

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 14 January 2016 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 11.52 am

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Ian Hudspeth (In place of Councillor David Nimmo Smith) – in the Chair

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Nick Hards (for Agenda Items 2 and 4)
Councillor Anne Purse (for Agenda Item 3)
Councillor Patrick Greene (for Agenda Item 4 and 5)
Councillor Rodney Rose (for Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Steve Curran

Officers:

Whole of meeting G. Warrington (Law & Governance); M. Kemp and D. Tole (Environment & Economy)

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
5 & 6	J. Sherwood (Environment & Economy)
6.	P. Mulvihill (Environment & Economy)

The Leader of the Council (deputising for the Cabinet Member for Environment) considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

Councillor Hudspeth advised that he was deputising for the Cabinet Member for Environment Councillor David Nimmo-Smith and wished him a speedy recovery following recent hospital treatment.

44/15 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

Councillor Nick Hards

Please would the Cabinet Member for Environment and Economy provide an update regarding the negotiations with South Oxfordshire District Council over their plans for redeveloping the east end of Lydalls Road, particularly the proposal to alter the junction between Lydalls Road and Station Road. The latest amendment to planning application reference **P15/S2159/O** refers to a possible shared use

surface at the east end junction between Lydalls Road and Station Road and some clarity about what exactly is being discussed would be appreciated by the local residents.”

Reply from the Leader of the Council (deputising for the Cabinet Member for Environment)

“Oxfordshire County Council deadline for responding to the application is 19th January, therefore Transport Development Control officers haven’t yet fully assessed the application at this point in time.

The outline idea of closing access at Lydalls Road junction with Station Road is one that has been discussed and accepted in principle, subject to the transport assessment. The shared use space would be used to help wayfinding from the station to the town centre and give more room over to pedestrians and cyclists, thus creating an improved movement space. This is an outline application with all matters (apart from access to the site) reserved, therefore the detail of the shared space area will come at a later stage - subjected to the outline planning application being consented. If consented, there will be opportunity at a later date to review more plans of this area and provide comment upon them then.

We continue to work with the district council on the proposals for the area going forward”

Supplementary from Councillor Hards

“As the deadline for responding to the application is 19 January it seems obvious to me that some discussions will have been and are being held with South Oxfordshire District Council and it would be helpful if I could be given some indication of that discussion. Could the leader ask officers to do that?”

Response from the Leader of the Council

“I will ask officers to contact you.”

45/15 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

Petition

Councillor Purse presented a petition (220 signatures) organised by residents of Horton-cum-Studley regarding withdrawal of subsidies to the 118/108 bus services. She advised that a second on-line petition, which also called for the protection of these services would obviously include signatures from outside the relevant area.

The submitted petition highlighted that “the service was an essential part of the community for the following reasons:

- They were an isolated rural community without any amenities such as a shop, post office or pub.

- Many residents were elderly without cars and were dependent on the bus to access Headington or Oxford for shopping and other such facilities.
- Many in the village used the bus in order not to drive into Oxford where cars were discouraged and parking difficult and expensive. That also helped reduce 'carbon footprints'.
- Many used the bus to get to work and children who attended school in Oxford also made very good use of the bus which was full in the early morning. Loss of bus service would inevitably increase car usage at rush hour times which was highly undesirable."

The Leader of the Council referred the petition to the Director for Environment & Economy to respond.

Public address

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Tim Foxhall – Consultant David Bird – Consultant County Councillor Patrick Greene (Didcot East & Hagbourne) County Councillor Nick Hards (Didcot West)))) Item 5 – Orchard Centre (Phase 2)) Didcot))
Jane Imbush Dr Janice Bridger Frank Dumbleton County Councillor Patrick Greene (Didcot East & Hagbourne)))) Item 6 – Traffic Improvements –) Hagbourne & Chilton Areas)
Ben Arrowsmith (on behalf of a local resident) Colin Alderman – Minster Lovell Parish Council Warwick Robinson – West Oxfordshire District Council County Councillor Rodney Rose (Charlbury & Wychwood)))) <i>Item 7 – Amendment of One-way</i>) <i>Traffic restriction – Old Minster Lovell</i>))))

Councillor Hudspeth advised that he was deputising for the Cabinet Member for Environment Councillor David Nimmo-Smith and wished him a speedy recovery following recent hospital treatment.

46/15 PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF DRIVING AND WAITING RESTRICTION - MEADOW LANE, OXFORD

(Agenda No. 4)

The Leader of the Council considered (CMDE4) objections received to a statutory consultation on a proposal to introduce a prohibition of driving of motor vehicles (except for access) and a prohibition of parking along a section of Meadow Lane in Oxford.

Referring to past opposition to a previously proposed CPZ for this area Councillor Curran was aware that there was likely to be more support for such a scheme particularly from residents of Stratford Street, which was already overparked. Although a number of houses on Meadow Lane had off-street parking there were some which did not and therefore it was likely if this proposal went ahead then those vehicles would be displaced, probably to Stratford Street, exacerbating the problems there. He felt any proposals for Meadow Lane should be considered as part of a proposed scheme for the area as a whole.

Responding to the Leader of the Council he confirmed that in his view residents would now favour a CPZ.

Mr Tole confirmed that the local member had also confirmed that local opinion seemed to have changed with more local support for reviving proposals for a CPZ for the Iffley Fields area. However, there was nothing programmed for that nor any developer funding available to fund any work.

Additionally he confirmed that as part of the consultation on this current proposal the County Council had contacted all residents with rear access to Stratford Street as well as residents of Meadow Lane with a reasonable level of support. He accepted that whilst not ideal it would fix the most significant problem in that Meadow Lane was not really wide enough for any parking and help address the concerns from St Mary and St John school regarding the operation of the school and safety of pupils.

The Leader of the Council acknowledged that a CPZ would be the ideal alternative but accepted that in reality that was unlikely to happen in this case due to funding issues. He agreed with officers that it was not an option to do nothing and in view of the City Council's support and funding for the proposal and having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above he confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve implementation of the proposals for the prohibition of driving and waiting restriction in Meadow Lane, Oxford as advertised.

Signed.....
Leader of the Council

Dated.....

47/15 PROPOSED BUS LANE & PARKING/WAITING RESTRICTIONS - ORCHARD CENTRE (PHASE 2), DIDCOT

(Agenda No. 5)

The Leader of the Council considered (CMDE5) comments and objections received in the course of a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce and amend various traffic restrictions in Station Road and The Broadway, Didcot as part of the Orchard Centre (Phase 2) development.

Tim Foxhall (Glanvilles) explained that his company had provided support to both District Council and county highway officers and that the orders currently before the Leader of the Council were fundamental to the success of the scheme. Having reviewed the findings of Vectos the other consultants involved he agreed that objections lodged could be met.

David Bird (Vectos) advised that his company had worked closely with both County and District Councils and he was satisfied that all issues had been fully considered and addressed. Thames Travel and Oxford Bus Company were now content with the road width proposed for Station Road and that there would be sufficient emergency procedures should there be any failures of the rising bollards. As all servicing would take place off-street there would be no interruption to bus flow. He confirmed one resident parking place would be lost but advised that Hammersons had agreed a provision of £10,000 towards the cost of a controlled parking zone. The scheme had been fully assessed with full safety audits carried out and there were no technical reasons why the scheme should not be approved.

Councillor Patrick Greene opposed the recommendation. He referred to a petition of over 1,500 signatures against the Station Road bus route proposals which had been presented to the County Council in April 2015 but not mentioned in the report currently before the Leader of the Council. Comparisons between this scheme and Queen Street in Oxford were misleading as the situation in Didcot was very different. He felt that opponents to this scheme had been denied a fair opportunity to present their views particularly at meetings at South Oxfordshire District Council and he asked that those concerns be conveyed to the District Council. He urged the Leader not to approve the scheme or at the very least defer to enable all necessary information to be considered including the petition previously presented to Council.

Mr Kemp confirmed that he had not been aware of the petition referred to by Councillor Greene.

Councillor Nick Hards also opposed the proposals and referred to a pre-planning public exhibition for the Orchard Centre Phase 2 proposals held in November 2013 which had been the first time that a large number of the public had first been alerted to the proposed arrangements for buses including closure of the bus link along High Street. He also referred to congestion at the Jubilee Way roundabout and asked if consideration had been given to the recent award of Garden Town status and how that might affect what was now being proposed. The proposals also needed to be considered in the light of a statement from the Leader of South Oxfordshire District Council who had referred to the need to reduce traffic into the town and that the

Northern Perimeter Road remained a first priority. The current road layout worked well with the large open space outside the Cornerstone well used. Some of that would relocate but not all and he mentioned the cinema, which had large numbers of children attending the Saturday morning show as a potential area of conflict. He was not convinced that the proposal had been looked at properly and whether consultants had in fact looked at the situation to see what happened on the ground and advised that only yesterday a large lorry had been unloading which would have inevitably held up any buses. He referred to a letter from Jenny Wilson (also submitted on behalf of 1500 local residents) objecting to the proposal.

Mr Tole advised that the report dealt with how traffic and safety implications of a planning permission issued by another authority could be best managed. It was not the function of the report to consider the rights or wrongs of that decision. Although the number of buses involved would not be great the use of Station Road for buses had been the main focus of objection. He accepted that the situation could change as Didcot grew but the road would only be used by buses with no other through traffic. The question had been asked if this was a suitable route for buses with comparisons made to Queen Street and, whilst the two routes were not exactly the same, buses used Queen Street without significant problems and, as similarly trained and experienced drivers would be using Station Road it was reasonable to expect that would be the case here and that vehicles would be present in a controlled way. County officers considered that would be the case and although the introduction of buses into the street would require pedestrians to learn and adapt but measures would be introduced to assist with that. It was inevitable that the area would change but he did not accept that all sitting areas would be affected and whilst the offer of funding for a CPZ had been welcome it was unlikely that that could be taken up due to lack of adequate enforcement. The one parking space to be lost was not one of long standing having only been in situ for 3 or 4 years. Regarding the letter from Jenny Wilson that had referred to a number of detailed design issues which would be addressed as the scheme developed. Bus shelters would be provided on Station Road with issues of loading accommodated through a combination of careful design and planned delivery by local businesses. The road would be widened with the number of buses adapting to local needs. There would not be a constant stream of buses. The issue of further investment in the strategic network was not a matter for consideration now and the County Council needed to focus on its response to the proposals put forward by the developer and agreed by the District Council. He had not been aware of the earlier petition presented to the County Council but confirmed that this consultation had been free standing and had focussed around the recent planning process.

Responding to questions from the Leader of the Council:

Mr Tole confirmed a £10,000 offer of funding towards a CPZ but as that was a brand new offer it had not been included in any S106 agreement but that it could be used towards funding a much wider scheme in the future.

Mr Sherwood confirmed that the whole length of Station Road would be resurfaced to a suitable standard. The only difference between the northern and southern sections being the need to introduce traffic restrictions on one.

Mr Tole confirmed that the main part would be widened on the east side of the southern section with the whole width resurfaced.

Mr Tole confirmed that it was not possible to impose a legal limit below 20 mph. Oxford's Queen Street had an advisory limit of 5 mph and that would be applied in this instance. Bus operation was now very controlled and these measures would to a large extent be self-enforcing by bus operators.

Mr Sherwood confirmed that detailed design would be carried out as part of the planning process and not in consultation with local businesses and residents.

The Leader of the Council recognised that the status of the northern perimeter road had been ongoing for the past 20 years and that the recent award of Garden Town status for Didcot was no guarantee that that situation would change. The County Council needed to deal with the detail of the issued planning permission and he could see no reason why the situation, which existed in Queen Street, which was not bus dominated, could not be successfully transposed to Didcot. He also hoped that proposals for a suitably enforced CPZ could be pursued and that developers would take on board local views as part of the detailed design work. Therefore having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above he confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve implementation of the proposals for bus lane and waiting restrictions as advertised.

Signed.....
Leader of the Council

Dated.....

48/15 PROPOSED TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS (SPEED LIMITS & CROSSINGS) - HAGBOURNE & CHILTON AREA

(Agenda No. 6)

The Leader of the Council (CMDE6) considered comments and objections received to a statutory consultation on proposals to introduce various traffic restrictions in the Science Vale UK (SVUK) area, in relation to the Chilton Interchange Improvement.

Jane Imbush considered the report incorrect insofar as it stated that horses didn't cross at this point and that video surveillance had supported that. However, she tabled evidence which showed that the approaches that particular day had been heavily flooded. Contacts made with neighbouring societies indicated that there were 200+ horse users in the area and that this particular point was an integral part of the local horse route and without an adequate crossing point there were huge safety implications for horses and riders. It was a concern that non-traffic use was not being

encouraged and she asked that this particular element of the proposal be deferred to enable further research.

Dr Janice Bridger supported calls for a modified crossing that could be used by horse riders. This was an important crossing point for horses and the report (paragraph 16) was incorrect insofar as a signal crossing which a horse rider could not operate would require that user to cross the road when the traffic signals were green for road traffic presenting a danger to horses and riders as well as traffic on Hagbourne Hill road who might not be expecting a horse to be crossing when the signal was green. Also the line of the restricted highway had recently moved so unless use was catered for in any new design riders would have to ride along the road rather than straight across. Paragraphs 14 and 15 of the report stated that there were significant delivery challenges and referred to Traffic Advisory leaflet 03/03. However, the report failed to mention paragraph 4.27 from the Design Manual for Roads & Bridges published in the following year which listed parameters, such as fenced waiting areas and segregation of users and that needed to be considered. The project design engineers seemed to have interpreted these as mandatory for the provision of a crossing but her society did not believe that they were and that a simplified and modified Pegasus crossing would allow riders to cross safely. Experience over the 10 or so years since that Department of Transport advice had been drawn up was that, in a number of instances, Pegasus crossings were being over engineered to the detriment of equestrian safety. There were examples of throughout the UK where a simplified specification has been installed which took up less space and had been significantly cheaper to install. She asked that these be considered with a view to designing a safe crossing for horses at Chilton. The basic needs for horse riders were that they could reach a button which controlled the traffic signal and that that button be set back from the carriageway so that the horse's head was not in the path of the road traffic as the rider operated the button. If a suitable crossing was not installed at Chilton then riders would either cross on a green signal in the face of oncoming traffic; try to use the Toucan crossing if that was physically possible or cease to use this route ultimately severing the rights of way network. That was inconsistent with statements in OCC's LTP3 and Rights of Way Management Plan which had not been referred to in this report. On behalf of the British Horse Society she asked that a decision be delayed to enable design engineers to meet with the Society & local riders to look into how the needs of horse riders could be catered for at this site, thus preserving the amenity value of the rights of way network in this area and supporting the economic value of the horse industry.

Frank Dumbleton speaking on behalf of Chilton Parish Council advised that one of the documents published at the time of consultation on the northbound slips scheme had included the sentence that:

"The impact on NMU facilities as part of this proposal will be considered as part of detailed design, but care will be taken to ensure that NMU's are not disadvantaged as a result of the scheme, existing facilities will be maintained and any opportunities to enhance the facilities for NMUs will be sought."

However, the scheme had not included a safe crossing for equestrian users, who would therefore be disadvantaged. It had been further observed that it was deemed inappropriate to encourage equestrians to use a controlled crossing when there was

no facility for them to use on the other side. That betrayed a lack of knowledge of the roads within Chilton village, which had no through traffic and were therefore safe for equestrians to use. In addition he sought reassurance that the measures for the Toucan lights to be controlled by traffic exiting Chilton village at Townsend and Chilton Field at Newbury Road were to be provided in order to avoid queues of traffic exiting the village and Chilton Field against the predicted huge increase in traffic on Hagbourne Hill and the A4185. Also the measure allowing buses to turn right into the village at Townsend would trigger the Toucan crossing to prevent delays to the bus service. The new scheme would result in a huge increase in traffic off Hagbourne Hill and the new slip road from the A34 southbound, which might delay buses if they had to wait for an opportunity to turn right. These measures had not been mentioned in the recent consultation on the crossings, and the County Council's attempt to renege on the agreement not to disadvantage equestrian users had prompted his calls for reassurance that the other agreed enhancements in connection with the crossing were to be provided.

Councillor Patrick Greene supported the concerns expressed by the speakers all of which needed to be investigated and he called for deferral of the specific element relating to the crossing. The issue of varied speed limits in the area which had been raised by West Hagbourne Parish Council also needed to be addressed.

Mr Tole confirmed that with regard to issues of speed limits as raised by Councillor Greene West Hagbourne parish council had been consulted. However, those issues were not part of this scheme although any issues which required consideration would come back for decision if required ending with it was hoped with a logical set of speed limits.

He confirmed that issues as raised by Mr Dumbleton regarding Townsend and Chilton Field would form part of the scheme.

Additionally he confirmed there had been no real objections to the published proposals other than the one generic objection regarding the suitability of crossings on major roads to which the County Council had well established protocols.

He accepted the unfortunate nature of the survey which as the photographs tabled by Dr Bridger showed would not have established true levels of use. As there were no other Pegasus crossings elsewhere in the county the examples of simplified crossings tabled by the speakers were useful but it was clear that within the existing land constraints it would not be possible to comply fully with government guidance for such a crossing. However, in the light of concerns expressed at the meeting he suggested a decision could be deferred in order to consult with the design team and equestrian groups and possibly other areas where such crossings were in use to see if a satisfactory design for a modified crossing could be agreed by all parties and if so then authority be given for that to proceed. However, if that was not possible and there were outstanding issues which needed to be considered then a report be brought back to the March meeting of the Cabinet Member for Environment.

Responding to questions from the Leader of the Council Mr Tole:

Confirmed that a 30 mph limit existed.

The desire line for a crossing was more or less straight across Hagbourne Hill road. There would be no central reservation.

The approaches to the crossing point would also need to be widened.

The Leader of the Council was minded to support further investigation for a modified crossing as suggested by officers on the basis that a Pegasus crossing might not be able to be accommodated but stressed the need for that to come back if necessary to the March meeting for the Cabinet Member for Environment. Therefore, having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above he confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve implementation of the proposals as advertised and set out in the report but to defer a final decision on provision of a crossing near Townsend to enable further discussions on provision of a form of modified Pegasus crossing for equestrian users. In the event there were further objections than that element should be reconsidered by the Cabinet Member for Environment at the 17 March 2016 meeting but if there were none then the agreed provision should proceed to implementation without further consideration.

Signed.....
Leader of the Council
Dated.....

49/15 PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF ONE WAY TRAFFIC RESTRICTION - OLD MINSTER LOVELL

(Agenda No. 7)

The Leader of the Council considered (CMDE7) comments and objections received to a statutory consultation on a proposal to clarify the precise extent of a current one-way traffic restriction on a minor road in Old Minster Lovell, which had been in place in some form since 2008.

Ben Arrowsmith spoke on behalf of the residents of Windrush who whilst not objecting had specific concerns regarding the siting of the no entry sign as in its current location it restricted the lower access to their property. Approaching the property from the bridge over the river Windrush there was already one very clear no-entry sign and that together with the fact that the road was not very narrow at this point had prompted them to request that the other sign be relocated above the lower access to their property and to amend the traffic restriction order accordingly.

He then responded to questions from the Leader of the Council.

He could not confirm whether or not his clients had attended meetings of the parish council.

He accepted that the lower access could be used if the one-way system was used but that his clients felt this seemed very disproportionate.

Colin Alderman for the Parish Council confirmed the one-way system had been in existence since 2008. He had been involved in its implementation and he was clear that the intention had been to site signs at the bridge junction with School Hill. However, the sign in question had been moved without permission from its correct spot some 18 months previously to enable the occupants of Windrush to use their lower access but had now been moved back to its original and correct siting. He emphasised that this was a dangerous corner and asked that the current siting be ratified as per drawings in Annex 1 to the report.

District Councillor Warwick Robinson confirmed that the plans originally considered by the Parish Council were as those set out in Annex 1 to the report. The lower access to Windrush had only recently been opened up following development at the property and he had been surprised to find that the sign had been moved without any consultation. That was now back in its correct position and he urged that that situation be ratified.

County Councillor Rodney Rose had been the local member for Minster Lovell when this scheme had originally been put in place and no discussion had taken place at that time regarding the need for a second access to the Windrush property. The intention had clearly been to prevent any turn after crossing the river bridge from Leafield but when the sign had been moved it presented a clear danger to motorists who had made that turn and who then might be required to reverse. He supported the recommendation.

Mr Tole confirmed that following legal advice it had been agreed that the most appropriate way to resolve the uncertainty was to formally consult on a new traffic restriction order which had been worded in line with the parish council's understanding of how the one-way system had been intended to operate and how the signs were currently sited. The residents of Windrush and the parish council were diametrically opposed. The police had indicated that signs should match the detail in any order and had been keen to establish that no-entry points should not be staggered. It was normal practice for a one-way system to start at a junction and it was within the remit of this meeting to make that decision as access to Windrush via the lower access was not being denied and would be available at all times if the one-way system was used. In this case there was clear support from and benefit for the wider community but a clear disbenefit to the residents of Windrush as suggested by their representative. The officer recommendation would clarify the matter once and for all.

The Leader of the Council read out an extract from the Parish Council minutes of a meeting held on 2 July 2007 from which it was clear to him that the original intention had clearly been to place the signing at the junction and represented a clear mandate for that to happen. There was clearly a need to clarify this situation and as restriction to Windrush Cottage would not be denied he was minded to approve the recommendation. Therefore having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above he confirmed his decision as follows:

.....

to approve the amendment to and implementation of the one-way traffic restriction in Old Minster Lovell as advertised.

Signed.....
Leader of the Council

Dated.....

.....