

Divisions affected: *Wolvercote & Summertown, Iffley Fields and St. Mary's, Headington & Quarry, Barton, Sandhills & Risinghurst, Churchill & Lye Valley, Marston & Northway*

**CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT –
14 DECEMBER 2023**

**OXFORD: PROPOSED PARKING PERMIT ELIGIBILITY & CPZ
ADMIN AMENDMENTS**

Report by Corporate Director, Environment and Place

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Cabinet Member for Transport Management is RECOMMENDED to approve the following proposals in respect of eligibility for parking permits and day-to-day CPZ operations, as advertised:
 - a) **Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive area** – exclude the additional new property at No.78A Linkside Avenue from eligibility for resident's parking permits,
 - b) **East Oxford** – (i) exclude Flat Nos.1-3 at No.30 Temple Street from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits, and (ii) replace a section of existing 'No Waiting at Any Time' parking restrictions by Nos.33, 35 & 37 Stockmore Street with additional 'Permit Holders Only' parking bay,
 - c) **Headington Central** – exclude Flat Nos.15 & 16 at No.138-140 London Road from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits,
 - d) **Headington Northeast** – exclude the new properties at No.9 Gurden Place from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits,
 - e) **Hollow Way (South)** – exclude No.73 Horspath Road from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits,
 - f) **Lye Valley** – exclude No.1 Inott Furze from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits,
 - g) **Marston North** – exclude No.26 Cavendish Drive from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits,
 - h) **North Summertown** – (i) exclude No.55A Sunderland Avenue from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits, (ii) exclude the two new properties at No.15 Blandford Avenue from eligibility for resident's parking permits, and (iii) exclude No.43 Davenant Road from eligibility for resident's parking permits.

Executive summary

2. This report presents responses received to statutory consultations on proposed amendments to existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) orders in respect of eligibility for parking permits, and modifications to adjacent parking restrictions as a result of the development of properties for residential purposes, and the associated conditions within the planning permissions granted by Oxford City Council.

Financial Implications

3. Funding for consultation on the proposals has been provided by the various developers of the properties in question.

Equality and Inclusion Implications

4. Officers note that the proposals may have a negative impact on those with mobility issues in terms of parking provision, it is considered that these are mitigated by the fact that in all permit schemes that operate in Oxfordshire, blue badge holders can park with their badge on display in permit bays or areas without time limit or the need to hold a valid permit.
5. Additionally, the County Council will consider any requests for additional dedicated Disabled Persons Parking Places on a case-by-case basis - subject to applicant & site suitability - this is provided free of charge to the applicant, and will provide additional parking capacity for any holder of an authorised current blue badge.
6. Proposals brought forward for changing permit eligibility link to the City Council's planning policies which require developments to be car free where criteria stipulates that there is good transport links and access to local facilities.

Sustainability Implications

7. The proposals would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and support the use of sustainable and active travel modes.

Formal consultation

8. Formal consultations were carried out between 13 July & 11 August, 26 October & 24 November, and between 02 November & 24 November 2023. Notices were published in the Oxford Times newspaper, and emails sent to statutory consultees & key-stakeholders, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Bus operators, countywide

transport, access & disabled peoples user groups, Oxford City Council, the local County Councillors, and the local Oxford City Councillors.

9. Letters were also sent directly to approx. 475 properties in the areas surrounding the various proposed amendments.

10.35 responses were received via the various online consultation surveys, and these are summarised in the table below:

a) Permit amendments:

Proposal	Support	Object	Concerns	No objection or opinion	Total
Flat Nos.1-3 at No.30 Temple Street	2	1	0	9	12
No.9 Gurnen Place	9	5	1	3	18
No.1 Inott Furze	3	2	0	7	12
No.55A Sunderland Avenue	2	1	2	13	18
No.15 Blandford Avenue	3	1	1	7	12
No.43 Davenant Road	2	1	1	8	12
No.73 Horspath Road	2	3	2	11	18
Flat Nos.15 & 16 at No.138-140 London Road	3	1	2	12	18
No.26 Cavendish Drive	4	1	2	11	18
No.78A Linkside Avenue	4	1	-	-	5

b) Parking restriction amendments

Proposal	Support	Object	Concerns	No objection or opinion	Total
remove DYLS adjacent to Nos.33, 35 & 37 Stockmore Street	2	1	2	-	5

11. Two emails were also received during the course of the July consultation, with one resident raising concerns about the proposal to allow one permit per property at Nos.33, 35 & 37 Stockmore Street, and one resident supporting the proposal to remove the DYLS adjacent to these properties.
12. Additionally, a further three emails were also received during the course of the October/November consultations, with one resident raising concerns about the permit eligibility amendment at No.73 Horspath Road, one resident objecting to proposals for No.138-140 London Road, and one objecting to the proposals for No.55A Sunderland Avenue.

13. The responses are shown at **Annex 1**, and copies of the original responses are available for inspection by County Councillors.

Officer response to objections/concerns

14. Thames Valley Police expressed no objections to the various proposals.

Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive:

15. In the Cutteslowe & Five Mile Drive area CPZ – which was introduced in 2014 – residents are currently permitted to apply for a maximum of one permit per resident, with 50 visitor permits also permitted a year.
16. At No.78A Linkside Avenue planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse and garage, and the erection of 2 x 4 bed dwellinghouses (use Class C3) (23/01492/FUL), a condition was placed on the development that required the exclusion of the additional new property from eligibility for resident's parking permits.
17. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause parking stress in the surrounding area.
18. The site was deemed to be 'car free', with consideration given to the fact that there is already off-street car parking spaces for the existing property, which is to be reduced to meet the City Council's maximum standards of one car parking space per dwelling.

East Oxford:

19. In the East Oxford CPZ – which was introduced in 2010 – residents are currently permitted to apply for a maximum of one permit per resident, and a maximum of two permits per property, with 50 visitor permits also permitted a year.
20. At No.30 Temple Street planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the erection of a two storey infill building to provide 1 x 2-bed and 2 x 1-bed maisonettes (use Class C3) (19/01178/FUL), a condition was placed on the development that required the exclusion of Flat Nos.1-3 from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits.
21. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause parking stress in the surrounding area.
22. The site was put forward to be 'car free', with it deemed to be located in a sustainable location, i.e. close to a range of amenities and public transport links. Therefore, the restriction of permit eligibility is seen as necessary to help ensure that the development remains car free. It should also be noted that

cycle parking will also be provided on site, and within the internal communal areas.

23. At Nos.33, 35 & 37 Stockmore Street planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the demolition of existing buildings, and the erection of a three storey building to create 3 x 3-bed dwellings (use Class C3) (21/02960/FUL), conditions were placed – which included the conversion of some existing double yellow lines in front of the application site into additional controlled parking bays.
24. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause parking stress in the surrounding area.
25. The site is deemed to be located in a sustainable location, i.e. close to a range of amenities and public transport links, however it was noted that seven on-site car parking spaces would be lost as a result of the development. It should also be noted that cycle parking storage will also be provided on site for two cycles per dwelling.
26. As a result, Planning Officers have permitted one space per dwelling on the development site, and as such the alteration of the double yellow lines to the front of the site and expanding the parking bays on the street to cover this area would help create additional parking for approximately three additional vehicles for permit holders to utilise.
27. An additional condition was placed to exclude the approved new properties from eligibility for more than one resident's parking permit per each property, with concerns regarding the pressure on existing parking availability received in relation to this aspect of the proposal.

Headington Central:

28. In the Headington Central CPZ – which was introduced in 2005 – residents are currently permitted to apply for a maximum of one permit per resident, with 50 visitor permits also permitted a year.
29. At No.138-140 London Road planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the change of use from office use to residential to provide 2 x 1-bed flats (14/01500/B56).
30. The site is located within the Headington shopping area which has been identified as an area of the city that is accepted to be highly accessible by non-car modes of transport. The development was proposed to be car free, and was also deemed to be likely to generate less traffic/vehicle movements than the commercial office use.
31. It should also be noted that Flat Nos. 1-14 at Hohn Leon House are already excluded from permit eligibility, and as such these proposals ensure consistency within the development and across the CPZ.

Headington Northeast:

32. In the Headington Northeast CPZ – which was introduced in 2006 – residents are currently permitted to apply for a maximum of one permit per resident, with 50 visitor permits also permitted a year.
33. At No.9 Gurden Place planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the demolition of the existing bungalow and garage, and the erection of 3 x 3 bed dwellinghouses (20/02202/FUL), a condition as placed as to exclude the new properties from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits.
34. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause parking stress in the surrounding area.
35. The site is deemed to be located in a sustainable location, i.e. close to a range of amenities and public transport links, and would be car free. It should also be noted that cycle parking would also be provided on site for at least three cycles per dwelling, which would be accessible at street level.

Hollow Way (South):

36. In the Hollow Way (South) CPZ – which was introduced in 2022 – residents are currently permitted to apply for a maximum of one permit per resident, and a maximum of two permits per property, with 50 visitor permits also permitted a year.
37. At No.73 Horspath Road planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the change of use of from a single dwelling (use Class C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation (use Class C4) (23/00581/FUL), a condition was placed as to exclude the property from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits.
38. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause parking stress in the surrounding area. The exclusion of permit eligibility will help protect existing on-street parking from the potential pressure of the development as there is likely to be an increase in the number of adults living at the property.
39. The site is deemed to be located in a highly sustainable location, i.e. close to a range of amenities and public transport links, and would also retain the off-street parking space to the rear of the site. It should also be noted that cycle parking would also be provided on site for at least five cycles, providing the requirement of one space per occupant.
40. Officers have been made aware that some residents (in the intervening period) have applied for and received permits. Informal discussions with one

affected party directly has resulted in the compromise that these would be allowed to run their course, but wouldn't be eligible for renewal when the time came. The outcome of which was welcomed.

Lye Valley:

41. In the Lye Valley CPZ – which was introduced in 2016 – residents are currently permitted to apply for a maximum of one permit per resident, with 50 visitor permits also permitted a year.
42. At No.1 Inott Furze planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the change of use of from a single dwelling (use Class C3) to a Large House in Multiple Occupation (22/02019/FUL), a condition was placed as to exclude the site from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits.
43. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause parking stress in the surrounding area.
44. The site is deemed to be located in a highly sustainable location, i.e. close to a range of amenities and public transport links, and does not include any amendments to the existing parking arrangements, with the existing parking space being retained. The exclusion of permit eligibility will help protect existing on-street parking from the potential pressure of the development as there is likely to be an increase in the number of adults living at the property.
45. It should also be noted that cycle parking would also be provided on site for at least five cycles, providing the requirement of one space per occupant.

Marston North:

46. In the Marston North CPZ – which was introduced in 2021 – residents are currently permitted to apply for a maximum of one permit per resident, and a maximum of two permits per property, with 50 visitor permits also permitted a year.
47. At No.26 Cavendish Drive planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the change of use of from a single dwelling (use Class C3) to a Large House in Multiple Occupation (22/02401/FUL), a condition was placed as to exclude the site from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits.
48. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause on-street parking stress in the surrounding area. The existing garage at the site has been identified as not meeting the minimum dimensions required for a modern parking space, and therefore the conversion of the garage is not considered to result in a loss of parking at the site.

49. The exclusion of permit eligibility will help ensure that the proposals do not result in an increase in on-street parking within Cavendish Drive and the surrounding residential streets. It should also be noted that cycle parking would also be provided on site for at least three cycles, providing the requirement of one space per occupant.

North Summertown:

50. In the North Summertown CPZ – which was introduced in 2007 – residents are currently permitted to apply for a maximum of one permit per resident, with 50 visitor permits also permitted a year.
51. At No.55A Sunderland Avenue planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the demolition of the existing dwelling, and erection of 2 x 4 bed dwellings (use Class C3) (21/00478/FUL), a condition was placed as to exclude the site from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits.
52. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause on-street parking stress in the surrounding area.
53. The site has been deemed to be 'car free', with it deemed to be located in a sustainable location, i.e. close to a range of amenities and public transport links. There are already four off-street car parking spaces for the existing dwelling, and as such parking on the site would not exceed this existing provision.
54. It should also be noted that cycle parking for five cycle parking spaces per dwelling has been approved, with the storage being secure, covered and allowing good access to & from the highway.
55. At No.15 Blandford Avenue planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the demolition of the existing dwelling, and erection of 2 x 4 bed dwellings (use Class C3) (22/00611/FUL), a condition was placed as to exclude the site from eligibility for resident's parking permits.
56. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause on-street parking stress in the surrounding area.
57. The site has been deemed to be 'car free', with it deemed to be located in a sustainable location, i.e. close to a range of amenities and public transport links. There are already two off-street car parking spaces for the existing dwelling, and as such approval was given for parking on the site to be reduced to one car parking space per new dwelling.
58. It should also be noted that cycle parking (shelter to be located in the rear garden) would provide sufficient spaces, with the storage being secure, covered and allowing good access to & from the highway.

59. At No.43 Davenant Road planning approval has been granted by Oxford City Council for the demolition of the existing dwelling & garage, and erection of 2 x 4 bed dwellings (use Class C3) (21/02814/FUL), a condition was placed as to exclude the site from eligibility for resident's parking permits.
 60. The condition was placed to ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would affect highway safety, or cause on-street parking stress in the surrounding area.
 61. The site has been deemed to be 'car free', with it deemed to be located in a sustainable location, i.e. close to a range of amenities and public transport links. There are already two off-street car parking spaces for the existing dwelling, and as such parking on the site would not exceed this existing provision.
 62. It should also be noted that cycle parking for three cycle parking spaces per dwelling has been approved, with the storage being secure, covered and allowing good access to & from the highway.
 63. Finally, in response to general concerns about having constraints placed on residents' ability to park where they live, it is important to note that the restrictions have been put forward in response to the development of properties for residential purposes. The proposals – a condition of planning approval granted by the City Council – will help ensure that the potential increase in residents at properties as a result of the development do not result in increased demand for on-street parking in the local area, thereby adversely affecting existing residents.

Bill Cotton
Corporate Director, Environment and Place

Annexes Annex 1: Consultation responses

Contact Officers: James Whiting (Team Leader - TRO and Schemes)

December 2023

ANNEX 1

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	No objection
<i>July 2023 Consultation</i>	
(2) Local Resident, (Headington, Binswood Avenue)	<p>No. 21 Binswood Avenue - Concerns</p> <p>I believe no 21 on our street is a house of multiple occupancy and I am concerned that there could be a excessive number of cars requesting permits and parking on an already crowded cul-de-sac street in terms of parking. What is the justification for now allowing the residents at this address to apply for resident's permits? Could this be limited to one resident's permit only, as for No33,35&37 Stockmore also within this list of amendments?.</p>
(3) Local Resident, (Headington, Inott furze)	<p>No.1 Inott Furze - Object</p> <p>It blocks the entrance to inott furze and dangerous at the top of a hill</p>
(4) Local Resident, (Oxford, Alice Smith Square)	<p>No.15 Blandford Avenue - Support No.43 Davenant Road - Support No.1 Inott Furze - Support No.3 Barton Lane - Support No.60 Headley Way - Support Nos.33,35 & 37 Stockmore Street - Support No.30 Temple Street - Support No. 21 Binswood Avenue - Support</p> <p>less parking for cars equals more space for pedestrians</p>

	<p>Stockmore Street parking - Support the less cars there is in the city, the better for everyone</p>
(5) Local Resident, (Oxford, Blandford Avenue)	<p>No.15 Blandford Avenue - Object No.43 Davenant Road - Object</p> <p>Inappropriate method of reducing car pollution and also discriminatory. Make the alternatives - buses, cycling, walking superior in cost, security and convenience to change behaviour, not placing illogical restrictions on individual properties.</p>
(6) Local Resident, (Oxford, Blandford Avenue)	<p>No.15 Blandford Avenue - Concerns No.43 Davenant Road - Concerns</p> <p>From my experience of the area, I don't think that granting residents' permits to these properties would affect the on-street parking amenity or safety. There seem to normally be a good number of parking spaces available.</p>
(7) Local Resident, (Oxford, Blandford Avenue)	<p>No.15 Blandford Avenue - Support</p> <p>Blandford Avenue is already very congested with on street parking so I think to allow more due to a house being developed into 2 semis would be a mistake which is why I agree with the proposal of exemption for number 15</p>
(8) Local Resident, (Oxford, Davenant Road)	<p>No.15 Blandford Avenue - Support No.43 Davenant Road - Support No.1 Inott Furze - Support No.3 Barton Lane - Support No.60 Headley Way - Support Nos.33.35 & 37 Stockmore Street - Support No.30 Temple Street - Support No. 21 Binswood Avenue - Support</p>

	The cases I know about are in-fill developments with their own off street parking. The streets concerned already have limited parking for residents some or whom lack off street parking.
(9) Local Resident, (Oxford, Inott Furze)	<p>No.1 Inott Furze - Support</p> <p>We are residents of Inott Furze and the location of no. 1 at the top of the road is not conducive to on-street parking on what is a small street. Cars blocking the top of the road or parked along the street would hamper traffic, especially for larger vehicles. So our household support the exclusion of no.1 from parking and visitor parking permits.</p>
(10) Local Resident, (Oxford, Stockmore Street)	<p>Nos.33.35 & 37 Stockmore Street - Concerns</p> <p>I have no objection to the increase in parking spaces outside Nos 33,35 and 37 Stockmore Street, but, if each household is able to apply for one parking permit per property, this could mean up to 150 extra cars on the street per year. It is sometimes difficult to find residents' parking spaces on the street at present, and this will only exacerbate the issue.</p> <p>Stockmore Street parking - Support</p> <p>Three additional parking spaces on the street will be helpful to all residents. Car parking spaces are already at a premium. There is also an argument for increasing parking spaces outside Nos 7 and 9 Stockmore Street as long as there is an adequate turning circle at the Cowley Road end of the street if the LTN restrictions remain in place (which I hope they don't).</p>
(11) Local Resident, (Oxford, Temple Street)	<p>No.30 Temple Street - Object</p> <p>As a resident of Temple Street who owns one car, we are already struggling with parking on our street. Also with the increase to at least 5 NHS parking permits allocated to workers in St. Clement's Surgery (as well as 3 already dedicated parking spaces for doctors) the parking places are severely limited as it is. Did the original planning permission for this site specifically state that parking permits would not be included if permission is provided ?</p> <p>With the Jehovah's Witness hall having meetings every Tuesday, Thursday and twice on Sunday, the dentist, Mint</p>

	Lounge and Nando's as well as the corner shop on corner with Cowley Road, our street already has too many vehicles looking for parking as it is.
(12) Local Resident, (Oxford, Inott Furze)	<p>No.1 Inott Furze - Object</p> <p>This is a tiny street. Number has been converted to an HMO for 7-9 persons. We don't have the capacity to take anymore than 2 cars at that property. The property is also at the corner at the top of the hill and parking will create a blind spot making it dangerous for cyclist, pedestrians and motorists</p>
(13) Member of public, (OX33 area)	<p>Stockmore Street parking - Object</p> <p>No comments provided</p>
(14) Local Resident, (Oxford, Stockmore Street)	<p>Nos.33.35 & 37 Stockmore Street - Concerns</p> <p>I am concerned with the proposed residents parking permit in stockmore street. The street gets very busy especially when students are in Oxford.</p> <p>We barely have enough spaces in the street to accommodate those that already live here. I can come home from work and there are no spaces. I have at to park in another street especially when students have moved in at stockmore street because there is no parking.</p> <p>Although you say you would limit residents parking to one per house hold, there still maybe additional visitors permits that can be used so more spaces will be taken. I object especially due to having paid for parking and there is not enough spaces to accommodate those already living in stockmore street.</p>
(15) Local Resident, (Oxford, Stockmore Street)	<p>Stockmore Street parking - Support</p> <p>Being a resident of Stockmore Street I am all too aware that car parking on most of these streets is already stretched. At the same time as extending the parking bays outside Nos. 33, 35 and 37, which I fully support, I wonder whether you could also look at doing the same outside Nos. 9 and 7. This was historically a dropped kerb</p>

	for a pub car park which has now been developed into houses with a full height kerb. For some reason the double yellow lines were never removed to reflect this.
<i>October/November 2023 Consultation</i>	
(16) Rather not say, (Oxford, Headington)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Object No.55A Sunderland Avenue - Concerns No.73 Horspath Road - Concerns No.138-140 London Road - Concerns No.26 Cavendish Drive - Concerns</p> <p>We dont have enough space for parking as per house we only have 1 space parking lot.</p>
(17) Local resident, (Oxford, Horspath Road)	<p>No.73 Horspath Road - Object</p> <p>Residents of number 73 Horspath Road (which I understand is a house of multiple occupancy) have vehicles and are using the road to park haphazardly at present. They should have to pay to do so, the same as every other resident in the street who has been forced to pay for permits, as a result of these measures. I strongly object to the proposed exclusion of this address for having to pay for permits.</p>
(18) Local resident, (Oxford, Sunderland Avenue)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Object No.55A Sunderland Avenue - Object No.73 Horspath Road - Object No.138-140 London Road - Object No.26 Cavendish Drive - Object</p> <p>Completely unfair to prevent people from parking outside their homes, many people rely on their vehicle to meet their basic needs and earn a living, especially in the cost of living crisis we are in. To prevent residents from having reliable means of transportation you are only making residents lives more difficult.</p>

(19) Local resident, (Oxford, Aston Street)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Concerns No.55A Sunderland Avenue - Concerns No.73 Horspath Road - Concerns No.138-140 London Road - Concerns No.26 Cavendish Drive - Concerns</p> <p>what do these residents do if they need a plumber etc where do they park? also those with larger and more powerful vehicles should pay more for permits</p>
(20) Local resident, (Cowley, Horspath Road)	<p>No.73 Horspath Road - Object</p> <p>I live at 73, Horspath Road, Cowley, Oxfordshire, OX4 2QP and as placement students who need there cars to travel home to visit family and friends it's a joke to take away our parking especially after we have paid for the year only 3 months ago...</p> <p>There is always so many spaces outside so why is it fair to take away our parking permits?</p>
(21) Local resident, (Headington, Gurden Place)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Object</p> <p>I am a resident of Gurden Place. The planning permission was granted on the express permission that parking access for visitor permits would be excluded as the parking is already really tight and limited in the area. We are really against this being amended - especially given the circumstances. There are also young children living on the road and this would increase traffic and danger for them.</p>
(22) Local resident, (Oxford, Gurden place)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Object</p> <p>The road is extremely cramped for parking already. When the planning permission was granted the terms that we were told as residents living on the road was that they had parking on the site and would not need parking on the road -this being especially important as they have replaced 1 bungalow with 4 houses. This application directly goes against this initial decision and is a reason why we do not want them to be granted this permission</p>

(23) Local resident, (Headington, Gurden Place)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Object</p> <p>There is very, very limited parking already on Gurden Place. We struggle to park outside our house (number 2) already. This would exacerbate the problem and our understanding was that the initial planning application was approved on the basis that they wouldn't have parking.</p>
(24) Local resident, (Oxford, Cavendish Drive)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Support No.26 Cavendish Drive - Support</p> <p>Living close to 26 cavendish drive, which has 7 apartments, it would be totally unreasonable to find a possible 7 vehicles or more parked in the road.</p>
(25) Local resident, (Oxford, Cavendish Drive)	<p>No.26 Cavendish Drive - Support</p> <p>No. 26 Cavendish Drive is a multi-occupancy dwelling with numerous short term people staying. This should not constitute the definition of 'resident' for parking permit purposes, whilst the number of separate occupants could lead a large number of additional cars parked on nearby streets.</p>
(26) Local resident, (Headington, Gurden Place)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Support</p> <p>Properties at 9 Gurden Place should be excluded from parking as the original planning permission was submitted without parking. Residents made clear objections around parking at that time. Number 9 originally had a large driveway so did not require parking on the road.</p> <p>Gurden Place is a small close with only 5 permit holder spaces for 8 houses. Parking on the rest of Northfield Road is also very limited. There are already difficulties with parking and deliveries as cars sometimes park outside of designated spaces in Northfield Road and Gurden Place.</p> <p>Allowing three new houses to apply for permits could increase the number of cars in the street by 6 or more depending on the residents living in the properties. This would be unmanageable for this street as there are rarely spaces available in Gurden Place or Northfield Road.</p>

	<p>There is also a potential safety hazard to those in Gurden Place if the volume of cars coming in and out of a narrow road were to increase.</p> <p>Furthermore, with a focus on green initiatives, allowing further permits would go against policies to decrease car ownership and usage in the city.</p>
(27) Local resident, (Headington, Gurden Place)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Support No.138-140 London Road - Support</p> <p>I support excluding no.9 Gurden place, as the property has sufficient space for parking. Also, the public parking spaces are very limited and would lead to conflict and would affect community harmony.</p>
(28) Local resident, (Headington, Gurden Place)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Support</p> <p>Support the exclusion of no.9 Gurden Place, on street on parking is already limited in Gurden Place (6 parking spaces for 8 properties) so there is no capacity to accommodate more.</p>
(29) Local resident, (Headington , Gurden Place)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Support</p> <p>I support the exclusion of no.9 Gurden Place from parking eligibility. Parking is limited and non of the houses in Gurden Place except for no. 9 have parking space within the property so we rely on on-street parking.</p>
(30) Local resident, (Headington, Gurden Place)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Support</p> <p>Can't understand why these new houses would be granted parking when the planning was only given to them on the basis they couldn't have parking. There are not enough spaces already for local residents</p>
(31) Local resident, (Headington, Gurden Place)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Support</p>

	Planning permission for replacing a perfectly good bungalow (the former no 9 Gurden Place) with three new family dwellings was CONTINGENT on there being no car permits. This stance should be maintained. There is no space for more parking in this area. And traffic from additional vehicles would represent a hazard in a small space.
(32) Local resident, (Oxford, Charles Street)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Support No.55A Sunderland Avenue - Support No.73 Horspath Road - Support No.138-140 London Road - Support No.26 Cavendish Drive - Support</p> <p>There are a huge percentage of the Oxford population who don't own cars. Through excluding parking permits it will open these houses to people who seek active transport thereby moving more active movers into the city boundaries. Currently the city is very unequal as those within the ring road have all the benefits -- this will balance this</p>
(33) Local resident, (Adderbury, Round Close Road)	<p>No.9 Gurden Place - Support No.55A Sunderland Avenue - Support No.73 Horspath Road - Support No.138-140 London Road - Support No.26 Cavendish Drive - Support</p> <p>For the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
(34) Local resident, (Oxford, Horspath Road)	<p>No.73 Horspath Road – Concerns</p> <p>We are placement students who rely on our cars at the property to visit family members and friends as residents who don't originate from the area. Not only this but we have paid for a year! There is always so many spaces outside on the street so saying it's for congestion reasons is a joke. To only name our property is also a joke. For this to go ahead proper compensation or alternative parking would be required as this suggestion is just daft to our living as a household in the area. I hope you will seriously reconsider and think about others here.</p> <p>As long as our year permit we purchased stands we have no issue as we are doing 12 month placements so will work perfectly.</p>

	<p>No.138-140 London Road – Object</p> <p>To get the obvious out of the way, we have already been told that planning permission for the block was given on the understanding that parking permits would not be available. This important rule was hidden from the original key workers who purchased the flats, but we have swallowed that bitter pill long ago.</p> <p>Whilst the council policy has all the best intentions of improving access to Headington by restricting car ownership, we think that it is fatally flawed on grounds of basic fairness.</p> <p>Most residents in the area have the right to 2 on road parking permits per household, even those with off street parking. I know of households with 4 cars parked with the permission of the council. these households can also apply free of charge for visitors permits and have the right to purchase further visitor permits as they see fit.</p> <p>In stark contrast the key workers who live at John Leon House have no parking rights in Headington apart from one and two hour bays meant for cars needing access to the shops offices and public amenities in Headington.</p> <p>Here is our dilemma:</p> <p>We are a development for key workers. Many of the occupants are obliged to have cars in order to move around in the community as part of their job, or to be able to respond urgently during 'on call' duties. You will not be surprised to hear that we currently have 5 nurses, 3 hospital doctors 2 social workers and a pharmacist in the block. flats available for rent must be let to key workers, so this list can only grow. Some of us have applied in the past on exceptional grounds. council officials will not allow exceptions and we have been rejected.</p> <p>When at work, we don't have a particular problem because we take our car to work and parking is allowed overnight on 1-2 hours slots. However on days when we don't work we struggle to park legally with resulting parking fines, or a constant game of moving our cars from spot to spot to avoid the attention of parking wardens.</p> <p>I need to stress that not running a car is not an option for many of the residents leaving us feeling unwanted, unsupported and unfairly treated in comparison to our more fortunate neighbours. More than one household has been driven away (excuse the pun) from oxford by this problem. Recent press coverage of the recruitment crisis in the NHS demonstrates that oxford can ill afford to lose any more Key workers unnecessarily.</p>
(35) Local resident, (Oxford, London Road)	

	I would have thought that a pinch of common sense could lead to a resolution of this problem to everybody's satisfaction. We very much hope that you will be able to help us get parking permits on exceptional grounds related to work needs.
(36) Local resident, (Oxford, Sudnerland Avenue)	<p>No.55A Sunderland Avenue - Object</p> <p>May I ask the reason for preventing me from parking at my own home. I have already paid a substantial fee to park at my own home, which has been restricted to 1 vehicle. Now you are attempting to completely prevent me from having another vehicle, my household depends on having two vehicles for our work. How will people within the household commute to work? Travel to bookers has been completely cut off from the centre for another year making my vehicle significantly more important. I think it is wholly unfair to give one single house less rights than others in the street.</p> <p>I hope you understand the hardship you would cause myself, as well as those other households by restricting our vehicular access, when the public services run the council are not yet up to standard.</p>
(37) Local resident, (Oxford, Linkside Avenue)	<p>No.78A Linkside Avenue – Object</p> <p>78 a&b have the capability to park at least four vehicles across thier frontage. And potentially could park two or even three vehicles deep.</p> <p>Most residents are not blessed with so much off street parking. Please take into cosideratio weekend parking i.e impose restrictions. I am against the new properties having off street parking - there is no room.</p>
(38) Local resident, (Oxford, Linkside Avenue)	<p>No.78A Linkside Avenue – Support</p> <p>I live in the vicinity of property at 78 Linkside Avenue, which has ample off-street parking space, and support the proposal. I am concerned that the construction of two new properties, with likely limited off-street parking space will significantly increase congestion in Linkside Avenue, making it unsafe for cycling and conventional traffic.</p>

(39) Local resident, (Oxford, Linkside Avenue)	No.78A Linkside Avenue – Support To prevent an increase in on-street parking, which impedes the ability of existing householders to access the road easily and/or safely.
(40) Local resident, (Oxford, Linkside Avenue)	No.78A Linkside Avenue – Support Additional parking will affect road safety on this section of the road.
(41) Local resident, (Oxford, Lakeside)	No.78A Linkside Avenue – Support Too much on street parking already