

## **Siobhann Mansel-Pleydell – CPZ's**

First, I want to pan back and give huge credit to OCC. Oxfordshire has one of the most ambitious Local Transport and Connectivity Plans in the country, and there are many talented, hard-working people here genuinely committed to delivering a greener, fairer, healthier Oxfordshire.

On this side of the fence, you've also got civil society, pulling in the same direction, equally committed and hardworking staff and volunteers, slogging away after work and at weekends to further the agenda.

And yet, we're hitting some repeat themes here: decisions that feel disconnected from the ambition and intent of country-leading strategy and policy. The recurring issue isn't lack of strategy. It's translating good policy into consistent practice.

Because a parking proposal isn't just a parking proposal.

It's a traffic decision, at a time when we're trying to reduce congestion.

It's a pollution decision, when we're trying to improve air quality.

It's a carbon decision, when we're aiming for net zero.

It's an equity decision, when spatial justice has to be taken seriously.

It's a kerbside decision, when we want to make active travel easier.

And it's a safety decision, when we need to create conditions for safety for everyone, especially the most vulnerable. Small changes add up. Incremental decisions and structural changes are how systems shift, little by little, with ripple effects on behaviour and social change, in the right direction, or the wrong one.

Colleagues and coalition partners have already called for the rejection of the CPZ proposals, and I endorse that. But I'm also here to make a plea for a change in how decisions are made.

**Contradictions like this shouldn't reach Cabinet members. They should be caught upstream. Here are a few suggestions.**

First: if a proposal or report doesn't explicitly refer to the LTCP and the Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan, it's a sign we're not using our own policies as the decision filter. Let's make that non-negotiable: every CPZ and kerbside proposal should state, up front, how it advances LTCP/COTP targets — or it pauses.

Second: understandably, people can't carry deep expertise across every directorate. So let's design for interconnection: make Active Travel, Public Health and Road Safety formal internal consultees for CPZ and kerbside schemes, with a clear sign-off step.

Third - this is exactly why we need a kerbside strategy: to pull through our priorities across policy areas, build in equity and spatial justice, and set clear decision gates on who signs off changes to the kerbside

And finally - this is also about sanity preservation as much as it is about shifting complex systems. Coming up against the same issues, making the same points, about similar problems is as demoralizing as it is sisyphean for everyone in this room.

We can do better than that. Not by working harder, but by working differently: tighter alignment to strategy and policy, clearer gateways, and joined-up sign-off. If we prioritise that now, we'll save time, reduce friction, and get better outcomes on the street and for people - which is what we're all here for.