



STREET VOICE

A Citizens' Jury on transport, health and
climate change in Oxford

Initial report - July 2022

street.voice@kellogg.ox.ac.uk



Kellogg College
University of Oxford



Global Centre on
Healthcare & Urbanisation

NUFFIELD DEPARTMENT OF
PRIMARY CARE
HEALTH SCIENCES
Medical Sciences Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1.** Introduction and key points
- 2.** About Citizens' Juries
- 3.** Advisory Group
- 4.** Jury Sessions
- 5.** Recommendations
- 6.** Evaluation
- 7.** Acknowledgements
- 8.** Appendices



Introduction

The Street Voice Citizens' Jury brought together 16 people broadly representative of the population of Oxford, to provide robust public input into the question "How can we travel where we need to in Oxford in ways that are good for health and the climate?" They met over four weekends in June and July 2022. During the process, the jurors were provided with evidence related to this question that had breadth and diversity, and were given the time and space to learn, discuss and agree on ways forward that would lead to recommendations.

This initial report has been prepared for the July Cabinet meeting to describe the process and to offer initial insights into some of the key messages from the Jurors. A full report, including detailed recommendations and an evaluation of the process, will be prepared for an Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting in September.



Some key messages

- Public transport was a key concern for Jurors, with strong support for prioritising reliable, accessible and affordable bus services. This included, for example, considerable support to reinstate, and subsidise if necessary, the Pick-Me-Up service in a way that ensures it is accessible for all.
- Proposals focused on the need to enhance road safety for children and young people, particularly on routes to school, by reducing through-traffic in residential areas including the use of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. There was strong support for the council to work with partners in education to make cycle training available to all as part of the school curriculum, taught in PE lessons.
- Jurors proposed the creation of an Oxfordshire County Council project team to develop solutions for the public and for particular groups (e.g. teachers, parents, nurses, and shoppers) to try out new electric micro technologies such as e-bikes, cargo bikes and e-scooters. This should be linked to schemes to make these technologies affordable (such as hire, loan, trial long-term or buy with support) together with training for users where needed.
- The proposals called for meaningful public participation and co-creation at all stages of the implementation of interventions to reduce the impact of motorised vehicles, such as LTNs, as well as extensive communication with and support for affected groups. Such interventions would be best introduced after, or at least alongside, other measures to make alternatives to the car more feasible and attractive.



- Jurors favoured the introduction of infrastructure for clear physical or temporal separation between different forms of transport where this would make active travel safer. Paths for pedestrians and cyclists should be well maintained and designed, be continuous, well-lit and with sound, even surfaces.
- The 16 members of the Citizens' Jury were selected to reflect the socio-demographic make-up of Oxford as a whole as well as to reflect levels of concern about climate change in the UK population
- The Jurors heard from diverse speakers selected with input from a wide ranging Advisory Group
- During the sessions, Jurors were supported by independent facilitators in deliberating and seeking consensus on issues that were important to them
- Feedback from the Jury members provides strong evidence that the process was balanced, that the issues were discussed from a wide variety of perspectives and that the recommendations reflect the different views and judgements of the Jurors.



What is a Citizens' Jury?

A Citizens' Jury is one example of a representative deliberative process. Citizens' Juries have three defining characteristics:

- Representativeness – a randomly selected group of people, chosen through a process of sortition (see below) who are broadly representative of a community, make up the Jury
- Deliberation – participants spend a significant amount of time learning about relevant issues from a range of perspectives, and collaborate through facilitated deliberation to seek common ground on recommendations
- Impact – the process has a link to public decision making

Why a Citizens' Jury on transport, health and climate change?

The Street Voice Citizens' Jury was organised by an independent team of researchers, funded by the University of Oxford's Climate and Health Pump-Priming fund, which supports interdisciplinary research activities at the intersection of climate and health. The Citizens' Jury focused on transport in Oxford, as a key public policy that has the potential to address both climate and health issues in a holistic way.

Oxfordshire County Council acknowledged a climate emergency in 2019, and has therefore laid down its commitment to supporting policies that cut greenhouse gas emissions. It is well established that there is a strong link between poor air quality, poor health and polluting modes of transport. Furthermore, physical activity, to which active travel can contribute, is associated with improved public health. Therefore, the connections between transport, health and climate, together with the County Council's interests in these themes, provided the rationale for the Street Voice Citizens' Jury.



The Citizens' Jury was an opportunity for a diverse group of local citizens with different characteristics, situations and viewpoints to learn about issues relevant to transport, health and climate change. Information was presented from a variety of perspectives brought to the Jury by researchers, practitioners, advocates, employers and residents of areas where transport interventions have already been implemented. The Jurors were assisted by a facilitator in a process of questioning, discussing and deliberating, to develop recommendations that would work, as far as possible, for everyone in Oxford.

The Citizens' Jury was overseen by an Advisory Group composed of practitioners and researchers in the fields of deliberative democracy, transport, climate change and health, as well as local politicians and campaigners. The recommendations are intended to inform local government decision-making in Oxford.

Selecting and recruiting the Jury members

The Jury members were selected following discussion with the Advisory Group on the geographic area from which Jurors were invited, and the criteria through which they were matched to the population of Oxford. The Sortition Foundation advised and assisted throughout the process of recruiting Jurors.

Recruitment of Jurors followed a two-stage process, which is considered good practice for deliberative events. It focused on five electoral wards covering Headington and the surrounding area (see below for more detail of the boundary). Headington was considered an appropriate location because a number of transport schemes such as bus priority measures and improvements to the park and ride interchange have already been implemented. There are also plans to consult on the introduction of new traffic schemes in Headington in the near future. The area includes a variety of neighbourhood types, road layouts and spatial characteristics that are also found elsewhere in Oxford.



Recruitment stage 1:

Invitation letters were mailed on 22nd April 2022 to 2,000 randomly selected households in the five target wards (see invitation letter in Appendix 1). A higher proportion were mailed to more deprived areas: 20% of the invitations were sent to addresses in Index of Multiple Deprivation deciles 1-3, and the other 80% were distributed randomly across all deciles 1-10. The invitation letters included a link to an online form, as well as a phone number where people could register their interest in taking part and record demographic and attitudinal data on the selection criteria agreed by the Advisory Group:

- age band
- gender
- ethnic group
- disability
- concern about climate change

Registration was open for three weeks, until 15th May 2022.

Recruitment stage 2:

Sixty-one residents registered their interest and indicated they were available to take part in the Citizens' Jury over the four specified weekends. Sixteen Jurors were selected from this pool to match targets for each of the criteria above, plus Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), to reflect the population of Oxford.^[1] The Sortition Foundation oversaw the selection of the 16 jurors using an algorithm freely available at Github (<https://github.com/sortitionfoundation>). Three of the jurors originally selected were no longer able to commit to all four Jury meetings and were therefore replaced by three others from the registered pool who matched their demographic profiles.

Pages 6 and 7 show the target demographic characteristics, the demographics of those who responded to register their interest, and of the 16 who were selected as Jurors. The selected Jurors were very closely matched to the population targets.

[1] Targets for Jurors from 'other ethnic groups,' IMD deciles 1-3 and people with a long-standing illness or disability were boosted relative to available population data to compensate for potentially out-of-date data (2011 Census for ethnic group) and to ensure inclusion of people from groups that are often under-represented in public engagement exercises.






Juror data

Target




Respondents

Selected




Age Band






Gender



Ethnic Group



Disability






Juror data

Target




Respondents

Selected

Concern about Climate Change



IMD Decile



Number of jurors

It is advised that for a Citizens' Jury to work effectively, there should be between 12-24 Jurors. Sixteen was thought a sufficient number to be broadly reflective of the city and provide a wide range of views, and was a pragmatic number, given the time and resource constraints. The evaluation data confirm that the Jurors themselves felt other Jury members had different views compared to their own and that, other than children and young people (who could not be included in this process), no groups or parts of society were absent from representation on the jury.



Advisory Group

In keeping with standard good practice for Citizens' Juries, an Advisory Group was appointed to oversee the legitimacy of the process. Members were selected to represent a range of perspectives: academics, practitioners, campaigners/advocates and experts in deliberative democracy. Three elected members were also invited to join the Advisory Group, selected following advice from the Group Leaders in the Council, to represent a range of perspectives while at the same time excluding cabinet members who are directly responsible for decisions. The Advisory Group members are listed below.

Name	Affiliation
Lizzie Adams	Involve
Emeritus Professor David Banister	Transport Studies Unit, University of Oxford
Dr Audrey de Nazelle	Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London
Cllr Mohamed Fadlalla	Labour County Councillor
Dr Jo Hamilton	School of Geography, University of Exeter
Cllr Kieron Mallon	Conservative County Councillor
Sadiea Mustafa-Awan	Reconnecting Oxford
Professor Alan Renwick	Constitution Unit, University College London
Cllr Roz Smith	Liberal Democrat County Councillor
Scott Urban	Oxfordshire Liveable Streets

The Advisory Group met online before the Jury sessions on two occasions: 30th March and 16th May, with a third and final meeting scheduled for September. In particular, they provided their expert advice on the wording of the core question and sub-questions, the profile of the group of speakers and the selection of Jurors (geographical area and socio-demographic criteria).

3. ADVISORY GROUP



Facilitation and process

The Street Voice Citizens' Jury brought together – for the first time, to our knowledge - the principles of *representative deliberative democracy* with the practice of *convergent facilitation*. Facilitation was led by Paul Kahawatte, a facilitator experienced in convergent facilitation.

Convergent facilitation is a process that makes it possible for communities, organizations, and groups taking opposing viewpoints to reach collaborative decisions that everyone can wholeheartedly embrace. It is designed to:

- build trust from the very beginning, even across power differences
- surface concerns and address them
- turn conflicts into dilemmas that the group feels energized to solve together.

The process of convergent facilitation was used for the *Street Voice* Citizens' Jury to bring together the different perspectives of the Jurors to work towards recommendations that would achieve consensus among the group.

Jury meetings

The Jury met four times over a total of 21 hours, divided into two full days and two half days in June and July 2022 at Old Headington Village Hall.

- Day 1: Sunday 12th June (afternoon): 1.30pm - 5.00pm
- Day 2: Saturday 18th June: 10.00am - 5.00pm
- Day 3: Sunday 26th June: 10.00am - 5.00pm
- Day 4: Sunday 3rd July (afternoon): 1.30pm - 5.00pm

Schedules for each day are included in Appendix 2.



Core questions

The Jurors were tasked with addressing one core question and three sub-questions:

Core question:

How can we travel where we need to in Oxford in a way that's good for health and the climate?

Sub-questions:

- 1. What do people who live in, work in or visit Oxford need so that they can move around safely and easily?*
- 2. How are people's travel needs best balanced with the need to promote health and fairness and tackle climate change?*
- 3. What can Oxfordshire County Council do to help achieve these aims across the whole city?*

Witnesses

Speakers addressed the Jurors during days 1, 2 and 3. The speakers were carefully briefed and asked to bring to the Jurors information to help them address the overarching question and sub-questions. They were asked to end their presentation with a statement beginning *“In my position, faced with your question, trying to find solutions that work for everyone affected in Oxford, my advice would be...”* followed by a summary of three main points from their presentation.

The speakers included researchers, council officers, campaign groups, businesses, and a local school teacher. Statements from local residents and others were also read to the Jury. The full list of speakers and spoken statements is shown below (in order of their appearance).



Witness list

Name	Affiliation
Day 1	
Dr Karl Marlowe	Chief Medical Officer at Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust
Claire Taylor	Corporate Director at Oxfordshire County Council
Day 2	
Alexis McGivern	Department of Geography, University of Oxford
Prof. Tim Schwanen	Transport Studies Unit, University of Oxford
Dr Suzanne Bartington	Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham
Dr Tim Jones	School of the Built Environment, Oxford Brookes University
Dr Brenda Boardman	Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford
Emily Scaysbrook	Chair, Oxford Business Action Group
Harriet Waters	Head of Environmental Sustainability, University of Oxford
Luke Marion	Interim Managing Director, Oxford Bus Company
Day 3	
John Disley	Head of Transport Policy, Oxfordshire County Council
Sean Scatchard	Cheney School
Jon Burke	Decarbonisation advisor to cities and former London Borough of Hackney Cabinet member
Richard Parnham	Reconnecting Oxford
Robin Tucker	Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel
Pre-recorded videos	
Shared on the Street Voice website	
Dr Ashley Hayden	Sustainable Transport and Strategy Lead, Oxford Brookes University
Dave Beesely	Chief Executive Officer, Oxford Office Furniture Ltd

Written statements:

- Sajad Khan, City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association (COLTA)
- East Oxford District Nursing Team
- South Central Ambulance Service
- Local residents positively impacted by LTNs
- Local residents negatively impacted by LTNs
- Royal Automobile Club (RAC)



Recommendations

During days 3 and 4 of Street Voice, Jurors developed over 130 proposals to address the core question and sub-questions, organised under the following themes:

1. Public transport
2. Active travel
3. Private vehicles, motorised transport, congestion and LTNs
4. Education and public engagement
5. Infrastructure and logistics.

The final stage of the process involved identifying those proposals most important to the group and working to find consensus on them. Public transport was a key concern for Jurors, with strong support for prioritising reliable, accessible and affordable bus services with simplified ticketing systems, and the installation of bus priority features such as bus lanes or bus gates where appropriate. There was a strong wish to reinstate, and subsidise if necessary, the Pick-me-up service in a way that ensured it was accessible for all, including those without smart phones.

Proposals focused on the need to enhance road safety for children and young people, particularly on routes to school, by reducing through-traffic in residential areas, including Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. There was strong support for encouraging the council to work with its partners in education to include cycle training as part of the school curriculum, taught in PE lessons, and ensuring it is available to all children by providing bicycles for children from low-income households for the training sessions.



Jurors proposed the creation of an Oxfordshire County Council project team to develop solutions for the public and for particular groups (e.g. teachers, parents, nurses, and shoppers) to try out new electric micro technologies such as e-bikes, cargo bikes and e-scooters.

Demonstration sessions for the public to try these out should take place in easily accessible places or taken on a roadshow to major employers. This should be linked to schemes to make these technologies affordable (such as hire, loan, trial long-term or buy with support) together with training for users where needed.

The proposals called for meaningful public engagement in the implementation of interventions designed to reduce the impact of motorised vehicles, such as LTNs, and extensive communication with and support for affected groups such as care workers, community nurses and residents for whom car use is essential. Jurors propose the council establishes more channels for participation, co-creation and community decision-making at all stages of the process: from gathering initial ideas, providing feedback on plans, to decision-making about proposals.

Jurors favoured the introduction of infrastructure for clear physical or temporal separation between different forms of transport where this would make active travel safer. Paths for pedestrians and cyclists should be well maintained and designed, be continuous, well-lit and with sound, even surfaces.



Evaluation

On days 1, 2 and 4, fifteen of the sixteen Jurors attended, and on day 3, fourteen were present. No Juror missed more than one session. Those who were unable to attend reported that this was due to either illness, testing positive for Covid 19, or that a family issue had arisen that required their attention. The high level of attendance suggested that the Jurors enjoyed the process and felt it was worthwhile.

Feedback questionnaires were completed by Jurors at four time points: before day 1, after day 2, after day 3, and after day 4. The feedback from days 2 and 3 was used to inform the design of subsequent sessions.

Evaluation feedback from the Jury members provides strong evidence that the process was balanced, that the issues were discussed from a wide variety of perspectives and that the recommendations reflect the different views and judgements of the Jurors.

The extent to which Jurors felt informed on five relevant policy issues was measured before and after the Citizens' Jury, to examine potential changes over the course of the process. Responses show that Jurors' understanding had increased markedly on all five issues (transport planning, public health, air pollution, climate change and net zero). Jurors were asked before and after the Citizens' Jury about their trust in local government and the likelihood that they would be engaged in decisions that affect their community in the future. Both aspects increased considerably over the course of the process.

Further evaluation data are reported in Appendix 3. The evaluation is ongoing at the time of publication and will be reported in full in the Final Report in September.



Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Pete Bryant from Shared Future, Tom Lord from Sortition Foundation, and Liz Goold for generous support and guidance through the project. Thanks to Ben Kenward from Oxford Brookes University for support and ideas about evaluation.

Thanks also to Alick Bird, Carole Stowe, Claire Taylor and Avni Gupta, Officers at Oxfordshire County Council, for support in the process. The facilitation team was supported by Ama, Katie and Roz. The research team was supported by Yanelle Cruz Bonilla and Eliza Leveté-Newell. Support during the Juries was provided by Mary, Caroline and Marta. Thanks also go to the whole Advisory Group for providing time and expertise to support the project.

Project team

The project was organised and delivered by an interdisciplinary team of researchers from the University of Oxford: Dr Juliet Carpenter, Dr David Howard and Robert Weavers from the Global Centre on Healthcare and Urbanisation at Kellogg College, and Dr Alison Chisholm and Professor Catherine Pope from the Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences. An independent facilitator, Paul Kahawatte, was appointed as lead facilitator.



8. APPENDICES

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Appendix 1 | Invitation letter |
| Appendix 2 | Daily schedules |
| Appendix 3 | Evaluation data |
| Appendix 4 | Jurors' Statement |



22 April 2022

Dear Resident(s),

We would like to know whether you would be interested in joining a Citizens' Jury organised by the University of Oxford to help answer the important question:

How can we travel where we need to in Oxford in a climate-friendly way that promotes health?

It will be held over four sessions at Old Headington Village Hall in Headington on these dates:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) Sunday 12 June: afternoon, 1.30-5.00pm | 3) Sunday 26 June: full day, 10.00am-5.00pm |
| 2) Saturday 18 June: full day, 10.00am-5.00pm | 4) Sunday 3 July: afternoon, 1.30-5.00pm |

We are looking for **16 people in total**. If you are selected to take part, we will cover your meals and transport costs and give you **£210** if you attend all four meetings, to thank you for your time taking part.

During the Citizens' Jury, local residents from all walks of life will hear a range of evidence and views on issues to do with how we travel within the city, how it affects people's health and the climate, and the problems and benefits that can come with changing how we travel. It can be difficult to find solutions that work for everyone. The Citizens' Jury is an opportunity for local residents to understand each other's views and experiences, and to try to reach decisions that people can agree on about how to make Oxford an inclusive, fair and safe place to move around.

The jury members will develop recommendations for Oxfordshire County Council.

Oxfordshire County Council has endorsed this process and has agreed to listen to, and respond to, the recommendations.

You don't need any prior knowledge of the issues to take part. All we ask from you is your willingness to listen to the information presented, to share your views and ideas, and to work with your fellow residents to explore ways forward. The process is entirely independent of the council.

Register your interest

The University team leading this work will randomly select 16 local residents to take part who represent the make-up of the community. Every person aged 18 years old and over, at this address, can register their interest by visiting www.gchu.org.uk/reply or by calling 01865 612035 (9am-4pm, weekdays). The deadline to register is midnight on Sunday 15 May 2022. More details about the event are available overleaf. Thank you for your interest. We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

David Howard

Dr David Howard, Lead Researcher

Day 1: Sunday 12th June

APPENDIX 2: SCHEDULES

Time	Activity
From 1:00pm	Refreshments
1:30pm	Welcome and introductions to the team
2:00pm	Icebreaker
2:30pm	Break
2:45pm	Basic group agreements
3:30pm	Speaker panel: Setting the scene
	Dr Karl Marlowe, Chief Medical Officer, Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust Claire Taylor, Corporate Director, Oxfordshire County Council
4:00pm	Break
4:15pm	Principles and values for solutions to transport, climate and health
5:00pm	Finish for the day



Day 2: Saturday 18th June

Time	Activity
9:30am	Refreshments
10:00am	Welcome and revisit last session
10:45am	Speaker panel: Climate change, health and transport
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexis McGivern - Department of Geography, University of Oxford • Prof. Tim Schwanen - Transport Studies Unit, University of Oxford • Dr. Suzanne Bartington - Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham • Dr Tim Jones - School of the Built Environment, Oxford Brookes University • Dr. Brenda Boardman - Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford
11:25am	Break
11:40am	Q&A and discussion and deliberation
12:45pm	Lunch
1:25pm	Speaker panel: Employers, businesses and buses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emily Scaysbrook – Chair, Oxford Business Action Group • Harriet Waters - Head of Environmental Sustainability, University of Oxford • Luke Marion - Interim Managing Director, Oxford Bus Company
1:55pm	Q&A
2:45pm	Break
3:00pm	Discussion
3:35pm	Lived experience of LTNs
4:00pm	Discussion
5:00pm	Finish for the day



Day 3: Sunday 26th June

Time	Activity
9:30am	Refreshments
10:00am	Welcome and revisit last session
10:15am	Speaker panel 1:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Disley, Head of Transport Policy, Oxfordshire County Council • Sajad Khan, City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association • Sean Scatchard, Cheney School
10:40am	Q&A and discussion
11:25am	Break
11:40pm	Speaker panel 2:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jon Burke, Decarbonisation advisor to cities • Richard Parnham, Reconnecting Oxford • Statements from East Oxford District Nursing Team and South Central Ambulance Service • Robin Tucker, Coalition for Healthy Streets and Active Travel
12:15pm	Q&A
1:00pm	Lunch
1:40pm	Deliberation and drafting recommendations
3:15pm	Break
3:30pm	Deliberation and drafting recommendations
5:00pm	Finish for the day



Day 4: Sunday 3rd July

Time	Activity
From 1:00pm	Refreshments
1:30pm	Welcome and introduction to the day
1:40pm	Claire Taylor, Oxfordshire County Council
1:45pm	Deliberation and drafting recommendations
2:55pm	Break
3:10pm	Deliberation and finalising recommendations
4:40pm	Finalise recommendations
5:00pm	Street Voice Citizens' Jury closes



On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “not at all informed” and 10 means “very well informed”, to what extent, if at all do you feel that you are informed at the moment on the following issues:

Issue	(n=14) Mean, pre-process	(n=9) Mean, post-process
Transport planning	2.5	6
Public health	3.3	6.2
Air pollution	3.5	6.1
Climate change	5.1	7.6
Net Zero	2.6	6.8

On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “not at all” and 10 means “very much”, to what extent, if at all, do you agree with the following statements:

Issue	(n=14) Mean, pre-process	(n=9) Mean, post-process
I have trust in local government	4.9	6.5
I am likely to be engaged in decisions that affect my community in the future	4.4	6.7

Other questions answered on a scale of 1 to 10	(n=9) Mean, post-process
To what extent did you feel that <u>the facilitators were neutral or biased</u> (favouring certain opinions or offering theirs)? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “completely neutral” and 10 means “very biased”.	1.7
To what extent do you feel that the <u>information resources provided, as a whole, neutral, with fair and diverse viewpoints represented</u> ? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “the information base felt very biased” and 10 means “the information base felt neutral with a large diversity of sources”.	7
To what extent, if at all, do you feel that the <u>final recommendations reflected the different views and judgements of the members</u> ? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “the diversity was not at all reflected” and 10 means “ultimately, our recommendations broadly satisfied the concerns of all members”.	8.2
To what extent, if at all, do you feel that <u>the issue was discussed from a variety of perspectives</u> (for example, considering underlying issues, existing structures, trade-offs values etc.)? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “from very limited number of perspectives” and 10 means “the issue was discussed from a wide variety of perspectives”.	8.1
To what extent, if at all, do you think that <u>the task you were given allowed you to consider a narrow or a wide range of options for your recommendations</u> ? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is “extremely narrow”, 5 is “just right” and 10 is “extremely wide”.	6.7
Please answer the following questions on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “not at all” and 10 means “to a great extent”. To what extent, if at all, did you feel: pressured to agree with ideas or arguments of others?	2.2
Please answer the following questions on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “not at all” and 10 means “to a great extent”. To what extent, if at all, did you feel: that your contributions made it into the recommendations?	8



Jurors' Statement

This statement was written by a sub-set of the jurors

We are a group of passionate Headington locals from a diverse range of backgrounds. We came together as a “Citizen’s jury” to answer the question: how can we travel in Oxford in a way that is good for our health and the environment.

We joined this jury because we felt strongly that, in navigating complex - and often divisive - topics such as local travel, a process which allows people time to deliberate and discuss is the best way forward. We were keen to learn more about Oxford’s travel and transport issues, and excited to think that the recommendations we put forward might help to shape future travel policy. We hoped that our suggestions would provide the Council with fresh ideas and a strong sense of what the people of Oxford value and prioritise as they travel around their local city.

We knew that reaching agreement on how to balance people’s travel needs with environmental and health considerations would be challenging and would involve much negotiation, including arriving at a greater understanding of the difference between “needs” and “wants”. However, our experience proved that, with expert facilitation, a group of people, diverse in life experience, knowledge and understanding, can be guided towards meeting such challenges; and that the negotiations along the way can be “bonding” rather than “polarising”.

In fact, everyone involved found this Citizen’s Jury process highly informative and rewarding. We would strongly encourage other people to get involved if the opportunity arises - and we would encourage councils to use more of these juries in place of surveys and brief consultations. People are far happier with change if they think they have been truly listened-to.



Oxford's travel and transportation system needs to be approached with an open mind. Our vision is for more flexibility to be built into the system: money could come from several different "pots" rather than being ring-fenced; big changes should be responsive to trials/feedback; new schemes could be assessed according to their benefit as policy tools rather than their immediate economic benefits. We hope for a transport system that works for the whole community, that is inclusive and not detrimental to any part of society. Our recommendations include options for public transport, local businesses, active travel, and private vehicles.

There are many challenges ahead, some of which can be solved more easily than others. For some, time will be needed to change cultural norms. A holistic approach to policy, infrastructure and the environment will be key to unlocking a cultural shift and enhancing our great city whilst being sensitive to climate emergency.

Oxford is beautiful, with a rich character and history. We urge Oxfordshire County Council and the organisations you work with to take time to understand our recommendations with a positive mindset. Maintaining communication going forward will be vital, and we, this local Headington citizens jury, one amongst many community groups, will be there to listen and be involved.

Engage with us, inspire us, work with us.





Kellogg College
University of Oxford



Global Centre on
Healthcare & Urbanisation

NUFFIELD DEPARTMENT OF
PRIMARY CARE
HEALTH SCIENCES
Medical Sciences Division

STREET VOICE

Contact

Global Centre on Healthcare and Urbanisation
Kellogg College
62 Banbury Road
Oxford
United Kingdom
OX2 6PN

street.voice@kellogg.ox.ac.uk

<https://www.gchu.org.uk/street-voice/>

Twitter: @GCHUOxford



Kellogg College
University of Oxford



Global Centre on
Healthcare & Urbanisation

NUFFIELD DEPARTMENT OF
PRIMARY CARE
HEALTH SCIENCES
Medical Sciences Division

STREET VOICE