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 requested 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: 229 November 2022

Response to report:

Cabinet welcomes the report of the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee on this important scheme.

Cabinet's responses to the Committee's recommendations are below.

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

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

Response to recommendations:

| Ref | Recommendation | Accepted, rejected or partially accepted | Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected) |
|-----|---|--|---|
| R1 | 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. | Partially accepted | This will be reviewed during the trial in light of monitoring. Reducing the number of residential passes may reduce traffic in some areas, but increase it in others – including the A34 and ring road. The current number of passes (100 for the Oxford area, 25 for the rest of Oxfordshire) is considered to be an appropriate balance for the start of the experimental scheme. |
| R2 | That the Council implements the policy that universal passes should be made available only to Oxfordshire residents | Accepted | Complete – approved scheme includes this change. |
| R3 | 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 | Rejected | Traffic modelling has been undertaken to give a view on the likely impacts of the traffic filters under a number of published scenarios. It is the view of officers that additional day passes outside of Oxford would have limited impact on the aims of the objectives of the scheme. It is therefore not deemed a good use of public funds to undertake further modelling scenarios that are |

| | | | not expected to yield significantly different results. The best way to test day passes will be through the trial itself. |
|----|--|--------------------|---|
| R4 | That the Council consults with the Street Voice Citizens' Jury members on the optimal number of residential traffic filter passes | Partially accepted | This will be reviewed during the trial in light of monitoring and consultation feedback. We can engage with the Citizens' Jury members as part of the consultation. |
| R5 | That the Council undertakes representative polling of the public about the traffic filters alongside the ETRO consultation | Partially accepted | Subject to acceptable cost estimates, this could be done during the ETRO consultation period once the scheme is in operation. |
| R6 | 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 | Rejected | It is likely that most vans will be used by legitimate businesses. The signage approved by the Department for Transport for the scheme uses the lorry symbol (below) to signify the goods vehicle exemption and encompasses all goods vehicles, including vans. Vans could potentially be excluded using a minimum weight (i.e. 'over 3.5 tonnes'). However, this would require further DfT approval, and increasing the complexity of the signage would make the signage less understandable and therefore less enforceable. |

| | | | Requiring all business vans to have permits would generate significant additional administration costs. |
|----|---|-----------------------|--|
| | | | The proposals seek to minimise large vehicles turning around at the filter locations, for safety reasons. |
| | | | Van use will be monitored during the trial. |
| R7 | That the Council provides a clear definition to the term 'car club' in order to prevent gaming | Accepted | Complete – the final scheme only extends this exemption to "qualifying" car clubs – which will be defined in the ETRO. |
| R8 | That the Council publishes the advice and reasoning on which the recommendation to delay the start date of the trial is based | Partially Accepted | Legal advice is not generally published unless written with a view to publication. However, officers will publish the reasons behind the delayed start. |
| R9 | 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 | Rejected | No timing changes were recommended in Annex 4 for Hythe Bridge Street. This will operate 7am – 7pm. For Hollow Way and Marston Ferry Road, Cabinet approval has been given for the filters to |
| | | | operate 7am – 7pm if needed. However, shorter operating hours (7am – 9am and 3pm – 6pm) will be tried first, and monitored against the scheme's objectives. If the objectives are not |

| | | | being met, the operating hours may be extended. |
|-----|---|--------------------|---|
| R10 | That the Council removes 'until 2024' from its recommendation to delay the start date for the trial in Annex 4 | Accepted | Complete – there was no reference to a 2024 start date in the final Cabinet report |
| R11 | That the Council reviews the impact of proposals with a view to improving the ease of egress for users of Redbridge Park and Ride | Accepted | All P&R sites will be monitored during the trial, including vehicular flows in and out of the sites. Changes to traffic management arrangements will be considered where needed. |
| R12 | That the Council undertakes work around Personal Travel Planning alongside the Traffic Filters proposals | Partially accepted | Council officers will work with schools, employers and other major traffic generators in the city on this although, as ever, funding and resources available will require a degree of prioritisation. |