

CMDTMT – 12 December 2024 – Charlbury Parking Scheme 2024

Dear Andrew,

I am prompted to get in touch by the officers' report which ignores and dismisses the significant concern about the proposed residents' parking scheme. I chaired the January meeting of Charlbury Town Council which set the ball rolling on this process, and stood down from the Town Council in May.

I'm not surprised there is such concern: it is a dogs' breakfast. In saying that, I attach no blame to officers who have been dealing with demands from the town council which has (with more than a hint of self-interest in places) broadly, sought to dump the problem from one part of the town to another. Worse, despite promising to listen to local businesses and identify areas where employees and customers can park, the Town Council's proposals show no regard whatsoever, leading to vocal comments from staff and customers. (Other providers, notably Charlbury Preschool further away from any car parking, are also affected).

Where I would challenge the report is in its inaccurate description of Charlbury Town Council carrying on a 'consultation exercise' early in 2024 which showed a narrow majority in support for a residents' parking scheme. In reality there was no such thing. Led by the voices wishing to dump the problem, they only consulted the minority of the town living in the currently proposed area. What a surprise that they supported dumping the problem! (Albeit narrowly)

Clearly in other places there have been unfounded concerns. However, larger towns or places with the visitor economy of Woodstock aren't comparable to a small town with a very fragile retail economy (numbers of shops down by around 80% in my lifetime) and a station that is a major railhead covering a vast area.

The impacts of three actors has a huge impact on Charlbury's streets. The station car park is full on some weekdays, with no funds available for expansion; the Bull and Bell have both been allowed to develop as businesses in ways that cause adverse parking impacts by (respectively) illegally reducing the car park size and banning staff from using a vast and normally empty car park. This impacts particularly severely on the relatively small Spendlove car park which is in multiple ownership.

I think that, as with Bicester's cycle lane proposal, the Charlbury plans should be deferred for further consultation and to remedy some of the more obvious flaws. Specifically:

1. The controlled area needs to extend further up Enstone Road and Nine Acres Lane, as well as addressing Hixet Wood. These are the desire points for drivers seeking to use Charlbury station without paying for parking, or the nearest parking spaces. Nine Acres Lane has long seen problematic on-street parking; Enstone Road has got worse in recent years. Hixet Wood is narrow with old houses and will also be affected by the overspill.
2. Jeffs Terrace and Fishers Lane should both have the ability to apply for residents'

permits. Many of the residents of the former are elderly; it is a block of 22 flats formerly in council ownership. It is badly affected by nuisance parking from Charlbury station already; all these proposals do is shift more of the problem from the wealthiest parts of the town to one where some quite vulnerable people live (more so when Cottsway redevelop the mothballed Evenlode Close sheltered housing). Fishers Lane has no place for parking on- or off-street at all and there is no fairness in denying them the right to residents' parking afforded to residents of Thames Street or Sheep Street.

3. The case has been persuasively made by the Sheep Street business to have a longer parking stay in that area; this should have been picked up in the Town Council's liaison with business. Similarly, not all of the staff at Little Monkeys work the whole day, and it would be possible to create parking areas that supported part-time workers and also the objective of deterring commuter parking (for example, a "permits only from 6pm-8am" zone on part of Church Street").

A delay would allow the town to improve aspects of the proposals that would affect several dozen households and at least one business particularly badly, as well as addressing the inadequacies that have led us to this point. It is clear that action needs to be taken, but 'something must be done' isn't the reason to implement a scheme that could be easily improved, in a manner that would reduce ill-will and demonstrate the County Council is listening.

Please can you defer the Charlbury proposal so that an improved version can be brought forward.

All the best,
Gareth Epps

CMDTMT – 12 December 2024 – Proposed CPZ – Cooper’s Gate, Banbury

I would like to object on the following reasons:

There is no current issue on the street but implementing residents’ permit holders parking only would create more problems, increasing traffic and congestion. After speaking to members of the fire brigade, they have expressed serious concerns as to how they would access the street from house #80-113 in an emergency if there were vehicles on any side of the road, which currently is restricted.

Problems include: creating blind spots on a narrow street, preventing residents from entering and exiting their driveways, creating a safety hazard for children who play (see photos 1-3).

Removing the ‘No waiting’ and time restrictions to allow for the proposed shared parking will exacerbate the above problems when a traffic warden has been sufficient. We do not want this amended.

I have also contacted Banbury Council regarding the refuse/bin collectors who have also expressed their concerns as to how they would navigate the street to carry out bin collection, if there were cars. They were shocked that they haven’t even been contacted or considered in these proposals and were unaware.

I have also contacted our MP Sean Woodcock on this matter with a number of other residents who are deeply against these proposals and not satisfied with how it’s being handled. Several residents do not have email or computers, therefore unable to engage with the process. Others have called the phone number provided and not had any response whatsoever.

I attach photos from the street and in purple highlight the only SAFE proposed space that wouldn’t block any driveways, create dangerous corners/blindspots that would allow a maximum of 9 cars between all three spaces.

It is my stance that the council should not be encouraging people to park in residential areas but instead using the many car parks available, for example the Compton car park located close by.

I do NOT support the changes to parking restrictions on Coopers Gate.

CMDTMT – 12 December 2024 – Westbury Crescent, Oxford

This proposal will seriously affect our ability to reverse safely out of our drive in Westbury Crescent by car. We live on the Western side of the Crescent, on the Northern bend. Proposed changes would require us to reverse into the blind bend to the west where the traffic will be traveling at speed in an easterly direction, coming round the bend on either side of the road. We will be at risk of the rush of oncoming traffic as it enters into the one-way system. Currently we reverse eastwards where we have an adequate view of traffic travelling on the straight section of the road and of the bend ahead of us. This scheme would prevent us from leaving home by car in a safe and straightforward manner.

This proposal creates hazards and difficulties for all people living in Westbury Crescent and the people of Churchill Road, living between the two branches of it's Eastern ends.

CMDTMT – 12 December 2024 – Armstrong Rd – Proposed Waiting Restrictions

I am writing on behalf of the Transport Committee and LPC to object to the proposal to amend existing and introduce new 'No Waiting at Any Time' (double yellow lines) parking restrictions in Armstrong Road, Minchery Farm Estate, Oxford.

We object for the following reasons:

1. Public bus service in the vicinity of Armstrong Road and the wider context of Littlemore is a limited service with little to no service on the weekends. Residents therefore living in this area face a different set of transport problems to most other residential areas in the city.
2. The City Councillor for Littlemore Cllr Anne Stares and City Councillor David Henwood have reported they have been out knocking on doors and held meetings with local residents of Armstrong Road. They have concluded the majority of the residents are against it. We have concluded the same from our interactions with local residents.
3. All that it will achieve is to move the issue of parked cars into other areas in Littlemore.
4. We understand the planning application for Armstrong Road included parking provision. One for each flat and two for each dwelling house. That is no longer being provided and therefore these restrictions are going to exacerbate the parking issues.
5. If parking restrictions are imposed, the restrictions should only apply Monday to Friday, with no parking between 10am and 12 noon only. There should be no restrictions at the weekend. This should also deter commuter traffic from parking and will ensure spaces are genuinely being used by residents.
6. However, if officers are inclined to establish double yellow lines, there should be concessions and spaces for blue badge holders, visitors, and universal service vehicles.

CMDTMT – 12 December 2024 – Proposed CPZ, Hightown Road Area

OBJECTIONS

1. If the goal is to stop commuters and hospital visitors parking on residential streets then this is a children's plaster on gunshot wound. Developers advertise Banbury as a commuter town even far from the station. This scheme pushes the problem to nearby streets leading to CPZs in those areas, expanding the resident funded administrative system further and further (Yes Minister vibes!) Create affordable parking for commuters first.
2. A similar scheme for Beargarden Road etc - permits were reported to be £66 p/a in 2023. The proposed scheme for this area is £76 per year. A 15% increase (vs CPI 3.2% to Oct-24). In 20 years we'll be paying £1,000 for one permit. Protection is needed against price hikes.
3. Per visitor charges penalises those with regular visitors (e.g. parents on parental leave mostly women, young families, those with caring needs not just the elderly), encourage social isolation for the most vulnerable and foster depression. OCC's own NFP focusing on loneliness, 'Ami', I suspect would raise similar concerns.
4. Why Saturday? Scrap the Saturday, it can be added later if necessary.
5. The current scheme introduces costly administrative burdens without just cause.
 - a. **Give 300 or unlimited visitor permits, not 25 extra at a time.**
 - b. **Instead of 8am-6pm, enforce a small slot during the day e.g. 10-11am - commuters would have needed to have parked and left. Reduces cost, and social restrictions.**

The will resolve OCC's capacity issue issuing visitor permits. Currently "Due to a high volume of applications, requests are taking longer than usual to process." Is it a surprise to OCC that people want to have visitors to their homes?

PROPOSALS:

If a scheme **must** be introduced the below scheme would be a significant improvement:

1. **Token** £20 per year for 2 permits for each **household** per year.
2. **Unlimited free visitors** (now the system is digital the cost of issuing scratch cards has gone)
3. Capped price increases at the lower of CPI inflation and 2.5% per year.
4. **Restrictions only for a small set period during the weekday e.g. 10-11am.**

PLEASE.

This allows flexibility for visitors, reduces the administrative burden for the council, reducing the cost to run the scheme.

CMDTMT – 12 December 2024 – Proposed CPZ, Cooper's Gate – Keith Young.

I am a resident within the proposed parking zone. I am over 70 years old, and although I no longer own a car, I am concerned that access to my home would be at risk. This year I have not been well and I am reliant on family members to support me with my necessary care. For the elimination of doubt this includes transporting me to and from hospital. I need others to be able to access my home in their vehicles, be it in an emergency, for deliveries and for refuse collection, or just visits by cars and to be picked up by taxis. My objections to this proposal are shown in Annex 2 of the paper as Respondent 10. The Parking Zone proposals are likely to prevent access because of on-street parking, as I understand happened before the current yellow lines were put in place (See Annex 2 Respondent 12). There are other options that could avoid this which do not seem to have been considered, which could also provide some visitor parking spaces.

I am a retired Chartered Engineer and a Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers, and studied Road Design as part of my degree. Coopers Gate is a Cul-de-Sac and all the properties in the proposed parking zone need continuity of access along a narrow road which is not wide enough to allow parking on both sides. The houses were all built with a garage and at least one other parking space. Most now have more but some have chosen to have plants rather than paved areas instead. Even the flats within the proposed Zone were provided with two parking spaces each. There is currently no 24/7 on-street parking, and its introduction will only encourage increased car ownership and cause obstructions and inconvenience to residents. Any increase in vehicles parked on the street will obscure sight lines for drivers and increase the risk to any children who may currently play outside. Any vehicles kept on the public street, as will now be permitted, will be IC or Hybrid and will not be Electric Vehicles because of the lack of charging facilities. To burn off any existing yellow lines will be polluting, not least due to the use of fuel for the burners, and also from the fumes of the burning paint.

The report paper is rather misleading:

Paragraph 4 shows 58% of the residents as being in favour. This was derived from the informal survey in September but the numbers of respondents and those who did not respond has not been disclosed. Only the boundary of the proposed Zone was shown on the Plan, with no other details available at the time. I assumed I would not be affected and chose not to respond. The latest proposal clearly will significantly affect my access and that of others. The results of any informal survey must have been superseded by the formal consultation based on the detailed proposals that have now been produced.

Paragraph 8 is clearly inapplicable to the proposed parking zone.

Paragraph 16 is incorrect in its assessment of the responses to the online survey: It is clear that 70% of residents who responded raised objections. The majority of of these objections have not been addressed, and yet the proposal has been recommended for approval. There is only one Fire Hydrant in all of Coopers Gate, near to Southam Road, outside No 73. All the homes to the east of this will be reliant on the water carried on Fire trucks, assuming they can get near to any fires. This is the area where all Single Yellow Lines (SYL) will be removed and 24/7 legal on-street parking created, which will cause obstructions denying access to emergency vehicles, and also refuse and delivery trucks. The proposed removal of SYLs will permit the legal obstruction of all existing dropped kerbs.

Some of these concerns may be mitigated by ensuring that if any length of SYL is to be removed, there should be a Double Yellow Line (DYL) on the opposite side of the road. Some visitor parking spaces could also be created where they would not cause obstruction, again as long as they are opposite DYLs. Similarly there should be DYLs provided on all corners to allow for the turning circles of large vehicles. I request that the current proposals should be withdrawn and reconsidered to address these concerns.