



Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport

***Thursday, 21 October 2010 at 2.00 pm
County Hall***

Items for Decision

The items for decision under individual Cabinet Members' delegated powers are listed overleaf, with indicative timings, and the related reports are attached. Decisions taken will become effective at the end of the working day on 29 October 2010 unless called in by that date for review by the appropriate Scrutiny Committee.

Copies of the reports are circulated (by e-mail) to all members of the County Council.

These proceedings are open to the public

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tony Cloke". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Tony Cloke
Assistant Head of Legal & Democratic Services

October 2010

Contact Officer: **Graham Warrington**
Tel: (01865) 815321; E-Mail:
graham.warrington@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Note: Date of next meeting: 25 November 2010

If you have any special requirements (such as a large print version of these papers or special access facilities) please contact the officer named on the front page, but please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.

Items for Decision

1. **Declarations of Interest**

2. **Questions from County Councillors**

Any county councillor may, by giving notice to the Proper Officer by 9 am on the working day before the meeting, ask a question on any matter in respect of the Cabinet Member's delegated powers. The number of questions which may be asked by any councillor at any one meeting is limited to two (or one question with notice and a supplementary question at the meeting) and the time for questions will be limited to 30 minutes in total. As with questions at Council, any questions which remain unanswered at the end of this item will receive a written response.

Questions submitted prior to the agenda being despatched are shown below and will be the subject of a response from the appropriate Cabinet Member or such other councillor or officer as is determined by the Cabinet Member, and shall not be the subject of further debate at this meeting. Questions received after the despatch of the agenda, but before the deadline, will be shown on the Schedule of Addenda circulated at the meeting, together with any written response which is available at that time.

3. **Petitions and Public Address**

4. **Headington West Controlled Parking Zone Review**

Forward Plan Ref: 2010/124

Contact: Peter Egawhary/Dean Gildea, Traffic Regulation Team Tel: (01865) 815857

2.00 pm

Report by Head of Highways & Transport (**CMDT4**).

5. **Oxford - Temple Cowley Area - Proposed Changes to Parking**

Forward Plan Ref: 2009/210

Contact: David Tole, Leader, Traffic Regulation (01865 815942)

2.15 pm

Report by Head of Highways & Transport (**CMDT5**).

6. **Bicester Residents Parking Scheme - Minor Amendments**

Forward Plan Ref: 2010/125

Contact: David Tole, Team Leader, Traffic Regulation Order Tel: (01865) 815942

2.30 pm

Report by Head of Highways & Transport (**CMDT6**).

Division(s): Barton & Churchill,
Headington & Marston

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT – 21 OCTOBER 2010

HEADINGTON WEST CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE REVIEW

**Report by Deputy Director of Environment & Economy
Highways & Transport**

Introduction

1. On 19 September 2006 Oxfordshire County Council's Cabinet considered a report on the introduction of Charges for Residents' and Residents' Visitors' Permits. Part of the resolution from that meeting was to draw up a programme of regular reviews for Oxford Controlled Parking Zones generally. This report details the review of the above Zone, which has been carried out as a consequence of that Cabinet resolution.

Background

2. A Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) has been in existence in Headington West since the current Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) came into force in March 2000. The Order created 2 separate zones with differing hours of operation in the northern part of the zone (HA) to the southern part of the zone (HB); permits are also zone specific. Since 2000 only minor variations to the TRO have been made, principally to allow for charging for permits and to exclude new residential development in the zone from entitlement to parking permits in accordance with planning consents. The 2000 Order introduced measures to address the problems associated with Oxford United FC supporters parking in the vicinity of the old Manor Ground. Oxford United FC has since moved to their new Kassam Stadium in Greater Leys and the CPZ has never been reviewed.
3. The main aims of a CPZ are to:
 - Tackle congestion by removing parking places available to commuters who park in the area, either near to their work or to access other forms of transport for onward travel.
 - Deliver accessibility by protecting accessways, junctions and narrow streets from inappropriately parked vehicles.
 - Prioritise the remaining parking places for residents or short term visitors to residents or businesses in the area.

The Review Process

4. Officers reviewed the existing parking arrangements by carrying out daytime and night-time parking surveys, as well as on site measurements and an informal consultation which sought residents' views on the existing scheme by distributing questionnaires to all properties within the existing zone. Copies of the letter and questionnaire are contained within background Document A which can be found in the Members' Resource Centre. Before the Informal Consultation, a meeting was arranged for local members from both Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council to discuss the above issues and find out any additional information that would be useful to the review process

Informal Consultation Period (11 December 2009 – 8 January 2010)

5. The informal consultation asked residents how the existing CPZ could be improved and opinions invited on the following issues:
 - (i) Their preferred hours of operation of the parking controls in their part of the zone.
 - (ii) Whether or not Permit Holders should be exempt from the time limit in the short-stay parking places throughout the zone.
 - (iii) Whether the number of residents' parking permits issued should be restricted to a maximum of two permits per household.
6. In total 222 responses were received during the informal consultation, and a full analysis of these can be found in the Members' Resource Centre with background Document A. From the results it was clear that the hours of operation within the permit holders' parking bays in the northern half of the zone (HA) should remain operational 24 hours, 7 days of the week to keep out extraneous traffic so close to the John Radcliffe Hospital. In the southern half of the zone (HB) the major traffic generator is Brookes University which operates daytime only Monday to Friday and therefore the general responses for this part of the zone was that the hours of operation should not be extended to cover evenings and Sundays - 55% of those that responded favoured this option. Similarly there was support for making Permit Holders exempt from the time limit in the 2 hour parking places a total of only 53% in zone HA but in zone HB it was much higher at 77% that favoured or did not mind this proposal.
7. There was no overall consensus of opinion regarding permit restraint in zone HA, but a majority in HB did favour this option. However, further analysis of the number of permits on issue has been carried out and this showed that a total of only 5 properties had in excess of 2 permits issued to them. Consequently it is not felt that introducing permit restraint at this juncture would have any significant benefit and so has not been pursued.

Formal Proposals

8. The initial scheme design in 2000 had done much to maximise the amount of on-street parking while maintaining accessibility throughout the area. However, it was felt by officers that some extra parking space could be created by rearranging some of the existing restrictions and improving the parking layout in some of the roads. The revised controls and parking layout would also take into account new access requirement as well as protecting those fire hydrants that are located within the carriageway. Additionally, an amount of extra parking could be made available to residents or their visitors in Cheney Lane and Warneford Lane through the introduction of a 24 hour limited waiting parking control with no return within 8 hours, which will prevent vehicles being left parked indefinitely along those roads.

Formal Consultation Period (17 June 2010 – 16 July 2010)

9. A consultation pack was sent to each of the 1400 properties within the existing CPZ. Information was also sent to 19 formal consultees and documents placed on deposit for public inspection at the Central Library, Headington Library, County Hall and Speedwell House. Street notices were placed in every road within the zone for the duration of the consultation period and a public notice published in the Oxford Times on 17 June. Copies of the consultation pack and deposit documents are contained within Document B, which is available in the Members' Resource Centre. Details of the proposed changes on a street by street basis are set out at Annex 1.
10. 14 responses were received during the formal consultation period. These have been summarized together with officer comments at Annex 2. Copies of the letters of comment are contained within Document C which is available in the Members' Resource Centre. The only formal consultee to respond was Thames Valley Police who state that they have no objections to the proposal. However, they did request that there should be some clarification in the proposed Order regarding the existing 'no entry prohibition' to clarify which of the two junctions of Grays Road with Gipsy Lane that the ban on motorised traffic applied; it has now been clarified that there are no proposed changes here. The main areas of concern from other respondents are discussed below.

Barrington Close

11. Three comments were received from the residents of Barrington Close. The first one simply requested further confirmation of the proposals. The other two stated that they would like the hours of restriction increased to 7am to 7pm Monday to Saturday (rather than the proposed alternatives of 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday or 8am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday) due to concerns of possible displaced parking resulting from the 'Highfield Area' Traffic Management Scheme.

12. In response, the hours of restriction are being standardised across each part of the whole Zone, which will be easier for everyone to understand and aid enforcement. Therefore it is not desirable to have differing hours of restriction in this Close. The above Traffic Management Scheme has been put 'on hold', however should it go ahead the situation will be monitored.

Cheney Lane

13. The Residents' Association of Granville Court objected to the proposal that the current unrestricted parking along Cheney Lane be restricted to 24 hour parking, with no return within 8 hours. They ask that the length adjacent to Granville Court become a residents parking area, possibly with 2 hour 'shared use' parking.
14. In response to this it is noted that all 52 of the Granville Court flats have their own garages, and the site has some additional parking. The proposed restriction on Cheney Lane will mean that vehicles could not be left there indefinitely, which would free up parking space. It is not felt that the concerns will be realised, however the situation will be monitored and action taken if appropriate.

Franklin Road

15. The Bursar of Rye St Antony School has written to request the provision of 30 minute parking bays for dropping off and collecting pupils on Franklin Road. Separately, a parent of a pupil attending Rye St Antony's School has written to request extending the existing 2-hour parking on the opposite side of the road to the properties and allowing residents' permit holders and their visitors an exemption from the time limit on those limited waiting parking bays.
16. The need for additional short-term parking was not raised as an issue during the informal consultation stage and has not been taken into account in the formal proposals. It is therefore proposed that no further action be taken at this time.

Conclusion

17. The response to the informal and formal consultation indicated a good level of support for the proposed changes in this zone. The proposals do introduce a greater degree of flexibility for non-permit holders as well as for residents. This has been achieved by introducing more general public parking spaces and exempting permit holders from some 2 hour parking places. The conversion of the existing lengths of uncontrolled parking in Cheney Lane into 24 hours limited waiting parking places will prevent their long-term occupancy and open up a much needed parking resource to residents and visitors.

How the Project Supports LTP2 Objectives

18. These proposals are in line with the LTP objective of improving the street environment and reducing traffic congestion on the principal radial routes through the reduction of longer term on-street parking provision.

Financial Implications (including Revenue)

19. The cost of implementing this review is estimated to be around £35,000, including an allowance towards upgrading signs and lines to the current national standards which will put additional pressure on the parking account.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Cabinet Member for Transport is **RECOMMENDED** to:

- (a) **approve the making of The Oxfordshire County Council (Headington-West) (Controlled Parking Zone and Waiting Restrictions) Consolidation Order 20**;**
- (b) **authorise the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy Head of Highways & Transport to agree any further non-substantial variations he considers appropriate subject to him consulting the Cabinet Member for Transport on any material variation and undertaking any further consultation which he may consider appropriate.**

STEVE HOWELL

Deputy Director of Environment & Economy
Highways & Transport

Background papers: Document A, containing covering letter and questionnaire associated with the Informal Consultation, together with an analyses of the results;

Document B, containing a copy the consultation pack and deposit documents associated with the Formal Consultation;

Document C, containing emails and letters of comment associated with the Formal Consultation.

All the above are located in the Member's Resource Centre.

Contact Officers: Peter Egawhary, Tel 01865 815857
Dean Gildea, Tel 01865 815724

September 2010

ANNEX 1

**HEADINGTON WEST CPZ REVIEW
Summary of Proposed Changes**

Certain lengths of permit holder parking bays have been shortened in Barrington Close, Grays Road, Sandfield Road, Staunton Road and Valentia Road to take into account new access arrangements, in some cases, following rekerbing work undertaken in the past by the Oxford City Council. Locations where short-term waiting would be beneficial were identified in the preliminary street surveys, such as, outside flats, local shops and schools. In Woodlands Road, Grays Road and Latimer Road 1 hour limited waiting parking is proposed along a short length in each road.

In the resident's parking Zone HA additional 2-hours general public limited waiting parking spaces have been introduced in Woodlands Road to take into account parking needs in this area particularly for visitors to the flats in Beech Place and resident's of Woodlands Close where the on-street parking provision is very limited due to the narrow width of the close.

In the resident's parking Zone HB the hours of operation are being shortened to take into account public comment during the preliminary informal consultation carried out with residents. It is now proposed that the new hours of operation for all permit holder parking bays within roads in zone B will operate between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5.30 p.m.; Mondays – Fridays. Additionally, it is proposed to allow resident's unlimited waiting in the 2 hours general public limited waiting parking spaces within Zone HB which will continue to operate between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.; Mondays – Saturdays.

ZONE A

Beech Road	Bay swapped to other side away from mature trees and extended.
Fortnam Close	No change.
Franklin Road	No change apart from reduction of period of operation for the Public Service Vehicles' parking place.
Headington Road	No change.
Headley Way	No change.
Horwood Close	No change.
London Road	No change.
Sandfield Road	Some of the longer bays have been shortened and marked out to protect accessways.
Staunton Road	Some of the longer bays have been shortened and marked out to protect accessways.
Woodlands Close	No change.
Woodlands Road	Additional 'short-stay' 1-hr and 2-hr general public parking places.

ZONE B

Acland Close	No change.
All Saints Road	No change.
Barrington Close	Some of the longer bays have been shortened and marked out to protect accessways.
Bickerton Road	No change apart from the introduction of 2-Hr shared-use parking bay on the eastern side at the Old Road end.
Brookside	Introduction of 2-Hr shared-use parking places at north-western end. Permit Holder's Only parking bay outside No. 15 has been shortened.
Cardwell Crescent	No change.
Cheney Lane	Parking places without a time limit changed to 24 hour parking spaces with no return within 8 hours. The central section of parking is to be moved from the north to the south side.
Divinity Road	No change.
Demesne Furze	No change.
Finch Close	Additional Permit Holder's Only on-street parking place.
Gipsy Lane	No change.
Grays Road	Some of the longer bays have been shortened to protect accessways and the introduction of a 1-Hr parking bay outside local shops.
Harcourt Terrace	No change.
Highfield Avenue	Reduction in hours of operation. 2-Hr parking outside nos 19 and 21 on west side has been moved to the top of the road at the southern end and turned into 2-Hr shared-use.
Latimer Grange	No change.
Latimer Road	Increase in availability for visitor parking places and the introduction of a 1-Hr parking bay and the introduction of 2-Hr shared-use parking places at north-western end.
Mileway Gardens	No change.
Old Road	Waiting restrictions period of operation reduced to 6.30pm
Roosevelt Drive	Waiting restrictions extended from Old Road southwards and westwards to Boundary Brook
Skene Close	No change.
Stapleton Road	No change apart from the introduction of 2-Hr shared-use parking bay on the western side at the Old Road end.
Stonor Place	No change.
Valentia Road	Some of the longer bays have been shortened and marked out to protect accessways.
Warneford Lane	Parking places without a time limit changed to 24 hour parking spaces with no return within 8 hours. Bays on the south-eastern side individually marked out and accessways protected.

HEADINGTON WEST CPZ REVIEW
Summary of Public Comments

No.	Consultee	Location of change	Summary of Objection or Comment	Observations of the Director of Environment & Economy
1	Thames Valley Police	Various	No objections to the proposals. However the draft Order is not clear as to which end of Grays Road that entry is prohibited from Gypsy Lane – Which is referred to as ‘Gypsy Road’ in the Order.	The Order has been amended accordingly.
2	A Barrington Close Resident	Barrington Close	Requested further confirmation of proposals	Confirmation provided
3	Two Barrington Close residents	Barrington Close	Would like the hours of restriction increased to 7am to 7pm Monday to Saturday due to concerns of possible displaced parking from the adjacent Zone resulting from the proposed ‘Highfield Area’ Traffic Management Scheme.	The hours of restriction are being standardised across the whole Zone, which will be easier for everyone to understand and aid enforcement. Therefore it is not desirable to have differing hours of restriction in this Close. The Traffic Management Scheme referred to has been put on hold, however should it be implemented its effects will be monitored.
4	Oxford Essential	Beech Road	Supports moving the residents parking bay currently beneath a tree to the other side of the road, but due regard needs to be given to no. 13’s access requirements.	Support noted, and adequate allowance has been given in the proposed design for access requirements.
5	Granville Court Residents’ Association	Cheney Lane	They object to the entire length of Cheney Lane being restricted to 24 hour parking, with no return within 8 hours. Would like the length adjacent to Granville Court to be a residents parking area, but possibly with 2 hour ‘shared use’ parking. However, would not like this length to be left unrestricted if the restriction on the rest of Cheney Lane goes ahead.	All 52 of the Granville Court flats have their own garages, and the site has some additional parking. The 24 hour parking restriction on Cheney Lane would mean that vehicles could not be left there indefinitely, which would free up parking space. There are sufficient reasons to justify imposing the 24 hour parking restriction on Cheney Lane, however I will commit to carrying out further formal consultation regarding making the length adjacent to Granville Court a residents parking bay if the

CMDT4

				residents do experience a problem.
6	A resident of Cheney Lane	Cheney Lane	'Objects' to a 2 hour parking restriction in parts of Cheney Lane.	This is not part of these proposals. Obviously confusion has arisen following discussions with the above Residents Association.
	Rye St Anthony School	Franklin Road	Requests the provision of 30 minute parking bays for dropping off/collecting children.	Parents can temporarily stop on the double yellow lines for the purposes of 'unloading/loading'.
8	A Stapleton Road resident	Franklin Road	Requests the provision of more short stay parking for dropping off/collecting children.	As above.
9	Grays Road Stores	Grays Road	Had misunderstood the proposals to mean that traffic would be prohibited from entering the northern end of Grays Road from Gypsy Lane.	It was explained that this was not being proposed, and that the restriction in question was that already in place at the other end of Grays Road. The consultee was happy with this explanation.
10	A Highfield Avenue resident	Highfield Avenue	Supports the proposal to move the 2 hour parking space from outside nos. 19 & 20 to the top end of the road. Also points out that the traffic signs need changing	Noted.
11	Five Highfield Avenue residents	Highfield Avenue	Support all the proposals, particularly the re-positioning of the above 2 hour parking bay	Noted
12	A Latimer Road resident	Latimer Road	Is of the view that the parking at the NW end makes getting in/out of the junction difficult.	The proposed new lay-out is in accordance with current design & safety standards.
13	A Woodlands Road resident	Old Road	Supports the proposed changes. They also attached a letter concerning the speed limit on Old Road	Support noted. Letter regarding the speed limit forwarded to the relevant Officer for attention.
14	A Woodlands Road resident	Woodlands Road	Minicab drivers park in the residents parking bays and cause a nuisance. Creating short-term parking bays within the Road will 'legalise' this problem.	This issue has been referred to my Civil Enforcement Manager for attention. Comment was made at the informal consultation stage that residents and visitors found it difficult to find parking spaces. Creation of short-term parking spaces, and correct enforcement of the use of the residents bays should help alleviate these problems.

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s): East Oxford

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT – 21 OCTOBER 2010

OXFORD – TEMPLE COWLEY AREA PROPOSED CHANGES TO PARKING

Report by Deputy Director for Environment & Economy Highways & Transport

Introduction

1. This report considers comments received in response to a formal advertisement and statutory consultation to vary the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) covering various streets in the Temple Cowley area of Oxford. The predominant effect is to amend the extent and timing of no waiting restrictions in response to requests from local residents and as a result of site observations.

Background

2. The parking controls in this part of Cowley were last comprehensively reviewed in 1998. Since then there have been requests to amend and provide additional controls to prevent parked vehicles obstructing narrow sections of road and access ways. Requests have also been received to regulate parking associated with a business in Marsh Road and there have been changes to the pattern of parking with the closure and subsequent redevelopment of the Temple Cowley Middle School.

Informal Consultation

3. Following an initial assessment, letters were sent to local members, residents of Marsh Road, St. Christopher's Place and the affected length of Temple Road. This contained a plan showing initial proposals and invited comments.
4. The results of this informal consultation, which took place in May and June 2010, were fairly mixed with some responses requesting additional parking controls while others were concerned about a perceived loss of parking opportunities; the latter despite the documentation stating that additional parking was being provided to compensate for any loss. One resident also appeared to be concerned that the proposals had been developed to encourage large vehicles to by-pass congestion on the Oxford Road.
5. Following the informal consultation the various comments were considered and revised proposals produced which incorporated some of the more viable requests. Where suggestions were felt inappropriate those concerned were given an explanation as to why their ideas had not been incorporated. It was also explained that the improvements allowing easier access for larger

vehicles were to enable them to service premises in the area and not to encourage through traffic.

Formal Consultation

6. Formal consultation on the revised scheme was carried out between 15 July and 14 August 2010. Letters and plans explaining the revised scheme were sent to the same properties as the informal consultation. A summary of this revised scheme is attached at Annex 1. Notices explaining the proposals were placed on site and in the Oxford Times and information also sent to local Councillors and the emergency services. A copy of the public notice and other legal documents, which were placed on deposit in Cowley Library and at County Hall, are available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre.
7. E-mails were received from four residents of St. Christopher's Place and were broadly supportive. However, they requested amendments to the proposed layout of no waiting controls in the vicinity of numbers 10, 12 and 14 St. Christopher's Place. These are summarized at Annex 2 with copies of the emails being available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre.
8. No other comments were received in relation to the controls in the other two streets.

Additional Consultation concerning St. Christopher's Place

9. Following discussions with the residents directly alongside the section of St. Christopher's Place concerned a further revised layout of parking was devised for the Close. As this was only a minor departure from the original formal proposals, the additional consultation was restricted to numbers 1-15 St. Christopher's Place and local members. A plan showing this revised layout can also be inspected in the Members' Resource Centre.
10. This additional local consultation generated one comment from the resident of number 12 St. Christopher's Place who asked for their proposed access protection to be downgraded from no waiting at any time to no waiting Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm. It is recommended that this request be met.
11. There remain two unresolved requests arising from either the formal or additional consultations. Both concern the provision of additional no waiting restrictions in the vicinity of numbers 12 and 14 St Christopher's Place. However, the extent and duration of the controls in each request differ and officers feel that they may not be necessary. Consequently it is felt that these requests should be kept on file for consideration at a future time.

Conclusions

12. The earlier concerns regarding the loss of parking and possible increase in large vehicles which had been raised during the informal consultation appear to have been assuaged since there were no similar comments received during the formal consultation.

13. However, some changes to the proposals around the turning area in St. Christopher's Place are desirable to address most of the concerns received; these have been incorporated into the recommendations below

How the Project Supports LTP2 Objectives

14. The proposals described in this report comply with the LTP2 objectives of tackling congestion (encouraging development that minimises congestion) and improving the street environment (better management of parking).

Financial Implications (including Revenue)

15. Funding for the costs of implementing the proposals described in this report are estimated to be around £3500 (including advertising) which will put additional pressure on the parking account.

RECOMMENDATION

16. **The Cabinet Member for Transport is RECOMMENDED to approve the making of the Oxfordshire County Council (City Of Oxford Various Streets Cowley Area) (Traffic Regulation) Consolidation (Variation No.10*) Order 20** as advertised but with the following revisions:**
- (i) To provide no waiting at any time instead of no waiting Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm opposite number 10 St. Christopher's Place.**
 - (ii) To provide no waiting Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm instead of no waiting at any time outside number 10 St. Christopher's Place.**
 - (iii) To provide no waiting Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm instead of no waiting at any time across the access to number 12 St. Christopher's Place.**

STEVE HOWELL
Deputy Director for Environment & Economy
Highways & Transport

Background papers: Cnsultation documentation.

Contact Officer: Stephen Axtell Tel 01865 244432

September 2010

TEMPLE COWLEY AREA, OXFORD**DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS AS
FORMALLY PROPOSED****MARSH ROAD**

1. Additional 1 hour parking outside 4 Marsh Road. This would provide legitimate short stay parking for up to two vehicles visiting the area.
2. To remove part of the no waiting at any time outside 10 Marsh Road to provide one additional parking opportunity.
3. To extend the amount of no waiting at any time, outside the access to 32 Marsh Road, to prevent overhanging vehicles obstructing it. This would mostly be achieved by relocating the No Waiting, Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm towards the Oxford Road Junction.
4. To extend the amount of no waiting at any time, outside the access to 38 Marsh Road, to prevent overhanging vehicles obstructing it. This would replace a short length of the existing No Waiting, Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm.
5. The removal of some No Waiting, Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm (single yellow line) outside 42 Marsh Road to provide one additional parking opportunity.

ST. CHRISTOPHER'S PLACE

6. To introduce no waiting at any time on both sides of the road, from its junction with Temple Road to the first turning area containing numbers 8 to 14 St. Christopher's Place.
7. To introduce various lengths of no waiting at any time and no waiting, Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm, around the turning area containing 8 to 14 (evens) St. Christopher's Place. Plans showing the arrangement as originally proposed are available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre.*

TEMPLE ROAD

8. To replace the parking place opposite 2 Temple Road with No Waiting, Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm. This is to reduce congestion when larger oncoming vehicles meet at this location, during the day.*
9. To remove the no waiting at any time in front of the access ways to number 2A Crescent Road. This would allow a vehicle connected with the property to

CMDT5

park in front of the gates, thereby releasing a space elsewhere in Temple Road.*

10. To remove the no waiting at any time between the access ways to 28 and 30 Temple Road. This would compensate for the loss of parking elsewhere in the road.
11. To extend the amount of no waiting at any time, outside the access ways to 53A Temple Road, to prevent overhanging vehicles obstructing it.*
12. To provide additional no waiting at any time outside 48 Temple Road. This will coincide with the existing School Keep Clear markings near St Christopher's Church of England Primary School.
13. To replace the parking place opposite the entrance to St Christopher's School with No Waiting, Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm. This is to improve visibility safety for Children crossing the road and vehicles leaving St Christopher's Place.*
14. To move the parking place immediately east of the junction with St Christopher's Place slightly further away from the junction to improve visibility.

* Indicates proposal modified or introduced as a result of the Informal Consultation.

TEMPLE COWLEY AREA, OXFORD

Summary of Comments Received and Officer Response arising from the Formal Consultation

	Comment	Officer Response
1.	The resident feels that the proposals are a sensible approach. However, he considers that the no waiting at any time protecting the access to 12 St. Christopher's Place should be extended by 5 metres to ensure that large vehicles can manoeuvre unhindered.	It is believed that the extent of no waiting restrictions currently proposed is sufficient. It is therefore recommended that this addition is not progressed. Although these requests should be kept on file and reviewed next time Oxfordshire County Council has cause to vary this TRO. RECOMMEND: No TRO change.
2.	Another resident requested no waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm outside numbers 12 and 14 St. Christopher's Place.	
	He would also like no waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm outside to protect their access way in place of the no waiting at any time.	RECOMMEND: Amend the Traffic Regulation Order to reflect this request (see recommendation (iii)).
3.	One resident wondered if the sign for the no waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm (as originally proposed opposite 10 St Christopher's Place) could be placed on the lamp column on the opposite side of the road.	Such signs have to be placed on the same side of the road as the restriction and in accordance with various siting rules. However, this comment has been largely overtaken by events (see below) RECOMMEND: No TRO change.
4	Another resident asked for the no waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm (as originally proposed opposite 10 St Christopher's Place) to be moved to the same side as number 10.	This can only be achieved by protecting their access way with the no waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm, to which they agree. RECOMMEND: Amend the Traffic Regulation Order to reflect this request (see recommendations (i) & (ii))

Division(s): Bicester

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT – 21 OCTOBER 2010

BICESTER RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME MINOR AMENDMENTS

Report by Head of Highways & Transport

Introduction

1. This report considers comments and objections received to a formal advertisement and statutory consultation undertaken by Cherwell District Council to introduce a new Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to amend the Residents Parking Scheme in Bicester.

Background

2. The Residents Parking Scheme in Bicester is operated by Cherwell District Council (CDC) under an Agency Agreement, with the County Council retaining responsibility for the making and amending of all Traffic Regulation Orders. The Scheme began in 2008 and covers around 140 properties in six roads close to the town centre.
3. In accordance with the decision taken at Transport Decisions Committee in 2007 approving the original Scheme, officers of the two authorities have been reviewing the scheme in response to feedback from residents. Initial proposals were prepared which were the subject of formal consultation in early 2010. It was clear from the responses to that consultation that further work was needed to produce a more acceptable solution. As a result a new proposal was advertised several months later and this report describes the outcome of that consultation.

Formal Consultation

4. Formal consultation on the revised Bicester Residents Parking Scheme (along with minor changes to associated waiting restrictions) was undertaken by Cherwell District Council in June/July 2010. Letters were sent to all properties in the streets affected, notices explaining the proposals placed on site and in the Oxford Times, information sent to Councillors and the emergency services and legal documents placed on deposit at County Hall and the Cherwell District Council offices in Bicester and Banbury. A copy of the Notice of Proposal which summarises the proposal is attached at Annex 1.

Consultation responses

5. A total of 14 responses were received by Cherwell District Council of which 2 were sent anonymously. The Cherwell District Council Portfolio Holder report attached at Annex 2 sets out (in Appendix 2) the issues raised by consultees.

There was particular concern regarding the proposed removal of permit eligibility for numbers 13/15/17 Kings End and changes to parking restrictions outside these properties.

6. Following discussions internally and with County officers, Cherwell District Council carried out a supplementary local consultation to amend the proposals to retain the status quo as requested by the objectors. This resulted in one new objection (see Appendix 3 of Annex 2).
7. Copies of all the letters/emails received during both consultations are available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre.
8. There remain four further matters on which objections have been received and not resolved.

- (a) Three residents have objected to the proposed increase in the cost of resident permits from £50 for the first permit (£25 for the second permit) to £84 plus £16 administration charge for each permit.

In response Cherwell District Council propose that the £84 will be discounted by up to 50% pending the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement.

- (b) Two residents have objected that as properties with off-street parking retain the ability to obtain one (currently two) resident permit as this plus the ability to park on the road across their driveways effectively gives 3 spaces.

In response, this is unlikely to be a significant issue as the number of properties concerned is very small and the driveways generally quite narrow making parking across them between parking bays very difficult.

- (c) One resident has objected to the introduction of charges for visitor permits. The proposed charge is £12.50 per block of 25 permits, with a maximum of 100 permits per household; holders of Residents Permits will be entitled to two free blocks.

In response, Cherwell District Council has indicated that they consider that those households which benefit from the scheme should contribute to its costs.

- (d) One resident has objected to the continuing provision of permits for camper vans. The current facility is proposed to be curtailed so that only those residents with a current permit can continue to use it with the camper van they currently own. This concession will come to end if they move or dispose of their current camper van.

This is considered to be a reasonable approach to dealing with a very localised issue

Conclusions

9. The proposals contained in the formal consultation (as amended by the supplementary consultation) appear to meet the needs of the majority of local residents. On the matter of the introduction of and/or increase in charges for permits, under the Agency Agreement this is a matter for Cherwell District Council to justify but it does not seem unreasonable given the size of the Scheme.
10. With regard to the issues in Kings End, unfortunately neither the proposals put forward initially by Cherwell District Council nor those in the supplementary consultation received complete support. In the circumstances it is felt that retaining the current arrangements (as proposed in the supplementary consultation) is the best option.
11. The other outstanding concerns are ones which none of the proposals completely resolve but the new Scheme will provide an improvement to the current situation.

How the Project Supports LTP2 Objectives

12. The proposals described in this report relate to the LTP2 objective of improving the Street Environment (better management of parking).

Financial Implications (including Revenue)

13. Funding for the costs of implementing the proposals described in this report, including advertising, will be met by Cherwell District Council.

RECOMMENDATION

14. **The Cabinet Member for Transport is RECOMMENDED to approve the proposed changes to the Bicester Residents Parking Scheme as advertised in the Oxfordshire County Council (Various Roads, Bicester) (Parking) Order 20** (and revised in the supplementary consultation) and the Oxfordshire County Council (Bicester) (Traffic Regulation) Amendment Order 20****

STEVE HOWELL
Head of Highways & Transport
Environment & Economy

Background papers: Consultation documentation.

Contact Officer: David Tole Tel: 01865 815942

September 2010



OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (VARIOUS ROADS, BICESTER) (PARKING) ORDER 20**

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (BICESTER)(TRAFFIC REGULATION)(AMENDMENT) ORDER 20**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Oxfordshire County Council propose to make the above mentioned Orders under Sections 1,2, 4, 32, 35, 45, 46 and 49 of and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and all other enabling powers.

Consultation in compliance with regulatory requirements for an order to replace the Oxfordshire County Council (Various Roads, Bicester) (Parking) Order 2007 ("Parking Order 2007") was initiated in January 2010 but that proposal has now been abandoned and is replaced by this proposal.

The effect of the proposed orders is to amend the provisions of the Parking Order 2007 by revoking that order and replacing it by a new one and making consequential revisions to the Oxfordshire County Council (Bicester)(Traffic Regulation) Order 1992 as varied. The new orders will provide as follows:-

1. To provide parking places for permit holders at all times along parts of Chapel Street, Church Lane, Kings End, North Street, Priory Road, Victoria Court and Victoria Road Bicester. Non permit holders will be precluded from waiting in these parking places. ***The existing permit parking on Kings End east of Coker Close will be extended and that west of Coker Close will be removed and replaced by No Waiting 8.00am to 6.00pm Mondays to Saturdays.***
2. To correct the description of existing lengths of No Waiting At Any Time restrictions along Kings End to correspond with current markings on site
3. Residents' permits will be available to the residents of the following properties

(1)	Victoria Road	1 – 9 odd numbers only 51 – 54 inclusive 1 – 13 inclusive – Bath Terrace 1 – 8 inclusive – Manchester Terrace 1 – 8 inclusive – Newport Terrace
(2)	Priory Road	1 – 59 odd number only 2, 4, 16 and 18
(3)	North Street	12, 14, 16, 18, 26, 28, 60A and 62A 33 – 67 odd numbers only (including 65A)
(4)	Church Lane	1A (The Barn) and 1 – 5 inclusive
(5)	Henley Gardens	1 – 8 inclusive except 6 (which does not exist)
(6)	Kings End	27 – 39 odd number only – <i>13-17 Kings End will no longer be eligible</i>

('the Properties') but any Property which has or in the future constructs an off-street parking place e.g. hard standing driveway or garage at the Property which can accommodate more than one vehicle will not /will cease to be eligible for any Residents' Permits. ***This is a new constraint.***

4. Residents' permits will be limited to two per household – one per household when the property has off street parking for one vehicle - and will cost £84 Index Linked per annum for

CMDT6

each permit together with an administration charge of £16 Index Linked per annum. Currently the charge is £50 for the first permit and £25 for the second permit but there will be a discretion to discount the £84 fee by up to 50% pending a change in enforcement procedures. Up to two vehicles may be designated on a permit.

5. Visitors' permits will be available for residents of the Properties. Usually a maximum of 100 (instead of 104) days' worth of visitors' permits will be issued per year for each household in blocks of 25. A charge of £12.50 per block of 25 permits is proposed but holders of Residents' Permits are entitled to the first 2 blocks free of charge. Currently all visitors' permits are free of charge
6. A permit may be withdrawn if a permit is not being used in accordance with the provisions of the Order or if it is being abused. This will also result in suspension of eligibility for a further permit.
7. Permits will be issued to medical practices for use when visiting patients at Properties. The issue of these permits will be undertaken in liaison with Oxfordshire Primary Health Care Trust NHS but a new limit is proposed of a maximum of 4 permits per medical practice.
8. Parking places may only be used by motor cycles and vehicles which do not exceed 2.25 tons in weight, 2 metres in height, 5 metres in length or 2 metres in width. It is proposed that there will no longer be an exemption for camper vans save for a concession which will apply to 1 permit per household for current residents only for use with the camper van they currently own. This concession will come to end if they move or dispose of their current camper van.
9. Parking in permit places will also be permitted for disabled badge holders, loading and unloading, waste collection, people to board and alight, emergency services, universal service providers (eg Royal Mail), local authorities carrying out their functions, vehicles being used in connection with roadworks and works to utilities and for official funeral vehicles.
10. Contractors may apply for a permit to use a parking place at a charge of £15 index linked for any period up to a week.
11. The charges for permits and the administration charge will be adjusted annually according to RPI (no earlier than April 2012). The administration charge of £16 index linked will also apply if a refund of any permit charge is sought if a replacement permit is requested or a permit variation is requested.

Oxfordshire County Council have entered into an agency agreement with Cherwell District Council who will operate and enforce the parking scheme.

Documents giving more detailed particulars of the Order are available for public inspection at County Hall, New Road, Oxford OX1 1ND from 9.00 am to 4.00 pm Monday to Friday, Bodicote House, Banbury from 8.45 am to 5.15 pm Monday to Thursday and 8.45 am to 4.20 pm on Friday and 38 Market Square, Bicester from 8.45 am to 1.00 pm and 2.00 pm to 4.45 pm on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday (10.00 am to 5.15 pm on Wednesdays) and from 8.45 am to 1.00 pm and 2.00 pm to 4.00 pm on Friday.

Objections to the proposals, specifying the grounds on which they are made, and any other representations, should be sent in writing to the Head of Safer Communities at Cherwell District Council, Bodicote House, Bodicote, nr Banbury, Oxon. OX15 4AA (quoting reference CR) no later than 16th July 2010. The District and County Councils will consider objections and representations received in response to this Notice. They may be disseminated widely for these purposes and made available to the public.

Dated: 17th June 2010

H Jones
Director for Environment and Economy
Oxfordshire County Council
c/o Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxfordshire
OX15 4AA

Portfolio Holder Report for Policy, Community Planning and Community Development

Bicester Residents Parking

Report of Head of Safer Communities Urban and Rural Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To summarise consultation outcomes.

To confirm proposed scheme details for April 2011 for recommendation to Oxfordshire County Council for approval.

This report is public
Reason Non-Key

Recommendations

The Portfolio Holder is recommended to:

- (1) Note the outcomes of the consultation exercises undertaken with residents.
- (2) Note that authority for making the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) rests with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) as the Highway Authority.
- (3) Approve the proposed scheme amendments set out at paragraph 1.11 to be recommended to OCC for implemented from 1 April 2011, subject to OCC agreement.

Executive Summary

Introduction

- 1.1 A residents parking scheme was introduced for designated roads in Bicester in 2008 under The Oxfordshire County Council (Various Roads, Bicester) (Parking) Order 2007.
- 1.2 Following the experience of running the scheme for a couple of years amendments to scheme arrangements were proposed and consulted on under a revised 2010 TRO. Following consultation feedback the decision was taken not to vary the 2007 Order but to leave that in place for a further year from April 2010 whilst further investigations were undertaken.
- 1.3 Following this further investigation a revised draft TRO was advertised for consultation and feedback received. Further amendments were proposed and a final consultation process undertaken with those residents directly impacted on by the proposed amendments. This consultation came to a close at the end of August 2010.

- 1.4 A revised residents parking scheme is now proposed for recommendation to OCC for introduction in April 2011.

Conclusion

A revised Residents parking scheme be recommended for adoption to OCC following the detailed consultation that has taken place during 2008, 2009 and 2010. The scheme is designed to benefit the greatest number of residents that live in Eligible Properties but can not satisfy every individual property owner's requirements.

Background Information	
1.5	2007 TRO: The original scheme was introduced on 2 January 2008 under the 2007 TRO. Following the experience of running the scheme, amendments were informally consulted on with a view to a revised scheme being implemented in April 2010.
1.6	The consultation resulted in various feedback, reproduced at Appendix 1, that required more detailed assessment so decision was taken to continue with the existing scheme in 2010 whilst this further work was undertaken.
1.7	A revised draft TRO was advertised and consulted on in June/July 2010 and consultation feedback published on the Council's website. A summary of this, together with the Officer recommendations, is at Appendix 2.
1.8	A further consultation then took place with residents in Kings End on amendments to the proposals in the light of the comments received from the June/July consultation. A summary of this, together with the Officer recommendations, is at Appendix 3. This information has also been published on the Council's website.
1.9	Where responses have been anonymous or they have not been submitted in writing they have not been considered.
1.10	It is now proposed to seek approval from OCC to a revised TRO as set out below.
1.11	Proposals for recommendation to Oxfordshire County Council for a revised Traffic Regulation Order for Bicester Residents Parking Scheme as advertised <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That 27-39 Kings End continue to be included in the scheme as eligible properties • All properties with off road parking for one vehicle be allowed to purchase one parking permit only. • That an additional area of highway on Kings End be included as designated Residents Parking bays. • Increase in cost of permits to £84 and £16 administration fee. Currently the charge is £50 for the first permit and £25 for the second permit but there will be discretion to discount the £84 fee by up to 50% pending a change in enforcement procedures. • Visitors' permits: will be available for residents of the Properties. A maximum of 100 permits will be issued per year for each household in blocks of 25. A charge of £12.50 per block of 25 permits is proposed but holders of Residents' Permits are entitled to the first 2 blocks free of charge. Currently all visitors' permits are free of charge. • No longer an exemption for camper vans save for a concession which will apply to 1 permit per household for current residents only for use with the camper van they currently own. This concession will come to end if they move or dispose of their current camper van. • Retention of keep clear markings on Priory Road as current.

Key Issues for Consideration/Reasons for Decision and Options

- 3.1 The proposed scheme follows detailed consultation with residents and aims to provide a Scheme to benefit the majority of residents in streets covered by the TRO.
- 3.2 Without Civil Parking Enforcement in place enforcement will continue in partnership with Thames Valley Police as Council Wardens do not have the powers to issue Penalty Notices.

The following options have been identified. The approach in the recommendations is believed to be the best way forward

Option One	Amend the 2007 TRO in line with the findings from the consultation processes
Option Two	Scrap the scheme entirely
Option Three	Do nothing and retain the 2007 Order.

Consultations

Oxfordshire County Council	OCC have been fully consulted on each stage of the consultation process.
Bicester Town Council	Have been kept informed of the proposals and have assisted in the consultation with display of information.
Residents	Residents and businesses in the streets included in the draft Order have been consulted and their feedback taken into account where possible in the final TRO.

Implications

Financial:	The proposals set out in this report can be implemented within the agreed budget. Comments checked by Joanne Kaye, Service Accountant 01295 221545
Risk Management:	There remains a risk that some residents will not be happy with the proposed schemes as there specific requirements are not being met. Comments checked by Rosemary Watts, Risk and Insurance Manager 01295 221566
Legal:	Residents could challenge the Council's process through judicial review, but as the scheme has gone through 3 consultation processes it is considered to be low risk. Comments checked by Malcolm Saunders, Senior Legal Assistant 01295 221692.

Wards Affected

All Bicester Wards

Corporate Plan Themes

An Accessible Value for Money Council

Executive Portfolio

Councillor Nigel Morris
Portfolio Holder for Community Safety, Street Scene and Rural services

Document Information

Appendix No	Title
1	Summary of consultation responses to the draft 2010 TRO
2	Summary of January 2010 consultation responses
3	Summary of August 2010 consultation responses
Background Papers	
Oxfordshire County Council (Various Roads, Bicester) (Parking) Order 2007	
Report Author	Chris Rothwell, Head of Safer Communities, Urban and Rural Services
Contact Information	01295 221712 chris.rothwell@Cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Summary of consultation feedback on the draft 2010 TRO

The updates in red below present the position that has been negotiated with Oxfordshire County Council following the consultation last year. Not all matters can be resolved but the changes that can be made and improve the scheme are being proposed in the revised Order. This will be advertised formally in the New Year and responses taken into account prior to any Order being Made.

Residents comments about Enforcement of the Scheme

The following comments were made by residents about enforcement:

- More enforcement required.
- Why can't the Council issue tickets?
- Council should prosecute vehicle owners that abuse the scheme.
- Specific residents that abuse the scheme should be warned.
- Problem is mainly Friday nights and weekends.
- Lots of cars park outside the Methodist Church.
- Provide telephone numbers for inspectors.
- Improve signage.

Council's Response

We need to demonstrate that we are doing more to ensure the Scheme is operating correctly and fairly and is not being abused by a minority of residents, or commuters/visitors.

Unfortunately Cherwell District Council does not have the legal powers to issue Penalty Notices for On Street parking offences. We are looking to achieve this through a process called Civil Parking Enforcement that will see this power transfer from the Police to the Council. The process for this requires legal agreements to be drawn up and an application to the Secretary of State. It will be Spring 2010 before this is achieved as there are wider parking related matters that have to be organised and Secretary of State approval secured. This is a process that the Council can not readily control the timescales on.

In the meantime, Thames Valley Police are working with us to police the Scheme and issue Fixed Penalty Notices where vehicles do not display valid permits. We are aware that there are still instances of cars parking without valid permits so we are planning a targeted enforcement campaign with the police.

In addition, evidence has been and will continue to be gathered on persistent offenders so that prosecution action can be brought against them.

Mobile numbers of the inspectors will not be issued but there is a hotline number (01295 221993) and e mail address parking.services@cherwell-dc.gov.uk on which you can let us have details of any issues/incidents. This will not generate immediate response but allows us to gather intelligence as well as advise Wardens of issues.

Signage will be reviewed if there are any material changes to the scheme, but this may delay introduction of any changes.

December 2009 Update

Oxfordshire County Council have advised that Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) is not one of its current transport priorities and have not therefore been able to put any resources to progressing this work with Cherwell District Council.

This means CDC is still lacking the transfer of enforcement powers from the police and continues to operate through PCSO's.

Talks are continuing as CDC does have CPE as a priority. Timescales will have to be extended and it will not be possible to introduce CPE (if agreed) inside of 18 months.

A report to the Council's Executive is planned for 11 January 2010.

Residents feedback on space available for residents parking.

The following comments were made by residents:

- Permits should only be available to properties that do not have off street parking.
- Space is taken up by inconsiderate parking by residents.
- It might be better to identify parking bays by road markings.
- Residents should only be allowed to park in the streets they live.

Council's Response

The Order currently sets out the specific properties that are eligible for permits. The Council consider that only properties without off street parking (garage, driveway, other parking that is not on the public highway) should be eligible and will be looking into this with OCC.

The current Scheme operates without sub zones to offer the best flexibility for parking by residents. To move to designated zones can be done but would require a new Order and new signage. No decision has yet been taken on this but, in the short term, it is unlikely that OCC would agree to such a change prior to the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement.

The existing road markings do not designate parking bays as vehicle size can vary. The Council's view is that this approach helps to maximise parking space whereas designated bays would reduce available parking space.

Unfortunately not everyone considers the impact of their parking on others. This should be self policing (as it affects all scheme participants). The Council will enforce the Scheme as set out above but we believe it is for residents and neighbours to be considerate in their parking to ensure the Scheme works to residents benefit.

December 2009 Update

The proposal is for:

- Only properties without off street parking to be eligible for a residents permit.
- All properties within the streets covered by the Order to be eligible for visitor permits.
- Existing road markings to be retained. Individual bays not to be marked.
- Where there is capacity for additional parking, bays to be extended.
- Individual Zones not being introduced. The new Order to continue to cover Bicester and the eligible streets.

Residents feedback on Visitor Permits

The following comments were made by residents:

- Visitor permits should not be issued.
- Visitor permits should be 24 hour and not run out at 2359 hours.
- Should be maximum 3 hour stay only.
- Should be available free to non permit holders.
- Should be free.
- Free to houses with off street parking.
- Same cost for all. Should reduce the number of visitor permits.
- 100 visitor permits is not enough.
- Unused permits should be allowed to be used the following year.

Council's Response

The reason for introducing the Scheme was to exclude non residents parking to enable home owners to park close to their homes. We recognise however that the Scheme should try and reasonably accommodate visitor parking, albeit that pay and display parking is fairly close to most roads in the Scheme and these car parks are free after 6pm Mon-Sat and 4pm Sun.

We envisage Visitor Permits continuing but will look at cost and operation of these.

The Council are concerned that Visitor permits are being abused by a small number of residents. Action is being planned to stamp this out.

We also need to consider the various options with the current scratch cards and feel that there are benefits of 24 hour permits rather than the current arrangement where visitor permits expire at 23.59.

We will be looking at permits costs and will resolve through an allocation of free and/or chargeable visitor permits. This type of approach enables all residents in permit areas to benefit from an allocation of free Visitor Permits for their visitors and also have a choice to purchase a further allocation for their visitors. There will need to be a limit.

Unused permits need to have expiry date in order to ensure that demand for parking places can be monitored and consequently there are no plans to move away from end of term expiry.

December 2009 Update

The proposal is for:

- The changes made to the Visitor permits for the 2009 Scheme to be retained so that they operate for 24 hours.
- Visitor permits to be available to all Residents (as defined by the Order) covered by the Scheme.
- Permits to no longer be issued free of charge. The proposal is that permits be available in books of 25 and cost £12.50 per book.
- A maximum of 100 permits per property within the Scheme area in each year of the Scheme. Part year applications to be allocated on a pro-rata basis.
- Eligible Residents that purchase a Residents Parking Permit to be able to apply and be issued with the first 50 Visitor Permits free of charge. Additional permit costs and restrictions as above.

Residents feedback on Medical Carers and Family Carers Permit

The following comments were made by residents:

- A Medical Carers Permit is required for all health professionals.
- Family Carers should use Visitor Permits.
- Family carers should get permit free.

Council's Response

The Residents Parking Scheme was introduced with the primary aim of making parking more accessible for residents. This principle has to continue to be the basis of the Scheme otherwise the complexities of trying to cover other requirements will make it non viable.

The Council's proposal is to continue to offer Medical Carers Permits but to limit the numbers as there are currently 85 Medical Carers Permits issued to Health Care Agencies.

With the Scheme emphasis on residents, it is felt reasonable to introduce a restriction bearing in mind that there is available parking close to hand in public car parks and that emergency vehicles are exempt from restrictions.

The Council also propose a Family Carers Permit when it can be demonstrated that a resident at an Eligible Property has need for care, this to be demonstrated via letter of support from the residents GP. Permits are proposed at the same cost as Residents Permits.

December 2009 Update

OCC have asked that this be deferred pending a review of proposals across the county and CDC have agreed to this.

Residents feedback on Blue Badge Holders

The following comments were made by residents:

- Not happy that Blue Badge Holders should be able to park free.
- Blue Badge Holders should not have to pay.

Council's Response

The Council current thinking is:

- Blue Badge Holders that are not permit holders should be allowed to park in residents parking areas subject to the Blue Badge Scheme conditions i.e. maximum stay restrictions and provided Blue Badge and clock are displayed.
- Blue Badge Holders that are Eligible Residents and wish to benefit from Residents Parking be required to purchase a Residents Parking Permit. There may be eligibility to apply to OCC for disabled parking bay.

December 2009 Update

The proposal is for Disabled Persons Vehicles to be exempt from the requirement for 'permit parking only in a 'Parking Place' provided it displays in the relevant position a Disabled Person's Badge.

Residents feedback about second permit

35 respondents agreed with the limit of 2 permits. 4 respondents did not agree.

The following comments were made by residents:

- Scrap the second permit.
- Issue one permit to every eligible resident that applies.
- Happy with 2 permits.
- More then 2 permits should be available.
- Second permit should be at same cost as first.
- Second permit should be at higher cost.
- Second permit should be at lower cost.

Council's Response

Currently there are 35 second permits in the Bicester scheme at 50% of the price of a first permit. It is possible that demand will expand over time and so this needs to be kept under review.

Most scheme participants have no problems with finding parking spaces close to their homes so it is likely that the limit to 2 permits will remain.

There are two or three small areas where specific issues are causing concern to a few residents. Some of these issues can be overcome by better enforcement, others by moving to a position where Eligible Properties do not have off street parking. We also have to recognise that there may be some issues that cannot be resolved without negative impact on greater number of residents. In these circumstances we have to be pragmatic. This may take the form of no changes being made.

Our current thinking is that a maximum of 2 permits continue to be made available but that this is kept under review. Costs are currently proposed at the same level as first permits to ensure fairness in scheme costs.

December 2009 Update

The proposal is for:

- Two permits to be allowed per Eligible Property and a maximum of two vehicle registrations per permit.
- Permits to cost **up to** £84 for each permit
- No discount for second permit
- An administration charge of £16 per permit
- Permit costs to rise annually by inflation once £84 level has been reached.

NOTE: The £84 cost is likely to be discounted in 2010. Probable cost is £42 per permit plus the admin charge making a permit £56.

Residents feedback on other monitoring.

The following comments were made by residents:

- Provide CCTV.
- Provide 24 hour monitoring.
- Install speed ramps.

Council's Response

It is not proposed that these suggestions be considered further due to costs. If they were, permit costs would have to increase considerably and it is not considered that the current scheme requires these to operate effectively.

December 2009 Update

Not being progressed.

Residents feedback on Permitted Vehicles

- The only concerns raised are on height of vehicles being restricted to 2.0m

Council's Response

The Order specifies the requirements for vehicles to be classed as a Permitted Vehicle. Camper Vans are currently exempt from any restriction. This may be too vague and the Council will review this with OCC.

December 2009 Update

The proposal is for:

- Continuation of the existing Permitted Vehicles requirements
- One motor caravan permitted per Dwelling, subject to specified restrictions

Motor Caravans

There may be issued to the Residents' Permit Holder who is the holder of a Residents' Permit at the date of this Order a Residents' Permit for the leaving of a motor caravan of which the Resident's Permit Holder is the Registered Owner/Keeper (as recorded in the records of Cherwell District Council) at the date of this Order provided always that:

- (1) *this concession shall only apply to one Residents' Permit issued during a year and if that Resident or any other Resident at the same Dwelling applies for a further Residents' Permit during the year in question it may only be issued for the leaving of a Permitted Vehicle(s); and.*
- (2) *for the avoidance of doubt this concession shall cease to apply if that Residents' Permit Holder ceases to be a Resident at the Dwelling in which he resides at the date of this Order and/or if that Residents' Permit Holder ceases to be the Registered Owner/Keeper of that motor caravan (as recorded in the records of Cherwell District Council at the date of this Order).*

Residents feedback on Eligible Properties

- There are concerns about properties with off street parking and a specific concern about which properties are eligible to park in which areas.

Council's Response

The Order sets out Eligible Properties. We will review the situation on properties that have off street parking, and we have raised with OCC the issue of drop curbs and white lines in front of property accesses.

There are no legal powers to designate on street parking to specific properties so there will be no change to this.

Where there are no restrictions in place, drivers are free to park where they choose provided vehicles are not parked dangerously or so as to cause an obstruction or hazard.

Zoning could be considered but this would have cost implications as is unlikely to solve the specific matters raised. This has been raised with OCC and it is unlikely to be supported.

December 2009 Update

The proposal is for:

- Only properties that do not have off-street parking to be eligible
- No sub zoning to be introduced. Permits to be valid in any of the streets covered by the Order.

Residents feedback on North Road issues and the Chinese Take Away/Fish and Chip Shop

These businesses have many short term stop offs to their premises which restricts parking to Eligible Residents.

Council's Response

We acknowledge that this is occurring. Prior to introduction of the Residents parking scheme, similar vehicle parking practices were taking place.

On balance, as the Scheme has decreased the amount of commuter parking that existed prior to its introduction, with consequent benefits to residents, and the business has to operate with short term visitor vehicles, a pragmatic view is likely to be taken as there do not appear to be any ready solutions to this.

December 2009 Update

No amendments proposed.

Bicester Residents Parking: Traffic Regulation Order proposals from 1 April 2011**Summary of Consultation responses**

Public consultation on revised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) has taken place with closing date for responses of 16 July 2010.

There are 120 Eligible Properties and 83 households involved in the 2010 scheme.

Of the 120 Eligible Properties, responses have been received from 14, two of which have been sent anonymously and are not therefore included in the summary below.

Ref	Traffic Regulation Order Proposal	Consultation Responses	Council Officers Response
1	That 27-39 Kings End continue to be included in the scheme as eligible properties	5 in support. 1 objection	27-39 Kings End continue to be Eligible Properties.
2	Reinstatement of single yellow line traffic restriction between 0800-1800 on length of highway outside No. 13-17 Kings End.	5 objections 1 in support subject to being eligible for the scheme.	Not to reinstate the single yellow line restriction and to retain designated residents only parking bay outside No. 13-17 Kings End.(see below)
3	No 13-17 Kings End and properties 13-17 Kings End no longer be classed as eligible properties	6 objections 1 objection but linked to Ref 1 and 2 above.	No. 13-17 to remain as Eligible Properties.(see below)
4	All properties with off road parking for one vehicle be allowed to purchase a parking permit for one vehicle only	2 objections	All properties with off road parking for one vehicle be allowed to purchase a parking permit for one vehicle only. The objections referred to ability of residents with drop curbs to park on the solid white line in front of the kerb thereby

CMDT6

			giving these properties 3 parking spaces. As parking on solid white lines is prohibited and enforceable, parking for two vehicles maintains equity across the scheme.
5	That an additional area of highway on Kings End be included as designated Residents Parking bays.	1 objection received.	Additional area of highway to be included in the scheme as this provides greater capacity for permit holders to park on Kings End and because the majority of responses relative to ref 1-3 above support a residents parking scheme in Kings End.
6	Increase in cost of permits to £84 and £16 administration fee.	4 objections	Permits costs to increase in line with the TRO proposal to cover the costs of running and administering the scheme. The Council will consider discount of costs by up to 50% pending introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement.
7	Visitors' permits: will be available for residents of the Properties. A maximum of 100 permits will be issued per year for each household in blocks of 25. A charge of £12.50 per block of 25 permits is proposed but holders of Residents' Permits are entitled to the first 2 blocks free of charge. Currently all visitors' permits are free of charge	1 objection	Visitor Permits to be introduced in line with the TRO proposal. The Council considers that a fair and equitable scheme is achieved by all households that benefit from parking in residents only areas contributing to the costs of managing and administering the scheme.
8	No longer an exemption for camper vans save for a concession which will apply to 1 permit per household for current residents only for use with the camper van they currently own. This concession will come to end if they move or dispose of their current camper van.	1 objection	Camper van eligibility in line with the TRO proposal.
9	Enforcement	3 comments received	Enforcement activity will continue in conjunction with Thames Valley Police and Fixed Penalty Notices issued. The Council's Vehicle Parks staff do not have powers to

CMDT6

			enforce, but will continue to take action under the TRO and remove entitlement to permits where there is abuse of the scheme. This could and has led to court proceedings being taken.
--	--	--	--

In addition to the feedback summarised above, some correspondence made reference to other issues that are not part of the consultation on the Traffic Regulation Order and have not therefore been included.

The Council Officer responses indicate a recommendation to proceed with the advertised proposals with a retraction of the proposals listed as reference 2 and 3 above. The Council will now write to all eligible properties in Kings End to notify them of the proposed retractions giving them a further 21 days to register any further comments/objections.

It should be noted that the Council Officer Responses do not form a decision, and that the District and County Councils will consider objections and representations received in response to the advertised proposals at a member (Councillor) level.

Appendix 3

Bicester Residents Parking: Traffic Regulation Order proposals from 1 April 2011**Summary of August 2010 Consultation responses**

Following the June/July 2010 consultation, a further process took place with properties in Kings End to seek feedback arising from the earlier consultation exercise. The August 2010 consultation was limited to a total of 10 properties as no others were directly affected by the proposals.

Ref	Traffic Regulation Order Proposal	Consultation Responses	Council Officers Response
1	Not to reinstate the single yellow line traffic restriction between 0800-1800 on length of highway outside No. 13-17 Kings End and Retain existing residents parking only bays outside No. 13-17 kings End Reason: On basis of objections received during the previous consultation.	1 objection	As per the proposal
2	Not to remove eligibility of No. 13-17 Kings End properties. Reason: On basis of feedback received during the previous consultation and in view of the actions proposed in 1 above.	No objections	As per the proposal