

## OUTLINE OF PREVIOUS CONSULTATION STAGES

1. **Stage 1:** A feasibility study of potential additional CPZs within Oxford was undertaken between August 2007 and January 2008. The Magdalen Road Area was one of 6 areas identified. The study included site surveys and parking surveys to determine the level of residential and commuter parking, as well as informal consultation with stakeholders and local councillors. A full report on the study is available in Background Document A. Based on the findings of the feasibility study, the then Cabinet Member for Transport decided to proceed with the promotion of the Magdalen Road Area CPZ alongside the adjoining proposed Divinity Road Area CPZ.
2. **Stage 2:** Wider, initial informal consultation was carried out between 13 June and 11 July 2008. Consultation packs were sent to every property in the proposed zone and just outside it. These packs included an explanatory leaflet, a questionnaire and example diagrams of parking arrangements, but not draft plans. Most respondents were overall in favour of a CPZ, and, whilst some were reluctantly in favour, they acknowledged the need for a CPZ in their area but resented paying for it and/or were concerned about the 'knock on' effect it might have in surrounding streets. It was also recognized that there was a need to restrict the number of permits due to the high demand relative to available space. Having reviewed the public response to the consultation alongside the county council's five LTP2 priorities, the Cabinet Member for Transport decided to proceed with a preliminary design. A report on the informal consultation is available in Background Document B.
3. **Stage 3:** Based on the results of the initial consultation the following proposals were to be put forward for the informal consultation, which took place between 7 November and 8 December 2008:
  - (a) for permit holder only parking to be provided at all times;
  - (b) any general short term parking for 2 or 3 hours from 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday with Permit Holders exempt from time limit, reverting to permit holder only in the evenings;
  - (c) under certain conditions footway parking would be provided:
  - (d) to restrict residents to 2 permits per property; and
  - (e) to include car club bays within the proposals.
4. A consultation pack, showing the parking layout and designation of parking bays in each street, including plans and a questionnaire, was delivered to every property within the proposed zone. A full report on the informal consultation is available in Background Document C. The response rate was 19%: 53% of respondents found the proposed layout acceptable, while 44% were against the proposals. However, the Fire & Rescue Service were concerned about the proposals to provide clear running lane widths of less than 3 metres in some streets, arguing that it could seriously affect fire appliance access. They requested that partial footway parking be considered where necessary in order to guarantee emergency access.

5. Following a review of the public response the then Cabinet Member for Transport decided to proceed with a detailed design, subject to the need to retain a running lane of 3 metres to guarantee emergency access, provide footway widths of 1.2m or greater except for short distances around pinch points where it may be reduced to 1.0m as an absolute minimum and, wherever possible, to retain one clear footway.
6. **Stage 4:** Taking into account the comments from the informal consultation, revised plans were drawn up for formal consultation, which took place between 11 June and 9 July 2009. Full details of this consultation were provided in the report to the former Transport Decisions Committee on 1 October 2009. A draft Traffic Regulation Order was advertised and consultation packs delivered to every property within the proposed zone.
7. The response rate was 17% overall, but 30% from within the Iffley Fields area (the area to the west of Iffley Road). Overall, 73% of respondents raised objections, many of which could be addressed by minor changes to the design. However, 86% of respondents from Iffley Fields had fundamental objections which officers considered it would not be possible to address with minor changes. Many related to the design, where residents' wishes to preserve the current situation of parking on both sides of the road with no footway parking, meant that there would be insufficient clear carriageway width to guarantee emergency access. The consultation documents, as well as individual comments from the consultation, are contained in Document D of the Background Documents in the Members' Resource Centre.
8. Throughout the consultation process, the proposed footway parking has been a controversial issue, with opinion split between those vehemently against any and those who recognise that it is necessary to provide sufficient parking whilst guaranteeing emergency access. This was discussed in detail in the report to the Transport Decisions Committee on 1 October 2009. While it is not possible to accommodate the recommended width of 1.5m within the design, the design allows a general minimum of 1.2m, down to an absolute minimum of 1m at pinch points, which is sufficient for wheelchairs and buggies to pass parked cars. Officers and many residents recognise that this would be a big improvement on the current situation in most streets within the proposed zone, where vehicles frequently block the footway, forcing pedestrians and wheelchair users onto the carriageway. However, footway parking is much less prevalent in the Iffley Fields area.
9. On 1 October 2009 the Transport Decisions Committee approved the principle of a CPZ in the Magdalen Road Area subject to the exclusion of the Iffley Fields area from the zone and authorised officers to advertise a new Traffic Regulation Order for the zone on that basis and also incorporating minor changes arising from responses to the formal consultation.

## SUMMARY OF MAIN OBJECTIONS WITH OFFICER RESPONSE

Objection	Officer response
<p>Objection to paying for permits, some seeing it as an unfair 'tax' on residents, and some relating this to the fact that they would not be guaranteed a parking space. Others said the scheme would make it harder for them to find somewhere to park.</p>	<p>Permit charges need to be levied to cover the costs of administration and enforcement of a CPZ and are not intended to generate a net income for the council. There would not be sufficient space to allocate a residential space for each resident's permit, because of the need to provide shared bays for visitors and the restricted space available. Also it would not be efficient use of the space – at any one time, not every resident is at home, and others should be able to use their space. Overall, officers consider that there would be sufficient space for residents because, although the number of spaces is reduced to prevent unsafe parking, parking by non-residents would be restricted and the number of resident permits per property would be limited to two.</p>
<p>Objection that the scheme could not be justified because there was no problem with commuter parking in their street. Some said commuter parking was not a problem because there was plenty of space in the daytime.</p>	<p>Parking pressures do vary from street to street and one of the main objectives of the scheme is to remove the availability of commuter parking, even if it is not causing problem for residents. In the feasibility study 391 cars were parked for more than 4 hours within the zone, of which 227 were parked for more than 6 hours. It is likely that the majority belonged to non-residents. The scheme would also deliver benefits for residents: better access, improved road safety, and protected parking, as well as less traffic caused by people coming into the area to park.</p>
<p>Objection to partial pavement parking.</p>	<p>The design provides sufficient room for pedestrians and wheelchairs to get past parked cars, which is an improvement on the current situation. Wherever possible the design allows for one clear pavement and there are clear pavement routes leading from the school in Hertford Street towards Iffley Road, to assist children and teachers moving between the site and the school's other site in Iffley Fields.</p>

CMDT4

<b>Objection</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
<p>Objection to the restricted number of visitors' permits, which are allocated per person over 17. People said that this would be overly restrictive, particularly as the parking restrictions would operate at all times. Some saw this as particularly unfair on single adult households.</p>	<p>The scheme would not work as intended without some restriction on visitor parking in the area. The proposed allocation of visitor permits is consistent with all other Oxford CPZs, but could be seen as more restrictive on residents of this proposed CPZ than some others, due to the fact that the restrictions are proposed to operate at all times and relatively few people have off street parking. Officers consider that visitor permit allocations should be included in any future review of permit arrangements across Oxford.</p>

**Responses by street within the proposed CPZ area (ordered by % of objections)**  
*(Streets shown shaded are SE of and including Magdalen Rd)*

Street	Packs sent out	Number of responses	% response rate	Support proposals in current form	Has objection either to overall proposal or a small detail	% of respondents with objections
Golden Rd	21	2	10%	0	2	100%
Howard	178	58	33%	5	53	91%
Hertford	40	12	30%	2	10	83%
Silver	31	11	35%	1	9	82%
Charles	121	31	26%	7	24	77%
Magdalen incl						
Newtec Pl	180	30	17%	7	23	77%
Sidney	44	12	27%	2	9	75%
Catherine	59	15	25%	3	11	73%
Percy	103	33	32%	7	24	73%
Hawkins	20	7	35%	2	5	71%
Barnet	13	3	23%	1	2	67%
Iffley Rd	234	13	6%	4	8	62%
Randolph	55	11	20%	5	6	55%
Aston	74	24	32%	11	13	54%
Essex	61	17	28%	6	9	53%
H Hicks Pl	14	2	14%	1	1	50%
Stanley Rd	53	12	23%	6	6	50%
Leopold	52	5	10%	3	2	40%
Green	23	3	13%	2	1	33%
Hurst	124	33	27%	23	10	30%
St Mary's Rd	101	36	36%	27	8	22%
Henley	64	23	36%	19	4	17%
Cowley Rd	55	1	2%	0	0	0%
Galpin Cl	6	1	17%	1	0	0%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1726</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>61%</b>

**Responses by street within the proposed excluded area**

Street	Packs sent out	Number of responses	% response rate	Support exclusion of Iffley Fields	Object to exclusion of Iffley Fields	% of respondents supporting the exclusion of Iffley Fields	% of respondents objecting to exclusion of Iffley Fields
Argyle	79	20	25%	18	2	90%	10%
Eyot PI	16	5	31%	4	1	80%	20%
Bedford	36	9	25%	7	2	78%	22%
Fairacres Rd	117	22	19%	17	5	77%	23%
Chester	38	4	11%	2	2	50%	50%
Warwick	92	24	26%	10	14	42%	58%
Stratford	77	21	27%	7	14	33%	67%
Parker	29	7	24%	2	5	29%	71%
Meadow La	5	4	80%	1	3	25%	75%
Bannister Cl	22	13	59%	2	8	15%	62%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>511</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>43%</b>

## EQUALITY AND INCLUSION

### 1. Introduction

It is the county council's policy to carry out a full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) on its services and on new policies. This involves assessing the service or policy's potential impact on people according to the following categories: gender, race, disability, religion, age, and sexual orientation, and on their human rights. It further involves assessing the impact on social inclusion.

The design of a particular scheme could not be described as a service or a policy, and so an EQIA would not normally be required. However, as there is no overarching policy specifically to cover the detail of CPZ schemes, it has been decided to carry out an assessment of any potential differential impacts of the two following schemes on people according to the above categories.

This assessment applies to the proposed Magdalen Road Area CPZ which is the subject of the main body of this report and to the proposed Divinity Road Area CPZ.

### 2. Main purpose of the scheme

By removing the availability of commuter parking, the CPZ aims to reduce the number of car trips into the area, contributing to the objective of reducing congestion on major routes into the city. The scheme would also benefit residents by reserving space for them to park their vehicles, reducing the number of vehicles coming into the area and would benefit all users of the roads in the area by removing potentially unsafe or obstructive parking.

### 3. Main features of the scheme

- Parking only within marked bays, backed up by enforcement.
- Bays designated as permit holders only, shared use (residents or time-limited between certain times for others), or time restricted for anyone.
- Some bays marked partially on the pavement where necessary to guarantee emergency access and preserve a reasonable level of parking space.
- Permits available for residents, max two per property, at a charge which is currently £40 each per year.
- Visitor permits available to residents: max 50 24-hr permits per year for each resident over 17. The first 25 of these are free, the next 25 for a charge of (currently) £15 but free for over-70s.
- Permits also available to businesses for max 2 vehicles required for business use.
- Carers' permits available to residents requiring frequent visits by carers for medical reasons.
- Restrictions in operation at all times.

4. **Consultation and stakeholder involvement**

Consultation packs were sent to every property within the proposed CPZ area and to a number of organizations. The full list of organizations from outside the area is available in background document E but includes the following groups representing people with disabilities:

Oxfordshire Association for the Blind  
Oxfordshire Council of Disabled People  
Mobilise  
Transport for All  
Oxford City Council Access Officer  
Talking Newspaper Service

This was the fourth consultation on the proposed CPZ. Throughout the consultation stages, individual responses have been considered in detail and requests from disabled people living in the area or those representing them have been taken into account with modifications made to the design in the immediate vicinity of their properties. Requests for disabled parking bays have been passed to the relevant officer and new disabled bays have been incorporated into the design.

In the consultation, individuals were encouraged to give reasons for any objections or comments they made. This information has enabled officers to consider the impact the scheme would have on various groups of people, and is incorporated in the assessment set out below.

5. **Potential impact of the scheme**

5.1 *Design*

The scheme consists of lines marking out parking bays, and additional signage. Lines and signs all accord with relevant regulations.

The design includes partial pavement parking in many streets. This means that bays are marked so that vehicles must be parked with two wheels on the kerb. Enforcement would be carried out against vehicles whose wheels were outside the marked bays. Partial pavement parking has only been proposed where necessary to preserve a reasonable amount of parking for residents (i.e. parking on both sides of the road) whilst providing sufficient clear carriageway width to guarantee emergency access.

The Department for Transport's guidance in 'Inclusive Mobility' advocates a minimum pavement width of 1.5m, in order to allow someone to walk to the side of someone with a wheelchair and for larger wheelchairs to turn. Because of the narrow width of carriageway and pavement in many streets it has not been possible to provide a clear footway width of 1.5m. The general minimum width allowed in the design is 1.2m, dropping to an absolute minimum of 1m at pinch points. 'Inclusive Mobility' provides for a width of 1m at pinch points over a maximum distance of 6m.

## CMDT4

There is a risk that the full marked width of clear pavement may be partially obstructed by wing mirrors that have not been folded in, overhanging vegetation, bins or recycling containers. However, with less non-resident parking it will be easier for residents, if they so wish, to remind each other of the need to retract wing mirrors. Overhanging vegetation can be removed by the county council if occupiers fail to cut it back when asked. Bins and recycling containers are generally placed back inside property boundaries by recycling staff once they have been emptied.

The restricted pavement width may have a higher negative impact on people with disabilities or age-related walking difficulties. Because women tend to live longer than men and are more likely to suffer from age-related disability it could also be the case that there is more of a potential negative impact on women than on men.

Activities that would be difficult under the design where there is partial pavement parking include:

- Passing someone in a wheelchair on the pavement, or two wheelchair users passing.
- Walking side by side with someone in a wheelchair or using a walking frame.
- Turning through 90 degrees or more in a wheelchair.
- Wheelchair users exiting or entering a narrow gateway alongside a car parked partially on the pavement.

These difficulties are mitigated as far as possible within the design by the provision of frequent passing places or other gaps in the parking, to protect accesses and fire hydrants, and provide clear sight lines around junctions. Where specifically requested, parking has been removed to keep the area around an individual gateway clear to assist disabled access. Disabled parking bays have in some cases been kept on the road rather than partly on the pavement, to assist users. Problems in the future for individuals accessing gateways could, when brought to the county council's attention, be eased through amendments to the design, subject to local consultation.

Unregulated pavement parking currently occurs in the vast majority of streets where regulated pavement parking is now proposed. Vehicles are frequently parked so as to prevent access along the pavement. The design would therefore improve conditions for disabled people in the following ways:

- Nowhere would marked clear pavement widths drop below 1m and generally the minimum would be 1.2m. With good enforcement, this means wheelchair users would be able to get around the area whereas currently their path is frequently blocked and they are forced into the road.
- Where possible, parking on the footway is only proposed for one side of the road. Where parking currently occurs on the pavement on both sides of the road, this is a significant improvement.
- Removal of parking from around junctions, where the kerb is usually

dropped, will create more opportunities for crossing the road.

**Taking all these factors into account, officers believe that there would be a significant net positive impact from the scheme's design for disabled people including those with age-related disability. The design is not considered to have any differential positive or negative effect on people according to their race, religion, or sexual orientation, or to infringe individuals' human rights.**

### *5.2 Designation of parking bays and position of yellow line restrictions*

The parking bays have been designated as permit holders' only, shared use, short term, or car club according to various practical considerations and local demand. Double yellow line restrictions have been placed where necessary for reasons of safety and access. As parking is currently unrestricted, this means that some residents would no longer be able to park directly outside their house and may have to walk a little further to get to and from their cars. It has sometimes been possible to accommodate particular requests for changes within the design.

Disabled drivers holding a blue badge benefit from the following mitigations:

- Non residents may park in permit holder only bays or unrestricted in time restricted bays
- Residents may apply for a Disabled Persons Parking Place (several new requests have been accommodated as part of the design but future requests will also be considered)

Loading (including dropping off passengers) is allowed within permit holder only bays and on double yellow lines where safe to do so.

**While it has not been possible to please everybody, the distribution of parking bay designations is not considered to have a potentially more positive or negative impact on any particular group.**

### *5.3 Restriction on residents' permits*

Residents would be entitled to permits: one each up to a maximum of two per property. This may create more difficulties for households with more than two adults, as well as residents in shared housing, where more than two people want to keep cars. However, the evidence from the consultations suggests that those likely to experience difficulties are relatively few in number, and that generally people recognize the need to limit demand for parking due to the constrained space available. A restriction per property is considered by officers to be a fair and practicable way of rationing the available space, and would not disproportionately affect people according to any of the equality groups.

Disabled residents with blue badges benefit from being able to park without a permit in residents' bays, so there is no negative impact on disabled people.

There is the potential for a negative impact on social inclusion, since some employment opportunities and other facilities may be impossible or much more difficult to access without a car. However, Oxford has an excellent public transport system to mitigate this and it is unlikely that within a household or shared house, all adults would need a car. Also the area is within walking or cycling distance of employment and services.

Additionally, we have responded to the growth in car clubs in the area, by incorporating dedicated car club bays within the design. Car clubs give access to a car for those who use them relatively infrequently, providing them with a lower cost option to owning a car.

**Officers do not consider that there is any clear potential negative impact on any particular group as a result of the restriction on residents' permits.**

#### *5.4 Restriction on visitor permits*

The restricted number of visitor permits available would present difficulties for some people, especially those with family members or partners who visit regularly by car, or those with childcare providers who come to their houses by car. While there is some shared use or short term parking space in almost every street it may be hard to find a space nearby, particularly in the evenings. Unlike the restriction on resident permits, which most people seem to accept, a recurring theme in the consultations has been dissatisfaction with restrictions on visitor permits.

In line with other Oxford CPZs, the allowance of visitor permits is per adult rather than per property. While this means that multi adult households and shared housing benefits from more visitor permits (in contrast to their disadvantage in terms of resident permits), it also means that single adult households are disadvantaged in terms of the ease with which they can receive car-borne visitors. Groups particularly affected may be single parent households relying on help with childcare and older single adult households. Non-car owners, who may be more reliant on car-borne visitors, do not qualify for any more visitor permits than do car owners. The majority of single parent households are headed by women and the majority of elderly single people are women, so there is potentially a greater negative impact on women than on men.

It should be noted that people requiring regular visits from carers or home helps for medical reasons (e.g. disabled or elderly frail) can apply for a carers' permit, which they keep and can give to any of their carers for the duration of the visit. Thus there is not considered to be any negative impact on disabled residents. Disabled people with blue badges visiting the area would be exempt from restrictions.

**The restriction is not considered to have any differential negative impact according to people's disability, race, religion or sexual orientation, or to**

**infringe their human rights. It could, though, have a slightly more negative impact on people according to gender or age.**

However, the area is well served by public transport, including buses late into the evenings, so in most cases visitors have alternative means of travel. There is also a provision for additional visitor permits to be issued in exceptional circumstances at the county council's discretion.

## 6. **Conclusion**

In summary, our assessment of the potential impact of the Divinity Road Area and Magdalen Road Area CPZs on people according to the equality categories is as follows:

**Gender:** The restrictions on visitor permits may indirectly affect more women than men due to the likelihood that there are more single adult households headed by or comprised only of women.

**Race:** No conclusive differential impact on any racial group.

**Disability:** Significant net improvement across the area on current conditions for people with disabilities, as a result of regulated parking.

**Religion:** No differential impact on any group as a result of their religion.

**Age:** The restrictions on visitor permits may negatively affect older people as they are more likely to live in single adult households. However, net improvement for disabled people will also bring benefits for older people where they experience age-related disability.

**Sexual orientation:** No differential impact on any group as a result of their sexual orientation.

**Human rights:** No infringement of human rights.

**Social inclusion:** The limits on resident permits may have a slight negative effect on households with more than two adults and residents in shared housing, insofar as access to a car gives people wider opportunities to access work and facilities. However, this is mitigated by good public transport, the availability of car clubs and the proximity of many employment sites and facilities.

**ANNEX 7****RECOMMENDED MINOR AMENDMENTS (SUBJECT TO LOCAL CONSULTATION)**

In response to comments received in the consultation, the following minor amendments to the scheme are recommended. These would be subject to feasibility investigation on site and to local consultation with those immediately affected.

However, the list may not be exhaustive. If Recommendation C is accepted, officers may, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and those people immediately affected make further minor changes during the implementation of the proposed CPZ.

1. Introduce a permit holder only parking bay across frontage of nos. 18 and 20 Aston Street in place of the proposed No Waiting At Any Time.
2. Review the parking layout outside 54 Catherine Street to accommodate the needs of disabled clients, moving the car club bay and substituting No Waiting 8:00am to 6:30pm in place of shared use parking.
3. Provide No Waiting at Any Time across the vehicle entrances to SS Mary and John School, in Hertford Street and Essex Street, to ensure emergency access to the school at all times, in place of the proposed No Waiting 8:00am to 6:30pm Mon-Fri.
4. Provide a permit holder only (partial footway parking) bay outside 102 Hurst Street in place of the proposed No Waiting at Any Time.
5. Add 190 Iffley Road to the list of Postal Addresses for Eligibility to Apply for Permits in Schedule 4 of the Traffic Regulation Order, with a note to indicate that it will cease to be eligible on the implementation of a planning consent to convert it into student accommodation.
6. Amend the list of Postal Addresses for Eligibility to ensure that any student accommodation forming part of the current redevelopment of 237-239 Iffley Road is not included.
7. Provide 3-hour shared parking 8:00am to 6:30pm Mon-Sun (Resident and visitor permit holders exempt from the time limit) outside 66-68 Magdalen Rd, in place of the proposed No Waiting at Any Time.
8. Provide No Waiting At Any Time across the dropped kerb access at the front of The Old Church Hall in Percy Street, in place of the proposed shared parking.
9. Provide No Waiting At Any Time across the dropped kerb access to the garage to rear of 45 Percy Street, which is in Catherine Street, in place of the proposed permit holders only parking.

## CMDT4

10. Provide No Waiting At Any Time across the dropped kerb access of 46a Percy Street, in place of the proposed permit holders only parking.
11. Check the position of the fire hydrant in Sidney Street and, if it will not obstruct any hydrant, provide additional permit holder only parking in place of the proposed No Waiting at Any Time outside numbers 10-14 Sidney Street.
12. Investigate the possibility of providing further parking bays in Stanley Road, between the No Waiting At Any Time restrictions that have been proposed to protect residents' dropped kerb accesses.
13. Provide No Waiting At Any Time across the dropped kerb access of 26 Stanley Road.