no access to off-road parking, to park near their homes, particularly in the midst of a cost of living crisis.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns I object to the proposed painting of double yellow lines along the south end of Wolvercote Green, near the Plough pub: there is plenty of space there for vehicles to park without obstructing traffic, which allows for a greater number of potential customers at a valued local business. I do not object to the other proposed waiting restrictions as indicated in blue on the Consultation Plan.</p> |
| <p>(14) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object It's not necessary; it's a lot of hassle; it's trying to fix a non-existent problem.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion Not likely to affect me.</p> |
| <p>(15) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object Unaware that there are parking problems and permits to park when there is no problem seems unnecessary.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object Unaware of any existing problem. Never seen any parking attendants to enforce existing system</p> |
| <p>(16) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object I live in Millway Close and, although there is undoubtedly a number of non residents parking in our street, it has never reached the point where we cannot park our cars. It's an unnecessary measure that will create more problems than it resolves.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object Parking in our street is no issue</p> |
| <p>(17) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object no need. there is plenty of parking here</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | no need |
| (18) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, St Peters Road) | <p>CPZ – Object I object because I live here and do want this restriction imposed on us by people who do not live here. We are able to live with the current situation. It is a(nother) tax on car ownership, and imposes an additional level of bureaucracy on everyone. It has been the Council's policy to encourage endless growth of the City, with increasing employment opportunities, whilst dumping unwanted housing requirements on all the surrounding towns and villages as well as unwelcome building on the Green Belt. Endless growth means this will NEVER END (until disaster strikes). The resulting traffic congestion caused by Council-encouraged/enforced commuting is entirely the Council's fault. Now, Councillors supporting what Greta Thunberg eloquently called "this infantile idea of unlimited growth on a finite land mass", want to PUNISH residents for the consequences of the Council's own policy. Previous surveys in the area have already REJECTED Controlled Parking Zones, but as Labour & Co-operative Party member, Duncan Enright, has publicly pointed out, residents are going to get these County Council traffic measures whether they like it or not! That is current Oxfordshire County Council thinking.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns It means more bureaucracy for everyone.</p> |
| (19) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, St Peters Road) | <p>CPZ – Object I live on St Peters Road. There are currently no issues with parking that cause me concern. I do not wish to see the introduction of parking permits which will cause me inconvenience and expense.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object If these are introduced, this will necessarily mean the Parking permits are introduced and I fundamentally disapprove of the introduction of Parking permits</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>(20) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Ulfgar Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object Commuters do not use Upper Wolvercote to park and travel into Oxford for work. You are fleecing residents to "solve a problem" that does not exist. This is a low-income area and an additional charge of £65, during a cost of living crisis, is an absolutely shocking thing for the council to inflict on people. This should absolutely not go ahead: there is NO cause for it, and it offers SEVERE damage to the residents.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion No opinion on waiting restrictions</p> |
| <p>(21) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Ulfgar Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object This country is supposed to be a democracy where the opinion of the general public, especially those directly involved, is taken note of, not like in this case where a majority have already objected, but the County Council is determined to have their way, irrespective.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object The vast majority of residents have already objected to the proposal. The Council members are voted into office to represent their constituents, not ride roughshod over their opinions/wants. We already pay road tax to keep our vehicles on the road, not contribute to wasteful exercises being carried out by the Council. It is a total disgrace that elected Council members feel it is within their power to decide how many cars a private household can have.</p> |
| <p>(22) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Ulfgar Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object You have not made the case that this expensive programme of works - which will adversely affect residents - is needed. It seems to be a solution to a problem that doesn't exist.</p> <p>The phrasing of the letter you sent me implies a causal connection between the "informal" consultation and these specific proposals. However nowhere does the letter indicate any actual data gathered by that (or any other) consultation, so I am left wondering what you consider justifies this expenditure. I am unaware of any resident of Upper Wolvercote who supports these proposals, but many who object.</p> <p>For the record I have read the "Statement of Reasons" document which I found vague to the point of meaninglessness. It offers no reason for these parking innovations beyond vague references to being "in</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>accordance with the Council's policies on traffic management and parking restraint which seek to manage transport & development, and to protect residential streets".</p> <p>As a resident of one of the affected streets I am unaware of any evidence that there is a problem which these measures might address, and you have pointed to none. In the absence of specific, detailed, measured evidence that there's a problem the Council should not be spending money implementing a "solution".</p> <p>In short, if you are minded to proceed with these proposals, kindly do so only after offering detailed evidence of need specific to this area (ie not just generically "around Oxford"), and then securing the support of the community in the light of that proven need. You have no mandate to proceed without that informed support.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object Same reasons</p> |
| (23) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Wolvercote Green) | <p>CPZ – Object I live on Wolvercote Green and don't experience any problems with parking, there is always space within a reasonable distance from my home on weekdays and even at weekends, which is when there are more people parking here, there are parking places nearby. I'm happy that parking for visitors to the Green, the church and the Plough Pub have access to local parking as it supports local businesses.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns As I don't support the permit scheme I feel that there is no need for waiting restrictions.</p> |
| (24) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Mere Road) | <p>CPZ – Object The proposed parking restrictions do not address any problems that exist or are likely to exist in Upper Wolvercote. The proposal applies only to parking Monday-Friday, 9am to 5pm. There is no parking congestion in Upper Wolvercote at these times and key workers such as teachers for the Upper Wolvercote school and health care workers that serve Upper Wolvercote absolutely need daily parking access M_F 9am to 5pm. Many parishioners also need access to parking on Mere Road on Sundays to attend services at St Peter's church in Upper Wolvercote, most of whom are elderly and require parking. Any parking problems that do exist are outside of these times, are when visitors to the Plough pub arrive by car in evenings or at weekends. The council's efforts would be better focused on enforcing existing restrictions at these times, rather than introducing parking restrictions that cover</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>only times when there are no problems and will ultimately disadvantage keys workers and the elderly disproportionately.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support The implementation of double line down by the playground will ensure the safety of children who use the Upper Wolvercote playground.</p> |
| (25) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Cyprus Terrace) | <p>CPZ – Object I am a resident at Cyprus terrace, I own one of the terraced houses. I find that the financial burden of a residential parking permit on St Peters road would be unacceptable when I already pay so much of my income towards income tax, national insurance, and council tax. Additionally, I do not feel parking restrictions are necessary - there are always parking spaces for residents on St Peters road! In summary - the benefit of a restricted parking zones to residents does not outweigh the financial cost of a parking permit. I completely object any Parking restrictions on St Peters road.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion they do not bother me at all</p> |
| (26) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Dove House Close) | <p>CPZ – Object An CPZ is an attempt from the Council at making more money. If you cared about the amount of cars parking in Upper Wolvercote, or anywhere in Oxford, then the permits would be free to residents. So no doubt this CPZ will proceed, whether residents agree or not, and I will now have to pay for the privilege of parking at home. This is clearly another ploy to chase people out of Oxford and make it even more unaffordable. Soon if I can't even drive in Oxford or park at home without paying out then there's no desire to stay in this crap city.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns Other than at school collection times I can't see how this would be valued at all.</p> |
| (27) Member of public, (Wolvercote, First Turn) | <p>CPZ – Object There is suitable and adequate parking within the village already and the proposed CPZ is not necessary to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. There is ample residential parking and parking for visitors. The proposed CPZ is not necessary.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Neither is there a need for a new CPZ in Upper Wolvercote to address traffic overspill from an existing CPZ. The report of the informal consultation recognises that the proposed CPZ in Wolvercote is not popular, but that the survey was undertaken post-Covid; suggesting that the lack of popularity would have been based on a period of time when we wouldn't have experienced such high commuter levels in the village. Actually, the CPZ adjacent to Upper Wolvercote have been in place for some time, and long before COVID. The survey responses were made on the basis of a good understanding of the normal traffic levels, including parking demand. Arguably, as a result of COVID Wolvercote had its biggest traffic influx ever, onto Port Meadow for access to the river. At no point did it become necessary to have a CPZ to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. The period of traffic influx was very short lived.</p> <p>There is no evidence that a CPZ is required in Upper Wolvercote in order to to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. There is ample residential parking and parking for visitors. The proposed CPZ is not necessary.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion Do not know enough about traffic movements in these areas to form an opinion.</p> |
| (28) Member of public, (Wolvercote, First Turn) | <p>CPZ – Object</p> <p>There is suitable and adequate parking within the village already and the proposed CPZ is not necessary to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. There is ample residential parking and parking for visitors. The proposed CPZ is not necessary.</p> <p>Neither is there a need for a new CPZ in Upper Wolvercote to address traffic overspill from an existing CPZ. The report of the informal consultation recognises that the proposed CPZ in Wolvercote is not popular, but that the survey was undertaken post-Covid; suggesting that the lack of popularity would have been based on a period of time when we wouldn't have experienced such high commuter levels in the village. Actually, the CPZ adjacent to Upper Wolvercote have been in place for some time, and long before COVID. The survey responses were made on the basis of a good understanding of the normal traffic levels, including parking demand. Arguably, as a result of COVID Wolvercote had its biggest traffic influx ever, onto Port Meadow for access to the river. At no point did it become necessary to have a CPZ to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. The period of traffic influx was very short lived.</p> <p>There is no evidence that a CPZ is required in Upper Wolvercote in order to to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. There is ample residential parking and parking for visitors. The proposed CPZ is not necessary.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Don't know enough to comment |
| (29) Member of public, (Wolvercote, First Turn) | <p>CPZ – Object There is suitable and adequate parking within the village already and the proposed CPZ is not necessary to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. There is ample residential parking and parking for visitors. The proposed CPZ is not necessary. Neither is there a need for a new CPZ in Upper Wolvercote to address traffic overspill from an existing CPZ. The report of the informal consultation recognises that the proposed CPZ in Wolvercote is not popular, but that the survey was undertaken post-Covid; suggesting that the lack of popularity would have been based on a period of time when we wouldn't have experienced such high commuter levels in the village. Actually, the CPZ adjacent to Upper Wolvercote have been in place for some time, and long before COVID. The survey responses were made on the basis of a good understanding of the normal traffic levels, including parking demand. Arguably, as a result of COVID Wolvercote had its biggest traffic influx ever, onto Port Meadow for access to the river. At no point did it become necessary to have a CPZ to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. The period of traffic influx was very short lived. There is no evidence that a CPZ is required in Upper Wolvercote in order to to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. There is ample residential parking and parking for visitors. The proposed CPZ is not necessary.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion Visit regularly and from what I see there is no need</p> |
| (30) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Goose Green Close) | <p>CPZ – Object I don't think lack of parking is a particularly acute problem in Upper Wolvercote.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object see responses to (3)</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(31) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object I can't quite believe that in a time when money is stretched for many households, the council are attempting to take an annual payment off homeowners for parking. A major perk of living in Wolvercote is being able to park free of charge.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns I understand this proposal, but don't really see that it's necessary.</p> |
| <p>(32) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Ulfgar Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object There is no issue with parking at any time in any of the roads in Upper Wolvercote. The only problem is when there is something going on at Wolvercote Young Peoples club in St Peters Road but only after the 5pm deadline</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion there is no</p> |
| <p>(33) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Ulfgar Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object There is suitable and adequate parking within the village already and the CPZ is not necessary to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. There is ample residential parking and parking for visitors. It is simply not necessary.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object I have lived in Upper Wolvercote for 10 years and in that time have experienced no issues whatsoever associated with the current waiting/parking format</p> |
| <p>(34) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Wolvercote Green)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object The proposals will create far more problems than they allegedly solve are as far as I can see are just a money making machine for OCC to waste</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object Sometimes people need to wait!</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>(35) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Wolvercote Green)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object it is clear to me that there's no need for a CPZ in the Wolvercote area. Only possible reason (hidden behind a virtue signalling front of concern for the environment) is to raise more money for the council coffers. We don't want traffic wardens here. Most properties have nowhere off road to put cars. Most of us would use cars less if there was a better public transport structure in place. You are pressing on with this without acknowledging the clear view given in the first consultation in 2021 which was clearly against the proposals.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object council are not listening to their electorate, they are meant to carry out our wishes, not attend to their own interests or even their own ideas of what are our interests. Local opinion is clearly against this plan. LISTEN TO US! We don't want a CPZ or waiting restrictions, and we don't need them. We don't need to pay for permits to swell your coffers and pay your pensions. Concentrate on improving the bus services and the infrastructures required to support the building expansion that has somehow been permitted, also clearly against the wishes of the local population and evidence of it breaking council's own recommended guidelines for development and sound pollution.</p> |
| <p>(36) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Cyprus Terrace)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object First of all you are excluding Cyprus Terrace in upper Wolvercote from being able to apply for a permit - shocking!!! We are a row of 9 historical cottages and every single household has a car. We do not have a drive way or garage as our terrace is pedestrian only access. Secondly, I don't want to pay £65 per car to be able to park at my address in the current cost of living crisis. The scheme will negatively impact on those studying and living here - plenty of people need to drive to remote locations and not owning a car is NoT an option. Your scheme is not inclusive, it is draconian and exclusive. Also limiting this to 2 cars doesn't work with multiple adults HAVING to use their car to get to their place of work!!!! (Our cottage has 3 bedrooms, so that can equal to 4 adults living here!!!). We did not move into Wolvercote from London to accept introduction of parking zone. Finally - this is clearly seen as precursor to the insane Oxford filtering system, which is just going to cut off neighbourhoods from each other. Wolvercote no long has post office (thanks to planners allowing it to be knocked down and redeveloped into housing), summertown - ditto. The local services are few and far in between. It is shocking really what you are trying to impose on Oxford residents - building massive housing projects and restricting of movement by car for work and leisure. This will also impact the local school and young persons club activities. You are proposing to squeeze everyone in Wolvercote financially. I have been supporting my family for 10+ months on one salary. How On earth do you expect people will be able to manage? And no, I can't use public</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>transport to commute to work. My work of place is not in Oxford and it would take me 5hrs per day to commute, while having young children and family. Your scheme simply can't be forced onto our communities. If you want to do it - you need to issue FREE parking permits to up to 4 adults in every household. Then you are not excluding people from work and study opportunities.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object Objecting to this proposal of a restricted and PAID for parking permit. Also Cyprus terrace of 9 cottages is currently excluded from the scheme yet we will be severely impacted by it!!!</p> |
| (37) Member of public, (Wolvercote, First Turn) | <p>CPZ – Object There is sufficient suitable and adequate parking to facilitate the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic. It is not necessary.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support I think the proposed waiting restrictions are a good idea and I would support them</p> |
| (38) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Rawson Close) | <p>CPZ – Object There is no need for this. We are not inundated with people coming from fair and parking in the week days then commuting further on or anything. There is no requirement for this and when you asked a few years ago there wasn't then either. If there ever is an issue with parking which is hardly ever is weekends but this plan doesn't cover that so pointless. Stop trying to fix something which isn't broken for your Financial gain.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object The only place it is is needed is around the school as that can be dangerous where people dump their cars but parents don't care now so doubt this will help</p> |
| (39) Member of public, (Wolvercote, St Peters Road) | <p>CPZ – Object I've lived in Wolvercote for over 25 years and have never had a problem with parking. I think money should be spent sorting out potholes than wasting money on parking zones where its not needed .</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object Not needed in Upper Wolvercote as there isn't a parking issue</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | |
| <p>(40) Member of public, (Wolvercote Oxford, Elmthorpe Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object I am a local resident in Wolvercote. The previous 'informal consultation' was objected to and rejected. This formal consultation appears to be merely a revenue raising exercise by Oxfordshire County Council by imposing a CPZ on Wolvercote. The reasons given for the proposed CPZ are unfounded. The 'Statement of Reasons' was poorly drafted and gave inadequate reasons which do not relate to Wolvercote ("..to address local parking issues'..."). There are NOT currently any parking issues in the proposed controlled time (Mon-Fri 9-5) in Wolvercote and therefore no current need to impose parking restrictions. The additional reasons given by The Transport Planning Team (upon further direct email enquiry) state that "the need for parking controls is required to prevent future residents and commuters at Oxford North from parking in nearby areas". Local Wolvercote residents should not be penalised for the nearby development of Oxford North. This is manifestly unfair and surely is not part of the transport and planning policy aims of Oxfordshire County Council to penalise residents. The parking needs of the Oxford North development are not the responsibility of Wolvercote residents - we should not have the inconvenience nor the cost of a CPZ due to a future possible event caused by an Oxfordshire County Council development outside of our control. A CPZ is not wanted nor needed. It will negatively impact on the lives of residents. It will add an unnecessary financial burden at a time when the cost of living crisis is already biting deeply. It will add unnecessary and ugly street furniture (signage), it will affect the ability of visitors to park and visit Wolvercote Green and Port Meadow. It imposes a cost on family and friends visiting residents who in most cases will have to pay for visitor parking permits (adding on more expense for residents). The scheme itself is flawed with only two permits per property (where individual houses with more than 2 working adults may have more than 2 vehicles). It adds further costs to local businesses which will likely be passed on to local residents. It significantly adds on costs where house renovations will be done (contractors vehicles will be charged to residents at an additional £25 per week) which is unacceptable especially considering how this cost will multiply where several contractors' vehicles are necessary which is often the case. It is unfair and I object in the strongest terms.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object The current waiting restrictions 'prohibition of waiting at any time' (Double Yellow Lines) in the area are adequate and do not need changing</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>(41) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object There is enough parking space in upper Wolvercote. It is not necessary to impose a CPZ. In this time of unprecedented financial hardship for people with rising food cost, energy bills and fuel prices, it is completely unacceptable to start to charge people to park outside their own homes. This is a selfish idea with the council wanting only to raise more money for themselves.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object It's is not necessary or needed.</p> |
| <p>(42) Member of public, (Wolvercote)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object I would like to oppose strongly to the proposed CPZ introduction in Wolvercote. This was brought up a year or two previously and as residents we opposed the introduction. It appears from letters received and notices placed that yet again the powers that be, are once again putting forward another CPZ zone.</p> <p>Having read the literature, you are charging residents to park!!! Residents should NOT have to pay to park. It should visitors to the Village that have to pay, not those that reside here.</p> <p>I am disabled. I have a disability badge. I currently park outside my gate all day every day as i need to be able to access my vehicle close to my home due to mobility issues.</p> <p>I have applied for disabled parking outside in March 2022 and still have not heard back regarding this matter. If you introduce this CPZ zone here it will make it tremendously difficult for me to park outside my home as the other residents will have no choice but to "grab" wherever they can to park up.</p> <p>Currently we can park up and there are no issues. Introducing this will create issues. Bad feeling and hard ship for residents that are already under pressure. We have a regular bus service in place. Every 15 minutes a bus enters and leaves Wolvercote so we are well provided for. Residents should NOT have to pay to park. Visitors SHOULD.</p> <p>I personally know of many residents that are furious with this proposal. You appear to be intent on money making schemes to the detriment of residents.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>I oppose this scheme. It might also help if you set out the reasoning and justification for it, as I sense you are trying to mend something that is not broken (except Summer weekends which it doesn't cover). The proposals make no sense whatsoever.</p> <p>If you want to make money, charge for visitors using the car park at Airman's Bridge. Not by punishing residents.</p> |
| <p>(43) Member of public, (Oxford, Wolvercote Green)</p> | <p>CPZ – Object</p> <p>I write, yet again, to object to the proposed CPZ in upper Wolvercote which will NOT help anyone. She do not need parking restrictions during the week days. The only difficulty with parking is in the evening and the WEEK-END! Please STOP inflicting extra pcosts on local people which will only make car parking worse!</p> |
| <p>(44) Member of public, (Oxford, Church Lane)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns</p> <p>I live in on Church Lane, Wolvercote, Oxford OX2 8AS. I have just seen the notice put up at the end of Church Lane that OCC proposed to introduce a CPZ in Upper Wolvercote. The notice lists the roads in which residents can apply for a residents' permit. This does not include Church Lane which runs between First Turn and Wolvercote Green. Church Lane is a footpath with no vehicle access. For my house we are dependent on parking on First Turn and then walking down Church Lane about 20 metres to our house. I wanted to bring your attention to this and request that you include properties in Church Lane in the list of those eligible to apply for a residents' permit.</p> <p>There are three properties in Church Lane although The Close (2 Church Lane) does have off street parking through a long drive that goes down to the other end of Church Lane at the junction with Osbourne Close.</p> |
| <p>(45) Member of public, (Lower Wolvercote, Rosamund Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns</p> <p>I AGREE with the principle of the CPZ. but I heartily DISAGREE with it only being for 5 days a week. It SHOULD be for 7 days a week as the Weekends are now the busiest times of the week in Wolvercote for visitors to the city of Oxford who want to park and take the bus & for April to September weed-end visitors to the Port Meadow Bathing Place which has just received nationally recognized status. mmer</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Clifford Place is a valuable parking areas for Lower Wolvercote residents. Now the bus no longer stops there, it would be ludicrous to make this a no waiting zone instead of allocating valuable parking spaces on it on ONE SIDE ONLY of the road.</p> |
| <p>(46) Member of public, (Oxford, First Turn)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns The documents give details of residents permits and business permits, but St Peter's Church is a charity, so what permits apply here? Regular services are held whereby clergy will sometimes be in attendance for longer than 2 hours, necessitating a permit of some sort; but the limitation of two permits would be difficult to work with as sometimes several (i.e. more than 2) clergy members will be in attendance. Also, when weddings, funerals, baptisms, services take place, as well as the clergy involved, there are inevitably some congregants who come by car and would need to park somewhere. I understand from the document that the restrictions only apply during the week, and not at the weekends, but not all of our services and special services happen at the weekend.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns I see that waiting restrictions do not apply to funeral cars, but what about weddings?</p> |
| <p>(47) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Church Lane)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns I am a local resident in the proposed CPZ. I support this proposal, but I note that there is no mention of Church Lane or Osborne Close in the list of roads for which residents would be allowed to apply for permits. I request these two streets be added to the list of residents who will be eligible to apply for residents annual parking permits.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns I am a local resident in the proposed area for Waiting Restrictions. I support this proposal, but I note that there is no mention of Church Lane or Osborne Close in the list of roads for which residents would be allowed to apply for permits. I request these two streets be added to the list of residents who will be eligible to apply for residents annual parking permits.</p> |
| <p>(48) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Cyprus Terrace)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns I am a resident of Cyprus Terrace, situated off St Peter's Road, Upper Wolvercote. The terrace runs at right angles to St Peter's Road and has no off-road parking provision, There are nine houses in the terrace. Each house has at</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>least one car. We have to park on St Peter's Road but there is only space for five cars just outside the entrance to the terrace. Our Terrace is not mentioned as being eligible properties although clearly we are. The consultation also indicates that further double yellow lines will be introduced on St Peter's Road and First Turn. The map on the OCC website does not indicate where these double yellow lines will be so Cyprus Terrace residents are even more concerned about loss of potential parking anywhere close to our homes. I will be writing to both our local city councillor and Oxfordshire councillor to express my dismay at this threat to our ability to park and use our cars freely. In my case, I am over 70 years of age and use my car to transport musical instruments from home to practice places so need to be able to park within a reasonable distance.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object</p> <p>For the same reasons I object to the CPZ: I am a resident of Cyprus Terrace, situated off St Peter's Road, Upper Wolvercote. The terrace runs at right angles to St Peter's Road and has no off-road parking provision, There are nine houses in the terrace. Each house has at least one car. We have to park on St Peter's Road but there is only space for five cars just outside the entrance to the terrace. Our Terrace is not mentioned as being eligible properties although clearly we are. The consultation also indicates that further double yellow lines will be introduced on St Peter's Road and First Turn. The map on the OCC website does not indicate where these double yellow lines will be so Cyprus Terrace residents are even more concerned about loss of potential parking anywhere close to our homes. I will be writing to both our local city councillor and Oxfordshire councillor to express my dismay at this threat to our ability to park and use our cars freely. In my case, I am over 70 years of age and use my car to transport musical instruments from home to practice places so need to be able to park within a reasonable distance.</p> |
| (49) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Dove House Close) | <p>CPZ – Concerns</p> <p>I live in am concerned about the impact on Dove House Close where I live.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns</p> <p>I am concerned that Dove House Close will become very congested if non-residents are permitted to park here. And we need reassurance that the private residents' parking area will remain closed to non-residents.</p> |
| (50) As part of a group/organisation, (Upper Wolvercote, First Turn) | <p>CPZ – Concerns</p> <p>Meetings based in the church can take longer than 2 hours. The life of the church and congregation depends upon people having easy access for meetings and social contact. Income raised by church space bookings is essential for the church to survive. Without parking space there will be many fewer bookings.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns waiting restrictions will impact on whether my grandchild can attend after school clubs.</p> |
| <p>(51) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Mere Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns I live on Mere Road. I teach from home. Clients need to park outside my house while delivering/collecting their children. Will they be able to do that?</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns if there are 2-hour or 3-hour parking areas, they will soon fill up.</p> |
| <p>(52) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns Permits (both residents and visitors) charges can be lowered.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns Would the introduction of double yellow lines on Godstow Road push vehicles into other areas, such as Mere Road, Millway Close and St Peters Road, and how would the council try to do to resolve the issue about limited parking spaces?</p> |
| <p>(53) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, St Peter's Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns Those temporarily resident for study i.e students should be eligible for a resident's permit. They shouldn't be discriminated against. I'm not a student but think they have a hard time and if they have a car there's probably a good reason for it. I think the number of visitors' passes looks 'neat' but arbitrary. I think in the first year you should allow people to apply for as many as they want and use that as a basis (transparently) for deciding on numbers to issue in year 2. I think you shouldn't penalise businesses with such high charges. They are contributing to the local economy. They are more likely to have to rely on cars. I hope that alongside the tightening on card you will increase the bus service 6 into the centre and that you will encourage local shops for the local 15min plan. It was a HUGE blow that the post office on St Peter's Rd was shut down and replaced by residential accommodation. It is no longer 15min to the nearest shop.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns As above</p> |
| <p>(54) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Wolvercote Green)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns I am a Pensioner aged over 70. I live alone but I have a longtime partner who lives separately. He spends time with me at my home which can be anytime of day. He overnights. He's also a senior citizen. I live alone and I have no family in Oxford. I need to know that my partner can be in my home WITHOUT RESTRICTION at any time of day. He is NOT a visitor. He is my partner. I want him to have a PERMIT WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS. Also I need to know that friends can visit me for more than 2 hours! It would unacceptable that friends have time restrictions visiting my home. I reiterate once again that I live alone and have no family in Oxford. It makes me feel vulnerable and stressed to think that there might any restrictions in regard to my personal life. SIMPLY NOT ACCEPTABLE!</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns I am a Pensioner aged over 70. I live alone but I have a longtime partner who lives separately. He spends time with me at my home which can be anytime of day. He overnights. He's also a senior citizen. I live alone and I have no family in Oxford. I need to know that my partner can be in my home WITHOUT RESTRICTION at any time of day. He is NOT a visitor. He is my partner. I want him to have a PERMIT WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS. Also I need to know that friends can visit me for more than 2 hours! It would unacceptable that friends have time restrictions visiting my home. I reiterate once again that I live alone and have no family in Oxford. It makes me feel vulnerable and stressed to think that there might any restrictions in regard to my personal life. SIMPLY NOT ACCEPTABLE!</p> |
| <p>(55) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Collett Drive)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns Enforcement is the key. Restricting parking will simply force drivers to find other places simply moving the problem to another area.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns Effective enforcement.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>(56) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Webbs Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns It's only for certain times of the day and week which will not help in summer when it get besy at weekends.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion Don't know</p> |
| <p>(57) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Ulfgar)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns Extra costs added to an already very high cost of living daily, permits for residents should be free. How the hell are we meant to continue working , just about able to pay for fuel to get to work. Now have to pay to park my car at home !</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Object People already struggling with high cost of living ! And now being added a bill !!</p> |
| <p>(58) As part of a group/organisation, (Wolvercote Young People's Club, St Peter's Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns As a local amenity providing services for young people and members of the local community, we are extremely concerned with the proposals. We host a variety of youth sessions at times from 3pm onwards and are soon to launch into daytime youth work. Whilst traffic can be problematic at school drop-off and pick-up, we find that otherwise, during the day, the roads are fine. Permit parking only outside the premises will make drop-off and pick-up even busier and potentially more dangerous for children and young people attending the club, especially crossing the road from the primary school. We hire our premises to local businesses and community members in order to remain sustainable and continue providing a subsidised facility for young people in the area. We do have a car park but with limited capacity. Where necessary, the overspill is on to the surrounding roads and people are asked to park responsibly. If we do not have the option for street parking we could lose business, money, and a crucial vital asset resulting in young people hanging around the community. We cannot imagine there is provision for the club to be provided with free visitor parking permits for the street. This certainly has not appeared on the proposals. By implementing these measures, the traffic is likely to be a lot worse at pinch points, put lives at risk, and have a detrimental impact on local resources. The plus side is it will be a money spinner for the council, however, will organisations like ours see the benefit of the money?</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>As Charity Manager I have liaised with our young people who have agreed with the points raised, and to quote one of them: 'What's the point in the council doing this? They clearly want to make money out of our families and don't care about the impact it will have on our community'.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns As per the previous box</p> |
| <p>(59) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Church Lane)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns I live in Church Lane, Wolvercote. This is a pedestrian only lane and we park on First Turn or a nearby road. The proposal for the CPZ lists the streets that will be eligible for a residents permit but it does not include either Church Lane or Cypress Terrace, which is also pedestrian only and runs off St Peter's Road. Can you please ensure that residents in Church Lane and Cypress Terrace are eligible for residents parking permits as we have nowhere else to park.</p> <p>Parking is not generally a problem in Upper Wolvercote except around school drop off and pick up. I am concerned about the impact that the CPZ will have on people using St Peter's Church where staff and volunteers may need more than two hours' parking and for those participating in some services in church and meetings in the church hall which also require more than two hours' parking. A CPZ will also be problematic for local businesses including Univerlab in the Old School and the Plough (the car park is often full at lunchtimes).</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns I would be concerned about increasing double yellow lines in Upper Wolvercote if that decreases the amount of parking available.</p> |
| <p>(60) Member of public, (Wolvercote, St Peters Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Concerns Centering may attention on St Peters Road, don't get me wrong, most people respect the drop kerb areas, some obviously don't, life is really too short to worry about bringing obstruction charges to bear</p> <p>You are proposing removal of the single yellow line along 'my' section of St Peters Rd. Can you confirm that account has been taken to re-install the WAP that was bought and paid for probably 15yrs ago. It stretches across the frontage of house nos10, where I reside with my partner. The WAP is a little faded and worn but can be seen to exist.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>I asked the question about the number of permit holders predicted against the number of residents that exist, do you have that type of statistic available?</p> <p>Walking along Davenant Rd yesterday, are the current road markings there what we can expect in St Peters Rd?</p> |
| <p>(61) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support I am overall in favour but am concerned that having a permit zone in Millway Close; will turn what is essentially a parking area for the residents of Millway Close into a parking area for anyone coming to the area.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support This may improve congestion.</p> |
| <p>(62) As part of a group/organisation, (Oxford, Apsley Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support CycloX is the cycle campaign group for Oxford. We campaign to put cycling at the heart of Oxford's future. Our mission is to get more people cycling, more often, and more safely. Parking can have a considerable impact on cyclist safety in terms of visibility, especially at junctions, risk of being hit by a car door being opened when passing, and routes to parking crossing cycle paths.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support We are in support of removing parking from close by junctions to improve visibility.</p> |
| <p>(63) Member of public, (Oxford, Fairlawn End)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support I am a resident of Fairlawn End, one of the roads included in the consultation and I support the proposal for a CPZ. At present the road is typically congested with cars and other vehicles parked the length of the narrow, dead end road from 7am until evening, some of which remain in situ for several weeks at a time. This causes issues for road cleaning and rubbish collection and access for other deliveries to the residents. We also have difficulty accommodating the parking needs of our visitors.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – No opinion This does not appear to affect me.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(64) Member of public, (Oxford, Marriott Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support We really need better control of parking around Wolvercote School. Parents are parking all over the place, including on corners - thus blocking line of sight around the corner and causing accidents. It's dangerous and I hope that a CPZ, properly enforced, could reduce the risk to parents and children.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns Preventing cars from waiting near Wolvercote Primary would reduce risk of accidents, cars are often waiting on double yellows to collect kids from the school and this both blocks the road and prevents children from safely crossing. In addition, I hope it would reduce the number of cars waiting with their engines idling, and therefore improve air quality.</p> |
| <p>(65) Member of public, (Oxford, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support There is a significant amount of commuter parking in the area, particularly affecting Millway Close where I own a flat. This is likely to increase substantially when the adjacent Oxford North development becomes established. There is also great difficulty in passing down various roads in Upper Wolvercote due to thoughtless parking, and the buses find it especially difficult to travel along its route between Godstow Rd and First Turn</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns They are insufficient to ensure safety around the school during the arrival and departure times, and also to enable the buses to travel down Mere Road</p> |
| <p>(66) Member of public, (Oxford, Wolvercote Green)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support I live there and regularly can't park due to pub traffic</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support Prevent commuters parking there</p> |
| <p>(67) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Cyprus Terrace)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support Oxford has too many cars. This is clear from the queues of traffic on the main roads into the city at peak times. And it is likely to get worse, given the additional housing being built near the main access routes. There isn't an easy solution; people will be reluctant to switch back to public transport if it is unreliable, but it is unlikely to get any</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>more reliable until traffic is reduced, or another means is found of enabling buses to move more easily through congestion, working with Oxford's unchangeable geography.</p> <p>So what role do CPZs play in that? The costs are borne by local residents; the benefit, hopefully, is that it will be easier to park near home. It is unlikely to make any difference to the decisions residents make on what form of transport to use for a particular journey. So the main behaviour to be addressed is non-residents parking in the area, possibly using it as a cheaper alternative to the nearby park and ride.</p> <p>There is limited parking in Upper Wolvercote, with the result that it is often difficult for residents to park near home. This is particularly the case during the week, when non-residents (including commuters and parents) leave their cars in the area during the day. It also results in dangerous and inconsiderate parking, especially in the pinch points around the corner of St Peter's Road and First Turn,; it is a particular problem at school drop-off and pick-up times. This is currently being exacerbated by the building work on the former site of the Londis shop and post office.</p> <p>However, please note that Cyprus Terrace is not currently listed as an eligible address for parking permits; I assume this was an oversight. Unlike many of the houses in nearby streets such as St Peter's Road and First Turn, the houses in Cyprus Terrace have no driveways as they are accessed from a pedestrian path, and so have no alternative but to park on the road.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns</p> <p>It is chaos around the Wolvercote primary school at drop-off and pick-up times, but it is hard to see how limiting waiting times will help unless it is actively enforced and alternatives put in place. It may be more useful for the county council to engage directly with the school and parents to discuss how this can be addressed to make it safer for all concerned.</p> |
| <p>(68) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Fairlawn End)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support</p> <p>Fairlawn End is currently used, each weekday, and totally filled by city commuters parked cars. This leaves no parking spaces for residents, deliveries or visitors.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support</p> <p>Fairlawn End is currently used, and totally filled, each weekday by city commuters' parked cars. This leaves no parking spaces for residents, deliveries or visitors.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>(69) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Mere Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support I support the broad principles of the CPZ I do have concerns about the implications on traffic flow in the area, in particular on Mere Road, where the current parking in effect slows the average speed of flowing traffic down</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support I support these changes</p> |
| <p>(70) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Millway Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support I live at Millway Close</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns I have a garage and parking for one car in front of my garage, it is on my deeds therefore off road. Do I need a parking permit for this?</p> |
| <p>(71) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Pixey Place)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support I support the scheme aims overall. I particularly support the extension of 'no waiting at any times' for the areas marked in blue on the map. I would like to recommend a small number of variations: 1) Enable householders to apply for a maximum of three permits not two. Upper Wolvercote has a number of multi-generational households where adult children live at home as they are unable to afford to buy property in Oxford city. If both parents and adult child work and off-street parking at the house is not available, they cannot all have a car permit. This will force the household to arrange off-street parking by paving over a front garden to keep one car off-road. This is a perverse incentive for the council to create from an environmental point of view. There is no issue with the availability of parking spaces (i.e. no overcrowding) in Upper Wolvercote, so issuing a few more permits will not overload the parking spaces that will exist, and avoid front gardens being paved over. My household has one car and an off-street space, but I know of neighbours that probably pave their front gardens if there are only two permits allowed. 2) The stretch of road along first turn from the Woodstock road to the railway bridge should be changed to 'no waiting at any time' as cars regularly park here and cause obstructions for cyclists and other road users. This would improve safety. All houses here have off-road parking, so this will not impact householders.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Parking restrictions – Support See my previous comments.</p> |
| <p>(72) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Ulfgar Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support We do have a parking problem here, especially at school drop off and pick up times where parents and carers driving their children to and from school and parking (often illegally, on double yellow lines) in the streets around the school is causing a dangerous situation around the school, especially on the corner of First Turn and St Peter's Road. If they are not in future allowed to park in the streets around the school, and if this were properly enforced, many will probably reconsider their journeys to and from school and walk or cycle instead. I understand there are some pupils who live outside the catchment and whose parents and carers need to bring them by car, but I think this is a small number out of the c 310 pupils at the school, most of whom live within 10-15 minutes' walk of the school.</p> <p>It would be much better if the time period included school drop off time i.e. from 8 am onwards, to 5 pm Monday to Friday, not 9 am to 5 pm.</p> <p>This would help to address the traffic chaos that occurs around the primary school at those times of day. I urge you to come and have a look, to see just how dangerous it is as 300 plus children and their families go in and out of the school gates whilst there is far too much road traffic in the vicinity. I have seen so many near accidents and nearly been run over myself by someone reversing into me as I crossed the road by the zig zags to get into the St Peter's Road gate to the school.</p> <p>One of the reasons St Peter's Road is especially dangerous is that having a row of (legally parked) cars on the Londis site side means that a car coming from First Turn has to wait on the zig zags if a vehicle is coming down St Peter's Road from the opposite direction. This blocks one of the playground exit gates and makes it impossible for children to see across the road and cross safely.</p> <p>I have lived in Upper Wolvercote for almost 13 years. I've never seen a traffic warden enforcing the existing parking restrictions, and there is often dangerous parking, for example along the double yellow lines on the steep part of First Turn, on the way to The Plough pub, which makes it particularly dangerous for cyclists (including school children) coming up the hill, as vehicles going down the hill have to move into the middle of the road to avoid the illegally parked vehicles.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>I would also very much like to see the 6 bus able to return to its old route i.e. going both ways up and down Mere Road, instead of dropping off on Woodstock Road and going up to the roundabout. I understand from talking to the Oxford Bus Company that it had to be rerouted because of collisions in Mere Road. If parking on the road was not allowed here (the houses do have driveways), then I would have thought the bus would be able to use the old route again. This would be safer for young children coming back from secondary school in Summertown on the bus, especially on dark winter evenings.</p> <p>I've been involved in campaigning to improve road safety around the school for a few years. I was really glad that the council put up some new triangular School signage (and replaced old signs) in all the roads leading to the school, as well as new 20 mph repeater signs -- thank you! Also, the playground signage in both Lower and Upper Wolvercote is much better than it was.</p> <p>As well as parking enforcement by Conduent, we also need more enforcement by the police of the speed restrictions as many vehicles continue to exceed the limit.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support Please see my response to the previous question. But to be effective this must be rigorously enforced, otherwise an unintended consequence of the parking restrictions may be more parents and carers stopping on the zig zags outside the school, or in other dangerous locations, to drop off their children near the school gates instead of parking and walking them in to school. Obviously this would make it even more difficult for children (and their parents/carers/younger siblings) to cross the roads near the school safely.</p> |
| <p>(73) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Upper Close)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support Occupier Upper Close</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Concerns There are no resident parking bays in the stretch of Godstow Road up from Mere Road. I understand that the recent addition of the island makes that tricky. However, some could be formed on the wide grass verge at the top of Godstow Road around the access road to Upper Close. Since the double yellow lines went in following the installation of the island people are having to park on the verge any way.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>(74) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Wolvercote Green)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support I live on Wolvercote Green (right next to the Plough Pub). We have no road in front of our property and so rely on the parking by the side of the Plough. It has become increasingly difficult and sometimes impossible to park anywhere near our house. This is proving very, very difficult when unloading shopping, home improvement or gardening materials or luggage. We are often having to carry heavy materials a substantial distance because the parking spaces are all full, which can be very challenging. Despite having to pay for the parking permit, we are very much in favour of the introduction of this controlled parking zone to overcome an increasingly difficult situation which is taking away some of the joy of living here. One problem with this proposal is that many of the parking problems around the Plough are particularly bad at weekends. I would say that they clearly need to be extended to cover the weekends if they are going to help our situation effectively. That is also even worse when there are also events at the church and the village hall. I also question why some form of painted boxes could not be included in this specific area to clearly demonstrate where cars should park. I am only talking about the area specifically outside the Plough Pub as the unusual shape of the road means that a number of people park poorly and therefore knock out two or even three spaces. We are also getting regular double parking to cope with the parking difficulties. A clearer outline of where parking is permitted would help with both of those issues (poor & double parking) and could also maximise the number of spaces available. I am sure this could be done sympathetically to minimise the number of painted lines.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support This all seems sensible to me to keep traffic moving around Wolvercote. One issue I have noticed is with the double yellow lines leading up to the new crossing on Godstow Road by the Wolvercote Village Hall. The current yellow lines around the crossing end far too close to the crossing. I have witnessed a vehicle parked very close to the crossing and a number 6 bus struggling to maneuver between the car and the raised paving around the crossing to travel down the road towards the railway bridge. The double yellow lines clearly needed to be lengthened as soon as possible.</p> |
| <p>(75) Member of public, (Upper Wolvercote, Ulfgar Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support To many people from outside of the area parking their cars and then getting bicycles out and biking into the city. Which restricts the parking for those of us that live in Wolvercote.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support To stop people that don't live in the village parking all day.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(76) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Pixey Place)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support Many non-residents use the area as a free park and ride. This means roads are packed with cars and it can be really dangerous for children to cross the road to get to the primary school.</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support This would help make it easier for kids to see if it's safe to cross the road. It would have to be enforced though as people often wait on double yellow and even the zigzag lines outside the school.</p> |
| <p>(77) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Pixey Place)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support Reduce non residents parking in the area</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support Reduce traffic at Wolvercote Primary School and increase safety for children</p> |
| <p>(78) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Ulfgar Road)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support Supporting to stop commuter parking around the school and multi vehicle households that collect unroadworthy cars</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support great</p> |
| <p>(79) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Wolvercote Green)</p> | <p>CPZ – Support i live on Wolvercote green next to the plough pub with no parking directly outside of my house. I almost always struggle to find a parking space due to commuters driving and parking in the roads and then commuting to work on bike or bus. I often have to carry children/shopping over 60 m to my house. I believe the plough pub business is affected by difficulties for their customers parking due to commuters using upper Wolvercote as a park and ride area. it would be useful to have resident only or 3 hour only parking as an option so the plough business isn't affected by a CPZ</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support 3 hours may be better for local business such as the plough pub as lunch time may take 3 hours rather than 2</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | |
| (80) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Rowland Close) | <p>CPZ – Support Too many commuters parking for the day, who come from outside of the city</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support It is too difficult to get past Wolvercote school at present time as any restrictions are not checked.</p> |
| (81) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Wolvercote Green) | <p>CPZ – Support As a resident in Wolvercote Green, it is increasingly difficult to park anywhere near my house because of people from other areas taking advantage of the current unrestricted parking</p> <p>Parking restrictions – Support Wolvercote Green has an increasing numbers of campervans parked long term which restricts residents parking</p> |
| (82) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Dove House Close) | <p>CPZ – Support I am entirely in agreement with the Controlled Parking Zone proposals described in the Formal Consultation</p> |
| (83) Member of public, (Wolvercote, Dove House Close) | <p>CPZ – Support I am a resident of St Peters Road I am also a registered childminder and look after several children every day At the moment St Peters Road is choc a bloc with cars. Many of these are people who park and then to town in the bus or bike leaving their cars all day. This is particularly bad by the School Field area. I think residents parking would be a brilliant idea in St Peters Road</p> |



Oxfordshire County Council
Equalities Impact Assessment

Upper Wolvercote – Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)
January 2023

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Section 1: Summary details | 43 |
| Section 2: Detail of proposal..... | 44 |
| Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics | 46 |
| Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts..... | 51 |
| Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Wider Impacts..... | 53 |
| Section 4: Review | 54 |

Section 1: Summary details

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Directorate and Service Area</p> | <p>Highways and Operations – Network Management</p> |
| <p>What is being assessed (e.g. name of policy, procedure, project, service or proposed service change).</p> | <p>Upper Wolvercote – Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)</p> |
| <p>Is this a new or existing function or policy?</p> | <p>No – the parking team already operate CPZs/Permit Parking Zones elsewhere in Oxfordshire, and measures to restrict and control car parking availability, including further use and expansion of CPZs, form part of the county’s recently adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.</p> |
| <p>Summary of assessment Briefly summarise the policy or proposed service change. Summarise possible impacts. Does the proposal bias, discriminate or unfairly disadvantage individuals or groups within the community? (following completion of the assessment).</p> | <p>CPZs are areas where on-street parking is subject to restrictions. In deciding on whether to introduce a CPZ both residents support and policy implications are considered. CPZs give residents preferential treatment when parking in the street around their home. Permit holders can park without restriction throughout the CPZ operational hours, but non-permit holders can only park for a limited period, usually for up to two hours. Disabled badge holders may park free of charge in CPZs.</p> <p>Large parts of Oxford are already covered by CPZs and where these have been implemented, they have been extremely successful in removing commuter parking. CPZs help to reduce congestion and pollution, and encourage use of sustainable transport, by removing free on-street commuter parking in the city. They also improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users by removing obstructive parking. These benefits mostly fall on those living within the zones but there are wider transport and environmental benefits.</p> <p>All residents in CPZ areas who wish to park their vehicle on the public highway in the zone during the hours of operation have to pay for a permit(s); unless access to a permit has been restricted because of a planning permission, for example, the development is car free. Businesses can also apply for permits. Both residents and businesses can also apply for permits for their visitors. Special provisions also apply for carers and contractor’s vehicles with more details available on https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/public-site/parking-permits.</p> <p>Households that don’t have access to a drive or private parking are likely to be most disadvantaged particularly if it is a household with multiple car ownership. Parking permit charges may also affect low income households. The charges are however necessary to ensure that more of the schemes operating costs are met and they are able to continue to operate and deliver their transport and environmental benefits.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| | This assessment is an interim assessment. It will be updated and published as part of any formal consultation on specific CPZs and will then be reviewed following formal consultation before being submitted as part of the officer report to the Cabinet Member for Highways Management on the CPZ. |
| Completed By | Vicki Neville – Technical Officer |
| Authorised By | Jim Whiting – Parking Manager |
| Date of Assessment | January 2023 |

Section 2: Detail of proposal

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Context / Background Briefly summarise the background to the policy or proposed service change, including reasons for any changes from previous versions.</p> | <p>Measures to restrict and control car parking availability, including use of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), form part of the county's recently adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (adopted in 2022) and Oxford City Council's Local Plan (adopted in 2020). Much of Oxford is already covered by CPZs, with further CPZs planned and which are required to support several local transport and planning objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transport management – to remove free on-street commuter and other non-residential car parking spaces from the city, thereby reducing traffic levels and helping boost use of non-car modes; ▪ Development management – to support the city and county councils' policies to limit the number of car parking spaces provided as part of new developments by ensuring restricted off-street provision does not lead to overspill parking in surrounding streets; and ▪ Protecting residential streets – by removing intrusive or obstructive non-residential on-street car parking and, where necessary, limiting the number of on-street spaces occupied per dwelling by residential and visitor parking; <p>Demand management measures being developed by the County and City Councils – particularly a workplace parking levy – also means further expansion of CPZs is required in the city to ensure that parking is not just displaced to residential streets.</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Proposals</p> <p>Explain the detail of the proposals, including why this has been decided as the best course of action.</p> | <p>Officers at the County Council have worked with the local County Councillor to develop the proposed CPZ for Upper Wolvercote. The proposed operational hours of the CPZ are Monday – Friday 9am – 5pm Permit Holders or 2 hours no return within 2 hours Monday – Friday 9am – 5pm for non-permit holders.</p> <p>The proposed CPZ would be subject to a formal public consultation and approval of a Traffic Regulation Order by the Council following formal consultation.</p> <p>The proposed scheme has been designed as a Permit Parking Area (PPA) which uses entry and repeater signs to inform motorists of the restrictions in place (e.g. no bay markings). This affords residents the flexibility of where they can park and reduces the amount of sign and line clutter.</p> |
| <p>Evidence / Intelligence</p> <p>List and explain any data, consultation outcomes, research findings, feedback from service users and stakeholders etc, that supports your proposals and can help to inform the judgements you make about potential impact on different individuals, communities or groups and our ability to deliver our climate commitments.</p> | <p>Informal consultation has been carried out (Feb 2021) on the proposed CPZ for Upper Wolvercote. Several factors are considered when deciding whether to approve and implement a CPZ including local support and existing and future parking pressure and other policy considerations. All CPZs are subject to formal consultation. Outcomes of formal consultations will be used to update this interim assessment. Any objections to the formal consultation will be reported to the Oxfordshire County Council Cabinet Member for Highways Management’s decisions meeting – these are public meetings, which members of the public may apply to address.</p> |
| <p>Alternatives considered / rejected</p> <p>Summarise any other approaches that have been considered in developing the policy or proposed service change, and the reasons why these were not adopted. This could include reasons why doing nothing is not an option.</p> | <p>Targets to reduce private car travel form part of the county’s Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.</p> <p>Controlled parking zones work alongside other strategy proposals (see emerging Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan) to manage travel by private car (traffic filters, workplace parking levy) and encourage more sustainable modes of travel (for example public transport, cycling or walking) by managing the availability and demand for parking. This is traditionally achieved by on street parking schemes with controls on who is able to park, for how long and a charge to do so.</p> <p>Within the design of the CPZ concession has been made to allow for 2 hours of free parking for non-permit holders.</p> <p>Doing nothing is not an option because existing parking issues would remain and potentially worsen, because of housing and economic growth, and displaced parking is likely to occur with the roll out of other recently introduced CPZs and should proposals for a city-wide workplace parking levy be approved and implemented.</p> |

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics

| Protected Characteristic | No Impact | Positive | Negative | Description of Impact | Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts | Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation) | Timescale and monitoring arrangements |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>A reduction in commuter parking and/or the removal of obstructive car parking from residential streets is expected help improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users including older people and children.</p> <p>No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on any age group.</p> | Residents (aged 17 or over) can apply for up to 50 visitor parking permits per year; the first block of 25 issued are free, and the second block of 25 currently cost £25. A cap is applied of a maximum of 100 visitor permits per property. Those over 70 do not have to pay for your second set. | OCC Project Team | Post implementation engagement including with Local Member |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|------------------|--|
| Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Those with a disability may be more reliant on a car for mobility and/or require support from a professional carer or family or friends for daily care. Management of on street parking may impact on people reliant on care.</p> <p>A reduction in commuter parking and/or the removal of obstructive car parking from residential streets is expected help improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users including those with a mobility impairment including those who use a wheelchair or motorized scooter.</p> | <p>Blue badge holders can apply to have a bay provided outside their homes.</p> <p>Blue badge holders can park in CPZs unlimited.</p> <p>Within the design of the CPZ concession has been made to allow for 2 hours of free parking for non-permit holders.</p> <p>Residents (aged 17 or over) can apply for up to 50 visitor parking permits per year; the first block of 25 issued are free, and the second block of 25 currently cost £25. A cap is applied of a maximum of 100 visitor permits per property. Those over 70 do not have to pay for your second set.</p> | OCC Project Team | Post implementation engagement including with Local Member |
| Gender Reassignment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on any gender. | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|------------------|--|
| Marriage & Civil Partnership | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on any gender. | | | |
| Pregnancy & Maternity | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pregnant people and with infants may require home support from a medical or other professional who need to park on street. A reduction in commuter parking and/or the removal of obstructive car parking from residential streets is expected help improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users. Less traffic will also reduce pollution. | Residents (aged 17 or over) can apply for up to 50 visitor parking permits per year; the first block of 25 issued are free, and the second block of 25 currently cost £25. A cap is applied of a maximum of 100 visitor permits per property. Within the design of the CPZ concession has been made to allow for 2 hours of free parking for non-permit holders. | OCC Project Team | Post implementation engagement including with Local Member |
| Race | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on any race. | | | |
| Sex | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on either sex. | | | |
| Sexual Orientation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately in terms of sexual orientation. | | | |
| Religion or Belief | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not expected to impact disproportionately on any religious groups. | | | |

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts

| Additional community impacts | No Impact | Positive | Negative | Description of impact | Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts | Action owner (*Job Title, Organisation) | Timescale and monitoring arrangements |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Rural communities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Removes free on-street commuter parking in the city, which is mostly likely to impact on those travelling from outside the city. Parts of Oxford are highly accessible by public transport including Park & Ride. | | | |
| Armed Forces | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not expected to impact disproportionately on any armed forces groups. | | | |
| Carers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Carers, including family and friends, that need to look after older and disabled people, and who need to drive and park on street. | Within the design of the CPZ concession has been made to allow for 2 hours of free parking for non-permit holders. Residents (aged 17 or over) can apply for up to 50 visitor parking permits per year; the first block of 25 issued are free, and the second block of 25 currently cost £25. A cap is applied of a maximum of 100 visitor permits per property. | OCC Project Team | Post implementation engagement including with Local Member |
| Areas of deprivation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Parking permit charges may affect low-income households. The most deprived LSOA in Oxford is Northfield Brook (Blackbird Leys). Areas of The Leys, Rose Hill, Barton, Carfax and Littlemore are amongst the | Within the design of the CPZ concession has been made to allow for 2 hours of free parking for non-permit holders. Residents (aged 17 or over) can apply for up to 50 visitor parking permits per year; the first block | OCC Project Team | Post implementation engagement including with Local Member |

| Additional community impacts | No Impact | Positive | Negative | Description of impact | Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts | Action owner (*Job Title, Organisation) | Timescale and monitoring arrangements |
|------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>most deprived 20% in England. Nationally, those on lower incomes have lower levels of private car ownership, with 40 per cent of those in the lowest income households having no access to a car or van.</p> <p>A reduction in commuter parking and/or the removal of obstructive car parking from residential streets is expected help improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users. Less traffic will also reduce pollution. This is important as deprived areas can also have the worst health outcomes. Where CPZs have been previously introduced, including in places where deprived residents live, they have improved on street parking for local residents and businesses. CPZs can also help to boost active travel and public transport modes which also benefit from less traffic.</p> | <p>of 25 issued are free, and the second block of 25 currently cost £25. A cap is applied of a maximum of 100 visitor permits per property.</p> | | |

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Wider Impacts

| Additional Wider Impacts | No Impact | Positive | Negative | Description of Impact | Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts | Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation) | Timescale and monitoring arrangements |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Staff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Staff will not be disproportionately impacted. | | | |
| Other Council Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Potential need for some council services e.g. social services, to use a car and park in residential streets. | Within the design of the CPZ concession has been made to allow for 2 hours of free parking for non-permit holders. Residents (aged 17 or over) can apply for up to 50 visitor parking permits per year; the first block of 25 issued are free, and the second block of 25 currently cost £25. A cap is applied of a maximum of 100 visitor permits per property. | OCC Project Team | Post implementation engagement including with Local Member |
| Providers | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not expected to impact disproportionately on any providers. | | | |
| Social Value ¹ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | A reduction in commuter parking and/or the removal of obstructive car parking from residential streets is expected help improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users. Less traffic will also reduce pollution. | | OCC Project Team | Post implementation engagement including with Local Member |

¹ If the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 applies to this proposal, please summarise here how you have considered how the contract might improve the economic, social, and environmental well-being of the relevant area

Section 4: Review

Where bias, negative impact or disadvantage is identified, the proposal and/or implementation can be adapted or changed; meaning there is a need for regular review. This review may also be needed to reflect additional data and evidence for a fuller assessment (proportionate to the decision in question). Please state the agreed review timescale for the identified impacts of the policy implementation or service change.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Review Date | December 2023 – as part of post implementation scheme monitoring |
| Person Responsible for Review | Vicki Neville |
| Authorised By | Jim Whiting |