

Division(s) affected: *Churchill & Lye Valley, Marston & Northway, Summertown & Walton Manor, Jericho & Osney*

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

**18 JUNE 2026**

### **OXFORD: 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 eligibility for properties to apply for Residents & Visitors parking permits, as advertised:

- (a) Lye Valley – exclude No.75 Town Furze from eligibility to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits,
- (b) Marston North – exclude No.81 & No.83 Cherwell Drive from eligibility to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits,
- (c) North Summertown – exclude the two new properties at No.34 Davenant Road from eligibility to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits, and
- (d) North Oxford – include No.101 Bainton Road in the list of properties eligible to apply for visitors' parking permits only,

The following Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) administrative amendments:

- e) Cowley Marsh – exclude the three flats at No.112 Cricket Road from eligibility to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits,
- f) Jericho – exclude the two flats at No.6a King Street from eligibility to apply for resident's parking permits & residents' visitors parking permits, and
- g) North Oxford – confirm that (as per existing arrangements) 'South Lodge' at No.128 Banbury Road is eligible to apply for both resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits.

## Executive Summary

1. This report presents comments received to a statutory consultation – and the subsequent response to objections from County Council Officers – on proposals to make amendments to existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) orders in respect of eligibility for parking permits as a result of planning approvals, or to correct historical administrative inconsistencies.
2. 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 permits, or following internal review of current eligibility when requested.
3. Additionally, due to administrative/historic inconsistencies, corrections need to be made to the relevant legal documents to clarify parking permit eligibility permissions for properties in Cricket Road (Cowley Marsh CPZ), King Street (Jericho), and Banbury Road (North Oxford).

## Corporate Policies and Priorities

4. In terms of Oxfordshire County Council's 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 active travel and public transport in the first instance, and a focus on reducing car journeys.
5. 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 .
7. Finance has completed a high-level review of this report. As no financial figures or costings were included, this sign off is limited to confirming that the narrative is reasonable based on the information provided. Service area Officers therefore take responsibility for confirming the funding arrangements, validating the financial position & underlying data independently from Finance.

*Comments checked by:*

*Andrew Price – Interim Business Partnering Accountant*

[Andrew.Price@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Price@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)

## **Legal Implications**

8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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:*

*Jennifer Crouch – Principal Solicitor (Regulatory)*

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

## **Staff Implications**

8. There are no negative staff implications – with the appraisal of the proposals, as well as the consultation process having been undertaken by Officers from the 'TRO & Schemes' teams as part of their regular day-to-day duties, with no additional or 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 is good transport links and access to local facilities.

## **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 09 April and 08 May 2026. A notice was published in the Oxford Times 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, Oxford City Council, relevant local City Councillors, Blackbird Leys Parish Council, and the local County Councillors representing the Churchill & Lye Valley, Marston & Northway, Summertown & Walton Manor, and Jericho & Osney divisions.

18. Additionally, a letter was sent directly to approx.255 properties in & around the immediate vicinity of the proposals.

19. During the course of the formal consultation, 21 responses were received via the online survey, and these are summarised in the table below:

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Partially support / concerns</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>No opinion /objection</b>
No.75 Town Furze	2	-	11	8
No.81 Cherwell Drive	2	1	5	13
No.83 Cherwell Drive	2	1	5	13
No.34 Davenant Road	3	1	6	11
No.101 Bainton Road	2	-	5	14

20. Additionally, a further four emails were received directly – with Thames Valley Police not objecting, the local County Cllr for the Summertown & Walton Manor division offering their support, a local resident objecting to the proposals for No.34 Davenant Road, and a local resident supporting the proposals for No.75 Town Furze.

21. 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**

22. In response to general objections & 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). Officers from the Transport Development Control department will have contributed outlining the County Council's view, with permit allocation and/or varying permit types helping to play a part in the effective long-term management of CPZs

23. As such, the proposed amendments to parking permit eligibility (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
24. With regards to the specific objection for the proposal at No.34 Davenant Road, the existing dwellinghouse and garage are planned to be demolished and two new five-bed dwellinghouses are to be constructed, with off-carriageway private parking available for one vehicle at each of the new properties, and also cycle shelters in the rear garden.
25. Officers confirm that – as previously stated in the general response – the development as approved falls under the Oxford City policy M3 of the 'Oxford Local Plan 2036', i.e. where occupants do not have an operational need for a car, and where the development is located within a 400m walk to frequent public transport services and within 800m walk to a local supermarket or equivalent facilities planning permission will only be granted for residential development that is car-free.
26. Officers also verify that the proposals follow set-precedent in the area, with similar exclusions having been undertaken at Nos.13, 26, 30, 43 & 45 Davenant Road, as well as on other roads within the wider CPZ, confirming that this follows a standard/consistent approach to managing parking demand within the City.
27. There were no objections or concerns raised regarding the proposed Traffic Regulation Order administrative amendments put forward, and as such Officers recommend approving these due to the fact that no material change on-the-ground will be witnessed as a result.

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

Annex(es):                      Annex 1: Consultation responses

Background papers:        n/a

Other Documents:         n/a

Contact Officer(s):        James Whiting (Team Leader – TRO & Schemes)  
    Cathey Champion (Operations Manager – Civil  
    Enforcement)

June 2026

## A. Email responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(e1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police)	<b>No objection</b>
(e2) Local County Cllr, (Summertown & Walton Manor division)	<b>Support</b> – These all seem reasonable proposals.
(e3) Local resident, (Oxford, Blenheim Drive)	<p>No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Object</b></p> <p>As a local resident, the first question I must ask is – what problem is being solved by imposing restrictions on residents and visitor parking? Perhaps someone can explain what the problem being solved actually is.</p> <p>If there is a perceived problem that existing residents could potentially be adversely affected by additional demands on parking due to new developments, then for Davenant Road, this is not relevant as the vast majority of existing properties have multiple vehicle off-street parking spaces due to the large housing plots, and therefore on-street parking is not over-burdened by new developments.</p> <p>In fact, on-street parking is very seldom not available. Since January 2025, I have been collecting data several times a week and as a local resident with an NS residents parking permit I have never failed to find a nearby parking space, I can provide a copy of my data if needed. There is absolutely no shortage of on-street parking capacity near to 34 Davenant Road.</p> <p>My second point is that 34 Davenant Road, as well as some other new developments in Davenant Road, already has severe off-street parking restrictions. To have a blanket policy that provides owners with restricted off-street parking, and then to totally deny on-street parking for owners and their visitors seems not only discriminatory but is fundamentally unfair.</p> <p>Why should someone who buys a house that is “new” be discriminated against those living in “older and nearly new” houses. For example, next door to number 34 are numbers 34a, 34b and 34c. The vehicle impact of these</p>

	<p>three new developments built around 2022 is actually greater than at number 34, but no such restrictions apply to these properties. That is unfair. All owners pay the same council tax and therefore there should be equality and parity amongst all residents and their visitors.</p> <p>Thirdly, I would like to point out that the “NS” parking zone allows residents with parking permits in other local roads as far away as Harpes Road and Blenheim Drive to park outside 34 Davenant Road without restriction, but you are proposing that the residents and visitors to 34 Davenant Road should not have that option! This presents the parking policy that is a lottery and totally unfair.</p> <p>In summary, the parking policy you propose may be relevant in some areas, but for 34 Davenant Road, it is not relevant as there is no parking problem to be solved. There is sufficient capacity for all residents and visitors, of both existing properties and any new residents at 34 Davenant Road. Without this option, the residents and their visitors are adversely impacted and unfairly discriminated against.</p>
(e4) Local resident, (unknown)	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Support</b></p> <p>This is an a 10 bed HMO - completely unsuitable for this corner site and should never have passed planning.</p>

B. Online responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
<p>(o1) Local resident, (Oxford, Davenant Road)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Object</b>            No.81 Cherwell Drive – <b>Object</b>            No.83 Cherwell Drive – <b>Object</b>            No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Object</b>            No.101 Bainton Road – <b>Object</b></p> <p>It is unfair as all properties are paying council tax at the correct rate and yet are punished by not being allowed parking permits unlike their neighbours. It should be the same rule for all. If you wish to stop car traffic in Oxford you need to improve safety for bicycles, reduce bicycle theft, improve bus services and consider those who are unable to use these methods of transport eg shift workers with very young children</p>
<p>(o2) Local resident, (Oxford, Bainton)</p>	<p>No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Object</b>            No.101 Bainton Road – <b>Object</b></p> <p>I think the council are acting as judge &amp; jury and clearly have an anti-car stance. People should be able to live in a home and park their vehicle outside it. If the council put on better car alternative services - eg better cycle lanes/paths, better road maintenance, better bus services then this policy would be easier to stomach, but try getting a bus later at night, or cycling down the Woodstock road without hitting a pothole (dangerous during the day, lethal at night. I hear buck passing from local to regional, but as a resident I don't care whose responsibility it is...oxford infrastructure is not fit for purpose and the only strategy in town seems to be anti-car.</p>
<p>(o3) Local resident, (Oxford, Blenheim Drive)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Object</b>            No.81 Cherwell Drive – <b>Object</b>            No.83 Cherwell Drive – <b>Object</b>            No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Object</b>            No.101 Bainton Road – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>It is completely discriminatory and unfair for anyone to purchase a property where the terms of parking are different from their neighbours. In Davenant Road for example, if parking is not permitted then there is nowhere suitable to park nearby the houses at numbers 32A and 34.</p>
<p>(o4) Local resident, (Oxford, Davenant Road)</p>	<p>No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Partially support/concerns</b></p> <p>Whilst I can understand the exclusion of a permit for the residents, as there appears to be room for them to park off-street; why are their visitors not to be allowed visitors' permits</p>
<p>(o5) Local resident, (Oxford, Town Furze)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Support</b>  No.81 Cherwell Drive – <b>Support</b>  No.83 Cherwell Drive – <b>Support</b>  No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Support</b>  No.101 Bainton Road – <b>Support</b></p> <p>The HMOs would put too great a burden on the streets if allowed permits.</p>
<p>(o6) Local resident, (Oxford, Cherwell Drive)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Support</b>  No.81 Cherwell Drive – <b>Partially support/concerns</b>  No.83 Cherwell Drive – <b>Partially support/concerns</b>  No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Support</b>  No.101 Bainton Road – <b>Support</b></p> <p>I support your proposals but they must be enforced as the likelihood of residents parking anyway is high. Vans have parked everywhere during the build with no enforcement of the 2 hour parking. Coupled with the disaster of the Swan school traffic management the area is a problem</p>
<p>(o7) Local resident, (Oxford, Davenant Road)</p>	<p>No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Support</b></p> <p>When the council agreed to give the planning permission the conditions applied to the application at the time of consent should be adhered to.</p>

	<p>In Davenant road the council have recently allowed to builders to change landscaping to front gardens to accommodate cars. This is after planning consent allowed parking on a drive for one car. I can name 5 such properties in davenant road. I don't agree with encouraging more cars.</p>
<p>(o8) Local resident, (Oxford, Davenant Road)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Support</b>  No.81 Cherwell Drive – <b>Support</b>  No.83 Cherwell Drive – <b>Support</b>  No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Support</b></p> <p>In-fill developments should include sufficient off road parking as part of their plans.</p>
<p>(o9) Local resident, (Oxford, Davenant Road)</p>	<p>No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Support</b></p> <p>Plenty of space on Davenant Road for people to park</p>
<p>(o10) Local resident, (Oxford, Town Furze)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Support</b>  No.81 Cherwell Drive – <b>Support</b>  No.83 Cherwell Drive – <b>Support</b>  No.34 Davenant Road – <b>Support</b></p> <p>As a resident I worry that the narrow streets that can manage 1 or 2 cars per household will be blocked if HMOs encourage 5 cars per household</p>
<p>(o11) Local resident, (Oxford, Bainton Road)</p>	<p>No.101 Bainton Road – <b>Support</b></p> <p>Parking on Bainton Rd is not problematic, I do not think 101 having visitor permits would cause any issues.</p>
<p>(o12) Local resident, (Oxford, Bainton Road)</p>	<p>No.101 Bainton Road – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>We live next door at 99 Bainton Road and there is plenty of on-road parking available in this section of Bainton Road as it is sparsely populated here. We think that visitor parking permits for 101 will not have any negative impact and support the application. The only time the on-road parking places get fully used up is on Sundays when people attend the nearby church and parking restrictions do not apply on Bainton Road at all so, again. there would be no impact.</p>
<p>(o13) Local resident, (Oxford, Inott Furze)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Support</b></p> <p>When permission is given for the conversion of 1930s semi-detached houses into properties that support multiple occupance, an increase in traffic is one consequence. The proposal is a way of addressing that consequence. However, the problem arises from permission being granted in the first place - Lye Valley has in the last few years become peppered with many such conversions - without a clear policy for such development being debated and agreed. The proposal is a locus classicus of 'closing the stable door after the horse has bolted'.</p>
<p>(o14) Local resident, (Oxford, Town Furze)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Support</b></p> <p>Supporting because of the incredibly over crowded, area, people and vehicles</p>
<p>(o15) Local resident, (Oxford, Lye Valley)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Support</b></p> <p>Too many cars parked on a corner</p>
<p>(o16) Local resident, (Oxford, Lye Valley)</p>	<p>No.75 Town Furze – <b>Support</b></p> <p>New HMO is on a dangerous corner and having additional cars parking in this area will be a significant safety hazard</p>
<p>(o17) Local resident, (Oxford, Cherwell Drive)</p>	<p>No.81 Cherwell Drive – <b>Support</b> No.83 Cherwell Drive – <b>Support</b></p>

	I live in Cherwell Drive and do not want cars parked outside on the grass verge etc. there is also a clear way which ends by these properties and the road itself is very busy.
(o18) Local resident, (Oxford, Town Furze)	<b>No.75 Town Furze – Support</b>  I believe the 75 town furze property is a HMO. There are already a lot of cars on the road now. It would make the street significantly busier and start blocking the corner due to the on street parking.
(o19) Local resident, (Oxford, Town Furze)	<b>No.75 Town Furze – Support</b>  75 Town Furze is a new HMO. Many local objections were made to this development. One of the objections was against the inevitable increase in cars in this area. I support anything which will restrict this.
(o20) Local resident, (Oxford, Town Furze)	<b>No.75 Town Furze – Support</b>  Potential for too many vehicles on the street
(o21) Local resident, (Oxford, Cherwell Drive)	<b>No.81 Cherwell Drive – Support</b> <b>No.83 Cherwell Drive – Support</b>  Parking restrictions are not enforced at present so adding more permits would compound the issue since any parking spaces are far away from said property. Since planning is for hospital staff alternative transport options are possible. If however the HMOs are to be used as refugee breaching planning then other safety concerns would be paramount