

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT SCRUTINY REPORTS FOR CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD THURSDAY 10 SEPTEMBER 2015

5. Scrutiny Committees Reports

The following Scrutiny Committee reports have been submitted in this supplementary agenda following the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 7 September 2015:

Comments and recommendations on the following CEB reports:

- Leisure & Wellbeing Strategy 2016-2020
- Oxford Growth Strategy
- Integrated Performance Q1 – no comments from Scrutiny Committee

Finance Panel

- Municipal Bonds

Other

- Report of the Cycling Review Group
- Report of the Waste Water Flooding Panel

a) Leisure & Wellbeing Strategy 2016-2020 (Pages 7 - 10)

The Scrutiny Officer has submitted a report which details comments from the Scrutiny Committee on the Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy 2016-2020 report.

Recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

1. That the City Council looks into extending the functionality of its mobile apps to enable leisure bookings.

2. That the City Council's Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy includes a greater emphasis on strengthening integration between leisure centres and the broader leisure offer, including community centres.
3. That the City Council continues to monitor the accessibility of leisure provision across Oxford, including in those parts of the city that have no swimming pools within a 20 walk, such as Littlemore and Cowley, and how this relates to leisure target groups (the Committee noted that corporate performance measure LP106: To increase participation at our leisure centres by target groups was below target for 2015/16 quarter 1).

b) Oxford Growth Strategy (Pages 11 - 16)

The Scrutiny Officer has submitted a report which details comments from the Scrutiny Committee and Housing Panel on the Oxford Growth Strategy report.

Recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendation:

1. That the Council's strategic approach to providing new affordable housing should be aligned with, and referenced in, the Oxford Growth Strategy.
2. That the Oxford Growth Strategy includes a greater emphasis on mobile working and the opportunities presented by Better Broadband for Oxfordshire.

c) Report of the Scrutiny Finance Panel - Municipal Bonds (Pages 17 - 22)

The Scrutiny Committee has submitted a report from the Finance Panel relating to Municipal Bonds which includes the suggested City Executive Board response provided by the Portfolio Holder.

Recommendation of the Finance Panel to the City Executive Board:

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

1. That the City Council welcomes the establishment of the Municipal Bonds Agency as a worthwhile social investment vehicle and source of capital financing.
2. That the City Council doesn't make significant investments in the Municipal Bonds Agency or borrow from it at this stage but keeps a watching brief on the Agency and considers it as a future source of prudential borrowing.
3. That the Executive Member for Finance, in consultation with the Head of Financial Services, considers the case for the City Council making a £10k capital investment to become a minimum shareholder in the Municipal Bonds Agency before its first bond issuance, which is expected to take place in September 2015. This investment would be made with no guarantee of a return but it would secure preferential interest rates on any future Council borrowing. The Executive Member for Finance is asked to report on the outcome of his deliberations at the September City Executive Board meeting.
4. That in considering whether to make a minimal investment (Recommendation 3), the Head of Financial Services speaks with one or more District Councils that have already signed up as shareholders in the Agency.

d) Report of the Cycling Review Group (Pages 23 - 60)

The Scrutiny Committee has submitted a report from the Cycling Review Group which includes the suggested City Executive Board response provided by the Portfolio Holder.

Recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

1. That the City Council's unallocated cycling capital budget (approx. £110k over two years) should be used to fund the lower cost Cycling Review Group wish-list items in order of priority. The highest priority is signing City Council route 5, extending to Littlemore and the Leys Pool. This should include signing cyclists onto this route from key destinations such as Oxford Business Park, Vue Cinema and Oxford Academy.
2. That the wish-list of cycling improvement projects drawn up by the Cycling Review Group, with advice from Cyclox and Sustrans, should be used to decide how future City and County Council funding for cycling improvements is spent. Flexibility should be applied so that new opportunities can also be funded where this is appropriate.
3. That the City Council encourages the police and Direct Services to proactively send reusable abandoned bikes to Broken Spoke and other bike shops that are happy to take part, so that as many of these bikes as possible can be refurbished and reused locally.
4. That the City Council ensures that developer funding can be used to contribute to cycling improvements where appropriate, including by:
 - a) Ensuring that the City Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) list is consistent with funding the higher cost cycling improvement projects set out in our wish-list, next time the CIL list is reviewed;
 - b) Using CIL funding as a local contribution to attract match funding, for example from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, for cycling improvement schemes in accordance with the Council's CIL list (often these will be part of wider transport improvement schemes);
 - c) Alerting Ward Members when significant sums (we suggest >£5k) of the 'neighbourhood portion' of CIL have been allocated to their local area. We would encourage members to consider spending this funding on lower cost cycling improvement schemes from our wish-list where possible.
5. That the City Council ensures that its planning policies are consistent with its vision for Oxford to become one of the great cycling cities of Europe, including by:
 - a) Ensuring that cycling routes and provision are considered and included in all major new developments, prioritising cycling and pedestrian access;
 - b) Reviewing and updating planning policies relating to cycle parking standards for non-residential cycle parking, as part of the next full or partial review of the Local Plan.
6. That the Council Leader or Board Member for Planning and Transport writes to the County Council and requests that they do the following in consultation with the City Council:
 - a) Implement the Cycle Super Routes and Cycle Premium Routes as soon as possible;
 - b) Bring together cycling organisations, county highways planners and highway engineers to agree a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford, drawing on findings from the London Cycling Campaign. This should include priority phasing of traffic lights for cyclists;

- c) Consider how cycle routes can be signed more consistently and what the standard should be. We suggest that destinations and distances, rather than route numbers, should be shown on cycle signage;
 - d) Agree that highway maintenance works should not be signed off until they are safe and suitable for cycling;
 - e) Work with Government and other local authorities to implement the All Party Parliamentary Group recommendation to achieve a £10 per head of population investment in cycling.
7. That the City Council nominates a Member Cycling Champion (a Councillor) to lead on work to improve cycling in Oxford at a political level and maximise the City Council's influence.
8. That the City Council brings forward proposals for additional staffing resources to enable the City Council to engage proactively with cycling groups, work smarter with the County Council, and support the member champion (see recommendation 7). We would suggest 1 FTE dedicated to cycling, with a creative solution to funding this post which may involve other organisations. This role should include:
- a) Supporting the Member Cycling Champion (see recommendation 6) in convening a forum of the different cycling groups and representatives of other stakeholders such as schools to co-ordinate efforts and agree a common position when lobbying for cycling improvement schemes;
 - b) Engaging with the County Council to maximise the City Council's influence as LTP4 is put into practice;
 - c) Influencing the development of a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford (see recommendation 5e);
 - d) Monitoring the County Council's Highway Asset Management Strategy (road repairs) to identify opportunities for cycling provision to be improved during planned maintenance works (we have identified 4 such projects);
 - e) Examining existing evidence on what works for improving cycling take up;
 - f) Promoting active travel to school through Bikeability training and advocacy, particularly at the beginning of every academic year. Excellence in this area should be recognised perhaps through the Lord Mayor/Member Champion going in to schools to give prizes, or inviting winners to attend civic events.
 - g) Identifying ways to change motorists' behaviour.
9. That the City Council promotes positive images of cycling in Council literature, particularly the soon to be signed route to Blackbird Leys pool.

e) Report of the Waste Water Flooding Panel (Pages 61 - 64)

The Scrutiny Committee has submitted a report from the Waste Water Flooding Panel.

Recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendation:

1. That the City Council continues to engage with Thames Water Utilities (TWU) at a senior level through the Oxford Area Flood Partnership and other appropriate channels. This should include early engagement in relation to future development proposals that affect TWU.

This page is intentionally left blank

To: City Executive Board

Date: 10 September 2015

Report of: Scrutiny Committee

Title of Report: Leisure & Wellbeing Strategy 2015-20

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To present recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee on the Leisure & Wellbeing Strategy

Key decision? Yes

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Craig Simmons

Executive lead member: Councillor Mike Rowley, Board Member for Leisure, Parks and Sport

Policy Framework: Corporate Plan priority – Strong & Active Communities

Recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

1. That the City Council looks into extending the functionality of its mobile apps to enable leisure bookings.

2. That the City Council's Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy includes a greater emphasis on strengthening integration between leisure centres and the broader leisure offer, including community centres.

3. That the City Council continues to monitor the accessibility of leisure provision across Oxford, including in those parts of the city that have no swimming pools within a 20 walk, such as Littlemore and Cowley, and how this relates to leisure target groups (the Committee noted that corporate performance measure LP106: To increase participation at our leisure centres by target groups was below target for 2015/16 quarter 1).

Introduction

1. The Scrutiny Committee reviewed the Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy at its public meeting on 7 September 2015. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Rowley and Ian Brooke for presenting this item. The Committee would also like to thank a public speaker for his useful contribution which helped to inform the Committee's questioning.
2. The Strategy had previously gone to the City Executive Board (CEB) at the pre-consultation stage so the Committee focused the majority of its discussion on how the City Council had responded to feedback received in the consultation.

Summary of the discussion

3. A public speaker said that compared to the population of Oxford 100 consultation responses was very low and questioned the methodology used. The public speaker also said that the consultation questions were very bland and questioned whether they represented a serious attempt to find out what people really want.
4. In response to a question about black and minority ethnic participation, the Community Services Manager said the consultation had also included meetings with representatives of community groups, Public Health, the County Sports Partnership, teachers and focus groups. The Committee heard that taken together, the data gathered provided a robust view. The Committee heard that the consistent message received in the consultation responses was that the Council could be better at communicating the leisure service offering.
5. In response to a question about the new Bungee mobile app for young people, the Committee heard that this had been schools-led and was something that could help with improving communication. The Committee questioned whether service users could use Council apps to book classes or crèches at leisure facilities and heard that this was not currently possible.

Recommendation 1 – That the City Council looks into extending the functionality of its mobile apps to enable leisure bookings.

6. The Committee also suggested that the strategy should include more emphasis on integrating leisure facilities with the city's broader leisure offer, which included anywhere that sport and physical activity could take place, such as community centres and community buildings such as schools, churches and village halls.

Recommendation 2 – That the City Council's Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy includes a greater emphasis on strengthening integration between leisure centres and the broader leisure offer, including community centres.

7. The public speaker also highlighted the Facilities Planning Model maps and noted that there was little or no difference in the 2014 and 2025 charts. The Committee heard that there was a severe lack of provision in the 'blue spaces'

(areas of the city not within 20 minutes walking time of one or more swimming pools). This included the area previously served by Temple Cowley Pools, which was where many of the Council's 'target groups' lived and had the greatest rate of population increase in the city. The Panel heard that many of the former users of Temple Cowley Pools, particularly the older users, had not switched to using the new facility at Blackbird Leys.

8. The Community Services Manager said that the Council had invested in facilities and that leisure centre usage had increased, especially amongst target groups. The Council had used Sport England models which showed that the city as a whole was well served for leisure provision. The Committee heard that lots of users of Temple Cowley Pools had transferred to Blackbird Leys, which was performing very well in terms of visitor numbers, some of whom were travelling in to the city. However, Temple Cowley Pools had been more accessible for some. The Council had recently invested in providing a new gym at Oxford Spires School, which was not yet accessible.
9. The Committee noted that the strategy contained no mention of the closure of Temple Cowley Pools, or of monitoring its impact. The Board Member said that the focus of the strategy was on the city as a whole, and while there was not a general gap in provision, the City Council would continue to monitor where gaps are identified.

Recommendation 3 – That the City Council continues to monitor the accessibility of leisure provision across Oxford, including in those parts of the city that have no swimming pools within a 20 walk, such as Littlemore and Cowley, and how this relates to leisure target groups (the Committee noted that corporate performance measure LP106: To increase participation at our leisure centres by target groups was below target for 2015/16 quarter 1).

10. The Committee also asked questions about private leisure centre usage, cycling, whether the targets for increasing leisure centre usage were viable and the financial cost of delivering the strategy. The Board Member said that providing an overall figure would be misleading, as some money had been budgeted for and other figures would be conjecture.

Further consideration

11. The Committee requested an update on facility running costs, including capital and revenue spend, following on from a scrutiny recommendation on the Fusion Lifestyle Performance 2013-2014 report, in June 2014.
12. The Committee later noted that a corporate performance measure - LP106: To increase participation at our leisure centres by target groups - was below target and wished to question how this related to evidence presented on Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy.

Name and contact details of author:-

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee
Scrutiny Officer
Law and Governance
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: abrown2@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers: None
Version number: 1.0

To: City Executive Board

Date: 10 September 2015

Report of: Scrutiny Committee

Title of Report: Oxford Growth Strategy

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To present recommendations from the Housing Panel on the Oxford Growth Strategy

Key decision? Yes

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Craig Simmons

Executive lead member: Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Board Member for Transport, Planning and Regulatory Services

Policy Framework: Corporate Plan priority 'Meeting Housing Needs' in particular sub-objective 3 'Reviewing the Green Belt'.

Recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendation:

- 1. That the Council's strategic approach to providing new affordable housing should be aligned with, and referenced in, the Oxford Growth Strategy.**
- 2. That the Oxford Growth Strategy includes a greater emphasis on mobile working and the opportunities presented by Better Broadband for Oxfordshire.**

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Notes of Oxford Growth Strategy discussion at the Housing Panel meeting on 3 September 2015

Introduction

1. The Chair of Scrutiny requested to pre-scrutinise the Oxford Growth Strategy decision and this was placed on both the agendas for both the Housing Panel on 3 September and the Scrutiny Committee on 7 September.

2. The Scrutiny Committee would like to thank Councillor Hollingsworth, Matthew Bates and Lyndsey Beveridge for presenting this item to the Housing Panel and answering the Panel's questions. The notes of this discussion were circulated to the Scrutiny Committee and are attached as appendix 1.
3. The Committee would also like to thank Councillor Price and David Edwards for attending the Scrutiny Committee meeting to discuss the work of the Oxfordshire Growth Board and for staying to support the Committee's discussion on the Oxford Growth Strategy.

Summary of the discussion

4. The Chair of the Housing Panel said that the Panel had received good answers its questions the Panel and was broadly supportive of urban extensions to Oxford with improved transport links.
5. The Committee questioned whether the strategy could provide more analysis of how growth would affect social housing. The Leader of the Council said that there were both economic and demographic growth pressures in the city and that delivering 28,000-30,000 would be a huge challenge. The City Council required that 50% of new housing within the city was provided as affordable housing. However, the city had no such policy levers for new housing located outside the city boundaries as other authorities' local plans were sovereign.
6. The Committee also heard that the city also lacks an integrated transport system, and was unlikely to get one. The challenges around growth were not limited to Oxford but were particularly acute in the city. The Executive Director for Regeneration and Housing said that market housing would be needed to fund infrastructure improvements but that a proportion of new housing could be provided as key worker housing. The Committee heard that the Council had not reached the stage of developing parameters yet so any such opportunities sketched out in the strategy would be speculative.
7. The Committee noted that the Inequality Panel had recommended that factors around inequality should be considered in all major Council strategies. The Committee suggested that affordable housing should at least be alluded to at strategy level and that there were strategic opportunities to deliver affordable housing without affecting the sovereignty of local plans, such as through investing in 'real lettings'. The Committee noted the need for strategic thinking about affordable housing that aligns with this Strategy.

Recommendation 1 – That the Council's strategic approach to providing new affordable housing should be aligned with, and referenced in, the Oxford Growth Strategy.

8. The Committee noted that increasing patterns of mobile working meant that distributed housing was becoming more feasible. Better Broadband for Oxfordshire provided such opportunities and the Committee suggested that this should be reflected in the Strategy.

Recommendation 2 – That the Oxford Growth Strategy includes a greater emphasis on mobile working and the opportunities presented by Better Broadband for Oxfordshire.

Name and contact details of author:-

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee
Scrutiny Officer
Law and Governance
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: abrown2@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers: None
Version number: 1.0

Appendix 1 - Notes of Oxford Growth Strategy discussion at the Housing Panel meeting on 3 September 2015

The Board Member for Transport, Planning and Regulatory Services introduced the report and explained that it contained nothing substantially new but provided a useful summary of the current position.

A Principal Planning Officer highlighted an error on page 96 of the paperwork (paragraph 17 of the report), where '£50,000 for Vale of the White Horse and South Oxfordshire Examinations' should read '£50,000 for Vale of the White Horse and West Oxfordshire Examinations'.

The Panel questioned whether the Council had looked at potentially cheaper alternatives to the proposed additional resources, such as co-funding some of this work on a county-wide basis. The Panel heard that there was a joint working process but not full agreement on some issues, so there was a need for the City Council to frontload evidence to the Oxfordshire Growth Board. Two districts were trying to evidence that Oxford's housing needs could be met within Oxford, for example through the removal of height restrictions and certain environmental protections. The City Council was identifying sites on the edge of the city for housing development and the Districts were not necessarily keen to carry out such work on a joint basis.

The Panel asked whether there was scope for the City Council to negotiate on issues such as housing density and height restrictions in the city, or to consider sites outside the city on major transport routes, in order to find middle ground and seek agreement with the districts. The Panel heard that there had been positive engagement with some districts and less positive engagement with others. The Board Member advised that finding solutions to Oxford's unmet housing need would require difficult decisions about sustainability that would have to balance a range of views. However the evidence that Oxford's housing need far out-scaled its capacity meant that progress was now being made towards agreement of Oxford's unmet housing need that would need to be met outside of the district. The Board Member advised that the housing need figure that the City Council had agreed to accept [from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment] as a working assumption for the purposes of calculating the unmet element, was at the lower end of future projections and would not meet the affordable housing needs by some way.

The Board Member advised that height restrictions were very important to the character of Oxford but that did not mean that a completely flat skyline would be desirable. Some higher developments on selected sites could be appropriate if they are carefully designed, such as potentially at the Oxpens site.

The Board Member advised that the City Council would consider whether high density housing would be appropriate on future development sites. It was unlikely that there were streets of older housing within the city that could feasibly be redeveloped and replaced with new housing blocks, as suggested by a Panel member.

The Panel expressed disappointment that so far, only student accommodation had been allocated on the Oxpens site. The Panel heard that the City Council was awaiting the latest plans for selling the site from the landowner, London and Continental Railways.

A Principal Planning Officer advised that the City Council had assessed that there was capacity for 10,368 additional housing units in Oxford in the period from 2011-31. This was a slight increase on the figure given in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), and was a significant increase from the SHLAA in previous years. This was a very ambitious figure that made some very optimistic assumptions about density and overcoming constraints, and hence it should be seen as an absolute upper limit.

The Panel questioned what else the City Council was doing to get its message across. The Panel heard that the City Council was seeking to influence districts' local plans and had successfully pushed for a 2 year time frame for Cherwell to review its local plan. South Oxfordshire (SODC) would be the last of the 4 neighbouring districts to review its local plan, with examination anticipated in late 2016. SODC's latest draft assumed a contribution of 3,000 new homes towards meeting Oxford's unmet housing need, and considered three sites; land South of Grenoble Road, Wick Farm north-east of Barton, and a new settlement near Lewknor off junction 7 of the M40 motorway. The Board Member advised that he was not confident that Grenoble Road would be SODC's preferred option.

The Panel questioned who owned land South of Grenoble Road and how many houses could be accommodated on this site. Principal Planning Officers advised that this depended on the size parcel of land in question but that the site could accommodate at least 4,000 homes. The City Council, Thames Water Utilities, Magdalen College were the major land owners.

The Panel asked whether improved transport links would be part of any urban extension of Oxford and heard that this would be part of the detailed work including routes for cycling, walking and buses. The Board Member advised that the Cowley branch line represented an opportunity to improve public transport in that part of the city, along with new or extended bus routes. More ambitious options, such as trams, were unlikely.

The City Council was also continuing to engage at Leader and officer level and using political persuasion and argument to challenge undesirable alternative options, such as developments near Swindon or in more distant Oxfordshire villages, which would be less suitable for meeting Oxford's needs. The preferred option for meeting Oxford's needs is through sustainable urban extensions around the edge of the City. The City Council's position had been clearly represented in local media. The City Council was also making a technical and political case to national government.

This page is intentionally left blank

To: City Executive Board

Date: 10 September 2015

Report of: Finance Panel (Panel of the Scrutiny Committee)

Title of Report: Municipal Bonds

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To present recommendations from the Finance Panel following an item on municipal bonds

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Simmons

Executive lead member: Councillor Ed Turner, Executive Member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health

Recommendation of the Finance Panel to the City Executive Board

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

- 1. That the City Council welcomes the establishment of the Municipal Bonds Agency as a worthwhile social investment vehicle and source of capital financing.**
- 2. That the City Council doesn't make significant investments in the Municipal Bonds Agency or borrow from it at this stage but keeps a watching brief on the Agency and considers it as a future source of prudential borrowing.**
- 3. That the Executive Member for Finance, in consultation with the Head of Financial Services, considers the case for the City Council making a £10k capital investment to become a minimum shareholder in the Municipal Bonds Agency before its first bond issuance, which is expected to take place in September 2015. This investment would be made with no guarantee of a return but it would secure preferential interest rates on any future Council borrowing. The Executive Member for Finance is asked to report on the outcome of his deliberations at the September City Executive Board meeting.**
- 4. That in considering whether to make a minimal investment (Recommendation 3), the Head of Financial Services speaks with one or more District Councils that have already signed up as shareholders in the Agency.**

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Suggested executive response provided by the Board Member

Introduction

1. The Finance Panel convened a discussion on municipal bonds at its public meeting on 2 July 2015. The Panel is grateful to Christian Wall from the Municipal Bonds Agency for attending this meeting to provide a presentation and answer the Panel's questions. The Panel would also like to thank Nigel Kennedy and Anna Winship for contributing to this discussion.
2. This meeting followed on from a previous Finance Panel item on 8 October 2014, where the Panel reviewed documentation on the establishment of the Municipal Bonds Agency and a briefing note from the Head of Financial Services.

Summary of the discussion

3. Christian Wall from the Municipal Bonds Agency provided a presentation which set out the vision, model, credit structure and governance of the Agency, together with an overview of the market for local authority borrowing.
4. The Panel asked how much capital the Agency had raised and heard that it has raised £5.8m against an original target of £8-10m, which would include a buffer to ensure that the Agency was sufficiently capitalised to cover the worst case scenario. The Agency would obtain credit ratings from two agencies once it had secured £6m of capital. It expected to do so imminently and issue bonds in September 2015. The agency would break even once it had issued 1.6-2bn worth of bonds and expected to pay dividends from year 5.
5. In response to a question, the Panel heard that 54 local authorities had signed up to the Agency. The Local Government Association was the largest shareholder, having invested £0.5m and a County Council was the next largest shareholder at £350k. About 12 District Councils had invested the minimum shareholding amount of £10k. Investments were made with no guarantee of a return but they would secure a preferential interest rate on future borrowing.
6. The Panel heard that local authorities that had expressed an interest in the Agency but opted not to sign up had done so because they didn't need to borrow, not because they had a problem with the concept.
7. The Panel asked how long local authorities needed to hold shares for in order to obtain a preferential interest rate. The Panel heard that the preferential rate was not dependent on the amount invested or how long shares were held for, so long as the investment was made before the first bond issuance.
8. The Agency's directors were still to agree the level of the premium on borrowing for local authorities that joined later. The Agency aimed to provide preferential and non-preferential interest rates that were both lower than that offered by the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) (currently 80 basis points). The Agency expected its rates to track the PWLB rate over time, as Transport for London had done, so there would still be an incentive for non-shareholding local authorities to borrow from the Agency rather than the PWLB, even if the PWLB lowered their rate.

9. The Panel noted that Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA) included borrowing in future years. In recent years, the Council's borrowing requirements had been met through internal borrowing. However, it was possible that recent national policy changes would result in substantial changes to the Council's HRA business plan and potentially, the Council's future borrowing requirements.

Recommendations:

1. That the City Council welcomes the establishment of the Municipal Bonds Agency as a worthwhile social investment vehicle and source of capital financing.

2. That the City Council doesn't make significant investments in the Municipal Bonds Agency or borrow from it at this stage but keeps a watching brief on the Agency and considers it as a future source of prudential borrowing.

3. That the Executive Member for Finance, in consultation with the Head of Financial Services, considers the case for the City Council making a £10k capital investment to become a minimum shareholder in the Municipal Bonds Agency before its first bond issuance, which is expected to take place in September 2015. This investment would be made with no guarantee of a return but it would secure preferential interest rates on any future Council borrowing. The Executive Member for Finance is asked to report on the outcome of his deliberations at the September City Executive Board meeting.

4. That in considering whether to make a minimal investment (Recommendation 3), the Head of Financial Services speaks with one or more District Councils that have already signed up as shareholders in the Agency.

Name and contact details of author:-

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee
Scrutiny Officer
Law and Governance
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: abrown2@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers: None
Version number: 2.0

Suggested executive response provided by the Board Member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health

Recommendation	Agreed? (Y / N / In part)	Comment	Board Member / Lead Officer
1. That the City Council welcomes the establishment of the Municipal Bonds Agency as a worthwhile social investment vehicle and source of capital financing.	Y	Agreed. The City Council welcomes the establishment as an alternative source of financing to PWLB	Cllr Ed Turner / Nigel Kennedy
2. That the City Council doesn't make significant investments in the Municipal Bonds Agency or borrow from it at this stage but keeps a watching brief on the Agency and considers it as a future source of prudential borrowing.	Y	Agreed. There is still some uncertainty about the rate of return any investor would get from investing in the Municipal Bond Agency if indeed there would be any at all. There are no plans to undertake prudential borrowing in the immediate future to fund capital expenditure and given latest announcements from the Chancellors Budget in July the authority will be looking to reassess all its future spending plans. When and if the authority has a requirement to borrow then it will consider all sources of finance.	Cllr Ed Turner / Nigel Kennedy
3. That the Executive Member for Finance, in consultation with the Head of Financial Services, considers the case for the City Council making a £10k capital investment to become a minimum shareholder in the Municipal Bonds Agency before its first bond issuance, which is expected to take place in September 2015. This investment would be made with no guarantee of a return but it would secure preferential interest rates on any future Council borrowing.	In Part	There still remains uncertainty as to the rationale behind investing in the MBA since the Council currently has no requirement to borrow in the immediate future. The preferential rate referred to (and mentioned at the Finance Panel by the representative of the MBA) is not referred to in any of the documentation submitted to the Council and therefore cannot be validated. Information obtained from the Council Treasury advisors, Capita suggest that there remains a number of unanswered questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early paperwork from the MBA referred to a 'new issue premium' in the first year or two, it is uncertain whether early joiner borrowing authorities would voluntarily pay a higher interest rate 	Cllr Ed Turner / Nigel Kennedy

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a joint and several guarantee for investors, whilst this would presumably be in proportion to holding there may be a risk to the authority • How flexible can the agency be around bond maturities and how will ensure that its meets the requirements of its customers in terms of size, duration and interest rate. • The MBA representative mentioned that the preferential rate for investors would be 2 or 3 basis points below the preferential bond rate for other investors (although this is by no means certain). Additionally rates move quickly and this differential could be wiped out quickly even before the overall costs of the bond are taken into consideration. <p>Due to the level of uncertainties although a £10k 'hedge' may be seen as relatively small in the scale of the Council's overall finances there are a number of important questions which need to be answered before such funds should be committed. Officers will undertake to investigate answers to these questions and either commit £10k if the answers suggest investment would be in the interests of the Council, or report back to CEB and Scrutiny within the next three months with the outcome of the investigation.</p>	
4. That in considering whether to make a minimal investment (Recommendation 3), the Head of Financial Services speaks with one or more District Councils that have already signed up as shareholders in the Agency.	In part	The MBA advise that there are 10 authorities who have invested £10k with the fund although it is not known who they are. To some extent it is irrelevant as to the reason why other authorities have invested in the fund since it is a matter of judgement for the Section 151 Officer of this authority in consultation with the Finance and Asset Portfolio Holder to decide whether to invest.	Cllr Ed Turner / Nigel Kennedy

This page is intentionally left blank

To: City Executive Board

Date: 10 September 2015

Report of: The Scrutiny Committee

Title of Report: Report of the Cycling Review Group

Summary and recommendations

Purpose of report: To present the recommendations of the Cycling Review Group

Key decision? No

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Louise Upton

Executive lead member: Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Executive Member for Planning, Transport and Regulatory Services

Policy Framework: Strong and Active Communities & Cleaner, Greener Oxford

Recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendations:

- 1. That the City Council's unallocated cycling capital budget (approx. £110k over two years) should be used to fund the lower cost Cycling Review Group wish-list items in order of priority. The highest priority is signing City Council route 5, extending to Littlemore and the Leys Pool. This should include signing cyclists onto this route from key destinations such as Oxford Business Park, Vue Cinema and Oxford Academy.**
- 2. That the wish-list of cycling improvement projects drawn up by the Cycling Review Group, with advice from Cyclox and Sustrans, should be used to decide how future City and County Council funding for cycling improvements is spent. Flexibility should be applied so that new opportunities can also be funded where this is appropriate.**
- 3. That the City Council encourages the police and Direct Services to proactively send reusable abandoned bikes to Broken Spoke and other bike shops that are happy to take part, so that as many of these bikes as possible can be refurbished and reused locally.**

4. That the City Council ensures that developer funding can be used to contribute to cycling improvements where appropriate, including by:

- a) Ensuring that the City Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) list is consistent with funding the higher cost cycling improvement projects set out in our wish-list, next time the CIL list is reviewed;**
- b) Using CIL funding as a local contribution to attract match funding, for example from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, for cycling improvement schemes in accordance with the Council's CIL list (often these will be part of wider transport improvement schemes);**
- c) Alerting Ward Members when significant sums (we suggest >£5k) of the 'neighbourhood portion' of CIL have been allocated to their local area. We would encourage members to consider spending this funding on lower cost cycling improvement schemes from our wish-list where possible.**

5. That the City Council ensures that its planning policies are consistent with its vision for Oxford to become one of the great cycling cities of Europe, including by:

- a) Ensuring that cycling routes and provision are considered and included in all major new developments, prioritising cycling and pedestrian access;**
- b) Reviewing and updating planning policies relating to cycle parking standards for non-residential cycle parking, as part of the next full or partial review of the Local Plan.**

6. That the Council Leader or Board Member for Planning and Transport writes to the County Council and requests that they do the following in consultation with the City Council:

- a) Implement the Cycle Super Routes and Cycle Premium Routes as soon as possible;**
- b) Bring together cycling organisations, county highways planners and highway engineers to agree a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford, drawing on findings from the London Cycling Campaign. This should include priority phasing of traffic lights for cyclists;**
- c) Consider how cycle routes can be signed more consistently and what the standard should be. We suggest that destinations and distances, rather than route numbers, should be shown on cycle signage;**
- d) Agree that highway maintenance works should not be signed off until they are safe and suitable for cycling;**
- e) Work with Government and other local authorities to implement the All Party Parliamentary Group recommendation to achieve a £10 per head of population investment in cycling.**

7. That the City Council nominates a Member Cycling Champion (a Councillor) to lead on work to improve cycling in Oxford at a political level and maximise the City Council's influence.

8. That the City Council brings forward proposals for additional staffing resources to enable the City Council to engage proactively with cycling groups, work smarter with the County Council, and support the member champion (see recommendation 7). We would suggest 1 FTE dedicated to cycling, with a creative solution to funding this post which may involve other organisations. This role should include:

- a) Supporting the Member Cycling Champion (see recommendation 6) in convening a forum of the different cycling groups and representatives of other stakeholders such as schools to co-ordinate efforts and agree a common position when lobbying for cycling improvement schemes;
- b) Engaging with the County Council to maximise the City Council's influence as LTP4 is put into practice;
- c) Influencing the development of a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford (see recommendation 5e);
- d) Monitoring the County Council's Highway Asset Management Strategy (road repairs) to identify opportunities for cycling provision to be improved during planned maintenance works (we have identified 4 such projects);
- e) Examining existing evidence on what works for improving cycling take up;
- f) Promoting active travel to school through Bikeability training and advocacy, particularly at the beginning of every academic year. Excellence in this area should be recognised perhaps through the Lord Mayor/Member Champion going in to schools to give prizes, or inviting winners to attend civic events.
- g) Identifying ways to change motorists' behaviour.

9. That the City Council promotes positive images of cycling in Council literature, particularly the soon to be signed route to Blackbird Leys pool.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Project Scope

Appendix 2 – Proposed wish-list of cycling projects in order of priority

Appendix 3 – Suggested executive response provided by the Board Member

Contents

Foreword	4
Introduction.....	5
Background	5
Terms of reference	5
Methods of investigation	6
Findings and recommendations.....	6
The case for cycling	6
Unallocated investments.....	7
Priority cycling improvements	7
Alternative options	9
Developer contributions	10
Planning Policy	11
Overall strategy for cycling.....	12
Cycling Champion.....	15
The case for a Cycling Officer.....	15
Conclusion.....	18
Acknowledgments	19

Foreword

If you lived in a city in Denmark, the chances are that each morning you would go to the cycle parking by your home, where you and your children would hop on your bicycles and then travel on a dedicated cycle lane to work and school. Riding alongside you would be all sorts of people, from businesswomen to builders. The traffic lights would be balanced in your favour. Pollution and congestion would be minimal. Your colleagues would be slimmer and healthier.

Oxford is one of the few cities in the UK where we have a chance of achieving something similar. With our large student population and restricted city centre parking we already have a near critical mass of cyclists. As well as active members of national cycling charities (Sustrans and CTC) we have our own organisations (Cyclox and Isis) to champion and encourage cycling here in Oxford. We have examples of good practise that are trumpeted nationwide (Cherwell School has the highest proportion of children cycling to school in the whole country).

However, many people find cycling in Oxford to be difficult and frightening. We have to find ways to get more people out of cars and on to bicycles. Everyone that we convert will be good for the city, good for the environment and good for the individual.

Many great resources are already available - from apps providing low traffic cycling routes to EU-funded research on incentive schemes. We don't need to reinvent the wheel, but we do need someone who can read the research and adapt it for Oxford! This is why we are proposing that we find a way to fund a Cycling Officer who can examine these resources, liaise with our cycling groups and schools, ensure County transport schemes bring maximum benefit to cyclists and that all new developments are not just cycle-friendly but cycle-tastic!

Councillor Louise Upton
Chair, Cycling Review Group

Introduction

1. The Cycling Review Group is a cross-party working group established by Oxford City Council's Scrutiny Committee during the 2014/15 municipal year. The Group's membership comprises Councillors Upton (Chair), Gant, Pressel & Wolff.

Background

2. Oxford is acknowledged as one of the few true 'Cycling cities' in the UK but barriers to cycling remain including the limited availability of secure cycle parking and the general experience of cycling on heavily trafficked roads.
3. Oxfordshire County Council is the highways authority for Oxford but the City Council claims the right to maintain unclassified highways in the city. The County is leading on the development of a new Oxford Transport Strategy as part of Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031 (LTP4) and Oxford City Council has submitted a response to the consultation on this strategy.
4. Oxford City Council established a four-year capital investment programme in 2012 totalling £300k, to support the objectives of Oxford Cycle City. A further £62k was added in 2014. This investment programme aimed to realise the City Council's vision for Oxford to become one of the great cycling cities of Europe, and in particular:
 - I. *To create an environment and culture that encourages cycling at all levels in Oxford, and which in particular encourages new cyclists. This will be achieved through effective promotion of cycling, and by completing a fully joined-up dual cycle network that is attractive to use and provides safety, convenience and directness.*
 - II. *For the total proportion of journeys to work made by cycle as the main mode of travel to be over 20% by the time of the 2021 Census¹.*
5. The objectives of the Cycle City project did not include developing an overview of the process for the planning and development of a cycle strategy for the city. Its remit was restricted to identifying a package of cycle improvement and promotional measures over 4 years. Some of these improvements were things the City Council could achieve independently of the Highways Authority, and others were done in partnership with the County Council and the Canal and Rivers Trust.

Terms of reference

6. The Cycling Review Group met four times from March to June 2015. At its first meeting the Group agreed that its primary focus would be to inform how the City Council can maximise the impact of its unallocated cycling investments and any additional funding for cycling improvements. The project scope was agreed by the Scrutiny Committee on 23 March and is included as Appendix 1.

¹ [Oxford Cycle City Plan 2012-16, Oxford City Council, July 2012](#)

Methods of investigation

7. The findings of the Cycling Review Group have been informed by verbal evidence provided by officers and stakeholders at meetings, as well as by written submissions and desk research. The Group has:
 - Met with representatives of Cyclox and Sustrans;
 - Spoken with a low-carbon transport planning researcher and watched '[Making Sustainable Life Attractive](#)', which demonstrates the planning solutions that have been used in Copenhagen;
 - Cycled route 5 from The Plain to Cowley and then on to the Science Park, Kassam Stadium, the Leys Pool and Oxford Business Park;
 - Held discussions with City Council officers and reviewed reports and briefing notes provided by them;
 - Reviewed documentation relating to cycling, including:
 - Oxford Transport Strategy (OTS) – Oxfordshire County Council;
 - Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031 Cycle Strategy;
 - OTS Consultation Response – Oxford City Council;
 - A Vision for Cycling in Oxford – Cyclox, Sustrans & CTC;
 - London Cycling Design Standards – Transport for London;
 - Increasing Active Travel to School – Sustrans;
 - Get Britain Cycling – All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group.

Findings and recommendations

8. Our findings and recommendations are set out and explained below under the following headings:
 - The case for cycling
 - Unallocated investments
 - Priority cycling improvements
 - Alternative options
 - Developer contributions
 - Planning policy
 - Overall strategy for cycling
 - Cycling champion
 - The case for a Cycling Officer

The case for cycling

9. Cycling is healthier, cleaner and cheaper than motorised forms of transport. In a historic city with spatial constraints and issues with congestion, it can also be a quicker and easier way of getting around.
10. The Director of Public Health for Oxfordshire's annual report for 2014/2015 states that cycling has real, tangible, strong and lasting health benefits. The health benefits of switching to cycling as a form of travel to work result in savings of approximately £1,100 per year per person.

11. The City Council is keen to make cycling a more attractive option and to encourage new cyclists. It also has a specific aim to increase the proportion of journeys to work made by bicycle. We are fully supportive of these aims and of the valuable improvements the City Council's Cycle City programme has delivered.

Unallocated investments

12. At the beginning of this review we were advised that the City Council had £50k of capital funding in its budget for cycling improvements in 2016/17 that had not yet been allocated to any specific schemes. A further sum was made available in 2015/16 due to the County Council agreeing to fund improvements on Willow Walk that the City Council had budgeted for within its Cycle City programme. Some of this additional spend was committed to upgrading Pembroke Street but approximately £60k remained unallocated. This raised the total unallocated cycling budget to £110k over two years.

13. The Cycle City project has delivered very valuable cycling improvements and we have identified some constructive ways of deploying the remaining budget. Our priorities for spending this capital funding are explained in the next section.

14. The City Council currently has a £10k revenue budget to support the delivery of Cycle City capital projects. This funding pays for 0.2 FTE of officer time but is due to end in April 2016. Any works scheduled for 2016/17 therefore need to be organised within the current financial year. Part of this revenue funding has been used to support events promoting cycling, this includes bike maintenance workshops in Low carbon Oxford Week, Tricky Trail bike course at FloFest and at the Leys Festival, to encourage children to cycle.

Priority cycling improvements

15. There is no shortage of ideas for improving the city's cycling infrastructure. The Cycle City consultation exercise produced many ideas (some of which overlap with the priorities set out below), but there is often as much divergence as there is coherence. Infrastructure investment decisions are made, as often as not, with reference to sources of possible funding, with the aim of maximising the use and effectiveness of these grants. However, in the absence of an agreed strategy the investment choices do not necessarily reflect priorities that are broadly agreed by different stakeholders. For example, a recent £3.3m Cycle City Ambition Grant awarded to the County Council was spent on a new bridge which was not considered to be a priority by the City Council or the cycling groups we spoke to.

16. We initially came to the view that the two priorities for investing £50k on cycling improvements should be signage on the East Oxford route from The Plain to Cowley Centre via Iffley Road (25k) and white line painting on priority routes around the city centre (£25k). We also considered the options of investing in an abandoned bicycle reuse scheme and a cycling app (see next section), before producing a wish-list of priority capital schemes in consultation with Cyclox and Sustrans.

Signing the East Oxford Route – City Council route 5

17. We identified that signing this route should be a high priority because it is quieter and safer than cycling along the busy Cowley Road between The Plain and Cowley Centre. This route is currently little known and under-used, particularly

amongst student groups, partly because it is counter-intuitive to cycle up Iffley Road rather than Cowley Road from The Plain when travelling to Cowley Centre.

18. A member of the Review Group photographed this route to highlight where the 16 or so additional signs should be placed and highlighted the benefits of removing one-way restrictions for cyclists (currently the route splits in different directions due to such restrictions). We understand that the County Council may be amenable to removing these one-way restrictions, which would be very welcome as it would make the route easier for cyclists to follow.
19. We later agreed that signage on this the route should extend beyond Cowley Centre to Littlemore and on to the new pool at Blackbird Leys. To ensure this route can become more known and well used, cyclists should be signed onto it from important employment, education and leisure destinations, including those outside the ring road such as Oxford Business Park, Vue Cinema, and Oxford Academy.
20. The representatives of cycling groups we spoke to were strongly supportive of this priority and we cycled this route with members of Cyclox and Sustrans on 8 June. We agreed that signing this route in full should be the City Council's priority improvement scheme because it would benefit many of Oxford's cyclists (and other road users) for a relatively modest outlay.

White line painting

21. White line painting on major routes is a County Council function but we felt that in a number of key locations, the existing mandatory white lines were inadequate and potentially dangerous for cycling. Once re-painted, road markings are clearly visible for about 5 years. Upon further enquiry we learned that white line painting would require revenue funding. It could therefore not be funded from the City Council's unallocated capital investments. We have included white line painting on our wish list and suggest that the City Council calls on the County Council to consider the frequency road markings should be repainted as part of a wider piece of work developing standards and specifications for cycling infrastructure, in partnership with cycling stakeholders (see recommendation 5e).

Wish list of cycling improvement schemes

22. We identified that there needs to be a more strategic approach to cycling improvement schemes to maximise the opportunities for improving the experience of cycling in Oxford. We recognise that there is a need for some flexibility in order to be able to fund new opportunities that present themselves, but where possible future investments in cycling improvements should be guided by a wish list of priority schemes. Ideally, this priority list should be based on broad agreement amongst the various cycling stakeholders.
23. We started to produce our own wish-list of cycling improvement schemes based on member suggestions but in discussions with Cyclox, it became clear that they already done considerable work on producing a more comprehensive wish-list, which could be updated and used as the basis for a unified wish-list of priority improvement schemes. This wish list is included as appendix 2. It lists lower cost schemes in order of priority, with signage of the East Oxford route being the number one priority.

Recommendation 1 - That the City Council's unallocated cycling capital budget (approx. £110k over two years) should be used to fund the lower cost Cycling Review Group wish-list items in order of priority. The highest priority is signing City Council route 5, extending to Littlemore and the Leys Pool. This should include signing cyclists onto this route from key destinations such as Oxford Business Park, Vue Cinema and Oxford Academy.

Recommendation 2 - That the wish-list of cycling improvement projects drawn up by the Cycling Review Group, with advice from Cyclox and Sustrans, should be used to decide how future City and County Council funding for cycling improvements is spent. Flexibility should be applied so that new opportunities can also be funded where this is appropriate.

Alternative options

24. We looked at the options of investing in a cycling mobile app and reconditioning abandoned bicycles.

Cycling app

25. There are already a number of mobile apps available that can provide cyclists with tools for route planning, ride mapping and logging, reporting pot holes, monitoring fitness, and information about cycle hire. A list of the best cycling apps for iPhone and Android has been published by [Cycling Weekly](#). We did not identify an obvious need for a specific app unique to Oxford.

Reconditioning abandoned bicycles

26. The majority of abandoned bicycles that are currently collected appear to be in poor state. Most are damaged in some way and many have been exposed to the weather for extended periods of time, so the percentage that could be restored is quite low. Reconditioning those bicycling that could potentially be reused would require revenue funding. We were unable to identify a proven model in operation elsewhere that could be replicated in Oxford.

27. Direct Services currently provide some reusable abandoned bicycles to organisations such as Aspire and Broken Spoke as and when they make contact. The remainder of the abandoned bicycles collected are scrapped and count towards the Council's recycling credits. We would like to see the City Council working more closely with cycle shops in the city, many of which are staffed by genuine enthusiasts, on issues such as abandoned bicycles. We suggest that the Council considers whether it can be more proactive in engaging with cycle shops so that more abandoned bikes collected by the Council can be restored and reused locally. There may be a case for investing some revenue funding at a later stage if there is potential to scale up this initiative, for example to include a bike shop in every community.

Recommendation 3 - That the City Council encourages the police and Direct Services to proactively send reusable abandoned bikes to Broken Spoke and other bike shops that are happy to take part, so that as many of these bikes as possible can be refurbished and reused locally.

Developer contributions

28. Developer contributions are a potential major source of funding for cycling improvement schemes. The developer funding regime is currently changing, with the Community Infrastructure Levy replacing Section 106 agreements from April 2015.

Section 106 (S106)

29. S106 agreements were based on a case by case negotiation led by the County Council, and focused on large development schemes. A number of S106 legacy items are on-going and some S106 funding has not yet been committed. The County Council was unable to advise us precisely how much S106 money has been spent on cycling improvements because these have normally been incorporated into larger transport works.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

30. CIL funding is collected by District Councils and is not ring-fenced for a particular type of infrastructure. The City Council has more control over the use of CIL funding than S106 agreements, although CIL covers County Council as well as city council responsibilities. The level of CIL funding developers are required to contribute is based on a floor space calculation but there are a number of exemptions, such as for charitable uses. The CIL payable on redevelopments can be much lower than on green-field developments because existing floor-space is subtracted from new floor-space as part of this calculation.

31. 15% of CIL funding is top-sliced and allocated to neighbourhood areas. The remainder goes into a central pot and is not ring-fenced for a specific geographical area. The City Council estimates that it will receive £2.5m to 3m of CIL funding annually and officers advised us that this projection is looking accurate. A slow start had been expected and although £1.4m of CIL funding was in the bank, none had yet been spent as of May 2015. The only allocated CIL funding that would include cycling measures was for wider public realm improvements at Frideswide Square.

The Council's CIL list

32. The 85% of CIL money that is held in a central pot has to be spent in accordance with the City Council's [Community Infrastructure Levy \(CIL\) list](#), which is agreed by full Council alongside the Council's annual budget. The CIL list sets out strategic infrastructure improvements that can be funded from CIL. There are many competing demands for CIL funding, including education, community services and environmental improvements, as well as transport schemes. The CIL list currently includes generic headings related to cycling such as 'improved city centre cycling environment' and 'orbital and radial cycle routes'.

33. We suspect that the cycling schemes set out in our wish-list would be compatible with the Council's CIL list but suggest Council Officers double check this, next time the CIL list is reviewed. This would provide assurance that all of the priority schemes we are proposing could potentially be funded through developer contributions.

Using CIL to attract match funding

34. It was noted that CIL funding could be used as a local contribution when bidding for match funding, for example to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. Using

CIL monies to lever in additional funding is likely to be the most effective way of using these developer contributions to improve cycling in Oxford.

Neighbourhood portion of CIL

35. We looked into the element of CIL that is top-sliced for geographical areas and found that in un-parished neighbourhood areas of the city, contributions are allocated to ward areas. With the exception of the Carfax ward, which had benefitted from the new Westgate Shopping Centre, few wards had substantial amounts CIL funding allocated to them as of May 2015.
36. Where appropriate, we would encourage ward members to spend this local funding on low cost cycling measures, preferably from our wish-list. To this end, members should be alerted once spendable amounts of CIL funding have been allocated to their ward. We suggest a £5k threshold for informing members.

Recommendation 4 – That the City Council ensures that developer funding can be used to contribute to cycling improvements where appropriate, including by:

- a) Ensuring that the City Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) list is consistent with funding the higher cost cycling improvement projects set out in our wish-list, next time the CIL list is reviewed;***
- b) Using CIL funding as a local contribution to attract match funding, for example from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, for cycling improvement schemes in accordance with the Council’s CIL list (often these will be part of wider transport improvement schemes);***
- c) Alerting Ward Members when significant sums (we suggest >£5k) of the ‘neighbourhood portion’ of CIL have been allocated to their local area. We would encourage members to consider spending this funding on lower cost cycling improvement schemes from our wish-list where possible.***

Planning Policy

37. The City Council is able to improve the experience of cycling in Oxford through its planning policies. For example, the Council can set minimum standards for cycling provision and promote better integration with public transport when granting planning permissions. We spoke with a Planning Policy Team Leader who advised us that the City Council has no single planning policy document for cycling. Such policies are instead spread across different policy documents as a result of various national legislative changes over recent years.

Major developments

38. We would like the City Council to ensure that cycle routes and provision are embedded in all major development plans. We welcome the proposed layout of the new Barton Park development and suggest that a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the ring road from the new Barton Park development could be a hugely positive step towards getting residents to choose cycling over their cars. A good example of this is York’s Millennium Bridge that links two residential areas across the River Ouse. This bridge enables residents to make short trips without having to negotiate the heavy traffic on the other city centre bridges.

A cycle hub at Oxford Station

39. The [Leeds Cycle Point](#) was the first of its kind when opened a couple of years ago. It provides secure cycle parking with hire and repair facilities, as close as possible to the station. Other stations are now following suit and we would welcome Oxford having a similar cycle hub at the redeveloped Oxford Station. This would mean that longer distance trips could be made more easily by bike.

Cycle parking standards

40. The City Council has separate cycle parking standards for residential and commercial properties. The residential standards have been reviewed relatively recently, in 2013, as part of the Sites and Housing Plan. The cycle parking standards for non-residential properties are older and were not applied recently in the case of the major redevelopment of the Westgate Shopping Centre. We suggest that this policy is reviewed, updated and applied consistently.

Compliance with planning conditions

41. We considered including a recommendation about the need to ensure that planning policies and conditions relating to cycling are followed and implemented. However, at our request, planning officers checked compliance with a sample of recent planning conditions relating to cycling measures or facilities. This exercise demonstrated that officers are aware of the Council's cycling policies when considering planning applications. Planning officers then conducted a further check of planning applications that had been granted over recent years to see whether the details required by planning conditions had been submitted and approved by the City Council. It was not possible for officers to conduct site visits to check whether these conditions had been implemented due to resourcing pressures in the planning team at the time.

Recommendation 5 - That the City Council ensures that its planning policies are consistent with its vision for Oxford to become one of the great cycling cities of Europe, including by:

- a) Ensuring that cycling routes and provision are considered and included in all major new developments, prioritising cycling and pedestrian access;***
- b) Reviewing and updating planning policies relating to cycle parking standards for non-residential cycle parking, as part of the next full or partial review of the Local Plan.***

Overall strategy for cycling

42. For Oxford to become a leading 'cycling city' comparable to those on the continent, it would need to have an overall strategy and plan for cycling that is broadly supported by all parties.
43. The County Council is developing a new Oxford Transport Strategy (OTS) as part of Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031 (LTP4). We support the aim of achieving a further modal shift to cycling and walking by making journeys easier, safer and more cost and time efficient in comparison to other modes. However, the OTS is very broad-brush, containing little detail.
44. We reviewed Oxford City Council's response to the consultation on this strategy. We fully endorse this document and have some further suggestions relating to, or building on, the strategic direction for cycling in Oxford that has been set out to date.

Enhancing the cycle network

“The really great thing to bear in mind is that once a cycle path is in place, the pay-back in terms of health goes on increasing for decades”²

45. Enhancements to the route network proposed in the OTS are aimed at providing safe and direct access to educational and commercial destinations, and extending coverage across residential areas. The OTS proposes a cycling network based on a hierarchy of Cycle Super Routes, Cycle Premium Routes and Connector Routes.
46. Cycle Super Routes will provide continuous and uniform provision for cyclists travelling in both directions. Complete or semi-segregation will be provided wherever possible (otherwise mandatory cycle lane markings will be used). We note that the Director of Public Health for Oxfordshire’s annual report for 2014/2015 advocates separating cyclists from other road users and building this into selected new transport schemes whenever possible. The following routes have been classified as Cycle Super Routes:
- A420 Botley Road, Oxpens Road, St. Aldates & High Street;
 - A4144 Woodstock Road & Abingdon Road (Sustrans route 5);
 - A4158 Iffley Road;
 - B4150 Marston Road;
 - B4495 Headley Way, Cherwell Drive & Weirs Lane;
 - B4495 Windmill Road, Hollow Way & Church Cowley Road;
 - Longwall Street, St. Cross Road, South Parks Road & Parks Road.
47. Premium routes will also feature uniform cycle lane provision in both directions free from obstruction but these are likely to be shared with bus lanes. Dedicated cycle lanes should continue through junctions. These routes include:
- A420 Headington Road/London Road to Thornhill Park & Ride;
 - A4165 Banbury Road to Kidlington;
 - B480 Cowley Road/Watlington Road from Howard Street to Blackbird Leys;
 - Morrell Avenue, Warneford Lane & Old Road.
48. Enhancing these direct routes will provide the best value for money and serve the most cyclists. We would like the Cycle Super Routes and Cycle Premium Routes to be implemented as soon as possible. Longer term, we would also like to see improvements to quieter routes being emphasised too. For example, leisure areas could be connected by quieter routes to enhance Oxford’s leisure offer.

Specifications for cycle infrastructure

49. The route classifications set out in the OTS could be developed into a wider, coherent and consistently-applied set of design specifications for the construction of cycling infrastructure. The production of such specifications would need to be led by the County Council but we would strongly argue that these should be co-produced with the City Council, the cycling lobby and other stakeholders.

² [Director of Public Health for Oxfordshire Annual Report VIII, June 2015, p. 21](#)

50. The development of detailed specifications for cycling infrastructure design should draw on lessons from the London Cycling Campaign and Transport for London's [London Cycling Design Standards](#). We suggest that specifications should be produced for the following types of infrastructure (this list is not exhaustive):

- Segregated and semi-segregated cycle lanes, including whether to use parked cars as a barrier between moving traffic and cycles without loss of road width;
- Cycle lanes on pavements and on highways, including standards for when cycle lanes on pavements cross side roads;
- Junctions and right turns;
- Routes designated as being suitable for children aged 12+ to get to school;
- Locations where shared use is suitable and where it is not (cycles and pedestrian; cycles and bus lanes and what happens at bus stops);
- Maintenance schedules including frequency of repainting road markings and the clearing of snow and ice.

Signage

51. Signage on cycle routes in the city is inconsistent, with signs on some routes display the destination, while others show the route number. Similarly, some signage shows the time a route takes to cycle while others provide the distance. Again, we would like a signage standard to be developed and applied consistently across the city. As the Highways Authority, the County Council would need to lead this work, in partnership with the City Council and other stakeholders. We would suggest that signage should show the distance to the destination, be that the city centre or a major destination away from the city centre such as district centres, park and rides, Blackbird Leys Pool.

Maintenance standards

52. In some cases, highways maintenance works are not completed to a high enough standard to be safe for cycling. We believe that all maintenance works should be suitable for cyclists before they are signed off, and urge the City Council to seek the agreement of the County Council on this point.

Investing in cycling

“Dutch cities reap massive economic benefits because of a consistently high level of investment for several decades (now £24 per person per year)...England outside the capital still spends less than £2 per head; far too low to seriously increase cycling levels”³

53. An All Party Parliamentary Group report entitled ‘Get Britain Cycling’ recommended a cycling budget of at least £10 per person per year, increasing to £20. The County Council’s Cycle Strategy states that the County will work with Government and other local authorities to achieve a minimum spend of £10 per person per year by 2020-21. We fully support and would like to reinforce this aim, whilst recognising that the County Council cannot achieve this alone.

Recommendation 6 - That the Council Leader or Board Member for Planning and Transport writes to the County Council and requests that they do the following in consultation with the City Council:

³ [Get Britain Cycling, All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group, April 2013](#)

- a) **Implement the Cycle Super Routes and Cycle Premium Routes as soon as possible;**
- b) **Bring together cycling organisations, county highways planners and highway engineers to agree a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford, drawing on findings from the London Cycling Campaign. This should include priority phasing of traffic lights for cyclists;**
- c) **Consider how cycle routes can be signed more consistently and what the standard should be. We suggest that destinations and distances, rather than route numbers, should be shown on cycle signage;**
- d) **Agree that highway maintenance works should not be signed off until they are safe and suitable for cycling;**
- e) **Work with Government and other local authorities to implement the All Party Parliamentary Group recommendation to achieve a £10 per head of population investment in cycling.**

Cycling Champion

54. We think there is more the City Council could do to maximise its influence on cycling matters in the city. We suggest that a member champion would provide a focal point for people to approach about cycling issues, for example with concerns over the effects of policies and planning applications on cycling. This Councillor could also champion cycling initiatives with schools and businesses and convene a forum of representatives of cycling groups and other stakeholders.

The case for a Cycling Forum

55. There has for many years been a lack of coherence in the responses of the cycling lobby to consultations on highways schemes and cycle infrastructure, for example in the case of the roundabout at The Plain. A recent academic study has suggested that there is sufficient disagreement about infrastructure specifications as to cause the cycling lobby's contributions to public consultations to effectively undermine each other, leading to decisions being made that favour the stronger and more organised lobbies, notably the bus companies. A Cycling Champion would be well placed to convene a forum of the different cycling groups and other stakeholders such as schools to co-ordinate efforts and agree a common position when lobbying for cycling improvement schemes. The wish-list of improvement schemes could also be reviewed annually with the forum.

56. A forum would also provide a means for stakeholders such as schools to promote cycling initiatives and share best practice. We note that Cherwell School is recognised nationally because 60% of pupils cycle to school (compared to 2% nationally) and only 10% travel by car. The school runs cycle maintenance workshops, has an active cycling club and even campaigns to improve road conditions for cyclists. We would like to see other schools and employers following this lead with similar initiatives.

Recommendation 7 - That the City Council nominates a Member Cycling Champion (a Councillor) to lead on work to improve cycling in Oxford at a political level and maximise the City Council's influence.

The case for a Cycling Officer

57. There are opportunities for the City Council to make an increased contribution to developing an environment that encourages cycling at all levels in Oxford. This

would require a real but relatively modest increase in the amount of officer time focused on cycling (currently 0.2 FTE which is due to end in April 2016). We would ideally like to see 1 FTE dedicated to cycling, ideally an officer with highways planning credentials. We appreciate that the Council is operating within a difficult financial climate so it should explore the option of part-funding such a role with the County Council, the universities (who already have "Sustainable Transport Officers") and other large employers.

Maximising the City Council's influence on the Local Transport Plan (LTP4)

58. The initial period following the adoption of a long-term Highways Authority strategy and the development of a detailed strategic plan for the cycling network in our city will be critical. The city's urban environment, intense traffic pressures (particularly the concentration of bus traffic), air quality concerns and potential volume of cycle usage creates a need for closer cooperation between County and City.
59. The County Highways Authority sometimes operates with little or no reference to the City Council or to cycling groups. The County does not currently employ planners with specific cycle infrastructure planning experience and does not tend to consult on proposed schemes or seek views on their overall design. This may change, given the emphasis in the countywide Local Transport Plan on developing a modal shift to cycling and walking. Until then, the City Council needs to have a coherent and consistent voice in the process on behalf of the city of Oxford. This will be difficult to achieve within existing resources, with one officer supporting the delivery of Cycle City capital projects one day a week until April 2016. The County, under severe financial pressure, might value more consistent practical support from the City.
60. We believe that as an urgent necessity, the City Council should deploy additional staffing resources to engage with the County's highway planners to achieve the best possible outcomes for cycling in the city as LTP4 is rolled out and money becomes available. This will enable the City Council to maximise its influence. It could also help to ensure that all the good work done by many experienced and concerned people with a deep knowledge of the city is coordinated and channelled such that it is able to shape both the plan and the specifications for the cycling component of that strategy.

Improving cycling provision during maintenance works

61. Opportunities to improve cycling provision are not always taken when maintenance works are carried out. This may be because engineers "think maintenance" and reproduce what was there before, rather than looking for opportunities to improve cycling provision at the same time. This underlines the need for a clear line of communication between the two local authorities. We feel the City Council could work smarter and more proactively with the County Council in this area.
62. The County Council's Highways Asset Maintenance programme lists planned works within the next 3 years at Pembroke Street (St Aldate's to St Ebbe's), Derwent Avenue (off Headley Way), Marston Road West side, and Giles Road (behind Oxford Academy). These locations are all on our wish list and we believe these four items present an opportunity for the two authorities to work together on improving cycling provision.

Promoting cycling take up and training

“Cyclists in England are around four times more likely to be killed than they would be if they cycled in the Netherlands”⁴

63. Perceptions that cycling is unsafe are a major barrier to increased take up and too often this is the reality. We hope that the new strategy and a sensible and widely agreed set of specifications for cycling infrastructure will go a long way to improving cycle safety in the city. In addition to this, part of the role of a dedicated cycling officer could advocate cycling and cycle training.
64. We were advised by an expert in low carbon transport planning policy that cycling can move from being relatively niche activity to being a mainstream mode of transport through the following steps:
1. Demonstration effect – showing how things will be
 2. Legitimation – people perceiving it to be mainstream
 3. Creating coalitions to provide a unified approach
65. A cycling officer would be able to make a difference in each of these respects, working in partnership with the County Council, city schools and other stakeholders
66. Schemes for encouraging cycling take up should be evidence-led. A lot of existing research and evidence already exists so there is little need to ‘reinvent the wheel’ locally. For example, [Eltis](#) is an extensive EU-funded resource that includes a wealth of case study examples such as the [Nordic Cycle Cities](#) project. Officer time would be needed to examine these in detail. A dedicated officer could also draw on resources such as the Sustrans resource for teachers, parents and governors called “[Increasing Active Travel to School](#)”. In addition, a Cycling Officer could contact all City schools at the beginning of each academic year to promote these kinds of initiatives and motivate the school community to walk and cycle.
67. We would also like to see more active promotion of [Bikeability](#) training (“cycling proficiency’ for the 21st Century!”) to both children and adults. We would ideally like Bikeability training to be offered all Year 6 pupils in the city. Schools that offer good quality (on-road) cycle training, storage and promote cycling can achieve spectacular results. Research has suggested that adults are more likely to take up cycling again if they had cycle training as a child, so Bikeability training could provide long term benefits.
68. We also suggest that the City Council considers whether it could do more to promote positive images of cycling in its own literature. For example, once signage has been installed on the East Oxford route, this route should be promoted to leisure users in Council literature and on the Leys Pool and Leisure Centre website. We need to promote changes in behaviour not just of cyclists but of motorists and pedestrians too. Research has found that although, on average, a cyclist will sustain a minor injury once every 20 years, they will have an

⁴ [LTP Volume 4: Cycle Strategy and Bus and Rapid Transit Strategy, Oxfordshire County Council, p. 5](#)

unpleasant or frightening interaction with a motorist once a month⁵. A cycling officer could lead on putting out positive messages in our publications, on bus stops, encouraging other road users to be considerate of cyclists.

Recommendation 8 - That the City Council brings forward proposals for additional staffing resources to enable the City Council to engage proactively with cycling groups, work smarter with the County Council, and support the member champion (see recommendation 7). We would suggest 1 FTE dedicated to cycling, with a creative solution to funding this post which may involve other organisations. This role should include:

- a) Supporting the Member Cycling Champion (see recommendation 6) in convening a forum of the different cycling groups and representatives of other stakeholders such as schools to co-ordinate efforts and agree a common position when lobbying for cycling improvement schemes;***
- b) Engaging with the County Council to maximise the City Council's influence as LTP4 is put into practice;***
- c) Influencing the development of a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford (see recommendation 5e);***
- d) Monitoring the County Council's Highway Asset Management Strategy (road repairs) to identify opportunities for cycling provision to be improved during planned maintenance works (we have identified 4 such projects);***
- e) Examining existing evidence on what works for improving cycling take up;***
- f) Promoting active travel to school through Bikeability training and advocacy, particularly at the beginning of every academic year. Excellence in this area should be recognised perhaps through the Lord Mayor/Member Champion going in to schools to give prizes, or inviting winners to attend civic events.***
- g) Identifying ways to change motorists' behaviour.***

Recommendation 9 - That the City Council promotes positive images of cycling in Council literature, particularly the soon to be signed route to Blackbird Leys pool.

Conclusion

69. Our review primarily focused on helping the City Council to achieve maximum benefit from its unallocated cycling capital investments and we have provided a prioritised wish-list of improvement schemes that we developed in consultation with cycling groups. Beyond this, we have set out our suggestions as to how the City Council could work more effectively with partners and achieve a step-change in making its vision for Oxford to become one of the great cycling cities of Europe a reality. Our recommendations are for the City Executive Board to consider and, if agreed, we look forward to monitoring implementation over the year ahead.

⁵ [Investigating the rates and impacts of near misses and related incidents among UK cyclists \(2015\) Aldred and Crossweller. Journal of Transport and Health 2:379-93](#)

Acknowledgments

70. The Cycling Scrutiny Group would like to thank those who have provided evidence that has informed the findings of this review:

- a) Mai Jarvis – Oxford City Council
- b) Adrian Roche – Oxford City Council
- c) Richard Wyatt – Oxford City Council
- d) Shaun Hatton – Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council
- e) Craig Rossington – Oxfordshire County Council
- f) Simon Hunt – Cyclox
- g) Cecilia Fry – Sustrans
- h) Yannick Cornet – Technical University of Denmark

Name and contact details of author:-

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee
Scrutiny Officer
Law and Governance
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: abrown2@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers: None

Version number: 1.0

This page is intentionally left blank

Cycling Review Group – Draft Project Scope

Review Topic	Cycling
Lead Member Review Group	Councillor Louise Upton
Other Review Group Members	Councillor Andrew Gant Councillor Tom Hayes Councillor Susanna Pressel Councillor Dick Wolff
Officer Support and allocate hours	Scrutiny Officer – approx. 2-4 days per month. Additional support from the Environmental Policy Team Leader.
Rationale	Cycling is a priority review topic for the City Council's Scrutiny Committee. Oxford is acknowledged as one of the few true 'Cycling Cities' in the UK but barriers to cycling remain including the limited availability of secure cycle parking and the general experience of cycling on heavily-trafficked roads.
Purpose of Review/Objective	<p>The primary purpose of the review is to inform how the City Council can maximise the impact of its unallocated Cycling investments (£50k in 2016/17) on improving cycling take up, safety and connectivity.</p> <p>The Review Group aims to do this by engaging with relevant experts and producing a costed priority list of recommended cycling improvements.</p> <p>Other objectives are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Produce a 'wish list' of additional priority schemes for future investment. - Consider the merits of further City Council investments beyond 2016/17. - Evaluate the use and monitoring of S106 and CIL funds to improve cycling provision. - Review the City Council's response to the Oxfordshire Transport Strategy. - Consider the merits of lifting the moratorium on cycling improvements where there is no conflict with the Oxford Transport Strategy. - Urge Oxfordshire County Council to progress the recommendation in the motion on cycle safety adopted at Council on 1 December.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider the level of revenue needed to support the delivery of capital schemes. - Consider the merits of investments in training. - Consider mechanisms to make sure that cycle routes and provision are considered in planning decisions. - Understand what research data already exists. - Influence a cycling event to be held in summer 2015. - Explore the feasibility and cost of cycling apps and abandoned bike recycling schemes. - Understand and seek to influence the County Council's cycling priorities.
Indicators of Success	<p>The Review Group recommends costed priority projects covering all City Council contributions that would help to increase cycling take up, safety and connectivity.</p> <p>Broad agreement on recommended schemes amongst Review Group Members and stakeholders.</p> <p>The majority of recommendations are accepted by the Board Member/CEB.</p> <p>The Review Group is able to influence/inform the County Council's prioritisation of cycling schemes.</p>
Methodology/ Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence sessions with stakeholders. - Review of existing research data (if available). - Written questions to officers if required. - Development of a ratings system to prioritise schemes. - A site visit if required.
Specify Witnesses/ Experts	<p>The following cycling stakeholders will be invited to engage with the Review Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Craig Rossington and/or Stewart Wilson – Senior Transport Planners, Oxfordshire County Council. - Cecilia Fry – Treasurer, Cyclox (and Sustrans). - Simon Hunt – Chair, Cyclox. - Peter Challis – Area Manager, Sustrans. - James Dawton – Rides Secretary, CTC Oxford City. - Sean Hatton – Highways and Engineering Manager, Oxford City Council.
Specify Evidence Sources for Documents	<p>Possible document sources include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oxford Cycle City report to 23 March Scrutiny Committee - Oxford Transport Strategy - Cycletopia - Oxford Cycle Map - The Times Cities fit for cycling manifesto

Specify Site Visits	TBC – a site visit may be required following stakeholder engagement.		
Projected start date	16 March 2015	Draft Report Deadline	19 June 2015 (for 30 June Scrutiny Committee)
Meeting Frequency	Monthly	Projected completion date	Report to 9 July 2015 CEB

Draft outline of meetings (Not in necessarily in chronological order)

Meeting one – 14 April 2015, 4.30pm
Engage with stakeholders at a Review Group meeting (Shaun Hatton and Simon Hunt).
Meeting two – 12 May 2015, 4.30pm (TBC)
Engage with stakeholders at a Review Group meeting (Cecilia Fry and Simon Hunt).
Meeting three – TBC
Possible site visit if required.
Meeting four – TBC
Review of evidence gathered.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2 - Proposed wish-list of cycling projects in order of priority

This is a list of priority cycling improvement schemes for Oxford which is intended to guide future investments in cycling, whether they are funded by the City Council, County Council, other partner organisations or a combination of these.

Route numbers refer to existing City Council routes and Super/Premium refers to planned County Council routes.

#	Scheme	Location	Route	Cost	Details
1	Signage and branding: Route 5	East Oxford: from the Plain and out to Littlemore and the Leys, Science Park, Kassam stadium	CITY 5	25k	Alternative to Cowley&Iffley Rds. Serves Leys destinations. Scrutiny members reconnoitred this on June 8th. Sync with Giles Rd resurfacing (County maintenance).
2	Removal of one-way restrictions	Howard St &Magdalen Road	CITY 5	5k	Either just of the short sections necessary for Route 5, or better, the whole length of both roads.
3	A4158 Iffley Rd crossing	James St	CITY 5	££	Toucan to ease inbound City 5 to Iffley Rd cycle lane – the best way for unconfident cyclists to approach The Plain from East Oxford . Associated with (1).
4	Repainting of faded white lines	Key routes into the city centre e.g. Cowley Rd		£	Repainting of white lines where mandatory white lines are inadequate and potentially dangerous for cyclists.
5	Signage to use Pembroke St	St Aldates		£	[County has agreed to make it 2-way for cycles] Sign route West (Bonn Square; New Westgate; rail station etc.). Sign Broken Spoke Co-op.
6	A4144 St Aldates crossing	Near main Post office		££	Facilitate Blue Boar St to Pembroke St link;
7a	B4150 Marston Rd: Segregate cycle track	From A420 junction to Ferry Road	Super	£££	Create new cyclepath on grass verge adjacent to the Sports Grounds out to Ferry Road. Sync with resurfacing Marston Rd West side (County)
7b	B4150 Marston Rd: Repaint cycle lane	From A420 junction to Ferry Road	Super	£	Mandatory lane: now indistinct. Cheap temporary job if 6a impossible. No point if County does resurface Marston Rd.

7c	Marston Rd: widen mandatory lane	B4150 Marston Rd inbound	Super	£	St Michaels Primary school to A420 junction. Only possible if 6a proceeds, to realign carriageways.
8	Physical barrier removal	many sites		£	For example: barriers at either end of Frys Hill Park, Sustrans route north from Cherwell School at Summerfields School and Lonsdale Road.
9	A420 London Rd : inbound off-carriageway segregated cycle track	A420 London Place, Continue inbound segregated cycle track to Morrell Avenue signals.	Premium	££	Segregated cycle lane bypassing Marston Rd Junction signals. Give Morrell Ave junction signals a cyclist phase.
10	One station (6-place: 5-bikes) for the Oxon Bike hire scheme	To be advised	--	££	Each station with bikes costs £12K. Needs subsidy/sponsorship for running cost.
11	Segregate cycle track on London Place and link eastbound to existing signals, for unconfident cyclists	A420 junction: Cherwell St & Marston Rd. St Clements outbound to Headington Hill	Premium	£ or ££	Outbound off-carriageway provision is a nonsense now. Local residents want ped-cycle separation. Existing median on-carriageway cycle lane is only for the very confident.
12a	A420 St Clements. Reduce conflict with parked vehicles. Remove parking on inbound (South) side	Approaching Rectory Rd, inbound	Premium	£	Replace left turn vehicle lane with a cycle lane.
12b	A420 St Clements. Reduce conflict with parked vehicles	Pelican at Rectory Rd	Premium	£	Concentrate parking on north side of St Clements, in bays either side of Pelican, ends of which would be built out.
12c	A420 St Clements. Reduce conflict with parked vehicles	Opposite Caroline St	Premium	£	Remove parking in bay outside almshouses.
13	B4495 Hollow Way. Cycle lane provision	Make cycle & traffic lanes consistently narrow north of Horspath Road.	Super	££	Temporary, pending complete review of Temple Cowley area desire lines and routes.

		Median strip.			
14	B4495 Hollow Way	Junction with Garsington Rd	Super	£	Connect track to ASL, northbound cycle lane.
15	B4495 Donnington Bridge Rd	Junctions at both ends	Super	££	Cycle lane revisions and use of signals for R turns. Signal by-pass for L turns.
16	B4495 Headley Way avoidance: new access to JR from North.	Eden Drive		££	To JR West Wing via allotment lane between 16-18 Eden drive, pave through to roundabout at hospital entrance, joining Route 2 (Sandfield Rd) to 2b (Copse Lane).
17	B4495 at Cowley Centre	Junction with Barns Rd		£££ plus	Needs crossing N-S near present roundabout. Signalise junction and remove roundabout.
18	A4144 Woodstock Road	Continuous cycle lane on length of Woodstock Road	Super	£	The only arterial road into the city without a continuous cycle lane. It is a major route to a number of schools, including three primary schools on the road itself, and another close by. No changes to any kerbs or other structural works are required. It is simply a question of making the relevant orders and painting the marks.
19	Massey Close barrier removal and access revision for peds and cyclists	Girdlestone Rd to Churchill Drive		£82k	Main off-carriageway access point for cyclists from SE Oxford to Churchill Hospital/Old Rd campus. Improve access to and through the Churchill Hospital area. Work with stakeholders to determine what will achieve most. May be used to part-fund route across Warneford Meadows that respects the Town Green status, or alternatively provide other links to and through the Churchill, Park and Warneford Hospitals and Old Road Campus.

20	Access to N.O.C, Headington	Gardiner Street, south	3A branch	£	Repaint double-yellows to stop cars blocking cycle route, paint cycle lanes and markings. Consult on where cycle lanes, junction priority markings and ancillary works need improving
21	Catte Street Reposition tourist info sign	Exit on pavement to High St		£	Everyone is blocked by folk consulting the sign.
22	Signs and markings: Mansfield Rd, South	Junction with Holywell	CITY 2	£	Bikes exit to Holywell too fast. Possibly install mirror on New College.
23	Re-mark cycle lane and make mandatory	South end of Holywell at junction with High St	Super	£	Take some carriageway width at the wide part up to the phone box in opposite direction.
24a	A420 Headington. Make new cycleway.	Uphill part of Headington hill	Premium	£££	To avoid on-road cycle lane in the threatening part of slow uphill, part-obstructed by lamp standards. Use half the footway space. Problem to prevent downhill usage that side.
24b	A420 Headington. Remove street lamps	Uphill part of Headington hill	Premium	£££	Remove street lamp columns from cycle lanes. Alternative to 22a.
25	A423 slip road South. Install protected exit from cyclepath	Cyclepath beside bypass as it joins Kennington Rd (like one at top of Kennington Road)		£	Cars may exit A423 on to slip without signalling or noticing cyclists.
26	Canal to A40 cycle ramp	Where A40 crosses Oxford canal		££	A40 cycle path and canal only linked by steep steps.
27	A40 Shared space cycleway, Elsfield Way South side	Between Jackson Rd & Cutteslowe roundabout		£	Widen current shared space and cut back vegetation. Also enforce No Left Turn into Jackson Rd.
28	Improve Canal towpath	Between Aristotle Lane and Elizabeth Jennings Way		££	Work with Canal & River Trust to fund this.

29	Cowley Centre improvements : Coordinated improvements to improve safety for cyclists	Part of Cycle route 5		£100k	i. Junction improvement at Beachamp Lane, Church Cowley Road and Rymers Lane intersection (e.g. Toucan crossing); ii. Junction and cycle lane improvements on Barns Road, Between Towns Road and at Crowell Road traffic lights.
30	Signage and branding of Iffley Route	Iffley route: Littlemore → Rose Hill → Iffley → Meadow Lane → Iffley Road → City centre (with alternative route Iffley → Iffley Lock → Thames Towpath → City centre)			
31	Segregate cycle track on South Parks Road / Parks Road	Parks Road / South Parks Road junction at the Museum of Natural History	Super	££	Continue the segregated Sustrans cycle path southwards across South Parks Road at the traffic lights on a toucan signal, and feed in to Parks Road south of the junction.

The following additional items were on the Cycle City list and are not listed in order of priority:

32	Interim improvements at Botley Road rail bridge	Botley Road rail bridge		£15,000	Improve the safety and usability of the road under the rail bridge by Oxford Station, by creating more space and visibility for cyclists east-bound, on the approach to and under the bridge, and on the approach to Frideswide Square junction.
33	Abandoned cycle clearance	City wide and in particular the city centre		no cost : improve existing operations	Review current arrangements for clearing abandoned bikes from areas suffering cycle parking congestion, in particular the City centre.
34	Foliage clearance	City wide		no cost : improve existing	Local stakeholders to identify overgrown cycle paths that would benefit from foliage clearance

				operations	
35	Increase cycle parking:	overnight parking built at Redbridge and Seacourt		£15,000 (Cycle City) + £60,000 S106	City and County Councils to work together to identify further opportunities for implementing increased cycle parking in the City centre, and improve cycle parking and signage at Park and Ride sites
36	Scheme design for new Thames crossing at Jackdaw Lane :	Jackdaw lane		£10,000 (feasibility)	Initial feasibility report for new cycle and pedestrian bridge to provide an alternative quiet route between East Oxford and the City centre via the Thames Path (avoiding The Plain), and providing a direct link between East Oxford and Grandpont. Longer term funding would need to be found from other sources to enable detailed design work and implementation.
37	Scheme design for new Thames crossing at Oxpens	Linking the Thames Towpath at Osney Mead to the Oxpens development site.		£10,000 (feasibility)	Initial feasibility report for new pedestrian and cycle bridge as alternative quiet route between West Oxford and Oxford City Centre West End, linking the Thames Towpath at Osney Mead to the Oxpens development site. Longer term funding would need to be found from other sources to enable detailed design work and implementation
38	Inbound cycle lane, Abingdon Road	Abingdon Road		£20,000	Pedestrian refuge realignment and paint cycle lanes. Consult on removing or restricting main carriageway parking.
39	Highway improvements to provide a convenient, navigable route from East Oxford to the Thames Towpath route and South	East Oxford to Thames Towpath via Donnington Bridge		£25,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Improve cycle lanes / priority on Donnington Bridge Road ii. Upgrade crossing and its approaches between Fairacres Road and Howard Street to provide option of continuous off-carriageway route iii. Change traffic regulation to allow 2-way cycling in Howard Street

	Oxford				
40	Improve lighting along Ring Road Cycle Track	Ring Road Cycle Track		To be determined	Identify unlit sections of Ring Road cycle track that would most benefit from lighting, and work implement a scheme (City to work jointly with County Council)
41	Improvements around Donnington Bridge,	OCoCCiL Route: Redbridge to Churchill Hospital			Upgrade footpath between Iffley Road and Marsh Road, new links across Cowley Marsh Park and Southfield Golf Course and improvements on Churchill Hospital site.
42	Creation of a continuous high quality route following the 'Eastern Arc' along the B4495 corridor.	OCoCCiL Route: Rose Hill to Summertown			Upgrade Henley Avenue to Ellesmere Road bridleway, improvements to B4495 including major improvements through Cowley centre, and improvements to Hollow Way, The Slade, Windmill Road, Headington centre, Headley Way/Cherwell Drive and Marston Ferry Road.
43	Improve A40 cycle track east of Ring Road from Thornhill,	OCoCCiL Route: Thornhill Park & Ride to St Clements			Improvements through Headington Quarry, Windmill Road (Gaythorn Road to Old Road), Old Road and Morrell Avenue. Complementary improvements to Cheney Lane. New crossings to complement these.
44	Improvements from Ring Road cycle track at Old Headington leading to improved routes around and through John Radcliffe Hospital, continuing down Jack Straw's Lane, Marston Road and linking to University Parks route.	OCoCCiL Route: Thornhill Park & Ride to South Parks Road			Complementary improvements to Stoke Place and Cuckoo Lane. Various new crossings to complement these.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 3 –Suggested executive response provided by the Board Member for Planning, Transport & Regulatory Services

55

Recommendation	Agreed? (Y / N / In part)	Comment
<p>1. That the City Council's unallocated cycling capital budget (approx. £110k over two years) should be used to fund the lower cost Cycling Review Group wish-list items in order of priority. The highest priority is signing City Council route 5, extending to Littlemore and the Leys Pool. This should include signing cyclists onto this route from key destinations such as Oxford Business Park, Vue Cinema and Oxford Academy.</p>	<p>In part</p>	<p>This recommendation isn't wholly clear, as the definition of 'lower cost' isn't precise in reference to the list of items in Appendix 2, which includes both precise sums of money – albeit without confirmation that these figures are accurate – and very approximate bandings of potential expense. However the general direction of the policy, that lower cost and achievable items with significant positive impacts, should be the priority, is accepted.</p> <p>It is important to note that as the County Council is the Highways Authority there are considerable constraints on what the City Council is able to do on its own. The County Council has been clear that it is unwilling to progress schemes in areas where it is planning or already carrying out consultation on larger projects – for example in the Headington area. The sums of money set aside by the City Council for capital schemes can and should be progressed as soon as possible, and that means selecting schemes that do not require any input or permission from the County Council.</p>
<p>2. That the wish-list of cycling improvement projects drawn up by the Cycling Review Group, with advice from Cyclox and Sustrans, should be used to decide how future City and County Council funding for cycling improvements is spent. Flexibility should be applied so that new opportunities can also be funded where this is appropriate.</p>	<p>In part</p>	<p>While the wish-list is a useful starting point, there needs to be greater assessment of the actual costs, benefits and feasibilities for each scheme or block of schemes before it can be used as the basis for spending prioritisation. A prioritisation scheme that referenced cost, impact, feasibility/deliverability against objective criteria would seem to be a more appropriate mechanism. This is particularly important for the County Council as the Highways Authority, who will be responsible for the vast majority of spending decisions about on-street schemes, and it is reasonable to expect them to carry out such as an assessment.</p>

		Furthermore, almost all the schemes identified are on-street schemes, and don't include for example the funding of cycle parking and storage facilities off-street, whether on public (Council-owned) land or otherwise. For example there may be substantial benefits to a partnership approach with major employers, educational establishments (schools, colleges and universities) and other organisations to provide better cycle parking and storage; for the City Council, which is constrained in what it can carry out without County Council permission, these sorts of schemes may perform well in terms of benefits and deliverability.
3. That the City Council encourages the police and Direct Services to proactively send reusable abandoned bikes to Broken Spoke and other bike shops that are happy to take part, so that as many of these bikes as possible can be refurbished and reused locally.	Agreed	Direct Services already makes repairable bikes available to shops and other schemes in this way; the remainder are recycled and are counted as part of the City's recycling figures. Direct Services will liaise with the police and any other institutions who collect abandoned bicycles to see if there is scope for greater co-ordination and efficiencies.
4. That the City Council ensures that developer funding can be used to contribute to cycling improvements where appropriate, including by: a) Ensuring that the City Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) list is consistent with funding the higher cost cycling improvement projects set out in our wish-list, next time the CIL list is reviewed; b) Using CIL funding as a local contribution to attract match funding, for example from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, for cycling improvement schemes in accordance with the Council's CIL list (often these will be part of wider transport improvement schemes); c) Alerting Ward Members when significant sums (we suggest >£5k) of the 'neighbourhood portion' of CIL have been allocated to their local area. We would encourage members to consider spending this funding on lower cost cycling improvement schemes from our	Agreed	a) The Regulation 123 list which sets out what CIL can be spent on already is consistent with the recommendations. See list here: http://www.oxford.gov.uk/Library/Documents/Planning/CIL%20Regulation%20123%20List.pdf It includes: 'Improved environment for pedestrians and cyclists in City centre, including Queen Street, St Giles, Magdalen Street, George Street and Broad Street' , 'Improved City centre cycling environment' & 'Orbital and radial cycle routes'. The Regulation 123 list is reviewed regularly, and is approved annually as part of the Budget process, and will be reviewed in the light of the wish-list and the responses above at that time. b) Agreed; this is largely how CIL is utilised already. c) Subject to the proviso that the 'neighbourhood portion' of CIL

wish-list where possible.		is only available in the non-parished areas of the city (in the parished areas it is transferred to the relevant parish council), and subject to final decisions on the process for allocating these funds to projects supported by the local community, agreed.
<p>5. That the City Council ensures that its planning policies are consistent with its vision for Oxford to become one of the great cycling cities of Europe, including by:</p> <p>a) Ensuring that cycling routes and provision are considered and included in all major new developments, prioritising cycling and pedestrian access;</p> <p>b) Reviewing and updating planning policies relating to cycle parking standards for non-residential cycle parking, as part of the next full or partial review of the Local Plan.</p>	Agreed	<p>a) These issues are already covered in a range of policies in the Local Plan, including Core Strategy Policy CS14, Saved Local Plan Policy TR.4 and associated car parking standards, Saved Local Plan Policy TR.5 and the Parking Standards, Transport Assessment and Travel Plans Supplementary Planning Document SPD approved in 2007. (See http://www.oxford.gov.uk/Direct/61407AdoptedParkingStandardsSPD.pdf)</p> <p>b) Agreed</p>
<p>6. That the Council Leader or Board Member for Planning and Transport writes to the County Council and requests that they do the following in consultation with the City Council:</p> <p>a) Implement the Cycle Super Routes and Cycle Premium Routes as soon as possible;</p> <p>b) Bring together cycling organisations, county highways planners and highway engineers to agree a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford, drawing on findings from the London Cycling Campaign. This should include priority phasing of traffic lights for cyclists;</p> <p>c) Consider how cycle routes can be signed more consistently and what the standard should be. We suggest that destinations and distances, rather than route numbers, should be shown on cycle signage;</p> <p>d) Agree that highway maintenance works should not</p>	Agreed	

<p>be signed off until they are safe and suitable for cycling; e) Work with Government and other local authorities to implement the All Party Parliamentary Group recommendation to achieve a £10 per head of population investment in cycling.</p>		
<p>7. That the City Council nominates a Member Cycling Champion (a Councillor) to lead on work to improve cycling in Oxford at a political level and maximise the City Council's influence.</p>	Agreed	
<p>8. That the City Council brings forward proposals for additional staffing resources to enable the City Council to engage proactively with cycling groups, work smarter with the County Council, and support the member champion (see recommendation 7). We would suggest 1 FTE dedicated to cycling, with a creative solution to funding this post which may involve other organisations. This role should include: a) Supporting the Member Cycling Champion (see recommendation 6) in convening a forum of the different cycling groups and representatives of other stakeholders such as schools to co-ordinate efforts and agree a common position when lobbying for cycling improvement schemes; b) Engaging with the County Council to maximise the City Council's influence as LTP4 is put into practice; c) Influencing the development of a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford (see recommendation 5e); d) Monitoring the County Council's Highway Asset Management Strategy (road repairs) to identify opportunities for cycling provision to be improved during planned maintenance works (we have identified 4 such projects);</p>	In part	<p>While on paper there is much to commend the idea of a City Council employed cycling officer, there are considerable practical concerns about proposed scope of the role, and the impact that it would have. The proposed responsibilities range from the organising of meetings to the identifying of ways in which to change motorists' behaviour, with many of the suggested responsibilities essentially overlapping with those already sitting with the County Council's Highways teams – this seems problematic in a single post.</p> <p>The proposal as it stands can of course form part of the annual budgetary discussions, but at a time of extremely constrained budgets and with many critical services facing cuts to their budgets, the Council may find it difficult to justify substantial expenditure on a new post in an area primarily covered by another local authority's statutory responsibilities.</p> <p>However, there may be scope to develop an innovative partnership approach with major employers/organisations that would share costs and responsibilities. For example a collaboration with the Universities and the local NHS Trusts could provide expertise for their internal travel planning, and at the same time input into the planning of the city-wide cycle network that would join-up their sites. I would suggest that this option is explored as one more likely to deliver the objectives of the review panel. It is important to note that staff resource will</p>

<p>e) Examining existing evidence on what works for improving cycling take up; f) Promoting active travel to school through Bikeability training and advocacy, particularly at the beginning of every academic year. Excellence in this area should be recognised perhaps through the Lord Mayor/Member Champion going in to schools to give prizes, or inviting winners to attend civic events. g) Identifying ways to change motorists' behaviour.</p>		<p>be required to develop this sort of 'sustainable transport partnership', but once established and supported by other organisations the need for time and financial resource would be less than for a stand-alone officer employed solely by the City Council.</p>
<p>9. That the City Council promotes positive images of cycling in Council literature, particularly the soon to be signed route to Blackbird Leys pool.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The City Council already promotes cycling through maps, leaflets and other publications which highlight cycling's benefits for both individual health and the collective well-being of the city, and will continue to do so.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

To: City Executive Board

Date: 10 September 2015

Report of: Scrutiny Committee

Title of Report: Report of the Waste Water Flooding Panel

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To update members and present a recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee following the Waste Water Flooding Panel's recent engagement with Thames Water Utilities on the progress of the Oxford Catchment Study

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Roy Darke

Executive Lead Member: Councillor Bob Price, Leader and Executive Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development

Policy Framework: Corporate Plan 2015-2019

Recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the following recommendation:

1. That the City Council continues to engage with Thames Water Utilities (TWU) at a senior level through the Oxford Area Flood Partnership and other appropriate channels. This should include early engagement in relation to future development proposals that affect TWU.

Background

1. The Waste Water Flooding Panel was set up by the Scrutiny Committee in 2013 with cross party membership to address concerns about sewage flooding across the city. The current members of the Panel are Councillors Darke (Chair), Goddard, Pressel and Thomas.
2. The Panel originally met with representatives of Thames Water Utilities (TWU) on 9 May 2014 where it was agreed that a catchment study of the sewerage system in Oxford would be brought forward. TWU estimated that it would take 2 years to get to the point of programming works. A small pilot study would also take place independently in Grandpont.

3. The Panel held a further meeting with representatives of Thames Water Utilities on 16 July 2015 to monitor progress of the Grandpont pilot study and the main catchment study.
4. The Council's Interim Head of Environmental Development updated the Panel on the work of the Council's Environmental Development service in relation to flooding issues, and on recent organisational changes at the City Council. Flood-related activities were dealt with by the Environmental Sustainability team, Housing and Direct Services.
5. Both meetings were attended by Andrew Smith MP, a representative of Nicola Blackwood MP and a member of Oxford Flood Alliance.

Grandpont study

6. With the support of partners including Oxford City Council, TWU led on work investigating the most likely causes of sewer flooding experienced at Grandpont.
7. A condition survey of the sewerage infrastructure and network indicated that it was generally in good condition. There was little evidence to suggest that the state of the sewerage system was the primary factor in the flooding.
8. The study focused on the possible role of private groundwater flood protection devices (sump pumps), which were known to exist in the area. If, for example, they were incorrectly connected to the foul sewer, instead of the surface water network, flood water would quickly overwhelm the sewerage network with the unpleasant result of raw sewage entering properties.
9. To determine whether this was the mechanism for basement flooding, further investigation was needed. Residents received an update on the study, and TWU was working with the community to ensure sump pumps were correctly connected.
10. Ahead of the winter period, residents would be advised to discharge water in a flood event in to the road and not pump to sewers. Although the discharge of water across footways was not permitted without a suitable licensed channel, it was acceptable as a practical solution in a flood situation.

Catchment study

11. The catchment study is a substantial long term study of the sewerage system in Oxford. It would inform a long term strategy for a robust drainage network, including a cost-beneficial programme of improvement works. The study would also identify actions that partner agencies could take to minimise the risk of flooding incidents.
12. Phase 1 of the catchment study was now largely complete. It involved gathering customer evidence, flow monitoring of the foul system and the surface water system, and asset surveys including the use of CCTV and inspections.
13. TWU reported that during their investigations they came across a number of serious problems, which they had been dealing with on a find and fix basis.

These fixes would open up capacity, improving flows and access. TWU were also working to prevent problems such as fatbergs from occurring and considering piloting a scheme in Oxford of working with food outlets to prevent commercial fat, oil and grease from entering the sewer network.

14. Phase 2 included in depth and on-going inspections of trunk sewers and the development of predictive 3D modelling. This would enable TWU to manage flows effectively in real time to prevent flooding incidents. TWU intended to link their hydraulic models of the foul and surface water systems to the Environment Agency's river model.
15. TWU advised that the sewerage pumping station at Littlemore was the largest in their western region. A specialist team from London was being brought in to clean the wells and trunks, and the two pumps may be replaced with higher capacity models. This would optimise the performance of the station and reduce the risk of it being knocked out by sediment.
16. TWU were keen to improve their customer communications operation and better inform the public of what they are doing. There was now a dedicated [webpage for the Oxford catchment study](#).
17. TWU would welcome advance notice and early engagement from the City Council in relation to major development proposals that may impact them, perhaps through the Oxford Area Flooding Partnership, which meets quarterly.

Recommendation – That the City Council continues to engage with Thames Water Utilities (TWU) at a senior level through the Oxford Area Flood Partnership and other appropriate channels. This should include early engagement in relation to future development proposals that affect TWU.

Next steps

18. The Panel agreed to issue a press release to welcome the progress of the catchment study and circulate a communication to all City Councillors.
19. TWU would continue to provide quarterly updates to the Oxford Area Flood Partnership and agreed to provide an end of year update to the Flooding Panel. Representatives of the Environment Agency and Oxford Flood Alliance (OAF) and South Oxford Action Group (SOFAG) would be invited.
20. The Scrutiny Committee agreed that TWU would be asked to hold an annual member seminar as an alternative to continue with a Flooding Panel.

Name and contact details of author:-

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee
Scrutiny Officer
Law and Governance
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: abrown2@oxford.gov.uk

List of background papers: None;
Version number: 2.0

This page is intentionally left blank