

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT

26 FEBRUARY 2026

OXFORD & DIDCOT: VARIOUS CPZs – PROPOSED PARKING PERMIT ELIGIBILITY & ADMIN AMENDMENTS

Report by Director of Environment and Highways

RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet Member is **RECOMMENDED** to approve the following amendments to permit eligibility, as advertised:

- (a) Exclude the following properties in Oxford from eligibility to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits:**
 - (i) Marston North – No.44 Arlington Drive,**
 - (ii) Marston South – the Flats at Friar Court, No.2 Old Marston Road (30 student rooms),**
 - (iii) North Oxford – the new properties at the 'University College Annexe' development at No.115 Banbury Road/No.98 Woodstock Road/Staverton Road, and**
 - (iv) Wood Farm – No.59 & No.67 Masons Road.**

- (b) Include property Nos.1-44 Rymans Court (Didcot) in the list of those eligible to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits.**

Executive Summary

2. This report presents responses received to a statutory consultation on proposed amendments to existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) orders in respect of eligibility for parking permits and parking provision as a result of planning approvals, or to correct historical administrative inconsistencies.

3. The proposals have been put forward as a result of either planning permissions which have been granted by Oxford City Council for residential units on the basis that applications for Residents Parking Permits will be subject to the relevant Traffic Regulation Order for that area, which may limit eligibility for residents to obtain residents and/or visitors parking permits, or following internal review of current eligibility when requested.

4. The variation orders for Marston North, Marston South, North Oxford, and Wood Farm propose that various properties are excluded from eligibility to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits as a result of planning conditions being placed when permission was granted by the City Council for the development of the sites for residential purposes, or conversion of existing single dwellings into 'Homes of Multiple Occupation' (HMOs).
5. Additionally, following requests received and a subsequent review by Officers, it is also proposed that residents of Nos.1-44 Rymans Court in Dicot, will be eligible to apply for both resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits within the newly implemented Central Didcot residents parking permit scheme.

Corporate Policies and Priorities

1. Of the three priorities identified within the newly adopted 'Oxfordshire Strategic Plan 2025-2028' which are listed below, these proposals actively support priority nos.1 & 3:
 - (1) Greener Oxfordshire – *“We want our communities to enjoy clean air, access to green space, and safe and sustainable ways to move around. This means reducing traffic congestion and investing in public transport, cycling and walking; protecting our natural environment; and helping Oxfordshire respond and adapt to a changing climate.”*
 - (2) Fairer Oxfordshire – *“We want all our residents to benefit from the advantages our county has to offer. This means supporting a local economy that benefits everyone; assisting people who face challenges in finding work; making our services as easy to access as possible; and helping communities in need.”*
 - (3) Healthier Oxfordshire – *“We want all our residents to be happy, healthy and safe. This means helping children get the best start in life; creating opportunities for young people to reach their full potential; supporting older people to age well and stay independent for as long as possible; and encouraging everyone to make healthy choices.”*

Financial Implications

6. Where appropriate, funding for consultation (and all other aspects associated with amending the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders) on the proposals has been provided by the various developers of the specific properties in question.

Comments checked by:

Matt Kocak – Finance Business Partnering Manager

Matthew.Kocak@Oxfordshire.gov.uk

Legal Implications

7. 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.
8. 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.
9. In some cases, these proposals have been put forward because of associated conditions within the planning permissions granted by Oxford City Council as a result of the development of properties within the city for residential purposes.
10. When appropriate, developers have separately entered into a planning agreement or 'Unilateral Undertaking' under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with the County Council to undertake the promotion, consultation and, if appropriate, the making of a traffic regulation order to exclude the specific sites from eligibility for parking permits as appropriate. The 'Unilateral Undertaking' is a simplified version of a planning agreement, and is entered into by the landowner and any other party with a legal interest in the development site.

Comments checked by:

Nicole Olavesen – Solicitor (Regulatory)

Nicole.Olavesen@Oxfordshire.gov.uk

Staff Implications

11. 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.

Equality & Inclusion Implications

12. Officers note that the proposals may have a negative impact on those with mobility issues in terms of parking provision, it is considered that these are mitigated by the fact that in all permit schemes that operate in Oxfordshire, blue badge holders can park with their badge on display in permit bays or areas without time limit or the need to hold a valid permit.
13. Additionally, the County Council will consider any requests for additional dedicated Disabled Persons Parking Places on a case-by-case basis - subject to applicant & site suitability - this is provided free of charge to the applicant,

and will provide additional parking capacity for any holder of an authorised current blue badge.

14. Proposals brought forward for changing permit eligibility also link to the City Council's planning policies, which require developments to be 'car free' where criteria stipulates that there are good transport links and access to local facilities nearby.

Sustainability Implications

15. The proposals will help ensure that developments do not generate a level of on-street vehicular parking which would be prejudicial to highway safety or cause parking congestion in the immediate locality. Also, the measures will help facilitate the passage of traffic, thereby limiting any adverse effect on safety to road users, and local amenities in the immediate vicinity.

Risk Management

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

Formal Consultation

17. Formal consultation was carried out between 04 December 2025 and 09 January 2026. A notice was published in the Oxfordshire Herald Series & Oxford Times newspapers, and an email was sent to statutory consultees and key-stakeholders, including Thames Valley Police, the Fire & Rescue Service, Ambulance service, Bus operators, countywide transport/access and disabled peoples user groups, Oxford City Council, South Oxfordshire District Council, relevant local City and District Cllrs, and the local County Councillors representing the Marston & Northway, Summertown & Walton Manor, Churchill & Lye Valley, and Didcot West divisions.
18. Letters were also sent directly to approximately 700 properties in total, in the immediate vicinity of the various properties.
19. During the course of the formal consultation, 59 responses were received via the online survey, and these are summarised in the table below:

Proposal	Support	Partially support and/or concerns	Object	No objection or opinion	Total
Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive	15	1	8	35	59
Exclude Flats at Friar Court	18	2	4	35	59
Exclude properties at	43	2	7	7	59

'University College Annexe'					
Exclude No.59 Masons Road	14	2	4	39	59
Exclude No.67 Masons Road	14	2	4	39	59
Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court	14	2	7	36	59

20. Officers note that in a number of responses where an objection was submitted via the online survey, the comments provided actually suggest they support the proposals – and is likely due to a simple misunderstanding of the way the online survey questions were structured.
21. Additionally, a further five emails were received directly – with Thames Valley Police submitting a non-objection, along with Risinghurst and Sandhills Parish Council who try and support planning guidance whenever possible. The County Cllr responsible for the 'Jericho & Osney' division & a local resident submitted their support for the proposal to exclude the properties at the new 'University College Annexe', with a resident of Didcot supporting the proposal to allow the flats at Rymans Court to be eligible to apply for permits.
22. The full responses are shown in **Annex 1**, 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

23. In response to the general concerns about having constraints placed on residents' ability to park where they live, it is important to note that the restrictions have been put forward in response to the development of properties for residential purposes within existing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), and Officers from the Transport Development Control department will have contributed outlining the County Councils view, with permit allocation and/or varying permit types helping to play a part in the effective long-term management of CPZ's.
24. As such, the proposals (as put forward) help meet the City Council's 'car-free' policies that for residential development within CPZs where the site is within 800m of a local shop and 400m of a frequent bus service, the development should be 'car free'. Thus, helping ensure that the potential increase in residents at properties as a result of local development do not result in increased demand for on-street parking in the local area, which would likely adversely affect existing residents & their visitors ability to park.
25. In terms of Oxfordshire County Council wider transport policies, the proposals align with the 'Local Transport and Connectivity Plan' (LTCP) and the 'Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan' (COTP), given that LTCP's hierarchy is to cater for

ANNEX 1

A. Email responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(e1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	No objection – Thank you for the consultation documents. The Police have no objection.
(e2) Risinghurst and Sandhills Parish Council	No objection – Risinghurst and Sandhills Parish Council takes the view that they support planning guidance whenever possible. When an HMO is applied for, they have lodged their comments and/or objections and will support the enforcement of any planning conditions set by the planning officer.
(e3) County Cllr, (Jericho & Osney division)	Support – I very much agree with the proposal to exclude the new properties at the University College Annexe (115 Banbury Rd/98 Woodstock Rd/Staverton Rd) from eligibility to apply for residents' and visitors' parking permits. There are going to be hundreds of new student residents on the site, and it would be completely inappropriate and impractical for them to have permits – there is just no room in the surrounding streets for any more cars.
(e4) Local Resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)	Support – I am strongly in favour of the exclusion of the University College Annexe residents from applying for residents' parking and visitor parking permits. There are a very limited number of spaces available, particularly as Banbury and Woodstock Roads understandably do not permit parking, and to allow the significant number of new residents to compete for these spaces would seriously limit the ability of families and longstanding residents to park near to harms and allow visitors to do the same. The University project should be expected to provide spaces for those they have added to the neighbourhood.
(e5) Local Resident, (Didcot, Britwell Road)	Support – I feel Rymans Court should be able to be eligible to apply for residents & visitors parking permits, as at times with residents, visitors and carers, the car park can be full, meaning some have to park on the road at times.

B. Online responses: (**Note** – when a response is blank for a given proposal, this equates to a submission of “No objection/No opinion” having been provided by the respondent)

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(o1) Local resident, (Didcot, Britwell Road)	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude ‘University College Annexe’ – Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>It is important that Rymans Court residents can get visitors passes as parking is for residents only in the private car park</p>
(o2) Local resident, (Didcot, Britwell road)	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude ‘University College Annexe’ – Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>I am a resident of Rymans Court and was very upset and disappointed when I discovered residents of Rymans Court were not eligible to apply for visitors parking. At certain times of the year and also if we have social gathering 17 parking spaces for residents and visitors is just not enough to meet our needs. Most of the time our parking is sufficient but as I have stated certain days i.e.Christmas,Easter and Mother’s day. without the additional visitors parking we will not get the family visits we so look forward to and we will be penalised as residents locally with lots of off road parking can apply for residents and visitors parking permits. Could I suggest in the interim that Rymans Court be issued with paper permits as Christmas is fast approaching.</p>

<p>(o3) As part of a group/organisation, (Grove, Caudwell close)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>I am the Development manager (warden) at Rymans Court. The development consists of 43 flats occupied by residents over the age of 60 known as independant living) Some residents still own cars and drive. But we also have residents who require carers and other home based support.</p> <p>Our car park has 16/17 car parking spaces, however in the terms of the lease agreement, the parking spaces are for resident owned cars only.</p> <p>As all the residents / addresses at site are addressed as Rymans Court, Britwell Road and each property is liable for individual council tax. I feel that is a discriminatory against the residents of Rymans Court to at least have the same options as those living in individual properties along the road.</p> <p>It is very unlikely that many would request visiting parking permits however they should have the / a choice.</p>
<p>(o4) Local resident, (Oxford, Arlington Drive)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Object Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>They should require permits like they rest of the street.</p>
<p>(o5) Local resident, (Oxford, Arlington Drive)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support</p>

	<p>Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>Allowing too many HMO's in the area has already created chaos. during the day there are few cars however outside the permit times many of the residents return home with some have 6 -10 extra vehicles per property ion Arlington drive.</p>
<p>(o6) Local resident, (Oxford, Arlington Drive)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Object Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Partially support/concerns Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Partially support/concerns Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Partially support/concerns Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Partially support/concerns Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Partially support/concerns</p> <p>Parking is hard enough with multiple residents houses , people are parking on the bath making hard to pass on the path</p>
<p>(o7) Local resident, (Oxford, Arlington Drive)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Partially support/concerns Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>My main concern is Marston, and specifically Arlington Drive. There are now many HMOs where I live with insufficient off road parking to accommodate 8 or 9 bed occupancy of former '3-bed semis' if they all want to bring cars. This results in inconsiderate on street parking which is occasionally quite obstructing to larger vehicles such as delivery vans and ambulances. Whilst I am understanding of the need for cheaper housing options I am really concerned that the proliferation of HMOs, with it's changing population who have no real commitment to the neighbourhood has destroyed the previous family community feel to the place, and that this will potentially have a detrimental effect on local facilities and schools in the future.</p>

<p>(o8) Local resident, (Oxford, Arlington Drive)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>There are too many cars parked on the road as it is especially at school times</p>
<p>(o9) Local resident, (Oxford, Arlington Drive)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Object</p> <p>Arlington Drive is already heavy effected by parking all day and there has been issues with impassable places on a regular basis by badly parked vehicles, too many vehicles and illegally parked not permitted vehicles. Additionally, there is much building work planned on this road snd others in the area, constant renovations and vehicles for traders don't allow for additional parking. Ultimately planning permission was given based on my parking permits for multiple occupancies or the like. Therefore as plan ING permission was not granted for parking this should remain and so still be excluded for any requesting a review or change to eligible parking permits.</p> <p>Finally, Oxford has a congestion charge for areas on, it's not just 6 places that have too much traffic and this would open the flood gates for any large occupied property. To allow this the properties should not be multiple occupancies and revert back to a normal property use. No. 43 Arlington Drive is opposite me abd they have five cars as a minimum, three parked off the road but any additionally parked are always parked illegally with no permits because they aren't allowed. Their parking is no considerate. My neighbour has two caters visit three to four times a day with two separate cars. This makes Arlibgton drive busy all day and additional parking is not feasible or realistic. My driveway is often blocked by such parked cars. Please not not allow more originally excluded vehicles.</p>

<p>(o10) As a business, (Oxford, Banbury)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>As a business owner, we would support the exclusion of parking permits in North Oxford. The reason for our position is overcrowding, resulting in no available space for hotel guests or contractors to park.”</p>
<p>(o11) Local resident, (Oxford, Banbury Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Unacceptable intensification of demand on limited facility</p>
<p>(o12) Local resident, (Oxford, Bardwell Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. University College Annexe is near to where I live. I am not familiar with the others so I am unable to give comment on them. 2. Oxford University students have traditionally *not* been allowed permits or parking spaces. The amount of student accommodation in North Oxford has been increasing and (it appears) will continue to increase. Wolfson College is

	<p>currently building an extension in Linton Road - it would seem unreasonable to exclude the new Wolfson residents if the new Univ residents were not also excluded.</p> <p>3. The contractors working on the Univ Annexe are already parking on the East side of Banbury Road - the implication is that there isn't enough parking provision between Woodstock and Banbury Roads - and there wouldn't be enough for the students, either.</p> <p>4. It should be noted that Univ's plans for the site appear to be to have the accommodation occupied both in and out of the University term, so there would be no relief to the neighbourhood during the holidays.</p>
<p>(o13) Local resident, (Oxford, Belbroughton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>Something has to be done to control increased traffic caused by new developments and students. What is being proposed is the bare minimum. I would support even tougher measures.</p>
<p>(o14) Local resident, (Oxford, Benson Place)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Object Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>This will be largely used by commuting college employees, as it is currently, not for residential purposes..</p>
<p>(o15) Local resident, (Oxford, Charlbury road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support</p>

	<p>Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>Support measures to reduce the attractiveness of using cars within the ring road, especially for offices and businesses.</p>
(o16) Local resident, (Oxford, Charlbury Road)	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Object Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>There will be too many people living there and at the moment there are not enough spaces for residents or their visitors. Staverton should provide it's own parking.</p>
(o17) Local resident, (Oxford, Linton Road)	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Oxford's streets are congested enough without additionally vehicles owned by students adding to the problem.</p>
(o18) Local resident, (Oxford, linton road)	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p>

	<p>The new development of the University College Annexe is already on a scale that threatens the quiet residential character of this part of the North Oxford protected area. The residents of the Annexe should not be allowed to add to this pressure by bringing cars into the area, with all the associated problems of noise, pollution and road hazards. There are excellent bus services on the Banbury and (to a lesser degree) on the Woodstock Road, and anyone using the Annexe should have the strongest possible encouragement to use those services.</p>
<p>(o19) Local resident, (Oxford, Linton road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>The residents of university college annexe are students who should use active transport or public transport and not add to traffic and parking congestion in our already congested city streets.</p>
<p>(o20) Local resident, (Oxford, Linton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Object</p> <p>I wish to preserve North Oxford as a residential area and to prevent its becoming absorbed into an extended campus.</p>
<p>(o21) Local resident, (Oxford, Masons Rd)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Object Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Object Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Object Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Object Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Object Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Object</p>

	<p>This survey illustrates everything that is wrong with the council. Constantly working against the interests of the public.</p>
<p>(o22) Local resident, (Oxford, No)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Object Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>They should not be singled out of the street</p>
<p>(o23) Member of public, (Oxford, Norham Raod)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Will not be used by residents on site, merely as additional commuter parking as is was historically.</p>
<p>(o24) Local resident, (Oxford, Northmoor Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Partially support/concerns Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>In principle, I believe all new developments should rely on sustainable transport unless there are special circs involved. But I am concerned that residents of the new development will simply come and park in the timed bays in Northmoor Road, as indeed the constructors are doing now (all day and every day). Restrictions need to be enforced.</p>

<p>(o25) Local resident, (Oxford, Northmoor Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>It is already very hard to park in our area due to schools, building works etc, so I don't support any extra parking.</p>
<p>(o26) Local resident, (Oxford, Northmoor Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>There are so many parking permits in place in OX2 mainly belonging to the schools and endless contractors that all roads are fully occupied ever day making it look as if no restrictions are in place.</p>
<p>(o27) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>These developments were built in full knowledge of the restrictions on parking</p>
<p>(o28) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support</p>

	<p>Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>There's are already enough vehicles parking in our street . Additionally this what not how the application for the New College was done originally. As residents we were told it would not add to the considerable traffic issues during term time.</p>
(o29) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson Road)	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>I live in Rawlinson Road, backing onto the Univ site.Our road is often packed with cars and I don't want the limited spaces to be used by the Universsity College Annexe site. They have their own parking spaces and also bicycle racks for students.</p>
(o30) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson Road)	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>I live in Rawlinson Road where there is already a lot of pressure on street parking in the area.</p>
(o31) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson Road)	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Partially support/concerns Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Partially support/concerns</p>

	<p>Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Partially support/concerns Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Partially support/concerns</p> <p>New development should usually be car free. Univ development stated that it is to be car free. Allowing visitors permits only seems a sensible thing.</p>
<p>(o32) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Resident parking in Rawlinson Road very difficult over last two years due to contractor s taking up spaces - rarely monitored or fined. The campus is proud to be 'car free' so why should local residents be inconvenienced by this policy?</p>
<p>(o33) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>We live on Rawlinson Road. This street is overrun with unauthorised parking. A lot of this comes from workmen on the Stavertonia project (who are supposed to use the Park and Ride), but even before this project began many cars parking were parking here who do not have the right to do so. In addition we have a problem with tour buses using Rawlinson Road as a place to wait. No additional parking should be allowed on Rawlinson Road, or on any street near Stavertonia. Most of the houses on Rawlinson Road have off-street parking. Parking spaces on the street should be reserved for people who are given parking permits by residents...visitors and tradespeople working for residents. Frequent enforcement of existing parking rules would solve most of the problem.</p>

<p>(o34) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude ‘University College Annexe’ – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>The occupants of the Univ site are all students who should not have cars. In addition on-street parking is already limited in the area with three nurseries in Rawlinson Road or at the corner with Woodstock Road, all requiring short term parking space.</p>
<p>(o35) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude ‘University College Annexe’ – Object Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Live at the annexe in staverton and have flat neighbours who would need parking spaces</p>
<p>(o36) Rather not say, (Oxford, Staverton)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude ‘University College Annexe’ – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Univ have ALWAYS stated that students are not permitted to bring cars to university. This is in direct opposition to their promise to residents on this site. As their site is close to congestion charge zones, national cycle route and the current Council’s active plan to eliminate cars from Oxford it seems disingenuous oof Univ and the Council to encourage students to have their own cars to park. Strongly object.</p>

<p>(o37) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Object Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Object Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Object Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Object Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Object Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Object</p> <p>Anyone living within the congestion zone should be eligible for resident's parking permits and visitors parking permitd</p>
<p>(o38) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>I have commented on the exclusion for parking rights for the University College Annexe and Banbury Rd because as a resident of Staverton Rd, the revamping of the Annexe has been a huge concern in particular parking concerns in an already congested area with many school kids using us as a designated safe route. We'd like to keep it as safe as possible.</p>
<p>(o39) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>The University College site is a highly intense development in a residential area: it received hundreds of objections when it was submitted for planning. The College undertook to ban student parking.</p>

	<p>It is appropriate and necessary for the Council to reflect this by prohibiting use of residents' parking on the whole site including the Annexe. I fully support the proposal.</p>
<p>(o40) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>The restriction recommended for Staverton Road Permits addressed towards the residents of the new University College development (so called 'Stavertonia') is essential for this road which is not only residential, but has exceptionally high use at many times in the day by young people cycling to schools along the designated cycle route. It is of vital health and safety requirements that street parking in this busy road should be constrained to that which is absolutely necessary only. If the resident student population of the University development were permitted to apply for road parking in this area, it would be disastrous for the local community, and also lead to dangerous congestion & narrowing of the road for the vulnerable children who frequent it. The restriction is therefore absolutely essential.</p>
<p>(o41) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>I feel very strongly about this. There is a ban on university students bringing cars to Oxford. University College management has assured residents that students are told that they are not to bring cars to Oxford. However, University College Annexe students do sometimes manage to acquire permits which undermines the ban as most students honour the ban. It is unclear how those who obtain permits manage to flout the rules. If those living in the new properties (or any others) at the University College Annexe were eligible for parking permits this would have a significant negative impact on local roads as so many students live on the Univ site. I note that we live close to the University College Annexe site and each year students from University College and/or Trinity College ring our doorbell</p>

	<p>and ask if we can help them obtain parking locally be allowing them to park on our drive or help them get permits - we always point out the ban on them having cars in Oxford and decline to help.</p>
<p>(o42) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Not enough parking spots already in these streets and adjacent ones</p>
<p>(o43) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>No car policy, car free zone, allowing permits goes against this policy We are enduring congestion charges to limit cars and this works in the opposite direction</p>
<p>(o44) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Students should not be allowed to bring cars to UNIV north, it would clog up all the residential parking spots</p>

<p>(o45) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>University College made a pledge in its planning application for the Staverton Road Annexe that there would be no parking offered to student residents. It is a rule of the University that students are not supposed to bring cars to Oxford at all. I do not wish to see these promises reneged upon. Furthermore I do not see how the council can issue permits to temporary residents who don't even pay council tax as students!</p>
<p>(o46) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>The University should hold to its original vision for the site, i.e., halls of car-free student residence rather than premises in a dormitory suburb.</p>
<p>(o47) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Univ management have always stated that there is a ban on students bringing cars to Oxford and that University College Annexe is, and will be, a “car free” site as far as students are concerned. If those living on site became eligible</p>

	<p>for permits this would almost certainly mean an unacceptable increase in on-street parking in Staverton Road and other local roads.</p>
<p>(o48) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Object Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Object Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Object Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Object Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Object Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Object</p> <p>I object to students at Univ South on Staverton Road being able to obtain parking permits. It was previously stated that students should not be able to bring cars to university. Also the side street parking on Staverton and other roads between Woodstock and Banbury Roads has increased significantly since the the congestion charge was implemented.</p>
<p>(o49) Local resident, (Oxford, Windsor Crescent)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Object Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that seek to exclude certain properties—particularly those designated as Homes of Multiple Occupation (HMOs)—from eligibility to apply for on-street residents' parking permits and visitors' parking permits in the Arlington Drive area. Although I live on a neighbouring street rather than Arlington Drive itself, the decisions made under the TRO will directly influence how on-street parking is managed across the wider neighbourhood.</p> <p>My objection relates specifically to the complete removal of eligibility for these households to apply for on-street parking permits, even when doing so would not increase parking pressure or compromise the objectives of the scheme. I believe such a blanket exclusion is not proportionate, not justified by local conditions, and inconsistent with how other residential properties—many of which already operate multiple on-street vehicles—are treated under the same scheme.</p>

1 >> A Blanket Ban on On-Street Permits for HMOs Is Disproportionate

The proposed exclusion prevents certain households from applying for:

- * Residents' on-street parking permits, and
- * Visitors' on-street parking permits,

regardless of their actual parking needs or the capacity of the surrounding roads.

Meanwhile, other standard residential homes in the immediate area are freely able to apply for one or more on-street permits. In many cases, these households legitimately operate two or more vehicles, all of which rely on the same shared public highway. If the street system can accommodate these multiple-vehicle households without issue, it is inconsistent to entirely prohibit an HMO household from applying even for a single on-street permit, whether for residents or visiting guests.

This inconsistency highlights that the restriction applied to HMOs is not evidence-based or proportionate to actual on-street usage.

2 >> Planning Conditions Should Not Automatically Remove All On-Street Permit Eligibility

The planning conditions cited as justification state that eligibility for permits may be limited, not that it must be completely removed. They are intended to prevent developments that generate excessive on-street parking, not to prohibit any use of on-street space where demonstrably safe and manageable.

However, in the Arlington Drive area, on-street parking is not saturated, and traffic moves without obstruction except during school pick-up/drop off. The local network does not display the level of congestion that would justify removing the ability for certain households to apply even for visitor permits.

If the Council's purpose is to manage and balance on-street capacity, then a complete prohibition—rather than a considered cap or controlled allocation—goes beyond what is necessary to achieve that purpose.

3 >> On-Street Conditions Do Not Support the Need for a Full Exclusion

As a resident of a nearby street, I observe daily that:

- * On-street parking availability is consistently sufficient.
- * There is not a persistent shortage of spaces.
- * The flow of traffic is not impeded.

Both residents and legitimate visitors are currently accommodated without congestion.

In this context, allowing HMO properties to apply for a single residents' permit or visitor permits would not change the nature of on-street demand in any material way. The proposed total exclusion therefore fails to reflect the actual parking patterns and needs of our streets.

4 >> Denying Visitor Parking Access Is Especially Unreasonable

	<p>Visitors' parking permits exist to address temporary and occasional needs—maintenance workers, carers, deliveries, family visits, friends and other essential short-term access. These activities occur at all residential properties, including HMOs, and are not inherently linked to long-term vehicle ownership.</p> <p>Preventing a property from obtaining any visitor permits significantly disadvantages that household while providing no demonstrable benefit to the surrounding streets. Occasional visitor parking does not create congestion, nor does it contribute meaningfully to long-term vehicle numbers on the road.</p> <p>A policy that denies such basic, essential access appears overly restrictive and disconnected from realistic residential needs.</p> <p>5 >> A Balanced Approach Would Meet All Council Objectives</p> <p>The Council's stated aims—facilitating traffic movement, preventing congestion, and protecting local amenity—are entirely reasonable. These objectives can still be fully achieved while allowing HMO residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * To apply for one residents' on-street permit, and/or * To obtain visitor parking permits for essential short-term access. <p>A limited, controlled allowance is wholly compatible with sustainable parking management. It also ensures fairness, reduces disproportionate exclusion, and recognises the legitimate needs of households who rely on the same public streets as their neighbours.</p> <p>>> Conclusion</p> <p>For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that Oxford City Council reconsider the proposed prohibition and instead permit affected properties in the Arlington Drive area to apply for:</p> <p>At least one residents' on-street parking permit, and/or</p> <p>Visitors' parking permits, which are essential for day-to-day living and do not contribute to long-term parking stress.</p> <p>Such an approach would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Align with actual on-street capacity, * Ensure fairness across different household types, <p>Support the Council's objectives without unnecessary over-restriction.</p>
(o50) Local resident, (Oxford, Woodstock Road)	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive –</p> <p>Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road –</p> <p>Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support</p> <p>Exclude No.59 Masons Road –</p> <p>Exclude No.67 Masons Road –</p> <p>Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p>

	<p>This development describes itself as a 'major expansion'. However, it sits between residential roads that only have a limited amount of parking. Also, this is student accommodation and it is not clear why parking would be needed. Lastly, the development is described as having 'a focus on sustainability'. That suggests there was not an intention that the 150 residents would be offered on-road parking spaces.</p>
<p>(o51) Local resident, (Oxford,)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>exclude</p>
<p>(o52) Local resident, (Oxford, Linton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>Limited parking already for local residents.</p>
<p>(o53) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p>

	<p>I do not have sufficient information on the Didcot proposals or the Wood Farm ones to have an opinion on them - but as a north Oxford resident I am very aware of the impact it would have on the local roads if students at the new University College annexe had parking permits and this large extra group of people suddenly also required accommodation for their cars in the already congested neighbouring residential roads. The Marston South proposal appears similar - with potentially numerous extra vehicles attempting to park in existing residential roads - with no provision having been made for these additional vehicles as part of the developments.</p>
<p>(o54) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Object</p> <p>The road at Rawlinson is incredibly dangerous in morning. Cars parked randomly no ability for residents to park. Cars racing up and down far too fast. The university development was promised as a no car area. If you offer parking permits the whole incentives will change. Students should not be allowed to bring cars. The development was conditional on this basis. The proposal to give them parking permits breaks this and I strongly object.</p>
<p>(o55) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>I support the exclusion of the University College Annexe properties from the right of parking permits, as this development in the back gardens of four streets was always promised to be car free. The development comprises graduate/undergraduate flats, and Oxford university students are not supposed to have cars anyway. No new roads have been created, meaning any parking permits issued to this massive increase in population would entitle the dwellers to park in existing surrounding roads, already under pressure. I have no views on the other areas mentioned as I don't know the conditions there.</p>

<p>(o56) Local resident, (Oxford, Rawlinson Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Support Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Support Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Support Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Support Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Support</p> <p>During the planning process for the University College Annexe we were informed that it would be a no car site. The construction process has been a nightmare for local residents with construction workers parking in nearby streets and totally disregarding parking rules. There are limited spaces and University College should be kept to their promise of no cars . If people who work on site need to park the college should make on site provision or they should use the park and ride</p>
<p>(o57) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p> <p>Univ college stated that no students would be allowed to bring cars and thus would significantly increase the traffic on Staverton road</p>
<p>(o58) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Support Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court –</p>

	<p>Not allowing parking permits for surrounding roads will ensure there is no increase in car parking on these roads. Car parking can be a danger to cyclists. Hopefully this will also limit car journeys to the new properties which are very near to good public transport links.</p>
<p>(o59) Local resident, (Oxford, Staverton Road)</p>	<p>Exclude No.44 Arlington Drive – Object Exclude No.2 Old Marston Road – Object Exclude 'University College Annexe' – Object Exclude No.59 Masons Road – Object Exclude No.67 Masons Road – Object Include Nos.1-44 Rymans Court – Object</p> <p>No comment</p>