
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

by **A O'Neill BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/W/25/3370960

55 Randolph Street, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX4 1YA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by S Hackner on behalf of Parkview Development Group against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00878/VAR.
 - The application sought planning permission for 'Demolition of 2no. 2 storey buildings. Retention and redevelopment of 1no. 3.5 storey building, including the erection of a 2 storey extension to provide 5no. 1 bed and 1no. 2 bed apartments (use class C3). Erection of 2no. 4 bed dwelling houses fronting Randolph Street (use class C3). Provision of landscaping, cycle and refuse storage. (Amended description, plans and supporting information)' without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 21/01979/FUL, dated 15 March 2022.
 - The condition in dispute is No 12 which states that: The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the Order governing parking at Randolph Street; has been varied by the Oxfordshire County Council as highway authority to exclude the site, subject to this permission, from eligibility for resident's parking permits and residents' visitors' parking permits unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To ensure that the development does not generate a level of vehicular parking which would be prejudicial to highway safety, or cause parking stress in the immediate locality, in accordance with policies RE7, M2 and M3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The appellant seeks to vary the disputed condition to allow future occupiers of the two 4-bedroom dwellings to apply for parking permits. The flatted units would remain exempt from applying for parking permits.
3. The appeal site is located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and within a 400m walk to frequent (15 minute) public transport services and within an 800m walk to a local supermarket or equivalent facilities. Within such locations, Policy M3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 (the LP) requires new residential development to be car-free.
4. The supporting text for Policy M3 explains the aims of limiting opportunities for parking are to reduce car use leading to reductions in air pollution, congestion and the creation of a more attractive environment for walking and cyclists and to support a shift to the use of more sustainable forms of transport. The supporting text also states that planning permission may be refused where additional parking

pressures arising from the development would severely compromise highway safety and/or severely restrict the ability of existing residents to park.

5. The main issue is therefore whether the condition is reasonable and necessary with particular regard to encouraging sustainable travel, the living conditions of existing occupiers and future occupiers and highway safety.

Reasons

6. Randolph Street is a narrow street with dense terraced properties on both sides. In the vicinity of the appeal site, parking on Randolph Street is restricted to permit holders. Adjoining residential streets have a similar character and are also subject to on-street parking restrictions.
7. Randolph Street adjoins Cowley Road where a range of shops, services and facilities, including supermarkets and regular bus services to Oxford City Centre can be accessed within a reasonably short walking distance from the site. Thus, the site is in a location where sustainable travel is readily accessible. Permitting two additional residents parking permits on Randolph Street would therefore undermine the aims of Policy M3 insofar as it seeks to support a modal shift away from private cars and towards sustainable forms of transport.
8. Furthermore, permitting two additional cars would conflict with the policy's aims to reduce congestion and create a more attractive environment for walking and cyclists. Whilst the provision of electric vehicle charging points may contribute to a reduction in vehicle emissions, they would not mitigate the conflict with those other aims of Policy M3.
9. The appellant has submitted a Parking Survey (TCS, July 2025) which finds that the overnight parking stress in Randolph Street is considered low and, in the area around the site, it is considered very low. On this basis, the appellant contends that two additional cars would not add undue stress to the parking on Randolph Street.
10. Nevertheless, I note the concerns regarding the timing of the parking survey, which was conducted close to the summer holiday period when residents may be away from home and when university students may have vacated properties. I have also taken into account the evidence provided by local residents, who report that parking spaces on Randolph Street are under pressure, often requiring them to park on adjacent streets. Moreover, while my visit can only represent a brief snapshot in time, I saw that there was high uptake of on street parking in Randolph Street and the adjoining roads.
11. Whilst the impact of two additional cars may be limited, it would, nevertheless, reduce the amount of on street parking available to existing residents. Based on the information before me, including my observations on site, I find that the proposal has the potential to harm the living conditions of existing occupiers by restricting their ability to park.
12. With respect to future occupiers, it is suggested that the two 4 bedroom dwellings are likely to be occupied by families or individuals who may require flexibility in their transport options. Reference is also made to parking requirements for occupiers with disabilities. However, there is little before me to demonstrate the needs of future occupiers and no evidence of parking needs for disabled

occupiers. As set out above, the site is in a location with very good access to services and facilities, including supermarkets and regular public transport. Furthermore, I note that, should future residents choose to own a vehicle, parking is available within a short walking distance of the site on Cowley Road and Galpin Close. I appreciate that the existing occupiers of properties on Randolph Street are eligible to apply for parking permits. However, those properties existed prior to the adoption of Policy M3, which applies to proposals for new residential development. Accordingly, I find that the disputed condition, as originally worded, would not compromise the living conditions of future occupiers.

13. The reason for refusal refers to a detrimental impact on highway safety. However, this point is not further substantiated in the Council's case. In the absence of substantive evidence in this regard, I do not find the proposal would be harmful to highway safety.
14. Reference is made to a number of planning applications which the appellant suggests were approved to allow resident and visitor parking permits to be purchased (References: 23/00084/VAR, 24/00554/VAR and 24/03106/VAR). However, I have not been provided with the full details of those applications. Consequently, I cannot make a direct and reasoned comparison between those schemes and the appeal proposal. From what is provided, it would appear that those schemes would not alter overall parking requirements, which is not the case for the proposal before me now.
15. I appreciate the appellant's commitment to improving the local environment by redeveloping the site. However, I am not persuaded that this provides sufficient justification to set aside the adopted planning policy approach to vehicle parking in this case.
16. It is suggested, that without parking permits, there is a risk the two dwellings would not be sold. There is, however, little before me to substantiate this assertion. As such, this consideration does not alter my conclusions, which I have based on the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

17. I therefore conclude that, although I have found there would be no harm in relation to highway safety, the disputed condition is reasonable and necessary in the interests of supporting sustainable travel and the living conditions of existing occupiers. Furthermore, I have found that the disputed condition, as currently worded, would not harm the living conditions of future occupiers. Without the condition, the development would conflict with LP Policy M3, as set out above. Consequently, for the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

A O'Neill

INSPECTOR