Active Oxfordshire's Response to the Oxfordshire Local Transport Connectivity Plan and Active and Healthy Travel Strategy.

March 2022.

Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP)

Vision

We **strongly agree to the Vision** of the LTCP.

Making walking, cycling and public transport the natural first choice, not only directly opens daily physical activity as an option through active travel, but also creates the opportunity for the development of a public realm more supportive of active lifestyles. Active Oxfordshire wish to support a movement of movement, one that tackles inactivity and inequality, in which walking and cycling are crucial components.

Themes

We **support all five themes and strongly support those of Environment, Health and Place Shaping.**

We particularly support the inequalities focus within the definition of 'health', as our focus at Active Oxfordshire is fighting inactivity, tackling inequality.

Active Oxfordshire have championed Oxfordshire's Healthy Place Shaping approach, including attracting national investment for local wayfinding pilots.

We're glad to see 'Healthy Place Shaping' feature prominently within the document and suggest for consistency, and external promotion of Healthy Place Shaping that 'Place Shaping' be re-titled Healthy Place Shaping.

To distinguish Healthy Place Shaping from the current 'health' theme we recommend re-titling this theme either 'An Inequalities Focus' or 'Health Inequalities'.

Targets

We **agree with targets for 2030, 2040 and 2050**.

In support of the 'health' theme, we propose an additional target of '50% of journeys in towns and cities being walked or cycled by 2030' – to align with the Government's Gear Change strategy.

In recognition of the rural, and market town nature of much of Oxfordshire, there may be scope for an additional target focused on the rural connectivity and active travel.

We support the 'supporting' cycling targets but would encourage targets to include walking and cycling, in line with the hierarchy of users.

Policies

Walking and Cycling

We **strongly support all policies in this section.**

We strongly support the focus on walking and cycling as a key focus of the plan and the recognition of the impact that the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan can have on physical activity levels in the county.

The statistics mentioned here have been heavily impacted by COVID-19 and the inequalities related to this, we would be happy to furnish you with both up to date figures on this and also additional analysis of the Active Lives data (the source of these statistics) that show the stark difference in cycling and walking levels between high and low affluence families. We support all the policies in this section in general, but with certain comments and changes. Safety, and the perception of safety are major barriers to people adopting active travel.

An **additional policy** should adopt the **'Vision Zero'** or Safe Systems approach to reducing road casualties. This is the approach already identified by the Government for its new integrated road safety strategic framework (see Gear Change: One Year On, and http://www.towardszerofoundation.org/thesafesystem/).

Transport user hierarchy – We strongly support this policy.

- We have heard objections to this based on misunderstandings and pedantic interpretations (e.g. thinking that walkers and cyclists would gain priority in all situations) clearly these are nonsense and the policy is more directional than this.
- The inclusion of shared vehicles above private ones is important – car club vehicles are currently said to be replacing about 15 private cars each.

Cycling and walking networks – We strongly support this policy in general. But recommend that with a health inequalities focus it could be clearer on the intention to be inclusive and accessible to all.

- Policy 2: 'comprehensive walking and cycling networks that are attractive to the preferences and abilities of all residents in all towns' comes close but should be clarified to reinforce inclusivity for all ages and abilities. Walking routes should be walkable by those with mobility aids and double buggies, able to pass each other in comfort. We also recommend the adoption of child- and age-friendly approaches

such as those promoted by [Urban95](#) or [880Cities](#). Cycling routes should be rideable by unaccompanied children of 11-12 who have passed Bikeability to support the school run, and by disabled people who cycle as a mobility aid, or use other mobility aids that might be supported on these routes.

- With the well-designed LTN 1/20 standards forming the basis for inspections by Active Travel England, we hope that any subsequent 'Oxfordshire Cycle Design Standards' will only build upon these standards to reflect place-based strengths, and not weaken requirements in any way.

- Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) – We strongly support this policy, and the aim for completing LCWIPs for all 10,000 population towns by 2025. We recommend that these plans be designed not only to support travel across these conurbations but also journeys into-and-out-of town, to reflect their importance as local market towns, centres of education and other infrastructure (as is being explored by the Witney LCWIP).

- Connectivity between all areas of a town are essential, using grade separation where necessary to achieve routes that meet all five of the LTN 1/20 core design principles: (Coherent, Direct, Safe, Comfortable, Attractive).

Strategic Active Travel Network – We strongly support this policy.

- In light of the Healthy Place Shaping principle of building upon local strengths, we recommend that the initial network developed by the Oxfordshire Cycling Network, in 2016/17 be a good point to start.

Greenways– We strongly support this policy

- In Policy 9, Greenways are good, we welcome the recognition that not all active travel is about commuting to work, it can include friends visiting each other, or indeed cycling or walking to get somewhere for leisure purpose – rather than a 'sporting' bike ride. The term 'leisure commuting' is unwieldly and may require definition.

Community activation – We strongly support this policy

- We particularly support the policy's focus on health inequalities but we would also recommend a recognition of the potential to use community activation, not only to engage people with new infrastructure, but to inform improved outcomes in the design of the built environment.

- Designed correctly, activation can provide less formal, and more meaningful, informed and realistic consultation, with the ability to engage those who wouldn't otherwise feel able to share their voice. It also provides opportunities for individuals to understand how they and others like the can be beneficiaries of infrastructural changes,

- In our delivery of Community Activation attached to the Emergency Active Travel Fund we also became aware of the community demand for 'light' place making investments. Those that might 'test' or 'support', larger more permanent investments or that might improve a feeling of hygiene and safety factors and removed perceived and real inequalities in accessing our public realm for the purposes of active travel.

Active Oxfordshire response to the Active and Healthy Travel Strategy (AHTS).

We **strongly agree to the Vision** of the AHTS

We tend to agree with the targets within the strategy but propose the following the following amendments or additions.

We feel these targets reflect the unequal standing of walking and cycling in this strategy.

"Realise the cycling targets and improve the walking experience" – there should be targets for walking as well, and parallel wording.

These targets should make reference to the Government's target for 50% of all journeys in towns and cities being cycled or walked by 2030. (Gear Change p12).

There are also a lack of targets focused toward addressing equal access and adoption of walking and cycling to those facing inequalities, targets on the numbers of people and demographic make-up of those actively travelling would better reflect the vision of cycling 'open' to all.

The vision could be strengthened in its focus on cycling and walking as being accessible (and accessed) by all, in line with the health and place shaping themes of the LTCP.

The section could be strengthened by a link to health benefits. e.g. 'If we achieve these levels of active travel we expect to see a reduction in cardiovascular disease by x cases per year / early mortality by x life years per year.

If all 5 factors apply to walking, why is only factor 5 set out in the walking section, particularly when factor 5 explicitly references cycling as well as walking?

Commitment to active travel and governance

Though this is titled 'commitment to active travel', the focus is on mainstreaming cycling, we would like this to be cycling and walking.

This section is important in recognising the complex systematic cross-council approach that must be taken in delivering Active Travel – and the cross system benefits it can provide. We think there is scope to be more explicit in this and include a list of relevant departments, and directional active travel objectives for those departments.

For example:

• Education: Increase travel to school by active modes

• Transport Development Control: Improve Active Travel outcomes on and off-site, avoid car-dependent developments

Cycle Network

Though we strongly support the majority of these policies, particularly 18, 19, 20. there is a lack of accessibility and inequalities focus, particularly in policy 13, 14 and 17.

This section is based heavily on the OCS19 survey which is all people who are currently cycling, with a very heavy bias to frequent cyclists. It has no data on current non-cyclists and insignificant data on low frequency cyclists. This should be at least acknowledged.

OCS19 states 'New Cyclists generally have similar views to existing cyclists in terms of infrastructure choice', and 'evidence indicates as they become more regular cyclists, they take on the infrastructure choice of confident cyclists' – these statements have the risk of incorporating 'Survivor Bias' into decision making, we would like to see additional research into those who never became cyclists, or stopped cycling.

We recommend an additional Action to improve insight based on 'non' or 'latent' cyclists in Oxfordshire and their perceptions of cycling infrastructure or barriers to active travel.

Active Oxfordshire are also in possession of some limited current local insight on these issues, conducted as part of the activation funding of the Emergency Active Travel Fund, and as part of the Cycling on Prescription Trailblazer.

Top 5 barriers to cycling more as identified by participants (EATF)
- Road safety concerns
- Weather
- Lack of cycle infrastructure
- Don't own a bike
- Need to use car after

Top 5 barriers to walking more as identified by participants (EATF)
- Weather
- No time
- Need to use car after
- Personal safety
- Too far

We would be happy to share and engage on this further.

Policy 17 – We will prioritise and concentrate on measures that increase the number of frequent cyclists in the short term.

Our primary research, and secondary insight based on studies by TfL etc. suggests that it is not a general 'cycling culture' that encourages those 'hard to reach' groups but rather a lack of role models who are 'people like me'. Therefore supporting people who are already confident cyclists to cycle more is unlikely to achieve this. Focus must be on inclusion and the removal of systematic barriers, from a built environment, activation and health perspective -- in line with Healthy Place Shaping. (We would also recommend that 'hard to reach' be replaced by the term 'hardly reached' -- an acknowledgement that they are reachable, but that we are struggling to achieve this through current methods.)

The negative response from some quarters to Low Traffic Neighbourhoods is based on a perception that Oxford has a cycling culture -- and it is one that is exclusively white, able-bodied and middle class. Though this is not the case, an approach that boosts the current culture, without broadening the narrative and creating a more diverse representation of those currently cycling, has the potential to create a 'culture war' or them and us between active travel users and those who are not.

Policy 13 – Where it is impossible to design adequately for both confident and cautious cyclists, a dual choice network should be introduced.

Policy 14 – It is essential that the needs of confident cyclists are adequately met in support of LCWIP cycling targets.

OCS19 also appears to have had a heavy influence on the 'dual choice network'. With an inequalities focus, we would prefer a network that does not exclude certain people from cycling. The strategic approach should be build a network for accessible by all. If it isn't possible to build the highest quality infrastructure because of lack of resources, then that is an implementation issue. It should not detract from the overall strategic aim of creating a high-quality inclusive network.

We would like to see explicit preference and ambition for the creation of safe, inclusive segregated routes along arterial roads. Routes that are designed to attract, and respond to the needs of those not currently cycling. We know that there needs to be compromise where the road width and the funding is not available, but that is a delivery issue, the strategy needs to remain aspirational, inclusive and high-quality.

Local Transport Note 1/20 lists it's first principle as requiring infrastructure for everyone: "Cycle infrastructure should be accessible to everyone from 8 to 80 and beyond: it should

be planned and designed for everyone. The opportunity to cycle in our towns and cities should be universal."

Policy 18 – We will ensure that improvements to cycling and walking networks are supported by community activation.

Policy 19 – We will work closely with and seek views of stakeholders when developing and improving the active travel network.

Policy 20 – We will work closely with stakeholders using co-production methods to develop and improve cycle and walking designs of new infrastructure.

Having worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council on Community Activation we clearly believe in the importance of this work and are glad to see activation -- as a branch of Healthy Place Shaping -- recognised alongside the built environment. In line with our comments above though we would characterise the work as more important in addressing the broader systematic barriers that might restrict an individual facing inequalities from accessing active travel.

We also believe activation, applied with flexibility, has a greater capacity to inform improved outcomes in the design of the built environment. Designed correctly, activation can provide less formal, and more meaningful, informed and realistic consultation, with the ability to engage those who wouldn't otherwise feel able to share their voice.

It also provides opportunities for individuals to understand how they and others like them, might be beneficiaries of infrastructural changes rather than 'victims'.

During our community activation work, we have become aware of the community demand for 'light' place making investments. Those that might 'test' or 'support', larger more permanent investments such as improved access to somewhere to sit and rest, or public art approaches that might improve a feeling of hygiene and safety factors and removed perceived and real inequalities in accessing our public realm for the purposes of active travel.

These approaches fall in a grey area between community activation and highways infrastructure, yet may provide opportunities for 'test and learn' and 'active consultation'. We believe there is value in the identification of an approach to realise these potential benefits - essentially for Policy 18 to support better outcomes for 19 and 20.

We fully support the use of co-production methods, and making use of the strength of knowledge and expertise in the local cycling and walking bodies identified. We would

additionally recommend strengthening this through place-based co-production with those individuals not currently accessing active travel.

Policy 3. This policy could be stronger in recognising the need for all infrastructure to consider inclusivity and accessibility, rather than some of it, i.e. a statement in line with the first summary principle of LTN 1/20 "Cycle infrastructure should be accessible to everyone from 8 to 80 and beyond: it should be planned and designed for everyone. The opportunity to cycle in our towns and cities should be universal."

Policy 11. Replace in line with the preferences of confident or cautious cyclists' with 'and make them as inclusive as practical.' In practice, this will take many years – you may wish to note 'over time' or give a sense that priority routes will be tackled first.

Policy 12. It is not clear what would be a 'network improvement' vs. a 'route improvement', but we agree that an improvement that improves many journeys should be prioritised. This is a good example of where a plain English glossary might benefit the strategy.

Policy 21. The potential for the Strategic Active Travel Network (SATN) to support e-bike adoption, and the potential importance of e-bikes to our rural communities is well noted. We recommended that the broader LTCP consider e-bikes within its broader EV infrastructure plans – as is being developed in West Oxfordshire – and therefore supporting infrastructure such as storage/charging might be relevant to SATN.

Managing car use

Policy 25 – In developing LCWIP cycle networks, we will identify where LTNs can be created or improved. LTNs are residential areas where through motor traffic is prevented by traffic filters.

It is beneficial that this document note existing low traffic neighbourhoods that exist across Oxfordshire and have done for decades, as a result of design or geography, this is an important future narrative.

We would support an additional LTN policy in line with the LTCP's recognition of parklets, seating and other light infrastructure of value in supporting both a more vibrant, active public realm and enabling more people to make use of active travel.

We believe these would be most effectively delivered through a place-based mix of community activation and light 'tactical' infrastructure to conform with ETRO-requirement and to provide local residents a feeling of being involved in the design of their neighbourhoods. This aligns with our comments on the Activation -- and the potential to gather support and better outcomes.

We are very supportive of LTNs but believe they can achieve and support much more and should focus on their ability to support young and old without access to motorised transport to access facilities, rather than 'filters' and 'barriers'. A focus on the outcomes, and working with the community to design those to be enabled by LTNs, rather than a process that allows characterisation of 'road blocks'.

Cycling culture

Active Travel Activation

Policy 35 – We will continue to develop our ATA programme to support the AHTS targets. ATA takes many forms such as cycle network maps and bike libraries.

Policy 36 – We will ensure that local cycling and walking activation plans are developed in conjunction with the development of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs).

We are particularly supportive of Policy 35 and 36, and suggest adding a diagram of the Transtheoretical Model of Behaviour Change to the supporting narrative.

This will help explain the several stages of where activation may land -- as the list currently provided trends toward the Preparation and Action stages, whereas it will be neccesary to consider addressing those at Precontemplation -- This is the stage in the process when you aren't considering making a change -- and Contemplation. -- where you probably see that you could make a change in some area at this stage, but you aren't heavily invested in it, and it is not a priority.

Please see our comments on Policy 18,19, 20 for more on community activation.

Children and schools

Policy 37 – We will encourage active travel to schools in a number of ways such as encouraging schools to provide cycle parking.

Policy 38 – In partnership with district authorities we will seek to ensure there are safe places for young children to learn to cycle.

As suggested in earlier comments, we can provide additional insight on inequalities and the impact on children and young peoples' cycling and walking.

In line with this Policy 37 we would recommend the addition of providing access to cycles through bike libraries (so all children can access bikeabilty and cycling to school) -- as has been successful in recent activation.

We particularly like the opening statement and its reference to 'gaining independence by cycling alone to visit friends.. or visit places'. This independence has been highlighted as the basis for studies showing Dutch children to be the 'happiest in the world'. Therefore we recommend that thought could be given to an expanded Policy 37 (or additional policy)

that considers the broader infrastructure that children and young people might want to access independently -- particularly those facing social inequalities -- this will align well to the youth provision priorities of the Fair Deal Alliance.

Urban Realm

We strongly support all policies in this section

We believe Policy 47 should apply to walking routes also. There should also be an audit of existing infrastructure and remove/replace those not suitable to wheelchairs, adaptive bikes, pushchairs etc. As many of the policies set out under the cycling section apply to walking, the document should be explicit in this – such as our suggestion in Policy 47 – and all sections should be walking and cycling not solely cycling focused in the narrative.

Designing for Walking

We strongly support all policies in this section. As many of the policies set out under the cycling section apply to walking, the document should be explicit in this – such as our suggestion in Policy 47 – and all sections should be walking and cycling not solely cycling focused in the narrative.

Other comments

We believe in a place-based approach but one that builds on local strengths and uses them to overcome local barriers. There are narrow roads in many cities and nowhere else proposes changing from LTN 1/20. We should adopt the same strategies and standards, deviating only by exception. Therefore any Oxfordshire specific guidance would need reflect further innovation or another step-up from those outlined in LTN 1/20 that Active Travel England will monitor against.

The remainder of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan

Healthy Place Shaping

We strongly support the adoption of Healthy Place Shaping as part of Oxfordshire's approach to transport and connectivity planning.

Healthy Streets Approach – We strongly support this policy

- The Healthy Streets approach is well proven by TfL, who have also developed a helpful set of tools made available free to London Boroughs and consequently to other Local Authorities.

Health Impact Assessment – We strongly support this policy

- Quantifying health impacts of significant transport and development schemes, including their impact on health through the levers of physical activity, air pollution, climate change and casualties is essential to gauging their full effect on society. We must 'Protect the NHS' from poorly designed developments that load the physical and mental health burden of increasing private car use onto the actual health of the public and into the costs of running the NHS and local public health services.

Guidance and Standards for New Development – We strongly support this policy

- Oxfordshire's Street Design Guide needs to be updated in 2022 to reflect (a) the recently released 'Inclusive Mobility'; (b) the soon-to-be released 'Manual for Streets 3'; (c) 20 minute neighbourhood and LTN/filtered permeability approaches; (d) connectivity to existing settlements and other destinations.

- The guidance in Appendix 2 is good. It would be good to add a point warning against developments being cut-off for active travel because routes would travel across or along major roads or through major junctions. One bad junction can ruin a complete route.

- Priority should be given to car-free developments near transport hubs and well-connected for active travel.

Low Traffic Neighbourhoods – We strongly support this policy

- LTNs are proven to increase physical activity through walking and cycling, to reduce motor traffic, to reduce air pollution, to reduce road casualties, to reduce street crime, to increase business to local shops and if well-designed the do not delay emergency services and make it easier for disabled people to get around by walking, wheeling and cycling.

- More areas on Oxfordshire towns should be considered for LTNs.

- Priority to be given to the areas around schools, to facilitate car-free access by pupils. (School Streets are good, but LTNs are better).

- We value the recognition of the potential of parklets, seating etc. as part of the LTN process to support physical and social activity – and we believe these would be most effectively delivered through a place-based mix of community activation and light 'tactical' infrastructure to conform with ETRO-requirement and to provide local residents a feeling of being involved in the design of their neighbourhoods.

- The approach to consultation should change from 'proposing an LTN' to 'asking residents how they would like their streets to be'. An approach focused on outcomes rather than process. As outlined in Urban Movement/LCC 'How to talk to people about the future of their streets' http://www.urbanmovement.co.uk/thoughts/better-engagement-for-better-streets – this approach works well with the Healthy Streets approach.

20-minute Neighbourhoods – We strongly support this policy

- Putting amenities in reach of people is vital to avoiding emission creating journeys (the most powerful part of Avoid/Shift/Improve), building healthy activity into lifestyles, and establishing communities.
- There is some confusion between the definitions of 20-minute and 15-minute neighbourhoods, this, and other parts of this Plan would be well supported by a plain English glossary.

School Streets – We strongly support this policy

- School Streets should be combined with other programmes including: improved cycling and walking routes (and signage) in the vicinity; Bikeability training (ideally with a way that parents can access it as well as children); activation measures, e.g. information/promotion of healthy & active travel.

Road Safety

Road safety – We oppose this policy as worded.

- Policy 20 is too weak and comes across as a 'business as usual' approach to road safety. OCC should adopt a more proactive 'Vision Zero' or Safe System approach, and start working with Thames Valley Police and stakeholders to design danger out of the county's transport system.

20mph zones – We strongly support this policy.

- Safe Speed is a fundamental part of the Safe System approach, and "any impact greater than 30km/h increases the risk of dying significantly"[1]
- 20mph will need encouragement or enforcement in many places. OCC should support infrastructure measures (traffic calming, especially narrowing carriageways to reallocate space to people walking or cycling), community speed watch and 'official' speed cameras.

Equestrians – We strongly support this policy

Public Transport

We support public transport, and think that it should work alongside active transport as joint mainstays of the future transport system (for people). And a strong public transport system can only exist in a system where people can access public transport, safely and easily by means of active travel.

Bus strategy – We strongly support this policy, but think it should go further

- Setting habits when people are young is particularly important, and young people have lower income and assets. Subsidies should be focused there, for example a

---

[1] http://www.towardszerofoundation.org/thesafesystem/

'young person's bus card' offering discounted journeys at a simple flat price: £1 a journey. This should be considered alongside supporting young people facing inequalities to access facilities and activities to support healthier, happier lives.

Community transport – We strongly support this policy

- Community transport should be coordinated with other public transport, active travel (e.g. routes, signage, cycle parking) as much as possible.

Park and Ride – We partially support this policy

- We think that Park and Ride should be considered as an interim solution, a 'gateway' to a full public transport journey. You have someone who is happy to catch a bus, but still travels probably the greatest distance (hence emissions) by private car. This is an opportunity for behaviour change.
- Policy 29 – We support this review of Park and Ride. This could consider Park and Ride in a new modes, for example: 'Ride and Drive', where city dwellers store their cars which are un-needed and not required for city life. When required for a longer journey, they would take the bus to the 'Ride and Drive' and then drive on. This has the potential to remove unnecessary parked cars from our streets and pavements – thereby supporting Active Travel and Vision Zero.

Rail strategy – We strongly support this policy, but

- Every station should have an Active Travel plan, and copious secure cycle parking. (The lack of an active travel plan was a major omission and lost opportunity for Oxford Parkway.)

Multi-modal travel – We strongly support this policy, and policies 33, 34, 35

We support multi-modal travel and barriers to this have arisen in our discussions with latent, or non-users of active travel as a particular barrier to active and healthy travel.

Mobility hubs – We strongly support this policy

- Mobility hubs should also consider the facilities available at the hub (similar to Policy 34), active travel access routes, and activation campaigns.
- They may be best developed along a whole route at a time to gain cumulative publicity and volume impact that will enable service frequency increases and further volume growth.

Digital Connectivity

Digital infrastructure – We strongly support this policy

- Where fibre (or other services) are laid on existing routes, often the footway or cyclepath is chosen instead of the main carriageway. This can leave a poor surface or hazards for people walking, wheeling or cycling as these users are more sensitive to surfaces than car users. OCC should review its standards and requirements for such schemes.

Environment

Zero Emission Vehicles – We partially support this policy

- EVs will be part of the transport system of the future. However, we note as above, EVs only partly solve two of the big five problems with vehicle use, and will make one, congestion, worse.

- The county council should ensure it considers the road-user hierarchy in developing EV infrastructure. Firstly by avoiding EV infrastructure cluttering pavements and creating barriers for pedestrians, secondly by supporting through infrastructure and activation, the use of e-bikes – particularly in mind of our county's rural nature, then infrastructure for public transport and shared vehicles.

Green Infrastructure – We strongly support this policy

- A specific large opportunity is including an active travel route in the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme (OFAS). This was included in original designs, but not in some later ones. It must not be missed.

Network, parking and congestion management

Network management – We strongly support this policy

- Policy 51 – An integrated approach is essential. As seen with LTNs, one action can remove traffic, but divert other. The ability to model and plan is vital.

Parking management – We strongly support this policy, but the safe storage of cycles is a particularly important local issue, and major barrier to active travel – particularly in Oxford and we therefore propose the following additional policy.

New policy: Increase parking capacity in car parks and residential areas by converting car parking spaces into secure cycle parking for 8-12 cycles (including space for inclusive and cargo cycles).

Parking enforcement – We strongly support this policy

- We are particularly glad to see an intent to keep footways clear of pavement parking which can cause obstructions, especially for disabled people, and even when it does not creates an unattractive environment for people to walk and enjoy their streets.

- This should be edited to also include cycleways. Parking in cycleways (for example on The Slade and Headley Way) is more than a nuisance because it destroys the

value of safe cycling infrastructure, forcing cyclists into traffic when they are less expected.

Demand management – We strongly support this policy

- We agree that further demand management is likely to be necessary, in Oxfordshire's towns as well as Oxford. We support these measures in general. They should come with (a) a consultation that starts with 'what would you like your town to be like' (Healthy Streets / Urban Movement approach discussed above); (b) measures to ensure/improve active and public transport.

Road schemes – We strongly support this policy

- We agree the evidence for roads generating traffic, and road closures causing 'traffic evaporation' is strong. The recent rises in walking and cycling in Cowley LTNs are evidence for this.

Smart infrastructure – We strongly support this policy

- We again would recommend that consideration be given across the user-hierarchy to design infrastructure supportive of active, public and shared transport.

Innovation

Passenger micromobility – We partially support this policy

- We support developments in smaller, emissions-free vehicles that make it easier for people to get around.
- We support measures that make these more available and encourage responsible use: bike hire and e-scooter hire schemes.
- We are keen should also support cycle hire or bike library schemes that include other types of cycle that expand the range of active travel. Cargo bikes and trailers enable people to move bigger loads car-free. Inclusive cycles, similar to the fleet operated by Wheels4All would enable people of different abilities to find cycles that worked for them and to experience the freedom and joy of cycling.

Living Lab – We strongly support this policy

- We would be happy to support further innovation in the fields of healthy place shaping and active travel and link this to our national stakeholders such as Sport England who have already invested heavily in this area.

Innovation Framework – We support this policy

- It is important that OCC-driven innovation supports active travel, because it is so cost-efficient that there is less money available there than the fundamentally more consumptive transport modes of private car, or even public transport.