

# CABINET

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Tuesday, 18 October 2022 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4.15 pm

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor Liz Leffman – in the Chair  
Councillor Liz Brighthouse OBE (Deputy Chair)  
Councillor Glynis Phillips  
Councillor Dr Pete Sudbury  
Councillor Tim Bearder  
Councillor Duncan Enright  
Councillor Calum Miller  
Councillor Jenny Hannaby  
Councillor Mark Lygo  
Councillor Andrew Gant

**Other Members in Attendance:**

Councillors David Bartholomew, Robin Bennett, Donna Ford, Charlie Hicks, Ian Middleton, Michael O'Connor

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting Stephen Chandler, Interim Chief Executive; Lorna Baxter, Director of Finance; Anita Bradley, Director of Law & Governance; Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Committee Officer

*The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.*

## **123/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

(Agenda Item. 1)

Councillor Tim Bearder gave apologies for having to leave the meeting at 3pm.

## **124/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Agenda Item. 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

## **125/22 MINUTES**

(Agenda Item. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2022 were approved and signed as an accurate record.

## **126/22 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS**

(Agenda Item. 4)

See Annex

## **127/22 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda Item. 5)

The Chair agreed to the following requests to speak:

6 Reports from Scrutiny Committees – Citizens’ Jury  
Alison Chisholm, University of Oxford

7 Capital Programme Monitoring Report  
Cllr Charlie Hicks

10 Parking Standards for New Developments  
City Cllr Emily Kerr  
Cllr Charlie Hicks  
Cllr Ian Middleton  
Cllr Robin Bennett

## **128/22 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

(Agenda Item. 6)

Report of the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee on Parking Standards for New Developments

Councillor Charlie Hicks, Deputy Chair, presented the report. He welcomed the changes made to the standards document following the scrutiny report. He noted that there appeared to be consensus around most of the recommendations but that the scrutiny committee had not had a chance to consider the response on recommendations 1 and 4 relating to a review of the evidence and alignment to the LTCP (Local Transport and Connectivity Plan).

Report of the Performance & Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee on Street Voice - Citizens’ Jury

Alison Chisholm, Qualitative Researcher, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, welcomed the scrutiny committee’s comments on the relationship of the Citizens’ Jury recommendations to Council’s policy processes. She was concerned that some of the comments in the report may give the impression that there were particular shortcomings in the process which she does not believe was the case. She was happy to respond to any concerns anybody may have outside of this meeting.

Councillor Michael O’Connor, Deputy Chair, summarised the report. He welcomed the agreement from Councillor Glynis Phillips to consider the

question of how such juries fit into policy development. The scrutiny committee felt that it should only be used alongside other consultation methods.

Report of the Performance & Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the Property Strategy

Councillor O'Connor stated that the Committee welcomed early sight of the report but that it was at too high a level for them to easily provide useful feedback. They believed that there should be a focus on owned buildings, rather than leasehold, and colocation with partners and that local Members should be consulted and informed about proposals in their division.

Report of the Performance & Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the Local Government Association Peer Review on Communications

Councillor O'Connor highlighted two points from the report – that it was important that communications were embedded at an early stage of every project and that there was a need for political input.

Cabinet Members thanked the Deputy Chairs for presenting the reports in the absence of the Chairs of the scrutiny committees. They also thanked the University of Oxford for organising the Citizens' Jury. Cabinet will give a formal response to each of the scrutiny reports.

## **129/22 PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS**

(Agenda Item. 10)

Cabinet had before it the following:

In the agenda pack:

- Cabinet report on 'Parking Standards for New Developments' with annexes
- Report from the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee

In the (first) Addenda

- An addendum to the Cabinet report
- The latest draft of the "Parking Standards for New Developments" document (Annex 1)

In Addenda 2

- An overview of research

Before considering the item, the Chair agreed to the following requests to speak.

City Councillor Emily Kerr criticised the summary of research in the papers. She stated that there was decades of evidence to show a strong correlation between car ownership and availability of parking with the number of car journeys. She believed that the proposals were not in line with the targets

adopted in the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) adopted by the Council.

Councillor Charlie Hicks believed that there had been little movement on the evidence or targets since the Cabinet meeting last month. He did not accept the assertion in the reports that the evidence was not clear. The evidence should be established first and then it was possible to have a debate on values. There were better examples elsewhere of car-free developments both in-city and edge-of-city.

Councillor Ian Middleton supported the aims of the standards but called for a more holistic approach. Particularly with smaller developments, limiting the number of parking spaces just pushed the problem onto adjoining streets and verges. There was a need for it to be done alongside waiting restrictions and proper enforcement.

Councillor Robin Bennett stated that areas like Berinsfield and Culham were regarded as villages but, with new development, were effectively becoming the size of towns. However, they had no Controlled Parking Zones and really required similar policies to edge-of-city developments.

Councillor Duncan Enright, Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy, thanked Members, Officers and the councils for their input on this issue. The proposals were by no means encouraging cars and were in line with policy. Car usage was the primary target not ownership.

The proposals would remove the principle of having a minimum number of parking spaces. Along with improvements in active travel infrastructure, the provision of transport hubs and car clubs will mean that people will be happy to use cars less.

Councillor Enright proposed an amendment to the recommendations that he along with Councillors Gant and Sudbury conduct a review with officers and bring back further changes soon to strengthen the policy.

Cabinet Members made a number of observations:

- The proposal to further strengthen the document was welcomed.
- Improved public transport and active travel can be provided to edge-of-city developments.
- There were huge advantages to having fewer cars including reduction of accidents.
- The proposal was better than the old policy and it was important to adopt it to set a line in the sand.
- The biggest influence on car ownership was wealth.

Councillor Tim Bearder left the meeting.

Councillor Duncan Enright moved the amended recommendations. Councillor Miller seconded and they were agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

To adopt and implement the revised 'Parking Standards for New Developments' as amended in the Addenda as a formal supplementary document to the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP).

Councillors Enright, Gant and Sudbury to conduct a review with the relevant officers on issues raised by the scrutiny committee and bring back an update to a future Cabinet meeting before the end of this year.

**130/22 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING REPORT - AUGUST 2022**

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet received the second capital programme update and monitoring report for 2022/23, setting out the monitoring position for 2022/23 based on activity to the end of August 2022 and providing an update to the Capital Programme approved by Cabinet in July 2022 taking into account additional funding and new and/or changes to schemes.

Before considering the report, the Chair had agreed to the following request to speak on the item.

Councillor Charlie Hicks noted that there was no reference to the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) in the principles for the prioritisation framework.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, proposed an amendment to add a reference to the LTCP. He stated that the report was the result of a need to review the capital programme in light of inflationary pressures. The prioritisation principles were set out in Annex 1 and the changes following its application were summarised in paragraph 13.

All of the Oxfordshire councils were collectively responsible for the growth deal funding decisions under the Future Oxfordshire Partnership. The County Council needed to ensure that the proposals from the FOP were consistent with the County Council's responsibility to account for the overall capital expenditure.

Councillor Miller highlighted paragraphs 38 and 39 referring to £30m in funding not yet received from central government. The Chief Executive had written to central government on this issue the previous day.

The following amendment was agreed:

In Annex 1, Agenda Page 39, 6<sup>th</sup> Principle: "Major Infrastructure schemes align to OXIS prioritisation"

Append "and LTCP targets."

The recommendations as amended were proposed by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Enright and agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

**OCC Capital revised programme and prioritisation**

- a) Endorse the capital prioritisation framework (Annex 1 as amended)
- b) Approve the review of the OCC Capital Programme (paragraph 13)
- c) Approve the latest capital monitoring position for 2022/23 (Annex 2) and the associated updated capital programme at Annex 3, incorporating the changes set out in this report
- d) Note the approval made under delegated authority of the Leader of the Council for:
  - i. Marlborough School (paragraph 24)
- e) Approve the updated budget requirements:
  - i. Orion School (paragraph 22)
  - ii. Banbury Library (paragraph 48)

**Re-profiling**

- f) Agree the re-profiling (Annex 2 and 3)

**Funding**

- g) Agree the inclusion in the Capital Programme of the following grant funding updates and allocation:
  - i. Active Travel Phase 3 of £10.4m (Paragraph 57),
  - ii. Bus Service Implementation Plan of £8.7m (Paragraph 58)
- h) To note the inclusion of £10m towards Oxford Station (OCC acting as the accountable body on behalf of the OxLEP) (paragraph 59)

**Future Oxfordshire Partnership's (FOP) Housing and Growth Deal**

- i) Note the [Housing and Growth Deal revised programme](#) as approved by the Future Oxfordshire Partnership and note the implications for the Council's Capital Programme (paragraph 39)
- j) Note the approval made under delegated authority of the Leader of the Council for schemes that are part funded by the Council and other funding sources including the housing and growth deal:
  - A40 Oxford North (Northern Gateway) Scheme (Paragraph 28),
  - Science Transit Phase 2 (Eynsham Park and Ride) (Paragraph 29)
  - Benson Relief Road (paragraph 34)

## **131/22 BUDGET & BUSINESS PLANNING REPORT - 2023/24**

(Agenda Item. 8)

Cabinet had before it a report providing context and background information as well as updates about the wider economic environment since the 2022/23 budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy was agreed in February 2022.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, noted that the new Chancellor of the Exchequer had announced that he wanted further cuts in spending. Inflationary pressures meant that another £30m would need to be found in savings. Extra demands would require another £20m in order for them to be met.

The feedback from last year's extensive consultation process will be taken on board in the first stage. Proposals will be published on 18 November for this year's consultation process. Different aspects of budget planning have been taken to scrutiny committees twice already this year and they will continue to be involved in the process.

The recommendations were moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Phillips and agreed.

### **RESOLVED to:**

- a) **Endorse the report and note the assumptions that will form the starting point for the 2023/24 budget as well as updates since the Medium Term Financial Strategy was agreed in February 2022 that need to be considered;**
- b) **Approve the budget and business planning process for 2023/24; and**
- c) **Approve a three-year period for the medium-term financial strategy to 2025/26 and ten-year period for the capital programme to 2032/33.**

## **132/22 ZERO EMISSION BUS REGIONAL AREAS (ZEBRA) FUNDING AGREEMENTS**

(Agenda Item. 9)

Cabinet considered a report setting out the need to agree payment terms and key milestones with bus operators to ensure the project's timely delivery and the release of funds at appropriate points and ensure the funding conditions set out by the DfT are met. These provisions will be covered through legally binding funding agreements with the operators.

The recommendations were moved by Councillor Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Highway Development, and seconded by Councillor Lygo. The recommendations were agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

**delegate authority to the Corporate Director for Environment and Place, in consultation with the Director for Law and Governance and the Cabinet Member for Highway Management to negotiate, finalise and enter into funding agreements with Oxford Bus Company (Go-Ahead) and Stagecoach to provide electric buses and charging infrastructure based on the funding milestones set out in this paper.**

**133/22 STREET LIGHTING & ILLUMINATED ASSETS POLICY**

(Agenda Item. 11)

Cabinet was requested to approve an updated Street Lighting and Illuminated Assets policy reflecting the aspirations of the administration in terms of carbon saving and a more sustainable approach.

Councillor Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Highway Management, summarised the report. The new policy will allow dimming and reduction of lighting hours to be considered on a case-by-case basis with local communities. The policy was developed in consultation with a stakeholder group.

Councillor Gant highlighted keywords from the underlying principles including climate change, safety, pollution, environment, active travel and community involvement.

Councillor Duncan Enright particularly welcomed the proposals in the policy on decluttering.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Gant, seconded by Councillor Sudbury and agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

- (a) Support the new direction and approach for managing Street Lighting and Illuminated Assets to better reflect local requirements and aspirations of the governing administration in relation to a more sustainable and carbon considered approach.**
- (b) Approve adoption of the update of the County Council's Street Lighting and Illuminated Assets Policy statement as attached at ANNEX A.**

**134/22 FUTURE HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE DELIVERY MODEL - PROPOSED APPROACH**

(Agenda Item. 12)

Cabinet considered a report outlining the three main decision points in adopting the delivery model: i) this report seeking support for the proposed approach; ii) when the project team have a preferred option/s for



development and progression; and iii) to seek approval to commence procurement of the preferred option.

Councillor Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Highway Management, introduced the report emphasising that it needed to be read alongside the Highway Assets Management Policy. The current contract which expires in March 2025 with no further options to extend was based on the “Single Managing Agent” provider model. It was proposed to explore alternative models which will involve a great deal of engagement and specialist support.

Councillor Gant proposed the recommendations, Councillor Enright seconded and they were agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

- a) **Approve the commencement of work for a new highway’s maintenance contract.**
- b) **Endorse the proposed approach and key stages as set out in this paper.**

**135/22 ADULT SOCIAL CARE REFORMS: FAIR COST OF CARE EXERCISE AND DRAFT MARKET SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING**

(Agenda Item. 13)

Cabinet was asked to note the process undertaken so far, so that the project group can continue to work towards presenting the final analysis, findings, and report with the provisional market sustainability plan.

Pippa Corner, Deputy Director for Joint Commissioning, summarised the report. The Fair Cost of Care exercise was a statutory requirement. There was a competition to identify a supplier. LaingBuisson were contracted as a result. The process has been supported by the Oxfordshire Association of Care Providers. Work has now moved on to developing a market sustainability plan. Central government will decide when to publish plans.

Councillor Calum Miller noted that one of the challenges in being a ‘trailblazer’ in this process was that the Council had to adopt reforms before there was clarity from central government on funding. It would appear that clarity will not be forthcoming until January at the earliest which was very late in the budget planning process.

Asked if there was any early learning from the process so far, Pippa Corner responded that the government tools provided for information gathering were quite complicated and LaingBuisson had to engage in a lot of direct contact with providers to ensure the requests were understood correctly and the deadline for applications was extended to maximise the feedback.

The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Hannaby and agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

**note the process undertaken so far, so that the project group can continue to work towards presenting the final analysis, findings, and report with the provisional market sustainability plan, using the cost of care exercise as a key input in identifying risks in the local market and spend report, ready for submission to DHSC on 12 October 2022. The final market sustainability plan will be submitted in February 2023.**

**136/22 OXFORDSHIRE SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2021-22**

(Agenda Item. 14)

Cabinet was asked to note the annual report covering April 2021 to March 2022.

Dr Jayne Chidgey-Clark, Independent Chair of OSAB, summarised the report. She stated that the priorities last year had been leadership in homelessness, a new multi-agency process to tackle complexity and better links between strategic partners. She was pleased to report a narrowing of the gap between the life expectancy for people with a learning disability and the general population.

Dr Chidgey-Clark identified the following overarching themes requiring focus: recruitment, embedding learning, more preventive safeguarding work, training to meet the needs and the transition for young people to adult services.

Asked to identify what was in place this coming winter to tackle homelessness, Karen Fuller, Interim Corporate Director for Adult Services, responded that there was now a system leadership project including city and district councils. There was a lot more in-reach to hospitals streamlining that pathway and more sharing of data.

Members noted that there was more innovation with each report. The work of scrutiny had been taken on board. The Making Safeguarding Personal approach was welcomed. The importance of sharing action plans was emphasised.

The recommendations were moved by Councillor Brighthouse, seconded by Councillor Hannaby and agreed.

The Chair asked Dr Chidgey-Clark to take the thanks of Cabinet back to the Board for all their work.

**RESOLVED to:**

**note the contents of the report and its conclusions.**

## **137/22 OXFORDSHIRE SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2021-22**

(Agenda Item. 15)

Cabinet received the annual report on the effectiveness of local arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in Oxfordshire.

Derek Benson, Independent Chair of OSCB, introduced the report. It showed the need to improve practice with respect to the themes of neglect, child exploitation and keeping children safe in education. An emerging issue was the impact of the pandemic – especially on adolescents.

There was a major issue with insufficient availability of placements. This was a national issue and they continued to apply pressure on central government to address the problem. The emphasis continued to be on finding placements as close to home as possible but also ensuring the provision was suitable.

Derek Benson emphasised the need for more early help. Child sexual exploitation continued to be a major issue along with the sharing of images online.

Councillor Liz Brighthouse, Cabinet Member for Children, Education & Young People's services concurred that more early help was needed. She stated that the work of the Board was invaluable in ensuring that partners had the information they needed to respond to issues. She also described the lack of placements across the country as shameful.

The Chair thanked officers and asked the Independent Chair to pass on the thanks of Cabinet to all of the partners involved in the Board.

### **RESOLVED to:**

**note the annual report of the Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children Board senior safeguarding partners and to consider the key messages.**

## **138/22 DELEGATED POWERS - OCTOBER 2022**

(Agenda Item. 16)

The report was noted, including that paragraph 3 should refer to "2022" not "2021".

## **139/22 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS**

(Agenda Item. 17)

The Cabinet considered a list of items (CA17) for the immediately forthcoming meetings of the Cabinet together with a change set out in the Addenda 2.

**RESOLVED:**  
**to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.**

.....in the Chair

Date of signing .....

## ITEM 4 – QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p data-bbox="197 523 707 555"><b>1. COUNCILLOR JOHN HOWSON</b></p> <p data-bbox="197 639 1043 743">Will he explain the present situation with regard to funding the Woodstock Road corridor study that was the subject of consultation in the autumn of 2021?</p> <p data-bbox="197 823 430 855"><b>Supplementary</b></p> <p data-bbox="197 903 1043 1374">The Table in Annex 4 shows that the original £12m for the Woodstock Road has been reduced from £4m. I am grateful that he has been able to recover something for this important scheme. However, I note that the Oxpens Bridge has now been allocated £8m instead of £6m and that will carry far less cycle traffic than the Woodstock Road currently does and I would ask if he would consider with his colleagues whether that £2m could be recovered for the Woodstock Road. Similarly, there was a feasibility study for the Banbury Road and therefore I think it is questionable whether £2.37m are necessary for that feasibility study and I would ask if that money could be put into the Woodstock Road so that there is a real possibility</p>	<p data-bbox="1070 523 1926 595"><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p data-bbox="1070 639 1832 671">I would refer Cllr Howson to agenda item 7 (Annex 4):</p> <p data-bbox="1070 711 1769 783"><a href="https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/agenda-document-for-cabinet-18-10-2022-14-00">Agenda Document for Cabinet, 18/10/2022 14:00 (oxfordshire.gov.uk)</a></p> <p data-bbox="1070 823 1227 855"><b>Response</b></p> <p data-bbox="1070 903 1946 1374">You will of course be aware of the funding background to the schemes that you've referred to – they form part of the Homes for Infrastructure strand of the Growth Deal which was discussed at some length by the Future Oxfordshire Partnership at its most recent meeting following pressure on the schemes due to inflation. I am happy to take those points you make about the need for enhanced active travel infrastructure in the North Oxford area and discuss with officers alongside those other discussions. I would certainly echo what you say. The need is real on one of the principle corridors into our city which does not have a joined up cycle lane. The provision is on and off the pavement, in and out of the road, does not join up with crossings and does not even</p>

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>
<p>that the scheme which was consulted upon 12 months ago can now go to final detailed drawings. We know from the experience of the Botley Road that any work on the Banbury Road is not going to see the light of day for a very long time and with the uncertainty in construction costs, it would be better to use that money to see one project on the Woodstock Road completed.</p>	<p>reach the primary school which is on the road. Whatever project we bring forward has got to address those things, particularly with increased pressures coming from large scale development to the north. I am very happy to work with the local Members to achieve those benefits as soon as we can.</p>
<p><b>2. COUNCILLOR SUSSANA PRESSEL</b></p> <p>I strongly support the traffic filters in principle, and I'd like to thank all members of Cabinet for the enormous amount of work you are putting in on this issue and many others.</p> <p>Everyone in my division certainly agrees that something <b>MUST</b> be done urgently about congestion, pollution and accidents in Botley Road, Frideswide Square and Thames Street. The city centre seems to be gridlocked at most peak hours and every weekend, because of cars queuing for the car parks. However, the residents all think that the current proposals will <i>increase</i> traffic in these streets. Even our officers admit that this is the case! If <i>all the traffic</i> to the Westgate car park and to Worcester Street car park has to come along Botley Road, with no traffic filter to stop them, conditions will be even worse than they are now, which</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT AND COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL &amp; DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b></p> <p>The consultation for the traffic filters concluded on 13 Oct. This was extended by 10 days due to the late Queen Elizabeth's mourning period. Officers are now collating and analysing the results of that consultation to report to Cabinet on November 2022. Any proposed changes to the scheme as a result of the consultation, including those related to residents' permits, will be reported to Cabinet.</p> <p>Officers responded to Cllr Pressel on 9 September explaining the rationale for the location of traffic filters but specifically the filter on Thames Street. There are far ranging reasons but in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better opportunities for bus, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure on the Botley Road as well as general</li> </ul>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>would be intolerable.</p> <p>I have come up with several ways of reducing the traffic and I hope you will bear them in mind. Firstly, you could move the Thames Street filter slightly and send the traffic for the Westgate car park along Abingdon Road instead. That has the advantage that traffic from that direction has plenty of space to queue, without blocking other traffic. Secondly, you could decide not to give 100 free permits to residents in Botley, North Hinksey and Cumnor. Why on earth would we want to encourage people from outside the City to drive into town, past a large park and ride facility?! Thirdly, you could make charges at Seacourt Park and Ride even cheaper and advertise this clearly to all traffic approaching from the west. Fourthly, you could have a sign before the park and ride telling motorists how long they are likely to queue for the car parks. Fifthly, you could arrange for the City Council to raise the prices in their city centre car parks, so that you can put pressure on the Westgate to raise their parking charges still further.</p> <p>Will you please adopt at least some of these suggestions – or come up with better ways of reducing traffic in Botley Road - so that residents in my division will know that you are heeding their anger and despair?</p>	<p>traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Botley Road is shortest route to the city centre with existing bus lanes</li> <li>• The need for safe places for prohibited traffic to turn around</li> <li>• By having filters on Thames Street and Hythe Bridge Street, this will remove much of the non-city centre bound traffic from key areas such as Frideswide Square which is hoped will result in smoother traffic flow through this and surrounding junctions</li> </ul> <p>The traffic model we are using to test the likely impacts of the traffic filter proposals has predicted an increase in traffic levels on Botley Road west of the junction with Seacourt Park and Ride by around an average 10% across a typical weekday, whereas on Hythe Bridge Street traffic is forecast to reduce by around an average 50% across a typical weekday. On the inner section of Botley Road at Osney Bridge, weekday flows are expected to reduce by 4% but it is acknowledged there is a risk of increases in traffic at certain times of the day as a result of the traffic filters.</p> <p>Should the trial be approved at Cabinet on 29 November, officers could develop and implement a detailed plan for managing Botley Road traffic with the traffic filters in place, and in particular this would include the monitoring of traffic flows and air quality around Westgate and on Botley Road to</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
	<p>identify any particular concerns. The expansion of Seacourt Park and Ride, and very recent introduction of a combined parking and bus ticket, at the same time as an increase in Westgate car parking charges should even now encourage more people and groups travelling to the city centre to use Park and Ride services.</p> <p>Officers would investigate what could form part of a comprehensive signage strategy to support the introduction of the traffic filters including variable message signage at key points on the network informing motorists of traffic conditions.</p>
<p><b>3. COUNCILLOR SUSSANA PRESSEL</b></p> <p>If the trial scheme for traffic filters goes ahead and if congestion, pollution and accidents do not reduce sufficiently in Botley Road, Frideswide Square and Thames Street as a result, what will you do?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT AND COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL &amp; DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b></p> <p>The results of monitoring will be used to assess the need for changes to the scheme if it is not achieving the scheme objectives.</p>



