

Briefing note and supplementary papers

Date: **Monday 30 January 2023**

Time: **5.00 pm**

Place: **Council Chamber - Oxford Town Hall**

The Council agenda, reports, this briefing note, and any other supplementary papers should be considered together.

This briefing note forms part of the papers to be considered at the Council meeting. It contains additional information; councillors' questions, public addresses; and amendments to motions.

All papers for this meeting can be accessed through the council's website.

For further information please contact:

Committee & Member Services

 01865 529834

 democraticservices@oxford.gov.uk

Briefing note

Information for councillors and additional papers to be considered.

	Pages
PART 1 - PUBLIC BUSINESS	
1 Apologies for absence	
2 Declarations of interest	
3 Minutes	Minutes of the ordinary meeting of Council held on 28 November 2022. Council is asked to approve the minutes as a correct record.
4 Appointment to Committees	See main agenda frontsheets. Any proposed changes will be circulated with the briefing note or notified at the meeting.
5 Announcements	See main agenda frontsheets.
6 Public addresses and questions that relate to matters for decision at this meeting	None.
CABINET RECOMMENDATIONS	
7 Thriving Communities Strategy 2023-27	The Executive Director (Communities and People) submitted a report to Cabinet on 14 December 2022 recommending that it is adopted as part of the Council's policy framework. The Cabinet minutes dated 14 December 2022 are available at item 11a. Councillors Chewe Munkonge, Cabinet Member for Leisure & Parks, Shaista Aziz, Cabinet Member for Inclusive Communities and Culture and Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Health & Transport, will present the report and present Cabinet's recommendation.

Recommendation: Cabinet recommends that Council resolves to:

1. **Adopt** Oxford's Thriving Communities Strategy 2023-27 as part of the Council's policy framework, including the following recommendations:
 - (i) Agree and adopt the Thriving Communities Principles across the Council's work and encourage our partners to do the same;
 - (ii) Explore opportunities to improve the inclusivity and sustainability of Oxford's community facilities, and review opportunities as they arise through business cases;
 - (iii) Continue to integrate Council services and seek out opportunities to better align our work with partners agencies, including co-location.

OFFICER REPORTS

8 Flexible Working / Hybrid Working Policy

The Head of Business Improvement has submitted a report requesting Council approve the Hybrid Working Policy.

Cllr Nigel Chapman, Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services will propose the recommendation.

Main
agenda
pack

Recommendation: That Council resolves to:

1. **To Approve** the Hybrid Working Policy.

9 Disciplinary Policy

The Head of Business Improvement has submitted a report asking Council to approve the Disciplinary Procedure.

Cllr Nigel Chapman, Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services will propose the recommendation.

Main
agenda
pack

Recommendation: That Council resolves to:

1. **Agree** the Disciplinary Procedure and Guidance with immediate effect;
2. **Authorise** the Head of Business Improvement or their designated deputy to make revisions to the Disciplinary Procedure as required to correct any clerical errors or comply with changes to law;
3. **Authorise** the Head of Business Improvement or their designated deputy to make minor revisions to the Disciplinary Guidance to ensure that it continues to be fit for purpose.

10 Council and Committee meetings programme for May 2023 to May 2025

The Head of Law and Governance has submitted a report setting out a programme of Council, Committee and other meetings for the whole of 2023/24 and 2024/25 council years.

The Leader of the Council, Cllr Brown will propose the recommendations.

Recommendation: that Council resolves to:

1. **Approve** the programme of Council, committee and other meetings from 01 May 2023 to 31 May 2025 attached at Appendix A;
2. **Delegate** authority to the Head of Law and Governance, in consultation with Group Leaders, to make changes to this programme in the event that there is any decision by Council to change the committee structure or committee remits which impacts on the programme of meetings; and
3. **Delegate** authority to the Head of Law and Governance to set dates for additional training and briefing sessions for Members.

**Main
agenda
pack**

QUESTIONS

11 Questions on Cabinet minutes

This item has a time limit of 15 minutes.

Councillors may ask the Cabinet Members questions about matters in these minutes:

11a Draft Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting held on 14 December 2022

**Main
agenda
pack**

12 Questions on Notice from Members of Council

7 - 28

40 questions on notice.

The questioner may ask one supplementary question of the Cabinet Member who submitted the response, or the Leader in their absence.

PART 2 - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND SCRUTINY

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

29 - 32

This item will be taken at or shortly after 7.00pm

1 public address and 1 question not relating to matters for decision at the meeting.

Up to five minutes is available for each public address and up to three minutes for each question.

A total of 45 minutes is available for both public speaking items.

Responses are included in this limit.

14 Outside organisation/Committee Chair reports and questions

14a Scrutiny Committee update report

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

Council is invited to comment on and note the report.

Main agenda pack

PART 3 - MOTIONS REPRESENTING THE CITY

15 Motions on notice 30 January 2023

This item has a time limit of 60 minutes.

33 - 44

Minor technical or limited wording amendments may be submitted during the meeting but must be written down and circulated.

Council is asked to consider the following motions:

- a) Opposing Voter ID (proposed by Cllr Landell Mills, seconded by Cllr Smowton)
- b) Fixing Oxford's Water (proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Muddiman) [amendment proposed by Cllr Railton, seconded by Cllr Hunt]
- c) End Tory Cost of Living Crisis (proposed by Cllr Aziz, seconded by Cllr Upton) [amendment proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Rawle]
- d) Use Park and Ride Parking Sites for Solar Farms (proposed by Cllr Fouweather, seconded by Cllr Miles) [amendment proposed by Cllr Railton, seconded by Cllr Hollingsworth]
- e) Plant-based Food and Sustainable Farming (proposed by Cllr Dunne, seconded by Cllr Hollingsworth)

16 Matters exempt or part exempt from publication and exclusion of the public

If Council wishes to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of any aspects of the preceding agenda items it will be necessary for Council to pass a resolution in accordance with the provisions of Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 specifying the grounds on which their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act if and so long as, in all the

circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

(The Access to Information Procedure Rules – Section 15 of the Council's Constitution – sets out the conditions under which the public can be excluded from meetings of the Council)

16a Cowley Branch Line Local Funding for Full Business Case

Appendices 1 and 4 to this item include exempt information pursuant to Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. If Council wishes to discuss matters relating to the information set out in Appendices 1 and 4 to the report, it will be necessary for the Council to pass a resolution to exclude the press and public from the meeting (as set out at agenda item 16).

Main
agenda
pack

The Executive Director (Development) submitted a report to Cabinet on 14 December 2022 seeking approval for the funding package and to enter into all necessary contracts to undertake the Approval in Principle design and Full Business Case and local connectivity studies for the reopening of the Cowley Branch Line to passengers. This includes the parameters for a financial contribution from Oxford City Council, including the ring-fencing of future Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions.

Councillor Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Health and Transport, will present the report and present the Cabinet's recommendation.

Recommendation: Cabinet recommends that Council resolves to:

1. **Approve** a capital budget of £4.56m to deliver the next phase of the project made up of:
 - Up to £289,000 up front contribution from Oxford City Council from already-secured Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds;
 - Up to £3.5m of the costs to be funded by local landowners and then be reimbursed from CIL paid for any future developments by those landowners that gains planning consent after the date that contracts are entered into;
 - At least £771,000 from local landowners and Oxfordshire County Council as a non-repayable grant contribution;
 - In the event that the submitted Levelling Up Fund 2 application seeking £4.0m is found to be successful in total or in part, the local funding arrangement described above would be reduced commensurately from one or more of the funding pots outlined above.

This briefing note is published as a supplement to the agenda and should be considered along with the agenda; reports; and other supplementary papers.

To: Council
Date: 30 January 2023
Report of: Head of Law and Governance
Title of Report: Questions on Notice from members of Council and responses from the Cabinet Members and Leader

Introduction

1. 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.
2. Responses are included where available.
3. Questioners can ask one supplementary question of the Cllr answering the original question.
4. This report will be republished after the Council meeting to include supplementary questions and responses as part of the minutes pack.
5. Unfamiliar terms may be briefly explained in footnotes.

Questions and responses

Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Partnerships; Leader of the Council

SB1 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Brown – Conditions for Market Trading in Oxford	
Question	Written Response
What conditions does the city council place on market traders who wish to operate a market within the city of Oxford? What steps does the city need to take to develop and adopt a market policy to cover trading on Gloucester Green Market, the Covered Market and	All street trading in the city is considered to be covered by the Street Trading provisions of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1985 unless exempt under section 1(2) of that Act. The Council has a Street Trading Policy which sets out conditions

SB1 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Brown – Conditions for Market Trading in Oxford	
other market sites in the city in order to promote sustainable business practices of market traders?	<p>under which Street Trading activity may take place. That Policy is currently under review and does contain measures to encourage environmental sustainability in street trading. This review is likely to set out guidelines around the recognition of any new markets.</p> <p>Both the indoor Covered Market and the outdoor market at Gloucester Green are exempt from the street trading act and not covered by the current street trading policy. The market at Gloucester Green is operated by an independent market operator on behalf of the Council and are required to take full ownership for promoting and ensuring each trader complies with sustainable business practices.</p> <p>The Covered Market is owned and managed by the City Council, with each trader having their own Lease or Licence in place. The Leasing Strategy, approved by Cabinet in June 2021 is placing greater emphasis on sustainability and encouraging traders to do the same by reviewing supply chains, packaging etc. The Covered Market has also introduced EV Bikes which traders are encouraged to use for local deliveries.</p>
SB2 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Brown – Sky Lanterns	
Question Would the leader support a ban on the release of Sky lanterns in the City of Oxford due to their environmental impact including on wildlife and pets within and beyond the city?	Written Response We already stop the release of these lanterns on our land where we can and educate people about the potential hazards they cause. There are a substantial number of parks where we have banned fires using Public Spaces Protections Orders which would prevent the release of lanterns and we are currently investigating options to introduce more specific legislation which would allow a legally enforceable ban across all our parks. We are also proposing to amend our street trading

	<p>policy to ban the sale of lanterns, this proposal will be considered by the General Purposes Licensing Committee in February 2023 for recommendation to Council for adoption.</p>
--	--

SB3 From Cllr Roz Smith to Cllr Brown – Community Hub	
Question	Written Response
Does the council support the creation of a central community centre hub for Headington?	<p>There are a large number of community assets within the Headington area which are available to local people as meeting and community spaces. These include Headington Community Centre, Oxford Brookes University, Cheney School, Barton Neighbourhood Centre, Risinghurst Community Centre, Bullingdon Community Centre, Quarry Village Hall, the Coach House, Old Headington Village Hall, All Saints Church House, Ruskin College. In addition, the area is covered by our OX3 Locality Team. I therefore do not believe there is any demonstrated need for any additional Community Centre/Hub in Headington.</p>

SB4 From Cllr Roz Smith to Cllr Brown – Windrush 75th Anniversary Celebration	
Question	Written Response
To the Leader of the Council: 22 June will see the 75th Anniversary of the Windrush, the ship that brought hundreds of immigrants from the Caribbean to the UK. Campaigners are calling for the date to be “a diamond jubilee for modern, diverse Britain”. How will the City Council be marking and celebrating this date?	<p>The City Council have already put together a small team to explore ideas, which will include working with the community.</p> <p>This will include flying the Windrush flag on the Town Hall and supporting the Windrush group to put on a range of accessible activities through city council grant funding and the use of city council facilities (e.g. Museum of Oxford).</p>

SB5 From Cllr Jarvis to Cllr Brown – Council App and Digital Engagement	
Question	Written Response
Why has the Council discontinued its	There was limited usage of the Council

app? What plans are in place to replace this digital engagement?	app – which replicated the services available on our mobile-friendly website and was used primarily for bin collection reminders. About 18 months ago, we replaced the app with a new digital system that allows residents to sign up for automatic bin reminder messages as well as digital newsletters that provide details on upcoming events in Oxford, news on the Covered Market and the Museum of Oxford, advice on our Go Active programme to keep fit and much, much more. Removing the app has saved the Council £10,000 a year – and this saving was included in the 2022/23 Budget. Meanwhile, our digital newsletters have over 31,000 subscriptions across the various topics and we are continuing to work to expand this base and the levels of engagement.
--	---

SB6 From Cllr Morris to Cllr Brown – Oxford United Ground	
Question	Written Response
What is the Council doing to ensure Oxford United's home ground remains within the City?	The City Council is supportive of Oxford United and their search for a suitable ground. We have worked with them over many years and have supported them in looking for alternative sites in the city, but there are no suitable sites available.

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

ET1 From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Turner – Budget / ODS Commercial Model	
Question	Written Response
I note that in the budget for consultation, a “[revised] ODS Commercial Model”, comprised of altering the margins charged on services billed to the general fund and the HRA, has the effect in practice of moving £280,000 between the two accounts, which the council would be forbidden from doing directly. Does this	There is nothing unethical in the budget adjustment here. ODS have been incurring losses on building works undertaken on behalf of the council primarily in relation to repairs and maintenance to council houses. The budget adjustment is the residual part of an efficiency exercise undertaken in ODS

ET1 From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Turner – Budget / ODS Commercial Model	
bending of the spirit of the rules concern you, either from an audit or an ethics perspective?	which has seen increased efficiency in ODS through reduced operatives and better procurement. The residual charge of £280k will enable ODS to break even on these works and ensure that the appropriate amount of charge is made to the HRA.

ET2 From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Turner – Budget / Turnover Saving	
Question	Written Response
I note that the budget's proposed "Turnover Saving" refers to a policy of intentionally leaving a gap between an employee's departure and their replacement starting in post in order to save staffing costs. Do you agree that while not directly customer-facing, by inducing short-term labour shortages and inhibiting effective handover this is likely to have a negative effect on all council operations and therefore should be emphasised for reversal as future income permits?	In reality a one month drag on all posts that become vacant (on which this saving is based) is likely to take place anyway particularly as most appointees are on 3 months' notice periods, so this is a sensible way of assessing likely spend based on likely levels of staff turnover. The councillor has the opportunity to propose an amendment to this measure if he is concerned about the impact. We will of course look at the progress on this and other savings as part of our regular budget monitoring, as well as any impacts upon services, and we always try to include insights from this process in future budget rounds.

ET3 From Cllr Landell Mills to Cllr Turner – Trap Ground Bridge Repairs	
Question	Written Response
What is the current status of the Trap Ground bridge repairs?	I am not completely sure which bridge is being referred to. The Trap Grounds Bridge (from the allotments) has been inspected and minor repairs were identified. These repair works are now complete. A condition survey has also been undertaken on Aristotle Lane Bridge, and while the gabion baskets do not represent an immediate health and safety risk, works of repair have been identified. The financial responsibility to remedy lies with Network Rail and the Council is currently negotiating the costs

	with that body.
--	-----------------

Cabinet Member for Inclusive Communities and Culture

SA1 From Cllr Sanderson to Cllr Aziz – Transport for Asylum Seekers	
<p>Question</p> <p>What support is the city council providing directly or in collaboration with the county council to provide asylum seekers allowed to work with transport to and from the city to seek employment (e.g. in the hospitality industry)?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>Those who claim Asylum in the UK are not normally allowed to work whilst their claim is being considered, we would be required to ascertain if the said individuals have rights to work and access to funds, therefore would be on a case-to-case basis. However, people who have claimed asylum in the UK can apply for permission to work if they have been waiting 12 months for a decision, and they are not considered responsible for the delay. If permission is granted, the person will be allowed to take up jobs on the shortage occupation list only.</p> <p>Refer to this link to the relevant Home Office publication on the UK Government website.</p>

SA2 From Cllr Pegg to Cllr Aziz – Support for Asylum Seekers Housed Near Kassam Stadium	
<p>Question</p> <p>Can the portfolio holder provide an update on the Council's work supporting asylum seekers housed near the Kassam Stadium by the Home Office?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>Oxford City Council has been working alongside partners and stakeholders to ensure that asylum seekers are supported. This has included working in partnership with Care4Calais and Asylum Welcome to ensure that the residents have appropriate clothing through donations from the wider community including our local places of worship. We have also worked alongside grassroots community groups and stakeholders including Oxford hub, EMBS to organise basic English lessons at Blackbird Leys Community centre, volunteer led, that is in motion now and the turnout has been high with 60 people at the first session.</p>

	Both Care4Calais and Asylum Welcome continue their weekly outreach, onsite and at our Blackbird leys community enter, allowing an avenue for the asylum seekers to ask questions and be supported.
--	--

Cabinet Member for Safer Communities

DW1 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Walcott – Licensed Premises Bleed Kits	
Question What measures does the Council currently take to ensure licensed premises have bleed kits?	Written Response There is no legal requirement to have bleed kits in licensed premises. Bleed kits can be used to assist trauma cases in a variety of settings and have been actively promoted by a charity, the Daniel Baird Foundation. Some local authorities and police forces have recommended them to premises connected with the night time economy. We will raise the promotion of Bleed Kits in licensed premises at the next Pub Watch and Nightsafe meetings that we attend with our Police & NHS partners.

Cabinet Member for Housing

LS1 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Linda Smith – Selective Licensing	
Question Since the implementation of Selective Licensing, how many properties have been registered?	Written Response Since 1 st September when the scheme started over 7,500 applications have been received with over 2,000 expected from agents. 732 draft licences have been issued and 305 properties have been licensed. In addition, 52 Temporary Exemption Applications have been received with 38 issued and 8 refused.

LS2 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Linda Smith – Selective Licensing Enforcement Officers	
Question How many enforcement officers did the Council have before the introduction of Selective Licensing? Since the introduction of the scheme, what is the total number of enforcement officers to date?	Written Response The council had 6 enforcement officer posts dealing with the private rented sector before the introduction of Selective Licensing. These are all now funded by license fees and a further 3 posts are currently in the process of recruitment. As enforcement activity increases, more officers will be recruited.
LS3 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Linda Smith – Selective Licensing Inspections 1	
Question Since the introduction of Selective Licensing, how many properties has the Council done an inspection of?	Written Response The Council does not inspect properties before issuing a licence under the Selective Licensing scheme. Since 1 st September there have been inspections of 43 properties.
LS4 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Linda Smith – Selective Licensing Inspections 2	
Question How many properties is the Council hoping to inspect per year? Reference Selective Licensing.	Written Response The annual target will vary according to the numbers actually licensed and the resources available, but the bid to the government stated that we would licence an estimated 10,000 properties and that we would inspect 60% of them during the 5 years of the scheme.
LS5 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Linda Smith – Insulation of Rented Properties	
Question What insulation standards does the city council require for HMOs and private rented properties within the city and is there scope for these to be enhanced? What is the compliance rate of any insulation standards within the rented sector in Oxford?	Written Response In line with national statutory requirements, properties that are rented out in Oxford must be rated as an E or above on the EPC unless exempt from the requirements to have an EPC. The council cannot require higher standards than national legislation but we have incentivised higher standards through accreditation schemes where the

	landlord has to achieve the highest EPC ratings possible, within reason, for the property construction type. There are no F and G rated properties in the rented sector in Oxford and we continue monitoring the data to ensure that remains the case.
--	--

LS6 From Cllr Morris to Cllr Linda Smith – Solar Panels on Council Buildings	
Question	Written Response
What percentage of Council owned buildings currently have solar panels? What steps is the Council currently taking to increase this?	Currently 3.5% of Council owned buildings (General Fund and housing) have Solar panels. We are currently taking a fabric first approach with our housing stock as this is where government funding is targeted and is the approach recommended to reach EPC C (as per our target to reach EPC C by 2030 in 95% of our own housing stock). However solar PV will have a role to play in the future for reaching net zero for both our housing and general fund properties. As part of planned roof replacements we will be ensuring that, where possible, roofs are made suitable for future installation of solar panels.

LS7 From Cllr Rawle to Cllr Linda Smith – SWEP Provision 1	
Question	Written Response
How many beds have been provided under SWEP provision during cold weather during 2022/23?	Please note that SWEP is currently open at the time of responding to this question. The data used runs up to the night of January 18 th into 19 th . At this date there have been 15 days of SWEP activation providing 258 nights of accommodation, at an average of 17 spaces per night. The lowest number of people accessing SWEP on one night is 10, and the highest is 21. There are 29 spaces made available for SWEP each night. This can be supplemented by utilising spaces in existing supported accommodation or booking hotel rooms if required. Since

	January 1 st , the independent Oxford Winter Night Shelter (OWNS) has been operating, providing up to 10 spaces of accommodation until the end of March. Officers work closely with OWNS when planning SWEP activations.
--	---

LS8 From Cllr Rawle to Cllr Linda Smith – SWEP Provision 2	
Question Have there been any people turned away from SWEP provision in 2022/3. What are the reasons for this?	Written Response Please note that SWEP is currently open at the time of responding to this question. The data used runs up to the night of January 18 th into 19 th . So far this year no-one has been refused access to SWEP. Whilst we try to accommodate everyone during SWEP activation, access is not unconditional. Reasons for refusing someone would normally be connected to significant anti-social behaviour. If someone needs to be turned away from a venue consideration would be given as to whether they could be accommodated in an alternative venue.

Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Delivery

AH1 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Hollingsworth – Paving Over Front Gardens	
Question Can you confirm that paving over the front garden is in breach of the city's planning policy and if so, how many enforcement cases have been taken over the last 2 years?	Written Response The paving over of front gardens is, regrettably, permitted by the nationally set General Permitted Development Order 2015 (Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F). Therefore to do so is not in and of itself a breach of planning policy. However, there are conditions attached to the permitted development rules which need to be adhered to, and the Council can and will investigate if it appears that these have not been followed. Within the last 2 years the council has opened 5 investigations into potential breaches of the conditions relating to

AH1 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Hollingsworth – Paving Over Front Gardens

	permitted development at the front of properties. Of these, 3 were closed as investigation showed that there was in fact no breach. The remaining 2 investigations are ongoing, one of which is awaiting the determination of a retrospective planning application.
--	---

AH2 From Cllr Goddard to Cllr Hollingsworth – Nesting Sites

Question	Written Response
What scope is there for updating planning regulations to enforce the provision of nesting sites for species such as Swifts, bats, etc., in new builds across the city?	<p>The current Local Plan 2036 policy G8 requires that biodiversity measures are to be included in all development proposals that require a Design and Access Statement; the preamble to the policy makes clear that these measures should include bat and bird boxes as appropriate.</p> <p>Looking forward, the 2040 Local Plan Preferred Options recognises the hierarchy for delivery of mandatory 10% net gains as set out in the Environmental Act. It also, in recognition of the importance of securing biodiversity features on-site, tests the ambition for a policy with specific requirements to secure biodiversity features on site (Policy Option Set G5: Protecting and enhancing onsite biodiversity in Oxford). Bird and bat boxes would clearly have a part to play as part of such a suite of enhancement measures.</p> <p>The final wording of the policy will be part of the Regulation 19 Consultation on the 2040 Local Plan, which is due at the end of this year.</p>

AH3 From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Hollingsworth – Greenfield Site Review

Question	Written Response
I note that Ruskin Fields (HELAA site 463) would have a Site Policy in the 2040	The HELAA does not allocate land for development. It is a tool that follows a

<p>Local Plan draft, having flipped from rejection due to anticipated harm to the Old Headington CA in the 2016 HELAA, to acceptance without comment regarding that shift in opinion in the 2017 HELAA. Meanwhile HELAA site 112b2-6, the fields between Marston and the Cherwell, remain protected due to rejection in the Green Belt Report 2017, in turn citing harm to the Old Marston CA. Why the distinction between these two apparently-similar cases?</p>	<p>nationally prescribed methodology to identify sites that have development potential by testing whether the site is 'suitable', 'available' and 'achievable' (viable) for development.</p> <p>The actual allocation or otherwise of a site for development is made through Local Plan process, of which the HELAA is one piece of evidence.</p> <p><u>Ruskin Field</u> (HELAA site 463) falls within a conservation area and contains listed buildings. At the time of the 2016 HELAA the site formed part of the larger 'Land North of Old Headington' parcel (HELAA site 116) which was assessed as not suitable because of the unacceptable harm to the Old Headington Conservation Area, as set out by the Barton Area Action Plan Inspector in November 2012.</p> <p>In the 2019 HELAA update the smaller Ruskin Field parcel was assessed as being suitable for residential development and was included as a proposed allocation in the Draft Local Plan 2036. The Inspectors considered the proposed allocation and concluded that part of the site was suitable for residential development and it was subsequently allocated under Policy SP56.</p> <p>The OLP2040 Preferred Options document proposes that the Ruskin Field site allocation is carried forward from the current Local Plan to the new Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Land at Old Marston</u>, (HELAA site 112b) forms part of the Oxford Green Belt and is adjacent to a conservation area. It was assessed in the HELAA 2016 as not suitable following an assessment in 2014 which concluded that this segment of the Green Belt has a vital function in maintaining the open gap between Marston and Summertown. In addition, the assessment considered that development would cause unacceptable harm to the setting of the Marston Conservation Area.</p>
--	---

	<p>In the 2019 HELAA update, Land at Old Marston (HELAA site 112b2-6 (the northern part of the previous site 112)) was again assessed as not suitable following assessment in the 2017 Green Belt Study.</p> <p>In the 2022 Interim HELAA, Land at Old Marston 112b (5-6) was again assessed as not suitable for the same reason.</p>
--	---

Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services

NC1 From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr Chapman – AAreon QL System	
Question	Written Response
<p>Can the Cabinet Member update the Council on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The current state of the implementation of the QL system? b. When the consultants' report on the problems encountered during the implementation of the QL system be available for Councillors to read? 	<p>The QL system is now at Business-as-Usual status. All workarounds have been removed and the system is functioning as was intended although there is still an element of catch up to be finalised. The project team have already implemented a first upgrade to the system to drive additional benefits and is working towards the greater exploitation of the system. A report of 'lessons learned' following some work undertaken by external consultants was presented to Audit and Governance on 18th January 2023. The report was exempt from wider publication given that the Council are still in contractual discussions with the supplier in relation to the implementation, which it would not want to fetter.</p>

NC2 From Cllr Jarvis to Cllr Chapman – Benefit Thresholds	
Question	Written Response
<p>Later this year the thresholds for receiving social care from the County are to be changed so that those with up to £100,000 in assets can now get up to 80% of their care costs paid (previously the threshold was £23,250). Are the City Council planning to review their benefit</p>	<p>The Council is not able to change the threshold for capital for housing benefit as these are set by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP). There are no plans to change the £16k threshold for Council Tax Reduction Support (CTRS). The Council is one of a handful of</p>

thresholds in light of this change?	authorities in the country who have retained the original CTRS scheme conditions and pay support based on 100% of the council tax liability.
-------------------------------------	--

NC3 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Chapman – Glyphosate Warnings	
Question	Written Response
When the Council uses glyphosate, does it warn local people that this will be happening? If so, what is the process for issuing these warnings and do they note the potential risks to human health?	Weed treatments are carried out by trained (NPTC City & Guilds PA1 & PA6 certification) and experienced members of staff and contractors. Safe systems of works and risk assessments are in place for weed spraying. Residents are not informed when weed treatment is being placed and it is not a requirement under HSE and DEFRA guidance. When applying glyphosate, the chemical is sprayed directly on to the plant during active growth. Also chemicals can only be used under specific conditions such as temperatures between 12-20c, not in windy conditions, dry conditions etc. The exposure to the general public is minimised as much as possible.

NC4 From Cllr Pegg to Cllr Chapman – Glyphosate Usage	
Question	Written Response
How often did the Council (whether directly, or through ODS or other contractors) use glyphosate in 2020, 2021, 2022? Please provide figures for each year individually.	2020 – 3 times a year 2021 – 3 times a year 2022 – 3 times a year

NC5 From Cllr Pegg to Cllr Chapman – Glyphosate Alternatives	
Question	Written Response
Has the Council trialled the use of any alternatives to glyphosate?	ODS has carried out extensive research on this issue, and concluded, that at present, there are no practicable/financial viable alternatives. The current approach is therefore to use as little as possible and only where strictly necessary.

NC6 From Cllr Pegg to Cllr Chapman – Council Use of Glyphosate	
Question	Written Response
What is the Council's objective in its use of glyphosate?	Glyphosate treatment is the most effective and cost-efficient method of treating weeds to help maintain tennis courts and highway paths. Annual weeds, including grasses and most broad-leaved plants, are easily controlled using Glyphosate. Glyphosate use is also used for the treatment of invasive species such as Japanese knotweed which is prevalent in Oxford.

NC7 From Cllr Goddard to Cllr Chapman – Glyphosate	
Question	Written Response
Does the councillor agree that it would be good for the City Council to follow the lead of dozens of others around the UK in giving up the use of glyphosate altogether?	There is limited use of Glyphosate on some highway path areas and tennis courts to keep them free of algae/weeds. The current policy is to use as little as possible in as few areas as possible. There are currently no real practical and financially viable alternatives to its use.

NC8 From Cllr Rawle to Cllr Chapman – Council Tax Collection	
Question	Written Response
Over the last 12 months, how often has the council made errors collecting council tax? What is the average wait time of residents reporting mistakes and what is the council doing to reduce the number of cases and wait times?	The Council has received 223 complaints since January 2022 of which around 50% were justified. Complaints receive an acknowledgement within 3 working days and a response within a further 10 working days. A small number of complaints do take longer to resolve, due to the complexity of gathering the information before a reply can be dispatched, so we use a holding e-mail in such cases. Whilst the 'wait' times are considered to be reasonable the Council continues to invest in new technology and regular training of the staff both on the system and on customer contact to make improvements where we are able to.

Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice

AR1 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Railton – Hollow Way Pollution

Question	Written Response
<p>At the previous Council meeting, own pollution data record showed Hollow Way road was in breach of legal pollution limit. Since then, what measures have the Council taken to tackle this issue?</p>	<p>Publicly available data via the Oxfordshire air quality website shows this location has not been in breach of the legal NO₂ air pollution limit at any time that monitoring has taken place there. NO₂ levels have reasonable seasonal variation which is why the legal limit is set as an annual mean (40µg/m³) and an hourly limit (200µg/m³) not to be exceeded more than 18 times in a year. A single month's data cannot be taken in isolation.</p> <p>The city does not currently collect other pollution data at this location.</p>

Cabinet Member for Health and Transport

LU1 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Upton – Traffic Filters Pollution Monitoring Stations

Question	Written Response
<p>Has the Council installed / reinstalled pollution monitoring stations at all planned traffic filters' locations (including acknowledgement of locations, where there are currently none) to allow 2023 base line data to be captured, ahead of their installation in 2024? And if not, why not?</p>	<p>Yes, we have. Air quality consultants modelled the potential impacts of the traffic filters, and the modelling results were used to identify locations for deployment of an additional 53 diffusion tubes – to complement the 77 sites that we already monitor - in May 2022. The aim of this is to capture baseline data on air quality at the locations where both positive and negative impacts of the traffic filters are predicted to be greatest.</p> <p>As a result, the city currently operates a network of 130 diffusion tubes in Oxford. We will have at least 12 months' air</p>

LU1 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Upton – Traffic Filters Pollution Monitoring Stations	
	quality baseline measurements at those locations before the scheme's proposed implementation date.

LU2 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Upton – Support for Traffic Filters	
Question	Written Response
Does this Administration support the incoming traffic filters currently proposed by the County Council?	<p>Yes, we have publicly supported the decision taken by the County Council's cabinet in November 2022 to implement trial traffic filters under an experimental traffic regulation order.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to address congestion in Oxford, in order to sustain an affordable and reliable bus network. The city lost two bus routes last month primarily because congestion was making them commercially unviable.</p> <p>The modelling and assessments undertaken by the County and their consultants clearly demonstrated that trial traffic filters are the best intervention available to the County. The trial nature of the proposal will allow them to adapt their approach once the filters are in operation.</p> <p>We also support the way the traffic filter proposals have evolved through significant stakeholder and public engagement during 2022, with the County's decision in November being very different from its original announced intention of delivering traffic filters, an expanded Zero Emission Zone and a Workplace Parking Levy as part of a single package.</p> <p>The timing of the implementation will depend on factors including the expected impact of the unrelated Botley Road closure for the station redevelopment. However, to prevent the collapse of our bus network, which many people rely on to get around Oxford, interventions to prioritise buses are needed soon.</p>

LU3 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Upton – Cowley LTNs	
Question	Written Response
Can you please provide the latest pollution data figures in Cowley LTNs?	<p>Reported data from diffusion tubes installed to monitor the impacts of Cowley and East Oxford LTNs, is available in our latest air quality annual status report here.</p> <p>Data from 2022 will be available when fully processed and ratified (corrected); and this is expected in June 2023.</p>

LU4 From Cllr Malik to Cllr Upton – East Oxford LTNs	
Question	Written Response
Can you please provide the latest pollution data figures in East Oxford LTNs?	<p>Reported data from diffusion tubes installed to monitor the impacts of Cowley and East Oxford LTNs, is available in our latest air quality annual status report here.</p> <p>Data from 2022 will be available when fully processed and ratified (corrected); expected in June 2023.</p>

LU5 From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr Upton – Seacourt P+R Flooding	
Question	Written Response
<p>Can the Cabinet Member tell the council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How long the extension to the Seacourt P+R was out of use due to flooding earlier this month? How much revenue was lost as a result? What steps are being taken to ensure that flooding is prevented in future? 	<p>The extension to the P&R has been closed since 3rd January and the water levels remain too high to allow reopening at the current time. It is regularly monitored and the extension will be reopened as soon as the water levels recede and the area is cleaned. The car park is not at 100% occupancy and therefore it is not anticipated that there will be a loss in revenue as customers can be accommodated within the main car park.</p> <p>The car park is located in a zone 3 flooding area, which means there is a high probability of flooding. The car park has been designed to flood and therefore the preventive measure is to close the car park or sections of it when flooding is</p>

	likely to occur.
--	------------------

LU6 From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Upton – ZEZ Timescale	
<p>Question</p> <p>Noting the ongoing uncertainty with Botley Road works leading to schedule slippage of the proposed traffic filters, will you support pressing ahead sooner with the Workplace Parking Levy and Zero Emission Zone in order to reduce traffic on key radial roads and therefore improve bus service reliability?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>To my knowledge, both the County Council's timeline for implementing the traffic filters following their November 2022 cabinet decision and the schedule for works to Botley Road remain unknown, so it would be highly speculative to advocate pressing ahead with other elements of the Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan in the meantime.</p> <p>We believe the most critical element of the core transport schemes are the traffic filters as they will have the largest impact on congestion and supporting bus services which is absolutely critical.</p> <p>A Workplace Parking Levy would require Secretary of State approval after any relevant County Council decision, so it is not possible to implement it quickly. However, we actively encourage the County Council to continue work in progressing this whilst they are working to implement the traffic filters so it can be introduced as quickly as possible.</p> <p>The Zero Emission Zone is primarily an emissions-improving, rather than congestion-reducing, scheme. It would therefore not be expected to have a significant impact on radial road traffic levels and by extension bus reliability.</p>

LU7 From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Upton – ZEZ Income-Contingent Charging	
<p>Question</p> <p>I note that Cambridgeshire's proposed congestion zone features banded charge reduction for people on low incomes, with banding structure similar to Council Tax Reduction bands. Will you support similar measures regarding ZEZ charging?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>The charges associated with the current ZEZ Pilot are banded according to the amount of pollution emitted by the vehicle, with a series of discounts and exemptions for certain types of vehicles (such as community transport vehicles) and groups of people (such as blue badge holders).</p>

	<p>People on low incomes and with existing health conditions are disproportionately affected by air pollution. The ZEZ is focused on delivering clean air for all, to help address these health inequalities. It has a very different rationale from Cambridge's congestion charging zone which is focused on reducing congestion.</p> <p>The approach to tackling congestion being taken in Oxford is different, it relies on the separate traffic filters scheme which has no charges associated with it. By prioritising buses, the filters will make bus journeys faster, reducing the number of drivers needed for congested routes and making bus travel more attractive. This will increase patronage and help to bring down bus fares.</p> <p>To date we have been focused on assisting people and businesses to adapt to the ZEZ to ensure we deliver the improvements in air quality needed to improve the health of our citizens. I envisage that this focus will continue, by ensuring that people on all incomes will have access to affordable public transport and cleaner air while cycling and walking.</p>
--	--

LU8 From Cllr Pegg to Cllr Upton – Oxford Food Strategy	
Question	Written Response
Why has the Oxford Food Strategy been delayed?	<p>The Oxfordshire Food Strategy was developed by many elements of the food system within the county, in partnership with Good Food Oxfordshire, Oxfordshire County Council, Oxford City Council and the District Councils. It was endorsed at City cabinet in June 2022. It has similarly made its way through the separate County Council and District Council approval processes.</p> <p>The next step is to develop action plans for the City and each of the districts. These will be developed to provide support, opportunities and good governance for all the partners. The intention is for the action plan to go to</p>

cabinet in December 2023.

The City is the first of the district and City Councils to start this. I chaired the first meeting of the city's Food Action Working Group on 17th January – bringing together voluntary groups, small businesses, anchor institutions, ciity council officers, researchers on food poverty, campaigners and food experts of all sorts who will work together over the course of this year to produce an action plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

To: **Council**
Date: **30 January 2023**
Report of: **Head of Law and Governance**
Title of Report: **Public addresses and questions that do not relate to matters for decision – as submitted by the speakers and with written responses from 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
3. 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 2 of the agenda

1. Mr Ihor Terekhov, Mayor of Kharkiv – Oxford-Kharkiv Relations
2. Question from Jennifer Stanton – Council Banking

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

1. Mr Ihor Terekhov, Mayor of Kharkiv – Oxford-Kharkiv Relations

Dear Mr Lord Mayor, dear members of the Council, dear guests!

I am pleased to welcome you on behalf of the citizens of Kharkiv! Thank you for the opportunity to address you at this time when Ukrainian-British relations are at an all-time high.

We honour the people of Great Britain for their solidarity and support of Ukraine in our fight against the Russian aggressor. I believe that the United Kingdom and the City of Oxford, in particular, understand our circumstances because, more than 70 years ago, Britain, like Ukraine today, suffered from the enemy attack.

Kharkiv was one of the first cities to receive the enemy's treacherous blow. But the City has survived and overcome almost all of the difficulties. Even in the most difficult times, Kharkiv's municipal enterprises, services sector, and local authorities continued to

work. For the extraordinary bravery, courage, and heroism of its residents, Kharkiv has been awarded the honorary title of 'Hero City.'

Kharkiv and Oxford have a lot in common, for they are the centres of education and science, culture and art of their regions. Our cities have long university traditions. In my opinion, the very fact that Kharkiv has chosen the European path of development is one of the reasons for the extreme cruelty of our enemy. Despite the huge losses and damage, we are confident about the future. In building bilateral relations at the level of territorial communities, such as Oxford and Kharkiv, we see an opportunity to involve the best practices of world experts in the restoration of Kharkiv.

Dear ladies and gentlemen! Let me once again express my gratitude for your support! I look forward to meeting you in a peaceful, rebuilt Kharkiv!

Thank you for your attention!

Written Response from Councillor Ed Turner, Deputy Leader (Statutory) and Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management

Thank you for your address, Mr Terekhov, and first of all may I express my solidarity with the people of Kharkiv and all of Ukraine, as victims of Vladimir Putin's disgraceful war of aggression. I have been as humbled and impressed by Ukraine's resistance as I have been saddened by the appalling nature of Russia's attacks on Ukrainian territory and Ukrainian civilians. I am glad that many people in Oxford are supporting Ukraine – in the early stages of conflict supplies were gathered, notably by Oxford's Polish community, and transferred to Ukraine, and of course we have been in contact with our twin city, Wroclaw, which has close links to Lviv. I am especially heartened that so many people in our city have opened their homes to people from Ukraine, while others are giving of their time to assist those who are here. In Oxford, we are proud of our designation as a city of sanctuary, and see a duty to assist those in need wherever they come from.

Oxford values its international links and we are of course open to expanding these. The exact designation of a link is much less important, in my view, than what actually happens in contact between cities, and in particular between people of different cities. We are therefore very open to assisting efforts to bring people from Kharkiv and people from Oxford together, mindful that what is possible now will be different from what is possible in the happier times we hope lie ahead. Our officers will be willing to meet with you to discuss this further, and our website also contains useful information (https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20139/oxford_international_links/1401/our_twin_city_process).

I was fortunate to visit Ukraine in 2011 (although sadly not Kharkiv), and remember the richness of the culture I saw, and the warmth of the reception I received. This has compounded my horror and sadness at this war, and I sincerely appreciate your suggestion of a meeting in peaceful, rebuilt Kharkiv. That day really cannot come soon enough.

2. Question from Jennifer Stanton – Council Banking

Oxford City Council declared a Climate Emergency in January 2019 – one of the first councils to do so – but four years later continues to bank with Barclays, the largest funder of fossil fuels in Europe.

Last November, Extinction Rebellion presented a letter to the City Council asking that they move their account away from Barclays Bank.

Council leader Susan Brown responded that Barclays had the best social and ethical record among banks which tendered for the account.

However, the Good Shopping Guide rates Barclays as the least ethical of all UK banks with the lowest score of 35 out of 100. Meanwhile, Barclays continues to invest billions in fossil fuels.

It is therefore unconscionable for the City Council to continue to bank with Barclays.

Will the City Council commit to moving its account, within the next year, to a bank that is not contributing to the Climate Emergency through investment in fossil fuel extraction and use, **by putting the account out to tender with the requirement of no direct investment in fossil fuels as part of the tender?**

Will the City Council also **inform Barclays Bank that the reason for retendering their account is Barclays' extensive funding of fossil fuels?**

Written Response from Councillor Ed Turner, Deputy Leader (Statutory) and Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management

Historically Oxford City Council held its current account with the Co-operative bank but when the bank decided to withdraw from the local authority market, the Council was forced to procure a replacement banker. Of the bidding tenderers, Barclays scored joint highest in relation to social and ethical policies – the other two bidders were also major high-street banks. This is about our current account, not our investments. We would obviously have welcomed a wider choice of bank but there are limited banks willing to operate in the local authority market and the Council cannot function without a current account.

The Council engages with Barclays on Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) matters; it is a subject at each of the account manager meetings. We also ask for ESG information from all of our other counterparties and challenge them on this area as well. Oxford City Council takes climate change and the efforts to combat it very seriously and will continue to undertake our own measures towards change and work with suppliers and customers towards a sustainable future.

The approach that Barclays take to try to influence their customers to move away from harmful environmental activities and making the targets gradually tighter is an approach taken by others as well. Other banks who work within the local authority market take a similar approach and have targets relating to 2050 alongside Barclays.

The Council has a commitment, in line with local authority codes of practice, to consider the Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) ratings of its counterparties when considering its treasury management policies. ESG is a rounded measure of the sustainability of a company and its practices. Of the banks that are active within the local authority market, according to a leading ESG rating agency Sustainalytics, Barclays Bank plc has the best ESG rating.

I very much sympathise with the thrust of the question and we would welcome a wider choice of banks next time, and of course environmental, social and ethical policies will be part of that procurement.

To: **Council**
Date: **30 January 2023**
Report of: **Head of Law and Governance**
Title of Report: **Motions and amendments received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.18**

Councillors are asked to debate and reach conclusions on the motions and amendment listed below in accordance with the Council's rules for debate.

The Constitution permits an hour for debate of these motions.

Introduction

This document sets out motions received by the Head of Law and Governance in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.18 by the deadline of 1.00pm on 18 January 2023, as amended by the proposers.

All substantive amendments sent by councillors to the Head of Law and Governance by publication of the briefing note are also included below.

Unfamiliar terms are explained in the glossary or in footnotes.

Motions will be taken in turn from the Liberal Democrat, Green and Labour groups in that order.

Introduction

- a) Opposing Voter ID (proposed by Cllr Landell Mills, seconded by Cllr Smowton)
- b) Fixing Oxford's Water (proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Muddiman)
[amendment proposed by Cllr Railton, seconded by Cllr Hunt]
- c) End Tory Cost of Living Crisis (proposed by Cllr Aziz, seconded by Cllr Upton)
[amendment proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Rawle]
- d) Use Park and Ride Parking Sites for Solar Farms (proposed by Cllr Fouweather, seconded by Cllr Miles) [amendment proposed by Cllr Railton, seconded by Cllr Hollingsworth]
- e) Plant-based Food and Sustainable Farming (proposed by Cllr Dunne, seconded by Cllr Hollingsworth)

a) Opposing Voter ID (proposed by Cllr Landell Mills, seconded by Cllr Smowton)

Liberal Democrat member motion

Voting at elections is the cornerstone of democracy at both local and national level.

Participation in elections should be encouraged in all those who are qualified regardless of age, ethnicity or income.

Unnecessary barriers to voting are likely to reduce voter participation in elections, proper representation of all parts of the community and so legitimacy of those elected to office.

Voter ID is a solution without a problem and as such insinuates barriers to voting which should be of great concern to anyone who supports an open and effective democratic system of government.

The specific details released at the end of 2022, showing that considerably more forms of ID will be accepted for older voters than for younger voters, is particularly concerning in that it risks disproportionately disenfranchising voters who tend not to support the current Government.

This Council therefore requests that the Leader should write to Minister for the Cabinet Office to convey:

- This council's opposition to mandatory voter ID.
- That the list of acceptable documentation should be reviewed at the earliest opportunity and its equalities impacts measured.
- That adequate funding for local advertising must be provided to minimise the risk of voter disenfranchisement due to unawareness of the new requirements.

**b) Fixing Oxford's Water (proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Muddiman)
[amendment proposed by Cllr Railton, seconded by Cllr Hunt]**

Green member motion

Council notes

1. On August 24, Thames Water introduced a hosepipe ban following the driest July on record.
2. Across England and Wales, 3 billion litres of water are lost to leaks in the water system every single day
3. According to analysis by the GMB union, Thames Water's infrastructure allows 635 million litres of water to leak out of the system every single day - equivalent to leaving a hosepipe on for 73 years.¹
4. Failure to fix leaks has had a major impact on public infrastructure in Oxford - including the flooding of the Littlemore underpass for several weeks.
5. There has been a long delay in replacing the water pipe occupying the east bound cycle lane on Osney Bridge, which has endangered cyclists using Botley Road.

¹ <https://www.gmb.org.uk/news/thames-waters-daily-waste-same-hosepipe-being-73-years>

6. Between 2017 and 2021, Thames Water has accrued £32.4 million of fines over 11 separate incidents of water pollution - including a £4 million fine for sewage pumped into Oxford's waterways.²
7. Since privatisation in 1989, shareholders of water companies have pocketed over £72bn in dividends.³ Thames Water paid out £392 million in profit to shareholders between 2013 and 2017.⁴

Council believes

1. Thames Water is currently failing to deliver an adequate public service, is failing to invest in infrastructure, and has caused extensive environmental damage - all while putting the burden of water saving onto residents.
2. Serious questions have been raised as to Thames Water's performance - questions to which the public need answers. More accountability for the company is therefore necessary.
3. Going forward, the country's illogical privatisation of water must be reversed. Water is a basic need, a natural monopoly and a vital public service. Privatisation provides all the wrong incentives for running a water supply, and it should be returned to public hands, with democratic oversight.

Council resolves

1. To request that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks requests that Thames Water's CEO Sarah Bentley attend a meeting open to all Councillors to ask questions on the company's performance.
 2. To request that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks writes to the water regulator - Ofwat - expressing the concerns laid out in this motion and requesting action be taken to redress it.
 3. To request that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks writes to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Thérèse Coffey, and the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Grant Shapps informing them of the Council's view that the country's water system should be taken into public ownership.
 4. To lobby government ministers on an ongoing basis to tackle the issues raised in this motion, and for a publicly owned water system.
-

Amendment proposed by Cllr Railton, seconded by Cllr Hunt

Add the words in bold italics.

Council notes

1. On August 24, Thames Water introduced a hosepipe ban following the driest July on record.
2. Across England and Wales, 3 billion litres of water are lost to leaks in the water system every single day
3. According to analysis by the GMB union, Thames Water's infrastructure allows 635 million litres of water to leak out of the system every single day - equivalent to leaving a hosepipe on for 73 years.⁵

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/thames-water-fined-4-million-after-30-hour-waterfall-of-sewage-discharge>

³ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/aug/15/uk-water-boss-bonuses-reservoirs-built-leaks-fixed>

⁴ <https://weownit.org.uk/company/thames-water>

⁵ <https://www.gmb.org.uk/news/thames-waters-daily-waste-same-hosepipe-being-73-years>

4. Failure to fix leaks has had a major impact on public infrastructure in Oxford - including the flooding of the Littlemore underpass for several weeks ***and the ring road for several days in October.***
5. There has been a long delay in replacing the water pipe occupying the east bound cycle lane on Osney Bridge, which has endangered cyclists using Botley Road.
6. Between 2017 and 2021, Thames Water has accrued £32.4 million of fines over 11 separate incidents of water pollution - including a £4 million fine for sewage pumped into Oxford's waterways.⁶
7. Since privatisation in 1989, shareholders of water companies have pocketed over £72bn in dividends.⁷ Thames Water paid out £392 million in profit to shareholders between 2013 and 2017.⁸

Council believes

1. Thames Water is currently failing to deliver an adequate public service, is failing to invest in infrastructure, and has caused extensive environmental damage - all while putting the burden of water saving onto residents.
2. Serious questions have been raised as to Thames Water's performance - questions to which the public need answers. More accountability for the company is therefore necessary.
3. Going forward, the country's illogical privatisation of water must be reversed. Water is a basic need, a natural monopoly and a vital public service. Privatisation provides all the wrong incentives for running a water supply, and it should be returned to public hands, with democratic oversight. ***Only by bringing back water into public ownership can we guarantee the health and safety of Oxford's residents, of Oxford's cherished waterways, wildlife and the future of our water supplies.***

Council resolves

1. To request that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks requests that Thames Water's CEO Sarah Bentley attend a meeting open to all Councillors to ask questions on the company's performance.
 2. To request that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks writes to the water regulator - Ofwat - expressing the concerns laid out in this motion and requesting action be taken to redress it.
 3. To request that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks writes to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Thérèse Coffey, and the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Grant Shapps informing them of the Council's view that the country's water system should be taken into public ownership.
 4. To lobby government ministers on an ongoing basis to tackle the issues raised in this motion, and for a publicly owned water system.
-

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/thames-water-fined-4-million-after-30-hour-waterfall-of-sewage-discharge>

⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/aug/15/uk-water-boss-bonuses-reservoirs-built-leaks-fixed>

⁸ <https://weownit.org.uk/company/thames-water>

Council notes

1. On August 24, Thames Water introduced a hosepipe ban following the driest July on record.
2. Across England and Wales, 3 billion litres of water are lost to leaks in the water system every single day
3. According to analysis by the GMB union, Thames Water's infrastructure allows 635 million litres of water to leak out of the system every single day - equivalent to leaving a hosepipe on for 73 years.⁹
4. Failure to fix leaks has had a major impact on public infrastructure in Oxford - including the flooding of the Littlemore underpass for several weeks and the ring road for several days in October.
5. There has been a long delay in replacing the water pipe occupying the east bound cycle lane on Osney Bridge, which has endangered cyclists using Botley Road.
6. Between 2017 and 2021, Thames Water has accrued £32.4 million of fines over 11 separate incidents of water pollution - including a £4 million fine for sewage pumped into Oxford's waterways.¹⁰
7. Since privatisation in 1989, shareholders of water companies have pocketed over £72bn in dividends.¹¹ Thames Water paid out £392 million in profit to shareholders between 2013 and 2017.¹²

Council believes

1. Thames Water is currently failing to deliver an adequate public service, is failing to invest in infrastructure, and has caused extensive environmental damage - all while putting the burden of water saving onto residents.
2. Serious questions have been raised as to Thames Water's performance - questions to which the public need answers. More accountability for the company is therefore necessary.
3. Going forward, the country's illogical privatisation of water must be reversed. Water is a basic need, a natural monopoly and a vital public service. Privatisation provides all the wrong incentives for running a water supply, and it should be returned to public hands, with democratic oversight. Only by bringing back water into public ownership can we guarantee the health and safety of Oxford's residents, of Oxford's cherished waterways, wildlife and the future of our water supplies.

Council resolves

1. To request that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks requests that Thames Water's CEO Sarah Bentley attend a meeting open to all Councillors to ask questions on the company's performance.
2. To request that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks writes to the water regulator - Ofwat - expressing the concerns laid out in this motion and requesting action be taken to redress it.
3. To request that the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks writes to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Thérèse Coffey, and the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Grant

⁹ <https://www.gmb.org.uk/news/thames-waters-daily-waste-same-hosepipe-being-73-years>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/thames-water-fined-4-million-after-30-hour-waterfall-of-sewage-discharge>

¹¹ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/aug/15/uk-water-boss-bonuses-reservoirs-built-leaks-fixed>

¹² <https://weownit.org.uk/company/thames-water>

- Shapps informing them of the Council's view that the country's water system should be taken into public ownership.
4. To lobby government ministers on an ongoing basis to tackle the issues raised in this motion, and for a publicly owned water system.

c) End Tory Cost of Living Crisis (proposed by Cllr Aziz, seconded by Cllr Upton) [amendment proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Rawle]

Labour member motion

The cost-of-living crisis is deepening poverty, inequalities and insecurity, amongst thousands of people, families, and communities across our city.

Twelve years of Tory austerity and brutal central government funding cuts to councils such as ours continues to have a catastrophic impact on services and community support for working people.

The Covid pandemic has also pushed many people into further hardship along with independent and small businesses finding it impossible to survive.

Under a Tory government of millionaires, food bank use across the country and in our own city has rocketed, with more and more people in full time employment also dependent on food banks and food projects across Oxford. And now this government is wielding more cuts to services.

The Tories have shown over the past twelve years they have no desire to improve the lives of working people across our city and country. They need to go, now.

As winter continues, many are left to wonder how they will feed their families, heat their homes, pay spiralling energy bills and pay their rent and mortgages. People are terrified of becoming destitute and homeless.

Oxford City Council is working with people and communities, organisations and partners across the city including advice centres, food banks and food networks, the NHS, and others to provide information and support across Oxford's diverse communities.

We are proud of the many ways community groups are working together to support people and thank everyone for their tireless work.

This council condemns this out of touch government for the harm and devastation it is causing people and communities daily.

We condemn the increases in inequalities and specifically racialised inequalities that the cost of living crisis is exacerbating, as outlined in the recent Runnymede Trust report.

We reject this government's failed economic and social policies that have seen an increase in child poverty in our city that is creating a deepening mental health crisis, as the recent Marmot report highlights.

We demand an end to further cuts to local government budgets and services across our city and reject the Tories desire to wield austerity 2.0 against our city.

We call on the government to ensure benefit payments rise in line with record breaking inflation, so that people have a chance to survive the economic chaos created by a government of multi-millionaires and can make it through the winter.

We call on Universal Credit payments and Disability Cost of Living Payments to rise for everyone and for these payments not to be one off.

We call on the government to respect public sector workers' human rights to strike action and call on all workers to be paid wages enabling them to live lives of dignity and hope.

We call on the government to implement urgently the energy windfall tax and tax energy companies making huge profits while thousands of people across our city struggle to pay for gas and electricity.

Amendment proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Rawle

Add the words in bold italics and delete words struck through.

[no changes to first part]

We call on the government to respect public sector workers' human rights to strike action and call on all workers to be paid wages enabling them to live lives of dignity and hope. ***We applaud those trade unions and workers who are currently taking industrial action to secure a pay rise that matches the cost of living.***

We call on the government to implement urgently the energy windfall tax and ~~tax energy companies making huge profits while thousands of people across our city struggle to pay for gas and electricity.~~ ***follow the TUC's recommendation to take the big 5 energy retail companies into public ownership.***

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

The cost-of-living crisis is deepening poverty, inequalities and insecurity, amongst thousands of people, families, and communities across our city.

Twelve years of Tory austerity and brutal central government funding cuts to councils such as ours continues to have a catastrophic impact on services and community support for working people.

The Covid pandemic has also pushed many people into further hardship along with independent and small businesses finding it impossible to survive.

Under a Tory government of millionaires, food bank use across the country and in our own city has rocketed, with more and more people in full time employment also dependent on food banks and food projects across Oxford. And now this government is wielding more cuts to services.

The Tories have shown over the past twelve years they have no desire to improve the lives of working people across our city and country. They need to go, now.

As winter continues, many are left to wonder how they will feed their families, heat their homes, pay spiralling energy bills and pay their rent and mortgages. People are terrified of becoming destitute and homeless.

Oxford City Council is working with people and communities, organisations and partners across the city including advice centres, food banks and food networks, the NHS, and others to provide information and support across Oxford's diverse communities.

We are proud of the many ways community groups are working together to support people and thank everyone for their tireless work.

This council condemns this out of touch government for the harm and devastation it is causing people and communities daily.

We condemn the increases in inequalities and specifically racialised inequalities that the cost of living crisis is exacerbating, as outlined in the recent Runnymede Trust report.

We reject this government's failed economic and social policies that have seen an increase in child poverty in our city that is creating a deepening mental health crisis, as the recent Marmot report highlights.

We demand an end to further cuts to local government budgets and services across our city and reject the Tories desire to wield austerity 2.0 against our city.

We call on the government to ensure benefit payments rise in line with record breaking inflation, so that people have a chance to survive the economic chaos created by a government of multi-millionaires and can make it through the winter.

We call on Universal Credit payments and Disability Cost of Living Payments to rise for everyone and for these payments not to be one off.

We call on the government to respect public sector workers' human rights to strike action and call on all workers to be paid wages enabling them to live lives of dignity and hope. We applaud those trade unions and workers who are currently taking industrial action to secure a pay rise that matches the cost of living.

We call on the government to implement urgently the energy windfall tax and follow the TUC's recommendation to take the big 5 energy retail companies into public ownership.

d) Use Park and Ride Parking Sites for Solar Farms (proposed by Cllr Fouweather, seconded by Cllr Miles) [amendment proposed by Cllr Railton, seconded by Cllr Hollingsworth]

Liberal Democrat member motion

Oxford City Council declared a 'Climate Emergency' in 2019. Various initiatives have been proposed since then and the Council has been making progress in areas such as decarbonisation of Council owned social housing and leisure centres.

This proposal is to ask that the case for installing solar panels on the Park and Ride sites around Oxford is examined and a report prepared for Cabinet to consider at a future meeting.

A solar farm in this case would consist of solar panels mounted on a sufficiently high framework so that the majority of cars would be able to park underneath. An additional benefit would be that cars would be protected from both bad weather and overheating due to sunshine.

The French government has recently announced a plan to mandate that all car parks in France must have solar farms installed. The Bentley Car Company recently announced that they were installing a car park solar farm at their plant in Crewe which will cover 1378 spaces and generate 2.7 MW of power.

The benefit of this proposal is that it makes much more efficient use of available land – rather than using farmland in the Green Belt and demonstrates that the City Council is fully behind the push for Green Energy and Net Zero.

Taking the three City owned P+R sites (Peartree, Redbridge and Seacourt) together there are 3836 car spaces. This could generate at least 6MW of power – enough for

800–1000 average sized houses. If the other P+R sites (Thornhill and Water Eaton/Parkway) are included then this rises to over 9MW.

Therefore this Council requests that the Head of Corporate Strategy submits a report to Cabinet which:

1. Examines this proposal to assess its feasibility.
 2. Explores alternative possibilities for funding the installation costs.
 3. Considers the desirability or otherwise of the Council being the operator of the solar farm(s) and thus selling the electricity generated to energy companies.
 4. Assesses the potential income stream to the Council from the solar farms once installed.
 5. Reports on discussions with the relevant County Council officers about the possibility of the other P+R sites at Thornhill and Water Eaton being included in this scheme.
-

Amendment proposed by Cllr Railton, seconded by Cllr Hollingsworth

Add the words in bold italics and delete words struck through.

Oxford City Council declared a ‘Climate Emergency’ in 2019. Various initiatives have been proposed since then and the Council has been making progress in areas such as decarbonisation of Council owned social housing and leisure centres.

This proposal is to ask that the case for installing solar panels on the Park and Ride sites around Oxford ~~is examined and a report prepared for Cabinet to consider at a future meeting~~ ***continues to be considered by officers and Cabinet.***

A solar farm in this case would consist of solar panels mounted on a sufficiently high framework so that the majority of cars would be able to park underneath. An additional benefit would be that cars would be protected from both bad weather and overheating due to sunshine.

The French government has recently announced a plan to mandate that all car parks in France must have solar farms installed. The Bentley Car Company recently announced that they were installing a car park solar farm at their plant in Crewe which will cover 1378 spaces and generate 2.7 MW of power.

The benefit of this proposal is that it ~~makes~~ ***could make*** much more efficient use of available land – ~~rather than using farmland in the Green Belt~~ ***in addition to welcome proposals for large scale solar farms elsewhere in Oxfordshire*** and ***could further*** demonstrates that the City Council is fully behind the push for Green Energy and Net Zero.

Council notes that the Oxfordshire Energy Strategy, supported by this Council, identifies a need for installed PV capacity in Oxfordshire to increase from 300mW to 1900mW – a six fold increase. This Council therefore is supportive of exploring all possible opportunities for increasing that installed capacity, whether it is large strategic-scale installations like Botley West Solar Farm, or smaller and more tactical projects like the existing installation at Redbridge Park and Ride and Leys Pool and Leisure Centre.

Taking the three ***two*** City owned P+R sites (Peartree, Redbridge and Seacourt) ***there could be potential for substantial electricity generation, although this would depend on resolving other, potentially competing uses, such as freight consolidation to cycle delivery networks, EV charging and so on, of the sites and***

~~so would need careful planning.~~ together there are 3836 car spaces. This could generate at least 6MW of power – enough for 800–1000 average sized houses. If the other P+R sites (Thornhill and Water Eaton/Parkway) are included then this rises to over 9MW.

Therefore this Council requests that the Head of Corporate Strategy **continues to investigate the feasibility of extending solar installations on spaces in Oxford including Park and Rides, and that the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice provide a verbal update at a Council meeting before the end of the year.** submits a report to Cabinet which:

1. Examines this proposal to assess its feasibility.
 2. Explores alternative possibilities for funding the installation costs.
 3. Considers the desirability or otherwise of the Council being the operator of the solar farm(s) and thus selling the electricity generated to energy companies.
 4. Assesses the potential income stream to the Council from the solar farms once installed.
 5. Reports on discussions with the relevant County Council officers about the possibility of the other P+R sites at Thornhill and Water Eaton being included in this scheme.
-

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

Oxford City Council declared a ‘Climate Emergency’ in 2019. Various initiatives have been proposed since then and the Council has been making progress in areas such as decarbonisation of Council owned social housing and leisure centres.

This proposal is to ask that the case for installing solar panels on the Park and Ride sites around Oxford continues to be considered by officers and Cabinet.

A solar farm in this case would consist of solar panels mounted on a sufficiently high framework so that the majority of cars would be able to park underneath. An additional benefit would be that cars would be protected from both bad weather and overheating due to sunshine.

The French government has recently announced a plan to mandate that all car parks in France must have solar farms installed. The Bentley Car Company recently announced that they were installing a car park solar farm at their plant in Crewe which will cover 1378 spaces and generate 2.7 MW of power.

The benefit of this proposal is that it could make much more efficient use of available land – in addition to welcome proposals for large scale solar farms elsewhere in Oxfordshire and could further demonstrate that the City Council is fully behind the push for Green Energy and Net Zero.

Council notes that the Oxfordshire Energy Strategy, supported by this Council, identifies a need for installed PV capacity in Oxfordshire to increase from 300mW to 1900mW – a six fold increase. This Council therefore is supportive of exploring all possible opportunities for increasing that installed capacity, whether it is large strategic-scale installations like Botley West Solar Farm, or smaller and more tactical projects like the existing installation at Redbridge Park and Ride and Leys Pool and Leisure Centre.

Taking the two City owned P+R sites (Redbridge and Seacourt) there could be potential for substantial electricity generation, although this would depend on resolving

other, potentially competing uses, such as freight consolidation to cycle delivery networks, EV charging and so on, of the sites and so would need careful planning.

Therefore this Council requests that the Head of Corporate Strategy continues to investigate the feasibility of extending solar installations on spaces in Oxford including Park and Rides, and that the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice provide a verbal update at a Council meeting before the end of the year.

e) Plant-based Food and Sustainable Farming (proposed by Cllr Dunne, seconded by Cllr Hollingsworth)

Labour member motion

Council notes that:

- The global scientific consensus is that humans have heated the climate at a rate that is unprecedented, and we are heading towards mass extinction not just for ourselves but of entire eco systems if we do not change our actions today.¹³
- Oxford City Council is committed to reducing its impact on the environment and to becoming carbon neutral by 2030.¹⁴
- We have a duty as leaders in the city to empower the local community to make changes that can mitigate climate catastrophe and help preserve the vitality of our planet for future generations.
- The UK's agriculture produces 10% of the country's greenhouse gas emissions and makes up 70% of land use. Modern agricultural practices are a central driver for habitat and biodiversity loss and the UK is one of the world's most nature-depleted countries.¹⁵
- In the UK we eat twice as much meat and dairy as the global average which is not sustainable as there is not enough land in the world to meet this demand without destroying our natural world.¹⁶
- Plant-based sources of protein have much smaller carbon footprints than animal-based ones, even when comparing locally raised meat to imported plant foods.
- Farm animals across Europe are producing more emissions than cars and vans combined.¹⁷
- Our relationship to food is still an overlooked factor to the climate crisis yet it is the quickest and cheapest step to help tackle the climate crisis if we reduce our meat intake.
- The necessary change to confront the climate crisis needs to tackle existing inequalities in society while acting urgently.
- To protect and enrich jobs in Oxford, we should work closely with local farmers and plant-based food organisations to move to more sustainable farming methods and local produce that promotes plant-based food.

Council agrees to:

¹³ https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/outreach/IPCC_AR6_WGI_Press_Conference_Slides.pdf

¹⁴

https://www.oxford.gov.uk/news/article/1705/council_outlines_how_it_aims_to_become_a_zero_carbon_council_by_2030_at_the_latest

¹⁵ <https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/documents/conservation-projects/state-of-nature/state-of-nature-uk-report-2016.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://www.greenpeace.org.uk/news/how-much-meat-should-i-be-eating/>

¹⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/sep/22/eu-farm-animals-produce-more-emissions-than-cars-and-vans-combined-greenpeace>

- Request that the Cabinet Member for Health and Transport:
 - Works with local farmers to support, promote, and encourage their move to create more sustainable plant-based produce.
 - Recognises the benefit of sourcing food locally from producers who follow sustainable principles.
- Request that the Executive Director (Communities and People) submits a report to Cabinet with options to form a plant-based localised free food service by funding community groups who are already doing this work to transform Oxford into a more environmentally sustainable economy which will also tackle food poverty.
- Follow Oxfordshire County Council's lead by ensuring that food provided for internal councillor events are entirely plant-based and food provided at all council catered events and meetings include plant-based options, preferably using ingredients sourced from local food surplus organisations.¹⁸
- Call on Cabinet to request that the Council's Climate Action Plan be updated to state that all catering provided at Council events and functions from March 2023 will have plant-based options.
- Call on the Shareholder group to work with all Council run companies to encourage moving to having plant-based catering options by March 2023.

¹⁸ Oxford City Council stopped catering for council meetings a year ago so plant-based catering would be for the few remaining internal council events.