

# **DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT**

**13 NOVEMBER 2025**

## **DIDCOT: CENTRE SOUTH AREA – PROPOSED RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING ZONE**

**Report by Director of Environment and Highways**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**The Cabinet Member is RECOMMENDED to:**

**Approve the following proposals as advertised:**

- (a) To introduce ‘Residents permit holders parking only’ areas (DS prefix - Monday to Saturday, 8am- 6pm) on lengths of Bourne Street, Church Street, East Street, Hagbourne Road (between its junctions with Broadway & Kynaston Road), High Street, Kynaston Road, Mereland Road (between its junctions with Broadway & Kynaston Road), Newlands Avenue (between its junctions with Broadway & Kynaston Road), St Andrews Road, St Peters Road, Vicarage Road, and Wessex Road.**
- (b) To introduce double yellow line restrictions on the east side Hagbourne Road East for approximately 7.5m adjacent to No.5.**
- (c) To allow residents of specified properties within Bourne Street, Church Street, East Street, Hagbourne Road (between its junctions with Broadway & Kynaston Road), High Street, Kynaston Road, Mereland Road (between its junctions with Broadway & Kynaston Road), Newlands Avenue (between its junctions with Broadway & Kynaston Road), St Andrews Road, St Peters Road, The Broadway, Vicarage Road, and Wessex Road to apply for annual Residents and Visitors` Parking Permits.**

**Approve the following revised proposals (as shown in Annex 6):**

- (d) To introduce ‘Limited Waiting Monday to Saturday, 8am-6pm, 30 mins, no return within 1 hour’ parking bays on sections of St Andrews Road, Peters Road and Vicarage Road.**
- (e) The introduction of double yellow lines on sections of East Street, Hagbourne Road, High Street, Kynaston Road, Newlands Road and Wessex Road.**

- (f) **To remove the existing no waiting restriction (Monday – Saturday 8am-6pm) from sections of High Street.**

**Withdraw the following proposals:**

- (g) **To remove existing double yellow line restrictions on parts of St Andrews Way and Wessex Road.**
- (h) **To introduce double yellow line restrictions on the east side Hagbourne Road East for approximately 13m adjacent to No.5.**

## **Executive summary**

- 4. This report presents the consultation responses to the proposed permit parking area for the South area of Didcot as shown in **Annex 1** and recommends the introduction of controls in parts of the consulted area to deliver a residents' permit parking scheme.
- 5. In 2021, Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) was rolled out across the districts of Cherwell, South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse. The change of enforcement from the Police to the County Council, opened opportunities to review existing parking restrictions and consider new areas where controls of on-street parking would benefit the local community and assist in meeting the councils wider transport objectives including Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP).
- 6. In order to facilitate the introduction of new parking schemes, the council has successfully secured funding under a Community Infrastructure Levee (CIL) for a programme of schemes to be delivered in 2024/25. These schemes will assist communities to secure resident parking, reduce congestion and improve traffic flows (including bus punctuality) and ensure that the correct restrictions are in the correct places.
- 7. Further to requests from residents in the Didcot area, an informal consultation exercise was carried out in May 2025 by the Town Councillors, which aimed to gauge the views of local communities on the potential for new permit parking schemes to be brought forward.
- 8. The responses and feedback provided from the 2025 consultation have aided in the development of a proposed permit parking scheme for the 'Didcot Centre South' area – which has been done in collaboration with the local County Councillor and Town Councillors.

## **Corporate Policies and Priorities**

- 9. The effective management of parking through restrictions is a valuable tool in shaping how traffic uses the network and influences users travel choices.

10. Of the nine priorities identified within the 'Oxfordshire Strategic Plan 2022-2025', the proposals support priority nos.1, 3, 5 & 8, with the nine priorities listed below:
- (1) Put action to address the climate emergency at the heart of our work.
  - (2) Tackle inequalities in Oxfordshire.
  - (3) Prioritise the health and wellbeing of residents.
  - (4) Support carers and the social care system.
  - (5) Invest in an inclusive, integrated and sustainable transport network.
  - (6) Preserve and improve access to nature and green spaces.
  - (7) Create opportunities for children and young people to reach their full potential.
  - (8) Play our part in a vibrant and participatory local democracy.
  - (9) Work with local businesses and partners for environmental, economic and social benefit

## **Financial Implications**

11. Funding for the project is being provided through a Community Infrastructure Levee (CIL) allocation, where additional resources have been brought in to deliver schemes in the South Oxfordshire District. There are no risks or pressures on existing council budgets or resources.

## **Legal Implications**

12. The consultation that has been undertaken complies with the consultation requirements for the various elements as required by law including under the Highways Act 1980, the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and any other relevant legislation.
13. The scheme has been promoted by Oxfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority and Traffic Authority under the Highways Act 1980, and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

*Comments checked by:*

*Jennifer Crouch – Principal Solicitor (Regulatory)*

[Jennifer.Crouch@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Jennifer.Crouch@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)

## **Staff Implications**

14. The design & appraisal of the proposals, as well as the consultation process have been undertaken by Officers from the 'TRO & Schemes' team as part of their regular day-to-day duties, with no additional/negative impact on capacity expected.

## **Equalities and Inclusion Implications**

15. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the proposals which can be viewed in **Annex 5**.
16. No negative implications in respect of equalities or inclusion have been identified in respect of these proposals, however it should be noted that blue badge holders can park without time limit or restrictions within limited waiting/permit holder parking bays.

## **Sustainability Implications**

17. The proposals would help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and alleviate parking stress in the area, to help encourage the use of sustainable transport modes, and to help support the delivery of wider transport initiatives.

## **Risk Management**

18. No potential significant health and safety or service provision risks, or potentially significant financial impacts have been identified in these proposals.

## **Formal Consultation**

19. Formal consultation was carried out between 10 September and 10 October 2025. A notice was published in the Oxfordshire Herald Series newspaper, and an email was 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, South Oxfordshire District Council, local District Cllrs, Didcot Town Council, and the local County Councillor representing the Didcot South, and Didcot West divisions.
20. Letters were sent directly to approximately 1095 properties in the immediate vicinity (including a copy of the plan & details on permit eligibility and costs), public notices were also displayed on site at various locations within the proposed area.
21. Charts shown in **Annex 2** present the general position of the respondent to some of the proposed elements of the Didcot Centre South scheme. 399 responses were received via the online consultation survey during the course of the formal consultation – and in terms of the overall view on the proposed introduction of a controlled parking scheme in the area, there were: 176 objections (44%), 56 partially supporting (14%), 70 raising concerns (17%), 95 in support (24%), and two non-objection/no-opinion.
22. Further tables shown in **Annex 3** provide details of the most common themes which have been summarised from the public feedback.

23. A graph showing the overall level of objection/support for the scheme, based on the respondents that stated they lived within the proposed permit parking area can be found in **Annex 2**.
24. The County Councillor for Didcot South and Didcot West was contacted by officers after the close of the consultation for his comments but has not responded prior to the report being finalised. They have the opportunity to speak at the public meeting
25. The Town Council for Didcot responded as follows:  
  
*“Didcot Town Council’s Planning and Development Committee does not hold strong views regarding the proposed permit parking on the suggested roads. However, the Committee wishes to raise concerns about parking arrangements during funerals at Kynaston Road Cemetery. On such occasions, a significant number of mourners may attend, who may have no alternative but to park along Kynaston Road, which would fall within the proposed permit zones. The Committee therefore requests that both mourners and Council vehicles be granted exemption from these restrictions”.*
26. The full responses are shown in the accompanying **Annex 4**, and copies of the original responses are available for inspection by County Councillors. Any comments received that Officers identify as containing personal abuse and/or other personal information will be redacted as appropriate.

## **Officer response to objections/concerns**

### **a) General feedback to the proposals:**

27. In total, we received 399 responses regarding the proposed scheme, with the majority not in support. Specifically, 44% of the respondents were not in favour, 24% were in favour, 17% raised concerns, 14% partially supported elements of the scheme and 1% did not state an opinion. However, a sizable proportion of the total respondents identified as not living within the proposed scheme area, so potentially these could be commuters or employees of local businesses.
28. From the 399 responses, 252 of the respondents identified as living in the proposed zone and out of these 34% were against the scheme, 33% were in favour, 16% partially supported elements of the scheme, 15% raised concerns and 2% didn’t state an opinion. This clearly shows that there is an appetite for a scheme.
29. The main feedback highlights a strong need for the scheme (77), with many suggesting that better enforcement of existing restrictions could resolve current issues (31). There is also a call for allocated bays for all residents (11), and improvements to public car parks to support local businesses and their staff (11).

30. Some feel that those without off-street parking are being unfairly penalized (10), and residents of The Broadway want parking access within the zone (9).
31. Concerns were raised about emergency vehicles struggling on Hagbourne Road due to obstructive parking (8).
32. Other notable points include claims that there are no parking problems on certain roads like Kynaston Road, Wessex Road, Newlands Avenue, and St Andrews Way (5, 1, 1, 1 respectively), and that the junction of Wessex Road and Hagbourne Road is dangerous (3).
33. Some believe the scheme won't address the root cause of parking shortages, which is resident parking (3), and worry about negative impacts on house prices (2) and stress for residents (1).
34. Suggestions also include incorporating electric vehicle bays (1), extending the scheme to Didcot Leisure Centre (1), and prioritizing residents without off-street parking (1).

Officer response:

35. While existing restrictions may deter some obstructive parking, they require residents to either move their vehicles during the restricted hours (e.g. single yellow lines) or residents are not able to park on them at all (e.g. double yellow lines). The proposed permit scheme offers greater flexibility for residents and their visitors. If implemented, the scheme would include higher enforcement levels to ensure compliance.
36. Although permit parking schemes do not allocate parking spaces to individual properties, by removing external parking pressures on the area, it would increase the likelihood of residents being able to find available parking near their properties.
37. Car parks that are not on the public highway are outside of the scope of the County Council and therefore officers cannot recommend any changes to these. However, the comments will be fed back to the District Councillors and relevant entities for their consideration.
38. Whilst it may seem that residents with no off-street parking are being penalised due to them having to purchase permits, overall, the scheme has many benefits. It is apparent that there is a significant pressure and demand on parking in the area and the best way to control this would be through the introduction of a Permit Parking Area (PPA).
39. Officers have reviewed the roads eligible for a permit in this zone and it is recommended to including resident of The Broadway in the permit zone.
40. The proposed scheme has been designed to prevent parking at any locations that could hinder visibility and accessibility (e.g. junctions and bends) through the introduction of no waiting at any time restrictions. If introduced, this

scheme will assist all road users that travel the zone, including emergency vehicles.

41. Whilst some residents claim there are no parking issues on certain roads, the representations received in the statutory consultation highlight there to be mixed opinions on this. Furthermore, when designing a PPA, it is important to cover a large area to eliminate the chances of displacement parking on roads in the immediate vicinity.
42. Although some residents have stated the parking shortage is caused by residents alone, this is not the view of the majority that have contributed to the statutory consultation. Several comments have been received regarding obstructive parking caused by those working and visiting the area and the proposed scheme will assist with this.
43. There is no evidence to suggest that permit schemes affect property prices. The benefits of such schemes could be attractive to some residents. It is important to note that residents will only need to apply for a permit if they need to park on the street. A reduction in the number of vehicles parked on the road would benefit the street scene and other road users.
44. Under the scope of the Didcot Centre South area project, it was not possible to consider the introduction of electric vehicle (EV) charging bays as they require separate tender exercises with providers to maintain the sites. However, there is a wider strategy looking at EV bays across the County.
45. The County Council are not able to extend the scheme to incorporate additional areas that were not in scope of the original consultation, but if approved the changes would be monitored to assess whether further restrictions would be beneficial.

**b) Costs associated with the scheme:**

46. The most frequent concern raised by residents is that they should not have to pay for parking permits (137 comments). Many also believe that the primary motivation for the proposed scheme is financial gain for the Council (40 comments).
47. There are additional worries about the cost of visitor permits, which some feel are too expensive (7 comments), and a few suggest that non-residents, rather than residents, should be charged for parking on these roads (4 comments).
48. Other points include the perception that permit costs are generally too high (2 comments), and that the older generation is being subsidised by working-age people because they receive visitor permits for free (1 comment). Finally, one comment suggests that council tax should be reduced if the costly scheme is introduced (1 comment).

Officer response:

49. The standard permit zone rules have been applied effectively in other areas, catering to the majority of users while implementing controls to prevent abuse and oversubscription. A fundamental principle is that the costs to operate permit schemes must be met by the users who benefit from preferential parking. These charges are set annually by our cabinet to cover the operational costs.
50. The principle of charging for permit parking permits is to ensure that the costs for their operation are covered. This includes back-office administration, sign and line maintenance, and the enforcement of the schemes. The aim is to run these schemes on a cost-neutral basis, prioritising parking for residents and meeting transport objectives.
51. These permit schemes are not introduced to generate revenue but to manage parking effectively and meet the needs of the community. By covering the operational costs through user charges, we can maintain the integrity and efficiency of the permit zones, ensuring they serve their intended purpose.

**c) Timing of the scheme:**

52. One suggestion was that the scheme should only apply for one hour a day (1 comment). Another comment proposed that the scheme should not apply on Saturdays (1 comment). There was also a recommendation to reduce the time the scheme applies, for example, limiting it to 12pm–2pm (1 comment). Conversely, one comment suggested that the scheme should apply at all times from Monday to Sunday (1 comment).

Officer response:

53. The proposed operating hours of Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6pm, have been selected, as this mirrors the timings of the limited waiting bays and no waiting restrictions in the zone and on The Broadway. This represents when parking is at its peak. Relaxing the restrictions to not apply during the evenings and on Sundays, gives residents further flexibility around visitors and other users.
54. In residential areas, parking demand is typically higher during the evening and weekends because residents and their visitors are more likely to be at home with their vehicles. Since residents with valid permits can park during the hours of operation, extending the scheme to apply at all times may not impact evening parking, as capacity issues arise from the residents themselves.

**d) Operational elements of the scheme:**

55. The most frequent comment was the need for regular enforcement if the scheme is introduced (51). Many also expressed concern that the scheme would restrict visitors (48), and that it could lead to displacement parking on nearby unrestricted roads (37).



56. There were significant worries about negative impacts on businesses, especially those operating from home, due to limited parking for customers and staff (35). Comments have also been received regarding parents lacking parking during school pick-up and drop-off times (8). Furthermore, feedback has been received from local police staff stating they need permits because of limited parking at the police station (13).
57. Some respondents felt that more than two resident permits are required (19).
58. The scheme was seen as potentially harmful to several groups: those with carers (13), the elderly (10), disabled residents (8), and those needing childcare assistance (3). There were also calls for free permits for carers and traders (1 and 10, respectively). Suggestions included allocating bays for carers or disabled residents (2) and providing one free resident or visitor permit per household (2 and 1, respectively).
59. Some comments highlighted that purchasing a permit does not guarantee a parking space (3), and that the scheme discriminates against those unable to use online systems (2).
60. Specific locations like Orchard Centre and Busby House were mentioned, with suggestions that they should not be allowed permits (8 and 3, respectively). There was also concern about the impact on those visiting the local dentist due to limited parking (7).

Officer response:

61. It is standard practice where new schemes are introduced, to increase the level of enforcement to drive better compliance of the restrictions and to change behaviours of non-residents who have become used to parking within the area.
62. The visitor permit system in Oxfordshire has been in place for several years and generally works well for most residents. The first 25 visitor sessions are free, and time-limited parking is available for short-term visitors.
63. Displacement is a potential issue with any scheme; however, all schemes are monitored, and further measures can be considered if necessary.
64. Where businesses or schools operate within permit zones, the basic principles apply that permits are not made available for the purposes of allowing their employees to commute to work and park on roads within the restricted area. A key objective of the schemes is to prevent all day parking by non-residents (or their visitors) and by allowing concessions it opens up further challenges to the scheme.
65. A cap on 2 permits per property is the council's standard policy for new permit schemes and this is required to ensure the scheme is equitable and fair for all users and often there is a higher demand for on-street parking in general. This works well in most schemes by striking a balance between allowing residents

freedom to own and park vehicles on the road, whilst managing the demand, especially in situations that arise from Homes of Multiple Occupancy.

66. A resident's parking scheme offers more flexibility for residents and their visitors during operational hours, but it requires charging for permits to cover administrative costs. These costs are reviewed annually and are comparable to other councils with similar schemes. The permit scheme also accommodates tradespeople through contractor permits and allows the council to suspend restrictions for events or utility works.
67. There are also carer permits available for those who need support at home, allowing them to pass the permit to their visitors without a time limit on the number of visits. Furthermore, blue badge holders can within a permit scheme for free providing their blue badge is on display.
68. With a permit scheme in place, the amount of available parking for residents is expected to increase, especially in currently unrestricted areas. The permit scheme would provide more opportunities for on-street parking throughout the day.
69. For residents that cannot use online systems, friends and family can manage their accounts on their behalf. Also, the Residential Permits Team can provide assistance.

**e) Proposed and existing limited waiting bays:**

70. There is a suggestion to extend the timing of the bays from 30 minutes to two hours to better support local businesses (2 comments). Furthermore, it is suggested that all limited waiting bays should be dual use, allowing residents to utilize them as well (2 comments).

Officer response:

71. The proposal of 30-minute limited waiting bays was developed with the County Councillor who stated they would like the restriction to mirror the timings of the parking on The Broadway. Furthermore, allowing a shorter parking period in the limited waiting bays means there is a higher turnover of vehicles utilizing these parking areas. We would not consider extending the maximum stay or making these bays dual use as we need to have a balance in the parking available for residents and businesses. However as with all schemes, if the proposed scheme is implemented, it would be monitored to see if any further changes are required.

**f) Proposed no waiting at any time restrictions:**

72. Several comments express concern that introducing additional double yellow lines will further reduce already limited parking availability (1). There is a suggestion to change the proposed double yellow line at the west end of Wessex Road to a resident permit parking bay instead (1).

73. Some feedback highlights the need for double yellow lines at the Wessex Road/ Hagbourne Road intersection to address obstructive parking (1), while another comment notes that a double yellow line is being proposed where a disabled bay has recently been implemented on Hagbourne Road (1).
74. Other points include requests to remove double yellow lines outside 24 East Street (1), to add double yellow lines outside 8-14 Newlands Avenue and 135/137 Wessex Road, and to extend the lines at the Wessex Road/ Hagbourne Road junction (1). There is also an objection to introducing more double yellow lines on Hagbourne Road due to the impact on parking (1).

Officer response:

75. The proposed new locations for the addition of double yellow lines have been kept to a minimum and limited to areas where vehicles would obstruct the road at junctions for safety reasons.
76. The proposed double yellow lines at the west end of Wessex Road were designed as they are in close proximity to a junction, on a sharp bend, this location is an access point into the estate and in the interest of visibility. Therefore, it is recommended to introduce these restrictions and not replace them with a resident permit parking bay.
77. As part of the design, double yellow lines have been proposed at the junction of Wessex Road and Hagbourne Road to eliminate any obstructive parking that is currently taking place at this location.
78. Prior to the disabled bay being implemented, separate approval was sought which included undertaking a site visit to understand the safety and suitability of the location and a statutory consultation. Based on all of this, a decision was made to introduce the disabled bay. We then proposed double yellow lines at this location as part of this scheme due to a request by the local Councillors. However, after analysing all the comments received, it is recommended leaving the disabled bay as is, introducing double yellow line on the other side of the disabled bay, covering the access for 5 Hagbourne Road. If approved, the County Council will monitor the situation if the disabled bay is causing any safety or traffic issues and relocate/ remove the bay accordingly.
79. The County Council would not consider removing the proposed double yellow lines outside 24 East Street as these have been designed in line with the Highway code which states no vehicles should be parking within 10 metres of a junction.
80. The scheme cannot consider extending the scope to include new locations, but if approved, it would be monitored, and further changes could be considered.

**g) Proposed removal of the no waiting at any time restrictions:**

81. Several respondents expressed strong opposition to removing double yellow lines, emphasizing that these restrictions are necessary for safety and effective traffic management (3 comments). Specific concerns were raised about the potential hazards of removing the lines south of St Andrews Way near the Wessex Road junction (2 comments).
82. Additionally, there were individual comments highlighting the importance of retaining double yellow lines outside 11a St Andrews Way (1 comment) and at the Wessex Road/Mereland Road junction (1 comment).

Officer response:

83. When designing this scheme, officers have tried to maximise kerb capacity for residents as we know there is a demand on parking in the area. As part of this, we reviewed all the existing restrictions to see if they were still required. It was apparent that the double yellow lines on the junctions of St Andrews Way/ Wessex Road and Mereland Road/ Wessex Road were quite lengthy, and we liaised with our Road Safety Team who confirmed they had no concerns if we were to propose reducing these. If these recommendations were approved, the changes would be monitored closely. However, the Council has taken on board all the comments above and it is recommended that the existing double yellow lines are retained.

**h) Other comments relating to the design of the proposed scheme:**

84. Several respondents expressed a preference for a single or double yellow line parking scheme over a residents' permit scheme (7).
85. There were also notable concerns about the need for more car parks (2), and the suggestion to convert disused land next to Travis Perkins into a car park (1).
86. Issues were raised about displacement parking on Kynaston Road if the school street scheme is implemented (2), and the dangers caused by parking on both sides of Wessex Road (1). Additionally, some suggested that Wessex Road, Kynaston Road, and connecting roads should be made one-way (1).
87. Other comments included the need for signs on Hagbourne Road to prevent large vehicles from entering (3), the installation of a zebra crossing on Mereland Road (1), and widening footpaths on The Broadway to allow residents to park on their front gardens (1).
88. There were also requests for "keep clear" markings to maintain access to properties (1), prioritizing parking for residents over businesses at Northborough Centre (1), and concerns about the new disabled bay on Hagbourne Road not being used by a blue badge holder (1). Finally, there was a call for more action to reduce traffic volumes and support active travel in the area (1).

Officer response:

89. Whilst a single yellow line or double yellow line scheme can be effective in eradicating obstructive parking caused by all day parking, this also restricts the times that residents that can park on their road. A residents permit scheme prioritises parking for residents during the hours of its operation, whilst also preventing obstructive parking caused by non-residents.
90. Car parks that are not on the public highway are outside of the scope of the County Council and therefore officers cannot recommend any changes to these. However, the comments will be fed back to the District Councillors and relevant entities for their consideration.
91. When designing this scheme, several internal conversations took place to understand the impact of both the school street scheme and the residents permit scheme. Kynaston Road is part of the proposed residents permit scheme and therefore if both schemes were introduced, we would be able to take enforcement action against parents that are parking on Kynaston Road.
92. Upon analysing the consultation responses, it is apparent that a lot of the dangerous parking is being caused by non-residents due to the high demand on parking in the area. However, the proposed residents permit scheme will address this and if the scheme is approved, be of great benefit to the area.
93. The County Council has a process where residents can apply to the council for the provision of an access protection marking (white line) in front of accesses and private drives. This is subject to criteria being met and necessary fees being paid. Full information on the process can be found on the council's website.
94. Northborough car park is a private car park and outside of the scope of the County Council. However, the comments will be fed back to the District Councillors and relevant entities for their consideration.
95. The County Council will continue to monitor the disabled bay on Hagbourne Road with regards to the location of the bay and the usage to ascertain whether it needs relocating or removing.
96. Issues that relate to road safety such as restricting access for larger vehicles, one way schemes, widening of footpaths, zebra crossings, active travel etc. is outside the scope of the project, but the council does have an active road safety team that responds to safety concerns raised by the public. The points highlighted will be passed over to the road safety team for investigation.

## **Monitoring and evaluation**

97. Officers suggest – that if approved – a review of the scheme is carried out approximately 12 months after implementation.

**Paul Fermer**  
**Director of Environment and Highways**

Annexes	Annex 1: Consultation plan Annex 2: Response summary charts ( <i>separate document</i> ) Annex 3: Response summary tables Annex 4: Consultation responses ( <i>separate document</i> ) Annex 5: Equality Impact Assessment Annex 6: Revised proposal plan
---------	--

Background papers:	n/a
Other Documents:	n/a

Contact Officer(s):	Manjinder Jutla (Senior Officer – TRO & Schemes) James Whiting (Team Leader – TRO & Schemes)
---------------------	---

November 2025





## a) General comments for the proposed parking scheme

COMMENT	No. COMMENTS
The scheme is needed	77
Better enforcement required of existing restrictions which would fix any current issues	31
Allocated bays should be provided for all residents	11
Public car parks need improving which will assist customers and staff of local businesses	11
Those that have no off-street parking are being penalised	10
Residents of The Broadway should be allowed to park in the zone	9
Currently emergency vehicles struggle to drive down Hagbourne Road due to the obstructive parking that is occurring	8
Parents will have nowhere to park during school pick up/ drop offs	8
There are no parking problems on Kynaston Road and Wessex Road	5
The junction of Wessex Road and Hagbourne Road is dangerous	3
Most of the parking shortage is caused by resident parking, so this scheme won't fix this problem	3
The scheme will have a negative impact on house prices	2
Haydon Road should be included in the scheme	2
The scheme will cause unnecessary stress for residents	1
The scheme will improve traffic flow	1
Electric vehicle bays should be incorporated into the scheme	1
The Council created the problem by creating additional houses in the area	1
Extend the scheme from Mereland Road/ Kynaston Road junction to Didcot Leisure Centre	1
There are no parking problems on Newlands Avenue	1
There are no parking problems on St Andrews Way	1
Even if this scheme is implemented, the pavements will remain obstructed	1
Priority should be given to residents that have no access to off street parking	1
The scheme will negatively impact staff of Didcot Orchard Centre	1

## b) General comments relating to the cost of the scheme

COMMENT	No. COMMENTS
---------	--------------



Residents shouldn't have to pay for permits	137
Only reason for the proposals seems to be financial gain for the Council	40
Visitor permits are too costly	7
Non-residents should be charged to park on these roads, not residents	4
The costs of the permits are too high	2
The older generation are being subsidised by working age people as they are getting visitors permits for free	1
Council tax should be reduced if this scheme is introduced as the scheme is costly	1

c) General comments relating to the timing of the scheme

<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>No. COMMENTS</b>
The scheme should only apply 1 hour a day	1
The scheme should not apply on Saturdays	1
Reduce the time the scheme applies e.g 12pm-2pm	1
The scheme should apply Monday-Sunday at all times	1

d) General comments relating to the operational aspect of the scheme

<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>No. COMMENTS</b>
Regular enforcement of the scheme is needed, if it is introduced	51
The scheme will restrict visitors	48
The scheme will result in displacement parking on unrestricted roads in the vicinity	37
Negative impact on businesses/ businesses operating from home as there will be limited parking for customers and staff	35
More than 2 residents permit are required	19
Local police officers/ police staff require permits as there is limited parking at the police station	13
The scheme will negatively impact those that have a carer	13
Traders permits should be free	10
The scheme will negatively impact the elderly	10
Orchard Centre is causing the most problems and shouldn't be allowed any permits	8
The scheme will negatively impact disabled residents	8

The scheme will impact those visiting the local dentist as they only have a small car park on site	7
More visitors permits are required	4
Busby House shouldn't be given any permits	3
The scheme will negatively impact those that require assistance with childcare	3
Purchasing a permit does not guarantee a space for residents or visitors	3
The scheme discriminates against those that cannot use online systems to purchase permits	2
Residents with company cars/ vans should be allowed to park outside their home for free	2
Bays should be allocated outside properties that have a carer/ a disability	2
One free resident permit should be allowed per household	2
One free visitor permit should be given per household with no expiry date	1
Only one resident permit should be allowed per household	1
Carers permits should be free	1

e) General comments relating to the proposed and existing limited waiting bays

<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>No. COMMENTS</b>
Extend timing of the bays from 30mins to two hour to help local businesses	2
All the limited waiting bays should be dual use so residents can utilise them as well	2

f) General comments relating to the proposed no waiting at any time restriction

<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>No. COMMENTS</b>
Can the proposed double yellow line at the west end of Wessex Road be changed to a resident permit parking bay	1
Parking is already limited, and additional double yellow lines will reduce this even further	1
Double yellow lines are needed on the Wessex Road/ Hagbourne Road intersection to assist with obstructive parking	1
A double yellow line is being proposed where a disabled bay has recently been implemented on Hagbourne Road	1
Remove the double yellow lines outside 24 East Street	1
Additional double yellow lines should be placed outside 8-14 Newlands Avenue and outside 135/137 Wessex Road. Also, the double yellow lines should be extended at the Wessex Road/ Hagbourne Road junction	1

Do not introduce additional double yellow lines on Hagbourne Road, it reduces the parking further	1
---	---

g) General comments relating to the proposed removal of the no waiting at any time restrictions

COMMENT	No. COMMENTS
Don't remove any double yellow lines, they are needed	3
Removing the double yellow lines south of St Andrews Way near Wessex Road junction is hazardous	2
The double yellow lines outside 11a St Andrews Way are needed, do not remove them	1
Don't remove the double yellow lines on Wessex Road/Mereland Road junction, they are needed	1

h) Other comments relating to general design

COMMENT	No. COMMENTS
A single yellow line/ double yellow line scheme is required, not a residents permit scheme	7
Signs should be placed on Hagbourne Road to stop large vehicles from entering this road	3
More car parks need to be created	2
Concerns regarding the displacement parking that will occur on Kynaston Road if the school street scheme is implemented	2
Parking on opposite sides of Wessex Road is dangerous and causes access issues	1
The dis-used land next to Travis Perkins should be turned into a car park	1
A zebra crossing is required on Mereland Road	1
The footpaths on The Broadway should be widened so residents can park on their front gardens	1
Keep clear marking should be implemented to keep rear access points to properties, free of obstructions	1
More needs to be done to reduce traffic volumes and support active travel in this area	1
Wessex Road, Kynaston Road and all the roads in between should be made one way	1
Staff from Thomas Merryfield, park in Northborough Centre car park every day . Parking should be prioritised for residents, not businesses	1
The new disabled bay on Hagbourne Road is not being used by a blue badge holder	1



**Oxfordshire County Council**  
**Equalities Impact Assessment**

DIDCOT CENTRE SOUTH – PROPOSED PARKING MEASURES INCLUDING  
RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING SCHEME

10/10/2025

## Contents

Section 1: Summary details .....	22
Section 2: Detail of proposal.....	23
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics .....	25
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts.....	28
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Wider Impacts.....	29
Section 4: Review .....	30

## Section 1: Summary details

<b>Directorate and Service Area</b>	ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS – NETWORK MANAGEMENT
<b>What is being assessed</b> (e.g. name of policy, procedure, project, service or proposed service change).	DIDCOT – PROPOSED CENTRE SOUTH PARKING MEASURES INCLUDING THE INTRODUCTION OF A RESIDENT'S PERMIT PARKING SCHEME
<b>Is this a new or existing function or policy?</b>	Existing – the parking team already operate CPZs/Permit Parking Zones elsewhere in Oxfordshire, and measures to restrict and control car parking availability, including further use and expansion of CPZs, form part of the county's recently adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan and Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan.
<b>Summary of assessment</b> Briefly summarise the policy or proposed service change. Summarise possible impacts. Does the proposal bias, discriminate or unfairly disadvantage individuals or groups within the community? (following completion of the assessment).	<p><b>Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) – July 2022 and the Network Management Plan (NMP) 2023-2028</b></p> <p>LTCP - We have ambitious plans to give residents more options for travel as outlined in our countywide Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. By supporting and encouraging active travel – walking and cycling – we can help improve people's health and wellbeing, reduce traffic congestion, and help address the climate crisis. In particular Policy 31:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertake Network management as part of an integrated approach, utilising emerging technologies to maximise its ability to tackle congestion issues in the county.</li> <li>Continue to work closely with all stakeholders, partners, and communities to minimise the adverse impact of disruptions on the entire road network within Oxfordshire and beyond.</li> <li>Balance the needs of all network users, whilst promoting and prioritising walking, cycling and public transport at every opportunity.</li> </ol> <p>NMP – Builds on LTCP as an operational document to better manage the highway network, reduce traffic congestion by (in this case) better management of the on-street parking asset, providing parking surety for local communities, redirecting commuter parking to off-street facilities, creating an environment that encourages active travel by improving bus journey times and active travel modes.</p> <p>With the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement across the County in 2021, we are embarking on a series of parking reviews across the County to ensure that the right restrictions are implemented in the right places, supporting a balance between residential, visitor and business parking to ensure support from local communities. These restrictions will then be actively enforced.</p> <p>Some areas in Oxfordshire are already covered by permit parking schemes and where these have been implemented, they have been extremely successful in removing obstructive parking caused by non-residents. Permit parking schemes help to reduce congestion and pollution, and encourage use of sustainable transport, by removing free on-street commuter parking. They also</p>

	<p>improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users by removing obstructive parking. These benefits mostly fall on those living within the zones but there are wider transport and environmental benefits. All residents in Permit controlled areas who wish to park their vehicle on the public highway in the zone during the hours of operation have to pay for a permit(s); unless access to a permit has been restricted because of a planning permission, for example, the development is car free. Businesses can also apply for permits. Both residents and businesses can also apply for permits for their visitors. Special provisions also apply for carers and contractor's vehicles with more details available on <a href="https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/public-site/parking-permits">https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/public-site/parking-permits</a>. Parking permit charges may affect low income households. The charges are however necessary to ensure that more of the schemes operating costs are met and they are able to continue to operate and deliver their transport and environmental benefits.</p>
<b>Completed By</b>	James Whiting – Team Leader, TRO and Parking Schemes
<b>Authorised By</b>	Cathy Champion – Operations Manager (Civil Enforcement)
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	10/10/2025

## **Section 2: Detail of proposal**

<p><b>Context / Background</b></p> <p>Briefly summarise the background to the policy or proposed service change, including reasons for any changes from previous versions.</p>	<p>Civil Parking Enforcement was decriminalised in 2021 and this opened up opportunities to consider areas that would benefit from the introduction of Permit parking schemes and to review existing restrictions. Didcot as a major town in South Oxfordshire was in scope for this project and as such, we have consulted local opinions over a wide area around Didcot Centre South. Didcot and the surrounding areas is growing significantly (with over 10,000 new homes and a similar number of new jobs), thus is becoming even more a draw as a shopping centre as well a more work commuters. The car parks in the centre of Didcot are well used and often at capacity meaning more people are looking to the roads around the central area in which to park, which is impacting the ability for residents to park near their properties.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Proposals</b></p> <p>Explain the detail of the proposals, including why this has been decided as the best course of action.</p>	<p>The proposals include a mixture of no waiting restrictions, time limited bays and permit holder bays to better manage parking in the Didcot Centre South area which will give priority to residents by preventing all day parking by non-residents. No waiting restrictions are proposed at locations where access needs to be maintained and to promote road safety. Enforcement of the restrictions would be undertaken by the County Council's enforcement contractor, as the town falls within the Civil Enforcement Area for South Oxfordshire.</p>
<p><b>Evidence / Intelligence</b></p> <p>List and explain any data, consultation outcomes, research findings, feedback from service users and stakeholders etc, that supports your proposals and can help to inform the judgements you make about potential impact on different individuals, communities or groups and our ability to deliver our climate commitments.</p>	<p>Prior to undertaking the public consultation, an informal consultation took place in May 2025 which was carried out by the Town Councillors. This was done to understand the parking issues in the area. The majority of the residents who responded were in favour of a residents permit scheme and mentioned there is a significant issue with non-resident parking. After this, a meeting was held with the County Councillor and Town Councillors to discuss the outcome of the informal consultation, and a preliminary design was presented in line with the feedback that was received. They approved the scheme and requested that the County Council to progress with the statutory consultation.</p>
<p><b>Alternatives considered / rejected</b></p> <p>Summarise any other approaches that have been considered in developing the policy or proposed service change, and the reasons why these were not adopted. This could include reasons why doing nothing is not an option.</p>	<p>The proposals have been developed in consultation with the County Councillors and following consultation with residents to address a known problem of non-resident parking in the Didcot Centre South area. The do-nothing option would likely result in the County Council continuing to receive complaints about the parking impacting the local community due to a lack of parking capacity for residents.</p>



Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of Impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A reduction in non-resident parking and/or the removal of obstructive car parking from residential streets is expected to help improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users including older people and children. No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on any age group.	Residents (aged 17 or over) can apply for up to 50 visitor parking permits per year; the first block of 25 issued are free, and the second block of 25 currently cost £31.50. A cap is applied of a maximum of 100 visitor permits per property. Those over 70 do not have to pay for the second set.	OCC project team	Post implementation engagement including with Local Member

<b>Disability</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Those with a disability may be more reliant on a car for mobility and/or require support from a professional carer or family or friends for daily care.</p> <p>Management of on street parking may impact on people reliant on care.</p> <p>A reduction in non-resident parking and/or the removal of obstructive car parking from residential streets is expected help improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users including those with a mobility impairment including those who use a wheelchair or motorized scooter.</p>	<p>Blue badge holders can apply to have a bay provided outside their homes.</p> <p>Blue badge holders can park in time limited bays and permit holder spaces without time limit, without a permit and for free, as long as the blue badge is on display.</p>	OCC project team	Post implementation engagement including with Local Member
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on any gender.			
<b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on marital status.			

<b>Pregnancy &amp; Maternity</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Pregnant people and with infants may require home support from a medical or other professional who need to park on street.</p> <p>A reduction in non-resident parking and/or the removal of obstructive car parking from residential streets is expected help improve the street scene and can make streets safer and more accessible for all road users.</p>	The proposals include a mixture of time limited and permit parking bays. With higher turnover of spaces there is a greater probability that users will be able to find spaces closer to their destinations.	OCC project team	Post implementation engagement including with Local Member
<b>Race</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on any race.			
<b>Sex</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on either sex.			
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on sexual orientation.			
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on sexual orientation.			

### Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts

Additional community impacts	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
<b>Rural communities</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on rural communities.			
<b>Armed Forces</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not considered to impact disproportionately on armed forces.			
<b>Carers</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Carers, including family and friends, that need to look after older and disabled people, and who need to drive and park on street.	The policies for operating permit parking areas includes provision for carers in the form of a permit which the person requiring care can hand the care provider at each visit. Further provision is provided for by the introduction of time limited bays which cater for short visits.	OCC project team	Post implementation engagement including with Local Member
<b>Areas of deprivation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Introduction of a charge for parking permits	The charge for residents' permits are kept to a minimum to cover the costs of operating a permit parking scheme. The decision to proceed with a scheme takes into account all factors including new fees and charges for residents and business users.	OCC project team	Post implementation engagement including with Local Member

### Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Wider Impacts

Additional Wider Impacts	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of Impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff working for the County Council will not be disproportionately impacted.			
Other Council Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Potential need for some council services e.g. social services, to use a car and park in residential streets.	Social workers and registered carers are already catered for in OCC polices and can apply for a permit to allow them to park in permit parking areas whilst undertaking their duties.	OCC project team	Monitoring as part of a wider policy changes.
Providers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No specific impacts identified and a CPZ is not expected to impact disproportionately on any providers.			
Social Value <sup>1</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No impact on social value within existing contracts.			

<sup>1</sup> If the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 applies to this proposal, please summarise here how you have considered how the contract might improve the economic, social, and environmental well-being of the relevant area

#### Section 4: Review

Where bias, negative impact or disadvantage is identified, the proposal and/or implementation can be adapted or changed; meaning there is a need for regular review. This review may also be needed to reflect additional data and evidence for a fuller assessment (proportionate to the decision in question). Please state the agreed review timescale for the identified impacts of the policy implementation or service change.

<b>Review Date</b>	<b>10/10/2025</b>
<b>Person Responsible for Review</b>	<b>James Whiting – Team Leader, TRO and Parking Schemes</b>
<b>Authorised By</b>	<b>Cathy Champion – Operations Manager (Civil Enforcement)</b>

Drawing No.

- Existing double yellow lines
- Existing disabled bay
- Existing single yellow lines Mon-Sat 8am-6pm
- Existing lining to be removed (Single or double yellow lines)
- Proposed double yellow lines
- Boundary of eligible properties
- Proposed Permit Parking Area Mon-Sat 8am-6pm
- Proposed Limited Waiting Parking Bays Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm, 30 mins, no return within 1 hour

SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

IN ADDITION TO THE HAZARDS NORMALLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE TYPES OF WORK SET OUT IN THIS DRAWING, NOTE THE FOLLOWING SIGNIFICANT RISKS TO ROAD USERS.

CONSTRUCTION  
(ENTER 'NONE' IF APPLICABLE)  
MAINTENANCE/CLEANING  
(ENTER 'NONE' IF APPLICABLE)  
USE  
(ENTER 'NONE' IF APPLICABLE)  
DECONSTRUCTION/DEMOLITION  
(ENTER 'NONE' IF APPLICABLE)

© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 OS AC0000801087

Rev.	Date	Purpose of revision	Drawn	Checked/Approved

**OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
Paul Farnon  
Director of Environment & Highways  
County Hall  
New Road  
Oxford  
OX1 1SD  
Tel: 01865 310 1111

Project title  
CIL Project 25/26  
South Oxfordshire

Drawing title  
Proposed permit parking area  
Didcot Centre South

Drawing Status

Scale @ A3	Drawn by MJ	Checked by JW	Approved by JW
	Date drawn	Date checked	Date approved

Oxfordshire Project No. & File Ref

Drawing No. CIL/25-26/ Didcot/ CN/01 Revision 0

