

## DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Thursday, 8 October 2020 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 11.08 am

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor Ian Hudspeth (In place of Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE) – in the Chair

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillor Glynis Phillips (for Agenda Item 4)  
Councillor John Howson (for Agenda Item 5)  
Councillor Kevin Bulmer (for Agenda Item 7)  
Councillor Charles Mathew (for Agenda Item 9)

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting G. Warrington (Law & Governance); P. Fermer & H. Potter (Community Operations)

Part of meeting

| <b>Agenda Item</b> | <b>Officer Attending</b>                     |
|--------------------|--|
| 4, 5 & 6           | J. Whiting & B. Smith (Community Operations) |
| 7                  | L. Turner (Community Operations)             |
| 8                  | A. Morton (Community Operations)             |
| 9                  | M. Wasley (Community Operations)             |
| 10                 | K. Broughton (Planning & Place)              |

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

**1/20 APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT**

(Agenda No. )

| <i>Apology for Absence</i>                                   | <i>Temporary Appointment</i>                    |
|--|---|
| Councillor Yvonne Constance – Cabinet Member for Environment | Councillor Ian Hudspeth – Leader of the Council |

**2/20 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS**

(Agenda No. 2)

No questions from County Councillors were received.

**3/20 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda No. 3)

| <i>Speaker</i>   | <i>Item</i>  |
|--|--|
| County Councillor Glynis Phillips                                      | 4. Oxford – Sandhills Area: Proposed Controlled Parking Zone                         |
| James Poole (Local resident)<br>City Councillor Mary Clarkson          | 5. Oxford – Marston North: Proposed Controlled Parking Zone                          |
| County Councillor John Howson  | 6. Oxford – Waterways: Proposed Controlled Parking Zone                              |
| County Councillor Kevin Bulmer   | 7. Goring: B4009 High Street – Proposed Traffic Calming Measures                     |
| Ron Carter (Local Resident)  | 8. Long Wittenham: Didcot Road – Proposed Zebra Crossing and Revised Traffic Calming |
| Vincent Goodstadt (Local Resident)<br>County Councillor Charles Mathew | 9. Eynsham: Various Streets – Proposed Waiting Restrictions                          |

**4/20 OXFORD - SANDHILLS AREA: PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ)**

(Agenda No. 4)

The Leader of the Council considered (CMDE4) responses received to a formal consultation on a new Controlled parking Zone in the Sandhills Area.

Councillor Glynis Phillips the local member spoke against approval of the proposal as advertised for a Controlled Parking Zone in the Sandhills area. She had been disappointed at the level of response from residents to the consultation but of those

43 (69%) were either opposed or strongly opposed to the proposal with only 14 in support. She suspected that the low response rate could be attributed to the large number of properties in Sandhills which had drives. However, despite the low response the consultation had reached a clear outcome which should be respected. There was no point holding a consultation exercise if the outcome was then ignored and it would not be reasonable to impose charges on an area when only 14 people had been supportive. She supported the objections from the residents in Green Ridges which had no road link to Sandhills, was in Barton with no parking problems and so would be wholly unreasonable to include it on the back of a Sandhills consultation. The objectors, the majority of whom were residents not adversely affected by inconsiderate parking by people who parked in Sandhills to avoid the charges at the Thornhill Park & Ride had queried the need for a CPZ. A number of them considered that existing parking restrictions with extended double yellow lines in certain areas would be adequate given proper enforcement priority and they saw that as the way forward for this area. The Cabinet Member for Environment had previously made it clear that there was no funding available to initiate CPZ consultations in Barton and Risinghurst so the risk of displacement parking from these areas was not imminent. Residents seemed aware of the risk in not becoming a CPZ now but, on balance, had decided by a considerable margin that they did not want Sandhills to become a CPZ. Sandhills was effectively a cul de sac and she could not see its relevance on its own in a strategic plan for Oxford. She asked the Leader of the Council to support the considered and strongly held views from Sandhills residents and not approve the proposal.

The Leader of the Council noted that written representations had been received from Risinghurst Parish Council who had resolved to support the outcome of the consultation which had been a clear majority against a CPZ in Sandhills.

A second submission from Neal Rupani a local resident who felt that the recommendation to approve the CPZ in Sandhills was unjust and unwarranted at this stage. There was a clear majority against on the grounds of lack of need and that residents would be penalised in paying to park their vehicles. The threat of displaced parking had not been based on any clear evidence but had been an assumption and, rather than adopt a blanket approach, problems in specific roads could be addressed if and when that became an issue. The number of visitor permits was too restrictive and no consideration had been given to the possible effect on house prices. Clearly there was no local support and, if approved, went against the primary function of regulation which was to protect.

Officers referred to the longer term strategic approach across Oxfordshire which was aimed at avoiding displaced parking. Proposals were planned for Barton & Risinghurst but there was no firm funding yet. With regard to issues of parking at school times then any specific issues could be looked at.

Councillor John Sanders endorsed Councillor Phillips' comments and expressed surprise, in view of the objections raised to this in April 2019 that it had gone ahead. He acknowledged the low response but what had been received had been clearly and heavily against the proposals. At the very least it should be put on hold with implementation delayed to coincide with proposals for Barton & Risinghurst.

The Leader of the Council thanked everyone for their contributions. He understood the concerns raised. The County Council was working with the City Council to improve the environment in Oxford and the CPZ programme formed part of that and the Connecting Oxfordshire programme. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report before him and the representations made to him at the meeting confirmed his decision as follows:

Approve the proposals as advertised for a Controlled Parking Zone in the Sandhills area but defer implementation to try and align the Sandhills scheme with the introduction of a CPZ scheme for the Barton & Risinghurst area subject to funding being available for the latter and also confirming that should the Sandhills scheme be progressed as a separate issue then Green Ridges should not be included.

Signed.....  
Leader of the Council

Date of signing.....

**5/20 OXFORD - MARSTON NORTH: PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ)**  
(Agenda No. 5)

The Leader of the Council considered (CMDE5) responses received to a formal consultation on a new Controlled Parking Zone in the Marston North area (previously referred to as the New Marston area)

James Poole a local resident stated that the consultation responses showed clearly that this parking zone proposal was deeply unpopular with only 29% of residents in support and even then the majority support had been confined to only 9 of the 30 streets affected and in 3 of those from the sole respondent. The primary concern raised by residents had been lack of need as parking for residents was not an issue. The report had stated that it should be stressed that the proposals sought to alleviate problems associated with commuter parking and overflow parking from adjacent CPZs. However, that concern was clearly not shared by the majority of residents who were querying the actual need for controlled parking in any form, citing that parking pressures in the area were not especially severe and that the scheme would instead cause unnecessary inconvenience and expense for existing residents and their visitors. Residents did not want this CPZ and did not see any need for it and were objecting to its imposition against their wishes. The recommendation that it should go ahead contradicted the results of the consultation. The report's primary reason for overturning the wishes of residents seemed to be that CPZs would become increasingly important if policy proposals such as demand management mechanisms e.g. traffic restrictions, or promoting higher density development in the city, were agreed. Those proposals were themselves subject to consultation with the outcome unknown and, even if implemented, their impact on the Marston North area was uncertain seeming very likely that any impact would be low and well within the tolerance of residents, rendering the CPZ unnecessary. Like other residents, he had not expressed his full objection at the consultation stage since he, as presumably had others, assumed that the council would determine to press ahead regardless – which

had now been confirmed by the report. If it was decided to go ahead against the clear response of residents, he urged that the recommendation to align Horseman Close, Clay Close, Jessops Close and Dents Close with the rest of the CPZ be accepted otherwise, the small amount of football-related parking at weekends would be pointlessly displaced to other streets less able to cope with it and the loss of the 2hr visitor parking would be extremely damaging to community life, unnecessarily constraining after school playdates and the visiting of elderly relatives. It was clear from the consultation that the most disliked aspect of this unwanted proposal was the application of stricter restrictions to these streets with only 9.7% of residents in favour. He asked that this unnecessary CPZ should not be imposed on residents who had clearly demonstrated did not support it but if it was to go ahead against the wishes of residents, then the need to align those four roads referred to above with the rest of the CPZ needed to be addressed.

City Councillor Mary Clarkson spoke as a Marston Ward City Councillor. The Old Marston area was virtually the only area on the North East side of Oxford with no parking restrictions and, being close to both the Headington hospitals and Oxford Brookes University, meant that parts of the area had suffered from commuter parking for many years making it difficult and sometimes dangerous for residents to leave their own driveways and side roads. So, while broadly welcoming the scheme, she wished to raise a number of points, to improve it and hopefully make it more acceptable to residents. Firstly, she welcomed the response which had been made to the high number of objections from residents in Horseman Close and Clays Close and agreed that the CPZ restrictions of 0900-1700 Monday to Friday should be the same for them as for the rest of the area. Since residents rarely saw a problem with commuter and football parking, there was no need to place weekend restrictions on them, which would impact on family and friends who wished to visit. Marston had a relatively high proportion of single elderly people and so having visitors was particularly important for them and she made a plea for a large number of shared use spaces, which would make it easier for family and friends to park nearby. That could be done on a detailed street by street basis to establish where the need was greatest.

Raymund Road suffered from inconsiderate and dangerous parking by parents of pupils at St Nicholas School. This problem was at the start and end of the school day only and the best way to resolve this was through a School Zone and she intended to press for that as a separate measure.

Many respondents to the consultation had pointed out that since lockdown, far more people had been working from home which had meant that far more residents' cars were parked in the streets with far fewer commuter cars. That pattern could well turn out to be long term and she wondered if the County Council had carried out any research to see what the impact of changing work patterns had been since March? It might be that if these changes became permanent, then a CPZ might not be the answer with residents paying for a permit which was no longer needed.

Her final concern was that the Marston North scheme excluded Old Marston Village. There was no timetable for introducing a scheme there and if there was a long gap between the introduction of the Marston North scheme and one for Old Marston Village, then there was a danger that Old Marston Village would suffer from displacement parking in its narrow roads. Cars already parked dangerously in Oxford

Road near Mortimer Hall and this would only get worse if the Village had no restrictions. She suggested that the two schemes be contiguous thereby allowing time to assess parking need post COVID and protect Old Marston Village from excess parking, with which it was singularly ill equipped to cope?

The Leader of the Council noted written submissions from Brian Welby who had referred to the 2 to 1 majority against the scheme. Mr Welby considered that those residents who, for whatever reason, had decided not to respond and Oxfordshire County Council should abide by the responses of those that had, respect the democratic vote and cancel the proposals.

Officers advised that there was no expectation that there would be displaced parking to Old Marston as there was no direct road link. The Marston North scheme had been identified as a key element in the programme to deal with commuter parking in an area of identified future growth which included the Swan School.

Acknowledging that the majority of respondents had objected to the proposals the Leader of the Council felt that the interests of Old Marston village also needed to be recognised. Therefore, having regard to the information in the report before him and the representations made to him at the meeting including that given by officers that the scheme had been identified as a key priority in the programme confirmed his decision as follows:

To approve the proposals as advertised for a Controlled parking Zone in the Marston North area subject to the times and days of the restrictions in Horseman Close, Clay Close, Jessops Close and Dents Close being amended so as to align with those for the other parts of the scheme but that implementation be deferred to allow consideration of an Informal Consultation for Old Marston.

Signed.....  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

**6/20 OXFORD - WATERWAYS: PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ)**  
(Agenda No. 6)

The Leader of the Council considered (CMDE6) responses received to a formal consultation on a new CPZ in the Waterways area.

Supporting the scheme County Councillor John Howson appreciated the addition of residents' parking within the CPZ for those living within the un-adopted 'Closes', including those owned by the social housing company. The inclusion of a small number of residential moorings on the Oxford Canal just north of his Division in the scheme was also welcomed as those boaters had traditionally parked in Elizabeth Jennings Way. There was concern about the need for additional double yellow lines west of the canal bridge and this needed to be kept under review. Finally, as part of

the implementation process, he asked whether the double yellow lines protecting the end of the cycle lane and footpath from Bainton Road and the dropped curb could be aligned with the footpath rather than the offset arrangement that existed at present. He had asked for this to be undertaken before but had been advised that it needed to be combined within a larger scheme.

Having regard to the information set out in the report before him and the representations made to him at the meeting the Leader of the Council confirmed his decision as follows:

To approve proposals for a Controlled parking Zone in the Waterways area, but with the following also being included for eligibility for resident and visitor permits namely Clearwater Place; Complins Close and residential moorings on the Oxford Canal in the vicinity.

Signed.....  
Leader of the Council

Date of signing.....

**7/20 GORING: B4009 HIGH STREET - PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES**

(Agenda No. 7)

The Leader of the Council considered (CMDE7) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a traffic calming buildout, flat top road hump and realigned footway at B4009 High Street, Goring put forward in conjunction with Goring Parish Council, who had undertaken to majority fund the project.

Councillor Kevin Bulmer advised that the Parish Council had worked on this scheme for some time and that it now formed part of the recently agreed Neighbourhood Plan. Goring was a major crossing point on the Thames with a great deal of traffic. The High Street itself was a traditional street with narrow pavements and was often difficult to cross. This proposal represented a good balance and he supported it both as the local County Councillor and Parish Councillor.

A written submission in support had also been received from Goring Parish Council setting out in detail the history of the scheme, which had been designed to deal with the problems of vehicle movement through the High Street. A great deal of work had been carried out over the years in conjunction with the County Council to secure a realistic scheme to improve the safety of pedestrians.

Lee Turner confirmed that County officers had worked closely with the Parish Council and that the scheme should achieve safety improvements on a narrow and busy street.

Having regard to the information in the report and the representations made to him at the meeting the Leader of the Council confirmed his decision as follows:

approve the proposed introduction of traffic calming measures at B4009 High Street, Goring, as advertised.

Signed.....  
Leader of the Council

Date of signing.....

**8/20 LONG WITTENHAM: DIDCOT ROAD - PROPOSED ZEBRA CROSSING AND REVISED TRAFFIC CALMING**  
(Agenda No. 8)

The Leader of the Council considered (CMDE8) responses received to a statutory consultation to introduce a humped zebra crossing and revised traffic calming feature comprising a symmetrical build-out with cycle bypasses in both directions, the latter feature to replace an existing traffic calming build-out put forward as a result of the development of land adjacent to the Didcot Road at Long Wittenham.

Ron Carter a Local Resident of 50 years supported the pedestrian crossing element of the scheme but considered that the traffic calming element needed further investigation as traffic exiting Saxons Heath, and Westfield Road had great difficulty getting onto Didcot Road due to the increase of vehicles coming from Didcot and, with Didcot growing at an alarming rate, that would only get worse. Therefore, he was suggesting that the traffic calming scheme be moved to the South side of the Saxons Heath turn by about 50 metres and then to put in speed humps between that and the pedestrian crossing thereby slowing traffic down to a more acceptable speed on Didcot Road. Conversely moving the traffic calming scheme 50 metres north of the existing position would cause untold problems for the residents of nos 1- 6 Saxons Heath and for a number of senior citizens living there, crossing the road to a bus stop on the opposite side of the road would be difficult. Moving the traffic calming scheme to the south would allow the residents of Didcot Road easier access to their properties and benefit the village to a greater degree than the scheme currently proposed.

Officers advised that other options had been considered but the conclusion that had been reached was that the scheme as currently proposed presented the best solution avoiding, for example, a long straight length of road between the traffic feature and the sharp bend leading into the village.

The Leader of the Council acknowledged that the scheme was required as part of a planning obligation but, being aware of the road environment, asked officers to investigate whether amendments could be made to increase traffic calming benefits in the village. Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report before him and the representations made to him at the meeting confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve the proposed introduction of a humped zebra crossing and revised traffic calming measures on Didcot Road at Long Wittenham as advertised.



Signed.....  
 Leader of the Council

Date of signing.....

## **9/20 EYNESHAM: VARIOUS STREETS - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

(Agenda No. 9)

The Leader of the Council considered (CMDE9) responses to a statutory consultation to introduce and amend waiting restrictions on residential roads within Eynsham where parking had resulted in road safety and access problems for residents. The proposals had been put forward following discussions and site meetings with officers, the local member and Eynsham Parish Council. The proposal for Thornbury Road related to a previous proposal approved by the Cabinet Member for Environment at the delegated decisions meeting on 12 July 2018, but which had required a further consultation as the order had not been made within the statutory 2-year time limit.

Vincent Goodstadt raised two issues both of which supported the Council's desire to improve safety and convenience in Eynsham from vehicular traffic. The first related to the detailed parking proposals for the junction of Queens Street and Orchard Close where he lived. He supported the proposal but considered that in order for it to be effective, restrictions needed to be extended and as far as he was aware that view had been supported by all the residents in Orchard Close who had responded, including those neighbours immediately abutting the section of road in question, and by the Parish Council. He considered such an extension to the proposal supported the core objectives of the order and improved on the draft proposals by controlling parking along the whole of the pinch point at the entrance to Orchard Close and took account of the fact that as this road space was shared by vehicles and pedestrians there was a greater need for safety considerations to be taken into account. Secondly, he advised that the proposed parking measures would be much more effective if they formed part of a full public realm plan for the village. No mention of that had been made in any report and he strongly advised that this should be done in anticipation that Eynsham would double in size over the next few years. He asked that the minor modification in Orchard Close be accepted for inclusion and that preparation of a full public realm strategy for the village centre be undertaken.

Councillor Charles Mathew advised that the loss of bus services in the Lower Windrush valley along with residential development in that area had put further pressure on loading and parking restrictions in Eynsham and while not curing all of those problems the proposals would help alleviate some of the pressure and he supported the scheme.

Mike Wasley acknowledged the points made by Councillor Mathew and Mr Goodstadt and would look to see if the proposed extension could be accommodated.

Therefore, having regard to the information set out in the report before him and the representation made to him the Leader of the Council confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve the proposed waiting restrictions on residential roads in Eynsham as advertised and officers asked to investigate and agree with the parish council possible modifications to the scheme to allow for an extension of the restrictions at the entrance to Orchard Close to secure improvements for access by commercial vehicles and also safer passage of vehicles.

Signed.....  
Leader of the Council

Date of signing.....

**10/20 MINERALS AND WASTE ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2018**

(Agenda No. 10)

The County Council was required to prepare and publish monitoring reports on the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan as a procedural and information requirement. Predominantly a factual document the draft Annual Monitoring Report 2018 now before the Leader of the Council (CMDE10) reported on progress in the preparation of the revised Minerals and Waste Local Plan in relation to the programme in the Council's Minerals and Waste Development Scheme and also:

- a) production of aggregate minerals;
- b) permissions granted for mineral working and landbanks of permitted reserves;
- c) production of secondary and recycled aggregates;
- d) amounts of waste produced and methods of management;
- e) permissions granted for waste management facilities and capacity of facilities.

It cross referred to the Council's Local Aggregate Assessment 2019 and Waste Needs Assessments 2020 and 2015, sitting alongside and complementing the Annual Monitoring Report and reporting on work undertaken by the Council to meet the Duty to Cooperate.

Having regard to the information set out in the report before him the Leader of the Council confirmed his decision as follows:

- (a) approve the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report 2018 (Calendar Year) annexed to the report CMDE10;
- (b) authorise the Director for Planning & Place to carry out any necessary Final editing of the Minerals and waste Annual Monitoring Report 2018 (Calendar Year) for publication on the County Council website.

Signed.....  
Leader of the Council

Date of signing.....

