

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT– 3 JUNE 2010**

### **DISABLED PERSONS' PARKING PLACES – VALE OF WHITE HORSE DISTRICT**

#### **Report by Head of Transport**

#### **Introduction**

1. This report considers the proposed provision of new Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPPs), the proposed formalisation of existing DPPPs, and the proposed removal of existing DPPPs that are no longer needed. This follows the publication of the draft Oxfordshire County Council (Vale of White Horse District) (Disabled Persons' Parking Places) (Amendment No.4) Order 20\*\*.

#### **Background**

2. The increasing demand for parking in Oxfordshire can lead to particular difficulties for disabled people who need to park close to their homes or place of work. The County Council may provide a DPPP on a public road where there is a need.
3. On 7 December 2004 the Executive agreed to rationalise policy with regard to disabled parking which included proposals to adopt a uniform approach to be implemented throughout the County. Previously, in Oxfordshire (as opposed to Oxford City) disabled parking was provided by the use of advisory bays. These bays are marked up on the ground but no disabled sign plate is provided and, as they do not appear in a Traffic Regulation Order, are not enforceable. A review of these DPPPs is being carried out across Oxfordshire to ensure they are still required and those that are will be formalised. It will then be possible to enforce them. At the same time, new requests for DPPPs are considered.

#### **Procedure**

4. A fact sheet listing the criteria required to qualify for a DPPP is available in the Members' Resource Centre. A primary condition for qualification is that the applicant has to be a Blue Badge holder. Applicants have to complete a detailed Application form and provide a copy of their driving licence and vehicle registration documents to prove that both the driver and the vehicle owner are resident at the address where the DPPP is requested.
5. The site is then assessed by a Highways Inspector to see if a DPPP is feasible. If it is, informal consultation is carried out with various authorities, such as the Emergency Services. If no comments are made, formal

consultation is commenced. This report considers comments in respect of the DPPP's referred to in paragraph 1 received at the formal stage.

## **Formal Consultation**

6. The Directorate sent a copy of the draft Amendment Order, a Statement of Reasons for the Order and a copy of the Public Notice appearing in the local press to formal Consultees on 13 April 2010. These documents, together with supporting documentation as required, and plans of all the DPPP's were deposited for public inspection at County Hall, The Vale of White Horse District Office at Abingdon and Abingdon, Faringdon and Wantage Libraries. They are also available for inspection in the Members' Resource Centre.
7. Separately, the Directorate wrote to local residents in each area where the proposed new and formalised DPPP's would be sited asking for their comments. The Directorate also wrote to local residents in areas where it was proposed to remove existing DPPP's that were no longer required. In addition public notices were displayed at each site and in the Oxford Times. A table showing all the bay proposals is shown at Annex 1.
8. Comments were received in respect of the proposed DPPP's in Herons Walk, Lyford Way, Northcourt Road and Turner Road, Abingdon; Dibleys, Blewbury; Cleyfields, Bourton; Brookside, East Hanney; Pye Street, Faringdon and Upper Crale, Stanford-in-the-Vale. Comments were also received in respect of the proposed formalisation of DPPP's in Appleford Drive, Abingdon.
9. A synopsis of each comment with an officer response is set out at Annex 2. Copies of the responses can be viewed in the Members' Resource Centre.
10. The only statutory or formal consultees to comment were Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Unit who advised that they had no objections to the draft order and Abingdon Town Council whose comments are dealt with in Annex 2.
11. Only two changes to the advertised proposals are recommended in response to comments made during the consultation: -
  - (a) It had been proposed to provide a DPPP in Berrymere Road, Wootton. However the disabled resident who requested it has withdrawn his request as Vale Housing has now provided a disabled friendly garage for him. Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal does not proceed.
  - (b) It had also been proposed to formalise and lengthen the existing informal DPPP in Field Gardens, East Challow. After further discussions with the residents and the Parish Council, it is recommended that the proposed formalisation does not proceed at this time as the current arrangement works well. This will be looked at again following any subsequent agreement on decriminalisation of parking enforcement.

All the other proposals are recommended to proceed as advertised.

### **How the Project supports LTP2 Objectives**

12. The introduction of new DPPP's and the formalising of existing informal DPPP's will help in Delivering Accessibility by enabling disabled people to park near to their homes and thus access a wider range of services.
13. Removal of DPPP's that are no longer required will Improve the Street Environment by reducing sign clutter and result in better management of parking.

### **Financial and Staff Implications (including Revenue)**

14. The cost of installing the DPPP's is approximately £6,000 and will be met from the existing revenue budget provided for these.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

15. **The Cabinet Member for Transport is RECOMMENDED to authorise variations to the Oxfordshire County Council (Vale of White Horse District) (Disabled Persons' Parking Places) Order 2006 as amended in this report to provide for:**
  - (a) **ten new DPPP's, and three DPPP formalisations as set out in Annex 1 to this report; and**
  - (b) **the removal of two DPPP's as detailed in Annex 1 to this report.**

STEVE HOWELL  
Head of Transport  
Environment & Economy

Background papers: Consultation documentation

Contact Officer: Mike Ruse, Tel 01865 815978

May 2010

<b>Proposed New Disabled Persons' Parking Places</b>	
<b>Abingdon</b>	
1	Heron's Walk, in the lay-by.
2	Lyford Way, outside No's 21 & 23.
3	Northcourt Road, in the lay-by, outside No's 58 - 68.
4	Turner Road, in the lay-by near No 19.
<b>Blewbury</b>	
5	Dibleys, in the parking area near No 14.
<b>Bourton</b>	
6/7	Cleyfields – in the lay-by - two bays adjacent to central path leading to No's 6 & 7.
<b>East Hanney</b>	
8	Brookside – in the parking area at the intersection of the south and east kerb lines.
<b>Faringdon</b>	
9	Pye Street, outside No 7.
<b>Stanford-in-the-Vale</b>	
10	Upper Crale, outside No 31 Van Diemens.
<b>Wootton</b>	
11	Berrymere Road, outside No's 8 & 10 * <b>not now required.</b>

<b>Proposed Formalisation of Advisory Disabled Persons' Parking Places</b>	
<b>Abingdon</b>	
1	Appleford Drive, outside No's 87 to 89.
<b>Buckland</b>	
2	Summerside Road, outside School House.
<b>East Challow</b>	
3	Field Gardens, outside No 5. * <b>not now to proceed.</b>
<b>Faringdon</b>	
4	Bromsgrove, outside Church Hall.

<b>Proposed Removal of Disabled Persons Parking Places no Longer Required</b>	
<b>Abingdon</b>	
1	Berry Croft, outside No 43.
<b>Faringdon</b>	
2	Marlborough Gardens, outside No.7.

## ANNEX 2

**Comments on the Proposed Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPPs) and the Proposed Formalisation**

	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>DPPP at Heron's Walk, Abingdon</b>				
1	Resident, Heron's Walk	Approves of the proposal.	Noted	Proceed.
2	Resident, Heron's Walk	Approves of the proposal but wants lay-by extended so more residents can park. Suggests DPPP is located on the road outside the flats as nearer, and disabled resident doesn't have to cross road. Wants a "parent parking space." Suggests having parking spaces provided for specific house numbers. Doesn't like to park on road as limited room for large vehicles to pass.	Consultation is purely about the proposed DPPP. If the lay-by were extended, this would require digging up the grassed area which is not highway. Putting any sort of parking bay on the road could create problems for large vehicles passing by. The disabled resident wants the DPPP in the lay-by in the planned position. A "parent parking place" is not a legal highway marking. Under highway legislation no part of the public highway can be allocated to specific individuals or property for parking. Resident directed to District Council/ private landlord to identify owner of grassed area.	As above.
<b>DPPP at Lyford Way, Abingdon</b>				
3	Resident, Lyford Way	Agrees with the proposal but concerned that there will not be room for them to park next to the DPPP as all other parking is taken up. The applicant's husband also parks his van here.	There isn't room for two vehicles to park in front of applicant and commentator's home without the car in the corner being blocked in. DPPP will prevent that happening which will also mean a loss of unrestricted parking. Cannot prevent the applicant's husband parking his van in the road.	Proceed.

<b>DPPP at Northcourt Road, Abingdon</b>				
4	Abingdon Town Council	Vehicles park in the lay-by at an angle leaving the rear end partially in the road. If a DPPP was provided parallel to kerb here this would put more pressure on parking and force vehicles onto the grassed area in front of the flats. They suggest providing more parking on the grass.	When parking is congested, disabled drivers are the most disadvantaged. Although DfT regulations mean DPPPs are large, the disabled resident already parks in the lay-by. The lay-by is not deep enough for a DPPP at an angle. Although the grassed area behind the lay-by is not adopted, the grassed verge between the road and the footway is. Passed to Area Office to consider extending the parking here.	Proceed.
<b>DPPP at Turner Road, Abingdon</b>				
5	Resident, Turner Road	Is a Blue Badge holder and has lived in the road longer than the applicant. Needs more than just one DPPP. Other badge holders here who might want to use the space so might cause trouble. Would be better to have spaces allocated to house numbers.	Applicant applied for the DPPP in the normal way and meets the eligibility criteria. Other Blue Badge holders would need to follow the same procedure. Under highway legislation no part of the public highway can be allocated to a specific individual or property. Applicant accepts that other badge holders could use the DPPP as well.	Proceed.
6	Daughter of resident, Turner Road	Objects to proposal – her mother and several other residents are Blue Badge holders and if OCC provided a DPPP for one resident this would restrict the parking in the lay-by for others. Why not increase the parking here?	As above. The adjacent grassed area is not highway so OCC could not increase the parking area here.	As above.
7	Resident, Turner Road	Thinks the DPPP should cover whole lay-by as all residents here are disabled and	As above. Need to leave room in lay-by for visitors and carers to park as they could not use proposed	As above.

CMDT8

		two residents have cars.	DPPP unless they were taking residents out or bringing them back.	
<b>DPPP at Dibleys, Blewbury</b>				
8	Resident, Dibleys	Pleased with proposal as her husband has a Blue Badge. Thinks applicant will expect the DPPP to be for her sole use. Currently neighbours avoid parking where applicant parks. As there are other badge holders on estate who could legitimately park in the DPPP this could create conflict. This area was originally designated a vehicle turning area.	Applicant is aware that any vehicle correctly displaying a Blue Badge can park in the DPPP. OCC may put a DPPP in a turning area if it assists the disabled resident and vehicles can still turn, as is the case here.	Proceed.
<b>Two DPPPs at Cleyfields, Bourton</b>				
9	Resident, Cleyfields	Approves the proposal because he is one of the two disabled drivers resident here who would use the bays. There are more vehicles parking here than the lay-by can accommodate.	Noted.	Proceed.
10	Resident, Cleyfields	Is disabled and approves of the proposal as it will help him.	Noted.	As above.
11	Resident, Cleyfields	Extended his property and a planning condition required him to extend parking by 2 car widths. He then asked Parish Council whether they could mark up parking bays in lay-by. They told him it was a loading bay not a parking area. What is the area "classed as?" proposed	The lay-by is adopted highway which can be used for parking by anyone. Proposed DPPPs are in response to requests from disabled residents who already park in lay-by when they can so any reduction in parking space for other residents would be small. When parking is congested, disabled residents are penalised.	Proceed.



CMDT8

		DPPPS will reduce parking available by 14% in this congested area. Will extra parking be provided to compensate? DPPPs would only serve Cleyfields – what if disabled residents moved or died? Could unrestricted bay marking be provided also?	Contact No. for Southern Area Office given for further investigation into providing extra parking and to arrange for remainder of lay-by to be marked out. Regular reviews carried out by OCC to establish whether existing DPPPs still needed. Consultations carried out to remove those that aren't.	
<b>DPPP at Brookside, East Hanney</b>				
12	Resident, Brookside	Agrees that DPPP is needed but in planned location would take up 6 parking spaces. Suggests putting bay diagonally in the corner.	DPPP diagonally in corner would block access to path to other people parking here. Space wouldn't be saved as bay would have to be wide enough to allow car doors to be opened fully for disabled access. DPPP has been planned to cater for applicant's vehicle and protect general access to the path.	Proceed as planned.
13	Resident, Brookside	Parking is congested here and a DPPP would take away 2-4 vehicle spaces. Suggests putting bay diagonally in the corner and dropping the kerb.	As above. Request for dropped kerb passed to Area Office.	As above.
14	Daughter of resident, Brookside	Doesn't object to a DPPP but mother is disabled and thinks planned bay would block access to footpath leading to houses.	DPPP has been planned to cater for applicant's vehicle and protect general access to the path while still conforming to DfT specifications.	As above.
15	Resident, Brookside	Doesn't object to DPPP but thinks it will take away 3-4 spaces. Cars currently park at right angles to both kerbs leaving a space where the kerbs meet	As above.	As above.

		and pathway starts. Could bay conform to current practice and go nearest to this space? Or could it actually go diagonally in corner?		
16	Residents, Brookside	They oppose proposed DPPP as it would obstruct access to footpath. They suggest a different location.	As above.	As above.
<b>DPPP at Pye Street, Faringdon</b>				
17	Resident, Pye Street	Objects to DPPP as would be outside their house and they are a family of 5 and eldest child is in a wheelchair. Residents at No's 5 & 9 don't have cars. There is already a DPPP outside No 11. Applicant already rents a garage.	Road is too narrow for parking both sides. Current parking practice in road is for vehicles to park on same side of road as No 7. DPPP is planned to be as near to disabled resident as is practical and is close to a dropped kerb on the other side of road which disabled the resident would need to use to reach bay. Bay outside No 5 is too far away. Not enough room between No 7 and dropped kerb leading to garage of No 9 to provide DPPP. Planned DPPP will only take up part of frontage of No 7 and there will still be room for another vehicle outside No 7. As No 7 & No 9 don't have vehicles there will be ample room for informal parking outside both houses. Applicant has agreed to give up their garage if the proposed bay is implemented	Proceed as planned.
<b>DPPP at Upper Crale, Stanford in the Vale</b>				
18	The applicant, Van Diemans	Concerned that planned DPPP would obstruct the normal parking practice	There is not enough frontage outside No 10 for a DPPP – it would extend over No 12. The resident	

CMDT8

		which is on other side of road. No 10 Upper Crale is happy for bay to go directly outside. Bay would also obstruct waste disposal vehicles which go up and down the adjacent private road to collect waste.	at No 12 wants to drop his kerb for a hard-standing in his front garden and objects to a bay encroaching on his frontage.	
19	Resident, Upper Crale	No objection to DPPP but thinks it should either be located directly outside No 10, or opposite the off-street car park.	As above. A bay opposite the car park would obstruct larger vehicles accessing and exiting the car park including the caravan which is parked in the private half.	
20	Resident, Upper Crale	Parking is at a premium here – DPPP location would obstruct current parking practice. Off-street car park is half private now so less room for general parking. Applicant able to walk dogs round the village 4 times a day.	As above. Applicant has a current Blue Badge and meets the criteria required to qualify for a DPPP.	

**Comments on Proposed Formalisation of Existing Informal Disabled Persons' Parking Places (DPPP)**

	Commentor	Comments	Response	Recommendation
<b>DPPP at Appleford Drive, Abingdon</b>				
1	Resident, Appleford Drive.	Could the DPPP be moved outside the user's flat so people could park outside their own flats?	Would require another consultation to propose a move of approximately 10 metres. If current proposal agreed, disabled sign plate could be attached to existing lamp column. If DPPP moved would require an additional post. Not justified.	Proceed as advertised.