

|   |  |
|---|--|
|  <p><b>WEST OXFORDSHIRE<br/>DISTRICT COUNCIL</b></p> | <p><b>WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL</b></p>  |
| Name and date of Committee  | <b>OFFICER DELEGATED DECISION MAKING MEETING 3<sup>RD</sup> DECEMBER 2025</b>  |
| Subject   | <b>CONSIDER FEEDBACK FROM PARKING CONSULTATION</b>   |
| Wards affected  | All  |
| Accountable member  | Cllr Lidia Arciszewska-Executive Member for Environment<br>Email: <a href="mailto:Lidia.arciszewska@westoxon.gov.uk">Lidia.arciszewska@westoxon.gov.uk</a>   |
| Accountable officer   | Claire Locke-Executive Director Corporate Services<br>Email: <a href="mailto:democratic.services@westoxon.gov.uk">democratic.services@westoxon.gov.uk</a>  |
| Report author   | Maria Wheatley-Parking Manager<br>Email: <a href="mailto:democratic.services@westoxon.gov.uk">democratic.services@westoxon.gov.uk</a>  |
| Summary/Purpose   | To consider consultation feedback on the proposed changes to stay times in Spendlove Car Park-Charlbury, Gildenford Car Park-Burford and Hensington Road Car Park-Woodstock.   |
| Annexes   | Annex A – Proposals<br>Exempt Annex B – Consultation feedback via email<br>Exempt Annex C – Consultation feedback via online survey raw data   |
| Recommendation(s)   | That decision makers resolve to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider feedback from the public consultation on the proposed stay times at each location.</li> <li>And if changes are to be made, instruct the Parking Manager to establish the Notice of Making and instruct legal to sign and seal the new parking order.</li> </ol> |
| Corporate priorities  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Putting Residents First</li> <li>Enabling A Good Quality of Life for All</li> <li>Creating a Better Environment for People and Wildlife</li> <li>Responding to the Climate and Ecological Emergency</li> <li>Working Together for West Oxfordshire</li> </ul>   |

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Key Decision                | NO  |
| Exempt                      | YES – Annex B and Annex C   |
| Consultees/<br>Consultation | Public Notice placed in the Witney Gazette 22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2025.<br>Statutory consultees. Ward Members. Town and Parish Councils. The statutory period is 21 days this consultation was for a period of 35 days. |

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 To consider the feedback from the consultation carried out for the proposed changes to stay times.

## 2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Executive met on the 9<sup>th</sup> July 2025 and gave delegated authority to Executive Director and Executive Member for Environment to consider the consultation feedback.

2.2 To make these changes we need to make a Variation Order, where there is provision for public and statutory consultation.

## 3. AVAILABILITY OF CONSULTATION INFORMATION

3.1 The Notice of Proposal was advertised in the local press; The Witney Gazette on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2025. It was also sent to the statutory consultees, Town and Parish Councils, Ward Members whose wards are directly affected, placed on the Council website, signs in all the affected car parks and copies placed at the Town Centre Shop in Witney. Additional signs were placed in the affected car parks for the public to access an online survey, the survey link was also available on the Council website.

## 4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES-VIA EMAIL (Annex B)

### Charlbury

4.1 The council received 15 email responses to the consultation, 9 of which related to Charlbury, 2 to Burford and 4 for Woodstock.

4.2 The responses relating to Charlbury are all opposed to or concerned about the proposed changes.

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Resident responses | 6 |
| Business response  | 1 |
| Town Council       | 1 |
| Parish Council     | 1 |

### **Burford**

**4.3** The responses relating to Burford are both concerned and opposed to the changes.

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Resident & Business | I |
| Business            | I |

### **Woodstock**

**4.4** The responses relating to Woodstock are concerned and opposed to the changes.

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Resident     | 2 |
| Business     | I |
| Not provided | I |

## **5. CONSULTATION FEEDBACK VIA SURVEY (Annex C)**

**5.1** There were 275 responses to the survey, not all respondents answered all the questions relating to all 3 car parks.

### **In what capacity are you responding to this consultation?**

|                                    |           |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Local resident                     | 149 (54%) |
| Member of the public               | 64 (23%)  |
| As a Business                      | 38 (14%)  |
| As part of a group or organisation | 10 (4%)   |
| Local Cllr (Town/Parish/District)  | 6 (2%)    |
| No answer                          | 6 (2%)    |
| County Cllr                        | 2 (1%)    |
| Total responses                    | 275       |

## 6. Responses relating to Charlbury

|                   |          |
|-------------------|----------|
| Object            | 85 (31%) |
| No opinion        | 78 (28%) |
| No answer         | 37 (14%) |
| Support           | 26 (9%)  |
| Concerns          | 22 (8%)  |
| Partially support | 19 (7%)  |
| No objections     | 8 (3%)   |
| Total responses   | 275      |

### 6.1 Summary of responses for Charlbury.

The overwhelming concern among respondents is that proposed parking restrictions, particularly the reduction or removal of long-stay spaces will severely impact local businesses, especially those whose staff work long shifts (often 10–11 hours) and commute from outside Charlbury. Many responses specifically mention nurseries (notably Little Monkeys) as being at risk of losing staff or even closing if staff cannot park for their full shifts. Several respondents highlight that public transport is not a viable alternative due to shift patterns and limited services.

There is also concern that the recent introduction of residents-only, on-street parking has already reduced available parking for workers, pushing more demand onto the Spendlove car park. Respondents argue that further restrictions will compound the problem, making it even harder for staff and visitors to park, and potentially harming the local economy.

A smaller but notable group of respondents' express concern about the loss of short-stay (1 hour) spaces, which they say are essential for quick visits to shops, the chemist, or the deli. There are also worries that without proper enforcement (e.g., ANPR), commuters will continue to use the car park for all-day parking, undermining the purpose of any changes.

Some comments mention misuse of parent-and-child bays and suggest clearer signage or enforcement. Others note that the new on-street restrictions have left many on-street spaces empty during the day, which could be better utilised by workers if permits were available.

In summary, the dominant theme is that further parking restrictions, especially on long-stay spaces will make it extremely difficult for local businesses to operate, threaten jobs, and reduce the vibrancy of Charlbury. There is also a call for a more balanced approach that considers the needs of both workers and short-term visitors, as well as better enforcement and use of existing parking resources.

## 7. Responses relating to Burford

|                   |          |
|-------------------|----------|
| Object            | 89 (32%) |
| No opinion        | 56 (20%) |
| No answer         | 56 (20%) |
| Support           | 26 (10%) |
| Concerns          | 20 (7%)  |
| Partially support | 15 (6%)  |
| No objections     | 13(5%)   |
| Total responses   | 275      |

### 7.1 Summary of responses for Burford

Among those who do comment, the most frequent concern is that limiting parking to 4 hours is too restrictive for visitors, workers, and local businesses.

Many say that 4 hours is not enough for activities such as walking, eating out, shopping, or attending events, and that this will negatively impact local businesses and their staff. Several highlight that workers, volunteers, and those attending events often need to park for longer periods and that reducing long-stay spaces will make recruitment and retention harder, push cars onto residential streets, and anger residents.

There is a repeated complaint that parking in Burford is already very difficult, with congestion, gridlock, and lack of spaces for residents. Some suggest that the proposals will not solve these problems and may make them worse, pushing cars onto side streets and causing more enforcement issues.

A few respondents question the practicality and cost of enforcement, and the rationale behind the proposals, with some calling the survey itself confusing or poorly designed.

There are mixed views on whether the proposals promote sustainable travel, with some saying it encourages car use and does not support active travel or public transport.

Some respondents mention specific issues such as the need for more long-stay spaces, the impact on hotel guests, the fairness of exemptions for parent/child or disabled bays, and the need for better lighting and security in carparks.

A minority support the idea of increased turnover and more short-stay spaces, saying it could make parking easier for visitors and encourage trade.

Overall, the most common themes are concerns about the negative impact of 4-hour limits on workers, businesses, and visitors, the risk of increased congestion and displacement to residential streets, and doubts about the effectiveness and practicality of the proposals.

## 8. Responses relating to Woodstock

|                   |           |
|-------------------|-----------|
| Object            | 153 (55%) |
| No opinion        | 35 (13%)  |
| No answer         | 32 (12%)  |
| Support           | 22 (8%)   |
| Concerns          | 15 (5%)   |
| Partially support | 13 (5%)   |
| No objections     | 5(2%)     |
| Total responses   | 275       |

### 8.1 Summary of responses from Woodstock

The overwhelming theme in the responses is strong opposition to reducing the number of long-stay (12-hour) parking spaces in favour of more short-stay (4-hour) bays. The most frequently raised concerns relate to negative Impact on Workers and Businesses. Many respondents, especially those who work in Woodstock or employ staff there, say that reducing long-stay parking will make it extremely difficult or impossible for employees, volunteers, and business owners to park for a full working day.

(This section is for summarising the conclusions and recommendations. It is not essential for very short reports but should be used for more complex reports.)

**9. LEGAL & FINANIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1** Should the council choose to change the proposals there will be a need to re-advertise and consult on the new proposals.
- 9.2** The cost to repeat the process will be in the region of £600.

(END)