

## **Rosalind Chaston – Lower Wolvercote Proposed CPZ**

I don't want to linger too long on the practical objections to the proposal, of which there are many, because these are well laid out in the consultation documentation. But, I would echo concerns that the proposals are much more restrictive than other areas and this will have a significant impact on local businesses and residents.

I wanted to pick up on the key justification throughout the document that the CPZ is largely motivated by the need to, I quote "mitigate development at Oxford North... and prevent parking in nearby residential areas" because the "number of car parking spaces on site were set at a lower standard compared to the Local Plan".

The reality is that the majority of parking at the moment is used by people who live in Wolvercote and haven't got driveways for their cars. We know this because the implementation of the CPZ in UW has made no noticeable difference to the busy-ness in LW. So, there is no current problem.

The argument for implementing the CPZ because of potential problems caused by Oxford North has got no evidence basis and is something that I really would challenge. According to google maps, Peartree Park and Ride is a 6 minute walk from Oxford North and has a capacity of over 1000 spaces. The closest parking in Lower Wolvercote is at least a twenty minute walk. So, the premise that the CPZ is built on is really not proven.

I think it's good to anticipate problems and open a dialogue about them, but the strength of public opinion against this scheme is something that I really think deserves a different approach. In the consultation, you write that "It is suggested that a review of the scheme is carried out approximately 12-18 months after the implementation of the CPZ should it be approved." With no evidence that the CPZ is actually needed, it would be a much more sensible approach to wait and see if a problem does arise from Oxford North and then re-open a dialogue about implementing an adjusted scheme.

My real motivator behind asking to speak at this session was actually one of governance. When I told people that I was speaking at this meeting, I was often greeted with "there's no point" or "they'll make the decisions anyway". It's no secret that people across the country feel disillusioned with the democratic system. And I understand that the council have to make difficult and unpopular decisions at times. But, this is not one of those occasions. Over 93% of respondents did not support or wanted amendments to this scheme. They should be listened to, particularly since the Cabinet Member is our representative. So I really, really urge you to reconsider.

## Linda Smith – Lower Wolvercote Proposed CPZ

I've lived on the Godstow Road for almost 24 years. We are a corner house and our front door is on Elmthorpe Road. Parking has sometimes been difficult but on only three or four occasions in all those years have I had to park in another street. Therefore I refute the suggestion that Lower Wolvercote is used by commuters. The largest amount of non-locals parking outside my house are dog-walkers and I have no objection to that since parking problems tend to resolve themselves quickly. The biggest traffic problem we have is when the village is used as a rat run when there is trouble on the A34.

I want to put the case against CPZ for Lower Wolvercote on behalf of the elderly and infirm. I am 75 years old and full-time carer for my disabled husband (78). I understand that visitor permits will be free for the over 70s (thank you) but need to know if there is a limit on the number of visitor permits. Here are the people who regularly come to our house to help:

Carers - daily (some unregistered)

Cleaner - 3 times a week

Podiatrist

Optician

Physiotherapist

Window cleaner

Gardener

Doctors, district nurses, ambulance service are presumably all exempt, but what about the rep from the medical firm, the technician fixing a broken recliner, etc. etc. etc.

I reckon we have about 10 visitors a week on average to see my husband. **This does not include family and friends.**

Despite this being such a friendly village, there are days when we feel isolated, and I dread to see that increase because friends from outside the area cannot just drop in. (Must we give up a day permit for a ten-minute visit?)

The plans, which seem almost punitive for Elmthorpe Road, look like crude callipers forced on to someone who is not crippled.

Finally, although naturally I agree with the need for cleaner air and less congestion, I don't think these proposals will make much of a difference and ask that they be more thoroughly thought through by a working committee that includes representatives from the community. But perhaps that's what the Citizens Assembly will provide?

## **Thank you. Naira Wilson – Lower Wolvercote Proposed CPZ**

This is a written statement for the meeting to discuss Oxford: Lower Wolvercote – proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

I am a clinical psychologist working in private practice from my home in Lower Wolvercote. I work with children with mental health difficulties and as you will be aware, we have seen a significant increase to mental health difficulties in children post pandemic, so my clinic is very busy.

These are my concerns for my business as well as my community regarding the parking proposals, listed here for ease:

1. I am not the only business practitioner in the area, as there is a high proportion of people working from home (music teachers/ chiropractors/ architects/ psychologists) that would be negatively affected by this proposal. As you have proposed insufficient numbers of visitors parking spaces, especially as currently there are no difficulties with parking for residents and visitors in lower Wolvercote - not sure why we need the restrictions.
2. For my specific business - parents need to bring their children who are coming from across Oxfordshire and further afield - there isn't direct public transport to make this journey easy for parents currently, so they need to drive to the therapeutic appointments throughout the day and evenings. Parents often wait in the car to work on their lap tops. Having limited parking options would cause considerable stress/ waste time for these families who are juggling work and school times to bring their children to appointments.
3. Sometimes the young people need to ask their parents to join appointments so parents need to be parked in close proximity - the new proposals would make this impossible.
4. Due to the specific time slots for appointments the proposal means these parents would be wasting time driving around trying to find a space, as very limited numbers of parking spaces are proposed
5. I appreciate the council need to make money and would not oppose 2-hour parking restrictions to give families more flexibility.
6. The village is made up of multi generations and many of the elderly have carers/ cleaners/ and family visiting from outside of the area - the current proposals would again cause a great deal of extra un-needed stress and practical problems when we currently have no problems with parking in this area.

Thank you for your consideration and support of local small business particularly those that are looking after the local community.

## **Rob Whitty – Lower Wolvercote CPZ**

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am unfortunately unable to attend the meeting in person next Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> so hereby request that this email can be included as a virtual petition for consideration.

It seems inevitable that the Council will ignore local opinion and recommend the Wolvercote CPZ despite residents' opposition. It is of no benefit, relevance or relevance to the residents of Lower Wolvercote.

It should also be noted that the council's reference to 'many' residents objecting is actually incorrect. Over 80% of respondents objected which is the majority. Not just 'many'.

As a resident of Elmthorpe road may I request that if pushed through by this obsessed council, that the following changes are made to any imposition of this new CPZ as the CPZ may benefit the council's coffers, but will not benefit the residents that the council is supposed to represent.

- As one of the council's claims is to prevent outside visitors using limited parking spaces, the days that the CPZ is enforced are reduced from Mon-Sun to Mon-Fri.
- As the council claims commuters cause many of the problems but should in fact consider local and elderly residents visitor needs, that the hours the CPZ is enforced are reduced from 8am-8pm to 9am-5pm.
- As part of the over enthusiastic enforcement of any CPZ that will inevitably follow this new regressive and unwanted imposition on a village, CPZ enforcers will undoubtedly penalise residents of Elmthorpe road for partially parking on the pavement. May I request that the council actually faces the reality of the narrow road and permit partial parking on the pavement, as without doing so, not only would the council be potentially liable for the damage to parked cars by any car, van or truck on Elmthorpe road, but also bin collections would be impossible.
- The length of vehicles permitted to apply should also be extended to 5.25m as that would enable residents who have a van as part of their home-based business not to be doubly inconvenienced by the Council's obsession with penalizing vehicles while also forcing residents to find and pay for secure storage for the vehicle outside Oxford.

Yours in hope that you will actually listen to the majority of residents.

Rob Whitty.

## Proposed CPZ in Lower Wolvercote – Kevin Clarke

Thank you for the opportunity to address this meeting. Cllr Gant, as the elected County Council representative for Wolvercote & Summertown division, from the overwhelming number of objections received in Consultation feedback you will be acutely aware of the issues that most concern the residents of Lower Wolvercote. There are many technical reasons to object to this CPZ, however I wish to specifically highlight the issues that disproportionately affect me and my neighbours in Elmthorpe Road, and wish to appeal to your humanity. My key concerns:-

- I have very real concerns around the lack of provision for visitor parking. The proposal does not allow any shared (2-3 hour) parking, and we would have a maximum of 50 visitor sessions p.a. I estimate that last year I have had 200 visits. I have three children who all live away. If they visit 3 times a year and stay for say 3 days, then that is 27 visits. We host meeting groups with some members who are elderly, frail and vulnerable and they need to be able to park somewhere. This proposal will deny a basic human right. I am in my mid-sixties and can see some of my neighbours who are elderly, relying on visits from friends for their social life, to do shopping for them or just drop in for a chat. One neighbour relies on her daughter visiting daily – the limited number of visitor permits would barely cover a tenth of the 365 days required. I am frightened that I will be in that position before too long. Many people rely on visitors as their lifeline to the outside world and these proposals will sever that link, discriminating against them and denying a basic human right.

Accordingly, the lack of visitor parking will lead to isolation, discrimination and penalisation of certain groups within our community: vulnerable populations, including the elderly, people with mental health issues, those with lesser means and those who are digitally excluded.

- Elmthorpe Road is a no through road and unlike other side road in Wolvercote there are only a half dozen or so houses with any type of off-road parking. Gardens are too short to accommodate the 5m requirement for a dropped kerb, so off-road parking is not an option.
- The introduction of digital permits negates the previous arguments against provision of more than 2x 25 permits. However, it is incorrect to say that those who are digitally excluded can still have access to paper permits. Do try the advisors' phone number and ask them that question.
- Monitoring and Evaluation, Lack of Evidence: The parking beat and capacity surveys were flawed, inaccurate and not suitable for purpose. The three periods monitored were between 1 and 1 ½ hours, in the middle of the day. Two were in school holidays when many families are away. None covered the range of 8am to 8pm yet Mr Mauz told me that his colleagues concluded that the findings 'resulted in the CPZ proposal being designed to operate from 8am to 8pm every day' without any further justification.
- The Statement of Need is flawed: the basis of the statement of need in respect of overspill parking is hypothetical and therefore not justified.
- The proposed CPZ is discriminatory insofar as 8am-8pm and no shared use (2-3 hour parking allowed) in Elmthorpe Road is vastly at odds with comparable local schemes.

- Lack of proper consultation: majority views of previous consultations have not been taken into account

Financial Transparency: There is a lack of transparency regarding the finances of the proposal. The stated aim of charging is to fund the costs of the scheme. The setup costs have been covered by Oxford North s.106 monies and also by County Capital Funding. The latest papers show that Trellint will enforce restrictions, and presumably return funds to the Council. There is no transparency available to determine whether or not this proposal is primarily about raising funds

# **WOLVERCOTE COMMUNITY MARKET**

**Sunday Mornings @The White Hart Community Pub Wolvercote,  
Godstow Road, Lower Wolvercote OX2**

## **Proposed Controlled Parking Zone & Waiting Restrictions Order Oxford Lower Wolvercote**

01. The Community Market is a popular and successful not-for-profit social enterprise operating 50 weeks a year between 10 am and 12 noon in a marquee at the rear of the community pub, attracting stall holders and customers from outside Wolvercote Village. It is the successor to the original Wolvercote Farmers' Market established in 2003.
02. The Community Market also uses extra market space on special occasions (e.g. Annual Wolvercote & Wytham Midsummer Festival and at Christmas) on The Lower Green, Godstow Road across the road from the White Hart community pub.
03. It is essential at all markets for stall holders to bring their produce to the market, often in vans and then park for the period 9 am to 1 pm. The City Council's Godstow Road Car Park is not suitable for this parking because of size restrictions and distance.
04. At present stallholders usually manage to park their vehicles close to the market on adjoining roads: Rowland Close, Godstow Road, Home Close and Meadow Prospect. The adjoining private Mill Road and the Wolvercote Mill estate is not available because they are subject to their own private CPZ.
05. The proposed 7-day a week order could deter between 8 to 10 traders on ordinary weeks from supplying the market stalls. This could in turn could jeopardise the sustainability of the market, which does rely on reliability of parking within easy reach of the market.
06. To avoid this situation, The Decision Meeting is requested to amend the proposed CPZ order so that it does not operate on Sundays, and consideration should be given to de-restricting the scope of the order on Saturdays too.

**Representations made on behalf of Wolvercote Community Market Committee,  
stallholders and customers by John Powers**

**E: [wolvercotesundaymarket@gmail.com](mailto:wolvercotesundaymarket@gmail.com)**

**CUTTESLOWE SUNNYMEAD WOLVERCOTE COMMUNITY ACTION GROUP  
(CSW CAG)  
Proposed Controlled Parking Zone & Waiting Restrictions Order Oxford Lower  
Wolvercote**

07. The origins of CSW CAG go back to Wolvercote Recycling Group (1989). WRG then added energy and meeting the challenge of climate change to its aims and activities.
08. In 2010 it pioneered two other developments: community transport in CSW and concern for the survival of The White Hart Pub. In 2013 this latter campaign became the legally separate White Hart Community Pub Ltd, which in turn has become an independent and successful community hub, next to the much later Wolvercote Mill Community Space and Café.
09. This adds to the considerable diversity of parking needs in Lower Wolvercote, which should not be viewed only as a residential neighbourhood but also includes enterprises both commercial and social, trading and artistic, and often attracting visitors from outside Wolvercote.
10. At a meeting held at Wolvercote Young People's Club on Tuesday 10 December 2024 it was announced that Cotteslowe Sunnymead Wolvercote Community Action Group (CSW CAG) was now in operation and had added the community transport minibus operations of Oxford Swift Community Transport started in 2010.
11. CSW CAG aims to meet the specific and often different unmet needs of specific areas of the CSW as a City Locality. It does this by encouraging local residents and organisations to step up and speak for themselves both within the locality and all statutory authorities.
12. CSW CAG was asked to organise a drop-in advice session was held in Lower Wolvercote on Thursday 16 January, where those attending were advised how they could present their own needs for the Decision Meeting to balance those needs.
13. Community Transport had already made its own representations regarding reserved parking in Clifford Place and CSW CAG now reiterates those requests for reserved parking space to encourage sustainable travel and transport for all, including those without cars and rely on walking, cycling and public transport.
14. The Decision Meeting is requested to amend the proposed CPZ order so that it includes all the specific recommendations for reserved parking for community transport in Clifford Place and gives appropriate weight to other needs made at the Meeting.

**Representations made on behalf of Cotteslowe Sunnymead Wolvercote  
Community Action Group by Christopher Gowers  
E: [christophergowers796@gmail.com](mailto:christophergowers796@gmail.com)**



## **Dr Nick Hards - Central Didcot Proposed Parking Scheme**

I am a Lay Minister at Didcot All Saints Parish Church, speaking on behalf of the church. The church is in the ancient village of Didcot or Dudcote. This is not a place built with modern traffic in mind.

There is a lay-by between the churchyard and Lydalls Road, which is used for funeral processions and wedding parades. The church is not convenient for public transport. We are not aware of people leaving cars in the lay-by while they go on holidays. We do not think the section of Lydalls Road outside the church needs such extensive parking restrictions as those proposed.

We appreciate the help which the county council gives us when there is a funeral or a wedding, but these are not the only occasions when the parking on Lydalls Road is used by the church. Some members of our congregation prefer to park in the lay-by and walk from Lydalls Road when they attend services, and a hirer uses the Community Hall on Sunday mornings and needs to use the parking there. It would be very helpful if worshippers retained the option to park on Lydalls Road, for example on Sunday mornings.

Dr Nick Hards

## **Christine Watson – Corn Street and Church Green Proposed Residents Permits**

1. The following proposals for parking at Church Green, Witney have been drafted:
  - a All-day parking will be allowed on Church Green adjacent to the Henry Box school entrance
  - b There will be 4 hour or permit parking at the car parking area nearest to Church Green grassed area
  - c There will be 2 hour or permit parking on Church Green which leads to Station Road

My concerns are as follows:

1. Residents of Church Green adjacent to the Henry Box school will not be able to park outside their home if all day parking proposal is granted. There are already cars parked in this area for all day/week/month which already limits the spaces for residents to park their vehicles
2. Why has the area adjacent to the Henry Box school been singled out for all day parking and the other proposals have time limited or permit parking
3. Would it not be prudent to have Church Green as residential permit parking only considering there is a 24-hour multi storey car park available to other vehicle users
4. Why should elderly residents (average age is between 60-70 years) of Church Green be expected to park their cars away from their property and unloaded their vehicles and carry it to their homes
5. Will the council be supplying parking permits to residents free of charge or will there be a fee considering that most residents on Church Green are pensioners and can ill afford extra expenditure to park at their property
6. Will residents with disability or walking difficulties be taken into consideration so that they can park outside their property

Thank you very much for your time and would appreciate it if you would take all my concerns discussed today into consideration and the proposals amended accordingly to satisfy all concerned who are residents of Church Green

## **Graham Harrison – Thame Centre Parking Review**

I would like to speak in support of the Recommendation for North Street, Thame, made by the Director of Environment and Highways.

North Street is predominantly a residential street. When my wife and I moved there over 30 years ago our most significant concern was how to avoid getting a ticket when we parked in the bay close to our house for more than two hours.

In 2023 we received the welcome news that the town's Parking Permit Holder scheme would be extended to North Street with proposals that allocated space for 14 cars in three Permit Holder-only bays on the street's west side.

Reduced to 11 vehicles when implemented this time last year, the scheme improved parking for fee-paying residents, although spaces remain at a premium. Now residents face the loss of a further five spaces to Dual-use (in the bay adjacent to No. 5A), because of a proposal brought forward for consultation following representations to councillors by North Street businesses that appear not to have been explained publicly when the opportunity to do so was afforded late in 2024 with the *Thame Centre Parking Restrictions Survey*.

Meanwhile, North Street residents were forced to argue to keep the Permit Holder-only spaces they had been so recently granted, and indeed were already paying £100 a year for, for no guaranteed space. Furthermore, the bays have been inadequately policed since implementation to the degree that non-residents park there for free seemingly with little fear of penalty. The introduction of Shared-use with two hour parking would exasperate this problem.

Residents feel that the contribution they make to Thame town centre by investing in their homes and patronising local shops and businesses remains undervalued.

There is no need to change North Street parking again. There is more than adequate public parking for non-residents at the Cattle Market and on the High Street.

I would like to thank the committee for introducing Permit Holder bays to North Street last year and for the opportunity to speak today in support of the Director's Recommendation *not* to change parking on North Street other than replacing the double yellow lines with a new Shared-use bay on the east side of the street.

*Mr Graham Harrison*

## Lisa Holloway – Thame Centre Parking Review

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Permit Parking on North St in Thame. I'm here to speak on behalf of our neighbours who cannot be here today. We have a great community on North St with a cross section of residents, all of whom were so relieved when the Parking Permits were introduced. Having fewer spaces would make life exceedingly difficult for families with children, the elderly and infirm.

After 6pm anyone can park overnight in the permit bays, so often there are no spaces for residents when returning from work.

Waitrose is changing the parking times from 2-1.5 hours, so for shoppers, North St will be even more attractive. And they do not park for just 2 hours; the wardens are infrequent, so cars are parked for a lot longer. Often, we have to drive up and down North St waiting for a space.

If there are no spaces on either side of North St, it is not free to park in the Cattle Market, and sometimes we have a long walk back from the car to our homes. But we have already paid £100 per vehicle while the visitors pay nothing, and we are subsidising their parking.

There is plenty of public parking in Thame during the day; the Co-op carpark is not expensive and is almost always less than half full.

We are effectively paying for something we cannot have. If the Council wants people to live in the centre of town, we need to be able to park alongside our homes.

To have to share the 5 spaces with non-residents is a kick in the teeth for those of us who live on North St, and who pay not inconsiderable Council Tax as well as our Permits - yet we are not a priority. If there are any free spaces during the day, they are for us to park on our return- but it is rare to find a space as, particularly on Market Day (Tuesday), they are taken by drivers without permits.

Potentially sharing these parking spaces would make life very difficult and stressful for the residents on North St and frankly do not encourage us to stay living in the town centre.

We would ask that the 5 bays outside 5a are left as Permit Holder spaces only, and the residents of North St can have peace of mind and feel appreciated.

## **Danny Yee – Howard Street and Flower Lane Cycling Improvements 2024**

It is useful to compare Flower Lane's junction with Howard St with two similar locations.

One is where the path running north from Cherwell School comes out on Lonsdale Rd, opposite Kings Cross Rd. The other is where the path along Boundary Brook comes out on Cowley Rd, opposite Marsh Rd. There are differences, but both of these have large volumes of cycling and walking on the path, and significant pedestrian flows along the footway.

At both of these locations there is much worse visibility than at Flower Lane, between people walking along the footway and people cycling or walking out of the path. Indeed at Lonsdale Rd there are fences that completely obscure visibility right to the corners where the path and footway meet.

But neither of these locations have anything like the fence at Flower Lane, and any suggestion that such a fence should be put in place would be met with incredulity. Such a fence would force people cycling to go along the footway instead of directly joining the carriageway, increase conflicts by reducing the amount of space available, and be a collision hazard in itself.

The primary school-run for my daughter went through Flower Lane, so I have walked that route at least five thousand times and cycled it maybe a thousand times; I have also walked past Flower Lane at least two thousand times, on what used to be the trip to my nearest supermarket. I regularly observed conflicts between people walking and wheeling and cycling - often between people walking and wheeling, with no cycles involved. And on two occasions I saw actual collisions, one of them involving a woman with a cycle trailer colliding with the fence and coming off her bike, with no other people involved. On top of this, the fence forces people both walking and cycling to squeeze between parked cars, creating dangerous interactions with motor traffic on Howard St.

Removing the fence may create some potential conflicts at this location as well as removing or alleviating others. But to my mind the balance of risks clearly favours the removal.



**Addresses to Transport Delegated Decisions Meeting  
23 January 2025  
20mph speed limit proposals inc. Didcot**

From: Robin Tucker, Co-Chair of the Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel.

CoHSAT, and our 25 member groups strongly support this Council's locally driven approach to 20mph speed limits. The evidence supporting 20mph schemes continues to grow, although not all of it makes happy reading. In March 2023, a Mr Paine was killed by a driver on North Bar Street in Banbury. The crash investigator

reported the at 29 to 36mph the driver had ["insufficient time to react"](#), but at 20mph the driver might have been able to react and avoid the fatality. You may recall that this was a Banbury road where we called for the 30 limit be reduced to 20, but Councillor Mallon argued against. You have apparently been sent a letter and we ask that your officers give it due attention – the 20mph programme will already be saving lives, and we should allow it to save more.

On this note we come to the proposals for Didcot. We support all aspects of the given proposals, and hope you will approve them. They will make residents safer, and create a better environment for people to do basic things, like cross the road or go to the local shops or schools in safety. I know, because they have made my own town of Abingdon better: quieter, safer, easier to get around.

But the proposals should extend to some of the streets left at 30mph. In particular, Foxhall Road is a key link between station and the Girls' School often used by cyclists and students, with no safe infrastructure, leaving this at 30 falls short of national guidance. Also the section of Station Road from Cow Lane to the Cornerstone Centre.

The village schemes are all designed on the principle of being '20 where the people are' and we support these. The start of the limit in East Challow could be 100 metres southeast to include Goodlake Avenue, but possibly there is a signage location issue. Looking through the consultation responses, it is interesting to compare the blasé response from people who do not want their motoring speed restricted, with the responses of the people who feel intimidated and endangered by it. If there is division caused by traffic in our communities, it is between those who recognise the actual and potential harms of automobility, and those who don't

### **Phil Davies – Didcot Proposed 20mph Speed Limits**

I write to ask you to consider returning the scheme to add extending the 20mph limits proposed to Didcot South to all small/short roads too.

If 20 is indeed the new 30; then excluding these roads does not fulfill that aim. It adds confusion rather than simplicity.

At present many cul-de-sacs in Didcot South are excluded. The scheme is noted as an 'extension' of the successful Ladygrove 20mph scheme. Ladygrove has all the small/short roads as 20mph. Consistency would be beneficial, especially for those residents living in those few short roads excluded from the new scheme. I'm aware that specific requests have previously been made to Didcot Town's Traffic Advisory Group by residents on Short/small roads in Didcot South for 20mph on their residential roads.