

Minutes of a meeting of the **COUNCIL** on Monday 26 November 2018

www.oxford.gov.uk



Council members:

Councillor Cook (Lord Mayor)	Councillor Malik (Deputy Lord Mayor)
Councillor Simmons (Sheriff)	Councillor Altaf-Khan
Councillor Arshad	Councillor Azad
Councillor Aziz	Councillor Bely-Summers
Councillor Brown	Councillor Chapman
Councillor Clarkson	Councillor Curran
Councillor Donnelly	Councillor Fry
Councillor Gant	Councillor Garden
Councillor Goddard	Councillor Gotch
Councillor Haines	Councillor Harris
Councillor Hayes	Councillor Henwood
Councillor Howlett	Councillor Iley-Williamson
Councillor Kennedy	Councillor Landell Mills
Councillor Lygo	Councillor McManners
Councillor Munkonge	Councillor Pressel
Councillor Rowley	Councillor Rush
Councillor Simm	Councillor Linda Smith
Councillor Roz Smith	Councillor Tanner
Councillor Tarver	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Tidball	Councillor Turner
Councillor Upton	

Apologies:

Councillor(s) Corais, Djafari-Marbini, Hollingsworth, Humberstone and Wolff sent apologies.

Councillors Iley-Williamson, Bely-Summers and Turner arrived during the meeting as shown in the minutes.

52. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

53. Minutes

Council agreed to approve the minutes of the ordinary meeting of Council held on 1 October 2018 and the special meeting of Council held on 17 October 2018 as a true and correct record.

54. Appointment to Committees

The Leader announced and Council approved the following appointments to fill the Committee vacancies created by Councillor Henwood resigning the Labour whip and sitting as an independent councillor and as a consequence his place on the Growth Board Scrutiny Panel:

- East Area Planning Committee – Councillor Simm
- Scrutiny Committee – Councillor Curran
- Growth Board Scrutiny Panel – Councillor Tanner

Council noted the appointment of Cllr Arshad as the Council representative on the Florence Park Community Centre in place of Councillor Henwood.

55. Announcements

The Lord Mayor invited Council to join him for a seasonal reception in the Lord Mayor's Parlour after the meeting.

The Sherriff reported on the recent ceremony to appoint 16 Freemen/Freewomen.

56. Public addresses and questions that relate to matters for decision at this meeting

There were no addresses or questions.

57. Oxford North

Council considered a report of the Regeneration and Economy Programme Director and Head of Planning Services requesting an in-principle decision to use Homes England Housing Infrastructure (Marginal Viability) Funding (HIF) and Community Infrastructure Levy funds for infrastructure support at Northern Gateway/Oxford North.

Councillor Brown, Leader of the Council, presented the report, answered questions and moved the recommendations which were adopted on being seconded and put to the vote.

Council resolved to:

- 1. apply Community Infrastructure Levy receipts to the value of £8.85m (as generated from future strategic scale development at Northern**

Gateway/Oxford North) in order to fund investment in highways/transport infrastructure provision to support the delivery of the Northern Gateway strategic site allocation.

58. Animal Welfare (Licensing of Activities Involving Animals) (England) Regulations 2018 and approval of associated licence fees and charges.

Council considered a report of the Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services, submitted to the General Purposes and Licensing Committee meeting on 22 October 2018 detailing the Animal Welfare (Licensing of Activities Involving Animals) (England) Regulations 2018 and seeking approval of associated licence fees and charges.

Councillor Clarkson, Chair of the General Purposes Licensing Committee presented the report and undertook to provide a written response to a question about the pricing structure for the licence fees and charges.

Councillor Clarkson moved the recommendations which were adopted on being seconded and put to the vote.

Council resolved to:

1. agree the licence fees and charges as set out in Appendix A of the report;
2. delegate animal welfare licensing responsibilities to the Chief Executive.

59. Constitution Review 2018

Council considered a report of the Head of Law and Governance which detailed recommended changes to the Council's Constitution following an annual review of the Constitution overseen by an informal Cross-Party Constitution Group.

Councillor Chapman, Board Member for Customer Focused Services, presented the report.

Councillor Simmons, seconded by Councillor Gant, proposed the following amendment which was tabled at the meeting:

Item 9 Constitution Appendix 2 p70; Appendix 1 p8 #49

Section 11.18 (c): alter the word limit on motions to 500 words (from proposed 300 words)

Councillor Chapman accepted the proposed amendment and moved the amended recommendations which were adopted on being seconded and put to the vote.

Council resolved to:

1. **Approve the list of proposed amendments to the Constitution detailed in Appendix 1 and highlighted in Appendix 2 and subject to the inclusion of a**

further amendment to Section 11.18 (c) to alter the word limit on motions to 500 words.

2. **Adopt the revised Oxford City Council Constitution as presented in Appendix 2 with the addition of the change at (1) above.**
3. **Delegate authority to the Head of Law and Governance to amend any further wording that is identified as being inconsistent with the changes approved by Council.**
4. **Delegate authority to the Head of Law and Governance to amend the Constitution to include a social media policy, following consideration and approval by the Standards Committee.**

60. Council and Committee meetings programme May 2019 - May 2020

Council considered a report from the Head of Law and Governance which set out a programme of Council, committee and other meetings for the 2019/20 council year (May 2019 to May 2020 inclusive).

Councillor Susan Brown, Leader of the Council presented the report and moved the recommendations which were adopted on being seconded and put to the vote.

Council resolved to:

1. **Approve the programme of Council, committee and other meetings attached at Appendix 1 for the council year 2019/20;**
2. **Delegate authority to the Committee and Member Services Manager, in consultation with Group Leaders, to make changes to this programme, in the event that there is a decision at Annual Council to change the committee structure or remit which impacts on the programme of meetings; and**
3. **Delegate authority to the Committee and Members Services Manager to set dates for additional training and briefing sessions for members, for meetings of the Shareholder of the Council's companies, and for the Companies Scrutiny Panel, and, in consultation with the Head of Business Improvement, to set meetings of the Appointments Committee and Investigations and Disciplinary Committee (should they be required).**

61. City Executive Board Minutes

Council had before it the following minutes from the City Executive Board:

a) Minutes of meeting Tuesday 16 October 2018 of City Executive Board

Councillor Gant referred to minute item 83: which stated that the Construction Contract Award would be deferred for consideration at the City Executive Board meeting on 14 November 2018. As the report had not been considered at that meeting he asked that this should be recorded in the minutes.

Councillor Rowley apologised for the delay. He advised that the report was scheduled for consideration in January or February 2019. He asked for the matter to be appropriately recorded and noted as signed minutes cannot be subsequently altered.

b) Minutes of meeting Wednesday 14 November 2018 of City Executive Board

There were no questions.

62. Questions on Notice from Members of Council

30 written questions on notice were submitted. These, written responses, and summaries of the 9 supplementary questions and responses are set out [in the printed pack of these minutes](#).

63. Outside organisation/Committee Chair reports and questions

This item was taken before the public addresses.

a) Oxford Strategic Partnership

Council had before it the report of the Leader of the Council outlining the work of the Oxfordshire Strategic Partnership (OSP).

Councillor Brown presented the report. In response to questions and comments from Councillor Simmons she undertook to review the content of the OSP website to ensure that the material was current and said that she was also disappointed at the delay in the launch of the “on line giving platform” and was pressing for this to be progressed. She would inform Council when it was implemented.

Council noted the report.

b) Oxfordshire Health Improvement Board 2016/17

Council had before it the annual report on the work of the Oxfordshire Health Improvement Board 2016/17 and its priorities for 2018/19.

Councillor Upton, Board Member for Healthy Oxford, presented the report and responded to comments. The valuable work of local breast feeding services was noted. Councillor Upton agreed that the No Local Connection Review Group report should be referred to the Health Improvement Board and undertook to look into the funding of translation services at the East Oxford Health Centre.

Council noted the report.

64. Public addresses and questions that do not relate to matters for decision at this Council meeting

Councillors Bely-Summers arrived at the start of this item.

Councillors Iley-Williamson arrived during this item.

There were seven addresses to Council and two questions to Board Members.

1. Dr Ruvi Ziegler, Chair, Oxford European Association gave an address in support of the Oxford European Charter
2. Artwell gave an address on Farndon Court which was significantly different from that submitted in writing.
3. Artwell gave an address suggesting that the Council Tax payers should be described as “funders” not “customers”.
4. Mr Stefan Piechnik gave an address asking for an acknowledgement of his actions which he suggested had resulted in substantial monetary savings to the Council.
5. Artwell gave an address which challenged the Council’s vision for the city centre.
6. Sharone Parnes gave an address asking for clarity on the Council’s support for the full International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition.
7. Jabu Nala-hartley gave an address on the recent “What is Oxford Anti-racist city?” workshop.
8. Judith Harley repeated her previous question about Temple Cowley Library parking.
9. Nigel Gibson re-iterated his previous statements about charging arrangements at the Council’s leisure centres which he believed discriminated against disabled people.

The full text of these speeches and questions where these were read as submitted; responses from the Board Members in writing before the meeting; and summaries of the verbal responses given at the meeting are [set out in the printed pack of these minutes](#).

65. Scrutiny Committee update report

Council had before it the report of the Scrutiny Committee Chair, Councillor Gant.

Councillor Gant presented the report. He thanked Councillor Henwood for his services to the Scrutiny Committee and welcomed Councillor Curran to the Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Tanner to the joint Growth Board Scrutiny Panel. He confirmed that the election of a Vice-Chair and appointments to the Scrutiny Panels would be decided at the next Scrutiny Committee meeting on 4 December 2018. He commended the No Local Connection Review Group report to Council.

He undertook to provide a written response to a question from Councillor Simmons regarding progress on the audit of Fusion Lifestyle.

Council noted the report.

66. Motions on notice

Council had before it seven motions on notice and amendments submitted in accordance with Council procedure rule 11.17 and reached decisions as set out below.

Council resolved to adopt the following motions as set out in these minutes:

- a. Oxford European Charter
- b. Homelessness in Oxford
- c. Vehicle emissions in Oxford

The following motions were not taken as the time allocated for debate had elapsed:

- d. Farndon Court
- e. Fair Transitional State Pensions
- f. Oxford to Cambridge Expressway
- g. Climate Emergency

a) Cross Party Motion: Oxford European Charter

Councillor Tanner, seconded by Councillor Garden, proposed the submitted cross party motion as set out in the agenda and briefing note.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Council resolved to adopt the following motion:

1. Oxford City Council reaffirms its determination that Oxford should remain an international, open, and welcoming European city.
2. The Council believes that, irrespective of the outcome of the Brexit negotiations, rights of EU27 citizens who have made their homes here should be fully maintained and, that their electoral participation rights should be extended, to make our democracy more inclusive.
3. We call on the Government and all employers, institutions and authorities in Oxford to do all they can to respect, protect, and fulfil the rights to which EU27 citizens are entitled, and to ensure they are not discriminated against in any way.
4. In particular, we call for EU27 citizens living in Oxford to have rights to:
 - a. Live, work, study, and retire in the UK
 - b. Enjoy a lifelong guarantee that they can leave the UK and return thereto
 - c. Retain their existing right to vote in all local government elections
 - d. Be suitably enfranchised in national elections and referendums
 - e. Be able to register for settled status without onerous proof or excessive cost
 - f. Naturalise, should they wish to do so, at the cost of administration
5. We recognise the hugely valuable contribution that migrants, from the rest of Europe and around the world, have made to our city, and are making to the culture, prosperity and success of Oxford.

Council resolves to:

- 1. ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Prime Minister and local MPs to convey the City Council's views as expressed above.**
- 2. ask the City Executive Board to do whatever it can to support this Oxford European Charter.**

Councillor Turner arrived at the end of this item.

b) Homelessness in Oxford

Councillor Linda Smith, seconded by Councillor Aziz, proposed the submitted motion as set out in the agenda and briefing note.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Council resolved to adopt the following motion:

The Government's ideological pursuit of austerity has directly contributed to the soaring number of people being made homeless and sleeping rough on our streets. Despite this, Oxford City Council has an ambition that no one should have to sleep rough on the streets of our city and we have allocated our own budgets and successfully bid for government money to help achieve this.

This winter the council is providing an additional 41 bed spaces to help people off Oxford's streets. This is in addition to the 20 beds provided by the Oxford Winter Night Shelter throughout January, February and March and up to 20 extra night shelter beds which we are working with our neighbouring districts to provide through funding secured by this council.

This extra winter provision comes on top of the 167 beds and associated support for former rough sleepers which are funded throughout the year, and up to 74 bed spaces are available to anyone who needs them this winter, regardless of their connection to Oxford or their entitlement to benefits.

This council also operates a Severe Weather Emergency Protocol (SWEP) which opens extra beds during periods when extended cold weather is forecast, the protocol means emergency shelters are opened when night time temperatures are forecast to drop below freezing for three consecutive nights, but there is flexibility on the decision of when to open.

This council gives thanks for the hard work of our partner organisations, charities, voluntary organisations, professional workers and volunteers. We are especially grateful to the churches hosting the Oxford Winter Night Shelter for their enormous contribution to reducing rough sleeping on our streets.

This Council therefore resolves to ask the Board Member, Leisure and Housing:

- 1. To continue to work towards our vision of nobody having to sleep rough on the streets on Oxford. The extra beds this winter will help us move towards that goal, and council officers should use the discretion given to**

- them on when to trigger SWEP to help ensure that no one is left out in freezing temperatures whenever resources allow.
2. To work with partners towards a SWEP protocol, that will open emergency provision whenever night time temperatures are forecast to fall below zero.
 3. To ensure that preparations for next winter 2019/20 should include an increase in night shelter beds which are available to all rough sleepers throughout the season, moving away from the need for SWEP and adopting a model of continuous winter provision.
 4. To ensure that the City Executive Board monitors the application of SWEP this winter, and receive reports, from the Head of Housing Services, in January and April 2019 to cover: the occasions when SWEP has been triggered; the use of officer discretion on when to trigger SWEP; and statistics on the availability of bed spaces for adult single homeless persons within the city for the period covered by the report.

c) Vehicle emissions in Oxford

Councillor Harris, seconded by Councillor Landell Mills, proposed the submitted motion as set out in the agenda and briefing note.

Councillor Hayes, seconded by Councillor Taylor, proposed an amendment to the submitted motion as set out in the agenda and briefing note.

After debate and on being put to the vote, the amendment was declared carried.

After debate and on being put to the vote, the amended motion was agreed.

Council resolved to adopt the following motion, as amended:

This Council:

- Recognises that we all have a right to breathe clean air. However, across the UK illegal and here in Oxford harmful levels of air pollution are damaging people's health and their quality of life and cutting lives short;
- Recognises the urgent need to reduce levels of vehicle emissions in Oxford's most polluted streets and build on the considerable success of Oxford City Council in reducing air pollution so far;
- and notes that local authorities are hitting the limits of what they can achieve with the powers and funding they have from Government and calls for continued advocacy to Government—with existing allies such as Greenpeace UK, Friends of the Earth (England, Wales, and Northern Ireland), UK100, and other councils—to seek more powers and funding to accelerate the journey to zero;
- notes that considerable work has been undertaken since the public consultation last year to fully understand the impact of the journey to zero and develop proposals which account for the feedback from directly impacted stakeholders and groups. Oxford's Zero Emission Zone has to be practical; and

resolves to seek to reduce vehicle emissions urgently in Oxford's most polluted streets by asking Oxford City Council and the highways authority, Oxfordshire

County Council, to continue to work together in partnership on plans to introduce a Zero Emission Zone in Oxford from 2020, considering all options available, the details of which will be announced in early 2019.

d) Fair Transitional State Pensions

This was not taken because the time for debating motions had elapsed.

e) Farndon Court

This was not taken because the time for debating motions had elapsed.

f) Climate Emergency

This was not taken because the time for debating motions had elapsed.

g) Oxford to Cambridge Expressway

This was not taken because the time for debating motions had elapsed.

The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 9.00 pm

Chair

Date: Monday 28 January 2019

To: Council
Date: 26 November 2018
Title of Report: Questions on Notice from members of Council and responses from the Board Members and Leader

Introduction

1. Questions submitted by members of Council to the Board members and Leader of the Council, by the deadline in the Constitution are listed below in the order they will be taken at the meeting.
2. Responses are included where available.
3. Questioners can ask one supplementary question of the councillor answering the original question.
4. This report has been republished after the Council meeting to include supplementary questions and responses as part of the minutes pack.
5. Unfamiliar terms may be briefly explained in footnotes.

Questions and responses

Board member for Culture and City Centre

1. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Clarkson – BID for Oxford

Is the Board Member in favour of a Business Improvement District (BID) for Oxford city centre? How will the failure of the Abingdon Business Improvement District be avoided here?

Response

The appetite for a BID is not certain, given the added expense some businesses are facing from business rates reviews and more challenging trading conditions created by changing consumption patterns. We are in a dynamic situation and need to be clear a BID is workable. We are however continuing to explore the possibility.

A BID must be wanted by the business community if it is to go forward for a referendum and the business community in turn must be actively engaged if it is to be successfully delivered against shared priorities. At this stage, we are simply trying to understand short, medium and long-term city centre priorities, post Westgate opening by looking at past and future surveys and research. We can then understand where our information gaps are and will undertake this work with the support of the City Centre Task Force. City centre stakeholders are being encouraged to work with us here.

We will of course aim to learn from other BIDS in any future work.

2. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Clarkson – Covered Market

Does the Portfolio Holder an update on the number of empty shop units in the City Centre and Covered Market?

Response

- The following recent survey was undertaken by officers, which is based on circa 400 frontages. It's worth noting that this compares favourably against Centre for Cities data published in June 2018 with a reported English City average of 16%:

Retail Survey 2017 - Primary frontages	Retail Survey 2018 – Primary frontages	Retail Survey 2017 – secondary frontages	Retail Survey 2018 – secondary frontages
Vacancies 8.4%	Vacancies 8.8%	Vacancies 6.8%	Vacancies 10.3%

- Covered Market – Currently only 4 empty units:
 - Ex. Haymans – splitting in process to create 3 units, works due to finish just before Christmas. 2 tenants already signed up to open in the new year with interest for the 3rd unit .
 - Ex. McCarthys –Planning approved, re-development next year.
 - Ex. Lyndseys - in discussions with OPT about a joint refurbishment project next year
 - Ex. H&D House – Oxford Soap Company now open. Fedele of Oxford completed new lease, in process of fit out due to open later this month.

3. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Clarkson – Festival of Lights

The Festival of Lights procession this year required the High Street to be closed to all traffic, including public transport. This, in turn, caused traffic chaos and made it more difficult to access the Festival, especially for those unable to walk far. Can the Portfolio Holder agree to review the arrangements to see whether improvements can be made?

Response

The Christmas Lights Festival procession was not planned to include the High Street or closure to the High Street. Oxford Union had booked Steve Bannon as guest speaker on the day of the procession and, it being a closed event, the festival organisers were only aware about it the day before. The talk was due to start at 4pm and Steve Bannon was due to leave at 5.30pm well in time for any protests to be completed before the start of the procession at 6.30pm. Council senior managers were in touch with the police and union throughout the day but it became clear by 5.50pm that the protests, which were still ongoing, would not stop in time for the procession and would be frightening for young children to pass. In order to ensure the enjoyment of the young people and their families and protect the Council's reputation, a joint decision was taken by the Police and Council Gold, Silver and Bronze event management to divert the procession and apply for an emergency road closure. The diversion to the High Street was welcomed as it enabled better viewing opportunities than Cornmarket would have done for those people who were already in the city. The parade walked as

slowly as reasonable given the temperatures and age of the children and took more than an hour to complete its route to ensure that those who were stuck in traffic had as much time to join as possible.

4. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Clarkson – Accessibility audit

At the council meeting on October 1, the Leader told me that the Accessibility audit of Council buildings was expected to be completed and available “by November”. Is it?

Response

The access audit has been undertaken and it has been reviewed by the workgroup. The Facilities Management team are now writing a report on this and the next steps which will be available in the New Year.

5. From Councillor Harris to Councillor Clarkson – Wroclaw and Padua twinning

Why has Wroclaw been announced as a full new twin city for Oxford while Padua is only described as a "link"?

Response

A full twin city agreement has been negotiated and signed between Wroclaw and Oxford, but as yet there has only been a memorandum of understanding expressing a desire to reach a twinning agreement signed between Padua [Padova] and Oxford.

Supplementary question

Do we have a date when Padua will become a fully twinned city?

Response

We do not have a date as yet but I will update you once it is confirmed.

6. From Councillor Harris to Councillor Clarkson – Ramallah twinning

Following the Council's vote to support twinning with Ramallah what steps is the Council taking to pursue this?

Response

The Palestinian Ambassador is planning to visit Oxford in December to discuss the next steps with relevant councillors.

Board member for Customer Focused Services

7. From Councillor Goddard to Councillor Chapman - Trees

How many 'failed' trees -- dead, vandalised, knocked down by accident -- have been replaced annually by the City Council over the last five years?

Response

We only fell (remove) Council trees that are found to be dead, dying, diseased or causing damage to nearby structures when surveyed. The exception to this is if there is approved Planning consent which includes the removal of Council owned trees.

	No of trees/groups felled per year (calendar year)	No of trees planted per year (calendar year)
2018	89 to 20/11/2018)	105 (To be planted this winter)
2017	145	117
2016	147	217
2015	125	60
2014	73	162
Total	579	661

Not included in the above numbers are hundreds of whips (small saplings) planted across our Parks and Open Spaces in conjunction with Community Groups and Charities. Overall, including these whips we plant more trees than we fell. Within 2018/19 financial year we have a planting budget of £15k.

New trees that fail

In addition to keeping records of newly planted trees, of these we record failures. On average we lose up to 5% of newly planted trees although this year we believe this will double due to the long, hot and dry summer. We do not record numbers planted as when they start to mature we need to thin out these planted areas to allow the stronger trees to survive. Once the remaining whips grow to a size of 75mm diameter we add them to our Tree Management Database and the routine survey.

8. From Councillor Garden to Councillor Chapman – EU citizens employed by the Council

Oxford University will reimburse employees and their families for permanent residence, settled or pre-settled status applications.

1. How many EU nationals are employed by the council and its companies?
2. What steps is the City Council taking to protect the rights and freedoms of this city's council staff?

Response

1. The City Council and Oxford Direct Services employs some 34 EU nationals, based on information supplied by staff during the recruitment process.
2. Following the confirmation of the result of the EU referendum in 2016, the Council issued a briefing to all staff which confirmed its commitment to assist employees who might be impacted, as well as the value it placed on the commitment and professionalism of its diverse workforce. In addition the Council has provided financial assistance to any impacted employee who wished to apply for a document that confirms their right to live in the UK, either as a citizen of a European Economic Area (EEA) country or Switzerland, as well as signposting for staff on where to apply. The cost of this document is £ 65 and by the end of 2017/18 some 8 staff had applied for this financial support. However, no further applications have been received so far in 2018/19.

Supplementary question

As only 8 staff applied for this financial support are you reminding staff of this entitlement?

Response

Yes. I am sure that we are doing so and we will do so again.

Board member for Finance and Asset Management and non-statutory Deputy Leader

9. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Turner – “tar sands” investment

Given that this Council was the first in the UK to formally agree to divest from direct investment in fossil fuel, whilst agreeing to review its indirect investments (July 2014), and that this City has previously declared itself to be ‘tar sands free’ City (June 2013), will the Portfolio Holder write to Barclays, this Council’s bank, adding its voice to those protesting at the bank’s refusal to stop funding pipelines to take oil from Canada’s tar sands to market in the USA and Asia.

Note: Not only is tar sands a particularly energy inefficient and polluting fossil fuel to extract, but the pipelines have been in the news as they went over sovereign tribal lands. After HSBC’s change in policy, Barclays is now the only remaining UK bank funding these projects.

Response

The Council holds current accounts with Barclays who are the Council’s bankers following a tender exercise in 2014. The accounts are used for day to day transactions, however the vast majority of investments are with other counterparties. Recently Barclays have made some green deposit notice accounts available which the Council has taken advantage of and has invested in these in October 2018. In relation to these accounts, Barclays are working in association with Sustainalytics to achieve a positive environmental impact. Their green framework covers the following environmental areas:

- Energy efficiency projects and renewable energy
- Sustainable food agriculture and forestry
- Waste management
- Greenhouse gas emission reduction
- Sustainable water

We are concerned about the reported involvement of Barclays’ involvement with funding pipelines associated with tar sands and I am pleased to confirm that we have written to Barclays expressing our concerns and to request an explanation of the position and their stance on this matter.

10. From Councillor Munkonge to Councillor Turner – Fraud Investigation Service

Could the portfolio holder provide an update on the work of the fraud investigation service?

Response

The Investigation Service continues to go from strength to strength, having delivered some outstanding achievements in the current financial year.

In September, the team hosted its third Annual Fraud Conference at the Town Hall attracting over 200 people to the event. Industry experts presented detail on current and emerging fraud threats facing the public sector and a trade stand exhibition was in place for delegates to engage with.

In October, the team won an award for Excellence in Counter Fraud at the Institute for Revenues, Ratings and Valuations, Annual Performance Awards. This is the third consecutive year that the team have been recognised by the institute with Winner awards in both 2016 and 2017. The team has also just been shortlisted in 2019's LGC Awards for "Team of the Year".

The team has developed and renewed partnership working arrangements with multiple organisations, and now provides the Counter-Fraud response for South and Vale District Councils, Cherwell & South Northants Councils, Warwick District Council and most recently, has formalised arrangements to assist Oxfordshire County Council in tackling fraud.

As in previous years, the team is delivering excellent results and outcomes for the City Council. A recent empty homes review is expected to realise over £400k in government subsidy, 8 social housing properties which were being misused have been brought back into use, £370k of additional revenue for the authority has been realised and £720k of fraud losses have been prevented.

One of the factors behind the success and effectiveness is the team's innovative use of technology. Bespoke data matching software has been used by the team to prevent and detect fraud and irregularity. Officers worked to develop smart data matching algorithms and applied these to effect a proactive risk-based approach in a variety of exercises.

The successful empty homes review exercise, which utilises this technology, has also been used with partner organisations. In September 2017, the service was delivered to Reading Borough Council, the results of which delivered over £600k in government subsidy to the authority. Again in 2018, the data match and review service has been delivered to Slough Borough Council, with a similar outcome expected.

11. From Councillor Garden to Councillor Turner – Shared Prosperity Fund

The recently published report by Professor Philip Alston for the UN mentions that local governments had no or little information about the Shared Prosperity Fund set up by the government to replace EU funding were we to leave the European Union. Research has suggested that leaving the European Union would result in a £8.4 billion UK-wide funding gap for local councils.

- What arrangement has this Council made with the government's Shared Prosperity Fund about replacing this lost income?

- How will the poor and vulnerable members of our community be protected from the impact from this loss of income?

Response

We have been aware of this fund for a while now and have been waiting for the government to publish its formal consultation that is scheduled for some time during 2018. In the meantime the government has confirmed that it will guarantee existing EU funding arrangements until the 31/12/2020 by which time the details for the future prosperity fund will be known. The guaranteed funding arrangement has already been used to extend our ESiF community grants programme until 31/03/2019 and we are currently waiting for the Big Lottery Fund in conjunction with OxLep to provide details about any extension funding available for our project working with entrenched NEETs.

The existing fund has been widely criticised for its bureaucratic nature and the shared prosperity fund has been promised to “be cheap to administer, low in bureaucracy and targeted where it is needed most”. To date a position paper of 8 pages has been published but as mentioned above the promised consultation has not yet been made available.

We anticipate that the shared prosperity fund will be distributed through OxLep and will continue to engage with them through representation and ongoing communication. This will ensure that we are well placed and capable of applying and potentially leveraging any funding available to support vulnerable members of our community in line with our corporate priorities.

We are also working through OxLEP to deliver a Local Industrial Strategy, which might offer a route to prioritising access to such funds. However, to date there has been very little detail on how the fund will work but we continue to monitor the situation on an ongoing basis.

We are keen to ensure funds around skills and social inclusion and wider economic and industrial development are harnessed wherever possible. We will maintain our commitment to minimise the impact on communities that need access to funding for training and employability wherever possible.

Board member for Healthy Oxford

12. From Councillor Goddard to Councillor Upton – Five Mile Drive Pavilion

In answer to my question at council on October 1 about progress on the Five Mile Drive pavilion, the Board Member referred to “the 50K originally assigned to this project”. Of course the budget originally publicly committed by the council was the sum allocated in 2013, which was then spent by the council on other facilities around the city, including £1.1m at Headington Quarry, simply ignoring Five Mile Drive even though it was on the council's own list of projects included in the budget allocation. The existing pavilion was subsequently left to quite literally fall down, and Summertown Stars were threatened with expulsion from the league for not providing basic facilities for its young players and visitors. Although renewed progress is very welcome, it has been painfully slow on the part of the council.

Can the Board Member please provide us again with an update?

Can she also confirm the cost to the taxpayer of providing a temporary polling station for the by election on 6 December 2018, costs which, like all such installations over recent years, would have been avoided if the council had honoured its original commitment?

Response

The original budget of £50,000 was added to the capital program in April 2018. This initiated officer time and feasibility work to assess the viability of delivering a solution that would meet the needs of Summertown Stars AFC as one of the key regular users of the site as well as for use by the community as a polling station.

A number of options with differing capital costs were proposed and reviewed both by Summertown Stars AFC and Oxford City Council's electoral services team. As an interim measure and to ensure no impact to Summertown Stars AFC, temporary toilet facilities were installed for the start of the football season in September.

A preferred option of a robust unit that would cost c£82,000 and which would meet those needs of the football club and OCC electoral services team was presented on the 18 October 2018 with the club agreeing to proceed on 29 October 2018. To ensure the viability of the project an additional £20k was found along with a £12k contribution from Summertown Stars AFC. Once this was agreed then the legal agreement needed to be finalised with the club.

Now that we have that agreement, a business case has been submitted for review to the City Council's development board for internal approval in December. Oxford Direct Services have indicated there would be a 12-week period between the order being placed and the new unit being operational.

We continue to provide temporary toilet facilities at Five Mile Drive for use by the football club who have also secured storage facilities at the site. We will continue to involve the football club at every key stage of the projects delivery as well as local members.

The cost of the provision of a temporary building and associated items at Five Mile Drive Recreation Ground for the by-election on 6 December is £3025.

Board member for Housing (Building better homes)

13. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Rowley – deferred City Executive Board (CEB) item

The Agenda for the CEB meeting of 16 October contained an item regarding plans for the award of a contract to construct a number of housing units to be installed on council-owned sites in the city, using an off-site manufacturer. At the meeting the item was withdrawn and deferred, but did not appear at the CEB meeting on 14 November. Could the Board Member provide an update and account for the delay?

Response

The original report was delayed to allow negotiations to conclude on the arrangements for a comprehensive build contract to provide the entirety of the works on all 3 sites as opposed to separate contracts for the structures being constructed in the factory and the ground-works required to prepare the sites for the homes to be installed. We are

also still awaiting a decision on the planning application for the bungalow at Broad Oak which would be more cost-effective to include in the overall work package than to contract separately for a single unit. The report is now scheduled for January on the Forward Plan but could move to February in the light of the need to obtain planning permission. Detailed discussions are continuing with the chosen provider, F1 Modular, to ensure that the homes represent value for money for the Council. This will be the Council's first sites to use off site manufacture and we are making absolutely sure we get it right.

14. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Rowley – Elsfield Hall plans

In July 2014 planning permission was given [ref 13/03454/CT3] for 17 housing units, all "affordable", at Elsfield Hall, 15-17 Elsfield Way, on previously developed land. The applicant was Oxford City Council. Given the urgency of the housing crisis in Oxford, could the Board member explain why this good-sized, available site has not been built? Presumably the permission has now lapsed- will the council be re-applying to develop the site?

Response

The site was not built out to the original permission due to policy changes made by the Government which impacted negatively on the Council's HRA business plan rendering such development schemes undeliverable. The scheme has been revisited by the Council's housing company OCHL which believes a denser scheme of 26 flats is possible and this scheme is due to be submitted to Planning in conjunction with 9 houses at Cumberlege Close to provide 50% affordable housing by the end of this year for a start on site in Spring 2019.

Supplementary question

Would the Councillor agree with me that the Council's development of the site could and should have moved faster?

Response

I agree that it is regrettable that it hasn't been built out already. But I don't agree that the Council could have moved faster. There were three major changes to government policy on housing funding which resulted in delays in the Housing Revenue Fund building projects of which this was one. We are now back on track.

Board member for Planning and Transport

15. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Hollingsworth – Oxford North new jobs

Given the high levels of employment in Oxford and the projected increase in commuting into the City, which will lead to further transport chaos, what evidence is there of the need to create 4,500 new jobs as part of the proposed Oxford North development (as opposed to using the land for housing)?

Response

The evidence establishing the need for both employment space and housing on the Oxford North site was identified and extensively debated, and examined at public enquiry, as part of the Oxford Northern Gateway Area Action Plan. Extensive work on the current Local Plan (2016-36) has produced clear evidence of need for both housing and employment space: the relevant documents can be found on the Council's website as part of the Local Plan evidence base, and have been extensively debated by the Council over the last three years.

16. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Hollingsworth – Oxford North affordable housing

The Oxford North development proposals include 480 residential dwellings. What guarantees are there that there will be a significant number of the genuinely affordable housing this City so desperately needs included in this development?

Response

This is the subject of a live planning application, and so detailed comment would be inappropriate and likely to be prejudicial to the Council's ability to take the decision itself. Like all planning applications, this one will be judged against all the Council's planning policies, including those related to the proportion of affordable housing expected from a site.

17. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Hollingsworth – Oxford North Infrastructure and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Given the balance of employment and housing planned for the site [Oxford North], does the Portfolio Holder think this project worthy of almost £20m of the Council's Housing Infrastructure and CIL funding?

Response

The report to the CEB explained the careful balance required on this issue, and the importance of the provisional allocation of funds from the Government's Housing Infrastructure Fund and from the CIL generated from the scheme itself. The CEB, of which I am a part, voted unanimously in favour of the proposed provisional allocations, however, this was without prejudice to the consideration of the merits of the planning application in the council's capacity as local planning authority.

18. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Hollingsworth – Oxfordshire Growth Board housing

At the event on 16 October 2018 [18 October?], Oxfordshire Growth Board met with developers and providers of social housing to discuss plans for the County. What is the City Council doing to ensure that any housing built to serve Oxford is genuinely affordable, social housing and makes up a significant portion of any new developments?

Response

The City Council has been and continues to work very closely with our neighbouring district Councils to ensure that housing provided to meet unmet need in Oxford is genuinely affordable. It is of course up to those Councils to set their own policies for the precise percentages of different tenures, but all of Oxfordshire's district councils already require a high percentage of affordable housing from large developments when compared to the national average. The City Council is also working with our neighbouring district councils to obtain appropriate nomination rights from the City Council housing list for social housing for the city's unmet need built outside the city.

Board member for Safer, Greener Oxford

19. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Hayes – Zero Emission Zone progress

What progress is being made on plans to make Oxford City Centre a zero emission zone – the first stage of which is meant to be implemented by 2020? What consultations have happened since the initial public consultation, which ended a year ago?

Response

Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council are working together on plans to introduce a zero emission zone in Oxford from 2020. Officers have undertaken considerable work since the public consultation last year to fully understand the impact of the zone and are currently working on proposals which consider the feedback provided. During the last 12 months consultative meetings have been undertaken with directly impacted stakeholders and groups representing impacted stakeholders to help inform proposals. I expect the next steps to be announced in the New Year.

Supplementary question

What is the process for Councillors to get engaged in this?

Response

There will be lots of opportunities for councillors to get involved in the new year. There will be all member briefings for both city and county councillors.

20. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Hayes – Zero Emission Zone costs

Could the Board Member provide a figure of costs to the council of studies, admin and other work undertaken in relation to the proposed zero emission zone?

Response

The City Council has spent £14,988 on the Zero Emission Zone feasibility study.

21. From Councillor Harris to Councillor Hayes – Pollution monitoring

Is the Council satisfied that it has adequate monitoring equipment to monitor PM 10 and PM 2.5 particulate pollution in the city and if not what sets will it take to improve the situation.

Response

The City Council monitors PM10 and PM2.5 at two locations in the city centre, one of these sites is part of the Governments Automatic Urban and Rural Network, while the other is fully compliant with government quality assurances processes. The monitoring equipment in the two locations is the only government approved equipment for monitoring of PM10 and PM2.5 and we are therefore confident the equipment is adequate and suitable.

Supplementary question

The answer focuses on the equipment. Does this mean that it is the Council's view that there is no need for monitoring in additional locations?

Response

We focussed on the equipment to make it clear that it is adequate and suitable. We would like to see more monitoring but we don't get government funding support to do that. We continue to lobby government for further funding for this and other pollution issues.

Board member for Supporting Local Communities - None

Deputy Leader of the Council; Board member for Leisure and Tackling Homelessness and Improving the Private Rented Sector

22. From Councillor Harris to Councillor Smith – Severe Weather Emergency Protocol

Is the administration satisfied that the current arrangements for triggering the Severe Weather Emergency Protocol are appropriate?

Is there a case for implementing the protocol each night that the temperature is expected to drop below freezing?

Response

This winter the City Council is using Rough Sleeping Initiative Funds to provide an additional 41 bed spaces, on top of the 167 we already fund. During January, February and March we will also be referring rough sleepers into the Oxford Winter Night Shelter which has expanded from 10 beds to 20 for 2019, this is run by Oxford churches and this administration gives thanks for their huge contribution. Our work concentrates on giving rough sleepers the option to come inside and access support whatever the temperature, but extra efforts are made during SWEP as there are acute health risks for rough sleepers during prolonged periods of extreme weather.

The purpose of SWEP is to ensure that accommodation is available in adverse weather conditions - when required and at short notice – for all those who need it. The arrangements agreed with local homelessness organisations for winter 2018/19 will ensure that this is the case, including for rough sleepers who would not otherwise be eligible for the adult homeless pathway because they have no local connection or no right to claim benefits or housing in the UK, and for people who have not previously engaged with services and come inside.

SWEP will trigger on a forecast by the Met Office of 3 consecutive days at zero degrees Celsius or below, however as in previous years, the Council has discretion to open SWEP in other adverse weather conditions, e.g. snow on the ground, extreme wind chill, and together with our partners, will take a common sense approach on decisions as to whether or not to open / continue SWEP.

SWEP is currently run on a model which relies on homelessness professionals who staff core services in the city working overtime to deliver SWEP provision. This model, using overtime and professionals volunteering, means that continued and extensive periods of opening places considerable pressure on staff and services.

I would like to do more to ensure there is a safe and warm place available for all rough sleepers during periods of cold weather and I have asked council officers to use the discretion available to them to trigger SWEP during freezing conditions this winter if resources are available to do so. We are working on plans for next winter which will aim to provide more continuous night shelter provision throughout the season, and operate SWEP for every single freezing night - because opening and closing beds depending on the weather is never going to be an efficient way to run a service nor the best way to help people.

Officers will be working together with local homelessness organisations to monitor the operation of SWEP this winter, including getting feedback from people on their experiences of using SWEP, and will report as requested to CEB on this.

Leader of the Council, Board Member for Economic Development and Partnerships

23. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Brown – Oxford Living Wage

Noting the longstanding decision to set the Oxford Living Wage at 95% of the London Living Wage; how was the 95% original decided?

What process is in place to ensure that this still accurately reflects differences in cost of living and continues to do so?

Response

The Centre for Research in Social Policy has developed a methodology known as the Minimum Income Standard (MIS) for defining what level of income is needed to reach a minimum socially acceptable standard of living in the UK. The MIS informs the calculation of the Real Living Wage and the London Living Wage (and indirectly the Oxford Living Wage - which was originally set at 95% of the London Living Wage). The MIS is based on case studies and precise analysis with members of the public of what items need to be included in a minimum household budget. The analysis is conducted every second year, with an inflation linked element added for the years in between.

In future years, there may be a need to ascertain whether the 95% setting is still an accurate measure.

24. From Councillor Garden to Councillor Brown – Sustainable Communities Act 2007

On the 1 October, the council agreed to invoke the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 and asked the Leader of the Council to write on its behalf to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to obtain up-to-date information in order to best engage with businesses, institutions and communities, as well as to inform its own actions with respect to protecting Oxford, the Council and Council services from the Government's approach.

- Can a copy the letter be made public?
- Can the Leader inform us of the response from the Government on the matter?
- What action has the Council taken to protect Oxford City, the Council and council services from the Government's approach to Brexit?

Response

Given the uncertainty about the terms of Brexit and the impact on business, even as we approach the date for leaving, there is a limit to what the City Council can do to anticipate the outcomes, however, we have taken a number of actions we considered prudent:

- The City Council Corporate Management Team has recently commissioned and considered a report on potential Brexit impacts to identify any actions that may be required. We have also agreed with the other Oxfordshire councils to share intelligence, analysis and preparation plans.
- Steps have been taken to ensure EU citizens employed by the City Council and ODS have been advised of the Government's Settlement Scheme, which offers a permanent right to remain in the UK.
- The City Council continues to be a leading role in the delivery of the Oxfordshire Housing & Growth Deal. This is a significant Government investment programme that is linked to our strategic position anchoring the Oxford Cambridge Corridor and reflects the opportunity it sees in delivering growth in Oxford and Oxfordshire's knowledge-intensive economy to help offset the impact of Brexit.
- The City Council's Economic Development team continues to work with businesses, the universities and other employers across the city to help ensure the Council can be as responsive as possible to their needs.

A copy of the letter is attached at Appendix 1

Supplementary question

Thank you for making the letters public. Could you do the same for any responses that you receive?

Response

Certainly – any response will be circulated to all councillors when received.

25. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Brown – Growth Board Local Plan processes

As the representative of this council on the Growth Board, could the Leader update us on the possible impact of recent comments by Planning Inspectors on Local Plan processes in Vale of White Horse and Cherwell Districts (particularly those in the Vale, where the Inspector appears to be asking for considerably more work on the proposal for housing at Dalton Barracks) on the already tight timescale for timing and alignment of Local Plans laid down in the Growth Deal?

Response

The Growth Deal requires submission of all the districts' Local Plans by the end of March 2019. West Oxfordshire has an adopted Plan so have met this requirement. Cherwell and Vale of White Horse have also met this requirement as their Plans are at examination currently.

Following a preliminary hearing, the Cherwell inspector has agreed that hearings should continue, and the hearings are expected to resume early next year. The Inspector at the Vale of White Horse examination has requested clarity about the number of houses to be allocated at Dalton Barracks, in order to ensure that any Green Belt release that might be agreed to (he has not confirmed whether he would agree to it in principal or not) is fully justified. The Inspector has given the Vale of White Horse three potential ways to overcome his issues with the current allocation of Dalton Barracks. The options would not be particularly significant in terms of timescales. There are likely to be other major modifications, but this is generally expected following any Local Plan examination. If modifications can be made that would make the Plan sound, then the timeline is no different to what could have been predicted.

Work on the JSSP should not be delayed by these reports. In time for the first statutory round of consultation for the JSSP, draft or adopted versions of the all districts' Plans will be available to inform the JSSP. Joint working between the districts and the JSSP team will ensure work continues to align.

Supplementary question

The Dalton Barracks housing numbers are quite significantly different so that could have an impact on timescales and potentially on the whole JSSP process.

Response

The Leader undertook to provide a written response.

26. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Brown – Growth Board staff recruitment

Again as our representative on the Growth Board, could the Leader update us on the Board's progress in recruiting its own staff to support its work, in particular in instances where duties which will be taken on by new staff currently falls on officers of this council?

Response

In light of the additional responsibilities stemming from the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, the Growth Board agreed earlier this year to create three new sub groups and a Scrutiny Panel made up of councillors from all Oxfordshire authorities to broaden and deepen involvement from elected members in the work of the Board and provide effective oversight of the Deal.

Recognising that these new member structures require additional officer support, the constituent authorities of the Growth Board have agreed to share the costs of an additional post of a dedicated Democratic and Member Services Officer to service the Growth Board, its sub groups and the Scrutiny Panel. A recruitment process for this post is underway and the job is currently being advertised.

This is in addition to the existing post of Growth Board Programme Manager. A Scrutiny Officer to support the Scrutiny Panel will be provided by the authority holding the Chair of the Growth Board (currently South Oxfordshire District Council). This arrangement will be in place from January 2019.

In the meantime, officer support for the Growth Board sub groups and Scrutiny Panel has been divided between the Oxfordshire Authorities. In addition to these additional Growth Board secretariat roles, a number of appointments have been made to a small Deal Delivery Core Team to provide Programme Management, work on the Joint Statutory Spatial Plan and support to the authorities in delivering their commitments under the Deal. These various posts to support the work of the Growth Deal and to release pressure on the constituent authorities are funded by capacity funding provided under the Deal specifically for this purpose.

Supplementary question

Would the Leader join me in thanking the officers of this Council who have undertaken additional work to support the Growth Board sub groups and Scrutiny Panel?

Response

I would certainly agree with you on that point.

27. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Brown – Freedom of the City

Can the Leader update Council on the arrangements for the meeting to confer the Freedom of the City on Benny Wenda.

Response

Preparations are starting for the award ceremony to take place (subject to Council voting to agree on the day) on a date to be agreed with Benny Wenda and the Lord Mayor, probably in March 2019. Detailed preparations will take place in the next month or two once a date is agreed, including identifying available funds for this additional civic event.

This allows the civic office to plan a suitable event in a quieter part of the civic year, and gives the recipient time to make preparation for himself and his guests.

28. From Councillor Garden to Councillor Brown – People's Vote

During the July meeting, the council resolved to support a People's Vote on the final Brexit deal, put forward by Cllr Tidball and Turner. The council agreed to formally add its voice to those calling for a public "People's Vote" on the final deal and agreed to liaise with the official 'People's Vote' groups on ways in which it can help promote the campaign. The council also agreed to write to its MPs expressing the resolution and asking them to support a People's Vote, and the Leader was going to make representations and write to this effect.

Can the council please set out what actions have been taken four months after the motion was adopted?

- When has the action been taken?
- Can a copy of the letter be made public?
- Has the council received a response from our MPs?

Response

Letters from myself have been sent to both MPs setting out the Council's position on a People's Vote, however I must apologise to Council that this has only just been actioned. Copies of the letters are attached and will be published on the City Council website and once we receive responses from the MPs these too will be published.

Copies of the letters are attached at Appendix 2

29. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Brown – People's Vote

Following this Council's decision in July 2018 to back a motion calling for a People's Vote, what (if any) response has been received from our MPs and what has this Council been doing to promote the People's Vote campaign?

Response

City Councillors of all parties were involved in promoting the recent People's Vote march in London and many people from Oxford attended it. Oxford University Students union has also given its backing for a People's Vote.

30. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Brown – Oxford Union and Steve Bannon

Will the Leader join me in unconditionally condemning the alleged Bannon supporters who were photographed and filmed doing 'Nazi salutes' outside of the Oxford Union during a recent visit by the far-right former Trump strategist and urge the police to follow through with their investigations of the incident.

Response

It does the University of Oxford's reputation for diversity and inclusion no good at all to invite speakers from the far right to come and speak in front a privileged few under the dubious guise of 'free speech'. I am unimpressed that our hard pressed police force were taken away from far more important work such as investigating crime in our city.

On behalf of the city council, I am doubly outraged that they chose the night of our Christmas Lights Festival to invite a divisive and unpleasant speaker, causing last minute changes to have to be made for safety reasons to children parading through our city.

Supplementary question

Would you write to the Oxford Union expressing the views set out in your response?

Response

Yes I will.

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Council

Date: 26 November 2018

Title of Report: Public addresses and questions that do not relate to matters for decision – as submitted by the speakers and with written responses from Board Members

Introduction

1. Addresses made by members of the public to the Council, and questions put to the Board members or Leader, registered by the deadline in the Constitution, are below. Any written responses available are also below.
2. The text reproduces that sent in the speakers and represents the views of the speakers. This is not to be taken as statements by or on behalf of the Council
3. This report has been republished following the Council meeting and lists the full text of speeches delivered as submitted, summaries of speeches delivered which differ significantly from those submitted, and any further responses.

Addresses and questions to be taken in Part 2 of the agenda.

- [1. Address by Dr Ruvi Ziegler, Chair, Oxford European Association - Support for the Oxford European Charter](#)
- [2. Address by Artwell - Farndon Court](#)
- [3. Address by Artwell - Customers](#)
- [4. Address by Mr Stefan Piechnik - Acknowledgement of public involvement resulting in substantial monetary savings to the Council](#)
- [5. Address by Artwell – This Council 2020](#)
- [6. Address by Sharone Parnes – IHRA definition](#)
- [7. Address by Jabu Nala-hartley – What is Oxford Anti-racist city?](#)

[Questions in part 2](#)

- [8. Question from Judith Harley / Artwell – Temple Cowley Library Parking](#)
- [9. Question from Mr Nigel Gibson – Why is Oxford City Council STILL Discriminating Against the Disabled, and WHAT PRICE DISABILITY](#)

Addresses in part 2

1. Address by Dr Ruvi Ziegler, Chair, Oxford European Association - Support for the Oxford European Charter

As Chair of the Oxford European Association, I am delighted to commend to the Council the Oxford European Charter, which the Oxford European Association adopted on 23rd October 2018 nem con.

The OEA is proud of Oxford's open, diverse, and tolerant character: 1 in 10 Oxford residents was born elsewhere in the EU. The OEA is determined for Oxford to remain an international, open, and welcoming European city. We call on all employers, institutions and authorities in Oxford to do all they can to respect, protect, and fulfil the rights to which EU27 citizens are entitled, and to ensure they are not discriminated against in any way.

The OEA is vigorously campaigning for our rights as Europeans. It firmly believes that Oxford's EU27 residents should have their rights fully maintained *if* the UK leaves the EU. This must include a lifelong guarantee that EU27 citizens can leave the UK and return thereto, and that as residents, their right to vote in all local government elections is maintained. Electoral eligibility signifies membership of the communities in which EU27 have made their home; it demonstrates that they remain equal, in law and in fact. It enables EU27 citizens to continue to contribute to their local communities. EU27 citizens should be able to continue to fully participate in civic life.

The OEA also believes that, irrespective of Brexit, the UK should be much more forthcoming to EU27 citizens who have made their homes here by extending their electoral participation rights that so they are suitably enfranchised in national elections and referendums, and by reducing the financial burden of naturalisation for those who wish to do so to the cost of administration from its current, prohibitively expensive level. This is not only the right thing to do, but also the right time to do it, as a response to the exclusionary and unwelcoming nature of much of the discourse in this country around immigration.

Indeed, we are heartened by the cross-party support for the motion, which reflects the appreciation of residents across Oxford to the contribution that migrants, from the rest of Europe and around the world, have made to our city.

We sincerely hope other cities, Oxfordshire county council and, ultimately, Westminster will follow suit.

Written Response from Councillor Brown

Thank you to you and the OEA for the work you are doing to continue to campaign for the kind of open and inclusive society that on this council we are all committed to achieving. You will know that we have a motion later on the council agenda which has cross party support and that this council has repeatedly stated its opposition to the government's Brexit plans and its support for our European citizens

There was no further response at the meeting.

2. Address by Artwell - Farndon Court

Farndon Court was formerly Oxford's Young Women Christian Association's (YWCA) covenanted accommodation which uniquely offered accommodation to Oxford's vulnerable women.

The housing association Catalyst purchased Farndon Court with its covenant and tradition of offering accommodation commensurate with working women income. Farndon Court rents were really affordable for women earning Oxford's average income.

The recently reported sale of Farndon Court is a moral tragedy for the seller Catalyst; the purchaser Oxford University and the fifty residents who have been served with the two months eviction notice.

Catalyst's mission statement which speaks of assisting working people with affordable accommodation is undermined by Catalyst's decision to sell Farndon Court to Oxford University. Furthermore, despite Oxford University's commitment to gender justice, the University's purchase of Farndon Court deprives Oxford vulnerable women of precious accommodation.

The former site of Temple Cowley Pools and Gym has been purchased by Catalyst.

Indeed, Catalyst benefits greatly from public money and acts in "partnership" with the City Council to provide accommodation. The City Council ought to be troubled by Catalyst's decision of putting profits before its mission statement and for betraying the women refuge tradition of Farndon Court.

I call on Oxford City Council, to publicly support the women of Farndon Court by publicly ending all housing contracts with Catalyst and identifying a building which can be used to as a replacement refuge for the vulnerable women of Oxford.

Written Response from Councillor L Smith

The City Council recognises that the decommissioning of Farndon Court is a reasonable position for Catalyst to take given the poor quality of design and it needing significant investment to make it fit for 21st century living. Given the nature of the required works then vacant possession is required. However, we are quite rightly concerned that residents are supported in finding suitable alternative accommodation. Strong representation has been made to Catalyst to ensure this happens and good progress is being made with 39 households out 59 having been supported in finding a new home. Catalyst continues to work proactively and closely with the City council particularly with those more vulnerable households but also with other housing providers and letting agencies.

Catalyst continues to be a valued registered provider partner investing in the City on such projects as Temple Cowley and Blackbird Leys to provide much needed high quality affordable housing.

Supplementary response from Councillor L Smith at the meeting

I would like to make it clear that Farndon Court is not a refuge and it is not the case that all the residents are vulnerable. It is a market rent property in the private rented sector. It is an unfortunate situation that some of the long term residents find themselves in. Catalyst are a valued partner of this Council and we have been working very closely with them, in particular the 12 residents who might be regarded as having vulnerabilities are being given extra help.

Councillor Smith then read out a brief statement from Catalyst: *“The decision to dispose of assets is not an easy one, but we remain committed to making good business decisions to achieve our core social purpose of providing housing in Oxford and the South East for those that need a home most. Money raised by this sale will be reinvested to we continue to grow, expand and improve our housing stock and deliver more affordable homes at places such as Temple Cowley and Blackbird Leys.”*

3. Address by Artwell - Customers

Publicly elected Councillors, how can the Council Tax payers of Oxford be accurately described as “customers” as Cllr Chapman portfolio holder implies?

Despite the City Council having privatised or outsourced the majority of its services and responsibilities, the Council Tax payers of Oxford fund the City Council; including a considerable contribution to the staff’s pension.

For this reason, I call on Oxford City Council to address the council tax payers as Funders and cease from describing those who fund the City Council as “customers.”

Written Response from Councillor Chapman

My portfolio for “Customer-focused services” has the remit to ensure the efficient and effective delivery of Council services to residents and businesses and the continued success of the wholly-owned Oxford Direct Services Ltd.

This covers a wide range of services from waste collection, to housing repairs, building control and administration of benefits, to name a few.

The portfolio title recognises that to ensure the best customer experience for our residents and businesses, the services delivered need to be as streamlined as possible delivering real value and outcomes, and the quality of the interaction to make that happen needs to be timely, accessible and accurate.

The portfolio title emphasises the way we deliver our services to our residents and businesses, and recognises that there is a range of services and relationships that is not simply limited to council tax payers.

Almost all the City Council’s services remain in- house and we as a Labour Council are proud of having avoided the pitfalls of employing companies like Carillion, who have often saved money in the short term but damaged services in the long run, with weaker accountability and sense of local ownership.

As I have explained before in answers to the speaker, Oxford Direct Services Ltd is wholly owned by the Council as its only shareholder. It is not privatised or outsourced. Its profits are ploughed back into funding the City’s needs - a very different and much better model of public service than rewarding private shareholders.

Supplementary response from Councillor Chapman at the meeting

I don’t wish to get into a semantic discussion about customers. But what I do want to do, and I have said this before, is to re-iterate that to carry on saying that we privatise or outsource the majority of our services is absolute nonsense. We have to use every opportunity to put the record straight. So I will put the record straight now. That is not our policy, we have never believed in it, we have always kept all our services in-house,

we kept out 8000 council houses when we could have sold them off. How many examples do I have to give that we oppose privatisation and outsourcing. For the record we don't outsource the majority, or 50% or 30% of our services.

4. Address by Mr Stefan Piechnik - Acknowledgement of public involvement resulting in substantial monetary savings to the Council

I am here to ask for the acknowledgement of my actions that led to an estimated £1.5 Million pounds savings to the City Council Budget in not re-cladding three out of five Oxford Tower Blocks.

To make long story short, after the disastrous Grenfell Tower fire, on 14 June 14th, 2017, Mr Stephen Clarke sent the residents assurances about the fire safety of our homes. The assurances were in clear discrepancy with work schedules provided to me earlier that year, which explicitly stated non-fire resistant Trespa Vitrabond composite cladding panels and non-fire resistant StoTherm foam insulation panels; specifications common for all five Tower blocks.

Given my disappointment with Council officers earlier and the gross level of concern, I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister Theresa May on 19 June 2017. I argued for immediate intervention to save the cost in the still ongoing works. On 26 June 2017, the Prime Minister thanked me, and referred the case to the Department of Communities and Local Government. As you surely know, subsequent prompt checks found the works unsafe and required changing the already installed cladding on TWO Tower Blocks at the cost of One Million pounds (Extraordinary Council meeting 2017 08 22).

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that because of my prompt actions the Council had to replace cladding only on TWO tower blocks, not all FIVE of them. By proportion I estimate to have saved the Council £1.5 Million in re-cladding costs. This is directly attributable to my early action which allowed PROSPECTIVE changes in material specifications for the remaining three Tower Blocks.

I would like to state explicitly that I do not expect a word from Councillor Rowley, who (e.g. not limited to)

- (i) incorrectly assured the Council about the state of First Tier Tribunal submission (Council meeting 2016 04 18)
- (ii) stated details of consultations that he could not support by any evidence (Council meeting 2016 09 29) and
- (iii) shamelessly dismissed a reasonable request from Councillor Roz Smith even to apologise to Leaseholders for the eye-watering wrong £50,000 demands for the vastly unwarranted works to our homes (Council meeting 2018 07 23).

Instead, I respectfully ask the Council leader, Cllr Susan Brown to check the facts herself and say what measures the Council can take to acknowledge my contribution, hopefully through a customary cash award in proportion to the vast savings made. Not the words, but the scale of award would truly reflect the actual level of Council's welcome to public involvement in running the local affairs.

Written response from Councillor Brown

The decisions regarding tower block cladding were made internally based on ever-changing government guidance, building regulations and professional advice.

While we are aware that many hundreds, if not thousands of individuals, local authorities, landlords and building owners wrote to the government on fire safety issues

around that sad period, we do not acknowledge that Mr Piechnik had any influence or any personal involvement in the decisions taken by the Council.

As such it is felt that it would be entirely unwarranted and inappropriate to make a cash award to him. We will check the facts of the case.

Supplementary response from Councillor Brown at the meeting

Thank you. I would re-iterate that it would be entirely inappropriate to make a cash payment. I agree the last sentence of my response does not sit terribly well. We have of course checked the facts of the case. I think we meant that we would be happy to check the facts again and that we are confident that it would support the position we have stated.

5. Address by Artwell – This Council 2020

This Council's plans for Oxford City Centre will result in Bus Stops being located far from the main shopping area. Our society is ageing; with mobility difficulties affecting an increasing number of people of all ages.

Additionally, it is clear that Oxford City Council would like Oxford City Centre to be free from people who earn a living from asking the general public for assistance. Those in need are still part of Oxford society. It is widely believed and reported that a considerable percentage of today's needy formerly held responsible positions in the Merchant Navy or Military Service.

Finally, the current plan for electric vehicles only for Oxford City Centre by 2020, will not create any difficulty for the few who are able to purchase one of Mr Elon Musk's Tesla vehicles.

However, will the City Council abandon its current plans for an all-electric Oxford City Centre and instead concentrate on using the Council's resources to improve the entire life experience for families living on Oxford's Living Wage?

Written Response from Councillor Clarkson

Oxford City Council is not the transport authority and does not control where bus stops are located.

The City Council is currently undertaking two full public consultations that involve the city centre – the City Centre Conservation Area and the Local Plan. In addition, jointly with the County Council we commissioned a report from Phil Jones Associates on *Oxford City Centre Movement and Public Realm Strategy*. As we have repeatedly made clear, the report is and remains advisory – designed to help shape thinking on the Local Plan and the County Council's forthcoming *Local Transport Plan 5*.

The City Council continues to work with partners with the aim of ensuring no-one needs to sleep rough in Oxford. Under the Trailblazer programme we are also offering assistance upstream to those leaving hospital, prison and other institutions to help ensure they don't end up homeless. Oxford City Council is the main organisation trying to tackle the gross inequality across the city, and to suggest that we do not care about those in need is an outrageous slur.

The City Council is committed to start the phased introduction of a zero emissions zone in the city centre from 2020. All types of non-emitting vehicles will be permitted, not just electric. The zone will start in a small area of the city centre and then expand out to include more streets and more vehicle types over time. Crucially, the proposals are

dependent on technology. The City Council absolutely will not abandon its plans for a Zero Emission Zone. Oxford city centre has toxic and high levels of air pollution in some streets. Currently, people are living, working and commuting in an invisible killer. Not only *can* we cut air pollution and improve people's entire life experience, we *are* doing this.

There was no further response at the meeting.

6. Address by Sharone Parnes – IHRA definition

Hello and thank you for allowing me to speak here – again - today. At your July meeting, in this place, I attended as an Oxfordshire resident, an elected Councillor and a Jew (...not necessarily in that order), to draw your attention to the fact that the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition of anti-Semitism had not yet been considered for adoption by this Authority. I noted that 17 months earlier – in January 2017 – the then- Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government wrote to all Council Leaders, stating: “Anti-Semitism must be understood for what it is – an attack on the identity of people who live, contribute and are valued in our society. In light of this, I would like to take this opportunity to strongly encourage you to formally adopt the definition and consider its application in your own authority.”

Having asked if your Leader would undertake to put a motion for debate at the next Council meeting, I concluded my remarks with a clarification specifically stating that by the IHRA definition I meant the full definition including the published examples; and I also noted that the Chief Rabbi had said altering the guidelines would send a message of contempt to the Jewish Community. I left this place feeling that the Council was welcoming to me, and commendably open. But I also left feeling somewhat confused. Subsequently, I also feel a little bit duped. Here's why:

During proceedings here your Leader took an admirably candid step of acknowledging the lapse of time in addressing the particular issue, and her subsequently published letter to the current Secretary of State sought to confirm “on behalf of Oxford City Council that we support the IHRA definition as part of our commitment to tackle anti-Semitism and associated hate crimes in our city.” But it transpired Oxford City Council had been – and remains - ambiguous as to whether it accepts the full IHRA examples of anti-Semitism.

Initially the Board of Deputies of British Jews published social media announcements applauding Oxford City Council for adopting “the full IHRA definition of anti-Semitism, with all its appended examples, showing its commitment to tackling this ugly form of prejudice.” But shortly thereafter, all these posts were deleted. Surely there must have been a reason.

A short time later, on August 7th, the IHRA itself published a statement (a copy of which I have submitted for your consideration in advance of today's meeting) with explanations by Experts of the UK Delegation to the IHRA on the Working Definition of Antisemitism, explaining, among other relevant things, that “Any ‘modified’ version of the IHRA definition that does not include all of its 11 examples is no longer the IHRA definition.” The IHRA statement explains, “If one organisation or institution can amend the wording to suit its own needs, then logically anyone else could do the same. We would once again revert to a world where antisemitism goes unaddressed simply because different entities cannot agree on what it is.” So, by the standards of the IHRA which achieved internationally recognition on its definition of anti-Semitism, it is not clear that Oxford City Council has actually adopted it.

Just this month we have seen continuations of anti-Semitism in this City, including a swastika prominently painted on a wall and a Nazi salute at a public event. And every time the IHRA definition is mentioned in this full-Council (including in July and again at your previous meeting), it is not only noted that the definition actually doesn't preclude criticism of Israel but Members here go further in incorporating criticism of Israel into the discussion. It wouldn't be remiss for Members of this Council to acknowledge, at least for balance, that every now and then even the Israeli government displays positive actions, too! But really criticism or praise of Israel or any other country is really not the issue, however much some seem determined to deflect the focus of discussion on the IHRA definition.

Leadership involves flexibility, but on hate crime and prejudice there is no room for ambiguity. Oxford City Council owes it to constituents and neighboring communities, to confirm unequivocally whether or not it has adopted the full IHRA definition including all of its 11 examples. I ask for such confirmation today, whether it does so or not: Yes, or no?

Please see Appendix 1 for further information.

Written or verbal response from Councillor Brown

Thank you for your contribution Councillor Parnes. Oxford City Council's position on antisemitism is unambiguous, and as I stated previously when you addressed this chamber - we have adopted the full IHRA definition [as of course the Labour Party has done nationally.]

Where it is in our power to act – as was the case with the racist graffiti in the past week – we do so without hesitation. The swastika and other offensive graffiti were removed by our ODS teams within 24 hours.

Supplementary response from Councillor Brown at the meeting

We have never sought to distinguish between any of the many definitions and we have adopted the full IHRA definition. We take very seriously the tackling of any racism in the city and we have clear policies to ensure that we deal with incidents such as graffiti very quickly.

7. Address by Jabu Nala-hartley – What is Oxford Anti-racist city?

It is an organised platform which seeks to have an Anti-racist educational workshop in a safe place. I was one of the facilitators of the workshop which took place at the East Oxford community centre on the 27 October 2018. Along with Councillor Shaista Aziz, it was a well-attended workshop by all sections of the community from Oxford.

My name is Jabu Nala-Hartley. I am the co-founder of Oxford Unites as an Anti-racist city. I came to Oxford to join my mother who was studying at Ruskin College in Oxford in 1984. I attended Milham Ford girl school and later went to join Oxford college of further Education. I have also attended Courses at Oxford Brookes university as well as Ruskin College.

I have also worked around Oxford communities as a WEA tutor as well as working as a Royal mail Postal worker, Retail Oxford Story and a precarious worker as an employee at the JR hospital and Churchill hospital.

My experiences have given me the opportunities to come across all peoples of Oxford who work in Oxford and come from various parts of the world from all different backgrounds, serving Oxford in different roles, from student, teachers, postal workers, NHS workers to trade unions etc

The theme of Oxford Anti-racist city is to explore open dialogue about issues that affect this community of Oxford. Racism has had an impact in all these areas that I have come across. The aim is to look at:

- How are people impacted by racism around their communities?
- Are people aware of how they can be impacted?
- How does it affect people structurally
- What are the areas of concern
- Education (deconstruction/decolonisation of the curriculum)
- Employment
- Immigration
- Police
- Power

What happened at the workshop?

Themes were discussed as to how all people are affected by racism. How can we begin to have a dialogue as a city?

One person was affected by a situation where as a white person, she was out with her black friend, who was racially abused and she had to step in. Someone was affected by the fact that the majority of her constituency voted for Brexit.

Another incident was a community worker observed two kids black and white. The white boy who was causing trouble was let to get away from the police whilst a black disabled boy was tasered by police. When she enquired what will happen to the Black boy she was told she will be informed by letter or email. She has never been contacted.

Also we explored education issues around the curriculum. It still does not cover BAME oriented education e.g. black history. In employment there are high percentages of BAME discipline especially in the NHS. Statistics are still reflecting low recruitment records in certain jobs for BAME people.

Having been part of two historical days, the 16 November in Oxford, the Bennon protest and the 17 November on the estimated 40k Anti-racist March in London. I am enthused by the numbers of people who came out of their daily routines to say no to racist rhetoric.

I am also aware that we live in a population of millions of people, which makes 40k only a drop in the ocean. As we protested in Oxford and marched in London. I cannot get rid of that bitter after taste of having the Tommy Robinson supporters, coming to disrupt the protest by signing the Nazi offensive symbols. The Fascist that stood across the road from the 40k march in London. In Oxford to be woken up to alerts of a Nazi offensive symbol (swastika) drawn in a public pavilion.

We have a lot of work ahead of us. This racist rhetoric can only be eradicated by true honesty. We have to engage in powerful conversation with ourselves, families friends etc.

Why do you stand outside and watch people who are targeted and say nothing? That is where I feel is the starting point. People talk about feeling defeated, I feel that is a delusion. If we engage in powerful Conversation we can understand each other and move forward as a Community at peace with itself.

Thank you for inviting me to council.

I will also like to request the Council to give this project some further support.

Written Response from Councillor Brown

Thank you for your comments Ms Nala-Hartley. As I am sure you are aware, this council vigorously opposes racism, works with the police to tackle hate crime and seeks to foster real cohesion across all Oxford's communities. There is no place for racism in this city.

I would encourage Ms Nala-Hartley to talk to her Ward councillors about Council support for the project.

Supplementary response from Councillor Brown at the meeting

Thank you for raising these very important issues. I would encourage the speaker to contact her ward councillors regarding support for the project. I wish to reiterate the points I made previously and reassure the speaker that this Council takes seriously the issue of racism in the city and will work with communities to tackle it.

Questions in part 2

8. Question from Judith Harley / Artwell – Temple Cowley Library Parking

At April's full council meeting, I addressed council outlining problems with car and cycle parking at Temple Cowley Library caused by preparations for construction work on the former Temple Cowley Pools (TCP) site. Cycle parking has been resolved, as the bike racks were moved to a more visible and accessible position very soon after my address. However, nothing has changed regarding car parking.

The verbal response I received from Councillor Brown in April, as printed in the draft minutes, was:

"I will ask officers to investigate and respond to you."

By July's full council meeting I had received no response, so I again addressed council outlining the car parking problems. The verbal reply which I received from Councillor Hollingsworth, as published in the minutes, states:

"I apologise for the failure to respond to you – this was an oversight. Negotiations are underway between the City Council, Catalyst and the owner of an adjacent site to allow a site owned by the City Council to be used as temporary parking for the library. I have impressed on the officer leading this that this is a matter which now needs urgent resolution."

It is now nearly the end of November, seven months after my initial address, and three months since my last address on this matter. The Library still has no parking provision. What is your definition of the timescale of "urgent resolution"?

I understand that the "adjacent site" referred to by Councillor Hollingsworth is in Cox's Yard, currently used for vehicle repairs, which contains a small, land-locked area owned by the City Council. This area has no direct road access, except by arrangement with the site owner over his land. Despite Councillor Hollingsworth's impressing on the officer concerned that "this matter now needs urgent resolution", this area is being used for contractor parking, not library parking. The contractors have provided themselves with ample parking on the adjoining school field and at the rear of the adjacent Silver Band Hall. The Library has no parking provision.

At present the Library is undergoing roof repairs, for roof damage which may have been exacerbated by the adjoining building work. The Library is surrounded by scaffolding, which makes access to, and parking on, its slip road unsuitable.

When will the negotiations between the City Council, Catalyst, and the adjacent site owner be completed, so that Temple Cowley Library can have some parking provision?

Written Response from Councillor Hollingsworth

Following an initial meeting in July with the owner of the adjoining site which has the access on to Temple Road, the City Council wrote to him confirming that the Council's land would be used for temporary library parking. Legal agreements have been drafted, and are ready to issue. Catalyst have queried whether the responsibility for providing the parking is theirs or the City Council's: it is the Council's view that the responsibility to provide the parking is Catalyst's. The site is already cleared by Catalyst's contractors, and the City Council will therefore arrange for the appropriate final preparations and signage to be completed in the expectation that Catalyst will sign the appropriate legal documentation in short order.

Officers have raised with Catalyst the use of the Council's site by their contractors to park vans and Catalyst have said that they are not using it as the allotted parking is on the Silver Band Hall site. There are instances of parking on the site but it is not obvious where the vehicles are from. Officers will continue to monitor the situation and take the necessary action to keep the site clear.

There was no further response at the meeting.

9. Question from Mr Nigel Gibson – Why is Oxford City Council STILL Discriminating Against the Disabled, and WHAT PRICE DISABILITY

In now three previous Council meetings I've brought to your attention the way in which you are discriminating against the disabled and others qualifying for a Bonus card by increasing the admission charge at certain times of the week by 53.85%, from £1.30 to £2.00.

Telling me that the price increase is to 'encourage' those on the Bonus card to get their exercise at less busy times is clear and obvious discrimination – there is no similar charging regime for the general user. There are many reasons why a Bonus card user may want to exercise at a particular time, and if they find the facilities too busy they can surely choose for themselves, without an enforced additional charge as an 'incentive'.

It was extremely disappointing at the last Council meeting to have my question not answered. I am therefore asking it again. As you may infer by my presence at Council yet again, this issue is not going away until you decide to resolve things by stopping your discriminatory practices and compensating Bonus card users appropriately. And the topic will get increasingly embarrassing the closer we get to the next elections, so I would encourage you to roll back the discriminatory price increase as soon as possible.

So, I ask again:

Can you tell me how many times people with Bonus Cards have been charged £2 after 8pm during weekdays and after 4pm at weekends since the prices were raised in April?

At the meeting Mr Gibson concluded by offering his experience and services to engage with Fusion Lifestyle regarding the IT system.

Background

The 2018/19 increases for the Bonus Card concession increases were buried in the middle of an Appendix 7 of the budget document voted through by Council in February.

The Council offers a concessionary rate, called a Bonus card, for a range of people in need, including the disabled and their carers and different types of income support. The admission price for these concessions was increased by 53.85% from £1.30 to £2.00 at the start of April, with no advance warning, and discriminates against the disabled and those on benefits who now have to find extra money in order to be able to participate in exercise. The pricing shown on the Fusion websites is in line with the Budget appendix, but not what people are being charged.

Community Services Fees & Charges 2018/19

	2017/18 Charge	2018/19 Charge	Increase/ (Decrease)	Increase/ (Decrease)
	£	£	£	%
Leisure Centres				
Standard rated & inclusive of VAT				
ALL THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES ARE INCLUSIVE TO ACTIVE AND CHOICE MEMBERSHIP CARD HOLDERS				
Adult				
Casual Swimming	4.60	4.70	0.10	2.17
Family Swim Ticket	11.80	12.10	0.30	2.54
Hinksey Swimming	6.20	6.40	0.20	3.23
Hinksey Family Swim Ticket	18.40	18.90	0.50	2.72
Hinksey (early/late)	4.60	4.70	0.10	2.17
Hinksey Family Swim Ticket (early/late)	11.80	12.10	0.30	2.54
Sauna & Swim (LPLC)	7.80	8.00	0.20	2.56
Water Workout	6.50	6.70	0.20	3.08
Badminton (per person)	3.70	3.80	0.10	2.70
Squash (per person)	4.20	4.30	0.10	2.38
U17/Over 60s/ Student				
Casual Swimming	2.90	3.00	0.10	3.45
Hinksey Swimming	4.10	4.20	0.10	2.44
Hinksey (early/late)	2.90	3.00	0.10	3.45
Sauna & Swim (LPLC)	4.90	5.00	0.10	2.04
Water Workout	4.30	4.40	0.10	2.33
Badminton (per person)	2.70	2.80	0.10	3.70
Squash (per person)	2.80	2.90	0.10	3.57
Bonus Concessionary*				
Casual Swimming (Off peak)	1.30	1.50	0.20	15.38
Casual Swimming (Peak)	1.30	2.00	0.70	53.85
Hinksey Swimming (Off peak)	1.30	1.50	0.20	15.38
Hinksey Swimming (Peak)	1.30	2.00	0.70	53.85
Hinksey (early/late)	1.30	1.50	0.20	15.38
Sauna & Swim @ LPLC	2.50	2.80	0.30	12.00
Water Workout (Off peak)	1.30	1.50	0.20	15.38
Water Workout (Peak)	1.30	2.00	0.70	53.85
Badminton (Off peak per person)	1.30	1.50	0.20	15.38
Badminton (Peak per person)	1.30	2.00	0.70	53.85
Squash (Off peak per person)	1.30	1.50	0.20	15.38
Squash (Peak per person)	1.30	2.00	0.70	53.85

Written Response from Councillor L Smith

We undertake regular benchmarking with other local authority areas and this shows that the bonus scheme is comparatively low cost. The benchmarking has also shown that off peak pricing is a common practice to try and encourage more usage at quieter times.

We very much value all of our customers, actively promote all of the membership schemes including the bonus card and welcome all user feedback.

In light of Mr Gibson's concerns about overcharging, the system at the Ferry Centre system has been thoroughly investigated by the Council's leisure operator Fusion Lifestyle. We would encourage customers who think they may have been overcharged or have an issue with their bonus or membership cards to contact a member of the Fusion team at the facility of their choice so that the issue can be resolved.

Supplementary response from Councillor L Smith at the meeting

Thank you for the offer of assistance.

Since you last came to talk to us Fusion Lifestyle have informed me that there are some technical anomalies with a small number of cards. They will aim to rectify those anomalies as soon as possible. In the meantime anyone who thinks they have been overcharged should speak to the Duty Manager at the centre and get an immediate

refund. If the matter isn't resolved to their satisfaction at the centre they should contact the Leisure & Performance Manager at the City Council.

This page is intentionally left blank