PLACE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 23 April 2025

REPORT OF THE TRANSPORT WORKING GROUP

RECOMMENDATION

1. **The Committee is RECOMMENDED to**

   - **ENDORSE** the recommendations and report of the Transport Working Group;
   - **SUBMIT** the substantive report of the Transport Working Group (paragraphs 2 onwards) to Cabinet;
   - **DELEGATE** any minor editing to the Scrutiny Officer, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee and the Chair of the Transport Working Group.

Executive Summary

2. The Transport Working Group was established by the Committee at its September 2024 meeting. The Committee agreed that Cllr Bennett, Cllr Haywood, Cllr Hicks, and Cllr Walker should comprise the membership. Cllr Hicks was elected as Chair and Cllr Walker as Deputy Chair.

3. In its introductory meetings, the Group was concerned that, whilst the Local Transport Connectivity Plan (LTCP) set out the objectives for the Council, the LTCP5 Monitoring Report which had been reviewed by the Committee in September 2024 showed that the Council was not on track to meet those objectives. This was of concern to members who sought, through this Group, to scrutinise aspects of the Council's delivery to consider what was working well and what could be improved.

4. The Group conducted two deep dives, into the Oxford LCWIP and into the Science Vale Movement and Place Strategy.

5. From those deep dives, the Group proposes that the Committee makes 20 recommendations to Cabinet. These recommendations are grouped under the headings of data and monitoring; governance and responsibility/skills and capacity building; funding and budgets; working with other organisations; co-production and public engagement. Some of the recommendations inevitably cross categories but these headings are drawn from those identified by officers for the LTP4 report scrutinised by the Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 16 November 2022.

6.	The recommendations are listed in an annexe at the end of this report but they are set out below along with the narrative seeking to explain why the Group has proposed them.

7.	The recommendations are fundamentally about ensuring that the Council makes the changes necessary to meet its headline targets of the LTCP, including the necessary resources, monitoring, skills, capacity, and approach, to mean that its active travel plans are at the heart of its place-making priorities. In order to ensure the Group's work was focused, it concentrated primarily on the active travel targets whilst having an awareness of wider targets.

8.	In both its work and its proposed recommendations, the Group has been conscious of the lessons learned set out by officers on previous LTP monitoring reports. The Group notes in particular the review of LTP4 in Annex 1 of the report submitted to the Committee for its meeting on 16 November 2022.[1] On objectives and policies, the Group noted that there was a need:

(a)	for a clear vision to guide the document and supporting strategies;
(b)	to ensure alignment between policy goals;
(c)	for strong policy wording and more specific policies;
(d)	to improve internal processes, understanding of the LTCP, and a consistent application of policies;
(e)	for SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) targets/objectives;
(f)	to establish a monitoring framework and to improve the reporting of progress;
(g)	to consider language used and how policies/schemes are explained – including why they are needed and how they will benefit residents.

9.	When approaching area strategies, there was a need:

(a)	For a consistent countywide approach that aligns with LTCP policy;
(b)	To move away from 'predict and provide' transport planning approach;
(c)	For more ambitious measures to support the overarching objectives and move away from highways infrastructure improvements;
(d)	For a greater focus on activation, healthy place shaping, and measures to support infrastructure improvements;
(e)	For robust consultation and engagement.

Evidence

10.	The Group was grateful to a large number of officers for attending its meetings and preparing work for its deep dives and wider consideration. The Group extends its thanks to the officers below and to all those who have contributed to the work it has scrutinised.

---

[1] https://mycouncil.oxfordshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1173&MId=6832&Ver=4

- Paul Fermer, Director of Environment and Highways;
- Robin Rogers, Director of Economy and Place;
- Hannah Battye, Head of Place Shaping
- Ben Smith, Strategic Transport Manager
- Joseph Kay, Team Leader (Oxfordshire Transport Strategy)
- Ashley Hayden, Team Leader (Area Travel Plans)
- Dave Harrison, Team Leader (Public Transport)
- Sean Rooney, Head of Highway Maintenance and Road Safety
- Valerie Lambrechts, Infrastructure Portfolio Manager
- Stewart Wilson, Place Planning Team Leader (Central)
- David Calonge, Technical Lead (Active Travel)
- Julia Hawkins, Place Planning Manager (South)
- Jacqui Cox, Place Planning Manager (North)
- Joanne Fellows, Place Planning Manager (Central)
- Chris Dyer, Head of Transport Property and Infrastructure Delivery
- Odele Parsons, Team Leader (Place Planning and Coordination)

Introductory meetings

11. The Group met the Director of Environment and Highways, Paul Fermer, as well as Ben Smith, Strategic Transport Manager, Joseph Kay, Team Leader (Oxfordshire Transport Strategy), and Ashley Hayden, Area Movement and Place Strategies Team Leader. The conversation focused on a series of questions based on the detailed LTP4 review report which the Committee had scrutinised in November 2022.

12. It was agreed that the Council needed to have a clear vision to guide the implementation and outworking of the LTCP and supporting strategies and to ensure alignment between policy goals. There was a recognition that internal processes would benefit from improvement with a need for greater embedding of an understanding of the LTCP and consistent application of policies.

13. The success of the Movement and Place Strategies being developed by the Council was dependent on them being a package that work together and are deliverable. There needs to be an understanding of phasing (insofar as the core schemes are enablers for other policies in the Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan (COTP) and an understanding of what the priorities are in the policy hierarchy.

14. A second meeting was held with the Group, this time meeting Hannah Battye, Head of Placemaking, Sean Rooney, Head of Highways Delivery, and Valerie Lambrechts, Infrastructure Portfolio Manager. This meeting focused on the challenges of delivering policy ambitions and adopted strategies.

15. The broad areas of challenge identified were with regard to decisions and processes, and also resources and programming and how they are packaged up to move forward. With regard to funding, it was identified that sometimes

the money collected from either developers or active travel funding towards providing schemes is no longer enough but sometimes it was never going to be enough. There were also issues raised about the impact of the length of time it takes for a scheme to come to fruition. Sometimes, it might be considered that the scheme is no longer required or it might not fit with current policy. The importance of maintenance considerations were also highlighted as a key factor which were not necessarily embedded in decision-making when planning schemes currently.

16.   Having undertaken its initial exploratory work, the Group identified a number of issues it called 'emerging conclusions.' The Group was conscious that it would be inappropriate to identify formal recommendations so early on in its deliberations but considered that there were issues that had arisen which it sought to test against the evidence and information it scrutinised during its deep dives.

17.   These emerging conclusions are set out in Annexe 2 and offer an insight into the framing of the deep dives. The Group was conscious that they may be seen to be structured in a way that is unduly negative but that was not the primary purpose. There was an openness to these emerging conclusions being challenged and disproved. That was indeed the case with some of them.

18.   However, there were also some themes which initial hesitancy saw grow into desired recommendations to Cabinet. This report sets them out and seeks the approval of the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee to move them formally as such.

19.   Having developed the above emerging conclusions, the Group also compiled a series of lines of inquiry which it intended to use to explore via deep dive case studies, covering urban areas and market towns. This diversity of setting reflected both the divisions members of the Group represented but also some of the representative different settings found within Oxfordshire. It was intended that this breadth would help the Group to ensure any recommendations that arose were applicable across the county rather than simply focused on individual areas or projects.

Oxford LCWIP Deep Dive

20.   The first substantive meeting of the Group was held on 10 February 2025 and explored the Oxford Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. In advance of the meeting, members had received responses to their lines of inquiry.

21.   The Group established that, of the transport major infrastructure schemes active in the last two years, funding for them had been broadly split in the following way:

Mode	Funding
Bus infrastructure	£218m
Rail	£11m
Active Travel	£299m
General Highway capacity	£445m
Total:	£973m

22. Officers advised that, in addition to the information above, as part of the "Active Travel Capability Ratings 2024 self-assessment form" Local Authorities are required to calculate the percentage of total transport budget spent on active travel schemes. In 2023/24, the Council spent 7% of the total transport budget on active travel schemes.

23. In the 2023/24 financial year there was a total budget for transport of £146.782m. This was broken down into the following areas:
   - Major Infrastructure Delivery - £55.697m
   - Highways Capital Programme - £56.828m
   - Highways Maintenance - £21.160m
   - Transport and Infrastructure - £13.097m

24. Within these areas there was a budget of £10.695m for active travel and £12.17m for public transport.

25. The Group was keen to understand if the Council had robust monitoring tools in place to assist with the annual review of the LTCP. The monitoring report, as reviewed by the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee and subsequently submitted to Cabinet, sets out a full list of sources for the data used to monitor the headline targets and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

26. The Group was advised that car trips had not previously been monitored and that there was not a readily available data source but that work had begun in 2023 to collect that data. The Council had developed a bespoke monitoring mechanism which combined INRIX telematics data as well as automatic traffic count site data.

27. There was a recognition that scheme-level and monitoring data were weaker and that it was therefore challenging to establish how much of the changes to the LTCP targets or KPIs were a result of LTCP delivery. The Group was advised that some scheme-level monitoring and pilot travel behaviour survey work has been included in the 2023-24 LTCP monitoring report. There is ongoing work with iHUB, the Council's innovation hub which was created in 2015 initially to focus on transport innovation but which has since broadened out to other areas including modelling, air quality, and infrastructure, to develop a centralised and improved monitoring and evaluation approach.

28. At February 2025, 51% of Oxfordshire's population lived in an area that was covered by an approved LCWIP, broken down as follows:

City/Town	Population	Percentage of Oxfordshire's Population
Oxford	176,600	24%
Banbury	52,000	7%
Bicester	37,700	5%
Didcot	34,600	5%
Abingdon	31,300	4%
Witney	30,200	4%
Kidlington	17,200	2%

29.   The Group was advised that this was projected to rise to 61.9% by the end of 2025, on the completion and approval of the following LCWIPs:

City/Town	Population	Percentage of Oxfordshire's Population
Thame	13,273	2%
Wantage and Grove	21,000	3%
Wallingford area	11,600	2%
Woodstock	3,500	0.5%
Chipping Norton	9,600	1%
Carterton	18,000	2%
Charlbury	3,100	0.4%

30.   The Group also received a breakdown of routes within the Oxford LCWIP which were and were not 'shovel ready.' The Group noted that, of the 29, only two (namely OCR 17 Iffley Road and OCR 20 Abingdon Road) were identified as completed. Two were marked as largely completed (OXR 1 Canal Path and OXR 7 Marston Road); nine were neither completed nor was any significant progress noted; the remaining 16 reported some progress. Whilst the Group acknowledged there could be realistic and justifiable reasons for this variation in progress, it was concerned that the limited progress indicated that a lack of prioritisation compared to major infrastructure suggested that the schemes were not approached in the same strategic way.

31.   With regard to funding for these routes, nine were in scope of the Mini Holland project and there was some funding in place for some of the others, albeit this did not mean that all schemes had yet attracted funding. Funding streams were from a number of different sources including moneys via the Department for Transport, the Growth Deal, s.106 funding, the Canal and Riverside Trust, as well as via the Safer Roads Fund, through School Streets, Active Travel funds, and via the Cycle City Ambition Grant.

32.   The Group was advised that post-completion monitoring was undertaken for each scheme delivered with the Council's iHub assisting with both monitoring and evaluation. It was established that, from Active Travel Tranche 3 onwards, Active Travel England (ATE) would carry out a design review so that their inspections team could provide comments and ensure that schemes met their requirements with regards to LTN 1/20 compliance and quality. Officers also advised members that ATE would now also carry out post-completion inspections.

33. During the meeting, members explored the data regarding completion of LCWIP routes and emphasised the Council's need for detail in order for it to ensure it focused on fulfilling its aims and targets. The Group identified that data is not easily available to show all the routes are in place and what progress is needed in order to complete the schemes. Similarly, members emphasised the importance of funding being allocated appropriately in order to advance the schemes.

34. The Group confirmed with approval that, in line with the recommendation of the Chief Medical Officer's 2024 annual report 'Health in Cities' that "health and wellbeing should be given greater weight in appraisal assessment of capital and revenue projects relating to urban transport", the Council prioritised routes based on a variety of factors, including public health information. These prioritisation criteria ensured that critical areas received both attention and funding.

35. The Group emphasised the importance of a robust process being in place around LCWIP completion, including assessment of existing infrastructure quality as well as progress on routes. That progress should include timeliness, effectiveness and quality (as defined by LTN 1/20 which ACE uses to assess schemes). There was a recognition from officers that it would be useful to have more granular detail on completion. This would require more monitoring systems to be implemented. Whilst the data was available, it was not currently easily available and accessible and thus it was not easy to monitor owing to a lack of integration between multiple data sources. Without easy monitoring, the Group was concerned that there would be a negative impact on delivery.

36. Members discussed with officers how best auditing infrastructure both to identify 'pain points' and to prioritise improvements in the progress of routes could be achieved. The Group was of the view that the Council should invest in resources both to audit and to map existing cycling and walking infrastructure and there is the opportunity to work with a wide range of public stakeholder groups to help. This crowdsourcing would enable the Council to understand the status and quality of current infrastructure which would also inform future developments. The Group considers that Transport for Greater Manchester provides a strong example of effective crowdsourcing, particularly through the work of its former Active Travel Commissioner, Chris Boardman.

37. One issue that was noted was that it was not necessarily easy for either members of the public or other stakeholders to engage with the process because of a potential lack of visibility. The Group was advised that open data tools and interactive maps were being planned. Members were keen that there was sufficient investment in these to make them useful.

38. Easily-accessible open data tools would not only make the LCWIP process more transparent but it would also be more accessible both to the public and to potential investors. As set out above, not all routes within the LCWIP currently have funding attached to them which means they are unlikely to be

activated within the short-term. However, it is arguably more likely that funding might be forthcoming if stakeholders were able to see what was planned and how that would engage with the rest of the network.

39. That engagement on the part of stakeholders would also be improved by engaging the public too. Local residents in particular are those with most familiarity with the locales in which routes are to be activated and will have considerable expertise to offer in advising how best to implement them. The Group was keen to encourage co-production and engagement with stakeholders in both active travel scheme design and delivery. The Group noted the Council's intentions to strengthen its relationship with Active Travel England and hear of its intentions to improve the Council's capability rating through regular training and engagement.

40. With regard to skills and capacity, the Group established that the active travel policy team (three officers) sets the policy and guidance whilst the place planning delivery teams (four officers) are responsible for delivery of the LCWIPs. The Group recognised the value that external consultants can provide on occasion but it was concerned that an over-reliance on external resource would hinder the Council's success in delivery and its commitment to achieving this. Members were concerned that, where external resource is commissioned regularly, there is the potential – and, indeed, perhaps the likelihood – of that core skill and expertise within the Council not being as strong as it could be were the internal teams adequately resourced. The Group also had reservations about the relative seniority of officers in both the policy and delivery teams and considered that this could be understood to imply that the Council does not recognise the key importance of these areas.

41. The report above sets out the discussions during the Group's meeting on 10 February and which describe the background to the recommendations made below.

Recommendations arising from Oxford Deep Dive

42. The Group identified that data and monitoring was essential for efficient and effective progress to be made towards achieving the Council's LTCP ambitions. Whilst recognising that progress is being made towards having adequate information and commending the work on developing GIS-compatible maps and tracking tools for LCWIP delivery being undertaken, it makes two recommendations:

   1. That the Council should invest in resources to audit and map existing cycling and walking infrastructure to understand the current status, condition, and quality (including LTN 1/20 compliance) and identify gaps, including processes to crowdsource.

   2. That the Council should use open data tools to create publicly accessible, interactive maps that show the status of LCWIP delivery and future projects.

43. When considering its findings through the lens of Governance and Responsibility/Skills and Capacity Building, the Group recognised that active travel was a responsibility that lay more broadly than solely with one or two teams. It considered it imperative that there was appropriate training across all relevant teams and that there should be a clear governance structure so that accountabilities, roles, and responsibilities are immediately transparent and, ultimately, that delivery of a high quality active travel network happens.

> ***3. That the Council should ensure all relevant teams are trained in LTN 1/20 guidance, and that active travel is integrated into their day-to-day responsibilities.***

> ***4. That the Council should develop a clear governance structure that outlines the roles and responsibilities of different teams in delivering the LCWIP.***

44. The Group recognised some merit in having a distributed function responsible for active travel. However, it was nervous that there was not enough capacity or seniority within the active travel policy team (currently three officers) and in the delivery team (currently four officers). There was also concern over the regular use of external consultants rather than in-house activity. Therefore the Group considers that the Council should develop its own in-house capacity to develop active travel schemes and bring them forward for delivery.

> ***5. That the Council should develop its own in-house capacity to design and develop active travel schemes and bring them forward for delivery.***

45. The Group remained concerned that there was an over-reliance on a piecemeal approach to funding of LCWIP infrastructure, as set out in the second set of emerging conclusions (EC2.1-EC.2.4) The Group recognises that it is unlikely that funding would be solely provided from existing Council budgets, or even by Government grants, and therefore to meet the LTCP targets it will be necessary to attract additional funding from other sources or other revenue streams. The Group considers that it is important for a more strategic approach to be adopted and proposes four recommendations to that effect. As described in paragraph 30, the Group believes that the strategic approach demonstrated towards major infrastructure should also be adopted towards active travel, rather than the largely tactical approach currently followed.

> ***6. That the Council should actively develop a strategic approach to funding that includes identifying potential sources of funding and engaging with external organisations to secure financial support, including a revised approach to active travel whereby strategic funding becomes business as usual.***

> ***7. That the Council should adopt an agreed methodology to calculate how much is currently spent on active travel per person per year, in***

line with Department for Transport metrics.

8. *That the Council should match Scottish levels of funding for active travel, currently at £50 per resident per year.*

9. *That the Council should create a prioritisation matrix to systematically allocate funding to projects based on their impact and feasibility.*

46. Without working with other organisations, the Council will struggle to meet its commitments. In both the city and more broadly across the county, the Council has available to it a vast array of organisations that can offer both support and resource. The Group calls on the Council to do all it can to achieve that.

10. *That the Council should strengthen partnerships with local organisations, such as universities, colleges, and health institutions, to leverage their resources and support for active travel projects.*

11. *That the Council should encourage these organisations to invest in specific projects by providing clear information on the benefits and costs, using the open data tools to support this.*

47. The final three recommendations arising from this case study are linked to some of those proposed above. Co-production will be a key tool for enabling local stakeholders to engage in both design and delivery of active travel projects and a resource setting out how that will be understood and managed would be very useful. This co-production is part of a wider project to truly engage residents and other stakeholders for the betterment of their local active travel projects.

12. *That the Council should develop a Co-production Handbook to guide the involvement of local stakeholders and the public in the design and delivery of active travel projects.*

13. *That the Council should use interactive online maps and other tools to keep the public informed about the progress of projects and to gather their input.*

14. *That the Council should work transparently with local communities to complete the open data mapping and to adopt the Active Travel England Guidance on Best Practice Community Consultation and Engagement.*

Science Vale Movement and Place Strategy

48. On 10 March 2025, the Group met officers to consider draft proposals relating to the Science Vale Movement and Place Strategy. The Group was advised that Movement and Place Strategies (MAPS) reflect Oxfordshire's priority to

be a place shaper of choice and that the strategies are intended to be a better articulation in that regard. They provide strategies for places with a focus on achieving liveable, healthy neighbourhoods and are intended to help demonstrate integration across different modes. It was noted that MAPS replace LTP4 Strategies and provide a framework with clear actions for delivery at different spatial levels. This is to help the Council work with partners, provide a means to help monitor status and progress in delivery of schemes as part of an overall package of measures.

49.   The Group was advised that using the lens of place-making would help to provide a more people-focused approach and that there was a recognition that it is important to identify needs of an area in order to assess the contribution that a scheme or package of measures would make at the spatial level.

50.   During the meeting, officers set out what had been delivered and where progress had been made since the LTP4 strategy and explained that updates reflected both the Joint Local Plan of South Oxfordshire District Council and the Vale of the White Horse District Council and other more recent policy work, including other modal strategies. There was a recognition that further work was required and that the MAPS would be a live and evolving document which was regularly updated.

51.   In presenting the draft MAPS, officers were aware that further work would be required and had set out where gaps had been identified. In presenting the strategy, there was a keenness to make it more accessible to residents, potentially setting out the objectives and actions in a more flexible, geographic, map-based way.

52.   An infographic was provided which showed clearly on a map the nine schemes that had been delivered since LTP4 and the three that were in the pipeline. It also set out that the Science Vale MAPS would deliver another eight specific schemes, progress another seven specific ones, and that the Council would explore opportunities for another seven. This was in addition to generic schemes (such as 'enhanced bus services and infrastructure', 'network of cycling parking', and 'new car club and car sharing scheme').

53.   The Council was committed to engaging on its proposals but that engagement had not yet begun. The Leader of the Council has chaired the quarterly Didcot Garden Town Advisory Board, on which she serves as the Council's representative, and this has provided a public forum for updates on progress within the five wards of the Didcot Garden Town and the wider Science Vale area. It is anticipated that the Didcot Garden Town Advisory Board will continue to be the primary oversight body for this. Groups, including Councillor Working Groups, were proposed with the intention being that they would begin meeting after the local elections in May 2025.

54.   The Group was advised that the Council is keen to involve local stakeholders as widely as possible and that, collectively, the governance structures will guide the scale of ambition for the areas as well as helping to shape proposals

and identify links or gaps between places and people before the allocation of budgets or the start of major works.

Recommendations arising from Science Vale Deep Dive

55.   In discussion with officers broadly and when scrutinising the Science Vale MAPS specifically, the Group identified a cultural lack of comfort with uncertainty which it considered was likely to hamper a shift to the delivery of the Council's new policies. Moving from a 'predict and provide' approach to one of 'decide and provide'[2] requires the Council to become more comfortable with uncertainty, whether with transport modelling or more widely. The Group considers that one important way for the Council to become more comfortable with uncertainty is for it to use policy tools like strategic forecasting, backcasting, and foresights. This would strengthen the Council's ability to move to a truly vision-led approach. It is that vision-led approach which, ultimately, will translate the Council's ambitions into delivery. The Committee has previously commended the use of the Government Office for Science's Futures Toolkit[3] and the Group considers it relevant here too.

> ***15. That the Council should use the Futures Toolkit, adopting tools such as strategic forecasting, backcasting, and forecasting, so as to become more comfortable with uncertainty in implementing its vision-led approach.***

56.   The Group was keen to support the idea of data as a key strategic tool for planning and assessment with ambitions and targets relating to modal share being vital for effective prioritisation and delivery. The Group notes that the Royal Town Planning Institute's research paper *Net Zero Transport* [4] follows and encourages that approach of the centrality of modal share and the Group commends this method to the Council.

> ***16. That the Council should ensure, in its development and implementation of Movement and Place Strategies, that data is used as a key strategic tool with mode share targets being widely used.***

57.   A key advantage of being data-led is that it can be monitored. The Group was pleased to see that the Science Vale MAPS was presented as vision-led but it was also of the view that such a vision-led approach needed to be planned in a data-led way that aligned to the headline targets. The Group regretted that such targeting was not immediately obvious across all relevant workstreams. The Group considers it important that projects are assessed against the modal share targets given their impact on the LTCP headline

---

[2] see, for example, s.1.1 of
https://mycouncil.oxfordshire.gov.uk/documents/s62102/CA_SEP2022R12%20Annex%201_Implementing%20Decide%20and%20Provide%20-%20TA%20Requirements.pdf

[3] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/futures-toolkit-for-policy-makers-and-analysts/the-futures-toolkit-html

[4] https://www.rtpi.org.uk/media/9233/rtpi-net-zero-transport-january-2021.pdf

targets.

17. That the Council ensures vision-led planning is data-led with projects at all levels being assessed against modal share targets.

58.   The Group describes above its concerns that the Council's approach to funding active travel projects is not sufficiently strategic and its reservations remained when considering the Science Vale MAPS. The Group was concerned that sources of funding had not yet been identified for a number of schemes identified within this deep dive too and emphasises the importance of recommendation 6 above, calling for the prioritisation of a strategic approach to funding.

59.   The Group was of the view that now what was formerly the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership is the Council-owned company Enterprise Oxfordshire, it was key for the Council to take the opportunities afforded by this transition. The Council should work to ensure that its active travel ambitions are embedded in Enterprise Oxfordshire's work and that the latter should contribute positively to the question of funding.

18. That the Council should work to ensure that strategic funding for active travel is a priority for Enterprise Oxfordshire

60.   The Group recognises the key role of growth plans and infrastructure strategies across the county in contributing to the achievement of the Council's goals. As the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OXIS) is revised, the Group considers that the Council's active travel ambitions should be translated into the strategy. Similarly, the Group considers it imperative that the Strategy's ambitions and monitoring should be measured against the Council's modal share targets and the LTCP's headline targets. This will help to translate ambitions into delivery. The Group is conscious that this would impact on officer capacity which ties into its recommendation about relating to the importance of in-house capacity.

19. That the Council should ensure that there is sufficient capacity for future versions of the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy to be measured against modal share targets and the LTCP's headline targets.

61.   Similarly, recommendation 9 – about a prioritisation matrix for projects – is relevant here too. There needs to be an options appraisal process behind projects so that all stakeholders can understand on what basis individual schemes are being given priority.

62.   Relevant to this is developing good relationships with developers. The recently-launched Oxfordshire Developers Forum is a positive development and the Group is keen that the Council ensures that there is sufficient capacity in the organisation to engage with this and with more localised fora. The presence of relevant Council officers at local developer fora would provide the

opportunity for the Council to engage and encourage developers at an early stage to consider the impact on mode share of their projects. The Group recognises that this will be a capacity issue for officers but considers the benefits of such that it will be imperative for the Council to ensure that the team is properly resourced.

63. Effective and timely engagement with developers is also married to effective and timely engagement with local residents as well as other stakeholders. The Group has talked above of the importance of co-production and engagement. The development of the Science Vale MAPS provides a key opportunity for the Council to demonstrate this.

> ***20. That the Council should ensure further resource is provided to the active travel teams to enable it to participate in developer fora in order to engage developers at an early stage and to highlight the importance of mode share targets in their considerations.***

Contact Officer: Richard Doney, Scrutiny Officer,
richard.doney@oxfordshire.gov.uk

April 2025