

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>	<p>Agreed</p>	
<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>	<p>In part</p>	<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. 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. 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