



**Cabinet
Tuesday, 29 November 2022**

ADDENDA 1

4. Reports from Scrutiny Committees (Pages 1 - 22)

Reports from the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee on:

- Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan
- Traffic Filters

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT OF THE PLACE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: SCRUTINY OF CENTRAL OXFORDSHIRE TRAVEL PLAN

Cllr Kieron Mallon
Chair of the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee
November 2022

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Cabinet is **RECOMMENDED** to —
 - a) Agree to respond to the recommendations contained in the body of this report, and
 - b) Agree that relevant officers will continue to update Scrutiny for 12 months on progress made against actions committed to in response to the recommendations, or until they are completed (if earlier).

REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND

2. In accordance with section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee hereby requires that, within two months of the consideration of this report, the Cabinet publish a response to this report and its recommendations.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

3. At its meeting on 16 November 2022, the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the draft Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan (COTP) proposals.
4. In addition to Cabinet members Councillors Gant and Enright, Corporate Director for Environment and Place, Bill Cotton, Joanne Fellows, Growth Manager Central, and Aron Wisdom, Programme Lead, the Committee sought the input of a broad group of external stakeholders. External contributors to the meeting were:
 - Patrick Davey (West-East Roads in Walton Manor)
 - Robin Tucker (Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel)
 - Emily Scaysbrook (Oxford Business Action Group)
 - Richard Parnham (Reconnecting Oxford)
 - Zahura Plummer (Oxfordshire Liveable Streets)
 - Carolyn Plozynski (Head of Economic Development, Oxford City Council)
 - Alison Chisholm and Juliet Carpenter (Oxford University re Street Voice Citizens' Jury)
 - Tim Schwanen (Director of Transport Studies Unit, Oxford University)

5. Cabinet members have been sent through the presentations submitted as a way of giving a flavour of the breadth of views and concerns.

SUMMARY

6. Owing to the presentations being made available, no summary of the inputs from external members is included here.
7. Councillor Andrew Gant introduced the report. The COTP sat within 'part 2' of the local transport plan process. Along with other plans for certain area and specific corridors, the COTP sets out how policies within Part 1 of the LTCP will be applied across specific geographic areas, in this case the central Oxfordshire area.
8. Part 1 of the local transport plan (the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan) was considered by the Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee in June 2022, prior to adoption at full Council in July 2022.
9. Analysis of the public consultation on the COTP (undertaken between August and October 2022) had identified a number of amendments to the COTP, which were presented to the Committee.
10. In response, the Committee explored a number of issues in detail. These included data and targets, public access, economic impacts and mitigations, consistency with other elements of Council policy, increasing public uptake and support, and means of increasing the forecast drop in modal shift. Following this discussion, the Committee makes recommendations concerning i) target-setting and the data underpinning target-setting, ii) consistency of COTP policy, and iii) suggestions around implementation. On these issues it makes a total of seven recommendations.
11. This report gives voice to the majority view of the Committee. However, similar to both the public split in opinion and amongst the external presenters at the meeting, the Committee was not unanimous in its support for these proposals. Particular concern was raised that the Council had not undertaken an Economic Impact Assessment, suggesting a willingness to move forward with proposals without a full understanding of the impacts on a specific and particularly impacted demographic group: small business owners. It was suggested by this minority that the Council, given the deeply significant impact on business owners in particular, should delay its implementation of these proposals until it has a high degree of certainty over what the impacts will be.
12. This report is based on the report received by Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee; Cabinet members are invited to seek clarification if any subsequent amendments have rendered references to the substantive report unclear.

RECOMMENDATIONS

i) Target Setting and Data

13. One of the external contributors to the discussion, Prof. Tim Schwanen, introduced his presentation with an important consideration. In its recently-agreed Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) the Council has adopted an ambitious set of targets towards modal shift. The challenge, however, is to adopt policies which actually deliver on those targets.
14. The COTP is the first of a number of geographically-focused plans developed by the Council as a way to realise, in combination, the overall ambitions of the LTCP. This being the case, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the judgement of whether or not it is successful should be whether it is delivering its share of the overall LTCP targets. To this end, the Committee suggests that the Council should adopt a set of targets based on its understanding of the COTP's expected contribution to the overall modal shift targets to ensure that, as Prof. Schwanen pointed out, roll-out of policies actually delivers the Council's ambitions.

Recommendation 1: That the Council develops a set of targets for modal shift for the COTP which correlate with the LTCP's modal shift targets

15. One of the deep concerns expressed by business owners around the COTP proposals was 'what if your projections are wrong? What is your Plan B?'. The Committee was assured that one of the benefits of ETROs is their flexibility, they are by very nature experimental and can be altered. This ability to alter course is valuable, but it is worth considerably less if the Council is unclear on how, when and in what circumstances this flexibility will be employed. Not only is proactively planning for different scenarios better than reacting to them on the hoof in and of itself, but many individuals have deep concerns over these proposals. Providing an outline of how and when the Council will react would provide assurance to those legitimately asking about the Council's Plan B as well as providing a high level of transparency and public accountability. In such a contested sphere as transport policy being demonstrably transparent and accountable are particularly important, and the Committee recommends taking steps accordingly.
16. One such step is not just the creation of measures and targets, but the sharing of performance against them. To be publicly accountable it is necessary that there is public access to this information. The Committee is keen that the Council decide a suitable forum or fora to share its performance.
17. One issue to highlight is that Oxford City Council have the capacity to measure footfall in different parts of the extended City-Centre. Footfall is a very relevant data point, but the ability to look at it with a degree of granularity makes it very useful indeed. The Committee would highly encourage the Council to be partnering with the City Council to include this data as part of its scenario-planning.

Recommendation 2: That the Council publishes its measures and targets for the COTP, and levels below which different levels of intervention will be triggered in the proposed COTP plans if the project is not working. And that the Council clarifies where this performance will be reported to.

18. In presentations made to the Committee by external guests, one of the contested points was over the impact of making access to Oxford by car more difficult. Those against the proposals were of the view that this would make Oxford as a destination less desirable, lowering visitor footfall and spend. Those in favour of the proposals argued that evidence from similar schemes showed that a reduced-traffic environment meant people were more likely to go to the shops rather than order on the internet, and that they tended to buy more when there, thereby increasing spend.
19. The truth is that what the exact impact on Oxford will be is unknown. How its unique characteristics interact with changes to transport policy are impossible to model with great certainty. The situation is that the Council is currently facing contradictory positions and contradictory evidence. It is necessary, therefore, that it gathers its own evidence; in all likelihood those from different sides of the debate are likely to find areas evidence to support their positions once the proposals begun to be implemented.
20. In Waltham Forest, where a similarly contested set of transport policies have been enacted, the Council undertook customer surveys to determine the modes of transport used to access shops. This is crucial data, particularly if gathered over time. Oxford City Council, also presenting at the meeting, have many links with local businesses and were willing to work with the County Council to enable such surveys to take place. The Committee would welcome this occurring, as well as being able to determine the economic impact of modal shift to access shops by learning about the average spend per mode, and suggests that the Council learn from the experience of Waltham Forest in doing so.
21. Speak of economic impact is deliberate. It was confirmed to the Committee that the Council had not undertaken an Economic Impact Assessment of its proposals. As business owners pointed out, for those with leases in the City, the stakes are extremely high; their livelihoods are on the line. The Committee feels that it is absolutely necessary that a full Economic Impact Assessment be undertaken; the Council should not be proceeding when unsighted on the effect on businesses already struggling amidst the cost of living crisis, spiralling energy bills and increased wage-levels of different outcomes from the COTP. It suggests that the data collected in these surveys would be a very worthwhile inclusion in an Economic Impact Assessment and that this should be pursued as soon as possible.

Recommendation 3: That taking on good practice from Waltham Forest the Council partners with Oxford City Council to undertake customer surveys relating to the modes of transport used to access shops, and the average

spend per mode, and that this work informs a forthcoming Economic Impact Assessment of the COTP proposals.

ii) Consistency

22. On p. 35 of the LTCP the policy sets out its transport hierarchy. 'In order to deliver these benefits a new approach is required that prioritises walking and cycling. We will put this approach into practice through our transport user hierarchy. The transport user hierarchy translates our vision into policy and sets the direction for the rest of the LTCP.' This is an unambiguous commitment to prioritise walking and cycling in the LTCP (and therefore its area plans, such the COTP) over other forms of transport in policy.

23. On the other hand, the COTP Cabinet report contains a recommendation around having a 'wider commitment to/ a better balance on 20mph speed limits.' As part of that recommendation, the suggestion is that the Council adopt a policy whereby 'Any introduction of 20mph limits on sections of the highway network that form part of the strategic bus network (and/or support bus infrastructure) will be carefully considered to take into account impact on bus journey times or service provision that may result' and ' Each scheme/road will be assessed on a case by case basis to assess/minimise the impact on the local transport services and infrastructure.' To the view of the Committee, this recommendation does not appear consistent with the overarching hierarchy of road users. Specific reference in the text is made to the needs of bus services and the need to consider their needs, but none to the needs of those pedestrians and cyclists whose needs take primacy under the Council's policy hierarchy. The Committee suggests that a hierarchy by nature means choosing one category over another, and that this recommended amendment subverts the Council's policy, a policy it has adopted with good reason. Consequently, it is recommended that this text is not accepted as an amendment to the COTP.

Recommendation 4: That the Council does not accept the recommended text concerning the feedback around 'wider commitment to/ a better balance on 20mph speed limits'

24. One of the major challenges faced by the Council in its COTP is reducing traffic volumes whilst ensuring that organisations in the City are able to get the supplies they need, when they need them and at reasonable cost. However, one of the criticisms levelled at the COTP by Prof Tim Schwanen was that insufficient attention had been paid to the movement of goods and freight.

25. The Council has devoted consideration to these issues in one of the LTCP's other supporting strategies, the Freight and Logistics Strategy. In particular, issues around last-mile freight are of relevance. For example, the actions to promote cycle freight and improve road safety are clearly going to be impacted by how the Council designs its travel system within the COTP area and the priorities it chooses. Linked to the recommendation above, growth in cycle freight may rely on more aggressive prioritisation of cycling over buses. Reducing road accidents and fatalities may require greater limitations on

access by certain types of vehicles to certain parts of the city and different points in the day. The same is true for tackling noxious vehicular emissions. The Committee sees a general alignment in policy between the two documents, but would like to see them informing one another in implementation also to ensure they are pulling consistently in the same policy direction, and that the important issues relating to freight are not overlooked.

Recommendation 5: That the Council ensures the COTP and Freight and Logistics Strategy are aligned with one another throughout implementation.

iii) Implementation

26. From his studies of the Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) instituted in Nottingham, Prof. Tim Schwanen drew out an important conclusion. Whilst achieving modal shift relies on a suite of measures rather than any single intervention, the single most effective measure at increasing modal shift in a short space of time is the WPL. The reason for this is that the WPL brings in resources. Clearly, it generates revenue, and this revenue provides the financial resource for the Council to pursue measures for which it is exceedingly difficult to get money from the Department for Transport or Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. This enables additional interventions to be run which would not otherwise. However, on top of that, it is possible to leverage income by seeking co-funding from government for other, more mainstream, interventions. With this feedback, the Committee's view is that the WPL should be moved forward as soon as possible to generate the resources and impetus required to achieve its ambitions for the COTP, and seeks therefore that the Council accelerates its implementation.

Recommendation 6: That the Council works to accelerate the implementation of the workplace parking levy

27. Another point of learning from Nottingham is not simply that the financial resources of WPLs can be leveraged. A crucial element is creating narratives of success, telling a story about how interventions are leading to tangible improvements for residents. This is not a factor simply aimed at increasing local support for the proposals, important as that is, but it is important in placing the Council in a favourable light with central government when assessing possible co-funded schemes. Places with momentum are attractive to those seeking to further and normalise traffic management options at a central government level, so it is an investment in the Council's future prospects to be capturing and proactively communicating the benefits accruing from the WPL or any COTP proposals. The Committee encourages the Council to be proactive in doing so.

Recommendation 7: That the Council gives high emphasis in its communications on narratives of success arising from the COTP

NEXT STEPS

28. The Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee will review the published Cabinet response to this report and its recommendations at the meeting of the Committee after Cabinet's response in accordance with part 6.2, 13(f), of the Constitution of the Council.

29. The Committee does not intend to revisit the COTP as an agenda item during the remainder of the civic year.

Contact Officer: Tom Hudson, Principal Scrutiny Officer
tom.hudson@oxfordshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

Under section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, Overview and Scrutiny Committees must require the Cabinet or local authority to respond to a report or recommendations made thereto by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such a response must be provided within two months from the date on which it is requested¹ and, if the report or recommendations in questions were published, the response also must be so.

This template provides a structure which respondents are encouraged to use. However, respondents are welcome to depart from the suggested structure provided the same information is included in a response. The usual way to publish a response is to include it in the agenda of a meeting of the body to which the report or recommendations were addressed.

Issue: Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan

Lead Cabinet Member(s): Cllr Duncan Enright, Cabinet Member for Travel and Development Strategy, Cllr Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Highway Management

Date response requested:² 29 November 2022

Response to report:

Enter text here

Response to recommendations:

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
That the Council develops a set of targets for modal shift for the COTP which correlate with the LTCP's modal shift targets		

¹ Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

² Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

<p>That the Council publishes its measures and targets for the COTP, and levels below which different levels of intervention will be triggered in the proposed COTP plans if the project is not working. And that the Council clarifies where this performance will be reported to</p>		
<p>That taking on good practice from Waltham Forest the Council partners with Oxford City Council to undertake customer surveys relating to the modes of transport used to access shops, and the average spend per mode, and that this work informs a forthcoming Economic Impact Assessment of the COTP proposals</p>		
<p>That the Council does not accept the recommended text concerning the feedback around 'wider commitment to/ a better balance on 20mph speed limits'</p>		
<p>That the Council ensures the COTP and Freight and Logistics Strategy are aligned with one another throughout implementation</p>		
<p>That the Council works to accelerate the implementation of the workplace parking levy</p>		
<p>That the Council gives high emphasis in its communications on narratives of success arising from the COTP</p>		

REPORT OF THE PLACE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: SCRUTINY OF OXFORD TRAFFIC FILTER PROPOSALS

Cllr Kieron Mallon
Chair of the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee
November 2022

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Cabinet is **RECOMMENDED** to —
 - a) Agree to respond to the recommendations contained in the body of this report, and
 - b) Agree that relevant officers will continue to update Scrutiny for 12 months on progress made against actions committed to in response to the recommendations, or until they are completed (if earlier).

REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND

2. In accordance with section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee hereby requires that, within two months of the consideration of this report, the Cabinet publish a response to this report and its recommendations.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

3. At its meeting on 16 November 2022, the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the draft Oxford Traffic Filter proposals.
4. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Andrew Gant, portfolio holder for Highway Management for presenting the report and answering questions, and Councillor Duncan Enright, Cabinet Member for Travel and Development Strategy also for attending the meeting, Bill Cotton, Corporate Director for Environment and Place, for authoring the report and supporting the meeting, as well as John Disley, Head of Transport Policy, Joanne Fellowes, Growth Manager Central, and Aron Wisdom, Programme Lead, for supporting the meeting.

SUMMARY

5. Cllr Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Highway Management, introduced the report. The traffic filter proposals outlined in the report aimed to reduce

unnecessary journeys by private vehicles., This would help deliver an affordable, sustainable and inclusive transport system that enabled the county to thrive whilst protecting the environment and making Oxfordshire a better place to live for all residents. Traffic filters were an important tool to achieve this in Oxford and have been part of Oxford's transport strategy since 2015, including the recently adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. They were subject to public consultation in 2019.

6. In response, the Committee devoted significant discussion to the displacement effect, public consultation and engagement, expected outcomes and monitoring, filter passes, and practical ideas for improvements.
7. Following this discussion, the Committee makes recommendations concerning i) the number and operation of the free passes available to allow access through the traffic filters, ii) ensuring representative consultation iii) addressing potential loopholes, iv) transparency over the rationale for the proposals, v) amendments to the proposals put forward to the Cabinet, and vi) specific suggestions for improvements. On these issues it makes a total of twelve recommendations.
8. One issue to note is that the recommendations are made based on the papers received by Scrutiny. It is possible that, in order to accommodate Scrutiny's requests within the documentation, the papers Cabinet receives may have been amended to reflect these suggestions. As such, Cabinet members and members of the public may find that issues being referred to in this paper are not present in the Cabinet proposals. It is advised that during consideration of the substantive paper at Cabinet that any amendments to the draft report considered by Scrutiny to incorporate its recommendations are highlighted.
9. A further caveat is that this report makes reference to the Committee's views, and what is contained within this report reflects the majority view within the Committee. However, it should be noted that there was a significant degree of scepticism by a minority of members over whether traffic filters would actually lead to lower carbon emissions and/or modal shift, or whether it would simply slow existing traffic and lengthen queues, exacerbating existing carbon emissions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

i) Traffic Filter Passes

10. Although the Committee is keen that the Council be evidence-led, its initial assessment of the number of residential passes available to those living within the City, 100 per year, is likely to fall in a range which is ineffective in reducing vehicle journeys, but is also highly inconvenient for those who rely on their cars on a daily basis, say for work.
11. Evidence provided to the Committee by Prof. Tim Schwanen, Director of Oxford University's Transport Studies Unit was clear that to effect modal shift it is necessary to rely more on 'sticks' to change behaviour than 'carrots'. This being so, if the Council is to achieve its ambitions around modal shift it will

need to make individuals change their behaviour. This being the case, the Committee seeks that any reviews of the impacts of the residential pass scheme be undertaken from the primary perspective that modal shift is the ultimate outcome sought from this scheme, and that (at least temporary) inconvenience will be inherent in achieving that outcome. The Committee would welcome a review occurring.

Recommendation 1: That the Council reviews the number of residential passes made available, with a view to pursuing greater traffic reduction through giving out fewer residential per-person traffic filter passes during the trial period than is currently proposed.

12. The Traffic Filter proposals also have 25 'universal passes' to allow access to Oxford by those needing to come in from outside. Following discussion, the view of the Committee is that there are good reasons for these passes to be limited to residents of Oxfordshire only. Firstly, there is the issue of fairness, that in-county individuals make a contribution to the road network through their council tax which out-of-county individuals do not. Secondly, as a destination city for work, education and leisure much of Oxford's traffic is generated by those from outside the city. The number of journeys made to Oxford by a particular individual per year may be small, but there are many, many more people eligible to make those journeys. Consequently, the cumulative impact from out of county is significant. Given that the design of the traffic filters mean that all of Oxford remains accessible, albeit with longer journey times in some circumstances when there is more than one destination in the journey, the Committee's view is that it is not unduly onerous to incentivise usage of the park and rides or new train station for external visitors. The provision of universal passes to out of county visitors would undermine this.

13. The understanding of the Committee is that the Council has a strong understanding of the anticipated impacts of the proposals on Oxford City residents, but that on those coming to Oxford from outside is less well developed. The Committee encourages the development of models to understand the anticipated impacts on this group of drivers.

Recommendation 2: That the Council implements the policy that universal passes should be made available only to Oxfordshire residents

Recommendation 3: That the Council produces an additional traffic model for the scenario under which "universal" or "Oxfordshire-wide" traffic filter passes are included in the model

14. During the Committee's discussions, the academics who had coordinated the Steet Voice Citizens' Jury offered to consult Citizens' Jury participants on their views. The Committee fully recognises that the Citizens' Jury, being based on five wards in Oxford, is not fully representative of the City as a whole. However, members still represent a broad cross-section and have been recipients of significant input from experts on traffic issues. As such, the Committee sees value in hearing their opinions on the operation of the traffic filter pass scheme and encourages the Council to take up the offer.

Recommendation 4: That the Council consults with the Street Voice Citizens' Jury members on the optimal number of residential traffic filter passes

ii) Representative Consultation

15. Following on from the above, a clear message heard by the Committee from external members was that there can be a significant discrepancy between those who respond to consultations and the general public. Going beyond this, however, there are groups who are harder to reach for consultation, but who are disproportionately impacted by proposals around travel. For different reasons, those with disability and small business owners are both likely to be more impacted by changes to the way traffic is managed in Oxford, and yet face greater challenge in making their voices heard. The Committee's view is that for such an emotive topic with significant implications for residents of the City and its visitors, the Council needs to invest in securing better quality data on what the issues are and what residents think. Consequently, it suggests that representative polling, using YouGov or an equivalent polling company, would not only be representative, but give a voice to harder to reach groups which, feedback to the Committee suggests, is not currently the case.

Recommendation 5: That the Council undertakes representative polling of the public about the traffic filters alongside the ETRO consultation

iii) Potential Loopholes

16. One of the presentations given to the Committee highlighted that the definition of 'van' is such that it includes a large number of SUVs which are marketed for personal, rather than business, use, but which could be argued to constitute a van.¹ This grey area creates a perverse incentive for residents within the City to trade up to a bigger, less environmentally friendly vehicle. This is the precise opposite of the Council's intention. Even if the Council ultimately could prevail in these arguments over whether such private vehicles were cars or vans, it would be a waste of resources to need to engage with them in the first place. It would be far more effective simply to develop a more nuanced policy by banning all vans, and then seeking to identify the exceptions necessary to allow legitimate business use to occur without allowing private usage also.

Recommendation 6: That the Council adopts a default position that vans are not exempt from the traffic filters, and that it develops a definition which creates exceptions to enable legitimate business use

¹ In legislation, a van is defined as:

- A vehicle primarily constructed for the conveyance of goods or burden of any description
- A gross vehicle weight – fully laden – not exceeding 3,500kg

17. A second area which, without additional definition, could allow gaming of the system is the exceptions to car clubs from the traffic filters. The Committee recognises the reasoning for doing this. Modal shift is more likely if for those times an individual must have access to a car, they can easily and cheaply access one. Without this, people may hang on to their cars 'just in case' and end up using them more. However, there is sufficient grey area in the definition that a group of residents could simply use a joint car and call it a 'car club' to allow unfettered access throughout the City. The Committee would like to see clarification to close this loophole, so that the intended targets of this exception are protected, enterprises such as Co Wheels and Zip Car, which seek to cater to those without vehicles, and not groups of residents who simply would prefer to work together to sidestep limitations on car use within the City.

Recommendation 7: That the Council provides a clear definition to the term 'car club' in order to prevent gaming

iv) Transparency

18. The Committee recognises that there are many people in Oxford who do wish to pursue a strongly interventionist policy to provide greater impetus towards modal shift. The results of Oxford City Council's Citizens' Assembly support this. To these people, whether they are motivated by carbon reduction, a wish to support public transport or active travel, or concerns for air quality, the delay to commencement of the filters will be a source of frustration owing to the continued congestion and delays to bus services. The Committee, as mentioned below, generally recognises the trade-off between an immediate start date and the quality of data collected. However, given the Council's stated ambition to contribute towards a vibrant and participatory democracy, transparency over the reasoning for its decision should be made publicly available. To those who wish to participate in our local democracy it is important that they have access to the details of why the Council is acting as it is, and therefore the background for this recommendation should be open to the public.

Recommendation 8: That the Council publishes the advice and reasoning on which the recommendation to delay the start date of the trial is based

v) Specific Amendments to Cabinet Recommendations

19. A further element of feedback received by Prof Tim Schwanen was the importance of having a consistent and easy to understand approach for those impacted by new traffic proposals in getting the public onside. Much goodwill is lost by punishing those who break the rules by accident rather than design. Whilst the Committee understands that the reduced hours of operation are part of a phased introduction which will bring Hythe Bridge Street and Hollow Way/Marston Ferry Road in line with other filters, this detracts from the scheme's simplicity. Having differential timings at the start, when residents are getting used to the changes is the worst time to do so. The Committee does

not see value in having a short-term exception in these locations, and suggests that the clarity of having one set of timings, as originally proposed in the consultation, will be preferable for all stakeholders. In addition, the Committee is cognisant of an issue raised by external attendees, that of the displacement effect. Reduced filter times are liable to smooth traffic levels, but this would be achieved through displacing traffic from times when the filters are active to when they are not. Smoothing, whilst desirable, does not reduce the total number of journeys made, which is the ultimate purpose of the policy.

Recommendation 9: That the Council does not accept the recommendations in Annex 4 concerning changes to the timing for filters on Hythe Bridge Street and Hollow Way/Marston Ferry Road and continues with the timings proposed in the consultation

20. The Committee discussed the recommendation of officers being made to Cabinet that the Traffic Filter trial be delayed until 2024. It completely agrees with the rationale, which is to ensure that any data received is representative of normal usage, and that the impacts of works around Botley Road and station do not lead to anomalous results. However, it suggests that this specificity may actually not be helpful to the Council in the event that the works happen to be completed ahead of schedule. As such, it recommends removing reference to 'until 2024' from the proposals.

Recommendation 10: That the Council removes 'until 2024' from its recommendation to delay the start date for the trial in Annex 4

vi) Other Improvements

21. Assuming that the Traffic Filter proposals are successful in encouraging modal shift within Oxford City, the likelihood is that this will lead to an increase in demand for Park and Rides. The Committee is aware that since Covid demand is below its pre-pandemic levels so there is some room to grow without adverse impact, but it is also aware of that Redbridge Park and Ride is particularly challenging to exit, given that the Abingdon Road has priority over the road from which Park and Ride users must exit, the Old Abingdon Road. The Committee feels that there is little to be lost in assessing the likely impacts of differing levels of increased demand on Redbridge Park and Ride in light of the proposals in order to be ahead of the curve in developing mitigations should the length of time taken for egress from the site actually start to diminish its attractiveness to users.

Recommendation 11: That the Council reviews the impact of proposals with a view to improving the ease of egress for users of Redbridge Park and Ride

22. Although the Committee stands by its view that 'sticks' are more useful in bringing about modal shift than 'carrots' in reality to maximise modal shift both are required. To this end, the Committee would wish to bring to the Cabinet's attention one particularly effective 'carrot' which is Personal Travel Planning.

23. Personal Travel Planning seeks to provide targeted information, support and encouragement towards modal shift for those who are impacted by 'hard' changes to transport policy. In a report, the Department for Transport states that in the UK Personal Travel Planning is shown to 'reduce car driver trips by 11% (amongst the targeted population) and reduce the distance travelled by car by 12%' and that these impacts continue for up to five years beyond the intervention.² The cost benefit ratio of targeted interventions is estimated by the Department for Transport to be 1:30. The Committee recognises that it can be liable always to seek that the Council goes further than is proposed, but in this case the efficacy of these interventions and their cost-benefit ratio indicates that there is a compelling case for including Personal Travel Planning alongside its planned interventions as a means of maximising modal shift. Examples of places which have undertaken Personal Travel Planning from which the Council might wish to learn include Nottingham, Bristol, Brighton, Worcester, Darlington and Lancashire.

Recommendation 12: That the Council undertakes work around Personal Travel Planning alongside the Traffic Filters proposals

NEXT STEPS

24. The Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee will review the published Cabinet response to this report and its recommendations at the meeting of the Committee after Cabinet's response in accordance with part 6.2, 13(f), of the Constitution of the Council.

25. The Committee does not intend to revisit the Oxford Traffic Filter proposals as an agenda item during the remainder of the civic year.

Contact Officer: Tom Hudson, Principal Scrutiny Officer
tom.hudson@oxfordshire.gov.uk

² Making Personal Travel Planning Work

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

Under section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, Overview and Scrutiny Committees must require the Cabinet or local authority to respond to a report or recommendations made thereto by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such a response must be provided within two months from the date on which it is requested¹ and, if the report or recommendations in questions were published, the response also must be so.

This template provides a structure which respondents are encouraged to use. However, respondents are welcome to depart from the suggested structure provided the same information is included in a response. The usual way to publish a response is to include it in the agenda of a meeting of the body to which the report or recommendations were addressed.

Issue: Traffic Filters

Lead Cabinet Member(s): Cllr Duncan Enright, Cabinet Member for Travel and Development Strategy, Cllr Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Highway Management

Date response requested:² 29 November 2022

Response to report:

Enter text here

Response to recommendations:

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
That the Council reviews the number of residential passes made available, with a view to pursuing greater traffic reduction through		

¹ Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

² Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

giving out fewer residential per-person traffic filter passes during the trial period than is currently proposed.		
That the Council implements the policy that universal passes should be made available only to Oxfordshire residents		
That the Council produces an additional traffic model for the scenario under which “universal” or “Oxfordshire-wide” traffic filter passes are included in the model		
That the Council consults with the Street Voice Citizens’ Jury members on the optimal number of residential traffic filter passes		
That the Council undertakes representative polling of the public about the traffic filters alongside the ETRO consultation		
That the Council adopts a default position that vans are not exempt from the traffic filters, and that it develops a definition which creates exceptions to enable legitimate business use		
That the Council provides a clear definition to the term ‘car club’ in order to prevent gaming		
That the Council publishes the advice and reasoning on which the recommendation to delay the start date of the trial is based		
That the Council does not accept the recommendations in Annex 4 concerning changes to the timing for filters on Hythe Bridge Street and Hollow Way/Marston Ferry Road and continues with the timings proposed in the consultation		

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

That the Council removes 'until 2024' from its recommendation to delay the start date for the trial in Annex 4		
That the Council reviews the impact of proposals with a view to improving the ease of egress for users of Redbridge Park and Ride		
That the Council undertakes work around Personal Travel Planning alongside the Traffic Filters proposals		

This page is intentionally left blank