Divisions affected: Wolvercote and Summertown

### CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT 24 FEBRUARY 2022

# OXFORD: CUTTESLOWE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE – PROPOSED ADDITION OF BOURNE CLOSE & DAVID WALTER CLOSE

Report by Corporate Director, Environment and Place

#### RECOMMENDATION

- 1. The Cabinet Member for Highway Management is RECOMMENDED:
  - a) not to approve at present the proposed inclusion of Bourne Close and David Walter Close within the Cutteslowe Controlled Parking Zone) as advertised.
  - b) to keep under review the parking pressures in these roads to identify if measures may be required at a later date.

#### **Executive summary**

2. Following consideration of proposed no waiting at any time restrictions at Bourne Close at the Cabinet Member for Highway Management decisions meeting on 14 October 2021, following representations made by the local member officers were also asked by the Cabinet Member to look to include Bourne Close and David Walter Close in the Cutteslowe CPZ and as a result of this review the proposals were taken to formal consultation.

# **Financial Implications**

3. Funding for the consultation on the proposals was from the Councils Revenue budget, which will also fund their implementation if approved, with the costs of operating the permit parking being met from the permit fees.

# **Equality and Inclusion Implications**

4. No implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of the proposals.

# **Sustainability Implications**

5. The proposals would help facilitate walking and cycling and the safe movement of traffic.

#### Consultation

- 6. Formal consultation was carried out between 18 November and 17 December 2021. A notice was published in the Oxford Times newspaper and an email sent to statutory consultees, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Bus operators, Oxford City Council, and the local County Councillor. Letters were also sent to approximately 190 properties in the area, and notices placed on site in the immediate vicinity.
- 7. Nineteen responses were received during the formal consultation, comprising of 3 in support (16%), 13 objections (68%), 2 raising concerns (11%), and one expressing no objection.
- 8. The responses are shown at **Annex 1**, and copies of the original responses are available for inspection by County Councillors.
- 9. Thames Valley Police expressed no objection.
- 10. City Cllr Liz Wade expressed an objection specifically in relation to Bourne Close on the grounds that it was opposed by the majority of residents, who did not consider commuter parking to be currently an issue and stated they would be inconvenienced by the proposals in respect of the parking needs including that of their visitors, and also as a result of the cost of permits.
- 11. The remaining responses were from members of the public, the great majority being residents of Bourne Close, with no responses being received from residents of David Walter Close. The balance of opinion was fairly strongly not supportive of the proposals on the grounds stated by City Cllr Liz Wade.
- 12. Noting the above, it is recommended that at present the proposals are not progressed at present but kept under review should parking pressures in the area change.

Bill Cotton

Corporate Director, Environment and Place

Annexes Annex 1: Consultation Plan.

Annex 2: Consultation responses.

Contact Officers: Tim Shickle 07920 591545

Jim Whiting 07584 581187

February 2022

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	No objection
(2) Local City Cllr, (Wolvercote Ward)	Object - I write as one of the Wolvercote Ward Councillors, and refer you to the hearing before Tim Bearder, Cabinet Member, on 14 October last, about the proposal to prohibit obstruction of the turning area at the end of Bourne Close. Concerns had been raised that the turning area was used as a parking space by residents - which could cause an obstruction for emergency vehicles, in particular ambulances. This was a real concern because the six bungalows on the north side of the close are for elderly social housing tenants who might need emergency assistance. I attended with my County Councillor colleague Andrew Gant to confirm that we supported the proposal to prohibit obstruction of the turning area. A representative of one of the elderly tenants also asked for the turning area to be freed up.
	There was an opportunity at the hearing to talk about the problem that could be experienced by residents living adjacent to a CPZ - namely commuters using CPZ-free spaces for day-time parking. As a result of the concerns we expressed, a consultation was ordered into whether Bourne Close and the neighbouring David Walter Close should be included in the Cutteslowe and Five Mile Drive CPZ. This consultation expires on 17 December.
	I wrote to all the residents in Bourne Close and David Walter Close on 19 November advising them of the consultation and its deadline of 17 December. On 27 November I met a Bourne Close resident, at our ward surgery. He was very clear that the introduction of CPZ measures would make the parking in Bourne Close much more difficult. At my suggestion, he surveyed the households in the close, and the residents' views are attached to his submission to you.
	The reasons I have for opposing the extension of the CPZ are:  1. Elderly tenants in the North bungalows are now going to have the benefit of a clear turning area for emergency vehicles. Since they do not drive themselves, they are not going to need parking spaces, and carers could park on double yellow lines if spaces are not available on the South side or at the shops a few metres away (at least 10 long-term spaces for visitors).

	2. There are only 14 parking spaces (and 1 disabled space) on the South side of the road, which serve the 16 houses on the South side. This is just about an adequate number for the 16 households on that side. Commuter parking does not seem to be an issue. The nine residents surveyed did not see it as a problem.
	3. The Cutteslowe & FMD CPZ only operates from 10 a.m 5 p.m. on weekdays. This is a time when the Close is relatively empty because some residents drive to work. A 10-5 closure would not assist them.
	4. An elderly resident on the North side has expressed a worry that, if a CPZ comes in, she will have to find £25 for the second set of visitors' permits - and even if she could afford it, 50 permits a year would not be anywhere near the number she needs.
	I am convinced that extension of the CPZ would not assist the residents in Bourne Close, and would not support it. As far as David Walter Close is concerned, I wrote to all the residents, again advising them of the consultation and the deadline. I have had no response to the letter and so I am not in a position to argue the case for extension or otherwise of the CPZ. in respect of David Walter Close, but it may be that residents have written to you directly with their views.
(3) Email Response, (Unknown)	Object – I am against the decision for controlled parking in David Walter close.
(4) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	<b>Object</b> – A similar proposal was put forward about 10 years ago and I, along with Cllr Jean Fooks, canvassed the opinion of Bourne Close residents and it was agreed that we should not be included in the scheme. The major reasons for this is that we were not affected by commuters parking their cars in the day and that typically, but not always, we were a relatively quiet street. Not a single person wanted to be included in the scheme at that time - it made no sense at all.
	To the present day and nothing much has changed. We do not have any issues with commuters (see feedback from residents). There is still a slight shortage of parking. One side of the street (the odd numbers) have vehicles and as the even numbers side of the street consists of council social housing for the elderly, they almost exclusively do not have vehicles. There is only parking available of one side of the street.
	The only problem arises when visitors, carers, doctors and ambulances want to visit the social housing residents. If they park in the street then this does use up the space. This happens very rarely and could easily be avoided if proximal visitor car parking bays were used - also they often do not need permits and can even park of double yellow

	lines etc. These visits most often happen during day during the week when most of the cars in the street are not present as people have gone to work, so there is plenty of space, so there is absolutely no problem.
	The proposition of Resident Permit holders only from Monday - Friday 1000 - 1700 makes absolutely no sense. The main time residents want to be able to park is exactly the reverse of these times. Effectively we would be paying to be in a scheme to protect residents car parking spaces when we aren't typically there!
	Additionally, this would also somewhat restrict visitors' access to the elderly residents during the day when there would be lots of free space.
	The strong feeling against this proposal has been captured in the forms attached. There are only a couple of omissions which I will try and forward to you when I get them.
	One practical solution to supplying local residents with more parking would be to return the garages that are let out by Oxford City Council back to the council residences they were originally meant for (and only if they require them). Currently, these garages are often let to people who don't even live in the area. There are some 30 or so garages let out in this way with very short walking distance from this street. It is no coincidence that there are 9 garages on Kendall Crescent and there are 10 flats next to them. Likewise there are 9 garages at the end of Millers Acre and there are 10 even numbered houses on Bourne Close set back from the green.
	Another would be to consider widening the street (removing some of the green, to add some more car parking space) but at the moment I really do not think this is necessary.
(5) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	Object – do not wish to be included in the Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive CPZ and have not had any problems with commuter parking in the street.
	While the concerns raised by the council is about commuter parking, there is not even enough space for residents parking. Therefore it makes no sense for the proposal.
(6) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	Object – do not wish to be included in the Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive CPZ and have not had any problems with commuter parking in the street.

	There is no evidence that commuters are responsible for a lack of parking, which rarely happens anyway. This would be an inefficient response to a non-existent problem.
(7) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	Object – do not wish to be included in the Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive CPZ and have not had any problems with commuter parking in the street.
(8) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	Object – do not wish to be included in the Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive CPZ and have not had any problems with commuter parking.
(9) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	<b>Object</b> – do not wish to be included in the Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive CPZ and have not had any problems with commuter parking.
(10) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	Object – It is parking when residents are home from work, at night and weekends, that is the problem - Not parking during the day, there is no issue with commuter parking.  There are 22 dwellings on BC plus the 6 on a private estate at the end of the Close. There are 15 parking spaces, at a pinch. It means finding a parking space in the evening can be a struggle, especially if anyone has a visitor. While providing a turning space reserved for emergency vehicles etc, is a good thing: it has made the parking availability worse. There is no public transport on the estate now, so those with mobility problems may have no choice but to keep a car. While the grassy area on Bourne Close is very attractive, maybe a little of it needs to be sacrificed to provide some additional parking spaces.
(11) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	Object – do not wish to be included in the Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive CPZ and have not had any problems with commuter parking.  There have been no changes in the clothes that make inclusion of the CPZ now necessary or advantageous.
(12) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	Object – do not wish to be included in the Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive CPZ and have not had any problems with commuter parking, but folks visiting not having space.

The proposal does not solve the problem of occasionally residents not being able to park.
Object - not a good idea
<b>Object</b> - I object to the council charging or fining people for parking outside their houses on on residential streets (e.g. when visiting friends). Stop locking up Oxford by removing parking places and making money out of normal life.
Concerns - Last week the yellow lines were painted in Bourne Close, thereby reducing the available spaces for residents to park. If we are able to buy parking permits which cover the adjacent streets then at least we will have somewhere to legally park if all spaces are taken in the close.  But surely the painting of the yellow lines and the issue of permits should have been co ordinated. As it now stands we can't legally park in adjacent streets if no spaces are available because the council have jumped the gun with regard to the yellow lines.  When asked to comment on the proposal some weeks ago I did suggest that some of the sizable grassed area could be designated as residents parking. To me its the obvious solution but I have heard nothing about that idea since. I therefore have to come to the conclusion that the 'consultation' with residents was a sham and the council's actions were a forgone conclusion.  Could you please clarify what we as residents should do if we return home to find no spaces available in the close and we don't have the proposed parking permits yet. I believe one resident has received a parking notice when she was in precisely that position since the yellow lines were installed.
Concerns - The information you have given is not clear on 1) The reasons for the CPZ proposal (and yes I have read all of the available documentation and letters), 2) The evidence (if any) showing the efficacy of CPZ zones relating to the objectives of extended it here, and 3) The cost per car per house and justification of the charge amount (I have heard things anecdotally about this but the information on the council site we have been pointed to does not include this) or the regularity of enforcement.  Regarding the reasons given, it says "commuters" park on our road regularly. I have not observed this to be the case

	in the last 6 months working from a street-facing window. If you are actually talking about residents on other streets with permit parking using our road to park their second or third cars then you should have specified that and not used the catch-all term "commuters". I would like to see evidence of these commuters and where on our housing estate they are commuting to. I doubt anyone parks here and walks/cycles/buses into the city centre - perhaps they do, show us your evidence.
	Regarding the evidence, I am completely on board with encouraging other modes of transport and limiting car ownership to only essential ownership however, I do not think introducing a CPZ on a road with established residents will make one single difference to the number of cars per house currently. It might possibly deter someone from buying an extra car in future but in the grand scheme of how much a car costs to buy and run per year I doubt it. If the reasoning is at all related to reducing pollution in the city then any electric car owners should have a much reduced charge.
	Finally, a neighbour has pointed out that this is not a particularly easy to access survey so that could be improved in future consultations (e.g. typing in a long URL, forcing you to register to participate, and just being online only will exclude some people on our road).
	To conclude, I do think fewer cars would be a good thing. I think including our road in the CPZ could, in theory only, possibly put people who try and avoid it on other streets off parking here. However I'm not convinced there is enough evidence of that actually happening at the moment and I am not yet persuaded of a practical benefit in this case to fully support implementing not insubstantial charges on residents who already pay council tax etc.
(17) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	Support - I support the idea of parking permits . Many residents have to park on grass verge in the past due to people visiting in surrounding areas which are currently permits. This caused residents in Bourne close unable to park . If Bourne close became permits then residents would have a choice to park anywhere in the surrounding area which are currently permits.
	The petition that was done pervious and also this time is a family that owns 2 cars and doesn't want to pay for 2 permits! I think it would really benefit to be permits in Bourne close.
(18) Local Resident, (Oxford, Bourne Close)	Support - If it is parking permits it would solve the problems of people from other areas parking which mean the residents in Bourne close have to park on the grass or they block the turning point and it would stop residents parking there cars in between 2 space until there friends who cannot park else where owing to parking permits arrive

	then take a space which mean a resident who lives in street has no where to park the bungalow s there is only 3 who have car one which is a mobility and there is a parking bay already and it would be a idea to have the markings re done I strongly recommend parking permits I would then be able to come home and no I would have a better chance to park also car would not be causing problems for emergency service trying to get up road
(19) Resident, (Oxford, Bulan Road)	Support - If we are to get control over car use in the city we need to limit not only car use coming in but also the need to have one when living in Oxford