

Appendix 3

Comments from Environment Scrutiny Committee – 19th December 2005

Officers Report

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Comments / Suggested changes</i>	<i>Officer response</i>
4.7	<p>Need to highlight existing lack of Park & Ride capacity, and should make increase in P&R capacity more urgent.</p> <p>e.g. in last sentence of para 4.7, “potential future demands” should be replaced with “current and future demands”.</p>	Agree suggested change
4.14	LEZ feasibility study should be undertaken <u>next year</u>	Agree suggested change
4.16	Money proposed for cycle network development is not enough. Details of the County Cycling & Walking strategy reviews are required.	Agree suggested change, although given the LTP timescale it is unlikely in practice that details of the Cycling & Walking reviews will be available for consultation prior to submission of the LTP in March 2006.
4.19	Re. Botley Road Railway Bridge, add to end of para 4.19: “...and/or provide an alternative route for pedestrians and cyclists.”	Agree suggested change
4.22	Support CPZ in Cowley Templar’s Square area, highlighted significant parking problems & requested that Templar’s Square CPZ should have some degree of priority.	Agree suggested change
4.24	Need to emphasise seriousness of HAMATS transport problems.	This issue is already highlighted in the proposed response to County, but agree wording can be further strengthened.

Response to County Council (Appendix 2)

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Comments / Suggested changes</i>	<i>Officer response</i>
1.5	Include something along lines of "our comments do not appear to have been taken on board so far."	Agree suggested change
3.2	Add something to express disappointment that Transport Innovation Grant not applied for, which should have been spent on City transport schemes.	Agree suggested change
3.3	<p>Report should clarify what is meant by "radical restraint-based measures".</p> <p>Some members sought inclusion of a reference to congestion charging being considered as an option. Others felt a workplace parking levy would be preferable to congestion charging.</p> <p>Some members suggested that light trams should be considered as an option.</p>	<p>The proposed response to County refers to possible measures such as a workplace parking levy and Low Emissions Zone. Officers consider these to be the most realistic options in Oxford.</p> <p>However, Executive Board may wish to consider whether congestion charging and light trams should be added as options.</p>
3.5	Re. third sentence on increasing capacity of Park & Ride sites: change "this is likely to be necessary" to "this is already necessary".	Agree suggested change
10.1-10.3	Bus strategy – should highlight the need for off-bus ticketing arrangements to improve bus boarding times.	Agree suggested change

Additional Members' comments

	<i>Comments / Suggested changes</i>	<i>Officer response</i>
Additional	Ask Executive Board to consider whether the Portfolio Holder should contact local MP's and the DfT to express the City Council's substantial reservations about the	Whilst Officers share Members reservations about the emerging LTP, it is necessary for us to work in partnership with

	LTP.	the County Council. This course of action could undermine the credibility of the LTP with the Government, which may be counter-productive in terms of future funding.
Additional	Access to Oxford strategy should consider option of preventing parking in High Street.	Agree suggested change
Additional	Need to spell out objection to County Council's free on-street parking proposals.	County Council is already aware of the City Council's views, but these can be reiterated if necessary.