

I'm speaking here qua Active Travel Champion. There's much to really welcome in this CMD, I'm delighted to see the Eynsham LCWIP and the Abingdon pedestrian crossing as well as the DYLs in Woodstock and the Blackthorn road amendments; the parking changes in Abingdon appear sensible as does the shift on Sheep Street.

Onto the CPZs, items 8 (EO) and 9 (Headington).

On Item 8, East Oxford, I believe the cabinet member should accept officer recommendations for 8a, c, f, g, h, i, j, k and reject recommendations for 8 d, e, and b. If it is possible to defer the decision on b (Cave St) as has been done for h (Boulter St cycle parking), in order to consider it as cycle / micromobility parking instead, then I would propose this instead of rejecting outright.

On item 9, Headington, I believe the cabinet member should accept officer recommendations for 9b, e, f, g, j, l, m, and n. And reject those for a, c, d, h, l, and k. As above, if it is possible to defer the decision on item L, Gardiner Street, as has been done for item M, that should be done instead.

Firstly, I just want to outline that I know that a lot of work has gone into these CPZ reviews and I welcome the officers' innovative thinking especially on micromobility and cycle parking. I think a huge amount in them has improved from the original proposals, however I believe they are still not compliant - which is why I have made the recommendations above.

The most important reason for my objections are that increasing parking is not policy compliant. LTCP Policy 33 is quite explicit: Take measures to reduce and restrict car parking availability. And privileging those who can afford to own private cars over bus users, cyclists, and pedestrians goes against other goals of the LTCP and goals of the council despite what is asserted in the report in paragraph 42 / 43 (EO); 41 / 42 (H). It also goes against the corporate policies laid out in the report (paragraph 13 in both). For EO, I call your attention to paragraph 37, which also states that the majority of survey respondents oppose it "overall opinions mostly opposed increased car parking in East Oxford."

I am concerned that paragraph 46 EO/44 Headington is inaccurate - we know from 2021 census data that only 38% of Oxford commuters drive cars, and I would ask officers to validate their contrary claim.

I very much welcome the micromobility & car-share initiatives in paragraphs 47, 48, 49 (EO); 45, 46, 47 (Headington).

Paragraph 57 & 58 in EO appear inaccurate, it de facto states that the reason we need to go against all corporate policy and add 16 spaces to EO is because women might feel safer at night. First, there is not one response from the consultation which raises this issue. Second, there is no data provided by TVP or indeed any other data. Third, my division is full of women who don't own cars - more than 30% of households do not own cars. We know from ONS data that there's a direct correlation between richer people and car ownership, so privileging those who can afford private cars over those who need to rely on buses and cycling seems extremely regressive. Additionally, in EO, we have a significant number of students

who do not own cars at all and I would argue they are among those most likely to be using the night time economy.

I believe there may be some very exceptional circumstances where we should "balance", i.e. go against, our own transport hierarchy. However for me this is in occasionally prioritising bus users over cyclists on key bus routes, or taking into account business needs, and possibly being flexible where we have a lot of data or responses from vulnerable residents. None of those is true in this case and I advise the Cabinet Member to throw out the rationale in paragraphs 57 & 58 as they are speculative and no evidence is provided. I remind the Cabinet Member that there are already a lot of parking spaces - 737 - in East Oxford, and very few for cyclists, so rebalancing that should be an urgent priority.

Fundamentally, item C in EO (and item L in Headington) proposes converting DYLs to parking spaces on the grounds that they might be later converted to cycling spaces. We should be converting them directly now, not making the private car parking spaces first. This is why I propose you delay the decisions on these two items.