

## CABINET – 21 APRIL 2026

### ITEM 4 – QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

Questions are listed in the order in which they were received. Should any questioner not have received an answer in that time , a written answer will be provided.

<p><b>1. COUNCILLOR SAJ MALIK</b></p> <p><u>Agenda Item 17: Forward Plan and Future Business</u></p> <p>Neither the existing published OCC forward plan (which lists proposals as far away as Spring 2027), nor the forward plan update published as part of agenda item 17 for this meeting, lists the ZEZ expansion consultation as a forward agenda item - despite the ZEZ website itself stating that further consultation and engagement would take place from "Spring 2026" onwards.</p> <p>In the name of transparency, therefore, can Councillor Gant please provide me with his current estimated timeline for OCC's</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>There is currently no timeline for the launch of the ZEZ expansion consultation. Technical work is ongoing. Officers, in consultation with Cabinet Members, will need to consider the outcomes of the technical work before scheduling a consultation.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>launch of its ZEZ expansion consultation. Specifically: approximately on what day / month is Oxford's ZEZ expansion consultation currently scheduled to go live?</p>	
<p><b>2. COUNCILLOR JAMES FRY</b></p> <p><u>Agenda Item 9: Oxford Congestion Charge Investment Plan</u></p> <p>The preferred proposals raise many questions. Here I present just one of the possible questions.</p> <p>What, besides the hope of less congestion, does this offer residents of the city who do not work for the NHS or schools? Where are the cheap or free family bus passes for families with the lowest incomes? The City Council successfully targets Council Tax Reductions towards the poorest families using HMRC data, including Universal Credit and other benefits. Couldn't the County use a similar methodology to make bus travel for low income families in the city cheaper than the</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The congestion charge is designed to achieve one main outcome - to reduce car traffic in the city. The investment plan supports that objective by prioritising schemes with the largest potential to change travel behaviour.</p> <p>If car traffic is reduced, all residents of Oxford (but particularly the 45% of households without access to car in the lowest income areas of the city) will feel the benefits: faster, more reliable and more comprehensive buses; safer walking and cycling conditions; less congestion; cleaner air, and so on. The bus service improvements resulting from the congestion charge have been almost exclusively in Oxford.</p> <p>No-one is forced to pay the congestion charge; and most of the city is accessible without passing a charging point, and residents of Oxford can drive through the congestion charging points on up to 100 days a year free of charge.</p> <p>Residents of Oxford already have a broader range of lower-cost travel options than residents living outside the city. Bus journeys are shorter, and therefore cheaper. Under 19s can travel anywhere in the city for £1 on Go Ahead buses. Adult season tickets are available from £2 per day. Walking or cycling is an option for many and is effectively free of charge.</p>

<p>alternative of driving and paying the congestion charge? Can we please see the effect of modelling such a scheme as one of the options?</p>	<p>Unfortunately, offering free or heavily discounted bus travel for low income groups entirely would likely be unaffordable from congestion charge income, particularly if it were offered beyond Oxford or countywide, and the traffic reduction benefits far less perceptible, because the scheme would not be targeting peak-time car commuting as effectively.</p>
<p><b>3. COUNCILLOR JAMES FRY</b></p> <p><u>Agenda Item 14: Updates to the Parking Standards for New Developments</u></p> <p>Car-Free development means that no car parking spaces are provided within the development site, other than those reserved for disabled people and car clubs. Will parking provision also be provided for the carers visiting disabled residents?</p> <p>It is proposed to halve the present requirement of double the LTN 1/20 cycle parking provision, of 2 spaces per bedroom, to just the LTN 1/20 requirements, i.e., 1 space per bedroom. It would be good to see the evidence that drove the Council to adopt such high provision, but it seems drastic suddenly to halve the required</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</b></p> <p>Parking provisions are to be provided for people with impaired mobility in accordance with relevant current legislation. This is confirmed within the Tables of Annex 1 of the report. Such parking provisions will be required to be provided for as part of a development site's master plan as it is developed i.e. new developments will need to find creative solutions to provide access for a range of non-resident parking needs including taxi drop offs, emergency service access, deliveries, and carers as well as other visitors.</p> <p>The residential cycle parking standards have been revised to bring them into full alignment with the Department for Transport's (DfT) national guidance, Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20). This revision is proposed from constructive feedback received from local planning authorities and the development industry, where it has been identified the existing residential cycle parking standards are significantly higher than the national guidance. This has resulted in development sites having over-provisions of cycle parking on land that could have used for other purposes such as amenity / landscaped areas instead.</p> <p>For example, the existing cycle parking standards requires 2 spaces per bedroom, which means for a 4-bedroom house a house plot must provide 8 spaces. If 1.5 spaces per bedroom was required instead a 4-bedroom house would still need to provide 6 spaces on plot. Whereas LTN 1/20 requires 1 space per bedroom and is the national standard. This update is not anticipated to</p>

provision when growing cycle use and the likelihood of visitors to developments arriving on bikes mean that demand for bike parking spaces should grow.

I suggest going half way initially and apply 150% of the LTN 1/20 requirement, i.e., 1.5 spaces per bedroom, to see whether this is also considered to be an over-provision of parking space as cycle use increases?

reduce active travel behaviours as the current provision is considered to be beyond maximum demand.