

## Council 7 October Agenda Item 15 Motions on Notice

Updated Advice note from the Monitoring Officer on Motion (d) published at 4pm Friday 4 October

***This replaces the advice note included at Page 69 of the Briefing Note published on Friday 4 October***

Council should exercise caution in considering the original motion submitted by Councillor Haines.

The points to consider are:

1. The original motion pre-judges the conclusion of a comprehensive approach by assuming provision of more car parking.
  - Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council are currently undertaking public engagement on transport management proposals *Connecting Oxford* that both significantly improve public transport access for staff, visitors and patients to the John Radcliffe Hospital, and reduce congestion on local roads around the site. The proposed measures include a timed access restriction to prioritise bus movements along the Marston Ferry Road and the introduction of a workplace parking levy that would apply to all employee parking spaces on the JR site.
  - Officers of both councils have been in discussions with the Oxford University Hospitals Trust about the proposals and the associated issue of workplace and visitor parking on the JR site. These discussions are ongoing and confidential, but they do seek to address the challenge of patient and visitor parking and access
  - Across its Headington sites, Oxford University Hospital Trust has around 4,000 parking spaces, of which 2,500 are currently reserved for employee parking.
2. Council's consideration of the first bullet point in the motion must take account of the emerging Local Plan and the process associated with the Local Plan given it is currently being examined by an independent Planning Inspector.

The Council has submitted the plan for examination so only the Inspectors can require modifications to make the plan sound. The Council can review policies again in the future through a new plan or look at a site specific masterplan approach in the future if necessary. It has been suggested following a detailed discussion with the Inspectors and the suggested modification to M3 that has been accepted by the inspector subject to consultation includes the following:

*The parking requirements for all non-residential development, whether expansions of floorspace on existing sites, the redevelopment of existing or cleared sites, or new non-residential development on new sites, will be determined in the light of the submitted Transport Assessment or Travel Plan, which must take into account the objectives of this Plan to promote and achieve a shift towards sustainable modes of travel. The presumption will be that vehicle parking will be kept to the minimum necessary to ensure the successful functioning of the development.*

*In the case of the redevelopment of an existing or previously cleared site, there should be no net increase in parking on the site from the previous level and the Council will seek a reduction where there is good accessibility to a range of facilities.*

*Where the proposal is for the expansion of an existing operation on an existing large site, a comprehensive travel plan should be submitted that looks at the development in the context of the whole site, and demonstrates that opportunities will be sought to enhance and promote more sustainable travel to and from the wider site. The travel plan will be kept under review to ensure that future opportunities to encourage a shift towards sustainable modes of travel are taken*