

## Questions from Members of the Public

Questions are listed in the order in which they were received.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>1. SANDI ADAMS</b></p> <p>Can you confirm whether Oxfordshire County Council has given any consideration to the development of an urban cable car system in Oxford, either as a standalone proposal or as part of wider transport planning?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</b></p> <p>We are actively exploring innovative transport solutions, for example the study we are commissioning for mass rapid transport on the A40 corridor.</p> <p>Urban cable cars have been suggested periodically for Oxford over the years.</p> <p>A combination of very high cost, visual impact and the nature of Oxford's travel patterns make it challenging to see how there can be a business case for urban cable cars at this time.</p> <p>Oxfordshire already has a comprehensive road network which provides extensive transport connectivity. However, due to growth in vehicular traffic the county's road network is congested and hostile for active travel in many places. We are therefore working to manage traffic on the existing road network so that buses can run freely and pedestrians and cyclists can travel safely, whilst working with the rail industry and central government to improve the county's railway system.</p> |
| <p><b>2. PETER WEST</b></p> <p>Did OCC share the data protection impact assessment for both / either the traffic filters or congestion charge schemes with the Information Commissioners' Office (for approval / review)</p>                          | <p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>No. The UK GDPR only requires an organisation to consult the Regulator on a Data Protection Impact assessment (DPIA) if the DPIA identifies a high risk and it is not possible to reduce or mitigate the risk in any way. As the DPIA for the traffic filters and/or congestion charge schemes does not identify a high risk to individuals there was no requirement for Oxfordshire</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>ahead of the congestion charges going live and, if not, why not?</p>  | <p>County Council to consult with the Information Commissioners' Office (ICO) for approval or review ahead of the congestion charges going live. The DPIA for the schemes identified appropriate safeguards and mitigating measures such that no high residual risk remained. Responsibility for completing, assessing and signing off the DPIA rests with the data controller, not the ICO.</p>   |
| <p><b>3. PETER WHITE</b></p> <p>Give the high number of congestion charge warning letters issued, what plans does OCC have to install new warning signage on the major approach roads to congestion charge sites, especially those approach roads with few, if any, warning signs?</p>   | <p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>67,579 warning letters were issued during the first 6 weeks of the scheme. Oxfordshire County Council has no plans to install additional congestion charge warning signage. The current signage strategy is considered sufficient and provides motorists with multiple opportunities to avoid the charging points. A range of signs, including advance warning signs, are already in place to clearly warn of the congestion charge points.</p>   |
| <p><b>4. YOLA DRAGE BRUNELLI</b></p> <p>How does Oxfordshire County Council intend to mitigate against the adverse economic impacts of the congestion charge which on St. Clements (where I have two businesses) have suffered a fall of 40 % year on year turnover since the congestion charge went in. Until October 2025 we were doing well. Do you even recognise this impact still less have a plan to do anything about it ?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The congestion charge is still a new scheme. We do not yet have data on the scheme's impact on footfall and consumer spending across the city – officers are working to secure this.</p> <p>The broader economic impacts of the scheme will take some time to understand, as these extend well beyond businesses with a “shop front”. The scheme is temporary and is due to be replaced by the traffic filter trial when Botley Road reopens.</p> <p>The St Clements car park can be reached without passing a congestion charging point, from Iffley Road and Cowley Road.</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>5. BERNADETTE EVANS</b></p> <p>The council promised to record data on footfall and spend to monitor the impact of the Congestion Charge on Oxford's hundreds of small high street businesses. This was in response to business owners expressing concern that it would harm trade. Data for footfall in November was duly published on the council's website. The figures included many likely inaccuracies such as footfall in Botley Road retail park being up 47% and Summertown being down 35% and raises questions about whether it is reliable. The data was subsequently removed from the website due to the method of collecting it (Huq) being shown to be inaccurate. Since then no monitoring of either footfall or spend has taken place leaving the business owners high and dry.</p> <p>In the run up to Christmas, Cllr Gant said the Congestion Charge was 'good for business' due to footfall having increased (year on year) by 22% in the city centre. This became the council's narrative. The 22% increase figure came from the now withdrawn Huq data. Knowing this, will Cllr Gant now retract this statement?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The county council undertook to publish monthly monitoring data in relation to the temporary congestion charge. A key part of this data set is monitoring footfall and spend. For this, we engaged a new external supplier, which it was hoped could provide the required information. Footfall data for November was extracted directly from the supplier's platform and published in December. Through comparisons with other data sources which became available in January, a number of anomalies were identified which could not be explained. The data was published in good faith and as soon as this became apparent the data was removed. The supplier has identified the issue and is working on correcting it. As soon as the data is available and validated, it will be published. A full public <a href="#">statement</a> has been published on Oxfordshire County Council's website.</p> |
| <p><b>6. LINDA ELMS</b></p>   | <p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>In light of the high number of congestion charge warning letters and fines being issued, does Councillor Gant still believe that the congestion charge signage is adequate? There are, for example no warning signs along Cowley Road and Iffley Road in the run up to the St Clement's filter.</p>   | <p>Oxfordshire County Council has no plans to install additional congestion charge warning signage. The current signage strategy is considered sufficient and provides motorists with multiple opportunities to avoid the charging points. A range of signs, including advanced signage, is already in place to clearly warn of the congestion charge points and indicate where it applies.</p>  |
| <p><b>7. NICHOLAS HARDIMAN</b></p> <p>Please can Councillor Gant specify how Oxfordshire County Council is now monitoring the impact of the congestion charge on businesses? Will footfall and Mastercard spend analysis be reissued, or will other metrics be used instead. If so, what system will be employed and, in both cases, how soon will information be available?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The county council undertook to publish monthly monitoring data in relation to the temporary congestion charge. A key part of this data set is monitoring footfall and spend. For this, we engaged a new external supplier, which it was hoped could provide the required information. Footfall data for November was extracted directly from the supplier's platform and published in December. Through comparisons with other data sources which became available in January, a number of anomalies were identified which could not be explained. The data was published in good faith and as soon as this became apparent the data was removed. The supplier has identified the issue and is working on correcting it. As soon as the data is available and validated, it will be published. A full public <a href="#">statement</a> has been published on Oxfordshire County Council's website.</p> |
| <p><b>8. RICHARD PARNHAM</b></p> <p>Can OCC explain why there is a significant discrepancy between the numbers of cars captured via conventional traffic monitoring on congestion charge roads, during the time of congestion charge operation, and the number of cars captured by</p>   | <p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>It has since become apparent that the dataset we were receiving was incomplete, with a significant volume of repeated-journey counts missing from the information originally supplied. Videalert are now providing the</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>congestion charge monitors on the same roads, on the same days at the same time?</p>   | <p>corrected dataset, and we are awaiting this so that a full and accurate analysis can be carried out</p>  |
| <p><b>9. GEOFFREY SUTTON</b></p> <p>In the Oxfordshire BSIP Progress Report July 2025, in the table labelled “Progress Towards Headline Targets” on page 8, bus journey time was assessed to be 14.2 mph in 2019/20, (the base), 14.3 mph in 2024 with a target of increasing the 2019/20 base journey time of 14.2 mph by 10% (to 15.6 mph) by December 2025, meeting the target being a requirement of the Zebra funding as I understand it. Please can Councillor Gant state the bus journey time measured for 2025 and whether the target increase of 10% was achieved or missed by the end of December 2025?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The bus speed figures reported through the BSIP progress report are derived from monitoring data using <b>all operators, routes, days and hours</b>, and therefore reflect an overall network-wide average rather than performance at the times when bus reliability and capacity pressures are greatest. In practice, the performance improvements are being seen specifically during <b>weekday daytime operation (typically 07:00–19:00)</b>. We are therefore considering making changes to the BSIP reporting to reflect this.</p> <p>When performance is assessed on this basis, analysis comparing <b>November 2025 with November 2019</b> shows a <b>speed improvement of approximately 2.1%</b> indicating that bus journey times during core weekday operating hours have improved.</p> <p>It is important to note however, that the Enhanced Partnership commitment linked to government funding focuses on <b>bus productivity</b>, rather than headline average speed. Productivity improvements are delivered through a combination of speed improvements and reduced dwell time. While there is evidence of speed improvement, further operator data would be required to fully quantify changes in dwell time and overall productivity. The extended closure of Botley Road by Network Rail and resultant delay to the Traffic Filters scheme (which was unforeseen at the time the targets were set) has resulted in the target not being met. We are continuing to invest in bus priority measures and work closely with our operators to further improve bus journey times for passengers in line with our commitments in the Enhanced Partnership.</p> |

**10. DAVID STARES**

I would like to know, How many warning letters / congestion charge fines have been issued by reference to each of the congestion charge sites since the charge went live?  
i.e. x number of warning letters / x number of fines at the Hollow Way filter.

**COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT**

**Warnings**

| Month    | Hythe Bridge Street | St Cross Road | St Clements | Thames Street | Marston Ferry Road | Hollow Way |
|----------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|------------|
| October  | 1976                | 889           | 1802        | 828           | 555                | 53         |
| November | 9880                | 5060          | 13565       | 18635         | 2102               | 2685       |
| December | 1708                | 930           | 2142        | 4211          | 209                | 349        |

**PCNs**

| Month    | Hythe Bridge Street | St Cross Road | St Clements | Thames Street | Marston Ferry Road | Hollow Way |
|----------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|------------|
| December | 7435                | 2996          | 2504        | 12280         | 847                | 1516       |
| January  | 3934                | 3213          | 2235        | 12848         | 1267               | 1590       |
| February | 7140                | 2406          | 2300        | 10433         | 1848               | 1520       |