

CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT – 3 JUNE 2010

HEADINGTON CENTRAL CPZ, OXFORD MINOR AMENDMENTS

Report by Head of Transport

Introduction

1. This report considers comments and objections received to a formal advertisement and statutory consultation to vary the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the Headington Central Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to amend permit eligibility for Holyoake Hall and the parking arrangements in several streets in response to requests from local residents, councillors and businesses.

Background

2. Since the introduction of the Headington Central CPZ there have been a number of requests for amendments to better reflect the needs of those who live in the area. Some changes were made last year, but further requests have been received.
3. In addition there have been ongoing requests from residents of Holyoake Hall to reconsider the exclusion of these flats from eligibility for permits. When in June 2008 the proposal to exclude Holyoake Hall from eligibility for parking permits was advertised, a number of objections were received from residents of Holyoake Hall (some of whom were already in receipt of permits). These were reported to the Cabinet Member for Transport in September 2008 where the proposed exclusion was confirmed and it was agreed that those residents with existing permits would be allowed to keep them until June 2010 (ie existing permits could be renewed for a further year after expiry, a practice which has been applied elsewhere) to give time for residents to adjust, move or apply to have planning conditions removed/amended.
4. Since autumn 2008 the Council has been approached on numerous occasions by residents and/or owners of flats in Holyoake Hall asking how they can overturn this exclusion which they say is severely restricting the sale/letting of the flats. It has been explained that, as the reason properties are excluded is to mirror the decision of the planning authority, it would be necessary to approach the City Council on the matter of amending the planning consent. At least one has done that and been told that as the actual planning consent has no condition requiring exclusion, there is nothing that the City can change. As a result, your officers have put forward a proposal to

partially relax the exclusion so that each flat can apply for a maximum of one permit.

5. The consultation also sought to correct an error in the original Order regarding the limit on permits in eligible properties. Annex 1 describes all the proposals.

Formal Consultation

6. Formal consultation on the proposed changes took place in February/March 2010. Letters and plans were sent to all properties in the streets in the vicinity of the proposed principle changes, notices explaining the proposals placed on site and in the Oxford Times and information sent to local Councillors and the emergency services. A copy of the public notice and the other legal documents, which were placed on deposit at Headington Library and at County Hall, are available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre
7. In total, 34 letters or e-mails were received in response to the advertised proposals. A précis of these together with the observations of the Head of Transport is attached at Annex 2. Copies of all these communications are available in the Members' Resource Centre.
8. In addition, an officer was invited to attend a meeting of the City Council's Area Committee where this consultation – particularly the proposals concerning Holyoake Hall – were extensively discussed. That meeting decided to ask the Head of City Development to prepare a report which would be submitted to a further meeting of the Area Committee to take place prior to this meeting (extract of Minutes attached at Annex 3)

Consultation responses

9. Thames Valley Police raised no objection to any of the proposals. No comments were received regarding the proposed change in Osler Road; only one letter was received concerning the change in The Croft and two responses regarding the loss of part of a parking bay on Windmill Road. The proposed deletion of a parking bay on Holyoake Road received seven objections generally on the grounds that it was un-necessary and would exacerbate the current difficulties in finding parking space.
10. The vast majority (30 out of 34) of comments received concerned the proposal to allow residents of Holyoake Hall to apply for one permit per flat. Six residents of the flats and non-resident owners of five flats wrote in support of the proposal arguing that the flats were purchased without the knowledge that there would be no parking, that to remove parking from the flats would have a serious effect on their value and that there were generally spaces to park on the streets nearby.
11. A total of 22 residents of Holyoake Road and 10 from Stile Road (which is adjacent) wrote objecting to the proposed change to permit eligibility. These residents argued that to increase the number of permits on issue would make

a difficult parking situation even worse, that the development was approved on the condition that it would be car-free which the prospective owners/tenants should have known from the start and that to allow Holyoake Hall to have permits would lead to similar claims from other recent developments.

12. It is understood that the report referred to in paragraph 8 above has yet to be prepared and the Area Committee will therefore not be able to reach a conclusion in time to advise this meeting.

Comment

13. The issue of permit eligibility for Holyoake Hall has raised strong views on both sides. The problem has arisen because when, in October 2004, the Area Committee resolved to approve the application for the redevelopment of Holyoake Hall it was with the intention to "impose a planning condition to remove the development from the Residents Parking Zone" (extract from minutes of meeting). However when planning consent was granted, it was done so without such a condition, although the developer did enter into a Unilateral Undertaking with the County Council to exclude the development from the CPZ. Unfortunately this requirement was not acted upon until 2008 by which time permits had been issued to around 12 residents.

Conclusions

14. Apart from the Holyoake Hall issue, the proposals have been generally accepted and should proceed as planned. However, the proposed removal of one parking bay in Holyoake Road has attracted a number of objections from residents concerned that this is unnecessary and will exacerbate an already difficult parking situation; it is therefore suggested that this proposal does not proceed.
15. With Holyoake Hall, it would be appropriate to await the further deliberations of the City Council's Area Committee (see paragraph 12 above) before reaching a final conclusion. However, there are currently 5 residents permits on issue which expire on 15 June 2010 and in the circumstances it is suggested that these permits be renewed on a temporary basis until there is a final decision on eligibility, at which point the permits can be withdrawn if necessary.

How the Project Supports LTP2 Objectives

16. The proposals described in this report relate to the LTP2 objectives of Tackling Congestion (encouraging development that minimises congestion) and improving the Street Environment (better management of parking).

Financial Implications (including Revenue)

17. Funding for the costs of implementing the proposals described in this report, estimated to be around £1000 (including advertising) will be met from existing budgets.

RECOMMENDATION

18. **The Cabinet Member for Transport is RECOMMENDED to approve the proposed changes to the Headington Central CPZ as advertised in the Oxfordshire County Council (Headington Central) (Controlled Parking Zone and Various Restrictions) (Variation No 11*) Order 200* as amended as set out in this report**

STEVE HOWELL
Head of Transport
Environment & Economy

Background papers: Copies of all the legal documents plus letters and emails received in response are available in the Members' Resource room.

Contact Officer: David Tole Tel: 01865 815942

May 2010

HEADINGTON CENTRAL CPZ

DESCRIPTION OF EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES

WINDMILL ROAD

Replace part of a 2-hour shared use parking bay with daytime no-waiting restriction (8.00am to 6.30pm) opposite No.85 Windmill Road, to assist vehicle access at removals yard

OSLER ROAD

Reduce length of parking bay (Permit Holders only) outside No.11 Osler Road extending No Waiting at Any Time to improve access to off street parking

THE CROFT

Replace part of daytime no-waiting restriction (8.00am to 6.30pm) on The Croft (northern arm) with no-waiting at any time to improve access to/from off street bin storage.

HOLYOAKE ROAD

Remove one footway parking bay (Permit Holders only) outside No.25 Holyoake Road extending No Waiting at Any Time, to improve access to off street parking

Amend list of properties eligible for permits so as to limit residents of Holyoake Hall, Holyoake Road to apply for 1 resident permit per flat

GENERAL

Amend an Article in the Order to clarify there are no limits to the number of residents permits per dwelling unless otherwise specified

David Tole
May 2009

PROPOSED CHANGES TO PARKING – HEADINGTON CENTRAL CPZ, OXFORD
Summary of Public Comments

No.	Commentor's Address	Summary of Objection or Comment	Observations of the Director of Environment & Economy
1.	Thames Valley Police	No objection	Noted
2.	A Resident, The Croft (Old Headington)	Welcomes the proposed change in The Croft Objects to the proposal to allow more than two permits per household.	Noted Less than 20 households in the entire Zone have more than 2 permits, so limiting to 2 would have only a very small effect on parking
3.	Clearwater Swimming Pools	Concerned that the proposed loss of 2-hour parking on Windmill Road will cause difficulties for occasional visitors to the business	Only 2 of the current 5 spaces will be lost on this part of Windmill Road so there will still be room for occasional visitors
4.	A G Jacob & Sons, Removals & Storage	Welcomes the proposal to reinstate single yellow line in Windmill Road which will greatly assist accessing their yard	Noted
5.	A Resident, Holyoake Hall	Supports proposal to reinstate eligibility for permits. Purchased flat in 2006 having been told by City Council that there were no parking restrictions. Removing permits from residents who have had them for 3-4 years is a flawed process. There is no problem parking on Holyoake Road.	Noted
6.	A Resident, Holyoake Hall	Strongly supports the proposal to reinstate eligibility for permits. Commutes out of Oxford by car so requires a place to park. The parking problems caused by pizza delivery staff are a far greater disturbance than that caused by Holyoake Hall residents	Noted
7.	A Resident, Holyoake Hall	Supports the proposal for one permit per flat in Holyoake Hall. Particularly concerned that the	Noted

CMDT7

		resale value of the flat will be significantly affected if there was no parking	
8.	A Resident and Company Director of Holyoake Hall Management Company	Supports the proposal for one permit per flat in Holyoake Hall. Particularly concerned that the resale value of the flat will be significantly affected if there was no parking, especially as the flats were initially purchased at the height of the housing market in 2007. Has been checking parking availability on Holyoake Road and found that on average there are 2/3 spaces available.	Noted
9.	A Resident, Holyoake Hall	Supports the proposal for one permit per flat in Holyoake Hall. Not to have a permit would affect the value of the flat and would make life difficult for residents given that parts of Oxford are difficult to reach by public transport. There seems to be parking generally available in the street.	Noted
10.	A Resident, Holyoake Hall	Supports the proposal for one permit per flat in Holyoake Hall.	Noted
11.	Owner of a flat, Holyoake Hall	It is crucial to retain parking permits for Holyoake Hall. These flats were sold by the developers stipulating that there would be parking available. The flats were intended for key workers including those in the medical profession who work unsociable hours when public transport options are limited	Noted
12.	Owner of a flat, Holyoake Hall	Supports the proposal for one permit per flat in Holyoake Hall. As prospective owners they were not informed by solicitors of the lack of parking, and occupiers were indeed initially granted permits. Does not think the owners/residents of Holyoake Hall should be made scapegoats in a disagreement between the Council and the developers	Noted

CMDT7

13.	Owner of a flat, Holyoake Hall	Requests provision of one permit per flat. Was assured by the developers when the flat was purchased that there were no parking controls when planning consent was granted. Lack of parking will affect the value of the property.	Noted
14.	Owners of two flats, Holyoake Hall	Supports the proposal for one permit per flat in Holyoake Hall. The removal of permit eligibility in 2008 was flawed as there was no planning condition imposed by Oxford City Council – had there been the potential owners would have been aware before they purchased.	Noted
15.	A Resident, Holyoake Road	Considers that the number of permits per dwelling should be limited to 2 or even 1 Has sympathy with needs of Holyoake Hall residents but considers the principal of that development being car-free was important when it was approved. Concerned that if Holyoake Hall were allowed permits then other similar developments would seek to have the same.	Less than 20 households in the entire Zone have more than 2 permits, so limiting to 2 would have only a very small effect on parking. This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council
16.	A Resident, Holyoake Road	Objects to the proposed provision of permits to Holyoake Hall as the original planning application emphasised that it would be a car-free development	This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council
17.	A Resident, Holyoake Road	Objects to the proposed provision of permits to Holyoake Hall as the original planning application emphasised that it would be a car-free development. Concerned that the space available for permit holders is already under pressure and any extension of permit eligibility would exacerbate this	This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council

CMDT7

18.	A Resident, Holyoake Road	Objects to the proposed provision of permits to Holyoake Hall as there is already serious difficulties finding anywhere to park and lots of illegal parking especially by pizza delivery drivers	This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council Additional effort will be directed at this enforcement problem
19.	Two Residents, Holyoake Road	Object to the proposed provision of permits to Holyoake Hall as there is already serious difficulties finding anywhere to park and this would increase permits by 43%	This figure assumes that all Holyoake Hall residents obtain a permit, which is unlikely given the general pattern of permit distribution in the past
20.	Two Residents, Holyoake Road	Object to the proposed provision of permits to Holyoake Hall as there is already serious difficulties finding anywhere to park and this would increase permits by 43%	This figure assumes that all Holyoake Hall residents obtain a permit, which is unlikely given the general pattern of permit distribution in the past
21.	Two Residents, Holyoake Road	Object to the proposed provision of permits to Holyoake Hall as the original planning application emphasised that it would be a car-free development. There are already severe parking problems in the road. Concerned that lifting the exclusion from permits will erode the affordability of the flats in Holyoake Hall for first-time buyers and key workers, and potentially setting a precedent.	This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council
22.	A resident, Stile Road	Objects to the proposed provision of permits to Holyoake Hall as there are already serious difficulties finding anywhere to park. Wants to know why Stile Road residents were not consulted about the proposal	The proposal was advertised in the local press and on-street in Holyoake Road. Residents of Stile Road (and other roads) parking in Holyoake Road would have these opportunities to be consulted about the proposals
23.	A resident, Stile Road	Objects to the proposed provision of permits to Holyoake Hall as there are already serious difficulties finding anywhere to park across the whole area, not just in Holyoake Road	This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council

CMDT7

24.	A resident, Stile Road	<p>Thinks it unacceptable to even consider reversing the planning permission to allow Holyoake Hall residents to have permits. Wants to know why they still have to pay for permits when there is no hope of parking</p>	<p>This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council</p> <p>Permits are available for parking within the CPZ not a specific street</p>
25.	Four residents, Stile Road	<p>Opposed to the proposal to allow Holyoake Hall residents to have permits as parking in Holyoake Road and Stile Road is already difficult. The situation at present is just about acceptable – any more pressure on parking would be intolerable. Development of Holyoake Hall was agreed only with there being no parking permits allowed, and the situation hasn't changed.</p>	<p>This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council</p>
26.	Two residents, Stile Road	<p>There is no justification for any change to permit eligibility at Holyoake Hall. If this was to change it would affect parking on Stile Road which is already usually impossible to find a space</p>	<p>This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council</p>
27.	A resident, Stile Road	<p>Development of Holyoake Hall was agreed only with there being no parking permits allowed. Parking on Stile Road is already extremely difficult and this change would make things worse</p>	<p>This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council</p>
28.	Two residents, Holyoake Road	<p>Object to the proposed removal of a parking space on Holyoake Road as it is unnecessary Object to the proposed allocation of permits to Holyoake Hall as it will only make the parking situation worse; consent for the development was granted for key workers only with no parking; business permit holders make the parking situation in Holyoake Road worse, particularly as there is no parking at the top of Windmill Road. Suggest that if Holyoake Hall residents get permits they should be for the Headington North-East zone</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council</p>

CMDT7

29.	A resident, Holyoake Road	Welcomes the previous changes to parking in Holyoake Road which gave a small increase in capacity, but these proposals undo that benefit. Doesn't support the removal of the parking space, but accepts that the loss is manageable. Unable to assess the affect of allowing Holyoake Hall to have permits without information on the number of extra permits.	Noted There are 15 flats in Holyoake Hall, so the maximum additional permits would be 15 although given the general pattern of permit distribution in the past this is unlikely to be realised
30.	Two residents, Holyoake Road	Do not agree with the removal of the parking bay as there are no difficulties in access off street parking Strongly object to the relaxation of the exclusion from permits for Holyoake Hall as the matter was thoroughly discussed when consent was granted; there is severe pressure on parking in the road; the residents of Holyoake Hall should have known there were no permits when they moved in; relaxing for Holyoake Hall risks pressure from John Leon House to be treated the same	Noted This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council
31.	Two residents, Holyoake Road	Object to the removal of the parking bay as there are no difficulties in accessing off street parking. Strongly object to the relaxation of the exclusion from permits for Holyoake Hall as the matter was thoroughly discussed when consent was granted; there is severe pressure on parking in the road and residents often have to park in adjacent streets; the residents of Holyoake Hall should have known there were no permits when they moved in. Also suggest removal of short-stay parking at London road end of Holyoake Hall and better control of pizza delivery vehicles	Noted This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council Additional effort will be directed at this enforcement problem

CMDT7

32.	A resident, Holyoake Road	Object to the removal of the parking bay as there are no difficulties in accessing off street parking Object to residents of Holyoake Hall being allowed permits.	Noted This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council
33.	A resident, Holyoake Road	Object to the removal of the parking bay Object to residents of Holyoake Hall being allowed permits as the parking situation is worse than when it was granted consent	Noted This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council
34.	Three residents, Holyoake Road	Object to the removal of the parking bay as there are no difficulties in accessing off street parking Object to residents of Holyoake Hall being allowed permits as the parking situation is worse than when it was granted consent	Noted This matter is to be the subject of an investigation by the City Council

NORTH EAST AREA COMMITTEE
Tuesday 20th April 2010

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Darke), the Vice-Chair (Councillor Rundle), Councillors Altaf-Khan, Clarkson, McManners, Sinclair and Wilkinson.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Angela Cristofoli (Communities and Neighbourhoods Manager), Angela Fettiplace and Rachel Williams (City Development), Andrew Wright (City Works), James Dixon (City Leisure), Colin Gregory (Law and Governance).

County Councillor Smith, Parish Councillors Cox and Foster-Barnes.

138. PROPOSAL TO REVIEW RESIDENTS PARKING PERMITS IN CENTRAL HEADINGTON

The Head of Law and Governance submitted a report on behalf of the County Council (previously circulated, now appended) on the proposal to review the parking permits in the central Headington Area. David Tole from the County Council was in attendance to present the report.

After discussion, the Committee agreed to ask the Head of Service, City Development to prepare a report into the situation regarding Holyoake Hall parking permits to be submitted to a special meeting of the Area Committee so that the matter could be discussed with all the facts present. A report on the Committee's findings would then be sent to the County Council for a meeting of the Cabinet Member for Transport on 3 June.