

***Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport - Thursday,
25 March 2010***

Statement of Decision

Oxford, Magdalen Road Area Controlled Parking Zone

Documentation considered:

Report Oxford, Magdalen Road Area Controlled Parking Zone

A copy is attached to the signed copy of this decision.

Present:

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Rodney Rose

Officers: G. Warrington (Corporate Core)
S. Howell, J. White, C. Rossington and D. Tole (Environment & Economy)

Also in attendance:

Other Members: Councillor John Tanner; Councillor John Sanders; Councillor David Turner

Summary of representations in person

The Cabinet Member considered the results of a statutory consultation process on draft traffic regulation orders for the revised Magdalen Road area controlled parking zone.

Dennis Pratley referred to overwhelming opposition to this scheme which he considered an injustice to all concerned. The County Council had recognised in its own report that the proposals were controversial and he warned that there would be difficulties for residents and local businesses, which would suffer in already difficult times.

Barry Allday felt that the proposals if agreed would affect the fine balance of the area. The recession meant that local businesses were under increased pressure and his business employed 8 people. He referred to the injustice of the permit system and charging regime and appealed to the County Council to maintain a positive view and support the community spirit in the area.

Nicholas Fell challenged the legality of the process and the CPZ itself. He considered the County Council had not followed best practice or correct procedures on consultation.

Sylvia Barker felt the scheme was bureaucratic and simply a measure to raise funds and a blight on the local environment. The permit system gave an unfair advantage to multi-occupancy homes.

Tim Jones supported the proposals. He accepted that the CPZ was not perfect but felt that it would generally benefit local residents. The area could not cope with current levels of vehicles and therefore retention of the status quo was not a realistic option. Partial introduction could lead to problems of displaced traffic.

Paul Pemberton opposed the scheme. Highlighting the inadequacy of proposals for visitor permits he suggested that it could force some people in multi occupancy residences to leave the area. The County Council needed to be more flexible in its approach but should in the meantime and in view of the high level of opposition to the scheme withdraw the current proposals.

Dominic Woodfield questioned the legality of the proposals and referred to the high levels of opposition. He considered that a CPZ would not in reality change the current situation and only provided an opportunity to raise funds. The County Council should have consulted residents first and designed a scheme based on their responses.

Paul Dummett supported the scheme but had some concerns if it was intended to operate 24 hours a day 7 days a week and that if that was the case then it could be detrimental to those residents it was intended to help and businesses at weekends, when commuter parking was less of a problem. He suggested a limited scheme to prevent commuter and student parking.

Anthony Cheke felt that problems had increased recently because of significant student occupation and other influences. Because of that Hurst Street residents supported the proposed CPZ. He congratulated the County Council on its consultation but felt that 50 permits per annum would be too restrictive and that charges for small businesses were punitive. However, opponents to the scheme had offered no alternative and quotes of "61% opposed to the scheme" were misleading as many respondents although expressing some slight concerns were not totally opposed to the scheme.

Liz Fisher advised that 78% of St Mary's Road residents supported the CPZ and objections to the scheme varied considerably. Highways legislation stated that passage of traffic must be maintained but that clearly was not happening in this area. She considered CPZs worked for residents and businesses alike.

Ben Sheldon supported the scheme and expressed serious highway safety concerns, which he illustrated by describing 2 separate incidents where emergency vehicles had been seriously delayed because of access problems. He felt introduction of a CPZ would help prevent such occurrences.

Alison Chisholm supported the scheme. The area suffered from parked cars and blocked pavements with consequent highway safety issues for pedestrians who were forced into the road. The cost of permits was miniscule in comparison to the costs of running a car. The status quo was not a realistic option and something needed to be

done to prevent the loss of the street environment and improve the quality of life and safety for residents.

Hafwen Kaill supported the scheme. It was imperative to reduce levels of commuter parking and make streets safer for residents. She had witnessed many stand offs and collisions between cars. Access was affected and pavements in many places were non negotiable for buggies and wheelchairs. She would prefer no pavement parking but felt that some was inevitable.

City Councillor David Williams considered the CPZ to be based on a need to address problems which were more obvious in the west of the area. There had been two rounds of consultation, debate at the East Area Parliament and meetings with traders. The County Council had amended its proposals in response to that consultation and debate. Extra parking in Magdalen Road would help traders in these difficult times and suggested the County Council consider employee permits.

County Councillor John Tanner called for the County Council to withdraw the proposals, save local taxpayers money and listen to the needs and opinions of local people. To the west of Magdalen Road there was majority support for a CPZ but not to the east where opposition levels were 87%. He welcomed the exclusion of Iffley Fields from the original scheme.

County Councillor John Sanders questioned the motivation behind the introduction of a CPZ which he considered to be a means of raising funds rather than a genuine attempt to address parking issues. Any proposal needed to do more than maintain the status quo and this proposed solution, including proposals for permit parking, was not acceptable.

County Councillor Turner asked officers to address the legal issues which had been raised regarding the legality of the CPZ and its processes.

Joy White stated that pressure from commuter parking would only increase and therefore something needed to be done to address that. She did not accept that there were 61% levels of opposition to the scheme as had been quoted as many respondents had raised specific areas of concern in their responses and these did not represent an unconditional objection.

Mr Tole confirmed that the County Council had followed the required regulations for promotion of traffic regulation orders and allowed for proper consultation periods. Responding to the suggestion that the CPZs were subject to limits in size, 12 streets had been quoted, his understanding was that this was not the case.

Mr Howell confirmed that amendments to the proposal such as a proposed east - west split would need further consultation and could not be made on the basis of the consultation which had been undertaken.

Cabinet Member's Comments

Councillor Rose also questioned the accuracy of statements which had referred to levels of 61% opposed to the scheme. He had some sympathy with suggestions for the area to be split but at the same time had concerns that any such division could result in problems of displaced traffic for those areas which had been excluded. Ultimately he felt that those speaking against the proposed CPZ would be doing a disservice to fellow residents. He accepted officer advice that a decision could not be

taken on any revised proposals on the basis of the current round of consultation and that further consultation would be required.

Decision

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before me, the representations made to me and the further considerations set out above, I confirm my decisions on this matter as follows:

- (a) not to authorise the making of the Oxfordshire County Council (Oxford – Magdalen Road area) (Controlled Parking Zone and waiting Restrictions) Order 20**;
- (b) authorise the Head of Transport to undertake further statutory consultation for the Magdalen Road CPZ but on the basis of the following separate areas:
 - (i) Area 1 - all properties to the north west of Magdalen Road but excluding Magdalen Road;
 - (ii) Area 2 - all properties to the south east of Magdalen Road but including Magdalen Road.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Transport

Date200

***Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport - Thursday,
25 March 2010***

Statement of Decision

Proposed Parking Restrictions - Waterways Estate, Oxford

Documentation considered:

Report Proposed Parking Restrictions - Waterways Estate,
Oxford

A copy is attached to the signed copy of this decision.

Present:

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Rodney Rose

Officers:

G. Warrington (Corporate Core)
S. Howell and D. Tole (Environment & Economy)

Also in attendance:

Other Members: Councillor Jean Fooks

Summary of representations in person

Councillor Fooks welcomed progress but remained concerned regarding lack of progress on adoption of private roads, removal of spaces on Elizabeth Jennings Way and parking for canal boat residents.

Mr Tole confirmed that officers continued to work with British Waterways regarding adoption and the proposal now before the Cabinet Member addressed most of the problem locations, although a number of issues remained outstanding, such as unadopted roads. However, in order not to delay those issues which had been resolved satisfactorily they had been brought to the Cabinet Member for decision. The remaining issues would be addressed as soon as possible. Canal boat residents would be entitled to park under the current proposals.

Decision

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before me, the representations made to me and the further considerations set out above, I confirm my decisions on this matter as follows:

Signed
Cabinet Member for Transport

Date200

***Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport - Thursday,
25 March 2010***

Statement of Decision

Beech Croft Road, Oxford - Traffic Calming Scheme

Documentation considered:

Report Beech Croft Road, Oxford - Traffic Calming Scheme

A copy is attached to the signed copy of this decision.

Present:

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Rodney Rose

Officers: G. Warrington (Corporate Core)
S. Howell and A. Kirkwood (Environment & Economy)

Also in attendance:

Other Members: Councillor Jean Fooks

Summary of representations in person

Mr Whittington expressed concern regarding the potential for this scheme to lead to increased traffic levels on Moreton Road and asked for installation of some mitigation measures.

Councillor Fooks considered this an innovative scheme designed to meet the concerns of Beechcroft Road residents regarding speed of traffic and a desire for some environmental improvements. However, care would be needed to mitigate against intrusive street markings and possible effects on neighbouring roads such as Moreton Road.

Mr Kirkwood confirmed that a 5% increase in traffic had been predicted on Moreton Road and that some resources could be available to provide some speed alleviation work, if found to be necessary, as part of measures to support 20 mph zones.

Decision

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before me, the representations made to me and the further considerations set out above, I confirm my decisions on this matter as follows:

- (a) approve implementation of the scheme and authorise the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, to discuss with the

Beechcroft Road Residents Association any amendments to the current proposals to address concerns raised in the consultation prior to implementation of the scheme with the proviso that the financial contribution from the County Council towards the scheme should not exceed the amount stated in the Beechcroft Road Residents Association's budget;

- (b) authorise the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, to monitor the scheme (including an assessment of any transfer of traffic onto neighbouring residential roads) and, in the light of such monitoring to add, amend or remove traffic calming features as might be judged necessary.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Transport

Date200

***Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport - Thursday,
25 March 2010***

Statement of Decision

Oxfordshire County Council (Abingdon)(One-Way Traffic and Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting)(Amendment No 13) Order 200*

Documentation considered:

Report Oxfordshire County Council (Abingdon)(One-Way Traffic and Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting)(Amendment No 13) Order 200*

A copy is attached to the signed copy of this decision.

Present:

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Rodney Rose

Officers:

G. Warrington (Corporate Core)
S. Howell and P. Ronald (Environment & Economy)

Summary of representations in person

The Cabinet Member considered results of consultation on proposals for no waiting at any time restrictions along New Street, Abingdon together with a further 5 representations tabled at the meeting.

Decision

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before me, the representations made to me and the further considerations set out above, I confirm my decisions on this matter as follows:

- (a)** to make the Oxfordshire County Council (Abingdon)(One-way Traffic and Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting)(Amendment No 13) Order 200* as advertised; and
- (b)** implement the necessary works.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Transport

Date200

***Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport - Thursday,
25 March 2010***

Statement of Decision

Oxfordshire County Council (Wantage and Grove)(Traffic Regulation) Amendment Order 200*

Documentation considered:

Report Oxfordshire County Council (Wantage and Grove)(Traffic Regulation) Amendment Order 200*

A copy is attached to the signed copy of this decision.

Present:

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Rodney Rose

Officers: G. Warrington (Corporate Core)
S. Howell and P. Ronald (Environment & Economy)

Summary of representations in person

The Cabinet Member for Transport considered representations received to a consultation on proposed no waiting at any time restrictions on Main Street and Denchworth Road, Grove and noted that following changes made to the original scheme, which had been deferred at the February meeting, the original objection had now been withdrawn and the support of both local County Councillors.

Decision

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before me, the representations made to me and the further considerations set out above, I confirm my decisions on this matter as follows:

- (a) to make the Oxfordshire County Council (Wantage and Grove)(Traffic Regulation) Amendment Order 200* subject to a minor amendment in line with Drawing S/TRO/08/09/2; and
- (b) the necessary works to implement the proposals.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Transport

Date200

***Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport - Thursday,
25 March 2010***

Statement of Decision

**Review of Funding for Consultative Body Representing
People with Disabilities and Mobility Impairments**

Documentation considered:

Report Review of Funding for Consultative Body Representing
People with Disabilities and Mobility Impairments

A copy is attached to the signed copy of this decision.

Present:

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Rodney Rose

Officers: G. Warrington (Corporate Core)
 S. Howell, R. Helling and N. Timberlake (Environment & Economy)

Also in attendance:

Other Members: Councillor David Turner

Summary of representations in person

The Cabinet Member considered future funding for the Transport for All consultative body which represented people with disabilities and mobility impairments in relation to transport and accessibility issues.

Councillor Turner raised a number of issues regarding structure and management, the consultation role of the TFA, reinstatement of the disability awareness training badge for drivers and the appropriateness of a service level agreement. He supported the recommendations.

Mr Howell advised that the report had not intended to criticise the previous performance of the group. It was not intended to enter into a service level agreement but the TFA would be expected to develop a broader role under a funding agreement.

Mr Timberlake advised that the disability awareness training badge had been abandoned because of the high numbers of drivers who had undertaken the training.

Decision

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before me, the representations made to me and the further considerations set out above, I confirm my decisions on this matter as follows:

- (a) pay Transport For All a grant of £3,000 per annum to support the costs of its meetings and other consultative work for a period of one year commencing 1 April 2010, subject to the agreement of Transport For All to the terms of a Funding Agreement governing budget-setting and financial reporting and accountability and to an internal restructure to fit it for the enhanced role outlined in paragraph 13 of the report CMDT9;
- (b) ask officers to review the position further during 2010, in the light of developments in the establishment and progress of "Oxfordshire Unlimited" and report again in early 2011, with recommendations for further action; and
- (c) authorise the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, to consider and, if felt appropriate, offer additional grant funding to meet the agreed costs of any specific additional projects which might be proposed subsequently by Transport For All.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Transport

Date200

***Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Transport - Thursday,
25 March 2010***

Statement of Decision

Bus Service Subsidy

Documentation considered:

Report Bus Service Subsidy

A copy is attached to the signed copy of this decision.

Present:

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Rodney Rose

Officers:

G. Warrington (Corporate Core)
S. Howell, R. Helling, A. Field and J. Wood (Environment &
Economy)

Also in attendance:

Other Members: Councillor Jean Fooks; Councillor John Sanders and Councillor
David Turner

RESOLVED: that the public be excluded for the duration of item 10E since it is likely that if they were present during that item there would be disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and specified below in relation to that item and since it is considered that, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information on the grounds set out in that item.

Summary of representations in person

Councillor Fooks welcomed the proposed support for Service 218 and Service 17 but asked whether further consideration could be given to adopting PT/02B Option 1 to provide a service in the return direction. She expressed regret at the loss of Service 206.

Councillor Sanders thanked officers for their work on Service 16 and welcomed proposed support for continuation of the Service.

Councillor Turner asked for clarification regarding the effects of inflation on the County Council's bus subsidy budget and referred to the following specific services:

Service 4 and 4B reiterating comments from Councillor Janet Godden.

Service 49 improve services to Kings Copse

Service 12 routeing

Service 9 reiterating support from Councillor Roz Smith for services to Risinghurst.

Service X41 he understood that there had been no consultation with either of the Parish Council public transport representatives and Benson, Ewelme and RAF Benson had not been aware of the change until the timetable had been produced.

Officers confirmed that proposals for Service 49A would mean adjustments to the days when the service ran but would not result in any loss of service for Kings Copse.

Service 206 (Waterways) usage of that service was nil and the only real option would have been to procure a bespoke service which would not have been affordable.

Service 17 – the current level of service would be maintained but Option 1 was not sustainable in terms of price. Officers could investigate provision again but they recommended that the Cabinet Member proceed as recommended for the time being.

Service X41 – the withdrawal of the evening X41 had been a commercial decision by Thames Travel and therefore they were under no obligation to consult.

With regard to inflation officers advised that bus companies were paid an inflationary figure on the anniversary of the contract award and the County's Financial Officer included an estimated inflationary figure. They were confident that there would be enough to meet the County's commitments despite figures for bus inflation in previous years running at a higher rate.

Cabinet Member's Comments

The Cabinet Member thanked officers for their work in this review of subsidised bus services.

Decision

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before me, the representations made to me and the further considerations set out above, I confirm my decisions on this matter as follows:

- (a) approve subsidy for the services described in the report CMDT10E on the basis of the tender prices (and the periods of time) as set out in Supplementary Exempt Annex 2;
- (b) record that in the Cabinet Member for Transport's opinion the decisions made in (a) above were urgent in that any delay likely to be caused by the call-in process would result in service discontinuity and in accordance with the requirements of Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17(b) those decisions should not be subject to the call in process;

- (c) thank operators for the commercial declarations made during the course of the review in respect of various contracts.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Transport

Date200

