

Minutes of a meeting of Council on Monday 13 July 2026

www.oxford.gov.uk



Council members present:

Councillor Altaf-Khan	Councillor Arshad
Councillor Azad	Councillor Bala
Councillor Brown	Councillor Chapman
Councillor Clarkson	Councillor Corais
Councillor Davis	Councillor Dhall
Councillor Diggins	Councillor Elphinstone
Councillor Fouweather	Councillor Fry
Councillor Gant	Councillor Goddard
Councillor Harley	Councillor Henwood
Councillor Jarvis	Councillor Jupp
Councillor Kerr	Councillor Lancaster
Councillor Lygo	Councillor Malik
Councillor Miles	Councillor Max Morris
Councillor Muddiman	Councillor Mundy
Councillor Munkonge (Lord Mayor)	Councillor Ottino
Councillor Powell	Councillor Pressel
Councillor Qayyum	Councillor Railton
Councillor Regisford	Councillor Robinson
Councillor Rowley	Councillor Stares
Councillor Linda Smith (Sheriff)	Councillor Roz Smith
Councillor Snowton	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Thorniley	Councillor Turkson Wood
Councillor Turner	Councillor Upton (Deputy Lord Mayor)
Councillor Yeatman	

Also present for all or part of the meeting:

Caroline Green, Chief Executive
Tom Hook, Deputy Chief Executive - Citizen and City Services
Alistair Rush, Interim Group Finance Director

Emma Jackman, Director of Law, Governance and Strategy (Monitoring Officer)
Jonathan Malton, Committee and Member Services Manager
Celeste Reyeslao, Scrutiny and Governance Advisor
Hannah Carmody-Brown, Committee and Member Services Officer
David Butler, Director of Planning & Regulatory Services
Natalie Dobraszczyk, Development Management Team Leader
Sarah Harrison, Team Leader (Planning Policy)
James Watkins, Housing Policy and Projects Officer
Rachel Williams, Planning Policy and Place Manager

Apologies:

The minutes show when Councillors who were absent for part of the meeting arrived and left.

10. Apologies for absence

It was noted that Councillor Yeatman, Councillor Roz Smith, Councillor Lygo, and Councillor Goddard may be late.

11. Declarations of interest

Councillor Taylor, in relation to the Oxford living wage motion, noted that he is a member of a union and works in high-street retail.

The Monitoring Officer advised Council that whilst several relevant organisations are mentioned within the preamble to the recommendations on the motion, the recommendation itself does not directly impact on any of those organisations, and therefore, Members are not required to declare an interest unless they wish to.

Councillor Brown, in relation to motion G, noted that she would leave the meeting when this is discussed due to its relation to her employer. Council were assured she had taken no part in discussions on this motion.

Councillor Smowton and Councillor Railton noted their roles in the creation of the Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that as they had been present at the parish council meeting which approved the plan, they should vacate the chamber and not take part in discussion on the item.

Councillor Henwood informed Council that he was Chair of the working group for the Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan and would also leave the Chamber for the duration of debate on this item.

Councillor Stares noted the same.

12. Minutes

The Chair requested comments on the minutes for approval.

Councillor requested that the minutes of 23 March 2026 reflect the point of order he had raised. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the minutes could be amended to reflect the point of order he raised and that it had been ruled out.

On being proposed by the Lord Mayor and seconded by Councillor Arshad, the minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2026 were **approved** as a true and accurate record.

On being proposed by the Lord Mayor and seconded by Councillor Brown, the minutes, as amended, of the Annual Council meeting held on 20 May 2026 were **approved** as a true and accurate record.

13. Appointment to Committees

There were no appointments to committees.

14. Announcements

The Lord Mayor thanked Members for appointing him in May and noted the many engagement he had since completed, including welcoming his Majesty the King to Oxford, opening street markets, and attending the Leys festival.

The Deputy Lord Mayor noted that she had attended some events on behalf of the Lord Mayor and is enjoying her role as Deputy.

The Sheriff noted her new responsibilities as the conservator of Port Meadow and informed Council that on 5 June she had met with officers from the parks and communications teams and ODS to plan for keeping the meadow safe and clean over the busy summer months. Furthermore, on 19 June, she the annual Sheriff's inspection of the meadow with the support of ODS; the Sheriff had been impressed by the knowledge and dedication of the ranger team. Council also heard that since 2022, the water quality in Oxford's designated area of bathing water status has

declined and the Sheriff has written to the Chief Executive of Thames Water to express concerns. On 27 June, meetings were attended with Thames Water and the Environment Agency, at which time the Sheriff learned that despite investigations, the reasoning for the poor water quality is still unknown, although some evidence links to discharge from sewage treatment works and human faeces. Council were informed that the Environment Agency is now coordinating a project with a small local charity to bring together stakeholders and volunteers to identify the source of the pollution. The Sheriff expressed her disbelief and disappointment at the lack of progress and concern that a response led by a small local charity may not be commensurate to the priority of the environmental disaster. The Sheriff urged Thames Water and the Environment Agency to do more and to do better. The Sheriff noted that she would be writing to the relevant government ministers and Council will be kept informed of the progress.

The Leader informed Council that a decision from Government on Local Government Reorganisation is expected during the week and that this would be comprehensively communicated to staff, councillors, residents, and stakeholders. In relation to devolution, the Leader noted her disappointment that the Thames Valley devolution deal was vetoed by the Leader of Oxfordshire County Council with no warning. The Leader noted this as an undemocratic decision made on behalf of the district and city councils in Oxfordshire but with no warning or consultation; it had also removed 18 months of work. The Leader pledged to collaboratively work with the new Prime Minister to ensure that devolution can progress locally. In relation to the Oxford Union debate which took place recently, the Leader also emphasised that the Council had put out a very clear statement condemning the way in which the Oxford Union has consistently invited deliberately provocative speakers and not paid the cost to the community for security or support cohesion. Members heard that the Council would work with anyone wishing to push for the Oxford Union to take financial responsibility, rather than passing this to the taxpayer. The Leader also noted that along with the Cabinet Member for a Safer Oxford, Councillor Arshad, she had written to the Police and Crime Commissioner inviting him to support this endeavour; the County Council has committed to doing so. Furthermore, in relation to Campsfield, the Leader set out that she had worked with the Head of Planning to draft a letter outlining opposition to the use of the facility as a detention centre; this had been sent. The Leader drew Council's attention to the fact that Marie Tidball, former Oxford City Council Labour councillor and current Member of Parliament for Penistone and Stocksbridge had recently received the Stonewall changemaker award for policy change alongside her fellow Labour MP Rachel Taylor for their work on changing the law in relation to hate crime on the basis of someone's sexuality, gender identity, or disability. The Leader commended this work, noting it as a huge step forward in LGBTQ+ rights, and offered formal congratulations. Council applauded.

Finally, the Leader announced the appointment of Champions for the year ahead:

- Armed Forces and Veterans Champion – Councillor Mark Lygo
- Cycling Champion – Councillor Louise Upton
- Heritage Champion – Councillor Mary Clarkson
- Nighttime Economy and Events Champion - Councillor James Taylor
- Older People's Champion - Councillor Trish Elphinstone
- Small Business Champion – Councillor Chewe Munkonge
- Vision Zero Champion - Councillor Chris Smowton

Councillor Yeatman joined the meeting during the Leader's announcements.

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive, the Chief Finance Officer, or the Monitoring Officer.

The City Rector noted that 2,126 years ago Julius Caesar was born. Whilst an amazing general and a writer, he was not as accomplished at reading a room. The City Rector noted how privilege he feels to be able to address Council and noted their ability to read a room well.

15. Public addresses that relate to matters for decision at this meeting

Council heard 1 address and the Cabinet Members read or summarised their written response. The addresses and response are set out in full in the minutes pack.

1. Martin Reed

Councillor Goddard joined the meeting during the public address.

16. Urgent Business

The Monitoring Officer explained that under the constitution there is provision for members to raise emergency items, however it is required that 10 Members support the motion to ensure it can be determined. The Lord Mayor was advised to request that supporting Members raise their hands.

In the absence of 10 supporters, the motion fell.

The Lord Mayor proposed that the agenda be reordered. Items were considered in the following order: 9, 10, 12, 16, 14, 15, 8 and 11.

17. HRA Property Services Policies

The Director of Housing had submitted a report to approve the following policies: aids and adaptations, complaints, compliance, decant, disposals, gas safety, health and safety, lifting equipment and lifting operations, mutual exchange, no access, permit to work, radon and voids to ensure the maintenance and good management of the housing stock.

Councillor Linda Smith introduced the report, noting that the policies aim to provide assurance to council tenants, leaseholder, and shared owners, that they are safe in the home, to know that their landlord is performing, that they have the right to have their complaints dealt with promptly, and to be treated with respect and to have their voice heard. These principles ensure good quality homes and neighbourhoods. Council were informed that the policies also seek to ensure compliance with new regulatory requirements for social landlords and consider the lived experiences of residents.

There were no questions from Members of Council.

On being proposed by Councillor Smith, and seconded by Councillor Brown, the recommendations were put to a vote.

Council resolved to:

1. **Approve** the Aids and Adaptations Policy
2. **Approve** the Complaints Policy
3. **Approve** the Compliance Policy
4. **Approve** the Decant Policy
5. **Approve** the Disposals Policy
6. **Approve** the Gas Safety Policy
7. **Approve** the Health and Safety Policy
8. **Approve** the Lifting Equipment and Lifting Operations Policy
9. **Approve** the Mutual Exchange Policy
10. **Approve** the No Access Policy
11. **Approve** the Permit to Work Policy
12. **Approve** the Radon Policy
13. **Approve** the Voids Policy

18. Local Authority Housing Fund - Round 4

The Director of Housing had submitted a report to seek the required budget provision to enable the Council to proceed with entering into the national Local Authority Housing Fund Round 4.

Councillor Linda Smith introduced the report, noting that it considers both housing for the resettlement of refugees and temporary accommodation. Council heard that the Council expects to receive a grant of £898,500 from government which will be passed to a registered provider for the delivery of resettlement actions and provisions of four homes for Afghan households. By passing this to a registered provider, the Council will be able to ensure that the HRA fund does not take on further borrowing when it is already stretched; this preserves the HRA fund for other priorities. Councillor Smith outlined that the Council will however retain nomination rights for these properties and after three years, if the occupiers move on, the properties can be used to serve the wider housing needs of the city.

Councillor Rowley explained that the four temporary accommodation units will also be delivered in a similar manner to that outlined by Councillor Smith, for which the government grant will cover 50% of the cost. Council heard that this will also reduce the HRA borrowing requirements.

Councillor Smowton highlighted that across four rounds of the program the Council has acquired 22 units of housing in contrast to the 150 that were suggested. Councillor Smowton therefore emphasised the gulf between the scale of support from central government to deal with the national temporary accommodation crisis and the burden being placed on local authorities. The Cabinet Member was asked whether she would reiterate to government that there is a desperate need for more support to deal with the temporary accommodation crisis.

Assurance was provided from Councillor Rowley that the Council frequently reiterates this point to central government, however, it was reiterated this this report would not negatively impact on the Council's borrowing requirement.

Councillor Malik noted concern and commented that the government has historically prioritised Ukrainian refugees over Afghan refugees, however welcomed the support now coming in.

On being proposed by Councillor Smith, and seconded by Councillor Brown, the recommendations were put to a vote.

Council resolved to:

1. **Approve** the allocation of £808,000 of the LAHF R4 grant funding in substitution of approved HRA borrowing for the delivery of the temporary accommodation element of LAHF R4.
2. **Approve** the allocation of £898,500 of the LAHF R4 grant funding to a new General Fund capital budget for the payment of a capital grant of 898,500 to a Registered Provider to deliver the 'resettlement' element of LAHF R4.

Councillor Pressel joined the meeting during discussion of this item.

19. Urgent Key Decisions Since January 2026

The Director of Law, Governance and Strategy (Monitoring Officer) had submitted a report to update Council on key decisions taken in cases of special urgency since 26 January 2026.

Councillor Brown introduced the report, noting that it is now a requirement of the system introduced in recent years to record urgent decisions in a formal manner. Council heard that the decisions listed in the report related to receiving money from government and an urgent extension to an investment decision.

Councillor Miles welcomed the report but noted concern regarding the continued pattern of urgent key decisions; it was suggested that some processes may not be fit for purpose. Councillor Miles suggested this could be reviewed as part of the transition period following Local Government Reorganisation to ensure effective and sufficient democratic oversight continues and to ensure the Council responds and delivers quickly for residents.

Councillor Brown agreed with the premise of Councillor Miles' comments, noting the importance of ensuring these decisions are only taken when required but also that it may never been possible to take all decisions through length processes as there will always be some exceptional circumstances, Councillor Brown recognised that the Local Government Reorganisation transition process would be a good opportunity to assess and review the processes.

Council resolved to:

1. **Note** the urgent key decisions taken in cases of special urgency as set out in the report.

Councillor Roz Smith joined the meeting during discussion of this item.

20. Scrutiny Committee Annual Report

The Chair of the Scrutiny Committee had submitted a report which updates Council on the activities of the Scrutiny Committee over the last year.

Councillor Powell, as Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, introduced the report, noting that it had been an interesting year for the Scrutiny Committee running into the LGR year. Councillor Powell thanked the officers and Cabinet Members who had contributed to the meetings and informed Council that of 84 recommendations made during the reporting period, 51 had been accepted, with 17 also accepted in part. Council heard that this reflects the good working relationship that the Scrutiny Committee maintains with Cabinet as its critical friend in a minority administration.

There were no questions from Members of Council.

Council **noted** the report.

21. Scrutiny Committee update report

The Chair of the Scrutiny Committee had submitted a report which updates Council on the activities of scrutiny and the implementation of recommendations since the last meeting of Council.

Councillor Powell, as Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, introduced the report, noting that it summarised activity from 19 March 2026 to 1 July 2026, during which the Scrutiny Committee met twice. Council heard that 22 recommendations were made to Cabinet, 15 of which were agreed.

There were no questions from Members of Council.

Council **noted** the report.

22. Questions on Cabinet minutes

• 15 April 2026

Councillor Fouweather asked the relevant Cabinet Member to confirm that the proposed new housing and asset management system is to replace the QL system, and whether assurance can be provided that the new procurement will be smoother.

Councillor Chapman emphasised that the QL system has been working successfully for several years and referred Councillor Fouweather to an in-depth report previously provided. Assurance was provided that lessons had been learned from the previous procurement process.

In response to Councillor Fouweather, the Monitoring Officer also explained that the property system currently being procured is for property services and is not intended to replace the QL system; these are for two different functions of the Council.

• 17 June 2026

Councillor Smowton asked whether future fleet purchasing would focus on zero emission options, to which Councillor Chapman noted that this would depend on the availability in the market and the models available.

- **8 July 2026**

There were no questions from Members of Council.

23. Questions on Notice from Members of Council

59 written questions were asked of the Cabinet Members and the Leader, and these and written responses were published before the meeting.

These along with summaries of the 34 supplementary questions and responses asked and given at the meeting are set out in the minutes pack.

Councillor Lygo joined the meeting during discussion of this item.

Councillor Kerr, Councillor Morris, and Councillor Malik left and rejoined the meeting during discussion of this item.

The remaining Questions on Notice were heard after the public addresses.

Council adjourned during this item from 18.30 and returned at 19.05.

Councillor Qayyum did not return following the break.

24. Public addresses that do not relate to matters for decision at this Council meeting

Council heard 3 addresses and Cabinet Members read or summarised their written responses. Both addresses and responses are set out in full in the minutes pack.

1. Nick Eyre
2. Dom Birch
3. Chaka Artwell

25. Proposed Submission: Draft Oxford Local Plan 2045

The Director of Planning and Regulation had submitted a report to approve the Proposed Submission Draft Oxford Local Plan 2045 for submission to the Secretary of State for formal examination.

Councillor Railton introduced the report, noting that Council is asked to agree the draft Oxford Local Plan 2025 such that it can be submitted for examination. It was emphasised that this request would only be made if the plan is deemed to be sound and legally compliant.

Councillor Railton provided a summary of the plan's development, including the reg 18 consultation in the summer of 2025, the following reg 19 consultation, Council's previous approval of the plan in January 2026, and a judicial review process due to an injunction against submission of the plan. Members were informed that the hearing for the injunction will take place in October, and following this the plan must be submitted by 31 December 2026, otherwise the full process will have to be restarted. If this deadline is not met, Councillor Railton highlighted that the Council would be left with an out-of-date plan and several years of work unused.

Council were also informed that the Planning Inspectorate had advised the Council not to make modifications to the plan at this stage ahead of submission as it is preferred that any main modifications are identified during the inspection process. Councillor Railton emphasised that it is for the Planning Inspectorate to determine the soundness of the plan.

Councillor Brown seconded the report and reserved her right to speak until the end of the debate.

The Lord Mayor informed Council of the submission of a proposed amendment to the Local Plan.

Councillor Brown noted on behalf of herself and other cabinet members that due to representations received from the claimant's solicitor on the day of this meeting in relation to the judicial review, Councillor Turner, Councillor Linda Smith, Councillor Munkonge, Councillor Upton, and Councillor Chapman would not be participating in the debate on the amendment due to current or historic roles as shareholder of the Council. Council heard that advice had been taken from the Monitoring Officer and despite feeling that they could approach the debate with an open mind, the progression of the local plan is crucial. Councillor Brown emphasised that they would leave, despite not considering themselves to be predetermined or conflicted.

Councillor Henwood also noted that under the Monitoring Officer's advice, he and Councillor Stares would also leave the chamber for the duration of the debate on the amendment.

Before leaving, the Lord Mayor proposed that Councillor Rowley resume the role of the Chair for the duration of the debate on the amendment. On being seconded by Councillor Lygo, Councillor Rowley resumed the role of Chair.

Councillor Brown, Councillor Turner, Councillor Linda Smith, Councillor Munkonge, Councillor Upton, Councillor Chapman, Councillor Henwood and Councillor Stares left the meeting.

Councillor Dhall queried whether she would be required to leave the meeting given her previous concerns raised in relation to site access. The Monitoring Officer advised that without seeing the specific comments, she could not determine either way, and Councillor Dhall should leave if she felt unable to approach the debate with a fair an open mind.

Councillor Rowley thanked officers and the legal team for their work on the Local Plan.

Councillor Yeatman introduced the amendment, noting it as simple and sensible for addressing issues with the purchase of land at Meadow Lane by Oxford City Housing Limited. At the time of purchase, the site was expected to deliver 29 new homes however the Local Plan as now set out, notes that zero will be constructed. Councillor Yeatman queried why, on this basis, is the site still allocating for housing in the Local Plan. Council heard that the amendment did not oppose the Local Plan or seek to delay it, however it requests that the Council writes to the Planning Inspector at the appropriate stage to seek the removal of the site allocation from the plan. Councillor Yeatman emphasised that this would provide certainty for the local community and opportunity for local initiatives, such as The Meadow School project which seeks to use Oxford's last untouched meadow as an educational resource to help improve school attendance, raise educational attainment, and provide outdoor learning opportunities for young people. Council heard that in summary, the amendment would remove a redundant housing allocation and permit a valuable community project. Councillor Yeatman asserted that procedure guide provision 1.5 under reg 19 expressly notes changes that have not been consulted on can be submitted for examination.

Councillor Harley seconded the amendment and reserved her right to speak until the end of the debate.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that there is a process for submitting amendments to the Local Plan, however the view of the planning officers on this particular issue is that the removal of the site would undermine the plan and render it unsound. At this point, in their professional opinion, the plan would not meet legislative requirements in

terms of being ready to submit. Council heard this is largely because removal of the site from the plan would affect the housing numbers on which the plan is based.

Councillor Rowley invited debate on the amendment.

Councillor Smowton noted that he would be opposing the amendment as he believed the site plan, as stated, could facilitate sufficient social benefits and retain the opportunity for housing to be developed in the future. Councillor Smowton noted the need for housing in Oxford, specifically social housing with walkable and cycle suitable options, and did acknowledge that other sites in Oxford could also provide this, however he asserted his view that all the housing sites allocated in the plan would be required to ensure a chance of meeting the housing need. As a result, Council heard that he would not be content to begin removing housing sites from the Local Plan at this time. Councillor Smowton reminded Council that it is for the Planning Inspector to determine whether the Plan is sound.

Councillor Miles emphasised that Oxford needs housing of all types but noted that development at Meadow Lane would not meet the demand as it stands; instead, focus should be paid to development of brownfield sites rather than greenfield and biodiversity rich locations in the context of the climate emergency. Councillor Miles also cautioned against building homes on flood risk areas and urged for more focus on housing construction in place of commercial spaces and offices which push up commuting demands. Councillor Miles, on behalf of the Lib Dem group, noted that officer advice was acknowledged and, on that basis, she would not be supporting removal of a site from the plan and urged Council to leave this consideration for the inspection process. It was suggested that this amendment should have been put forward earlier.

Councillor Muddiman also recognised the local need for housing and welcomed increased development on brownfield sites with better connections to amenities and public transport, rather than employment spaces and labs. Councillor Muddiman urged Council to support more mixed developments in order to enable protection of green spaces in support of residents' health and well-being and local biodiversity. Councillor Muddiman noted her belief that the amendment would not make the plan unsound or require further consultation so noted she would be voting in support.

Councillor Ottino, recognising inequality in Oxford as stemming from housing issues, noted that the Local Plan identifies sites for more housing as a remedy to matters such as homelessness. Councillor Ottino also noted that this would still require planning applications to be brought before the relevant committee for consideration and appropriate scrutiny would be applied. Council heard his view that the site should not be removed from the plan as it opens the chance to build even one block of social housing which could be life-changing for one vulnerable individual or family. Councillor Ottino recognised officers' advice and noted his trust in the planning application process.

Councillor Jarvis noted agreement with Councillor Miles' comments, specifically in relation to process, and suggested that the inspector is best placed to determine whether the Local Plan is sound or not. Councillor Jarvis also acknowledged the advice of officers and on this basis and noted his opposition to the amendment. It was suggested that the amendment should have been suggested through earlier processes in which the political groups discussed the development of the Local Plan.

Councillor Malik agreed with Councillor Ottino's recognition of inequality within the city and noted dissatisfaction with current planning decisions, such as Botley Road. Councillor Malik also called for better use of brownfield sites and emphasised that planning must be considerate of all social and environmental requirements, specifically to support youth development and wellbeing. As such, Councillor Malik noted the value of green spaces for supporting younger people and therefore asserted his support for the amendment.

Councillor Arshad noted her opposition to the amendment and asserted that the Council has prioritised delivery of homes to meet the housing demand and support for a thriving economy. Council heard her recognition of the housing crisis and the work being done to bring forward more affordable and social housing, but also the need to ensure each site is properly tested through the independent examination process to ensure ecology, heritage, and sustainability are appropriately considered.

Councillor Railton noted that it is easy to support house building in principle, however the details of implementation are more challenging and divide opinion. Whilst recognising housing inequality in the city, Councillor Railton referred to Councillor Jarvis' concerns regarding process and urged Council to consider officer advice to ensure the submission of the plan is not blocked. It was emphasised that the amendment could render the plan unsound, and thus the Council would be left with an outdated Local Plan and the resulting consequences. Council was urged to reject the amendment.

Councillor Robinson recognised the complexity of this decision however stated her belief that it centred on the need to make compromises. Council was urged to see that the Meadow Lane site should be saved from housing development, and that biodiversity and green spaces should be prioritised; the environmental values of the site were summarised. Councillor Robinson noted her belief that, even with the incorporation of this amendment, the Local Plan would remain sound. Whilst not wishing to undermine the Local Plan, she would be voting in support of the amendment.

Councillor Harley thanked Councillor Robinson for her comments and, whilst recognising the great housing shortage in Oxford, also emphasised that housing should not be developed at any cost. Council was urged to protect green spaces, especially those which are not planned for housing, such as Meadow Lane. Councillor Harley asserted that then Local Plan would remain sound even with the incorporation of the

amendment and no delay would be caused. Councillor Harley also noted that the amendment would not affect the overarching strategy of the plan, it would save time, expense and stress. Council heard that the motion requested no more than for the inspector to be written to in order to invite the removal of the site allocation from the plan.

Councillor Yeatman, in summarising the debate, urged Council Members, as elected representatives, to take the opportunity to shape the development of the city and protect green spaces. The unique value of Meadow Lane was also emphasised and Councillor Yeatman suggested as an unsound site, it should be removed from the Local Plan to avoid threatening the soundness of the entire Local Plan. Councillor Yeatman also asserted that incorporation of the amendment would not delay submission, it would only make a request of the inspector.

On being proposed by Councillor Yeatman, and seconded by Councillor Harley, the amendment was put a vote.

9 voted in favour, 29 voted against, and 1 abstained.

The amendment fell.

Councillor Brown, Councillor Turner, Councillor Linda Smith, Councillor Munkonge, Councillor Upton, Councillor Chapman, Councillor Henwood and Councillor Stares rejoined the meeting following the debate of the amendment.

The Lord Mayor resumed his role as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Councillor Diggins left and rejoined the meeting during discussion of this item.

The Lord Mayor invited questions or comments from Members on the Local Plan as submitted to Council.

Councillor Miles thanked officers for their hard work to get the Local Plan to this stage and ready for submission. Councillor Miles noted that the recommendations, as set out in the report, do not open previous policy debates and focus on submission of the plan and scope for minor editorial corrections as required. Councillor Miles noted the positive aspects of the plan and recognised its greater recognition of some local centres. Council heard that she did not wish to undermine the work that has gone on in the plan, noting the significant cost to the taxpayer and risks of disrupting submission to the inspector within tight timelines. On this basis, Council Miles urged Council to support the Plan with recognition that input could be contributed to any revised local planning processes after Local Government Reorganisation and it is better not to leave the city in a position where no Local Plan is in place at all. On this basis,

Councillor Miles noted that the Liberal Democrat group would be abstaining from the vote.

Councillor Dhall left and rejoined the meeting during discussion of this item.

Councillor Turner commented on the balance between employment and housing which had featured in the debate repeatedly. Council heard that employment sites could be used for housing under the conditions of this Local Plan and a summary of matters relating to flood plains was outlined.

Councillor Roz Smith acknowledged Councillor Turner's comments but noted that Council can urge commercial property occupiers to change their property use into residential, if owned by the Council. Councillor Roz Smith noted that she would like the Council to act on this ability more.

Councillor Brown, as seconder, supported many of the comments from Councillor Turner. In respect of use of properties for housing and employment, she explained that every site in the city has the ability for the landowner to put housing on it, as noted under the Local Plan. However, this does not award the Council an ability to force people to develop houses. Councillor Brown emphasised that all members should be aware of this technicality via planning committee training. Members were reminded that the Council, as the Planning Authority, does not have the ability to make employers put housing on their sites. Councillor Brown also provided a summary of the values and strengths of the Local Plan as proposed, including positive housing policies and environmental considerations.

On being put to a vote, 30 voted in favour, and 17 abstained. The recommendations carried.

Council resolved to:

1. **Authorise** submission of the Oxford Local Plan 2045 to the Secretary of State for examination, including the minor amendments made according to recommendation 3;
2. **Approve** all the supporting statutory documentation including the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulation Assessment, Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP), Policies Map, Regulation 18 Consultation Statement, Regulation 19 Consultation Statement and Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendices 2-7 & 9);
3. **Authorise** the Director of Planning and Regulation, after consultation with the Lead Cabinet Member, to make any necessary minor editorial corrections to the Submission Draft Oxford Local Plan 2045, IDP, Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment, Policies Map, and to agree the supporting evidence base prior to submission;
4. **Authorise** the Director of Planning and Regulation, after consultation with the Lead Cabinet Member, to invite the examining inspector(s) to recommend any

modifications considered to be necessary in accordance with section 20(7C) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

26. Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan

The Director of Planning and Regulation had submitted a report to agree to “make” the Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillor Henwood, Councillor Railton, Councillor Smowton and Councillor Stares left the meeting for the duration of this item.

Councillor Diggins noted that the report mentions her place of employment but as a teacher, she has had little bearing on any of the decisions. It was noted she would remain in the meeting.

Councillor Brown introduced the report, noting that the plan had been in progress for a long time and went through public referendum on the 29 January 2026 with overwhelming support. Councillor Brown thanked all those who contributed for driving the development of the plan.

There were no questions from Members of Council.

Councillor Lygo left the meeting.

On being proposed by Councillor Brown and seconded by Councillor Ottino, the recommendations were put to a vote.

Council resolved to:

1. **“Make”** the Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan (Appendix 1). The Plan has been approved at referendum it and now forms part of the statutory development plan in helping to determine planning applications for the Littlemore Neighbourhood Area. The ‘making’ of the Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan would formalise this process in line with the relevant legislation.
2. **Authorise** the Director of Planning and Regulation, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Culture, to make any necessary editorial corrections to the Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan prior to final publication. This will include a final desktop published version of the Littlemore Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillor Henwood, Councillor Railton, Councillor Smowton
Stares rejoined the meeting.

and Councillor

Councillor Lygo rejoined the meeting.

At the conclusion of this item, Councillor Powell proposed that Council vote to suspend standing orders to ensure the meeting could extend to 9.25pm; Councillor Jarvis seconded the motion.

The motion was put to a vote and was defeated.

27. Motions on Notice July 2026

Council had before it 8 motions on notice submitted in accordance with Council procedure rules and reached decisions as set out below.

Motions agreed as set out below:

- a. E-bikes (Proposed by Cllr Turner, Seconded by Cllr Railton)

Motions not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished:

- b. Make Every Vote Count (Proposed by Cllr Smowton, Seconded by Cllr Altaf Khan)
- c. Ensuring the Oxford Living Wage is delivered where it would impact most (Proposed by Cllr Taylor, Seconded by Cllr Rowley)
- d. The Oxford Union and the Far Right (Proposed by Cllr Davis, Seconded by Cllr Dhall)
- e. Use of Park and Rides to facilitate pupil transport services (Proposed by Cllr Gant, Seconded by Cllr Miles)
- f. Pregnancy Support Services (Proposed by Cllr Turner, Seconded by Cllr Diggins)
- g. Inequity of Public Transport Provision and Safe Segregated Cycle Path provision across the City (Proposed by Cllr Elphinstone, Seconded by Cllr Ottino)

28. E-bikes (Proposed by Cllr Turner, Seconded by Cllr Railton)

Councillor Turner, seconded by Councillor Railton, proposed the motion as self-amended as set out in the supplement to the agenda.

Councillor Henwood, seconded by Councillor Harley, proposed an amendment to the motion, as set out in the briefing note. On being put to a vote, the amendment fell.

Councillor Smowton withdrew his proposed amendment to the motion, as set out in the briefing note.

Councillor Davis proposed, and Councillor Powell seconded, an amendment to the motion as set out in the briefing note. On being put to a vote, the amendment fell.

Following the debate and on being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

Council believes:

- That substantial public concern and risk is caused by use of illegally modified e-bikes and mopeds which are not authorised for public roads;
- That the government's proposal for a National Work-Related Road Safety Charter to improve compliance by employers, while a good initiative, will not be strong enough to address the menace caused by these dangerous vehicles;
- That while individuals committing offences by using these vehicles must feel the full force of the law, so too must those who tacitly support their use such as delivery platforms and retailers;
- That those who profit from the sale of kit from the illegal modification of bikes should cease doing so;
- That a decision on the July 2020 e-scooter trial is also long overdue;

Council welcomes and endorses:

- Recent enforcement efforts by Thames Valley Police to seize and destroy such vehicles;
- The campaign run by the Motorcycle Industry Association (MCIA) and the Bicycle Association (BA), which presses for national guidance to identify, seize and prosecute non-compliant e-bikes, strengthened oversight of the supply chain and delivery platforms (including mandatory compliance checks for fleet operators), and stronger enforcement against online marketplaces and retailers selling non-compliant vehicles and modification kits;

- Attempts to ensure that regulations relating to the Product Regulation and Metrology Act 2025 prevent the sale of kits using lithium-ion batteries which could be used to modify bikes in an unsafe manner.

Council resolves:

- To ask the leader to write to the Secretary of State for Transport in support of the MCIA / BA campaign, with copy to their CEOs and Oxford's MPs, to ask her to review whether existing legislation provides sufficient powers to prevent the manufacture, import, sale and advertising of products intended to unlawfully modify electrically assisted pedal cycles, to bring forward further legislation if necessary, to press for a decision on the July 2020 e-scooter trial, and urge swift action and stronger enforcement against riders who break the law, relevant employers and those who enable illegal activity
- To ask the leader to write to the Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police and the Police and Crime Commissioner urging an increase in enforcement activity against these vehicles, with such activity being focused upon public safety, and clamping down on exploitative working practices and those who profit from such practices, and offering City Council support so far as this is feasible.

29. The EHRC Code of Practice and Trans Rights (Proposed by Cllr Morris, Seconded by Cllr Jarvis)

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

30. Make Every Vote Count (Proposed by Cllr Smowton, Seconded by Cllr Altaf Khan)

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

31. Ensuring the Oxford Living Wage is delivered where it would impact most (Proposed by Cllr Taylor, Seconded by Cllr Rowley)

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

32. The Oxford Union and the Far Right (Proposed by Cllr Davis, Seconded by Cllr Dhall)

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

**33. Use of Park and Rides to facilitate pupil transport services
(Proposed by Cllr Gant, Seconded by Cllr Miles)**

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

**34. Pregnancy Support Services (Proposed by Cllr Turner, Seconded
by Cllr Diggins)**

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

**35. Inequity of Public Transport Provision and Safe Segregated
Cycle Path provision across the City (Proposed by Cllr
Elphinstone, Seconded by Cllr Ottino)**

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 9.00 pm

**Lord Mayor
2026**

Date: Monday 5 October

*Decisions on items of business take effect immediately:
Motions may be implemented immediately or may require further budget provision
and/or reports to Cabinet before implementation.
Details are in the Council's Constitution.*

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Council

Date: 13 July 2026

Report of: Director of Law, Governance and Strategy

Title of Report: Public addresses that relate to matters for decision – as submitted by the speakers and with written responses from Cabinet Members

Introduction

1. Addresses made by members of the public to the Council, and questions put to the Cabinet 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

This report will be republished after the Council meeting as part of the minutes pack. This will list 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 1 of the agenda

1. Address from Martin Reed

Addresses and questions to be taken in Part 1 of the agenda

1. Address from Martin Reed

Today councillors have the opportunity to delete an unsound policy from the draft Local Plan 2045 and smooth the wheels to the Plan's adoption by heading off a key cause for argument at Public Examination. Requesting the removal of this unsound policy would render the whole plan sound (a statutory obligation) before its submission to the inspector.

Policy SPS8 is unsound

Land at Meadow Lane in Iffley is 2.5 acres of biodiverse meadow habitat which is an integral part of the rural Iffley Conservation Area. It has the worst sustainability score of any proposed allocation site in the plan and (in recognition of the site's problems) no minimum housing number.

The evidence for the unsoundness of Land at Meadow Lane is in your agenda packs. You should take into account the results of the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultations which were not before you when Full Council met in January.

The absence of that essential public consultation material, and its relevance to your decision-making, was the reason Friends of the Fields Iffley took legal advice and was granted a Judicial Review and an injunction to prevent the submission of the Local Plan.

The Reg 18 consultation summary for the SPS8 site extends over 8 pages with many material objections including from Environment Agency, Oxford Preservation Trust, BBOWT, and Cyclox. Objections include:

3. Substantial harm to the rural Iffley Conservation Area
4. Biodiversity interest qualifying for Oxford City Wildlife Site status
5. Essential part of Core Green Infrastructure.
6. Poor access and harms to the adjacent Quiet Route for Active Travel

The Reg 19 consultation summary notes the absence of support for the allocation. Rather, a total of 45 responses found this policy to be unsound concluding that the policy is

- not positively prepared, justified or effective, and not compliant with national policies
- not compliant with the Council's policies on spatial strategy; green infrastructure, flood risk, heritage, housing and sustainability.

Two of the officers' responses are notable:

7. Responding to the lack of the requisite ecological assessment 'The horse prevented the surveyor from gaining full access to the site, so a best assessment was made from the edges'

This is symptomatic of the lackadaisical approach when originally allocating this site to Local Plan 2036. Whilst that was a past mistake, it is now being perpetuated in its flawed re-allocation. The Council now knows that the site has biodiversity interest of ample weight to protect it as Core Green Infrastructure. They also know that the Trust for Oxfordshire's Environment has declined to deliver off-site BNG due to its sensitivity.

8. In terms of the site's contribution to housing need the officer says that '*the site was assumed to have a capacity of more than 10 units*' but gives a curious justification for not putting 10 in the allocation, saying "*because it may be interpreted as saying that the number in [the current dormant planning] application is too high*". This justification would only be valid if 10 + houses was a maximum not a minimum. The actual reason appears much more straightforward – due to the site's constraints the site is unable to deliver even 10 homes in a policy compliant manner.

Dispelling 'myths'

Myth 1: The site is suitable for housing '*Because it was allocated to LP 2036*'¹

The Council's surveys since allocation to the Local Plan 2036 now show that its high sensitivity cannot deliver any minimum housing number. Re-allocation is at odds with the Council's processes to filter out unsustainable sites.

Myth 2 ‘*There is considered to be a potential scheme that responds appropriately to this setting*’

There is no evidence that a potential scheme can respond appropriately and the planning application has run into a brick wall for this reason. Even a small amount of housing around the edge of the site would lead to significant harm to the conservation area and biodiversity, for example by:

- Blocking the rural conservation area views accessible from the ancient lanes
- Removing ancient hedgerows and listed walls

Myth 3: Removing the site is not legal because there is a ‘*clear requirement that the Local Plan identify all viable housing sites to contribute towards meeting the housing need within the cities boundaries*’

There is no requirement to identify all viable housing sites either in law or policy. The requirement is to identify **sound** sites sufficient to meet the spatial strategy of the plan (e.g. enough housing sites in the right places to deliver the economic, social and environmental vision of the plan). Moreover, there is no evidence that SPS8 is viable given the constraints.

Myth 4: removing it would ‘*treat one specific site as an exception to the process used and that this inconsistency would undermine the plan*’ [3](#)

On the contrary, removal of SPS8 would be consistent with processes that led to many other proposed sites being rejected due to heritage, biodiversity or no capacity for at least 10 homes.

In fact, it is very common, if not routine, for Councils to propose modifications to the inspector at this stage of the Plan making process.

Myth 5: ‘*The suitability argument is one that needs to be looked at by the Local Plan inspector at examination or determined as part of the planning application*’ [5](#)

The decision on soundness cannot be delegated to the inspector or the planning committee. Elected members have a different role to the planning inspector by making decisions that reflect local circumstances and achieve balance to meet other needs in the city.

I hope that there will not be any additions to the mythology today!

Conclusion

For all these reasons I ask that members take this hard-won opportunity and vote for the only sound course of action, which is to remove SPS8 from the Local Plan 2045, and thereby send a Local Plan to Examination that is sound and ready for approval.

Response from Councillor Anna Railton, Deputy Leader, and Cabinet Member for Planning and Zero Carbon Oxford

Thank you very much Martin for coming to speak to us today.

I will attempt to run through point by point the substance of your address. Generally, about the process, councillors do not have the opportunity to delete an unsound policy from the plan; the publication version is the version that we must submit. Policy SPS8 is not considered unsound, but the inspector will have full access to the reg 19 representations and will make decisions about whether any changes are needed to the

plan to make it sound. That is very much their role. The weight of comments received does not render a policy unsound, and comments received out of reg 18 do not relate to soundness but are intended to shape the plan.

So, moving on to the housing quantum, the fact that there is now in the emerging local plan no housing number attached to this policy. So, no minimum is included in the policy to enable full flexibility in designing a scheme given the fully acknowledged sensitivities of the site. Policy allocations do not have to include minimum housing numbers, but most of them do to help ensure delivery of our assumed capacity. The capacity assessment, however, does make an assumption of 29 units, which is the minimum in the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

In response to myth one, it has never been suggested that the site is unsuitable for housing just because it was allocated in LP36. All sites have been reconsidered and reassessed a fresh as part of creating this emerging local plan.

Moving on to heritage, myth two. It is suggested that there is no evidence a scheme can respond appropriately to the heritage setting because any development would lead to significant harm, for example by blocking views from the ancient lanes and removing hedgerows and listed walls. It is suggested that the planning application has stalled for this reason. The current application is still under consideration; it has neither been withdrawn, nor determined. In any event, any application presents just one proposal for development that must be considered on its own merits and how it is determined will be relevant to that proposal, not the development potential of the site. It is reasonable to assume that sensitive design can retain key characteristics and that a scheme could bring benefits that outweigh any harms. The approach of the NPPF conservation area designations does not automatically prevent any new development, even on green spaces that are part of the setting. The allocation policy is written to note important characteristics and mitigations. This is informed by the initial testing through the capacity assessment process undertaken for all site allocations which indicated ways of responding appropriately to the site's sensitivities.

So, myth three covers housing pressure; this is not a matter of law, it is a matter of soundness that when a plan puts forward a housing requirement based on capacity, and which is lower than the identified need, then it must demonstrate every effort has been made to identify potential housing sites. It does not mean that unsuitable sites must be put forward for housing, but it does mean that identified suitable housing sites should be allocated for housing. There is no beauty contest for housing sites in Oxford, and the sustainability appraisal is not used to find which sites are best rated and should be taken forward. Even the lowest rated site will be taken forward if it seems that mitigation is likely to be possible for any identified issues.

So, the heritage constraints; there are occasionally but very rarely heritage constraints that would prevent a site being taken forward for a housing allocation and none in this round of plan making are rejected solely for this reason.

On the biodiversity point, designated sites are protected and therefore very rarely put forward to development and not investigated. This site is not designated although there is clearly biodiversity value. An ecological survey was carried out when the site was first allocated in the local plan 2036. This was a phase one habitat survey. The policy was clear that further detailed ecology ecological surveys would be required at application stage. These have been carried out to inform the mitigation that has not been ruled out.

Thank you.

To: Council
Date: 13 July 2026
Report of: Director of Law, Governance and Strategy
Title of Report: Questions on Notice from members of Council and responses from the Cabinet Members and Leader

Introduction

Questions submitted by members of Council to the Cabinet 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.

Responses are included where available.

Questioners can ask one supplementary question of the Cllr answering the original question.

This report will be republished after the Council meeting to include supplementary questions and responses as part of the minutes pack.

Unfamiliar terms may be briefly explained in footnotes.

Questions and responses

Cabinet Member for Partnership Working, Inclusive Economic Growth and Culture; Leader of the Council

SB1: From Cllr Henwood to Cllr Brown

Question

Can the Leader explain what process was followed to identify and select the successful candidate for Lord Mayor, and which group leaders were consulted before a recommendation was brought to Council?

Written Response

I approached members of the council in order of the longest serving councillors who have not yet served as Lord Mayor and to ask them in turn if they would wish to be Lord Mayor.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Henwood asked the Leader to confirm that all members of the Council who had not yet served as Lord Mayor were approached in order of length of service.

Verbal Response

Councillor Brown confirmed that one Member was not approached as there was assurance they would not receive majority support for nomination as Lord Mayor.

SB2: From Cllr Henwood to Cllr Brown

Question

Given that the appointment of Lord Mayor is one of the most significant civic appointments made by the Council, does the

Written Response

It is not a discussion between political groups.

Leader believe it is appropriate that discussions on the preferred candidate take place between a limited number of political groups rather than through an open and transparent process involving all group leaders?	
Supplementary Question Councillor Henwood requested that the Leader explain how this view was concluded if there had not been sufficient discussion between political groups.	Verbal Response Councillor Brown noted her understanding of this as a result of previous conversations with all political groups.

SB3: From Cllr Henwood to Cllr Brown	
Question While recognising that length of service does not guarantee appointment as Lord Mayor, can the Leader explain what criteria were applied in this year's selection process and how those criteria were communicated to councillors prior to the appointment being made?	Written Response The criteria used this year were the same as every previous year and as usual an announcement was made at council.
Supplementary Question Councillor Henwood asked whether the Standards in Public Life had been a consideration within this decision, and if so, where were they published for transparency. Councillor Henwood specifically questioned accusations against one councillor.	Verbal Response Councillor Brown declined to respond and noted the question as inappropriate.

SB4: From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Brown	
Question	Written Response The footfall total for January – June 2026 = 11,797 This has been calculated by adding the following together: Tickets sold 7,362 (source = ticketing system data)

What footfall has been observed at the Museum of Oxford in the period January-June this year compared with 2025 or previous years?	- Visitors to hires, events and activities (source = event tickets and hire forms) 2,967 - Schools and group visits (source = booking forms and group tickets) 1,468 The estimated footfall total for January – June 2025 is known to be inaccurate and to likely include double counting. - Of actual bookings, visitors to hires, events and activities 4,258 (source = event tickets and hire forms) - Schools and group visits 1,788 (source = booking forms and group tickets) The footfall figures have been calculated using different methods; therefore, no direct comparison can be made.
Supplementary Question Councillor Smowton asked whether the Leader disputes the accuracy of the figures provided.	Verbal Response Councillor Brown confirmed this.

SB5: From Cllr Yeatman to Cllr Brown	
Question Given recent FOI data suggests Museum of Oxford visitor numbers have fallen by around two-thirds since charging was introduced, while net income from admissions remains relatively modest, does the administration still believe the charging policy is consistent with widening access to Oxford's civic history?	Written Response The business plan will be reviewed by Cabinet in Autumn 2026 when sufficient data has been collected on footfall and income including over the summer season. Changes if required, will need to ensure a balanced business plan as well as meeting aspirations to widen free access.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

SB6: From Cllr Davis to Cllr Brown
Question

The recent election was unfortunately followed by concerns regarding student voter disenfranchisement, including through an article in the Cherwell in which several student voters claimed they had been 'removed' from the electoral roll without their knowledge. I have also spoken to several of my constituents who experienced this and faced this myself as a student. Will the portfolio holder commit to ending the process of 'bulk removing' students in student accommodation to avoid disenfranchising young and student voters?

Written Response

The registration of students in Oxford is complex, particularly since the introduction of individual electoral registration in 2014. Given that many students move address each year and sometime more, the electoral register quickly becomes very out of date for students. The Council, along with other university cities have, since informal guidance from government in 2014, followed a process to enable control of the register through the review of those students in formal student accommodation on the basis of both information confirming residents for the following year and return of Polling Cards.

In light of the election bill which is progressing through parliament we will seek to encourage government, working closely with other university cities and the universities in Oxford, to formalise an approach to management of the electoral role in the draft legislation specifically in relation to students. In any event we will review the process in advance of the elections to the Shadow Authority resulting from the decision on LGR. In addition, we will continue to work closely with the universities and the Students Unions to ensure appropriate and timely communication with students.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Davis queried whether, if students were removed from the Electoral Register again this year, whether the Council would contact them directly to inform them.

Verbal Response

Councillor Brown confirmed this and noted that the matter is being reviewed through collaborating with other local authorities who also have large student populations.

SB7: From Cllr Davis to Cllr Brown	
Question Given the changes incoming to our national government, can the portfolio holder outline any conversations she may have had with national government officials regarding Local Government Re-Organisation since the prime minister announced his resignation and if there are any doubts over whether it is still to go ahead?	Written Response I and council officers have continued to speak regularly to ministers and civil servants and continue to expect an announcement before parliamentary recess. At LGA Conference last week this was reconfirmed repeatedly by ministers.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

SB8: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Brown	
Question As a City of Sanctuary and following the motion passed at full council in Oct 2024, can the portfolio holder confirm whether the Council is making a submission to the Planning Inspectorate to object to the planning application to expand Campsfield by the consultation closing date of 24 July?	Written Response Yes. Several weeks ago, I commissioned officers to draft such a letter, and this has now been sent.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

SB9: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Brown	
Question In response to question AH3 at Full Council 20 November 2025, then Cllr Hollingsworth stated that “evidence from [the Museum of Oxford]... confirms that if entry is free then visitors are less likely to	Written Response Dwell time data has not been collected. Total shop income from January – June 2025 was £19,898 compared to £14,641.70 January – June 2026.

perceive the offer as positive” and “less likely to spend time in the location and therefore money in the museum shop.” Can the portfolio holder confirm whether we are now seeing more visitors spending more time in the Museum and in the shop since charges were introduced?	
Supplementary Question Noting a 25% drop in first two quarters of this year versus the previous year, Councillor Mundy asked whether previous estimates were incorrect.	Verbal Response Councillor Brown noted that it is still early days and a review will take place in the autumn.

SB10: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Brown	
Question Can the portfolio holder explain whether the Council is still pursuing grants to help fund our museum, or has this been stopped since the new charges have been introduced?	Written Response The Council is still pursuing grants to help fund the museum. 9 grant bids have been submitted since the new charges have been introduced and a further 7 are in process. Grant successes since charges have been introduced, including: Arts Council England £84,409 for Sounds of the City Exhibition and grassroots music project; William Delafield Foundation £9950.13 for a loan box project with older people and OCVA £4997.24 for the older people’s programme.
Supplementary Question Councillor Mundy queried which, of any, of the grants required that the museum charge an entry fee.	Verbal Response Councillor Brown noted that the original grant from the Arts Council required a business plan, in which entrance charges were put forward.

SB11: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Brown	
Question Can the portfolio holder set out what the change in levels of donations at the Museum has been since the introduction of entry fees?	Written Response From January-June 2026 we have taken £993.44 in donations compared to £5,265.89 for January-June 2025. Expanding donation schemes will form part of revisions to the MOX business plan to be considered by Cabinet Autumn 2026. I note that no Group in the council proposed ending charging for the Museum in their budget proposals, and that the business plan for the Museum does need to add up.
Supplementary Question Councillor Mundy asked whether the 80% drop in donations reflect the estimates previously provided.	Verbal Response Councillor Brown explained that this will be reviewed once the summer figures come in and emphasised the importance of the business plan for the success of the Museum.

SB12: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Brown	
Question Many residents of Oxford were dismayed by the decision of the Oxford Union to extend an invitation to Stephen Yaxley-Lennon, commonly known as Tommy Robinson, to a debate in Oxford on June 17. I note that the leader offered a clear response. As the portfolio holder for partnership working would she undertake to write to the Oxford Union asking that they adopt a more considered and thoughtful approach to inviting speakers going forward?	Written Response I have tried that approach, but they do not seem to pay much attention! From several weeks prior to the occasion, I have asked council officers to work with all other public and other bodies who incurred costs as a result of the Oxford Union's activities to seek reimbursement from the Oxford Union. The cabinet member for Community Safety and I have written to the PCC and Thames Valley Police to invite them to join us in so doing.
Supplementary Question Councillor Powell asked whether the Leader would take this opportunity to confirm support for Oxford Union paying	Verbal Response

compensation to businesses in the city centre who lost out income on the date of England's first World Cup match.	Councillor Brown noted that is the preference of each business as to whether they wish to put in a claim to the Oxford Union, but support was noted.
---	--

SB13: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Brown	
Question Does the portfolio holder agree that local businesses that were forced to close in order protect the safety of their staff and the community at the time of Tommy Robinson's appearance at the Oxford Union should be compensated by the union for their losses?	Written Response That is the approach that I am taking, and I am supportive of others doing so too.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

SB14: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Brown	
Question Regarding the invitation of Stephen Yaxley Lennon, commonly known as Tommy Robinson, and Laurence Fox to speak at the Oxford Union, does the leader agree that the Oxford Union owes a civic duty to consider the residents of the city which hosts it and will she undertake to write to the union requesting the generation of a set of agreed principles between the city and the union for speakers at future events?	Written Response As per my response above, unfortunately that approach does not seem to get any traction.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

SB15: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Brown**Question**

I was very concerned to see the collapse of negotiations regarding the formation of a Thames Valley Foundation Strategic Authority after 18 months of negotiations and work. Given the significant benefits of regional devolution, can the portfolio holder confirm what steps the council will be taking to encourage a resumption of work towards a Thames Valley FSA?

Written Response

The negotiations did not collapse – the new Leader of the County Council imposed his personal views and vetoed a deal at the final moment, entirely contrary to the position that the County Council had been progressing up until that moment and without any warning.

As I reported to cabinet (and via cabinet to this council), the City Council is doing its best to continue to work with other councils in the Thames Valley to campaign to see how we can ensure that councils in Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Swindon (and Buckinghamshire should they choose to join us) can form a Foundation Strategic Authority and benefit from the powers and investment that would come to our area as a result.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Powell noted that he shared the Leader's view however requested additional information on the campaigning activities mentioned in the response.

Verbal Response

Councillor Brown emphasised that the Council leaders across the Thames Valley will continue to meet will continue to meet to make progress on remaining opportunities. These include the change to a new prime minister who may be committed to the idea of devolution and directly elected mayors. Councillor Brown emphasised that it is very clear that future governments will be funding local government and local areas primarily through strategic authority areas, so it is clear it would be a huge disadvantage not to have one. and if you don't have a strategic authority it's going to be a massive disadvantage. Councillor Brown emphasised that as Leader, she takes up any opportunity to lobby ministers as civil servants alongside the chief executive.

SB16: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Brown	
Question Can the portfolio holder please confirm what processes are applied when the council becomes aware of an event with potential equalities implications and which is going ahead without appropriate permissions?	Written Response To the extent that an event requires permissions from the Council they would be required to submit an application for the necessary approval. I would expect any event to do a proper equalities impact assessment and make any mitigations necessary. Depending on the nature of the event, this is not a matter for determination by the Council as a general rule.
Supplementary Question Councillor Powell noted that he would send a further question via email.	Verbal Response
SB17: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Brown	
Question The County Council has recently seen proposals to give parking wardens civil enforcement powers to target pavement parking. Will the portfolio holder take this opportunity to lend public support for the introduction of these powers, in light of the significant disruption and frustration that residents of our city are frequently forced to endure by those selfishly using pavements as parking spaces?	Written Response I am supportive of measures taken to tackle unwarranted pavement parking which causes problems for pedestrians, particularly those in wheelchairs or pushing prams and buggies. However, as I have said to other members who have raised this, the county council will have to decide what it is then going to do about the rather large number of roads in the city where it has drawn lines on pavements to encourage pavement parking.
Supplementary Question Councillor Powell noted that he would send a further question via email.	Verbal Response

SB18: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Brown	
Question With the recent release of visitor numbers and income since the introduction of the entrance fee to MOX, we can see a dramatic and unsurprising reduction in footfall of approximately 70% and income of about 60% of the council's projections. In light of these marked changes, what does the Cabinet Member suggest that the City Council can do – to stop a potentially huge shortfall in income by the end of the year? Can the portfolio holder offer some urgent solutions; such as stopping the entrance fee and working with the MOX team to promote alternative revenue streams as soon as possible?	Written Response A range of revenue streams are already in existence at MOX and additional ones are in process. Revisions to the MOX business plan will be considered by Cabinet in Autumn 2026. I note that no Group in the council proposed ending charging for the Museum in their budget proposals, and that the business plan for the Museum does need to add up.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

SB19: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Brown	
Question Can the portfolio holder explain whether there is currently a plan or strategy to collaborate with Oxfordshire County Council to create a Cool Shelters Policy or a Cool Shelters Map, such as there is in London. If so, what is the criteria for a cool shelter and which wards in the city are included in this?	Written Response The following information is available on the council website: https://www.oxford.gov.uk/approach/severe-weather-updates
Supplementary Question Councillor Robinson noted that the link provided was empty; it was asked whether this meant there is no plan in place.	Verbal Response Councillor Brown apologised for supplying the incorrect link and committed to proving a new version.

SB20: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Brown**Question**

Can the portfolio holder confirm how disability is considered when undertaking considerations for granting event licenses?

Written Response

When determining an application for a Premises Licence, including applications that may authorise a range of events and regulated activities, the Council considers each application on its individual merits and against the four licensing objectives. The Council's Statement of Licensing Policy also recognises its duties under equality legislation and its expectation that licensed premises do not discriminate against people with protected characteristics, including disability. Where relevant representations are received, conditions may be imposed where necessary and proportionate to promote the licensing objectives, including supporting the equal treatment of disabled people.

The specific policy provisions can be found at:

- Section 2.5.6 – General licensing principles
- Section 2.5.16 – Equality Act 2010 considerations
- Section 2.5.18 – Equality and access to the licensing process
- Appendix 8, Sections 6 and 7 – Disability discrimination and licensing conditions relating to the licensing objectives.

Supplementary Question

None.

Verbal Response

Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management; Deputy Leader of the Council (Statutory)

ET1: From Cllr Miles to Cllr Turner	
Question How many and where are the commercial properties that are owned by the city council in Oxford? When will the council publish a list of these properties on its website?	Written Response The list of properties has been prepared, and the Property team will discuss with ICT how best to upload on the website.
Supplementary Question Councillor Miles asked specifically how many are owned by the city Council.	Verbal Response Councillor Turner noted the number was large and that the list would be publicly available soon; this would not include occupation details.

40

ET2: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Turner	
Question During the last budget setting process, council agreed to £40,000 for a survey of public toilet provision in the city. Can the portfolio holder please confirm a timeline for the completion of this work?	Written Response A stock condition survey is underway, and the output is expected by the end of July. This data will then need to be assimilated into an options appraisal which will be expected in October. Our ambition is to bring forward improvement work on public toilets as far as possible.
Supplementary Question Councillor Powell, noting the number of disabled facilities in the city that are currently out of order, asked whether maintenance of these could be prioritised.	Verbal Response Councillor Turner welcomed this and requested that details on such facilities be communicated so that officers could be alerted.

AR1: From Cllr Henwood to Cllr Railton	
Question The original Armstrong Road development was approved on the basis that developer contributions of approximately £1,000 per dwelling would be used to support improvements to local bus services. Given that a significant proportion of this funding appears to have been allocated to bus service enhancements in Wallingford, can the Cabinet Member confirm how much of the developer funding generated by the Armstrong Road development has been invested within the Armstrong Road, Littlemore and Sandford-on-Thames area, and what specific transport improvements have been delivered for local residents as a result?	Written Response The outline permission for Littlemore Park, Armstrong Road (14/02940/OUT) secured circa £200k contributions towards public transport routes. The obligation required improvements to existing bus services including additional daytime and evening journeys and a Sunday service within the Littlemore section of the route. It should be appreciated that this obligation was with the County Council as the Local Highways Authority. The County Council have confirmed that all the S106 funding from the Armstrong Road developments have been used to fund an enhancement of Service 3A from its previous every 30-minute frequency to its current 15-minute frequency, including better services in the evenings and on Sundays. This contract runs from February 2025 to August 2027. They have also confirmed that none of this funding has been used on the X40 service, which were improved using S106 from Benson and Wallingford.
Supplementary Question Councillor Henwood queried how the Council will ensure that the increased service and frequency of these transport improvements continue beyond the stated date.	Verbal Response Councillor Railton suggested this was a question for Oxfordshire County Council and committed to finding out further information.

AR2: From Cllr Henwood to Cllr Railton**Question**

The Warneford Hospital development has recently undergone scrutiny at both Planning Committee and Planning Review Committee, with considerable attention given to the number of parking spaces provided on site.

Would the Portfolio Holder agree that maintaining adequate parking provision at hospital sites should be regarded as a strategic priority, recognising the needs of patients, visitors, carers and NHS staff, and that decisions on healthcare parking provision should be driven by operational need and accessibility rather than political ideology?

Written Response

The application for the Warneford Hospital was approved by both the Oxford City Planning Committee and the Planning Review Committee. The officers' report set out the assessment of the parking provision for the development as a whole, including the entire range of uses that were being provided across the site. The level of parking put forward by the applicant was supported by a transport assessment which explained the operational need for this level of parking. The officers' assessment, as accepted by both committees, was that the level of parking satisfied the objectives of the Local Plan.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Henwood queried whether the portfolio holder agrees that parking provision at hospitals should be determined by the operational needs of patients, visitors, carers, and NHS staff, even when this could result in a higher level of parking than usual under the Council's transport policies.

Verbal Response

Councillor Railton emphasised that this would be best considered on a case-by-case basis and it must be balanced with the provision of healthcare services and facilities, such as the new trauma centre at the John Radcliffe Hospital.

AR3: From Cllr Turkson Wood to Cllr Railton**Question**

Some years ago, Oxford City Council allowed the old pavilion in the Five Mile Drive recreation ground to literally fall down, causing Summertown Stars football club to be held to account by the F.A. for not providing adequate facilities. This council eventually replaced the pavilion not with a new build but with pre-assembled

Written Response

Oxford City Council work closely with Summertown Stars and have done so for a number of years. This has included working closely with the club to enable significant inward investment enabling the full funding of the redevelopment of the club's main

buildings and a shipping container, with much of the cost landing on Summertown Stars. Since then, Summertown Stars has delivered remarkable growth, particularly among girls, with huge benefits for public health. Over 500 children now play at Five Mile Drive each weekend. However, Oxford City Council has failed to conclude a lease for the shipping container with the club for eight years. When will the council issue and sign the lease?	pavilion at Cutteslowe Park and the pavilion at Five Mile Drive historically. Both projects utilised funding from the Council as well as external funding through the Football Foundation and Sport England. The building at Five Mile Drive was a new build of modular construction and was built in 2019 with regular engagement with the club at the time, which helped meet the needs of the club at the time of delivery. The shipping container was purchased separately by the football club and is used for storage. The significant growth of the club has been incredible and is testament to the work of the Chair and volunteers. Officers continue to support them with their future ambitions, meeting them regularly including formal meetings twice per year. In addition, Cllr Linda Smith and Cllr Mark Lygo met Summertown Stars on 20th June at their tournament in Cutteslowe Park. Cllr Railton met them on 7th July, and the ongoing lease issue was one of the action points taken up. The Council is in active discussion with Summertown Stars but the proposal for the lease is broader than just the shipping container. The proposal under consideration would better support the long-term provision of community benefit from Summertown Stars at this location.
Supplementary Question Councillor Turkson Wood requested information on the date the Council would issue the lease.	Verbal Response Councillor Railton, noting that this is dependent on negotiations with a third party, could not provide the specific date.

AR4: From Cllr Goddard to Cllr Railton	
Question Oxford City Council has failed to agree a lease for the cricket nets in Cutteslowe Park with Wolvercote Cricket Club for over 7 years and 6 prime ministers. HS2, and the Botley Rd Bridge will take less time. This delay has caused and is still causing considerable frustration, inconvenience and worse, and limiting the club's ability to deliver its vital services locally. Will the Cabinet Member finally give a binding date for when this will be done?	Written Response The Council is actively engaging with the club on what will be included in the lease as the club's requirement has changed and expanded and the Council is supportive of this in principle. The terms of the lease are now broadly agreed. A binding date cannot be provided as it is a negotiation with a third party and not entirely in the Council's control. As per my emails of 10th April, 12th April, 26th April, and 23rd May I am more than happy to meet with the club to help sort this out.
Supplementary Question Councillor Fouweather requested information on the specific date for the lease.	Verbal Response Councillor Railton could not provide the specific date and emphasised that she is willing to meet with the cricket club.

AR5: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr Railton	
Question Having asked the same question at the Council meetings of March 26th and November 24th 2025, I find that the promised actions have still not been carried out. A survey at the weekend of June 27th/28th showed that none of the promised basketball net replacements have been carried out. Cutteslowe Park has two hoops, one without a net and one with a damaged net. Sunnymead has four hoops, none with nets. Alexandra Park has three hoops, one with no net and two with partial nets. Players report that not only does the absence of a net affect their ability to score but that injuries can happen, and have occurred, when a hand or wrist gets caught in a damaged net. Can the Cabinet member ensure that all nets are replaced as soon as possible and that regular inspections	Written Response We trialled rope nets at Alexandra Courts, Aristotle Lane rec, Court Place Farm and Margaret Road rec in March and all of the nets have failed due to damage and general use. RoSPA (The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents) recommend not using rope nets at all. Chain nets are around £500 a set and also require a complete replacement of hoop and fixings, as well as the on-going cost of net replacement and maintenance. We will therefore not be replacing these nets with rope nor chain nets.

(as claimed by ODS on notices on the fence around the court) are carried out to pick up damage to nets and replace them?	
Supplementary Question Noting disappointment, Councillor Fouweather suggested that rope is not durable and asked if chain could be used as a replacement material across the city.	Verbal Response Councillor Railton asserted that the Council does look after sporting equipment across the city and noted that the material is inconsequential. Members were reminded that ward member budgets could be used for similar matters.

AR6: From Cllr Yeatman to Cllr Railton	
Question Does the administration consider small-site intensification to be a core delivery model under the emerging Local Plan, and if so, what concrete safeguards will ensure that densely populated communities across Oxford are not over-intensified without matching infrastructure?	Written Response We need housing to come forward in all locations, and small sites in already built-up areas are an important part of this. Unlike other authorities which have the opportunity to plan for large scale new development, most of Oxford's new development comes from small to medium sized sites and almost all from the redevelopment of sites in existing use. Unfortunately, this means that we have to look beyond Oxford's existing boundaries for the sites that will make a real difference to tackling Oxford's huge housing need. Sites contribute to infrastructure requirements, usually through Section 106 agreements. Development cannot be asked to pay to resolve pre-existing issues, but officers will be pushing hard for all relevant infrastructure requirements, and this Council will continue with its judicious use CIL funding to provide much needed infrastructure such as the recently delivered Community Centres.

	We are working with the Growth Commission around proposals for a Development Corporation which would be a way of helping to resolve some of Oxford's bigger infrastructure problems.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

AR7: From Cllr Yeatman to Cllr Railton	
Question Can the Cabinet Member explain whether Equality Impact Assessments for new housing schemes, including Bertie Place, consider not only individual protected characteristics in isolation, but also the cumulative effects of densification, overcrowding and reduced access to family-sized green spaces on vulnerable communities?	Written Response Equality Impact Assessments for new (direct delivery) affordable housing schemes consider the direct impact of development and also wider impacts such as addressing housing needs and the lack of affordable housing supply in Oxford. Broader city-wide assessments of housing growth and community needs are considered and balanced more widely in the development of the Local Plan, with its own detailed evidence base and standalone assessment. This is because the Local Plan is where the principle of development is established through site allocations. The evidence is very strong that living in unstable, overcrowded accommodation has very severe impacts on people's health, welfare and children and young people's attainment prospects. Building more affordable housing provides hope and better prospects for families.
Supplementary Question Councillor Yeatman queried who is responsible for assessing impact.	Verbal Response Councillor Railton suggested that this is considered in the round throughout the Local Plan.

AR8: From Cllr Bala to Cllr Railton**Question**

Given the deaths and injuries caused by wild swimming in Oxford, please can the portfolio holder explain why sufficient water safety signage at key sites was only installed after a heatwave and following a death?

Written Response

In June 2025 OCC commissioned a review of the Councils water management including ownerships and conditions of assets. As part of this work the Royal Life Saving Society reviewed the Public Rescue equipment (PRE) provision and signage along with Risk Assessments on the higher risk sites.

This concluded in March 2026. Recommendations from the reviews were started from April 2026 including the updating of the council web pages, initiation of water safety awareness campaigns and installation of additional PRE and signage. These actions were ongoing at the time of the heatwave and tragic death.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Bala queried when the last assessment was undertaken prior to 2025.

Verbal Response

Councillor Railton committed to providing this information following the meeting.

AR9: From Cllr Dhall to Cllr Railton**Question**

Can the portfolio holder explain why in the Jericho Conservation Area a change to an external appearance of a property would be refused as it would affect the character of the Conservation Area, while other infrastructure may be permitted directly outside the property?

Written Response

There is an Article 4 Direction in place in the Jericho Conservation Area which has removed a number of the available permitted development rights afforded to properties to make alterations to their properties. This does not mean that all external alterations are automatically refused, but that the Local Planning Authority are able to consider the impact that

	changes have on the conservation area through the determination of planning applications for such developments. The Article 4 Direction also specifies the parts of the conservation area that are considered to be most significant. The removal of these rights does not mean that other pieces of infrastructure cannot be provided throughout the public realm of the conservation area. There are other available permitted development rights available to various parties to undertake works in these areas without planning permission. For example, Local Authorities can install various pieces of infrastructure without the need for permission (e.g. lampposts, street furniture, etc). This would also include works the Local Highways Authority undertake on the highway.
Supplementary Question Councillor Bala queried when there is a plan to put a structure in the road in a conservation area, whether the planning authority noted a difference between a conservation area and a non-conservation area. If so, information on the difference between the two processes was requested.	Verbal Response Councillor Railton committed to providing this information following the meeting.

AR10: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Railton	
Question The Bellway Housing Development in Mill Lane, Old Marston has been a nightmare for the residents of Old Marston throughout the past eight months. The construction traffic management plan has been breached; listed buildings, pavements and verges in conservation areas have been damaged and the notion of a safe quiet lane for wheelers and walkers has been completely lost. As a second housing development starts in Old Marston this month,	Written Response I understand Cllr Robinson has recently met with council officers regarding these concerns, and they discussed the matter in depth with her, outlining some of the challenges the City Council faces in dealing with some of the issues raised previously. Looking forward, we have spoken to OX Place who are developing the new site and have advised them that they need to monitor the impact of construction traffic and ensure

can the portfolio holder let us know what lessons have been learnt; if the council will now demand a Banksman at this dangerous junction and whether CCTV will be positioned to monitor construction traffic moving forward?	they act accordingly in conjunction with their planning permission, in particular the agreed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). Regarding, the request for a permanent Banksman and CCTV, this is not something that the City Council can enforce. Both the planning permissions for Bellway development on the former paddocks site and OX Place development were consulted upon by the County Council as the Highway Authority. They did not deem it necessary to ask for these requirements when the decision to approve was being made nor when the respective CTMPs conditions were being discharged.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

AR11: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Railton	
Question As part of the Air Quality Action Plan, the City Council's top two priorities are: 1) encourage active travel and reduce car use and 2) accelerate zero-emission transport. Can the portfolio holder therefore explain why Marston residents are continually frustrated by the irregular, infrequent and expensive bus services, and the total lack of any public e-charging points or EV car clubs?	Written Response Provision of on-street charging infrastructure moved to be entirely delivered by the county council with the announcement of the central government LEVI grant. The last on-street charger in the city was put in 2024 with the bulk delivered some years before that. Since then, the focus has been on the Government Grant, local electric vehicle infrastructure (LEVI) which was successfully awarded in July 2025 and has since been out to tender and awarded in March 2026.

	County Council have plans to install chargers on-street in Marston are in a tranche to be delivered in the first half of 2027. Car club cars (not always EV) are more commercially driven, with the county needing to put in a TRO for a designated bay. Unfortunately, take-up has been very slow by users across the city, but we remain committed to ensuring that we keep the car clubs, especially focussing on EV hire cars where possible. Whilst Marston has historically had limited public EV charging provision within the ward itself, residents are able to access public charging facilities in nearby Headington. Oxford City Council's LEVI programme has also identified both Court Place Farm Car Park and Northway Community Centre as potential locations for future public charging infrastructure, subject to feasibility. In addition, the wider Park & Ride facilities at Pear Tree, Seacourt and Redbridge provide further charging opportunities across the city transport network. It may be useful for residents to attend the upcoming EV event in Oxford at Seacourt Park and Ride, EV GO ELECTRIC Saturday 25th July 2026, where the City Council EVI Team will be in attendance and looking to obtain information from residents about future sites for EV charging. It is useful if residents flag where they would like to see chargers in the county's online tracker. https://letstalk.oxfordshire.gov.uk/oxfordshire-electric-vehicle-charger-and-car-club-demand-tracker Finally, the city continues to lobby for equitable access to bus routes across Oxford.
--	--

Supplementary Question Councillor Robinson requested more information on how feasibility is monitored in relation to the two sites referenced in Marston.	Verbal Response Councillor Railton committed to providing this information following the meeting but also noted that the work lies with the County Council.
---	---

AR12: From Cllr Davis to Cllr Railton	
Question Can the portfolio holder explain whether the council has been assessing the impact that the additional cut of grass verges has had on biodiversity in the city? Are there any concerns regarding the impact of this additional cut on the populations of insects, small mammals and other urban wildlife?	Written Response When we moved to fund extra cuts, after the County Council unilaterally reduced the number to one across the whole year, our City Ecology officer assessed all the verges across the city and found discernible biodiversity gain in around seven of them and these have remained with a single cut (and collect) a year. In all the other cases, there was no worthwhile biodiversity gain by leaving them uncut, so I am confident it is appropriate to respond to the overwhelming views of the public and instigate the extra cuts. Our move has been widely welcomed.
Supplementary Question Councillor Davis queried whether there was any attempt to understand the reasons why the seven mentioned verges saw a significant biodiversity gain, and to understand similar development of this on other verges could be achieved.	Verbal Response Councillor Railton noted that the work was completed several years ago and there were originally around 21 of these biodiversity verges that were cut and collected. Assessment of this would have been challenging and the decision was historically made of which to keep.

Cabinet Member for a Safer Oxford

LA1: From Cllr Davis to Cllr Arshad

Question

Can the portfolio holder outline what conversations they had with Thames Valley Police with regards to policing relating to the debate featuring Tommy Robinson at the Oxford Union on June 17, and if there were any additional costs incurred by the council in relation to the event? If additional costs were incurred by the council, what efforts - if any - has the council made to recoup these costs from the Oxford Union?

Written Response

Please see the previous answer to the question to Cllr Brown.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Davis requested monetary figure for the costs incurred in relation to the event.

Verbal Response

Councillor Arshad committed to providing this information in writing.

LA2: From Cllr Davis to Cllr Arshad

Question

Can the portfolio holder explain what impact the Oxford Union's decision to invite Tommy Robinson to speak has had on the council's approach to the Oxford Union and its events? Will the council be changing its approach to help ensure that no taxpayer money will be used to help platform divisive far-right figures?

Written Response

Please see the answers given to the questions to Cllr Brown.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Davis asked whether the Council would continue to spend taxpayer money to deal with Oxford Union events.

Verbal Response

	Councillor Arshad noted that the Leader had already addressed this matter and has sent a letter to the Police and Crime Commissioner.
--	---

LA3: From Cllr Davis to Cllr Arshad	
Question A number of my constituents have contacted me about hate crimes they have personally experienced whilst in the city centre, leaving them fearful to leave the house at night. However, they are also understandably mistrustful of the police to assist them in this matter. As far-right narratives continue to demonise minority communities, can the portfolio holder explain how the city council has been working to combat the threat that hate crimes pose to our community, particularly efforts beyond policing?	Written Response Oxford is known as city of internationalism and solidarity, rich in cultures and heritage. This is reflected in the city's commitment to being a recognised City of Sanctuary, demonstrating a formal pledge to create a welcoming, inclusive environment where all residents, particularly those seeking refuge, are supported, respected and able to contribute to community life. The Council, police and other organisations share information, align resources, and work together to strengthen local resilience against hate crime, manage the right to peaceful protest, and promote community cohesion. The Council are a member of the Oxfordshire Civic, Community and Faith Leaders Group who come together to promote tolerance and understanding between communities, including the Oxford Peace and Friendship Walk of Faiths event. I remind the Councillor of the Council's Anti-Racism Charter adopted by this Council on 9th August 2019. It sets out the principles which guide this Council's commitment to being both anti-racist and lays the foundation to advancing equality of opportunity for all ethnic minorities, people of colour and those with protected characteristics in our city

	As a member of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel that holds the Police and Crime Commissioner to account, I review the levels of hate crime across the force area. This issue has become more prevalent across the Thames Valley in recent years and is reflected in the crime figures reported to the police. Hate crime is also discussed at the annual Oxford City Council meeting with the Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable. This is scheduled for January 2027, and I encourage all councillors to attend this extremely useful meeting. More information will follow closer to the time.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

LA4: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Arshad	
Question Complaints about antisocial driving and moving vehicle offences are very common. This includes speeding, excessive vehicle noise and riding motorcycles on pavements and cycle paths. Enforcement appears to be limited. What conversations is the portfolio holder having with Thames Valley Police to ensure residents' concerns about safety are being heard?	Written Response Complaints about antisocial driving, speeding, excessive vehicle noise, dangerous parking, and motorcycles being ridden on pavements and cycle paths are concerns that we hear regularly from residents across Oxford. These issues have a real impact on people's sense of safety and quality of life. While the enforcement of moving traffic offences, speeding, and most road traffic offences is primarily the responsibility of Thames Valley Police, the City Council works closely with the police and other partners to ensure residents' concerns are raised and acted upon wherever possible. The recent Oxford City Residents survey highlighted residents' concerns regarding the anti-social use of motor

	vehicles and scooters. This information has been shared with local Neighbourhood Police Teams. The police encourage Community Speed Watch in locations of local concern and residents should get in contact with their local Neighbourhood Policing Team. I meet regularly with senior officers from Thames Valley Police through partnership meetings, including discussions on community safety priorities. I continue to press for targeted enforcement in areas where residents report persistent problems and encourage intelligence-led operations based on local complaints. We encourage residents to continue reporting incidents directly to Thames Valley Police, particularly where there is an immediate danger, as this evidence helps inform deployment and enforcement priorities. I would also encourage the councillor to support the motion that the Labour Group have later on the council agenda.
Supplementary Question Councillor Mundy asked if the Cabinet Member would support his attempt to get information from the police sergeant.	Verbal Response Councillor Arshad confirmed her support.

LA5: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Arshad	
Question Could the portfolio holder explain what measures the City Council has put in place to help reduce illegal use of e-bikes and unregistered mopeds along cycle lanes and pavements? Has the portfolio holder engaged with TVP and Operation Brake – and how do you see the future of enforcement?	Written Response The management of cycle lanes and pavements is the responsibility of the County Council and police depending upon the nature of the issue. As a member of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel that holds the Police and Crime Commissioner to account, I

	raised concerns about the increasing number of modified e-bikes and mopeds being used for antisocial behaviour across Oxford. The PCC confirmed that the police are continuing to carry out stop, seize and destroy operations and highlighted that enforcement alone will not solve the issue and believes new national legislation is needed to better regulate modified e-bikes and mopeds. The Commissioner reported that in April alone, 38 e-bikes, scooters and similar vehicles were seized in Oxfordshire, and he has committed to continuing this work with the local policing team and partners. Between April 2025-March 2026, 247 e-bikes and e-scooters were seized across Oxfordshire, and the police conducted 366 patrols relating to the issue. I encourage all councillors to contact their local neighbourhood police team through the TVP website to report these issues and help identify people and vehicles causing the anti-social behaviour. I would also encourage the councillor to support the Labour Group motion on the council agenda.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

LA6: From Cllr Miles to Cllr Arshad	
Question How many fines for littering have been handed out by the council to businesses over the last 12 months? Specifically, can you break	Written Response

down the data by type of business receiving the fine if it is categorised.	Over the last 12 months there has been 17 Fixed Penalty Notices issued to business. 10 – S47 Environmental Protection Act 1990 (waste) 4 – S34 Environmental Protection Act 1990 (Duty of care) 3 – S33 Environmental Protection Act 1990 (fly tipping) It is not possible to break the data down to the type of business.
Supplementary Question Councillor Miles queried if there is a specific geographical concentration of the 17 fixed penalty notices, and whether there has been a targeted approach taken.	Verbal Response Councillor Arshad noted not being aware of any specific geography but committed to writing with a further response.

57

Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies

NC1: From Cllr Davis to Cllr Chapman	
Question Can the portfolio holder explain what potential there will be for the voices of local LGBTQ+ and trans residents to be included in the council's implementation of the EHRC's Code of Practice to ensure that trans voices are protected and centred as much as possible in the process of implementing the EHRC guidance?	Written Response The work of the Council to review and assess the impact of the ECHR's code of Practice is at an early stage and there will need to be several stages, including establishing a policy position and then reviewing each service and space provision for current compliance against the code and next steps for each on a case-by-case basis. As the work continues the Council will consider the impact and input of all affected persons with the protected characteristics upon which it impacts, given that the scope of the changes spans many areas beyond single sex spaces.

	I would add that where there is a need as a result of the guidance to implement any changes to specific sites or services, we will ensure engagement and consultation is undertaken as required.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

NC2: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Chapman	
Question Can the portfolio holder set out how much making bulky waste collection free has cost the council since charging was abolished?	Written Response The free service has cost just over £100,000 since it was introduced in April. This provides citizens with 2 free scheduled collections of up to 3 items annually, and their items are collected within 20 days of the booking. To date we have collected over 6200 items from 3600 sites There has been widespread public approval of this service, and we want to see its use increase as more people become aware of it.
Supplementary Question Councillor Mundy requested additional data on the proportion of those using the free collection service that are landlords.	Verbal Response Councillor Chapman committed to providing a further written response.

NC3: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Chapman	
Question Can the portfolio holder explain what the change in frequency of fly tipping reports has been since bulky waste collection charging was abolished?	Written Response It is too soon to see what the long-term impact the bulky waste service will have on fly tipping since it was only introduced in April 2026. Our current data shows a marginal decrease, averaging 6.5%, in the number of recorded incidents compared

	with Q1 2025/26. However, these should not be considered as indicative for the rest of 2026/27, as incidents can fluctuate over the course of 12 months. We will continue to monitor these figures closely.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

Cabinet Member for a Healthy, Fairer Oxford

ML1: From Cllr Davis to Cllr Lygo

Question

With the recent hot weather making wild swimming and swimming at leisure centres increasingly popular, can the portfolio holder explain what efforts, if any the council has been making to ensure swimming and swimming lessons are accessible to marginalised communities, particularly ethnic minority communities (who are historically less likely to be able to access swimming lessons in the UK) and the LGBTQ+ community?

Written Response

The Council recognises that some communities continue to face barriers to learning to swim and accessing swimming opportunities. Through our leisure contract, we provide around [37 hours of free swimming each week](#) for Oxford residents aged 16 and under, alongside school swimming programmes, water safety assemblies for schools, and free taster swimming lessons during Big Splash Weekends, most recently on 6th and 7th June.

We have also supported a range of targeted initiatives aimed at widening participation, including swimming lessons for refugee families through the [in-kind Leisure Community Fund](#), weekly female-only swimming sessions at our leisure centres, support for Oxford Pride summer swimming sessions at Hinksey Pool, and water-confidence courses delivered in partnership with a local community group at Leys Pools and Leisure Centre, aimed at women from ethnic minority backgrounds.

	We recognise there is more to do, both as a local authority and across the wider system and are currently exploring options for additional targeted swimming lessons for children and young people who are least likely to be able to swim safely, alongside further opportunities to improve access to swimming across the city. We're also working with the River Learning Trust and Radley College to explore further initiatives.
Supplementary Question Councillor Davis queried what the methods of targeting being explored.	Verbal Response Councillor Lygo committed to writing with a further response once the conversations with officers are concluded.

ML2: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Lygo	
Question Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre has been closing the shallow/learner pool during opening hours. Can the portfolio holder explain whether this has been happening due to not having enough lifeguards on duty to cover all pools at the Centre during opening hours?	Written Response The learner and splash pools are not open throughout all opening hours, as the pool timetable varies during the day to accommodate different activities, including public swimming, lessons and school use. The Council has not been advised of any unplanned closure of these pools.
Supplementary Question Councillor Mundy noted that a resident had experienced issues with being told to use the main pool as only one lifeguard was on duty and therefore unable to cover all pools. It was asked whether it can be ensured that any timetable changes are communicated to residents with as much notice as possible.	Verbal Response Councillor Lygo noted being unaware of any changes to timetables but committed to passing on the details so an officer can respond.

ML3: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Lygo

Question

Can the portfolio holder please confirm whether he has been in contact with More Leisure regarding the EHRC Code of Practice and what intentions, if any, they have communicated to him in regard to this?

Written Response

Officers have been kept informed of communications regarding the implications of the Supreme Court judgment and subsequent EHRC guidance. We've received an interim position statement confirming that the operator was actively reviewing its policies, awaiting final EHRC guidance and sector advice before making any policy changes. The operator advised that, pending publication of the final Code of Practice, existing arrangements would remain in place, staff should continue to treat all customers with dignity and respect, and the organisation's aim would remain to provide an inclusive environment while ensuring compliance with legal requirements. The Council will continue to engage with More Leisure through normal contract management arrangements to understand any changes required following the final EHRC Code of Practice.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Powell welcomed the fact that dignity and respect are being prioritised but urged the Cabinet Member to also recognise the extreme levels of anxiety that many trans and gender non-conforming people currently experience. The Cabinet Member was asked to offer as much support as possible to the leisure provider to ensure a communications plan is developed.

Verbal Response

Councillor Lygo committed to providing a written response once conversations with officers had concluded.

ML4: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Lygo	
Question Will the portfolio holder undertake to encourage More Leisure to engage proactively with the Council regarding service delivery in their moves to implement the EHRC code of practice?	Written Response The Council would expect More Leisure to engage proactively with officers regarding any changes to service delivery arising from the EHRC Code of Practice, and this would be managed through the Council's established contract management and partnership arrangements. As noted in the previous response, More Leisure has already kept the Council informed of its interim position and has indicated that it is reviewing its policies in light of the evolving legal and regulatory framework. The Council will continue to engage constructively with the operator to understand any implications for service delivery and to ensure services are delivered in accordance with legal requirements and contractual obligations.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

ML5: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Lygo	
Question As the new member for health inequalities, can you let the residents of Marston know how you plan to help make improvements to the inadequate health services in their ward: there is no GP, optician, dentist or community health centre and the one pharmacy that is left has been poorly managed for many years?	Written Response Challenges of limited GP provision across the city have been raised at a strategic level through several channels including with the Oxford Growth Commission. The council's ability to make improvements directly are fairly limited as this is reliant on Integrated Care Board (ICB) funding. I have asked officers to raise the issues faced by Marston residents at their meetings with the ICB covering our area.

	These issues are not unique to Oxford or Oxfordshire. They are the sorts of issues that would be good to be raising at a Foundation Strategic Authority level.
Supplementary Question Councillor Ribinson, noting the limited role of this Council, asked if the Cabinet Member would commit to helping improve inadequate health services.	Verbal Response Councillor Lygo noted that efforts have been made for several years to push for improvements, however it was noted that even if an ICB has the money for buildings, it is likely that recruitment issues will still arise. This issue was also noted in the context of pharmacies and with practice managers.

Cabinet Member for Regulation of the Private Rented Sector and Preventing Homelessness

MR1: From Cllr Miles to Cllr Rowley	
Question Are there any costs associated with triggering the SWEP protocol and if so, what does it cost each time it is triggered for extreme heat or cold temperatures, and how is it currently funded?	Written Response There are costs associated with triggering Severe Weather Emergency Provision (SWEP) in both cold and hot weather. When SWEP is triggered due to cold weather, the Council has arrangements in place with venues and providers in three locations in the city to provide overnight accommodation. This incurs both venue rental and staff costs. In some instances, we will also make discretionary hotel/B&B placements where the circumstances require it. During a red heat alert, the Council will offer discretionary placements into hotels/B&Bs where there is a risk to health/life. This will also incur costs for the bookings. The Council funds SWEP through its Preventing Homelessness Budget. The cost for triggering SWEP will be different each time,

	depending on how many persons are estimated to be needing access to the provision. Other costs, such as bedding, camp beds, transport to venues, sunscreen, and hats for example, will also be funded through this budget as needed. During winter 2025/26, SWEP opened a total of 28 nights, with 394 attendances, with the total cost to the City Council £48,612.00. The average cost to the Council for SWEP per night was £1,736, with an average of 14 people attending SWEP per night. During the recent red heat alert, 15 bedspaces were offered across 4 nights, of which 9 were utilised to a total cost of £1,038. No other cost where incurred, as arranged by organisations through a range of means including donations.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

MR2: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Rowley	
Question Recent hot weather has triggered the Severe Weather Emergency Protocol. But this is currently limited to 10 people during day times only. Homeless people are still at risk after the hottest part of the day, especially if they are sleeping in a location that easily overheats like a car. Does the portfolio holder agree that it is time to extend the SWEP support available during heatwaves?	Written Response During amber and red heat alerts, O'Hanlon House in Oxford will open up for 10 additional people to access the building during the day. Other venues and homelessness support providers, such as The Porch, also provide shelter from the heat and sun as well. Outside of our commissioned services there are a number of cool spaces available for people to attend in the city, and details of these are published on the Council's website www.oxford.gov.uk/severeweather- The St Mungo's outreach team will provide advice to all individuals experiencing rough sleeping on how to protect themselves during periods of intense heat, and the importance

of hydration. In red alerts, we work with our outreach team to ensure that those most at risk can be offered accommodation so that they have shelter from the heat and sun. We review operations of SWEP regularly, and together with partners, will seek to amend processes where needed to ensure there are offers of support in place. This will include looking at further provision of shelter during the daytime during heat alerts, if the current provision is exhausted. We do not believe that anyone should be sleeping rough, at any time of the year, and we are working closely with commissioned providers to ensure that those who are experiencing rough sleeping can access long-term accommodation and support.

In relation to the 10 day time spaces at O'Hanlon House, these are available every day when there is an amber or red heat alert. We are not asking staff to track attendance at present, as we do not want to add additional work for their staff. We have very good working relationships with O'Hanlon House and they would alert us if there started to be concerns that the provision would be oversubscribed. Similarly, the team here is in regular contact with outreach, The Gatehouse and The Porch, to ensure that we are aware of what is happening on the ground and reviewing arrangement if needed. As mentioned in the answer, there are also a number of cool spaces across the city where people can access shelter from the heat. In relation to the overnight bedspaces that are in operation during red alerts, the team will work with outreach to ensure that those at risk are offered a space. Not everyone has this far taken up this offer, but the outreach team will continue to engage with individuals on a daily basis to make sure they are aware that the offer of a bedspace is open to them should they change their mind or their circumstances change.

Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response
--	------------------------

Cabinet Member for Housing and Communities

LS1: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr Smith

Question

As a landlord, the Council has a duty to its tenants to ensure that safety inspections including damp and mould, gas and electrical installations, fire and CO2 alarms are carried out on a regular basis. Can the Cabinet member provide data for Council owned properties showing the number of safety inspections carried out annually over the past 5 years both in total and as a percentage of the total housing stock? Can she also provide the number of properties which have had to be visited more than once because of difficulties in gaining access?

Written Response

As a landlord, the Council monitors compliance through a range of building safety management information measures. Performance data shows that the Council has consistently maintained high levels of compliance over the last five years.

Gas, water and lift safety inspections achieved 100% compliance over the last five years. Fire safety compliance remained consistently high, improving from 99.0% in 2021-22 to 100% in 2022-23 and 2023-24, before a slight reduction to 98.6% in 2024-25 and returning to 100% in 2025-26. Asbestos compliance was maintained at 100% between 2021-22 and 2023-24, fell temporarily to 70.1% in 2024/25 and increased to 100% in 2025-26. Electrical safety compliance was 97.30% in March 24-25 and increased to 98.8% in 2025-26. Fire alarm and carbon monoxide (CO) alarm compliance were both maintained at 100% in 2024-25 and 2025-26.

	In preparation for the introduction of Awaab's Law, which came into force on 27 October 2025, the Council has enhanced its monitoring of damp and mould cases. As at the end of March 2026, 100% of emergency damp and mould hazards investigated and safety works completed within 24 hours, 73.3% of significant damp and mould cases were investigated within 10 working days and 88.9% had any relevant safety work undertaken within 5 working days at the end of the investigation. These results demonstrate the Council's continued commitment to meeting its landlord safety obligations and maintaining safe homes for tenants. Where access difficulties arise, officers make repeated attempts to contact residents and arrange appointments. Where necessary, the Council follows formal escalation and legal processes to secure access and ensure mandatory safety inspections are completed.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

LS2: From Cllr Yeatman to Cllr Smith	
Question With nearly 4,000 households still on the housing waiting list and many overcrowded families facing acute cost-of-living pressures, can the Cabinet Member advise what specific proportion of the Council's current approved and proposed affordable housing pipeline consists of larger three and four-bedroom family homes, rather than one and two-bedroom flats?	Written Response In the current (committed) affordable housing supply programme – expected to deliver over 1,500 affordable homes to rent – 27% of the programme are 3, 4 and 5 bed homes, and 69% are 1 and 2 bedrooms (41% of which are one beds). The programme has deliberately increased the proportion of one beds in newly added schemes to address high housing need for one beds. Over 50% of households in temporary

	accommodation have a one bed need, and just over 50% of applicants in Bands 1 -3 on the housing register also need 1 or 2 bed homes. The 'match' between demand and supply is regularly monitored. The mix is in broad accordance with the Local Plan 2036 (Policy H4) which is based on broad housing needs data and supports 50 to 70% of new build homes as 1 & 2 bed, to best meet needs.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

LS3: From Cllr Jarvis to Cllr Smith

Question

Can the portfolio holder set out the usage levels of the East Oxford Community Centre and how this compares to levels prior to its closure for redevelopment?

Written Response

The Council undertook a soft launch of East Oxford Community Centre on the 25th November 2025. A soft launch enables the return of a reduced number of community users, that enables effective engagement with communities and tenants, tests new systems within the building and helps enable effective training for staff members.

This helps mitigate the risk of smaller things going wrong but with a larger impact and helps ensure that any defects can be managed appropriately. It also supports tenants in effectively and carefully being inducted back into the building in a phased and managed way.

The community opening of the building was on the 27th March 2026 and we still have a couple of tenants who are in the process of moving back. Given these considerations we wouldn't be in a position to compare like for like at this stage. Typically, any new facility would have 9 months to a year to satisfactorily compare to previous usage numbers to ensure

	comparing like for like. The current usage figures are increasing month on month with June 2026 figures showing 2,525 users in the month.
Supplementary Question Councillor Jarvis requested additional information on data usage levels.	Verbal Response Councillor Smith committed to sharing the data in 9 months' time.

LS4: From Cllr Thorniley to Cllr Smith	
Question Can the portfolio holder set out what policies are in place to ensure that where council funds (i.e. HRA) are used to build new homes that the new homes are to the greatest extent possible affordable houses, of which to the greatest extent possible council houses?	Written Response In policy terms, the ambition to maximise the number of affordable homes and in particular the cheapest rented tenure of Social Rent, is driven from the Housing, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023-2028; the Tenancy Strategy & Tenancy Policy (adopted Jan 2026); and the Local Plan 2036. Behind this, the programme is managed to ensure schemes include the most affordable homes but are also viable to deliver. This work feeds into both the HRA and OX Place Business Plans and the Budget/ MTFP. At scheme level, reports on each direct delivery scheme in the programme come to Cabinet for approval, with the proposed tenure mix and rationale clearly set out. Building more Affordable Housing is a priority for this administration and within that our priority remains providing more homes for social rent.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

LS5: From Cllr Thorniley to Cllr Smith	
Question Can the portfolio holder explain what the actual number of affordable houses delivered or still in development directly by the council (where the council website says this should be 847 according to the current programme) is?	Written Response We report on affordable housing completions annually, for example, last year there were 173 affordable home completions (89 by the Council and OX Place for the HRA, and 84 by housing associations). This year (2026/27) we are forecasting 553 affordable home completions (over half into the HRA), which would be the most completions in any single year for a generation. There are currently over 900 affordable homes in delivery and on-site, with considerably more in the future pipeline.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

LS6: From Cllr Thorniley to Cllr Smith	
Question Can the portfolio holder set out what policies the council has in place to ensure council-funded (either through the HRA or through the subsidiary companies) new build affordable housing are zero carbon and car free?	Written Response The direct delivery programme by the Council and OX Place build quality sustainable homes that usually exceed Planning and Building Reg requirements. Many schemes are delivered as car free and low car (often with car club and disabled/ visitor spaces) but, the housing company needs to balance viability and costs with the demand for car parking spaces. The City Council has ambitious but pragmatic car free and car light policies though its Local Plan, with further refinements in the draft Local Plan. These criteria apply to all residential development across the city. While car free will be suitable in

	some areas of the city, there is a need to improve public and active travel across the city to enable us to go further, faster. Recent coverage of the outcry over the new County Council parking standards, which apply car free to many development sites outside of the city where access is less good, shows that without a degree of pragmatism car free policies run the risk of stalling development of family homes without much better access to alternative means of transport. I know my colleague Cllr Railton has written to the County Council to set out our concerns relating to the County's new parking standards and the likely negative impact on the delivery of housing on the edge of the city, specially released to meet the city's unmet need.
Supplementary Question Councillor Thorniley requested a copy of the correspondence.	Verbal Response Councillor Railton committed to sharing the correspondence.

LS7: From Cllr Stares to Cllr Smith	
Question Can the council confirm the total cost of Statutory Home Loss Payments made to former residents of both Windale and Northbrook House?	Written Response The statutory Home Loss payment is currently £8,100. As at 03/07/26, Home Loss payments had been made to 38 former tenants of Windale and Northbrook House, totalling £307,800.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

LS8: From Cllr Stares to Cllr Smith	
Question Could the Council confirm the total spend on the refurbishment of both Windale and Northbrook House?	Written Response There has been no spend to date on refurbishment of Windale and Northbrook House
Supplementary Question Councillor Stares queried why the building is standing empty if there are no refurbishments ongoing, and why is it not being used to house the homeless.	Verbal Response Councillor Smith explained that several residents still live there, and there is an agreement in place that the property cannot be used for alternative purposes whilst this is the case. Councillor Smith also confirmed that there is no refurbishments budget and work only took place in relation to health and safety projects.

LS9: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Smith	
Question The Government is proposing to utilise a military site in Oxfordshire to house people seeking asylum. The CEO of Oxford based charity Asylum Welcome has denounced these proposals as 'astounding'. Given that Oxford is a city of sanctuary, will the portfolio holder take this opportunity to condemn these proposals and the broader government endorsement of populist narratives about asylum accommodation that they represent?	Written Response Oxford is a welcoming place, and we are a proud Council of Sanctuary and continue to advocate for a fair and equitable asylum system where decisions are made in a timely way to ensure people are able to move on and make progress in their lives. I am supportive of closing hotels used as asylum accommodation as they are not suitable. I note the recently publicised plans by the government to open a site in Oxfordshire for people seeking asylum which is in the feasibility stage.
Supplementary Question None.	Verbal Response

To: Council

Date: 13 July 2026

Report of: Director of Law, Governance and Strategy

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

Introduction

Addresses made by members of the public to the Council put to the Cabinet members or Leader, registered by the deadline in the Constitution, are below.

1. 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

This report will be republished after the Council meeting as part of the minutes pack. This will list the full text of speeches delivered as submitted, summaries of speeches delivered which differ significantly from those submitted, and any further responses.

Addresses to be taken in Part 2 of the agenda

1. Nick Eyre
2. Dom Birch
3. Chaka Artwell

Addresses to be taken in Part 2 of the agenda

1. Nick Eyre

Thank you, Lord Mayor

I'm not going to talk in general terms about the importance of climate change. I know that commitment to climate action is widely shared across the Council. Many of you have recently defeated opposition from climate deniers. And, from working with your officers on climate issues over the last few years, I know they are very committed and effective.

What I do want to talk about is the Council's specific goal to making the city net zero by 2040. This arose from the Citizens' Assembly on climate in 2019, where it was very clear that Oxford's citizens believe we should be a leader on climate action.

But net zero by 2040 is a tough goal. It's worth spelling out why.

'Net zero' means, by definition, matching emissions of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere with removals from the atmosphere.

In urban areas, the opportunities for removals within the city are quite limited. Tree planting can and should contribute but given the city's boundaries and pressures on land use, its contribution can only be small. And it's increasingly clear that the prospects for engineered removals are negligible.

Offsetting is possible – essentially by paying other places to reduce their emissions instead of doing it here. But offsetting our direct emissions is not compatible with good practice guidance on net zero.

So, the science clearly points to a conclusion that, to meet the city's net zero commitment, we have to eliminate most fossil fuel use in the city by 2040.

Fortunately, that is possible. And largely good economics, because of the declining costs of solar power, electric vehicles and heat pumps.

Many measures can contribute and are in the existing 2040 Net Zero Action Plansolar roofs, more insulation, public transport, better provision for cycling and walking, local food etc.

And these can all help. But when we are planning to eliminate most fossil fuel use, two measures stand out as essential.

First, replacing gas boilers, and

Second, replacing combustion engine vehicles.

If we don't do both of these, we will fail to meet the net zero goal.

In both cases, the change is beginning to happen. But it needs to go faster. And it will take time to complete. Both boilers and vehicles have lifetimes of about 15 years. We are now less than 15 years from 2040! So, we should already be avoiding installing gas boilers and buying new petrol and diesel vehicles. Delivery of the 2040 target implies speeding up action on these quickly.

Fortunately, there is a context in which this can be done – the Local Area Energy Plan. (Not to be confused with the Local Plan). Work has started on it, with input from your officers, who will update you on progress in due course.

My advice to you is to ask two questions of the plan

First, is it clear what incentives and regulations are going to be used to drive the phase out both petrol- and diesel-fuelled vehicles and gas boilers?

Second, is there a plan for changing our city's energy infrastructure: for including building district heating networks, upgrading electricity networks and decommissioning gas networks?

Of course, developing a detailed geographical plan is complex and may not be possible quickly. But the Local Plan Energy Plan at minimum needs to set out key priorities and begin a process to deliver that detail.

This clearly will raise questions for Cabinet and Scrutiny. But the changes needed will affect every neighbourhood, and almost every household. So, it's also an issue for you all as ward councillors as well.

That, I think is my 5 minutes. But I am happy to follow up with any of you in political groups or other forums.

Lord Mayor, thank you.

Response from Councillor Anna Railton, Deputy Leader, and Cabinet Member for Planning and Zero Carbon Oxford

Firstly, thank you very much Professor Eyre for coming along this evening to address us on this issue and for your ongoing excellent role as scientific adviser to the Council.

You have mentioned the local area energy plan which is one of four plans that have come up in this agenda, all of which are on different geographies. It is a really important piece of work for this Council, but it is somewhat difficult to discuss as we do not actually have it which is one of its problems. Discussion of it came up at the most recent climate scrutiny meeting, where numerous updates have also been heard on the delivery of the heat network.

When it comes to EV adoption, we already have some of the highest numbers of EV drivers in the in the country but also accept that it is only about 25% of new cars that are EV; there is still a pretty long way to go. The Council wrote an EV infrastructure strategy a few years ago which sets out the approach to support this transition given the 26,000 EVs in the city requiring charging. We are also looking forward to seeing EV chargers installed in the city at the end of this year after several years of no new infrastructure being installed. GUL-e is also part of the solution here; this is a cross pavement charging solution that ODS will be putting in for the county council.

When it comes to domestic heating, that is a more difficult problem. I am glad to see the boiler upgrade grant is still around and there is now a separate grant which covers air to air which I think is a great step forward. But I think you know air to air needs to be more seriously considered as part of the solution here, not only do you convert to electric heating, but you also get electric cooling as well. Personally, I am very keen for improvements for how residents interact with the planning system on this, and I think it is currently a little bit too challenging for people. We, as you know, are expecting people to become experts in planning policy and know where to find stuff too, for example, installing an air source heat pump or even an EV charger.

District heating heat network; I think plans are slowly moving forward but are in a procurement process. Hopefully towards the tail end of this year, it will move forward positively. You talk about decommissioning the gas grid and I think it is fair to say there is currently no real workable plan for this; in my ward it is continually frustrating that road after road is dug up for gas leak after gas leak. The infrastructure is genuinely falling apart and there does need to be a plan for decommissioning it; Scotland has some plan, but I think in England there is currently nothing.

On the local area energy plan, I am glad to see the growth commission is leaning into the grid upgrade problem which the energy plan covers. As you know, this is a real source of friction for putting in new developments.

When it comes to the local area plan, we will continue to work with the county council and its consultants to essentially make this as useful a plan as possible for the city and the wider county; when this emerges, we will have a good go around with various committees on it.

Thank you very much.

2. Dom Birch

As a non-binary resident of Oxford, I am speaking on the impact of the EHRC code of practice on Oxford's substantial trans community. The code of practice empowers the exclusion of trans people from services and spaces and will make the lives of trans people worse.

For a non-binary person like me, this means that I will have no legal access to government defined 'single sex' spaces or services. Or, to do so, I am now required by law to identify as my birth sex for accessing a service. Given the extensive changes to my body due to the impact of hormone replacement therapy this essentially places me with the choice: acting unlawfully to access a female only space or service, or face discrimination or open hostility by accessing a male only space where my gender presentation and identity make me a visible outlier. I have, since the introduction of the EHRC draft guidance, already been challenged in bathrooms and changing rooms no less than six times—moments that often start with confusion and leave me challenged and harassed when moving through Oxford or simply trying to do my job. One at least one occasion I was left fearing for my safety after particularly aggressive questioning in a nightclub (men's) bathroom. Not only does the code undermine my dignity of living out my gender, it also puts me (and people like me) in danger.

I say this to highlight that the impact of the code is not trivial, and it is particularly serious in Oxford. A city with a substantial trans community that is being threatened by our own government. Insidiously and subtly, yes, but threatened, nonetheless.

As an educator who works in inclusion and access, and volunteers with marginalised youth, I add that this harm will not simply be felt by Oxford's adults—but also by young people who are already struggling to interpret a world that chooses to reject them. Forcing them, as they come to terms with their gender identity, to also make the difficult choice between dignity and lawfulness, and between self-betrayal and safety.

Response from Councillor Nigel Chapman, Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies

Firstly, I would like to thank our speaker Dom Birch for coming to address Council on the concerns many trans people feel about the impact of the ECHR Code of Practice on their community. Hearing this testimony reminds us all of the discrimination and harassment many trans people face in their daily lives, and we know it takes courage to speak up, especially in a public forum like this.

Later in the meeting, we will be returning to the subject of trans rights in a motion which I expect will attract widespread and passionate support across the chamber. This Council

is proud of standing up for and with transpeople and that it offers inclusive services to all its citizens, including all groups with protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act of 2010.

Speaking personally, I do not want to see the EHCR Code of Practice used by unscrupulous and often prejudiced individuals and organisations to try and water down the rights of the many groups which have so far been protected by the Act. Human rights are not a zero-sum game, advantaging one group at the expense of another. Rather, we should be taking every opportunity to strengthen the framework of rights we have now.

The Supreme Court was very clear that its ruling last year does not diminish legal protections against discrimination for transgender people. *Oxford City Council is committing to providing safe accessible and dignified services to all residents. The Council is working within the 2025 ruling of the Supreme Court and the Government's draft Code of Practice in developing a policy setting out how we will ensure we do not fail to comply whilst recognising the impact it has on those not identifying as their gender at birth.*

As the Council begins its work this autumn on the impact of the revised Code on its services and facilities, we will be very mindful of the position taken by the Court.

There will need to be several stages, including establishing a policy position and then reviewing each service and space provision for current compliance against the code and next steps for each, on a case-by-case basis. As the work continues, the Council will consider the impact on, and the input of all affected persons with protected characteristics, given that the scope of the changes in the Code spans many areas beyond single sex spaces.

I would add that, where there is a need because of the guidance to implement any changes to specific sites or services, we will ensure there is strong engagement and consultation with all the relevant parties and organisations.

3. Chaka Artwell

Stonewall, the leading publicly funded lobby for the LGBTQIAP2S+ men and women, has been mute, and has not condemn the behaviour of the same-sex adoptive parents; who have been convicted of baby Preston's death.

Given that Oxford City Council has reported to have paid to attend Stonewall's training, and sending Oxford City Council employees to Stonewall's expensive training courses, will Oxford City Council disengage from financially supporting, and attending any training organised by Stonewall?

Response from Councillor Nigel Chapman, Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies

Thank you for your address. The case of Preston Davey is a tragic and deeply upsetting one and has been described by the children's Commissioner for England, Rachel de

Souza, as a “massive safeguarding failure.” A number of enquiries are underway to learn the lessons of it and help us ensure all other children – especially the most vulnerable - do not suffer a similar fate.

It is the practice of Stonewall (like most charities I know) not to comment on individual cases where they are not directly involved and we should not – unlike our speaker – draw any inference from that decision.

The council is a member of Stonewall as it provides access to resources and guidance to support and build inclusion. We do not currently buy into any training Stonewall provides. The council will continue as a member of Stonewall in line with our commitment to being an inclusive employer.