

Council



Briefing note and supplementary papers

Date: **Monday 18 March 2024**

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:

Jonathan Malton, Committee and Member Services Manager,

01865 529117  democraticservices@oxford.gov.uk

View or subscribe to updates for agendas, reports and minutes at mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk.

All public papers are available from the calendar link to this meeting once published

Briefing note

Information for councillors and additional papers to be considered.

	Pages
5 Public addresses and questions that relate to matters for decision at this meeting	7 - 9
1 public address relating to matters for decision at this meeting. Up to five minutes is available for each public address and up to three minutes for each question. <i>A total of 45 minutes is available for both public speaking items. Responses are included in this time.</i>	

CABINET RECOMMENDATIONS

7 Licensed Vehicles Emission Standards Amendment	11 - 75
<i>Following the General Purposes Licensing Committee of 5 February 2024, please find attached report and appendices.</i> The Executive Director (Communities and People) has submitted a report which sets out the decision of the General Purposes Licensing Committee to delay the introduction of new emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles licensed by this Authority by one year. Councillor Ed Mundy, Chair of the General Purposes Licensing Committee will present the Committee's report and present the recommendations. Recommendation: The General Purposes Licensing Committee recommend that Council resolves to: 1. Agree the amendments made by the General Purposes Licensing Committee, as stated in the report.	

QUESTIONS

9 Questions on Cabinet minutes	77 - 83
<i>This item has a time limit of 15 minutes.</i> Councillors may ask the Cabinet Members questions about matters in these minutes:	

10	Questions on Notice from Members of Council	85 - 98
	29 questions on notice. The questioner may ask one supplementary question of the Cabinet Member who submitted the response, of the Leader in their absence.	
11	Public addresses and questions that do not relate to matters for decision at this Council meeting	109 - 126
	<i>This item will be taken at or shortly after 7.00pm</i> 4 public addresses and 2 questions not relating to matters for decision at this meeting. Up to five minutes is available for each public address and up to three minutes for each question. <i>A total of 45 minutes is available for both public speaking items. Responses are included within this time limit.</i>	
13	Motions on notice 18 March 2024	127 - 149
	This item has a time limit of 60 minutes. 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) Cancel divisive non-evidence-based transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens trust in democracy (proposed by Cllr Ajaz Rehman, seconded by Cllr Shaista Aziz) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Sandy Douglas, seconded by Cllr Mary Clarkson] b) Uniting to Tackle Oxford's Housing Crisis (proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Chris Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman] c) In Support of Green Investment (proposed by Cllr Chris Smowton, seconded by Cllr Katherine Miles) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Alex Hollingsworth] d) Weight and emissions based parking charges (proposed by Cllr Emily Kerr, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Louise Upton]	

e) The Cost-of-living crisis and local government funding (proposed by Cllr Ed Turner, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman)

14a Exempt Appendix - Appropriation of land at Railway Lane

127

Updated appendix published as a supplement to the Cabinet meeting held on 13 March 2024.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Council

Date: 18 March 2024

Report of: Head of Law and Governance

Title of Report: Public addresses and questions 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
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 1 of the agenda

1. Address from Mr. Bashir Ahmed, President of C. O. L. T. A (City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association)

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

1. Address from Mr. Bashir Ahmed, President of C. O. L. T. A (City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association)

The secretary of our Association, Mr Sajad Khan, recently spoke at the general purpose licensing committee (GPLC) on 5th February 2024 highlighting the difficulties and the challenges our trade had endured since the onset of Covid back in 2020.

With the initial plan for the emission standard policy to begin in January 2025, after our secretary spoke at the GPLC meeting, Councillors agreed to allow a one-year delay to the emission standards policy, and for it to begin in January 2026. This 1 year delay was offered and approved as a compromise by both the Councillors and portfolio holders for Planning and healthier communities and Zero carbon/climate justice.

As a trade, we don't think the 1 year compromise was a balanced judgment of the facts available to all of us. The trade has lost 4 productive years since March 2020 since the

initiation of Covid. There was no work for us for 18 months all the way through till the end of 2021. Then the trade suffered due to the unimaginable rise in living costs due to the financial crisis and very high interest rates. The trade was further impacted with industrial action which crippled the U.K. and still continues till this date. And lastly, the impact of road closures which includes LTNs and the ongoing closure of Botley Road have created a huge disruption to the service we are meant to provide. All of these issues impact taxi drivers and our earnings have reduced drastically.

Unfortunately, at the GPLC meeting, it seems like our concerns were largely ignored. We lost 4 productive years and in return a one year compromise was given. This is regrettable.

I hope that the members have had sight of and read the 2 important pieces of information available to them. I had sent all of you the relevant link to access these documents.

Firstly, the results of the public consultation where over 80% of the general public supported the delay of the emission standards policy till January 2028. Secondly, the 'Hackney carriage fleet Affordability' report presents to everyone findings which highlight our plight. To briefly summarise, it clearly states in there that under current circumstances, it is actually more viable to operate in the current TX4 diesel Cab than it is in the electric one because the cost associated with operating in an electric cab are greater. This includes the 200% increase in energy cost to charge the battery on the cab.

The report also highlights that in 2018, our trade was responsible for LESS THAN 1% of the harmful emissions within Oxford. We are now in 2024 and have 34 electric cabs operating out of 107. I ask the members, what do you think that would have done to the

1 % figure? That would have significantly reduced further. We are an insignificant number of road users which contribute a minuscule of emissions which hardly contribute to the environment. These reports seem to have been ignored.

To us, a fair compromise would have been an extra two years delay from 2025. We were hoping that the members at the GPLC would understand our concerns and appreciate the reports in front of them including the public consultation. On that basis, we were hoping that the emission standard policy would be delayed till January 2027. This would have been a compromise. Unfortunately, this wasn't the case.

I don't need to emphasise the point of our willingness and the corporation we've had with authorities that has got us to this stage. Thirty four (34) of our cabs are electric. This is due to the good relations we've had with the authority which included financial grants available to 20 proprietors who made use of the grant and purchased an electric cab.

No such grant is currently available to us. Unfortunately, what the GPLC had failed to realise in our opinion, is that the circumstances for the trade had changed drastically since 2020 with all the issues explained.

So we ask all of you to help the trade and support us drivers of the trade who are your constituents by delaying the emission standard policy by an extra year from 2026 to 2027. As I've explained, we have always been cooperative, but at times, a common sense approach needs to be taken without ignoring the facts in front of you. Delaying the emission standards policy to 2027 will certainly give drivers who are faced with this

daunting investment a bit more breathing space, drivers who can then plan their investment accordingly with the prospect of 2027 in their mind. Currently we are all paying very high prices in everything whether it's fuel food and bills, including Mortgages.

The expanded ZEZ is planned for sometime in 2026. Probably the middle of 2026. To ask for the emission standard policy to be delayed till January 2027 is not a big ask whatsoever in light of this development. This will give some proprietors a little bit more time to invest than others. Some proprietors will have their license renewals in early 2027. So we shouldn't consider delaying till 2027 as something which is criminal.

As I've said, it will certainly give the extra breathing space to all of us that have yet to change to electric cabs. Thank you to everyone for listening.

Thank you

Colta

This page is intentionally left blank

To: General Purposes Licensing Committee
Date: 5th February 2024
Report of: Executive Director for Communities and People
Title of Report: Licensed Vehicles Emission Standards Amendment

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To consider a delay to the introduction of new emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles licensed by this Authority
Corporate Priority	Enable Inclusive Economy, Pursue a Zero Carbon Oxford
Policy Framework	Air Quality Action Plan, Low Emission Strategy, Sustainability Strategy
Recommendations: That the General Purposes Licensing Committee resolves to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider the request made by City of Oxford Licenced Taxicab Association to delay the introduction of ultra-low emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles licensed by this Authority. 2. Consider the results of a public consultation and statements submitted 3. Consider the contents of this report and options set out in it 4. Agree any amendments to the current emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles licensed by this Authority; 5. Agree that any such amendments be recommended to Council for adoption. 	

Appendices	
Appendix 1	GPL Committee Report January 2019
Appendix 2	COLTA request to delay the current HCV emission standards
Appendix 3	Responses to a Public Consultation
Appendix 4	Oxfordshire County Council representation
Appendix 5	Oxford City Council Sustainable Team representation

Introduction and background

1. On 23rd January 2019 the General Purposes Licensing (GPL) Committee approved the recommendation to introduce new emission standards for Hackney Carriage

Vehicles (HCV) licensed by this Authority to reduce emissions in the taxi fleet and to improve air quality in the City.

2. It was acknowledged that Oxford City centre has high levels of toxic nitrogen dioxide, which contributes to diseases including cancer, asthma, stroke and heart disease; and, to around 40,000 deaths in the UK every year.

The GPL Committee report can be found in **Appendix 1**.

3. The current HCV emission standards, as adopted by the Council, are:

A. From 1st January 2020 all renewal HCV applications must meet the EURO 4 standard as minimum; and, with immediate effect all new HCV applications must meet either the EURO 4, EURO 6 or ULEV standard as a minimum (EURO 5 vehicles are not considered to meet that standard);

B. From 1st January 2022 all new HCV applications must meet ULEV standard or at least Euro 4 if replacing an existing Euro 4, Euro 5 or Euro 6 due to the vehicle being written off by an insurance company or is a temporary courtesy vehicle due to repairs;

C. From 1st January 2025 all new and renewal HCV applications must meet the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle standard

Date From	Renewal HCV Applications	New HCV Applications:
Renewal – 1st January 2020 New – Immediately	All HCV must meet EURO 4 emission standard	All HCV must meet EURO4, EURO 6 or ULEV emission standard (EURO 5 vehicles will not be considered to meet this standard)
1st January 2022	All HCV must meet EURO 4 emission standard	All HCV must meet ULEV standard, *or at least Euro 4 if replacing an existing Euro 4, Euro 5 or Euro 6 due to the vehicle being written off by an insurance company or is a temporary courtesy vehicle due to repairs
1st January 2025	All HCV must meet ULEV standard	All HCV must meet ULEV standard

4. The Authority can confirm that first two phases of the agreed emission standards in points A and B have been complied with. As a result, 71 HCV's with Euro standards 1,2 and 3 were upgraded to Euro 4. Currently the Taxi fleet is a combination of 73 vehicles with Euro 4 standards, 2 vehicles with Euro 6 and 34 vehicles which meet the ULEV standard.

City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association (COLTA) request

5. On 29th November 2023 City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association (COLTA) submitted a formal request to the Licensing Authority requesting for the final phase of the Council HCV emission standards to be extended by three (3) years. The current Council standard sets out that *'From 1st January 2025 all new and renewal HCV applications must meet the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle standard'*

- COLTA provided various explanations in their request to consider delaying the final stage of the current emission standards implemented in 2019. The main reasons point to a financial and economic difficulties within the taxi trade

The final formal request can be found in **Appendix 2**.

Public Consultation

- Consideration of any substantial changes regarding the licenced trade provisions should be consulted at a local level in a form of public consultation, involving the trade, members of public, stakeholders and any other interested groups and individuals.
- The Authority conducted a public consultation regarding the proposed extension of the last phase of the HCV emission standards as requested by COLTA to provide members with the outcome prior to determination. The public survey was live for consultation for two weeks. It was aimed at all members of public, trade, customers, stakeholders, who could respond and make a comment. The consultation was based online. It was advertised on Council website and various social media. Participants would have submitted their responses online.

Total responses to the survey: **426**

Do you support the current requirement? Or would you support delaying the ULEV Taxi requirement?

Option	Total	Percent
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025	45	10.56%
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	21	4.93%
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by two years (January 2027)	7	1.64%
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January 2028)	350	82.16%
Not Answered	3	0.70%

What is the main reason for you choosing the above answer?

Option	Total	Percent
Financial	227	53.29%
Emissions	62	14.55%
Personal	47	11.03%
Vehicle	32	7.51%
Supporting Taxi Trade	299	70.19%
Not Answered	3	0.70%

9. The majority of respondents who supported the current emission standards or one year delay provided 'emissions' as the main reason. Respondents who supported a three-year delay mainly provided 'financial' or 'personal' as a reason.

The full responses can be found in **Appendix 3**.

Stakeholders' representations

10. Oxfordshire County Council Transport and Infrastructure Officer provided a statement in relation to the public consultation in response to the question of whether they support the current HCV emission standard requirements or if they would support delaying the final phase of the requirements for up to three years.
11. The statement said that *'The County Council appreciates there is a balance to be struck between emissions standards and the financial realities facing the HCV and PHV trades... However, air quality remains a pressing public health concern, so we encourage the city council to be as ambitious as possible in setting emissions standards and would **urge the shortest possible delay to the "zero-emission capable" requirement**, especially after the planned implementation date for the wider ZEZ (if the scheme is approved following consultation).'*

The full statement can be found in **Appendix 4**.

12. Oxford City Council Environmental Sustainability Team also provided a statement and a set of data for consideration.
13. Whilst providing data comparison relating to vehicle costs and emissions, the statement noted that *'Consideration for the licensing decision should include finding the right balance to continue to deliver cleaner air, taking into account the overall emissions contribution that is made by Hackney trade, in the context of the service they provide and the current economic climate.'*

Full statement including the data can be found in **Appendix 5**.

14. Additional joint statement has been provided by Councillor Anna Railton, the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice and Councillor Louise Upton, Taxi Licensing Portfolio Holder stating the following:

"The purpose of the current licencing requirements is to both improve air quality in the city (especially the city centre) and to decarbonise Oxford's transport. We appreciate that the increase in charging costs and of interest rates makes it harder to afford an electric HC, but our expectation that non-electric HCs will have to pay charges to enter the ZEZ from 2025/26 (and we all hope the cost of electricity is going to drop).

COLTA have asked for a three-year extension, we recommend a compromise position of a 1 year extension over the recommendation from 2019, in light of the current elevated charging prices."

Recommendations and option of emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles (HCV) licensed by this Authority

15. To help address the high levels of toxic nitrogen dioxide in some city centre streets, HCV emissions standard were introduced by the Council in 2019 in consultation with the City of Oxford Licensed Taxi Association (COLTA) and feedback from drivers and owners that have attended the Council's capacity building workshops.
16. The first two phases of the emission standards (paragraph 3) were implemented successfully. These standards have been very effective, reducing emissions from the HC trade by approximately 50%. This is a significant achievement and shows the general commitment by the trade to electrify their vehicles.
17. The last phase of the current emission standards is due to commence on 1st January 2025, requiring all new and renewal HCV to meet the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle standard.
18. In light of the request received from COLTA, the Committee members are requested to consider the following options having in mind details contained in this report and appendices:
 - A. Retaining the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025.
 - B. Delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by **one year** (January 2026)
*Recommended by Oxford City Council Environmental Sustainability Officers and City Cllrs for Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice and Taxi Licensing Portfolio Holder
 - C. Delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by **two years** (January 2027)
 - D. Delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by **three years** (January 2028)
*As requested by the Taxi trade Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association (COLTA)

Financial implications

19. Since the implementation of the HCV emission standards in 2019 the affordability of the ULEV Taxis has worsened recently, with the cost for power and interest rates increasing. The cheapest way to electrify is to purchase a second-hand LEVC e-TX. Costs of operation are estimated to be approx. £2k higher than operating a diesel fuelled Euro 4 (TX4) per annum.
20. The original Emissions Pathway anticipated ZEZ cost implications for HCVs and PHVs fuelled conventionally. Based on a ZEZ access cost in 2025 of £8 per day and 250 journeys into the ZEZ per annum, this would offset the price differential between the second hand TX4, and a second hand LEVC TX of approx. £2k per annum. Meaning that proprietors who purchase second hand LEVC taxi would benefit financially for not having to pay the daily ZEZ charge of £8, against conventionally fuelled taxis.

Legal issues

21. The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 at sections 47, 48 and 51 allows the Licensing Authority to attach to vehicle licences such conditions as it considers 'reasonably necessary'. Improving standards in vehicle safety and air quality are relevant factors in this respect.
22. Improving air quality is in the interests of all persons and therefore no separate equalities assessment is considered necessary.

Report author	Anna Dumitru
Job title	General Licensing Team Leader
Service area or department	Community Services
Telephone	01865 252565
e-mail	adumitru@oxford.gov.uk

To: General Purposes Licensing Committee
Date: 23rd January 2019
Report of: Head of Community Services
Title of Report: Licensed Vehicles Emission Standards

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To recommend introduction of emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles and amend the vehicle age limit for Private Hire Vehicles licensed by this Authority
Corporate Priority	Vibrant Sustainable Economy, A Clean and Green Oxford
Policy Framework	Air Quality Action Plan, Low Emission Strategy, Sustainability Strategy
Recommendations: That the General Purposes Licensing Committee resolves to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approve the recommended option for introduction of new emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles licensed by this Authority; 2. Approve the recommended amendment to vehicle age criteria for licensing of new Low and Ultra Low Emission Private Hire Vehicles; 3. Agree that such proposals be recommended to Council for adoption. 	

Appendices	
Appendix 1	Supporting Measures
Appendix 2	Full Analysis

Introduction and background

1. Oxford City centre currently has high levels of toxic nitrogen dioxide, which contributes to diseases including cancer, asthma, stroke and heart disease; and, to around 40,000 deaths in the UK every year. Emissions from licensed vehicles contribute to these high levels.
2. Oxford has the potential for a great offer to its visitors, residents and businesses: a world class, clean, modern fleet of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicles.
3. Currently Oxford licensed Hackney Carriage fleet has an old age, polluting profile - the fleet consists 100% of diesel vehicles: 51% are older than 15 years, with the six oldest vehicles being 19 years old. Over half of the fleet are Euro standard 3 and lower.

4. 81% of the fleet would not meet the current Oxford Low Emission Zone standards (Euro 5 for buses), if it were extended to include taxis.
5. Trip patterns indicate that taxi emissions are largely generated within the central areas of Oxford.
6. None of the existing licensed vehicles are zero-emissions capable and none meet the proposed Zero Emission Zone (ZEX) standards. Reducing emissions in the taxi fleet presents an opportunity not only to improve air quality, but to showcase electric vehicles to our residents, businesses and visitors.
7. Oxford is not alone in taking these steps. For example: Coventry already require all newly licensed vehicles to be EURO 6 and will have a fully ULEV fleet by 2024; London have required all new applicants to be ULEV since January 2018; and, Dundee already has 94 pure electric (private hire) taxis operating in the city.
8. The overarching goals of the proposals in this report are:
 - That the economic impact on the Hackney Carriage trade respects their livelihood and builds resilience to global trends in mobility.
 - Achieving the urgent air quality improvement needed to meet Council targets for clean, safe air.
 - That Oxford City Council be a leader in sustainability, helping to attract investment and funding.

Go Ultra Low Oxford: Taxi scheme

9. The Hackney Carriage trade provides an important service, within our wider transport system, to meet the diverse needs of the residents, businesses and visitors to Oxford.
10. The global trend in mobility is towards rapid adoption of electric vehicles, especially in cities where new forms of mobility are concentrated and infrastructure investment is needed. Oxford City Council has been working to support the trade to build capacity and resilience to the forthcoming changes to our mobility to ensure the valuable services it provides are preserved for the future.
11. These measures include raising awareness of the benefits of low emissions vehicles, bringing the manufacturers to Oxford, capacity building workshops, financial incentives and investigation of the local investment case for ultra-low emissions purpose-built taxis. The summary of those measures can be found in **Appendix 1**. The Council continues to actively explore other sources of finance and support for the local trade.

Recommended option of emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles (HCV) licensed by this Authority

12. To help address the high levels of toxic nitrogen dioxide in some city centre streets, options for an emissions standard were developed in consultation with the City of Oxford Licensed Taxi Association (COLTA) and feedback from drivers and owners that have attended the Council's capacity building workshops.

13. The proposals are based on the latest study of real world emissions by taxis¹ which show that EURO 5² models perform worse than EURO 4 and EURO 3 models, and are comparable to EURO 2 models. The proposals are therefore designed to avoid new EURO 5 vehicles applications, in order to ensure a real world emissions improvement is achieved in the journey towards a fully zero emissions capable fleet. **Appendix 2** describes and assesses the options, accounting for the overarching goals described above.

14. The recommended requirement:

- A. From 1st January 2020 remove the current requirement for new Hackney Carriage Vehicle (HCV) applications where the maximum age for a new vehicle to obtain a licence is “less than five years of age”
- B. From 1st January 2020 all renewal HCV applications must meet the EURO 4 standard as minimum; and, all new HCV applications must meet either the EURO 4, EURO 6 or ULEV standard as a minimum (EURO 5 vehicles are not considered to meet that standard);
- C. From 1st January 2022 all new HCV applications must meet ULEV standard or at least Euro 4 if replacing an existing Euro 4, Euro 5 or Euro 6 due to the vehicle being written off by an insurance company or is a temporary courtesy vehicle due to repairs;
- D. From 1st January 2025 all new and renewal HCV applications must meet the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle standard

Date From	<u>Renewal</u> HCV Applications	<u>New</u> HCV Applications:
1 st January 2020	All HCV must meet EURO 4 emission standard	All HCV must meet EURO4, EURO 6 or ULEV emission standard (EURO 5 vehicles will not be considered to meet this standard)
1 st January 2022	All HCV must meet EURO 4 emission standard	All HCV must meet ULEV standard, or at least Euro 4 if replacing an existing Euro 4, Euro 5 or Euro 6 due to the vehicle being written off by an insurance company or is a temporary courtesy vehicle due to repairs
1 st January 2025	All HCV must meet ULEV standard	All HCV must meet ULEV standard

15. The dates that EURO standards come into effect can vary: e.g. a manufacturer may be producing EURO 4 qualifying vehicles for a “transition period” before the official date that the standard comes into effect. For the purposes of this emission standard the following table describes how the emission standard of a vehicle will be assessed. Where there are “transition periods” the table assumes the highest Euro standard possible.

¹ Dallmann et al (2018). Available from: <https://www.trueinitiative.org/media/597524/true-london-rs-report-fv-20181214.pdf>

² Euro Standards are increasingly stringent exhaust pollution limits for new car models, introduced by the European Union in the early 1990s, starting with Euro 1. The current Euro Standard is Euro 6.

First DVLA Vehicle Registration Date	Standard assumed
From 1 st July 1992	Euro 1
From 1 st January 1996	Euro 2
From 1 st January 2000	Euro 3
From 1 st January 2005	Euro 4
From 1 st September 2009	Euro 5
From 1 st September 2014	Euro 6

16. A vehicle will be considered to meet the Ultra Low Emissions Vehicle standard if it meets the UK government's definition of an Ultra Low Emission Taxi (as of November 2018) "Taxis - These vehicles are purpose-built taxis and have CO2 emissions of less than 50g/km and can travel at least 112km (70 miles) without any emissions at all."²
17. Any applicant who believes that their vehicle meets a higher emissions standard than indicated by the requirements, as set out in the table above, may submit evidence to the Council. Where reasonable evidence is provided, officers may agree the appropriate emissions standard for that vehicle and issue a licence.

Amendment of vehicle age limit for first licensing of new Low and Ultra Low Emission Private Hire Vehicles

18. Oxford City Council licensed Private Hire fleet is currently considerably younger and less polluting than licensed Hackney Carriage fleet. However, the Authority desires to further encourage licensed Private Hire trade in supporting the Council vision in improving the air quality.
19. Current licensing age limit criteria for all new Private Hire Vehicles to obtain a licence are *"The maximum age for a new vehicle to obtain a licence is "less than five years of age" when it is licensed"*.
20. To support the trade further in investing and switching to Low and Ultra Low Emission Vehicles it is proposed to amend the current criteria to the following *"The maximum age for a new Private Hire Vehicle to obtain a license is "less than five years of age" or "less than seven years of age for Alternative Fuel Type Vehicles (Tax Code TC59 definition), OR petrol vehicles (TC 48 definition) OR diesel vehicles (TC 49 definition AND meeting the RDE2 standard), that also produce CO2 emission figures of 110g/km or less as displayed in the DVLA V5 Vehicle Registration Certificate."*

Financial implications

21. A study of local Hackney Carriage duty cycles was carried out. The study modelled the payback on investments in ultra-low emissions purpose-built taxis. It showed that ultra-low emissions purpose-built taxis, including the LEVC eTX and the Dynamo models, are a viable investment in Oxford due to the lower running costs compared to conventional vehicles. This is particularly pronounced for the Dynamo,

²See <https://www.gov.uk/plug-in-car-van-grants> - eligible taxis. Government ULEV definitions are expected to adapt to a developing market. Updated definitions might be considered for NEW applications post 2025.

which could generate a saving of £19,000 over 6 years of ownership at an average mileage of 25,000 per year. In comparison the LEVC eTX could generate a saving of £1,500 after six years based on the same mileage.

22. Access to capital may be a challenge for potential investors in the vehicles and is a key concern for the trade. The council has committed to subsidising the Certificate of Compliance test and Licensing Application fees for the first ten “early adopters” to invest in and license an ultra-low emissions Hackney Carriage Vehicle in Oxford.
23. It is expected that over the five year period of transition to the ULEV standard that the cost of new vehicles and models will become more affordable and that a second hand market will develop. As above, the Council continues to actively explore other sources of finance and support for the local trade.

Legal issues

24. In order to be enforceable the application of new emission standards and amendment of age limits would require the attachment of additional conditions to vehicles licences. The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 at sections 47, 48 and 51 allows the Licensing Authority to attach to vehicle licences such conditions as it considers ‘reasonably necessary’. Improving standards in vehicle safety and air quality are relevant factors in this respect.
25. Improving air quality is in the interests of all persons and therefore no separate equalities assessment is considered necessary.

Report author	Anna Dumitru
Job title	General Licensing Team Leader
Service area or department	Community Services
Telephone	01865 252565
e-mail	adumitru@oxford.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

29th November 2023

Dear Anna Dumitru (Licensing Team Leader)

On behalf of Oxford's Hackney carriage (black cab) trade, I write to you formally urging you to delay the Emission Standards policy and the requirement to change to zero emissions capable taxis to 2028.

It is absolutely vital that you have a clear understanding of the background of the difficulties that the trade has experienced since early 2020 such as medical emergencies, financial crises, industrial action and disruptions to the rail network. It is for these reasons which I will explain in more detail is why we are urging you to delay this policy for a further three years from 2025.

Impact of Covid-19

Oxford's Hackney Carriage trade has endured its most challenging period in living memory. The Covid-19 pandemic hit our taxi trade hard – with lockdowns introduced in March 2020 till December 2021 seeing business completely decimate as we experienced a drop in work by as much as 80-90%. Taxi drivers had faced a real danger every day risking their lives. At least 4 of our colleagues died of Covid-19, with others no doubt still suffering from the aftereffects of Covid. Taxi drivers as an occupation had raised rates of death of 65.3 deaths per 100,000 (The office of National Statistics). But our drivers were still out there courageously providing a public service in literally life-threatening circumstances.

Impact of financial crises.

Just as we were seeing the tail end of the impact of Covid, the financial crises unfolded as the cost of living increased sharply across the UK during 2021 and 2022. The annual rate of inflation reached 11.1% in October 2022, a 41-year high, before easing in subsequent months. This put a huge strain on our trade and drivers were and still are feeling the financial strain and trying to make ends meet by struggling to provide for their family. It continues to impact those that were already struggling. Fuel prices continue to be unstable and are higher to what they were before the onset of Covid.

The financial strain of high levels of costs has had a huge impact on our drivers throughout this year and it'll take time for our drivers to recover.

Through the rise of home working, the loss of local nightlife and the wider effect of the cost of living on consumers themselves, how and why people use taxi services has changed.

Impact of industrial action.

The industrial action which began around May 2022 further contributed to our woes as a trade. It caused a significant disruption to holidaymakers and commuters right through to April 2023 but the aftereffects are still felt with no end insight for industrial action and more particular, further rail strikes planned in December 2023.

The strike action had crippled many parts of the rail and bus networks, postal workers, civil servants, teaching staff and NHS staff. With fewer trains running, there are more people working from home, less people needing to come home at the end of the day, or in the middle of the day. So this is further impacting our earnings as we witness less people coming out of Oxford station. There was and still is a lot of sitting around on the ranks.

Botley Road closure and disruption to rail network.

To add to this, we cannot avoid the further disruption to our livelihood due to the circumstances surrounding Oxford rail station. With the closure of Botley road, this means 40% less jobs for drivers heading west of city as almost all of those passengers are now no longer hiring cabs due to the long detour we have to make to get to the west of the city adding time and money to passenger journey. Where a journey would cost around £7-8 from Oxford train station to the Premier Inn in Botley, is now costing around £25-£30 as we have to go around the ring road and whilst doing so, getting stuck in the traffic both ways caused due to Botley road closure.

This closure and the works on Botley road will continue till October 2024 as we've been informed which will mean a continuous disruption to our operations and a further impact on our livelihoods for a further year from now. A total of 18 months of disruption.

ZEZ – The requirement to change current cabs to EV in 2025 needs to be delayed.

The introduction of the Zero Emissions Zone (ZEZ) in Oxford is certainly a positive move. Our trade has had many communications and discussions about this policy when it was in its planning stage and consequently introduced in Oxford. As a trade, around 30% of our cabs are now zero emission capable, significantly reducing our carbon footprint. We are doing our bit.

However, in the current climate, change must be bridged with affordability. It requires careful thought and a balanced approach. Because of all the issues I have explained above, this change needs to be gradual as drivers now more than ever, need breathing space. The requirement on owners to change the remaining cabs to those that are zero emissions capable by 2025 has now become unrealistic and not achievable. We have lost out on what should have been almost 4 productive years from 2020 to current times and this will no doubt continue with a gloomy financial forecast until the end of next year 2024 due to the works on Botley road and the rail station.

As explained, around 30% of our drivers have made that switch from diesel to electric and had done so at the tail end of Covid when the situation started to improve, but just before the initiation of the industrial action in the U.K.

I'm sure you don't need reminding or see evidence of the fact that in terms of switching our diesel cabs to electric, we fair better than both our City Council and County Council whilst they transition from diesel to electric vehicles. They are far behind with many more vehicles that still run on diesel. You would think that they lead by example. Forcing our trade to be

100% electric, without recognising the huge financial burden that each Proprietor will face is totally unjust.

A grant of £5000 was provided then by the Environmental Sustainability team towards the end of 2021 to help owners make that switch. But even if a further grant was made available, it would have to be significantly more than the last amount for any owner to give it some consideration but very unlikely that any investment would be made.

Currently, owners are simply not financially secure in this volatile financial climate to invest in an electric cab which cost £65,000 cash price and over £70,000 on a loan agreement. On an initial deposit of £5000 for a new EV Cab, the owner of the cab would be paying over £800 a month instalments for the Cab over 5 years. This is a second mortgage. It is simply not affordable nor a viable option in the current climate. Its simply suicidal.

Many other factors need to be considered now when buying and owning an electric cab. The financial situation is undoubtedly different to what it was in 2018/19. Also, owners being accepted for a loan will be a factor as banks are not willing to lend. It is also important to highlight the fact that the price of energy has increased significantly to a higher rate when charging the electric cab. The cost difference to charge a cab or fill one with diesel is insignificant. So, drivers who are yet to invest are doing a cost comparison and are very concerned as there is no clear evidence of any benefit. Many of the electric cab owners are now running their cabs on petrol rather than electric because it's cheaper. There are currently no savings because the cost of charging has doubled.

The financial consequences for drivers forced to change in 2025 will be disastrous especially knowing the fact that each of those owners including myself are currently paying higher rates and double the amount in most cases on everything including mortgage, energy, food, clothing and maintenance on their current cabs. Taxi drivers can't work from home as many people are doing in many industries. Since the onset of Covid to current times, the trade has been impacted unimaginably and we are still suffering as a consequence.

An urgent need to improve our working conditions.

Those of us in the trade are hopeful the economy can bounce back. I emphasise the importance of revisiting the emission standards policy and allowing the trade a further three years beyond 2025, giving us some breathing space so that we may regroup, reevaluate and hope our situation improves. It is equally important that our authority understands how it can help the trade to recover from the difficulties we have experienced almost over the last 4 years at least.

Our working conditions must be improved and this can be achieved by granting us access through the routes in Oxford which we are currently restricted to access. This includes allowing us 24-hour access through the 'link route' (Norfolk Street) which runs alongside the Westgate shopping Centre. Secondly, allowing our trade access through those roads which have been blocked due to the creation of low traffic neighbourhoods (LTNs). Since the introduction of LTNs which were introduced during the time the trade was suffering due to the above difficulties, road closures quite frankly was rubbing the salt in the wounds. Our

movements are currently limited, and we are regularly getting trapped in traffic jams. We pride ourselves in providing a door-to-door service but are forced to settle for bollard to bollard. We can't get to the vulnerable passengers, especially those that are disabled and in a wheelchair. We are having to refuse bookings if it means we have to go the long way round to get to the passenger. As an example, a passenger we pick up from the train station going to Headington during traffic time now takes 1 hour 45 minutes as a round trip. Where is the sense in that? This means passengers are having to wait longer at the ranks because it takes longer for us to get back to the ranks.

Queen street/Carfax rank - As I have mentioned previously, to have a 24-hour rank on the Queen Street/Carfax will give the trade a massive boost and help the drivers begin to recover from the challenges we have had and are currently experiencing. Furthermore, as the Carfax rank being in an area quite central to Oxford city and a focal point where drivers can operate from during the day, will certainly put us on the path of recovery and we will begin to make back some of the losses incurred due to the difficulties I have explained. This will gradually improve our situation. This is absolutely vital in light of the circumstances we are up against at Oxford rail station which will continue throughout next year also.

I hope that our concerns are truly understood and the fact that we have been through a very difficult patch, and we continue to do so as currently the future looks bleak. Without your support, we cannot be on the path to recovery.

We urge you to allow the trade a further three years until owners are required to change their current cab to an electric one which will give us till 2028. This doesn't mean that owners will wait till 2028. If our working conditions improve, then as has been the case previously, owners will begin to invest. But our working conditions need to improve, and we need to see action rather than words. Access through the 'link route' beyond 7pm is vital in order for us to get round to our ranks quicker. Allowing our trade access through where the bollards are installed in places of LTNs. Most importantly, to support our desire to have a 24-hour rank on Carfax.

Thank you to everyone for reading my letter. I apologise if it's taken up a considerable amount of your time, but it was necessary that all of our immediate concerns were raised. I am confident that yourself and those officers that are working with you in relation to the emissions standards policy will take our concerns on board and fully appreciate our plight.

We have always had an amicable relationship with our Councillors and Officers throughout the years and you have always been prepared to help and have helped when the trade has asked. I am confident that you will once again help the trade as we've been through and are still experiencing serious challenges.

We look forward to receiving a positive outcome.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. Sajad Khan
Secretary of C. O. L. T. A
(City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association; est. 1952)

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 3

Do you support the current requirement? Or would you support delaying the ULEV Taxi requirement? - Support current or delay	What is the main reason for you choosing the above answer? - Reasoning - Financial	What is the main reason for you choosing the above answer? - Reasoning -	What is the main reason for you choosing the above answer? - Reasoning -	What is the main reason for you choosing the above answer? - Reasoning - Vehicle	What is the main reason for you choosing the above answer? - Reasoning -	Submitted Date
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 13:33:42
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 13:40:42
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025			Personal			2023-11-14 13:43:53
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-14 13:44:47
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 13:49:20
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 13:51:35
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial			Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 13:53:08
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-14 13:56:29
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 13:56:47

30

I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-14 14:01:27
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions		Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 14:02:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 14:03:34
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 14:11:25
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025			Personal			2023-11-14 14:12:45
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 14:19:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal			2023-11-14 14:21:06
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 14:36:16
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 14:38:06
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 14:57:15
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 15:02:33

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 15:20:39
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 15:40:11
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 15:46:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January				Vehicle		2023-11-14 15:49:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 15:50:40
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 16:13:16
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January				Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 16:59:22
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 17:01:00
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025			Personal			2023-11-14 17:01:13
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 17:03:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 17:15:14

31

32

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 17:45:05
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial	Emissions	Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 17:49:16
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 17:52:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 18:00:17
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 18:04:07
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 18:05:33
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions		Vehicle		2023-11-14 18:07:26
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 18:55:37
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025				Vehicle		2023-11-14 19:16:11
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 19:17:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 19:18:22

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 21:55:20
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 22:24:32
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 22:50:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-14 22:56:38
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 22:57:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 22:58:27
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-14 23:01:13
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 03:08:27
Not Answered						2023-11-15 03:44:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 03:45:58
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 09:09:54

33

34

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 09:43:22
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 10:38:10
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 10:41:59
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 10:44:12
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 10:45:13
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 10:45:24
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 10:46:29
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 10:47:45
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 10:48:56
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 11:14:30
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions		Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 11:23:30

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 11:50:10
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 11:57:04
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial	Emissions	Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 12:09:27
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 13:50:17
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 14:29:09
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-15 14:29:17
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January		Emissions			Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 15:34:32
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 16:32:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 17:02:53
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-15 17:23:44
Not Answered						2023-11-15 19:05:25

35

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 20:05:43
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial			Vehicle		2023-11-15 20:11:30
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 21:00:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-15 21:42:22
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-16 01:25:08
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-16 01:26:00
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-16 01:26:27
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 10:48:53
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 11:48:16
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 12:38:49
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 12:42:16

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 12:45:52
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 12:45:52
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions			Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 16:32:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial					2023-11-16 20:32:00
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 20:57:06
37 I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 22:14:22
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 22:14:23
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-16 23:11:44
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 00:27:54
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 00:28:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 00:31:50

38

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 00:34:23
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 00:51:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-17 00:53:35
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 00:57:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 06:44:43
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-17 11:44:30
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 13:21:40
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-17 14:05:31
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-17 15:59:51
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-17 20:04:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 20:23:28

39

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 20:24:21
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 20:51:51
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 20:52:32
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 20:53:12
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 21:47:45
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 21:54:36
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-17 23:16:05
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 00:17:47
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)		Emissions				2023-11-18 04:22:02
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)		Emissions				2023-11-18 04:23:03
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)		Emissions				2023-11-18 04:23:44

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)		Emissions				2023-11-18 04:24:12
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)		Emissions				2023-11-18 04:24:43
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)		Emissions	Personal			2023-11-18 04:25:36
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions				2023-11-18 04:26:18
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions				2023-11-18 04:26:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions				2023-11-18 04:27:18
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 08:11:25
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 08:11:55
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions		Vehicle		2023-11-18 15:26:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 15:56:46
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 16:09:19

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 16:10:59
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 16:16:30
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions				2023-11-18 16:43:52
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 16:46:23
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 17:40:41
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 17:42:16
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 20:43:38
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 20:44:56
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 20:47:34
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 20:48:37
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 21:20:02

41

42

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 21:20:52
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 21:21:58
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 21:23:03
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 21:48:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 21:53:18
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 22:14:58
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 22:17:00
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 22:29:12
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January			Personal			2023-11-18 22:30:58
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 22:42:13
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 22:43:26

43

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-18 22:51:19
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-18 23:40:44
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 12:50:24
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 14:29:13
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 14:52:29
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 16:13:58
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 16:16:30
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 18:37:36
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 21:11:07
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 21:44:10
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-19 22:48:52

44

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 22:51:55
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:08:45
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:09:43
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-19 23:11:21
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:12:59
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:13:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:15:02
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:17:19
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:27:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:28:40
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:29:22

45

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:29:58
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:30:42
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:31:27
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:32:11
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:32:55
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:33:31
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:34:04
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:34:41
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:36:14
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:36:45
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:37:19

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-19 23:37:54
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 01:08:05
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial			Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 01:15:18
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-20 02:29:47
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 06:29:11
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 08:21:30
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 09:01:46
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-20 09:03:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-20 09:04:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 09:05:24
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 09:06:29

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 09:29:24
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 12:49:57
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 12:51:38
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 12:54:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:09:29
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:13:15
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:25:01
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:29:39
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-20 13:31:16
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:34:32
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:40:11

47

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:41:41
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:42:17
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:46:42
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-20 13:49:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:51:38
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial					2023-11-20 13:52:15
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 13:59:16
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 14:06:56
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 14:08:19
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 14:10:14
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-20 14:23:02

49

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 14:26:37
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 15:16:07
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 15:41:00
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle		2023-11-20 15:45:57
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 15:49:23
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 16:05:39
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-20 16:25:21
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 16:26:39
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 16:26:57
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025			Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 16:28:39
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 16:29:54

50

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 16:30:55
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 16:34:18
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 19:57:37
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 20:00:17
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 20:01:11
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 20:27:58
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 20:29:22
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 20:30:57
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 20:32:03
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-20 20:33:12
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 21:28:00

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 21:32:32
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-20 23:00:44
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 08:58:54
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 09:01:01
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 09:02:31
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 09:06:30
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 09:10:51
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 09:57:52
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 10:00:32
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 16:22:03
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 17:39:34

5

52

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 17:41:36
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 17:42:26
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 17:43:13
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 17:44:08
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-21 18:36:45
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-21 18:59:13
Not Answered					Supporting Taxi	2023-11-21 23:31:07
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 01:01:20
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 01:03:16
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by two years (January 2027)					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 01:05:07
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-22 01:40:57

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 01:42:18
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 01:43:57
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions				2023-11-22 08:54:03
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-22 08:54:48
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 11:47:07
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:38:04
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:38:56
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:39:32
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:40:12
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial			Vehicle		2023-11-22 12:40:38
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:41:16

53

54

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:41:41
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:42:15
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:42:40
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:43:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:43:38
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:44:05
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:44:48
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:45:11
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-22 12:45:37
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-22 15:48:31
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions				2023-11-22 16:42:58

I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-22 16:43:34
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-22 23:17:05
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-23 09:06:42
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January			Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 16:12:04
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial	Emissions	Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 16:13:50
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial					2023-11-23 16:16:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial	Emissions	Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 16:23:37
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-23 16:31:53
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 16:32:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial			Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 16:36:10
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions				2023-11-23 16:37:43

55

56

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 16:49:21
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 16:55:24
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 17:42:25
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-23 17:42:27
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-23 20:05:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 20:56:59
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:51:47
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:52:27
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:53:04
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:53:43
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:55:42

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:56:26
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:57:04
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:57:38
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:58:15
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:58:51
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 22:59:23
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 23:00:22
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 23:00:57
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 23:01:32
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 23:02:23
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-23 23:02:55

57

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-24 21:43:37
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-25 11:20:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-25 12:47:53
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions				2023-11-25 15:16:25
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-25 15:17:00
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-25 15:17:30
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-25 15:17:56
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-25 15:18:35
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-25 15:19:16
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-25 15:19:42
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-25 15:20:07

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-25 18:34:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by two years (January 2027)	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-25 18:34:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-26 19:58:01
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by one year (January 2026)	Financial	Emissions				2023-11-26 21:41:43
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle		2023-11-26 21:42:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 21:42:38
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January			Personal			2023-11-26 21:43:03
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-26 21:43:19
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January			Personal			2023-11-26 21:44:36
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 21:52:19
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 22:06:57

90

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 22:08:15
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 22:10:51
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:12:10
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 22:12:39
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:12:47
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:13:17
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:13:42
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-26 22:13:58
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:14:07
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:14:32
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:14:52

9

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 22:15:07
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:15:15
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:15:37
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:15:58
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 22:16:14
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:16:25
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:17:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 22:17:33
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-26 22:18:44
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-26 22:35:41
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 02:32:42

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 08:16:31
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-27 08:16:53
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January			Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 08:17:12
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January				Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 08:17:32
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 08:17:51
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 08:18:12
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 08:37:03
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 09:42:44
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 09:55:08
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 09:57:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 10:27:47

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal	Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 10:28:22
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 10:28:40
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial			Vehicle		2023-11-27 10:29:02
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 10:39:27
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 10:39:53
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by two years (January 2027)	Financial		Personal		Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 10:40:27
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 10:47:08
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-27 10:47:45
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-27 10:50:29
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 11:20:49
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 11:23:37

63

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 11:27:34
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 11:29:27
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 12:28:55
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 12:41:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 12:45:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial			Vehicle	Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 13:10:19
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025				Vehicle		2023-11-27 13:49:30
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 13:50:30
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 14:03:41
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by two years (January 2027)					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 14:23:28
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by two years (January 2027)					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 14:24:24

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by two years (January 2027)					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 14:25:21
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 14:26:02
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 14:26:39
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 14:27:20
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 14:27:55
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 14:28:30
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by two years (January 2027)						2023-11-27 14:29:15
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 16:19:09
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 16:22:44
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 16:27:17
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 17:08:21

95

99

I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-27 17:13:29
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-27 17:13:51
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-27 17:26:20
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 17:28:11
I support the current requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by January 2025		Emissions				2023-11-27 18:58:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 19:13:59
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 19:14:33
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 19:15:21
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 19:15:47
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 19:16:15
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 19:16:42

I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 19:28:19
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 19:48:37
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 20:47:46
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 20:48:29
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 20:48:57
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January					Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 20:49:45
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 20:50:24
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 21:46:47
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial				Supporting Taxi Trade	2023-11-27 22:12:49
I support delaying the requirement for all Taxis to be ULEV by three years (January	Financial					2023-11-27 22:13:24

9

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear Anna

Thank you for consulting the county council on options to change the deadline date for Hackney carriage vehicles (HCVs) licensed in Oxford to meet your 'ULEV taxi' standard, which requires vehicles to be zero-emission capable, with a minimum 70 miles zero-emission range and CO2 emissions below 50g/km.

Along with most of the other district councils in Oxfordshire, the city council regulates HCV and private hire vehicle (PHV) emissions through the licensing process.

All PHVs, and HCVs licensed outside Oxford, are charged a daily fee to enter the Oxford the Oxford zero-emission zone (ZEZ) pilot unless they are fully zero-emission. HCVs licensed in Oxford are exempt from charges in the ZEZ pilot, on the basis that they will need to meet the city council's ULEV taxi standard to operate anywhere in the city.

The county council strongly supports the continued regulation of HCV and PHV emissions by the city and district councils through the taxi licensing process as this supports the aims of the Oxford zero-emission zone and the county council's broader aims to reduce transport emissions. The city council's approach is already delivering results, with around 30 zero emission capable HCVs already in operation and a steadily improving fleet of PHVs with a high proportion of hybrid-electric vehicles.

*The county council appreciates there is a balance to be struck between emissions standards and the financial realities facing the HCV and PHV trades, with changing travel habits and increased operating costs. However, air quality remains a pressing public health concern, so we encourage the city council to be as ambitious as possible in setting emissions standards and would **urge the shortest possible delay to the "zero-emission capable" requirement**, especially after the planned implementation date for the wider ZEZ (if the scheme is approved following consultation).*

Many thanks

Martin

Martin Krafft
Technical Lead (Transport Planning) - Central

Transport and Infrastructure
Oxfordshire County Council

This page is intentionally left blank

HC Fleet Affordability and Emissions Update 2024

There are a few key differences between 2019 and 2024, both regarding, the affordability of electric Hackney Carriages (HC) and regarding the Emissions benefit from the investment in such vehicles that should be considered in the context of this paper.

In summary, in 2018/19, over 50% of HC’s licenced in Oxford had Euro 3 or lower standard engines, emitting up to 8.7tonnes of NOx pa. The Zero-Emission Capable Licensing Standards brought in, in 2019, required a minimum of Euro 4 standard engines, with all HC’s to be zero-emission capable by 2025. These standards have been very effective, reducing emissions from the HC trade by over 50%. This is a significant achievement and shows the general commitment by the trade to electrify.

However, the affordability of the electric HC vehicles has significantly worsened recently, with the cost for power and interest rates more than tripling. This is unlikely to significantly improve within the next 12 months.

Consideration for the Licensing decision should include finding the right balance to continue to deliver cleaner air, taking into account the overall emissions contribution that is made by Hackney trade, in the context of the service they provide and the current economic climate.

1. Financial Implications

↳ In 2019, investment in an electric LEVC eTX showed a small return on investment at 6 years (see GPLC Paper 23/01/2019, Emissions Standards, §21).
 ↳ The business case for the trade at that time, based on a Feasibility study conducted by Cenex, was aligned with the Council’s ambition to reduce emissions. In 2023/24 this business case has declined substantially:

By 2023/24 the energy and cost of living crisis have had a significant impact on electricity cost (3 to 4 times higher) and borrowing costs (3 times higher). Costs used in calculations by Cenex in 2018 are shown in the table below versus the costs in 2023/24 and % increase.

Table 1 - Fuel & Electricity Costs Comparator (2018 vs 2023/24)

Fuel	2018	2023/24	% Increase
Diesel p/l	121	145	20%
Petrol p/l	119	135	13%
Electricity Home Charging p/kWh	10.7	34	219%
Electricity Public Rapid Charging p/kWh	18	69	283%

Taking into account the total cost of ownership per annum, the cheapest type of HCV to own is now a second-hand conventional fuel TX4.

The cheapest way to electrify is to purchase a second-hand LEVC e-TX. Costs of operation are estimated to be approx. £2k higher than operating a diesel fuelled Euro 4 (TX4) per annum. This is based on a ratio of 70% home charging and 30% public rapid charging. The higher cost of public rapid charging also means that drivers and operators without access to a home charger face additional cost increases.

Table 2 – Costs of Ownership in 2024

<i>Vehicle</i>	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 2
	New LEVC-TX Leased	New LEVC-TX Bought	2019 LEVC-TX Bought	2013 Euro 4 Bought
Net purchase price (after grants)		£ 64,842	£ 42,500	£3,000
Purchase/lease	Lease	Purchase	Purchase	Purchase
Total cost per annum using 30% petrol	£18,191	£14,009	£11,449	£10,578
Total cost per annum 100% electric	£19,229	£15,047	£12,487	£10,578
Cost per mile	£0.73	£0.56	£0.46	£0.42
NOx Emissions g/per mile	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.62
PM Emisions g/per mile	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.096

A more detailed estimate of costs of ownership between an LEVC eTX and Diesel (Euro 4) TX4 are shown in Annex 1.

2. Expanding ZEZ Implications & Charges

The original Emissions Pathway anticipated ZEZ cost implications for HCVs and PHVs fuelled conventionally: Based on a ZEZ access cost in 2025 of £8 per day and 250 journeys into the ZEZ per annum this would offset the price differential between the second hand TX4, and a second hand LEVC TX of approx. £2k per annum, giving zero emission taxi's a competitive advantage over conventionally fuelled vehicles, supporting the overall business case.

However, if ZEZ access is free for all HCs and PHs, then this advantage is lost, adding risk to the investment into an electric HC or PH vehicle. This is challenging for HC operators which face nearly twice the up-front cost for their accessible electric vehicles than PH operators do.

3. Emissions

The difference between HCV fleet emissions in 2018/19 and 2023/24 is shown in Annex 2 below. The investment of the Operators and the Council (via grant funding) in new vehicles has had a marked effect: In 23/24 one third of the Oxford HC fleet are ULEV compliant, emissions from the HC fleet have more than halved. The remainder of the fleet are operating Euro 4 Diesel Cabs (London Cab -TX4) and a few Euro 6 Diesel HCs.

There are two different data sources for calculating emissions, both of which are summarised below;

1. EU Euro standard calculations show that NOx, HCNOx and PM have reduced by 73% of original emissions. LEVC eTX are range extended vehicles and it is cost effective to run on petrol, so these assumptions include 30% of mileage in these vehicles is petrol fuelled.
2. Real World data (used for calculations in 2018/19). The comparison between 2018/19 and today, shows NOx have reduced to 54% of the original total. Note – we do not have accurate data for Real World petrol extended emissions, so an estimate for real world petrol emissions has been used.

The Air Quality Source Apportionment report (2020) for road transport only emissions, shows that NOx and PM emissions from Taxis are generally low (less than 1%) on a city-wide basis. The same report identified that in areas of higher taxi density, Hackney and Diesel taxis, have a more significant impact. Unfortunately, we do not have the same report for 23/24, so we are not able to confirm how apportionment has changed via the current electrification numbers, other than to confirm that overall Hackney NOx and PM emissions have reduced by over 50% and up to 73%.

73

Table 3 - Apportionment of Taxis as part of overall Transport emissions in Oxford (Report 2020, Data 2018)

City Wide (2020)	NOx	PM2.5	PM10
Hackney Cabs	0.07%	0.10%	0.07%
Petrol Taxis	0.01%	0.14%	0.16%
Diesel Taxis	0.11%		
Taxis Total (City-Wide)	0.19%	0.25%	0.23%
Worcester Street (2020)	NOx	PM2.5	PM10
Hackney Cabs	1.7%	2.2%	1.6%
Petrol Taxis	0.4%	3.0%	3.5%
Diesel Taxis	3.0%		
Taxis Total (Worcester St)	5.1%	5.2%	5.1%

ANNEX1: Comparative Costs of Hackney Ownership.

Vehicle	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 2
	New LEVC-TX Leased	New LEVC-TX Bought	2019 LEVC-TX Bought	2013 Euro 4 Bought
Net purchase price (after grants)		£ 64,842	£ 42,500	£ 3,000
Purchase/lease	Lease	Purchase	Purchase	Purchase
Running Costs (annual)				
Fuel/Charging 70% home, 30% fuel	£3,889	£3,889	£ 3,889	£4,768
Servicing & Maintenance	£620	£620	£920	£3,425
Insurance	£1,200	£1,200	£ 1,200	£1,200
Road Tax (annual)	£0	£0	£ -	£555
Congestion/ULEZ charges	£0			£0
Lease cost (annual)/Interest	£12,482	£3,891	£2,550	£180
Depreciation		£4,409	£2,890	£450
Total Cost	£12,482	£8,300	£5,440	£630
Total cost per annum using 30% petrol	£18,191	£14,009	£11,449	£10,578
Total cost per annum 100% electric	£19,229	£15,047	£12,487	£10,578
Cost per mile	£0.73	£0.56	£0.46	£0.42
NOx Emissions g/per mile	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.62
PM Emissions g/per mile	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.096

Please note: The average Hackney cab mileage used for calculations is 25,000 miles per year.

ANNEX 2: Emissions Impact (2018 vs 2023/24)

																	Average km Per Annum			Average km using fuel (if electric)				
https://dieselnet.com/standards/eu/ld.php																	40000			12000				
2018/19 Data for Hackney Cabs Licenced in Oxford																	g/ km per annum Standards classification Euro engines			Total kg/km per annum			Real World	
Age of Vehicle (First registration)	<2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Grand Total	NOx Commercial Vehicle	HCNOx	PM	NOx Commercial Vehicle	HCNOx	PM	Nox g/km	NOx Total Total per annum kg/km
Engine Type																								
E0	19	1													20	1.8	2	0.25	1440	1600	200	2.7	2160	
E1	23	4	2												29	1.5	1.7	0.25	1740	1972	290	2.4	2784	
E3	6		5	1	3										15	0.78	0.86	0.1	468	516	60	1.5	900	
E4						1	7	9	9	6	8				40	0.39	0.46	0.06	624	736	96	1.3	2080	
E5												3	2	3	8	0.28	0.35	0.05	90	112	16	2.4	768	
Grand Total	48	5	7	1	3	1	7	9	9	6	8	3	2	3	0	112			4362	4936	662		8692	
kg																								
2023/24 Data for Hackney Cabs Licenced in Oxford																	g/ km per annum Standards classification Euro engines			Total kg/km per annum			Real World	
Age of Vehicle (First registration)	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2014	2015	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Grand Total	NOx Commercial Vehicle	HCNOx	PM	NOx	HCNOx	PM	Nox g/km	Total NOx kg/km per annum
Engine Type																								
Euro 4 - TX4 (Diesel)	1	10	11	22	12	13	3	1								73	0.39	0.46	0.06	1138.80	1343.20	175.20	1.30	3796.00
Euro 6 (Diesel)									1	1						2	0.125	0.215	0.005	10.00	17.20	0.40	1.00	80.00
ULEV compliant - LEVC-TX - Euro 6 (petrol)										4	4	7	5	13	1	34	0.082	0.082	0.005	33.46	33.46	2.04	0.25	100.37
Grand Total	1	10	11	22	12	13	3	2	1	4	4	7	5	13	1	109				1182.3	1393.9	177.6		3976.4
Emissions Reduction %																				73%	72%	73%		54%
100% ULEV COMPLIANT - EURO 6																107	0.082	0.082	0.005	107.256	107.256	6.54	0.25	321
Emission Saved through 100% electrification																				1075	1286.6	171.1		3655.4

75

No real world data - this is estimated

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet on Wednesday 13 March 2024



Cabinet members present:

Councillor Brown	Councillor Turner
Councillor Hunt	Councillor Lygo
Councillor Munkonge	Councillor Railton
Councillor Linda Smith	Councillor Upton

Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Tom Bridgman, Executive Director (Development)
David Butler, Head of Planning and Regulatory Services
Lucy Cherry, Policy and Partnerships Officer
Lorraine Freeman, CIL, Data Analysis and Reporting Team Leader
Caroline Green, Chief Executive
Emma Jackman, Head of Law and Governance
Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Hagan Lewisman, Active Communities Manager
Emma Lund, Committee and Member Services Officer
Peter Matthew, Executive Director of People and Communities
Ossi Mosley, Rough Sleeping and Single Homelessness Manager
Lan Nguyen, Data Analyst
Carolyn Ploszynski, Head of Regeneration and Economy
Dave Scholes, Affordable Housing Supply Corporate Lead
Mish Tullar, Head of Corporate Strategy
Carri Unwin, Regeneration Manager
Jane Winfield, Head of Corporate Property
Richard Wood, Housing Strategy and Needs Manager

Apologies:

Councillor Chapman sent apologies.

131. Addresses and Questions by Members of the Public

None.

132. Councillor Addresses on any item for decision on the Cabinet agenda

None.

133. Councillor Addresses on Neighbourhood Issues

None.

134. Items raised by Cabinet Members

None.

135. Scrutiny Reports

The Scrutiny Committee had met on 4 March 2024 and the Housing and Homelessness Panel had met on 7 March 2024.

Recommendations from those meetings, together with Cabinet Members' responses, were provided in the separately published supplement to the agenda.

With the exception of the Corporate Key Performance Indicator Review, all of the recommendations related to items on the Cabinet agenda and were therefore considered within discussion of those agenda items.

136. Request for Exceptional Circumstances Relief from the Community Infrastructure Levy

The Head of Planning & Regulatory Services had submitted a report to seek approval for a recommendation to award Discretionary Exceptional Circumstances Relief (DECR) from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge on the BMW Mini Plant for a total sum of £832,421.

Councillor Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities, provided the background to the recommendation, explaining that BMW had taken the decision to site their production line for the new electric version of the Mini in Oxford. This would result in job opportunities both directly at the plant and within the supply chain and was a welcome development for the city. Planning permission for a large bespoke factory building for production of the new line had recently been granted, and BMW was also to receive a c£80m subsidy from central government for the location of production in Oxford.

The development of the factory buildings for which planning permission had been granted would normally attract a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): a charge levied by local authorities on new development which can then be used to help deliver the infrastructure needed to support development. BMW was seeking an exemption from this levy under the Council's Discretionary Exceptional Circumstances Relief Policy: due to the size of the sum involved, regard was also required to be given to the Subsidy Control Act 2022. Accordingly, the Council had sought and received appropriate legal advice.

Both BMW and Council officers were of the opinion that the request met the criteria required for relief. Given the balance with ensuring the economic viability of the proposal, and the importance of securing the continued presence of BMW in Oxford, Cabinet was recommended to approve the award of Discretionary Exceptional Circumstances Relief from CIL.

Councillor Upton highlighted that one of the scrutiny recommendations had related to seeking BMW's engagement with the Council on other ways in which the company might be able to help the community, and work on this had commenced.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Approve** the recommendations to award Discretionary Exceptional Circumstances Relief (DECR) for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge on the BMW Mini Plant for a total sum of £832,421; and
2. **Authorise** the Head of Planning & Regulatory Services to make any necessary minor corrections not materially affecting the report and to send the recommended outcome in writing to the claimant, as required by regulation 57(7) of the CIL regulations (as amended).

137. Allocation of Preventing Homelessness Budget 2024-25

The Executive Director (Communities and People) had submitted a report to seek approval for the Preventing Homelessness budget allocations for 2024/25 and the grant of a lease of the Floyds Row premises.

Councillor Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Housing, presented the report which set out the work which had been carried out over the previous year in preventing homelessness. The report also set out the proposed allocation of £1.65m of preventing homelessness budget for 2024/25, most of which (almost £1m) was spent through the Oxfordshire Homelessness Alliance which commissioned a number of important services across the county. These included the outreach team; supported accommodation such as the hostel O'Hanlon House and dispersed beds across Oxford; and the Somewhere Safe to Stay service.

Councillor Smith outlined the changes (as set out in the report) to the Somewhere Safe to Stay Service which would take place over the coming year, and which would involve the service no longer being delivered by St Mungo's at Floyds Row.

In addition to the services delivered by the Alliance, the Council also supported other services specifically in Oxford, such as extra beds at Mathilda House run by A2 Dominion; The Porch Day Centre, which provided meals and support for those sleeping rough or who were vulnerably housed; and The Gatehouse which helped existing and former rough sleepers.

In response to the recommendation from Scrutiny that the Council should carry forward any underspend of SWEP (Severe Weather Emergency Protocol) funds and that these should be specifically earmarked for that purpose, Councillor Smith responded that this was partially accepted but that the intention would be to use any underspend on SWEP to cover any overspends on Preventing Homelessness Grant funded services, or similar services, in-year.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Approve** the allocation of the Preventing Homelessness budget and identified Housing Revenue Account funds to commission homelessness services in 2024/25 as detailed in Table 1 of the report;
2. **Delegate authority** to the Executive Director (Communities and People) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing to revise the intended programme at Table 1 within the overall budget if required;

3. **Approve** a commitment of £798,532 from the Preventing Homelessness budget to fund supported accommodation provision from Matilda House for the period 1 September 2024 until 31 March 2027;
4. **Delegate authority** to the Executive Director (Communities and People) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing; the Head of Financial Services; and the Head of Law and Governance to procure and enter into an agreement for supported accommodation provision to be delivered from Matilda House for the period 1 September 2024 to 31 March 2027;
5. **Approve** the Council entering into the lease of the Floyds Row premises to St Mungo's on the basis set out in this report; and
6. **Delegate authority** to the Head of Corporate Property in consultation with the Deputy Leader (Statutory) - Finance and Asset Management; the Head of Financial Services; and the Head of Law and Governance to approve amendments to the final terms and enter into the lease of the Floyds Row premises on terms compliant with Section 123 Local Government Act 1972.

138. Appropriation of Land at Railway Lane

The Executive Director (Development) had submitted a report to (i) seek approval to appropriate a parcel of land (change the statutory basis on which it is held by the Council from one function to another) at Railway Lane from the General Fund to the Housing Revenue Account in order that the land could be used for the development of new council housing; and (ii) update Cabinet on certain aspects of the development.

Councillor Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Housing, highlighted that the development would provide 100% affordable housing. 90 new affordable homes would be delivered, with 47 for social rent and 43 for shared ownership.

Cabinet heard that whilst the parcel of land comprised only a small area of the proposed development, its incorporation would allow for a better scheme with an increased amount of housing.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Recommend to Council** the appropriation of the land owned by Oxford City Council that forms part of the development site for housing at Railway Lane from the General Fund (GF) into the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) at the established red book valuation figure.

139. Regeneration of 38-40 George Street

The Executive Director (Development) had submitted a report to seek delegated authority for a designated officer to spend additional budget for the regeneration of 38-40 George Street, if the parameters included in the report are met.

Councillor Ed Turner, Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management, outlined that the project would involve the regeneration of the Council asset at 38-40 George Street into an aparthotel, helping to relieve some of the pressure on the city's short stay housing market. It would also provide a new community space, with involvement from local groups and the community in its development. Work was currently underway to produce a more refined proposal for the scheme which would be acceptable in planning terms. The report before Cabinet sought to provide a financial envelope as the scheme

was still in development; however, there was a need to ensure that the budget was in place. Councillor Turner clarified that Cabinet's approval was only sought with regard to authority to spend within the financial envelope, as the development of any scheme would be subject to the appropriate planning approvals.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Delegate authority** to the Head of Corporate Property, in consultation with the Council's Section 151 Officer; the Head of Law and Governance; and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management, to agree the final scheme submitted in any planning application and authorise spend up to the maximum budget if parameters set out are met and enter into any property agreements required in connection with 38-40 George Street (see Confidential Appendix 1 for more details).

140. Oxfordshire Food Strategy - City Food Action Plan

The Executive Director (Communities and People) had submitted a report to set out the City Food Action Plan which accompanies the Oxfordshire Food Strategy and to seek Cabinet's endorsement of it.

Councillor Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities, highlighted that Cabinet had endorsed the Oxfordshire Food Strategy in June 2022. The report now before Cabinet set out the action plan which would underpin that Strategy's aspirations.

The action plan contained a number of strands, which included: helping people in food poverty; helping people to eat more healthily; binding communities together through participation in growing and sharing food; and reducing the carbon footprint of the food we eat. It had been developed by a multi-partner working group of stakeholders which had included involvement from, amongst others: the Oxford Colleges, food banks, commercial enterprises, community groups and food producers as well as the City Council.

Councillor Upton summarised some the work already being done in this area, which included setting up the Community Food Network; providing fridges and training volunteers for community larders; and supporting families to access Health Start vouchers.

Councillor Ed Turner, Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management highlighted that Council had, in July 2023, agreed a motion on Supporting a Community Right to Grow. This had included asking the Council to provide a register of unused public land which could be offered to community groups for cultivation. Councillor Turner commented that production of such a register was proving very difficult, given resourcing constraints. It was therefore suggested that a report be brought to Cabinet setting out options for what could be provided, and the additional resources needed. This could then be considered by Council as part of the wider budget setting process.

In response to the scrutiny recommendations, Councillor Upton advised that these had been mostly accepted. A recommendation to explore the collection of food waste from larger generators of food waste and distribute it amongst food larders had been rejected because of the intensity of resources it would require. Responses to all of the recommendations were included in the separately published supplement.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Agree** the City Food Action Plan which is part of the Oxfordshire Food Strategy;
2. **Delegate authority** to the Executive Director (Communities and People) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities to make any amendments to the action plan which are necessary following approval of the plan by the other local authority partners;
3. **Delegate authority** to the Executive Director (Communities and People) to negotiate and enter into the necessary grant agreements to deliver the City Food Action Plan; and
4. **Agree** that a report be brought to Cabinet setting out the options and resources required to address the Council motion of July 2023 on Supporting a Community Right to Grow.

141. Voluntary Adoption of the Socio-Economic Duty

The Head of Corporate Strategy had submitted a report to propose the Council's voluntary adoption of the socio-economic duty set out under the Equalities Act 2010, but not applied in England, with implementation in a way which minimised legal and resourcing impacts.

Councillor Susan Brown, Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Partnerships outlined the background to the socio-economic duty (SED) and its voluntary adoption by a number of councils, noting that implementation of the duty had been suggested in a number of areas, including by the Child Poverty Review Group. It offered an opportunity to try to reduce inequality and bring the life chances of all to where they should be.

The report before Cabinet set out the first stage of the process and confirmed the Council's position with regard to the SED. Future work would include developing an expanded Equalities Impact Assessment and confirming the appropriate data measures to assess socio-economic need and associated policy impacts.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Voluntarily adopt** the Socio-Economic Duty (SED), involving the development of a holistic approach, as part of the Council's policy making and decision-making processes. The SED considers and seeks to address the inequalities of outcome that stem from socio-economic disadvantage.

142. Integrated Performance Report for Q3 2023/24

The Head of Financial Services had submitted a report to update Cabinet on finance, risk and corporate performance matters as at 31 December 2023.

Councillor Ed Turner, Deputy Leader (Statutory) - Finance and Asset Management, reported that the financial and economic climate remained challenging. Some areas in the General Fund and the HRA were showing overspends, and some slippage had been experienced in the capital programme for a variety of reasons.

Councillor Turner highlighted that the position on temporary accommodation costs in the General Fund had worsened from that shown in the report (which gave the position as at the end of December). Other variances included an overspend on staffing in the

Contact Centre; however, the volume of calls and pressure on the Council's core services continued to increase in the context of the cost of living crisis.

In terms of savings, the Council had had an ambitious programme of efficiencies over recent years which had been successful delivering savings. However, this made the implementation of new savings more difficult. There therefore remained significant financial pressures and operational stresses which would require a focus on delivery of savings and the capital programme.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Note** the projected financial outturn as well as the current position on risk and performance as at 31 December 2023.

143. Minutes

Cabinet resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2024 as a true and accurate record.

144. Dates of Future Meetings

The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 6.52 pm

Chair

Date: Wednesday 17 April 2024

When decisions take effect:

Cabinet: after the call-in and review period has expired

Planning Committees: after the call-in and review period has expired and the formal decision notice is issued

All other committees: immediately.

Details are in the Council's Constitution.

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Council
Date: 18 March 2024
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 Sandelson to Cllr Brown – Elise Benjamin

Question

On the next refresh of the excellent new portraits in the council chamber, would the Leader consider featuring former Cllr Elise Benjamin, who became Lord Mayor in 2011 as the first Jewish person to do so, the first Green party representative, and at that time the youngest person to hold the post?

Written Response

Author:

We will be hoping to add to the portraits as we go forward and I'm very happy to receive suggestions from all groups for inclusion. I will take away an action to formalise a process for putting forward and agreeing future additions.

Criteria will need to be agreed, but the first Jewish mayor that I'm aware of (and she may not be the actual first) is Cllr

	Susanna Pressel who preceded former Cllr Elise Benjamin by several years and many lord mayors will have been the youngest to hold the post at some point!
--	---

SB2 From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Brown – Scrutiny of communities and ODS savings

Question	Written Response
Considering the ambitious savings sought from both communities and ODS budgets from FY 25/26, will you commit to engaging scrutiny early and often; for example, bringing a paper to scrutiny at the options phase, rather than only once final recommendations have been developed?	Scrutiny engagement has been very positive in the Council’s budget process. We will ensure that scrutiny of the two reviews is similarly strong.

SB3 From Cllr R Smith to Cllr Brown – Fair trade

Question	Written Response
As a Fairtrade City, will the leader consider appointing a Fairtrade Champion?	Author: There have been fairtrade champions in the past and there may be in the future. The role of champions are appointed by the leader around the priorities of the council and areas which need focus. Oxford is a well-established Fairtrade City and we are proud to be so.

SB4 From Cllr Aziz to Cllr Brown – Divisive rhetoric over democratic protests

Question	Written Response
Will the council leader write to the Prime Minister to register this council's dismay at the framing of Palestine supporters and marchers as "extremists" and "Islamists" along with other smears designed to stoke up tensions and fear in Oxford's diverse communities.	Author: I’m happy to do so. I share Cllr Aziz’s distaste and concern over the way in which the current government seem determined to divide communities rather than bring people together. This is the opposite approach to the one that I have always advocated.

SB5 From Cllr Aziz to Cllr Brown – Mayor of Ramallah video address**Question**

Can the leader provide an update on when the Mayor of Ramallah will be addressing council through a video message.

Written Response

We have contacted the Mayor of Ramallah's office several times to invite the Mayor of Ramallah to address council through a video message (on 7th and 8th December 2023, 2nd January, 24th January and 8th March 2024). Apart from a video with a Christmas message, we have not received any further replies. We are all sensitive to the awful situation that they are having to deal with and have sent a message of support. We don't want to put any additional burdens on them by continuing to ask about the video.

As Cllr Aziz is aware, we have subsequently issued an alternative invitation.

Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management; Deputy Leader of the Council**ET1 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Turner – Fly tipping fines****Question**

How many individuals has the Council prosecuted for refusing to pay a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) issued for fly-tipping?

Written Response

There were no prosecutions in 2022 or 2023 due to unpaid fixed penalty notices for fly-tipping – as all fines were paid.

ET2 From Cllr R Smith to Cllr Turner – Community Infrastructure Levies**Question**

Will the cabinet member for Finance please provide a total of Community Infrastructure Levy monies from developers held by the city council, and what is the interest accumulated over the last financial year?

Written Response

The balance as at the end of 22/23 was £13,044,828, with a further income this year of £3,937,000 this year – a total of £16,981,828.

Interest is not applied to balances.

Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks; Deputy Leader of the Council

CM1 From Cllr Snowton to Cllr Munkonge – Cycling in parks

Question

Do you agree with me that, generally speaking, people expect park pathways to be pedestrian-only, and that consequently cycleways through parkland should be explicitly designated? Will you work to amend the draft parks byelaws to accord with this?

Written Response: The proposed new byelaws are currently out for public consultation.

There is broadly balanced opinion around whether the general ban on cycling in parks should be lifted and it should not be assumed at this stage there is majority support in favour of this proposal. If there is, there would be very significant costs involved in creating designated cycle routes through the council's many parks and it would be difficult to police without large numbers of staff.

However, there are also difficulties in policing the current ban.

There will be an opportunity to further consider this issue once the consultation is complete and the wider views of park users and other stakeholders have been established.

CM2 From Cllr R Smith to Cllr Munkonge – Quarry Pavilion 1

Question

1. Who was responsible for the decision to install a key code system for the Quarry Pavillion in the Margaret Road Rec and why were stakeholders, hirers of the building not consulted?
2. Is the member content that the key new system is environmentally friendly and was a safeguarding risk assessment undertaken on the new key code system for the Quarry Pavilion building?

Written Response

Quarry pavilion is an Oxford City Council asset, the Council delegate the management and maintenance to ODS.

The decision to implement the new locking system is part of the general operational management of the pavilion, along with a number of similar sites across the city. This was implemented to improve the effective management of safe access to these spaces and ensure that we have a robust system in place for

	<p>managing who is utilising these spaces and when.</p> <p>We are working to ensure that we maximise usage across all of our pavilions and the new system will allow our communities to clearly see what availability there is and avoid any conflict with other users, which might in itself be a safeguarding issue. As this is an operational matter on safer access and that there are no fundamental changes, public consultation was not sought on this occasion.</p> <p>However, our community users and sports clubs that are registered on our Pitchbooking system were sent an email correspondence to advise them of the changes, notifying hirers of the new method of securing the building.</p>
--	---

CM3 From Cllr R Smith to Cllr Munkonge – Quarry Pavilion 2	
<p>Question</p> <p>Is the member content that the key new system is environmentally friendly and was a safeguarding risk assessment undertaken on the new key code system for the Quarry Pavilion building?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>The new system is more environmentally friendly than the previous system. It saves on fuel/ emissions as the previous process meant hirers had to come to Cutteslowe park to collect keys in advance of their booking and then return the keys after use. In addition, it saves on travelling emissions and time of Streetscene staff at a weekend having to travel to pavilions to unlock the top lock prior to hirers use. The new system will also avoid the need for replacement keys.</p> <p>Safeguarding risk assessments are carried out across all of our sites as part of the ongoing management and operation of these spaces. The new system will provide a more robust management system to ensure that we know who is entering the pavilions and when, which may help to reduce the</p>

	<p>safeguarding risk in this area.</p> <p>Hirers of the pavilions need to undertake their own safeguarding risk assessments where children, young people and vulnerable adults are in their care as part of the conditions of their bookings and those of the relevant National Governing Bodies of Sport.</p>
--	--

Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities

LU1 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Upton – Westgate car parking charges	
<p>Question</p> <p>The Council meets with the Westgate annually to discuss car park usage and how the Westgate could better promote use of the Park & Rides. What was the result of the meeting that was due to take place on the topic at the end of January 2024?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>Author: Emma Gubbins</p> <p>The Council usually meets with the Westgate management team in Q4 annually to discuss the parking tariff, along with general asset management matters. This year the meeting is scheduled to take place in Q1 24/25 as the Westgate have already confirmed their intention to increase charging in April 24, in addition to the uplift in September 23. The Council will be seeking to understand whether a further increase is planned for September 24.</p>

LU2 From Cllr Snowton to Cllr Upton – E-scooters on off-road cycleways	
<p>Question</p> <p>In general, Voi e-scooters are permitted to be ridden wherever a pedal cycle may be ridden. However, the draft park byelaws would exclude them from marked cycleways in parks, introducing confusion for riders and suppressing use of a desirable mode of transport. Will you work to bring the byelaws back into line with the general principle that cycle and e-scooter access is harmonised?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>Author: The proposed new byelaws are currently out for public consultation. Provisional feedback suggests there is broadly divided opinion around the lifting of the general ban on cycling in parks, but strong support to ban E-scooters.</p> <p>The legalities around where they can be used is not straightforward and their use 'off road' is also a matter for the</p>

LU2 From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Upton – E-scooters on off-road cycleways	
	landowner. However, there will be an opportunity to further consider this issue once the consultation is complete and the wider views of park users and other stakeholders have been established.

LU3 From Cllr Jarvis to Cllr Upton – Interim local centres	
Question Is it possible to designate ‘interim local centres’ during the period of a local plan’s implementation for areas not designated as local or district centres in the plan. If so, has the city council ever done so previously?	Written Response No, this is not possible. There is no mechanism for designating local centres outside of the Local Plan process. Local Centres have been identified in several previous local plans. In drafting the Local Plan 2040, we considered whether any additional ones should be added. We were alert to the NPPF definition of a local centre being clear that it can’t just include a parade of shops that serve only the immediate area. Also important to this consideration was the policy approach that applies to local centres (and district centres and the city centre), which is that there should be an area of active frontage notable in the street and that should be protected as an area of activity. We also looked at maps of access to facilities and services and considered where this was lacking. These considerations led us to add Underhill Circus to the list of local centres, other sites were examined, but were considered to be stretching the definition too far.

LU4 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Upton – Grandpont Nature Reserve	
Question Is the cabinet member concerned that in beginning to fell trees on Grandpont Nature Reserve, before having planning permission or a Forestry Commission	Written Response The Council was clear in all the press releases and correspondence with local people that the removal of trees did not

Licence in place, the council risks being accused of predetermining the outcome of the planning committee meeting regarding the planning application for the new bridge?	predetermine the outcome of the planning application for the bridge and, that if planning permission was not forthcoming that replacement tree planting would still be undertaken.
--	--

LU5 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Upton – Felling trees on Grandpont Nature Reserve 1	
Question When did the cabinet member become aware that the council was going to begin felling trees on Grandpont Nature Reserve in preparation for the building of the new bridge?	Written Response Key cabinet members were briefed on the issues and suggested approach by officers between 14 th February and 19 th February 2024.

LU6 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Upton – Felling trees on Grandpont Nature Reserve 2	
Question Why did the council begin to fell trees on Grandpont Nature Reserve when they did not have planning permission for the new bridge or a Forestry Commission Licence?	Written Response The programme for the delivery of the proposed bridge is dictated by the requirement to spend grant funding by March 2025. To meet this deadline construction will need to start over the summer. To remove the risk of birds nesting which would delay the construction and jeopardise the entire project, it was decided to remove and pollard the trees before the bird nesting season began. The Council’s technical advisors did not consider the works required a license. The trees removed did not require planning permission or a felling license. When advised a license may be necessary for further felling, work stopped.

LU7 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Upton – Felling trees on Grandpont Nature Reserve 3

<p>Question</p> <p>Can the cabinet member confirm that council will not fell any more trees on Grandpont Nature Reserve, in preparation for the new bridge, until it has been given a licence to do so by the Forestry Commission?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>The Council will not fell any more trees until either there is a felling license, or the works are confirmed as exempt from needing a license.</p>
---	--

<p>LU8 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Upton – Felling trees on Grandpont Nature Reserve 4</p>	
<p>Question</p> <p>Is the cabinet member grateful to the residents who prevented the council felling over 5 cubic metres of trees on Grandpont Nature Reserve, which, without a licence or planning permission in place, would have been an illegal act?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>Officers and members rely on the advice of technical specialists. The appointed technical specialists did not advise the works required a license. When the Forestry Commission informally advised they believed further felling may require a license, no further work was undertaken. It has been confirmed that a felling license was not required for the trees that have been removed. The Council has therefore not undertaken illegal works. The council always seeks to be transparent about the work it undertakes, which is why we publicised that this work would be taking place, and listens to the input of others, which it has in this case.</p> <p>Author: Jenny Barker Susan: amend</p>

<p>LU9 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Upton – Grandpont Meadow/Oxpens bridge 1</p>	
<p>Question</p> <p>What is the full cost of the proposed new bridge from Grandpont Meadow to Oxpens, and how is it being funded?</p>	<p>Written Response</p> <p>The full cost of providing the proposed Oxpens River Bridge will not be known until the design work is complete later this year. The bridge will need to be delivered within the grant funding that has been achieved.</p> <p>Funding of £8.6m from the Oxfordshire Growth Deal is being held for the proposed bridge. Funding of £1.7m has been identified through the Housing</p>

	Infrastructure Grant from Homes England for path works connected to the proposed bridge.
--	--

LU10 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Upton – Grandpont Meadow/Oxpens bridge 2	
Question	Written Response
Can the cabinet member give details of what arrangements are in place with the County Council, should the Oxpens Bridge project look at risk not being completed in time and is he satisfied that the County Council has the resources to meet these commitments?	City and County Council officers are working closely on the planning, design and delivery of the proposed bridge. The current programme shows the bridge being delivered by March 2025 and this is being carefully monitored. The bridge will be adopted by the County Council once complete. The County Council has retained £200k Growth Deal funding for their work on the proposed bridge.

LU11 From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Upton – Grandpont Meadow/Oxpens bridge 3	
Question	Written Response
Given that the council has declared a climate emergency and that it is widely agreed that it is generally much greener to refurbish/improve existing infrastructure rather than to build new, did the council seriously consider improving the existing bridge across the Thames, particularly the landing on North bank, before committing to the proposed new bridge from Grandpont Meadow to Oxpens?	<p>The bridge is a dedicated cycling and walking bridge, which is fully aligned with the Council’s support for increased active travel in response to the climate emergency. The bridge is also required by our adopted Local Plan 2036 to connect future development on Osney Mead with the Oxpens site and the city centre. It is a County Council scheme that is being delivered by the City Council with Oxfordshire Growth Deal Funding.</p> <p>A study was undertaken on behalf of the County Council by Skanska to explore the potential to undertake improvements to the Gas Works rail bridge to enable it to be designated as a cycle route. The study identified that considerable work would be necessary to the bridge, access on the northside, the bridge over Castlemill Stream and the meadows to accommodate cycling. It would also be a longer route than the proposed bridge alignment and not as accessible during times of flooding. This study was completed prior to the proposed new</p>

	bridge being taken forward and contributed to the decision for a new bridge.
--	--

LU12 From Cllr Pegg to Cllr Upton – Meadow Lane planning application	
Question	Written Response
<p>Can the Cabinet member confirm the arrangements in place to ensure a strategic approach is taken by officers in considering and bringing forward for decision the planning application(s) concerning Meadow Lane, particularly with regards to the riverside land between Fairacres Road and Donnington Bridge?</p>	<p>The Oxford Local Plan sets the vision and strategy for all development within Oxford City. Where sites are allocated in the Local Plan, the relevant site-specific policies provide a strategic overview regarding their delivery and set clear expectations as to what development will be supported. Land at Meadow Lane is currently allocated for residential development within the Local Plan 2036 (SP42) and within the emerging Local Plan 2040 (SPS13). It is the only allocated site in the Meadow Lane area and is located to the south of Fairacres Road and Donnington Bridge. The allocation at Meadow Lane sets out the need for specific consideration about open space, nature and flood risk, heritage and movement and access (amongst other factors).</p> <p>Sites which come forward outside of the site allocations are considered on their own merits and are expected to comply with the broad range of policies that comprise the Local Plan. Where relevant, and possible, officers will encourage comprehensive developments that consider neighbouring sites and landowners. For all developments, consultation with statutory and non-statutory consultees is undertaken to inform the decision-making process. Likewise, engagement with internal and external stakeholders will also be carried out by officers throughout the pre-application and application process.</p>

NC1 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Chapman – Fines for littering**Question**

What is the total income of fines given out for littering in Oxford over the last 12 months?

Written Response

Between 1 March 2023 and 14 March 2024, there were fixed penalty notice fines of £675 issued for littering.

NC2 From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Chapman – Housing Management System Update**Question**

Will you please update Council concerning the ongoing remediation of the issues affecting the Housing Management System that led to its late and problematic introduction?

Written Response

The Council's Housing & Asset Management system and its associated mobile working solution will have been live for three years this coming May. The remediation has taken place successfully and it is fully operational across the many Council and ODS services, including Incomes, Tenancy Management, ASBIT & CRT, Tenancy Sustainment, Temporary Accommodation, Housing Needs, the Contact Centre, Property Services for planned maintenance and in ODS, Building Services (repairs), H&S compliance, Voids, StreetScene, Pest Control and Parks. The members briefing of 9th February highlighted the many technological benefits that are operational within ODS.

NC3 From Cllr Pegg to Cllr Chapman – Cricket Road trees**Question**

Can the cabinet member provide an update on the replacement of trees on Cricket Road, following the death of trees planted there last year?

Written Response

All of the replacement trees have been planted on Cricket Road. The ODS tree team has advised that the reason for the failure of some of the trees, was that with the limited lead time for the planting in Winter 22/23 for the Queen's Green Canopy, the usual supplier was not available, which impacted on quality. The new trees will be closely maintained over a three-year period.

Cabinet Member for Safer Communities

ML1 From Cllr Aziz to Cllr Lygo – Islamophobic hate crime and antisemitism

Question

Following Tell Mama's report on Islamophobic hate crime showing a 235% rise in reported Islamophobic hate-crime since October 8th 2023, with the vast majority of cases impacting Muslim women, what work is being done by the cabinet member and stakeholders to ensure Oxford's diverse Muslim communities know that they are supported and are encouraged to report Islamophobic hate crime, including misogynist hate.

What work is being done to support members of the Jewish community over a big national rise in antisemitic hate-crime?

Written Response

The Council and Oxford Local Police Area work closely with the Oxford Council of Faiths to celebrate the strong friendships between our communities in Oxford. The police Independent Advisory Group, Community and Diversity Officer and our Locality Managers work with community representatives of all faiths to encourage reporting of hate crime.

ML2 From Cllr Aziz to Cllr Lygo – Make knife crime a public health issue

Question

What work is being done by the cabinet member for safer communities and stakeholders across the city to tackle knife crime in the city? Oxford has seen another spate of stabbings over the past few weeks. Will the cabinet member support Cllr Jabu Nala Hartley's call to re-frame knife crime through a public health lens to better support young people - especially with their mental health?

Written Response

The Oxford Community Safety Partnership brings together the police, councils, and other local partners to tackle serious violence and knife crime. The Oxfordshire Violence and Vulnerability Strategy illustrates this partnership approach and can be found on the Oxfordshire County Council website. The strategy uses a public health approach, working with youth organisations across the city including our Youth Ambition Team, to support young people and provide them with positive activities.

Cabinet Member for Culture and Events

JH1 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Hunt – Museum entry fee for non-residents

Question

What is the Cabinet's position on charging non-residents a small entrance fee for entry to the museum at the town hall?

Written Response

The museum is currently operating a 'Pay What You Can' model, encouraging users do donate what they can afford, including a recommended donation.

The museum management team are currently reviewing options around charging non-residents and the impact this will have on footfall, income and fundraising outcomes. These options will be available for consideration in Q1 of 24/25.

JH2 From Cllr Miles to Cllr Hunt – Revocation of pavement terraces permissions

Question

Would it possible to revoke pavement licences for cafe's where pavement parking by customers next to the cafe is a problem, and difficult to enforce? If so, what evidence would be needed to take this course of action?

Written Response

Parking enforcement matters on the highway including pavements are enforced by Parking Enforcement, Oxfordshire County Council Highways Department using the Traffic Management Act 2004 . When there is a substantiated complaint in relation to a public safety issue concerning a pavement licence and the suitability of the space, due process outlined in the Business and Planning Act 2020 and levelling up and Regeneration Act 2023 would be applied.

To: Council

Date: 18 March 2024

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. Address from Zuhura Plummer
2. Address from Dr. Sheikh Ramzy
3. Address from Danny Yee
4. Question from Richard Parnham
5. Question from Dr. Dominik Metz
6. Address from Kaddy Beck

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

1. Address from Zuhura Plummer

This motion mixes up three different traffic interventions – the LTNs, the filters and the workplace parking levy - and casually asks that all of them are dropped despite them being very different policies, covering different areas, with different aims, at totally different stages of implementation. This clearly demonstrates that while the proposers claim they are interested in evidence; they're not.

If they were interested in evidence they might note that in 2013 a poll of Oxfordshire business showed 76% thought congestion adversely affected them¹. In 2016, the Strategic Economic Plan put congestion and housing as the two most pressing challenges for the economy.

In the same year, the Oxford Mail reported “traffic jams ... worse than ever” and mentioned bad jams on Botley Road, Cowley Road, London Road and Iffley Road². This was way before any LTNs.

We have 100,000 houses being built in our county³, which means about 142k more cars on our roads⁴. If cars remain the default we are **all** going to be sitting in gridlock. It's common sense that some of us are going to have to swap out some car journeys to keep the city moving. Few people are going to do that by being asked nicely – hence traffic filters and LTNs which make driving less convenient, *while* making the alternatives better – the filters speed up buses and LTNs make cycling and walking safer and nicer.

The LTNs have manifestly succeeded in their primary goal of making walking and cycling safer and more accessible. For example, at Larkrise primary - a school with 20% pupil premium children and 40% on the SEN register - the LTNs and school streets have enabled ninety children, a fifth of the pupils, to switch from being driven to walking, cycling, scooting⁵. That's 360 fewer times cars are driven to the school and out again.

Let's look at the evidence around the Cowley Road

We tracked every opening and closing of business from 2010 to the present day on the Cowley Road from the Cape of Good Hope to Divinity Road –168 premises. Between 15-16 open and close along the stretch every year. These figures remained the same since the LTNs went in, in fact there was a dip in closures in 2022⁶. The Cowley road is a vibrant and brilliant place because 40,000 people live within walking distance⁷, something that's nicer to do with LTNs.

Let's look at the evidence around air pollution. The article which Cllr Reham and Aziz have referenced clearly stats that air pollution at the Plain was still lower 2022, post the LTNs, than it was in that same location in 2019 before the LTNs⁸. Of course, there was a rise between 2021 to 2022 as we all returned to normal life. The article they reference, which is based on the City Council annual air quality report, shows you huge reductions in pollution within LTNs while simultaneously having a slight decrease at Oxford most polluted spot⁹. This is a win for everyone.

But it is telling what issues the proposers do not mention where there is extremely strong evidence. For example, around inactivity. The Royal College of Surgeons recently announced that 20 minutes of light exercise daily, such as walking or cycling a short journey, cuts the risk of dementia by 30%, type 2 diabetes by 40%, breast cancer by 25%, depression by 30%, heart disease by 40% and osteoporosis by 50%¹⁰. Some people might look at this evidence and say ‘my gosh, we should make it as easy as possible for people to make better choices for themselves! Despite a multi-billion dollar

¹ <https://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/business/news/10743126.traffic-jams-major-threat-county-economy/>

² <https://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/news/14639676.traffic-jams-worse-ever-oxfordshire-businesses-count-cost-congestio>

³ https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/file/roads-and-transport-connecting-oxfordshire/Strategic_Assessment_traffic_filter.pdf

⁴ <https://www.nimblefins.co.uk/cheap-car-insurance/number-cars-great-britain>

⁵ https://primarysite-prod-sorted.s3.amazonaws.com/larkrise-ps/UploadedDocument/f050dbcf-503e-42a9-8932-b8425be8dfb3/27.larkrise-news-2021_2022-13th-may-2022.pdf

⁶ https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1m-MKf46mp3iUxr5ijD_vKsziSD5ENg-e/edit#gid=405704725

⁷ www.dataptive.com based on Census 2021

⁸ https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cgr61x5y28zo_amp

⁹ <https://www.oxford.gov.uk/downloads/file/833/air-quality-annual-status-report-2022>

¹⁰ <https://publishing.rcseng.ac.uk/doi/full/10.1308/rcsbull.2020.28>

car industry wanting us to drive everywhere, let's make it more inconvenient to drive, and nicer to walk or cycle! But no, they're suggesting we do the opposite.

Let's also look at what might happen if the County were to follow this suggestion and just dump the traffic filters. The traffic filters speed up buses. This is overriding, overwhelming reason they were chosen above other measures. This is what would happen if the filters were dumped:

Two brand new bus routes wouldn't happen. These are outer loops and will around the city so you don't have to change in the centre. Both will serve the hospital from the west, south and east. Maybe the proposers would like these to be cancelled?

- Would they like the planned increased frequency of the 3a and 5a serving Littlemore to be cancelled?
- Would they like the planned increase frequency of buses serving Wallingford, Didcot and Banbury to be cancelled?
- Would they like the planned increased frequency of P&R services on Sundays to be cancelled?
- Would like the 159 electric buses, invested in as a direct result of the traffic filters, to be cancelled? Would they prefer big petrol buses to keep pumping out toxic fumes on the arterial roads of Oxford?

Those bus improvements are coming about because buses are going to be faster, which frees up drivers and vehicles along a route.

I have some sympathy for the request around school streets for private schools. These schools tend to have far, far higher rates of car drop offs as they are non-catchment schools¹¹, and compared to state schools they are located closer into the centre of Oxford¹² – driving traffic right into the centre of our city. I believe the schools need to be far more proactive about a school bus for each individual school, and simply buy HomeRun, which is a secure app designed especially for school liftsharing. Luckily for the people of Oxford, the traffic filters are likely to drive behaviour changes around private schools, although, like Cllr Rehman and Aziz I would like to see much more done in this area.

I would urge you to oppose this motion today.

¹¹ <https://www.solvetheschoolrun.org/our-data>

¹² <https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/edit?mid=1iAf6p2z4rVUlnKTJ2WiASnjRtA5WqA&ll=51.75615078985504%2C-1.2346043499999948&z=12>

2. Address from Dr. Sheikh Ramzy

Honourable esteemed Members of the Oxford City Council,

Greetings and blessings

In light of our city's rich history and commitment to inclusivity, I would like to request that Oxford City Council consider giving its support to a two state solution to end the conflict in Gaza. This proposal reflects our shared values of justice, equality, and the pursuit of peace, aligning with the United Kingdom government's endorsement of a two-state solution for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The enduring conflict between Israel and Palestine has resulted in profound suffering and loss for both sides of the conflict. It is widely acknowledged that a comprehensive resolution is essential to ensure the security and rights of all parties involved. Central to this resolution is the establishment of a viable and independent Palestinian state alongside Israel.

Should Oxford City Council provide support for such a solution it represents a significant and symbolic step towards the parties to the conflict advancing the peace process. It underscores our solidarity with the Palestinian people and affirms the Council believes that a solution should be underpinned by international law, self-determination, and human rights. By confirming its support the Council will demonstrate support for a just and lasting solution to the conflict.

Oxford City Council, as the authority of a city renowned for its prestigious academic institutions and diverse community, is well-suited to lead by example in supporting the recognition of Palestine. As a city that values inclusivity and tolerance, Oxford City Council has a responsibility to champion the rights of marginalized communities. By endorsing this proposal, the Council honour our tradition of standing up for justice and equality.

In 2014 Sweden to recognised Palestine as a state in 2014, setting an important precedent for other nations and municipalities. By supporting a two-state solution, Oxford City Council will be lending its voice to the global momentum behind the recognition of Palestine. Such collective action amplifies the voices of the Palestinian people and strengthens calls for constructive dialogue and negotiation.

In conclusion, I urge the Oxford City Council to consider lending its support to the two-state solution to the conflict, demonstrating Oxford's unwavering commitment to peace and human rights, affirming your values as a compassionate and progressive city and standing in solidarity with those striving for dignity and freedom.

3. Address from Danny Yee

Outside my front door is a marked parking bay which can, if everyone parks carefully, just fit four small cars. But even one large car reduces its capacity to three.

Those of you who drive may have experienced finding a space in a car parking lot only for there to be wide vehicles on either side, right up to the dividing line, making the space impossible or very difficult to use. And car parks that might have had a hundred spaces twenty years ago may now only have eighty, because they have to cater for wider cars.

So charging larger vehicles more for parking would be justified simply on fairness grounds. But larger vehicles also create a whole range of community harms - pretty much all the harms created by cars are worse with larger and heavier cars.

In some places on-street parking has been shifted onto pavements, making them difficult or impossible to use for people walking or wheeling, because wider cars parked on the carriageway wouldn't leave enough room for bin lorries or fire engines.

A child is eight times more likely to die in a collision with an SUV than with an ordinary car, because they go under the SUV rather than onto the bonnet of the car. And because larger vehicles have poor visibility they are more likely to hit children, especially when reversing. Larger vehicles also contribute to road danger indirectly, even when parked or stationary, because they block visibility, raising the risk of collisions between other people - walking, wheeling, cycling or driving.¹³

Heavier vehicles cause more damage than lighter ones, both to the carriageway and to pavements. This is non-linear, and some analyses suggest the heaviest SUVs may do twenty times as much damage as a typical car.

Particulate air pollution largely comes from tyre wear, road dust resuspension, and brake wear. This means it is not solved by electrification, but also that larger vehicles create more of it. There is no safe level of particulate air pollution, which is why the World Health Organisation guidelines are now 20% of the UK legal limits.

Finally, larger vehicles burn more fuel and emit more carbon dioxide. All the decarbonisation gains achieved by vehicle electrification have been undone by increasing vehicle size.¹⁴

So we need to discourage the ownership and use of larger vehicles, especially in urban areas such as Oxford with large numbers of people walking and cycling and breathing the air. Increased parking charges would be a small but direct deterrent but would also, if accompanied by a suitable explanatory campaign, provide moral and psychological suasion.

Many other local authorities have emissions-based charging and a few have size or weight-based charging. Oxford and Oxfordshire should follow them. Please support this motion.

¹³ <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0022437522000810>

¹⁴ <https://infotec.news/2023/11/28/suvs-massively-undermine-efforts-to-decarbonise-transport-says-report/>

4. Question from Richard Parnham

This question is mainly directed at Anne Railton, Oxford City Council Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice.

"Can the cabinet member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice explain whether or not the Oxford Air Quality Annual Status report for 2023 will include a detailed analysis of historic / recent NO₂ pollution levels across the planned Oxford ZEZ expansion zone?"

5. Question from Dr. Dominik Metz

Dear Leader of the Cabinet Member,

I am a GP working in a community with a hotel housing asylum seekers. As more asylum seekers are granted refugee status, they are also being given 1 month notice (or less) of eviction from the hotels they reside in. As many will not have received any state financial support by this time and will not have had the necessary documents to find a job, they are facing destitution. As a GP working with asylum seekers, I can confirm that many are vulnerable for multiple reasons. My personal experience is that this month alone over 25 refugees from an Oxfordshire hotel are being evicted. I am very concerned for their welfare and ask the council if this current situation can be classed a housing/homelessness emergency? What measures can the Council take to support such persons?

6. Address from Kaddy Beck

We are campaigning to save Bertie Park, the only recreation ground in the southern half of the Hinksey Park ward.

How many times have you told us:

“Bertie Park has been on local plans for 20 years,” and “there’s been extensive consultation?”

Both are false. Your proposals depart from all previous plans which all required the park to be moved. You never asked us if we wanted the Park destroyed.

Bertie Park is not judged surplus to requirements, but your 2040 local plan has simply dropped the requirement to move it.

It says the Park is suitable for residential housing because “there is potential ... to replace the function of the site partially within the site and partially elsewhere in the local area.”

It says there should be a playground (of some sort) within the new development. The Multi-Use-Games Area could become “an alternative type of facility,” or maybe you could “increase the capacity” of the small kick-about area on Fox Crescent. The recreation ground itself isn’t mentioned.

Your current consultation on local byelaws shows that Bertie will disappear from the map.

In compensation, you will improve access to what you now call the Cold Harbour Nature Area.

No-one is concerned about access. Parents don’t allow kids to go there alone because it’s scary. There’s no natural surveillance. You’ve never any idea who or what you could find there. Thames Valley Police have said it’s not safe for unaccompanied children.

We are not NIMBYs. If you wanted to build housing there, few would object. But we do object to you building on our recreation ground.

Government guidance states that recreational space should only be built on if “the loss resulting from the proposed development (is) replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.”

Our research shows our community is of the overwhelming opinion that this would not be the case.

You have no intention of complying with government guidance. Yet you insist that new facilities will meet the needs of existing and future users.

After you have granted planning permission, you will ask us whether the fence posts should be blue or red and whether we want swings or roundabouts.

When Bertie Park has gone, you’ll say “there’s been extensive consultation” and “we are meeting the community’s needs.”

We all know that Oxford is a housing catastrophe; 3,000 people on the housing list; most ordinary working people can't afford to live here. You say that building on our 1.7-acre park will transform the lives of 31 families. "Don't we want somewhere for our children to live?"

Meanwhile, on the North Oxford Development, you have different priorities. The 64-acre site will provide one million square feet of labs and workspaces, 4,500 jobs, 3 public parks, but only 480 homes. This will super-charge the housing crisis. Advertised as a "model of sustainable living," few working people will afford to live there. If this site was used for housing, you could build 1,237 homes.

In this part of Oxford, you intend to build an additional 230 homes. UK children are getting less exercise than ever, but you want to destroy the only park we've got. Hinksey Park is over a kilometre away. For residents of your new development on Redbridge Meadow, it will be even further.

Will you use the 3 new parks in North Oxford for social housing too? It is clearly one rule for them, and another rule for us.

What makes this worse is that you are keeping us in the dark. Last time you gave us notice that Bertie Park would be discussed at cabinet, we leafletted our area to let everyone know. Many were disappointed when it was dropped from the agenda at the last minute. So now you keep quiet.

We've signed up for alerts. Each month we wait for cabinet and planning committee agendas to appear. Appropriation of Bertie Park has been on 3 forward plans. The latest says you'll decide in June. But we know you could cancel again. You're having us on.

We are Oxford residents. If you are determined to build on our only community facility, the least you could do is to keep us informed.

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Council
Date: 29 January 2024
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 6 March 2024, 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 Independent Group, Labour, Liberal Democrat, Green, Oxford Social Independents groups in that order.

Introduction

- a) Cancel divisive non-evidence-based transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens trust in democracy. (Proposed by Cllr Ajaz Rehman, seconded by Cllr Shaista Aziz) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Sandy Douglas, seconded by Cllr Mary Clarkson]
- b) Uniting to tackle Oxford's Housing Crisis (proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Chris Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman]
- c) In Support of Green Investment (proposed by Cllr Chris Snowton, seconded by Cllr Katherine Miles) [Amendment Proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Alex Hollingsworth]
- d) Weight and emissions based parking charges (proposed by Cllr Emily Kerr, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman) [Amendment Proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Louise Upton]
- e) The Cost-of-living crisis and local government funding (proposed by Cllr Ed Turner, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman)

a) Cancel divisive non-evidence-based transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens trust in democracy. (Proposed by Cllr Ajaz Rehman, seconded by Cllr Shaista Aziz) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Sandy Douglas, seconded by Cllr Mary Clarkson]

Independent Group Motion

This council calls on the leader to write to Oxfordshire County council and the transport minister to remove Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and cancel planned traffic filters.

LTNs have been introduced as part of schemes to reduce congestion and encourage active travel. They have failed to meet their stated objectives.

Congestion has increased and cycling remains a hazardous mode of transport.¹

Pollution has reduced in the streets where LTNs have been introduced, however the opposite has occurred on roads that are now heavily congested.²

The intention of congestion free bus travel has failed to materialise and Oxford's bus companies have expressed their disappointment at East Oxford LTNs being approved.³

Divisive transport policies are pitting people and communities against each other on class, social economic and racial lines in a way similar to the Tory Poll Tax, which was eventually scrapped. The most vulnerable in society have also been ignored with no amendments for the elderly⁴ or residents with disabilities.⁵

As democratically elected representatives it is our duty to find answers and develop and support policies that work and are fair. Imposing unpopular and seemingly failing strategies will not achieve behavioural change in encouraging active travel.

Residential neighbourhoods such as Littlemore have been left feeling isolated and cut off.⁶

80% of businesses and 60% of consultation respondents oppose the introduction of East Oxford LTNs.⁷

Independent businesses are part of the life blood of what makes East Oxford the vibrant, diverse place it is.

Cowley Road business owners have been vocally opposed to the LTNs.⁸

To reverse years of neglect of Oxford's transport infrastructure requires real investment from central government. In the meantime, this council agrees to propose to the County Council that they:

- Prioritise bringing in School Streets for all Private schools in the city.
- Ensure NHS staff and school teachers are excluded from any work place levy across the city.
- Lobby central government for major investment in infrastructure with safe clear segregated routes for pedestrians and cyclists and roads for motor vehicles.

¹ [Oxfordshire County Council will add traffic lights to 'dangerous' roundabout - BBC News](#)

² [Oxford air pollution falls by 8% in 2022, council report says - BBC News](#)

³ <https://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/news/23852089.oxford-bus-companies-disappointed-ltn-recommendation/>

⁴ [East Oxford residents who are pro- LTN share early doubts about LTN trial | Oxford Mail](#)

⁵ [Oxford LTNs: Council leaves 'most vulnerable' behind | thisisoxfordshire](#)

⁶ <https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/end-traffic-barriers-in-littlemore-and-cowley>

⁷ [aebhdfh \(oxfordshire.gov.uk\)](#)

⁸ [Oxford Cowley Road traders produce shock business survey on LTNs | Oxford Mail](#)

- Scrap plans for divisive traffic filters - which are not evidence based.
-

Labour Group Amendment

Amend ~~Cancel divisive non-evidence based transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens' trust in democracy~~

This Council calls on the Leader to write to Oxfordshire County Council Council to seek amendments to ~~the~~ and ~~the transport minister to remove~~ Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and ~~cancel planned traffic filters~~ **trials**.

LTNs have been introduced as part of schemes to reduce **road danger** congestion and encourage active travel. They ~~have failed to meet their stated objectives~~.

Congestion has increased **in some areas** and cycling **safety needs further improvement** ~~remains a hazardous mode of transport~~.

Whilst pollution has reduced in the streets where LTNs have been introduced, ~~however~~ the opposite has occurred on **some** roads that are now **more** heavily congested.

~~The intention of congestion free bus travel has failed to materialise and Oxford's bus companies have expressed their disappointment at the impact of the premature and badly co-ordinated implementation of the East Oxford LTNs~~ **East Oxford LTNs being approved**.

Following poor consultation and communication by the County Council, they have ~~divisive transport policies are pitting people and communities against each other~~ **squandered good will towards measures which can reduce traffic congestion and improve bus punctuality**. ~~on class, social economic and racial lines. in a way similar to the Tory Poll Tax, which was eventually scrap~~

Despite extensive representations to the County Council by local councillors who know their wards well, the most vulnerable in society have ~~also been ignored with~~ no amendments **agreed for elderly people** or residents with disabilities.

As democratically elected representatives, it is our duty to find answers and develop and support policies that work and are fair. ~~Imposing unpopular and seemingly failing strategies will not achieve behavioural change in encouraging active travel. Residential neighbourhoods such as Littlemore have been left feeling isolated and cut off.~~

~~80% of businesses and 60% of consultation respondents opposed~~ the introduction of East Oxford LTNs. Independent businesses are part of the life blood of what makes East Oxford the vibrant, diverse place it is. **Some** Cowley Road business owners have been vocally opposed to the LTNs.

To reverse years of neglect of Oxford's transport infrastructure requires real investment from central government. ~~In the meantime,~~ this Council agrees to propose to the County Council that they:

- Prioritise bringing in School Streets for ~~all private schools~~ **where appropriate** in the city **and work with private schools to reduce their impact on congestion**.
- Lobby central government for major investment in **public transport and infrastructure**, with safe clear segregated routes **and safer junctions** for pedestrians and cyclists ~~and roads for motor vehicles~~.
- ~~Ensure NHS and school teachers are excluded from any work place levy across the city.~~ **Work with the NHS and schools to understand the impact of the WPL upon them and ensure key workers have safe, convenient travel options.**

- Where LTN ANPR is in use and there is clear and sustained local demand, grant exemptions to blue badge holders and carers, and re-open these roads for local traffic outside school travel hours either by turning off cameras or using permits for local residents.
 - ~~Scrap plans for divisive traffic filters, which are not evidence based.~~ Commit to public and independent evaluation of the traffic filter trials against agreed success criteria before any decision to make them permanent, so that they only remain if supported by the evidence.
-

If amended, the Motion would read:

Amend transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens' trust in democracy

This Council calls on the Leader to write to Oxfordshire County Council Council to seek amendments to the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and planned traffic filters trials.

LTNs have been introduced as part of **schemes** to reduce road danger and encourage active travel.

Congestion has increased in some areas and cycling safety needs further improvement.

Whilst pollution has reduced in the streets where LTNs have been introduced, however the opposite has occurred on some roads that are now more heavily congested.

Oxford's bus companies have expressed their disappointment at the impact of the premature and badly co-ordinated implementation of the East Oxford LTNs.

Following poor consultation and communication by the County Council, they have squandered good will towards measures which can reduce traffic congestion and improve bus punctuality.

Despite extensive representations to the County Council by local councillors who know their wards well, the most vulnerable in society have been ignored with no amendments agreed for elderly people or residents with disabilities.

As democratically elected representatives, it is our duty to find answers and develop and support policies that work and are fair. Residential neighbourhoods such as Littlemore have been left feeling isolated and cut off.

60% of consultation respondents opposed the introduction of East Oxford LTNs. Independent businesses are part of the life blood of what makes East Oxford the vibrant, diverse place it is. Some Cowley Road business owners have been vocally opposed to the LTNs.

To reverse years of neglect of Oxford's transport infrastructure requires real investment from central government. This Council agrees to propose to the County Council that they:

- Prioritise bringing in School Streets where appropriate in the city and work with private schools to reduce their impact on congestion.
- Lobby central government for major investment in public transport and infrastructure, with safe clear segregated routes and safer junctions for pedestrians and cyclists.

- Work with the NHS and schools to understand the impact of the WPL upon them and ensure key workers have safe, convenient travel options.
- Where LTN ANPR is in use and there is clear and sustained local demand, grant exemptions to blue badge holders and carers, and re-open these roads for local traffic outside school travel hours either by turning off cameras or using permits for local residents.
- Commit to public and independent evaluation of the traffic filter trials against agreed success criteria before any decision to make them permanent, so that they only remain if supported by the evidence.

b) Uniting to tackle Oxford's Housing Crisis (proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Chris Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman]

Labour Group Motion

This Council notes with alarm the growing number of local households facing homelessness in Oxford and the increased pressure this has placed on our homelessness prevention services and on access to temporary accommodation.

This Council had brought down the number of people in temporary accommodation to around 100 households. But over the past year, this number has increased to approximately 220 households, and the figure is projected to reach 315 by July.

The rapid rise means that the 120 units of temporary accommodation owned by the council are no longer sufficient and we need to increasingly rely on hotel rooms to meet our statutory duties. This is a miserable and difficult situation for the families being placed in hotels and it has a huge unbudgeted financial cost for this council which is being left to pick up the bill.

This Council has moved swiftly to mitigate the situation by buying and leasing more temporary accommodation, block-booking hotels, hiring new staff to prevent homelessness and using more of our council owned homes for temporary accommodation.

These efforts have saved Oxford taxpayers about £2m, but this Council is still projecting a hole in the budget of as much as £3m every year – equivalent to 12.5% of the Council's annual net budget.

This Council is also finding it increasingly difficult to help people in temporary accommodation and our non-statutory homeless services to find affordable long-term homes.

This Council is working hard on behalf of the people of Oxford to deliver the affordable high-quality homes our city needs. We have retained our 7,900 council homes and we set up OX Place, our wholly owned housing company, to build 2,000 new homes over the next decade. Working in partnership with housing associations, we have a four-year programme to deliver 1600 affordable homes, including over 850 for social rent.

We also fund over 400 beds in supported accommodation for adults not entitled to statutory support.

We call upon:

- Council, regardless of the political groups, to unite behind our Labour Cabinet led housing programme. With limited land available for development in the city, we need to ensure sites identified for housing development in the Oxford Local Plan are used for that purpose. It is not responsible to debate alternative uses or play politics by appealing to narrow sectional interests and NIMBYism.
- The Leader of the Council to write to our neighbouring district councils to request, on behalf of this Council, that they unite with us, honour their duty to co-operate, and deliver the over 100 homes per year until 2040 which Oxford needs but cannot accommodate within our tight city boundaries.

- The Council to support the Leader of the Council's request for a meeting with Michael Gove, SoS for DLUHC, to discuss the spiralling costs of providing temporary accommodation. The extra £240,000 so far allocated is inadequate and the Tory Government needs to properly reimburse this council for the costs involved in picking up the pieces of their failures on housing and the economy.
-

Green Group Amendment

This Council notes with alarm the growing number of local households facing homelessness in Oxford and the increased pressure this has placed on our homelessness prevention services and on access to temporary accommodation.

This Council had brought down the number of people in temporary accommodation to around 100 households. But over the past year, this number has increased to approximately 220 households, and the figure is projected to reach 315 by July.

The rapid rise means that the 120 units of temporary accommodation owned by the council are no longer sufficient and we need to increasingly rely on hotel rooms to meet our statutory duties. This is a miserable and difficult situation for the families being placed in hotels and it has a huge unbudgeted financial cost for this council which is being left to pick up the bill.

This Council has moved swiftly to mitigate the situation by buying and leasing more temporary accommodation, block-booking hotels, hiring new staff to prevent homelessness and using more of our council owned homes for temporary accommodation.

These efforts have saved Oxford taxpayers about £2m, but this Council is still projecting a hole in the budget of as much as £3m every year – equivalent to 12.5% of the Council's annual net budget.

This Council is also finding it increasingly difficult to help people in temporary accommodation and our non-statutory homeless services to find affordable long-term homes.

This Council is working hard on behalf of the people of Oxford to deliver the affordable high-quality homes our city needs. We have retained our 7,900 council homes and we set up OX Place, our wholly owned housing company, to build 2,000 new homes over the next decade. Working in partnership with housing associations, we have a four-year programme to deliver 1600 affordable homes, including over 850 for social rent.

We also fund over 400 beds in supported accommodation for adults not entitled to statutory support.

We call upon:

- ~~Council, regardless of the political groups, to unite behind our Labour Cabinet led housing programme. With limited land available for development in the city, we need to ensure sites identified for housing development in the Oxford Local Plan are used for that purpose. It is not responsible to debate alternative uses or play politics by appealing to narrow sectional interests and NIMBYism.~~
- ~~The Leader of the Council to write to our neighbouring district councils to request, on behalf of this Council, that they unite with us, honour their duty to co-~~

~~operate, and deliver the over 100 homes per year until 2040 which Oxford needs but cannot accommodate within our tight city boundaries.~~

- Council to continue to support an ambitious programme of housebuilding within Oxford to play our part in alleviating the housing and temporary accommodation crises, recognising that remaining space within the city is limited.
 - The leader of the council to write to neighbouring districts asking them to continue to honour agreements to meet some of Oxford's unmet housing need.
 - Council to support the Leader of the Council's request for a meeting with Michael Gove, SoS for DLUHC, to discuss the spiralling costs of providing temporary accommodation. The extra £240,000 so far allocated is inadequate and the Tory Government needs to properly reimburse this council for the costs involved in picking up the pieces of their failures on housing and the economy.
 - The leader of the council to write to Michael Gove reiterating our call to be given powers to introduce controls on private sector rents and the short term let sector, as well as calling for an end to the disastrous right to buy policy to begin to tackle the housing and temporary accommodation crises.
-

If amended, the motion would read:

This Council notes with alarm the growing number of local households facing homelessness in Oxford and the increased pressure this has placed on our homelessness prevention services and on access to temporary accommodation.

This Council had brought down the number of people in temporary accommodation to around 100 households. But over the past year, this number has increased to approximately 220 households, and the figure is projected to reach 315 by July.

The rapid rise means that the 120 units of temporary accommodation owned by the council are no longer sufficient and we need to increasingly rely on hotel rooms to meet our statutory duties. This is a miserable and difficult situation for the families being placed in hotels and it has a huge unbudgeted financial cost for this council which is being left to pick up the bill.

This Council has moved swiftly to mitigate the situation by buying and leasing more temporary accommodation, block-booking hotels, hiring new staff to prevent homelessness and using more of our council owned homes for temporary accommodation.

These efforts have saved Oxford taxpayers about £2m, but this Council is still projecting a hole in the budget of as much as £3m every year – equivalent to 12.5% of the Council's annual net budget.

This Council is also finding it increasingly difficult to help people in temporary accommodation and our non-statutory homeless services to find affordable long-term homes.

This Council is working hard on behalf of the people of Oxford to deliver the affordable high-quality homes our city needs. We have retained our 7,900 council homes and we set up OX Place, our wholly owned housing company, to build 2,000 new homes over the next decade. Working in partnership with housing associations, we have a four-year programme to deliver 1600 affordable homes, including over 850 for social rent.

We also fund over 400 beds in supported accommodation for adults not entitled to statutory support.

We call upon:

- Council to continue to support an ambitious programme of housebuilding within Oxford to play our part in alleviating the housing and temporary accommodation crises, recognising that remaining space within the city is limited.
- The leader of the council to write to neighbouring districts asking them to continue to honour agreements to meet some of Oxford's unmet housing need.
- Council to support the Leader of the Council's request for a meeting with Michael Gove, SoS for DLUHC, to discuss the spiralling costs of providing temporary accommodation. The extra £240,000 so far allocated is inadequate and the Tory Government needs to properly reimburse this council for the costs involved in picking up the pieces of their failures on housing and the economy.
- The Leader of the Council to write to Michael Gove reiterating our call to be given powers to introduce controls on private sector rents and the short term let sector, as well as calling for an end to the disastrous right to buy policy to begin to tackle the housing and temporary accommodation crises.

c) In Support of Green Investment (proposed by Cllr Chris Smowton, seconded by Cllr Katherine Miles) [Amendment Proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Alex Hollingsworth]

Liberal Democrat Group Motion

Council notes that:

- A report by the Office for National Statistics in 2022 noted that over 40% of dwellings in Oxford had wall insulation rated Poor or Very Poor.⁹
- Analysis by the Institute for Public Policy Research found that the government is falling short if its home retrofit investment target, that billions of pounds a year are required to fully realise the benefits, and that households could save hundreds of pounds a year on their energy bills if those benefits are realised.¹⁰
- National Grid's plan for energy decarbonisation over the next ten years indicates a need for a radical increase in investment in grid infrastructure, grid-attached storage, and enabling works for green generation.¹¹
- The government's own road map for heat pump rollout suggests a need for billions of pounds more in investment.¹²
- Not only is the government failing to meet its investment in green infrastructure as noted above, but the Leader of the Opposition has slashed plans for major green investment.¹³

Council resolves:

- That the Leader should write to both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition expressing this council's support for a truly transformative green investment programme that will put the country on the path to net zero, place the UK as a world leader in green technology, and support hundreds of thousands of green jobs.
 - That the Leader should further write to Oxford's MPs requesting that they in turn pressure both government and opposition to deliver large-scale green investment.
-

Labour Group Amendment

Council notes that:

- A report by the Office for National Statistics in 2022 noted that over 40% of dwellings in Oxford had wall insulation rated Poor or Very Poor.¹⁴
- Analysis by the Institute for Public Policy Research found that the government is falling short if its home retrofit investment target, that billions of pounds a year are required to fully realise the benefits, and that households could save hundreds of pounds a year on their energy bills if those benefits are realised.¹⁵

⁹ [Insulation and energy efficiency of housing in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

¹⁰ [UK is falling billions short of investment needed in current parliament for energy efficiency and clean heat | IPPR](https://www.ippr.org)

¹¹ [download \(nationalgrid.com\)](https://nationalgrid.com)

¹² [Heat Pump Investment Roadmap \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

¹³ [Starmer to announce scale-back of £28bn-a-year green pledge \(energyvoice.com\)](https://energyvoice.com)

¹⁴ [Insulation and energy efficiency of housing in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

¹⁵ [UK is falling billions short of investment needed in current parliament for energy efficiency and clean heat | IPPR](https://www.ippr.org)

- National Grid’s plan for energy decarbonisation over the next ten years indicates a need for a radical increase in investment in grid infrastructure, grid-attached storage, and enabling works for green generation.¹⁶
- The government’s own road map for heat pump rollout suggests a need for billions of pounds more in investment.¹⁷
- ~~Not only is~~ **The government is** failing to meet the needed investment in green infrastructure as noted above, ~~but the Leader of the Opposition has slashed plans for major green investment.~~¹⁸
- **This council estimates retrofitting all of its operational buildings to net zero would be £30m, with all of its council housing to EPC C would cost £150m, and to net zero £500m. 300 homes are being retrofitted over the next two years at a cost of £7.6m.**

Council resolves:

- That the Leader should write to both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition expressing this council’s support for a truly transformative green investment programme that will put the country on the path to net zero, place the UK as a world leader in green technology, and support hundreds of thousands of green jobs.
 - That the Leader should further write to Oxford’s MPs requesting that they in turn pressure both government and opposition to deliver large-scale green investment.
-

If amended, the Motion would read:

Council notes that:

- A report by the Office for National Statistics in 2022 noted that over 40% of dwellings in Oxford had wall insulation rated Poor or Very Poor.¹⁹
- Analysis by the Institute for Public Policy Research found that the government is falling short of its home retrofit investment target, that billions of pounds a year are required to fully realise the benefits, and that households could save hundreds of pounds a year on their energy bills if those benefits are realised.²⁰
- National Grid’s plan for energy decarbonisation over the next ten years indicates a need for a radical increase in investment in grid infrastructure, grid-attached storage, and enabling works for green generation.²¹
- The government’s own road map for heat pump rollout suggests a need for billions of pounds more in investment.²²

¹⁶ [download \(nationalgrid.com\)](https://www.nationalgrid.com)

¹⁷ [Heat Pump Investment Roadmap \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

¹⁸ [Starmer to announce scale back of £28bn a year green pledge \(energyvoice.com\)](https://www.energyvoice.com)

¹⁹ [Insulation and energy efficiency of housing in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

²⁰ [UK is falling billions short of investment needed in current parliament for energy efficiency and clean heat | IPPR](https://www.ippr.org)

²¹ [download \(nationalgrid.com\)](https://www.nationalgrid.com)

²² [Heat Pump Investment Roadmap \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

- The government is failing to meet the needed investment in green infrastructure as noted above.
- This council estimates retrofitting all of its operational buildings to net zero would be £30m, with all of its council housing to EPC C would cost £150m, and to net zero £500m. 300 homes are being retrofitted over the next two years at a cost of £7.6m.

Council resolves:

- That the Leader should write to both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition expressing this council's support for a truly transformative green investment programme that will put the country on the path to net zero, place the UK as a world leader in green technology, and support hundreds of thousands of green jobs.
- That the Leader should further write to Oxford's MPs requesting that they in turn pressure both government and opposition to deliver large-scale green investment

d) Weight and emissions based parking charges (proposed by Cllr Emily Kerr, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman) [Amendment Proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Louise Upton]

Green Group Motion

Council notes:

1. Larger cars cause more damage to our roads, are more likely to seriously injure or kill pedestrians, and take up more valuable public space. They're outgrowing the design of our cities, especially small medieval cities like Oxford.
2. Cars have been growing at an astonishing 0.5cm per year since 2000.²³ The growth in size is very pronounced among luxury SUVs. For example, The Land Rover Defender grew by 20.6cm in just 6 years.²⁴
3. Large SUVs are now around 2m wide, or 220cm with mirrors, compared to a minimum parking width of just 180cm. In typical off street parking spaces (240cm), large SUVs often leave too little space for occupants to get in and out of vehicles. Data published last month shows half of new cars are too wide for parking spaces.²⁵
4. Wider cars reduce the road space available to pedestrians, scooters, and cyclists: and creates more danger for all of them. As Transport & Environment has said: "Cars have been getting wider for decades and that trend is likely to continue until we set a stricter limit. Currently the law allows new cars to be as wide as trucks. The result has been big SUVs and American style pick-up trucks parking on our footpaths and endangering pedestrians, cyclists and everyone else on the road."²⁶
5. Owners of larger and higher emitting vehicles cost the public purse more than owners of smaller and greener vehicles due to the higher number of fatalities and serious illnesses caused by pollution and accidents and the greater amount of damage to roads.^{27 28}
6. Cities across the world are taking a stand:
 - a. Paris has recently tripled charges for SUVs parking inside the city²⁹
 - b. Bath now charges higher-emitting vehicles more, having first considered it under the Tories in 2018.³⁰
 - c. Lyon charges heavier vehicles more.³¹
 - d. London boroughs have long had emissions based parking fees, including Greenwich, Lewisham, Merton, Newham, Croydon, Lambeth, City of

²³ <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2024/jan/22/cars-growing-wider-europe-report>

²⁴ <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

²⁵ <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

²⁶ <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

²⁷ <https://www.npr.org/2023/11/14/1212737005/cars-trucks-pedestrian-deaths-increase-crash-data>

²⁸ <https://edition.cnn.com/2023/03/01/world/suv-cars-emissions-iea-climate-intl/>

²⁹ <https://news.sky.com/story/paris-votes-to-triple-parking-charges-for-some-suvs-13064477>

³⁰ <https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/emission-based-car-parking-charges>

³¹ <https://www.connexionfrance.com/article/French-news/French-first-as-city-brings-in-parking-charges-linked-to-car-s-weight>

London. Westminster under the Tories launched a diesel parking surcharge in 2017.³²

Council believes:

1. It would be relatively simple to introduce increased parking charges for higher emitting and/or heavier vehicles, as the DVLA holds all this information on every car based on number-plate. Enforcement of car parks could be managed using cameras.
2. While Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council work together to manage car parks, and residents parking is managed exclusively by County, a joint project between City and County to come up with a fairer and more equitable charging system that more accurately reflects the greater cost to the public purse generated by larger, higher emitting vehicles would be beneficial.

Council resolves:

- To request the Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities and the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice work closely with the County to design a more equitable system of parking charges.
 - To request that these Cabinet Members report back to this Council within 6 months on any proposals they have developed with County colleagues.
-

Labour Group Amendment

Council notes:

1. Larger cars cause more damage to our roads, are more likely to seriously injure or kill pedestrians, and take up more valuable public space. They're outgrowing the design of our cities, especially small medieval cities like Oxford.
2. Cars have been growing at an astonishing 0.5cm per year since 2000.³³ The growth in size is very pronounced among luxury SUVs. For example, The Land Rover Defender grew by 20.6cm in just 6 years.³⁴
3. Large SUVs are now around 2m wide, or 220cm with mirrors, compared to a minimum parking width of just 180cm. In typical off street parking spaces (240cm), large SUVs often leave too little space for occupants to get in and out of vehicles. Data published last month shows half of new cars are too wide for parking spaces³⁵. **On narrow residential streets this often leads to pavement parking.**
4. Wider cars reduce the road space available to pedestrians, scooters, and cyclists: and creates more danger for all of them. ~~As Transport & Environment has said: "Cars have been getting wider for decades and that trend is likely to continue until we set a stricter limit. Currently the law allows new cars to be as wide as trucks. The result has been big SUVs and American style pick-up trucks parking on our footpaths and endangering pedestrians, cyclists and everyone else on the road."~~³⁶

³² <https://cities-today.com/more-uk-councils-adopt-emissions-based-parking-charges/>

³³ <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2024/jan/22/cars-growing-wider-europe-report>

³⁴ <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

³⁵ <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

³⁶ <https://www.npr.org/2023/11/14/1212737005/cars-trucks-pedestrian-deaths-increase-crash-data>

5. Owners of larger and higher emitting vehicles cost the public purse more than owners of smaller and greener vehicles due to the higher number of fatalities and serious illnesses caused by pollution and accidents and the greater amount of damage to roads.^{37 38}
6. Cities across the world are taking a stand:
 1. Paris has recently tripled charges for SUVs parking inside the city³⁹
 2. Bath now charges higher-emitting vehicles more, having first considered it under the Tories in 2018.⁴⁰
 3. Lyon charges heavier vehicles more.⁴¹
 4. London boroughs have long had emissions based parking fees, including Greenwich, Lewisham, Merton, Newham, Croydon, Lambeth, City of London. Westminster under the Tories launched a diesel parking surcharge in 2017.⁴²
 5. In November 2023, Cllrs Railton and Upton investigated introducing emissions or weight based parking in our city car parks. They established with officers that it would require significant capital investment & infrastructure in place before implementation. This under consideration for the 2025/6 budget.

Council believes:

1. It would be relatively simple to introduce increased parking charges for higher emitting and/or heavier vehicles, as the DVLA holds all this information on every car based on number-plate. Enforcement of car parks could be managed using cameras.
2. While Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council work together to manage car parks, and residents parking is managed exclusively by County, a joint project between City and County to come up with a fairer and more equitable charging system that more accurately reflects the greater cost to the public purse generated by larger, higher emitting vehicles would be beneficial.

Council resolves:

- To request the Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities and the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice work closely with the County to **investigate** designing a more equitable system of parking charges.
 - To request that these Cabinet Members report back to this Council within 6 months on any proposals they have developed with County colleagues.
-

³⁷ <https://www.npr.org/2023/11/14/1212737005/cars-trucks-pedestrian-deaths-increase-crash-data>

³⁸ <https://edition.cnn.com/2023/03/01/world/suv-cars-emissions-iea-climate-intl/>

³⁹ <https://news.sky.com/story/paris-votes-to-triple-parking-charges-for-some-suvs-13064477>

⁴⁰ <https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/emission-based-car-parking-charges>

⁴¹ <https://www.connexionfrance.com/article/French-news/French-first-as-city-brings-in-parking-charges-linked-to-car-s-weight>

⁴² <https://cities-today.com/more-uk-councils-adopt-emissions-based-parking-charges/>

If amended, the Motion would read:

Council notes:

1. Larger cars cause more damage to our roads, are more likely to seriously injure or kill pedestrians, and take up more valuable public space. They're outgrowing the design of our cities, especially small medieval cities like Oxford.
2. Cars have been growing at an astonishing 0.5cm per year since 2000.⁴³ The growth in size is very pronounced among luxury SUVs.
3. Large SUVs are now around 2m wide, or 220cm with mirrors, compared to a minimum parking width of just 180cm. In typical off street parking spaces (240cm), large SUVs often leave too little space for occupants to get in and out of vehicles. Data published last month shows half of new cars are too wide for parking spaces⁴⁴. On narrow residential streets this often leads to pavement parking.
4. Wider cars reduce the road space available to pedestrians, scooters, and cyclists: and creates more danger for all of them.
5. Owners of larger and higher emitting vehicles cost the public purse more than owners of smaller and greener vehicles due to the higher number of fatalities and serious illnesses caused by pollution and accidents and the greater amount of damage to roads.^{45 46}
6. Cities across the world are taking a stand:
 6. Paris has recently tripled charges for SUVs parking inside the city⁴⁷
 7. Bath now charges higher-emitting vehicles more, having first considered it under the Tories in 2018.⁴⁸
 8. Lyon charges heavier vehicles more.⁴⁹
 9. London boroughs have long had emissions based parking fees, including Greenwich, Lewisham, Merton, Newham, Croydon, Lambeth, City of London. Westminster under the Tories launched a diesel parking surcharge in 2017.⁵⁰
 10. In November 2023, Cllrs Railton and Upton investigated introducing emissions or weight based parking in our city car parks. They established with officers that it would require significant capital investment & infrastructure in place before implementation. This under consideration for the 2025/6 budget.

Council believes:

3. It would be relatively simple to introduce increased parking charges for higher emitting and/or heavier vehicles, as the DVLA holds all this information on every car based on number-plate. Enforcement of car parks could be managed using cameras.

⁴³ <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2024/jan/22/cars-growing-wider-europe-report>

⁴⁴ <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

⁴⁵ <https://www.npr.org/2023/11/14/1212737005/cars-trucks-pedestrian-deaths-increase-crash-data>

⁴⁶ <https://edition.cnn.com/2023/03/01/world/suv-cars-emissions-iaa-climate-intl/>

⁴⁷ <https://news.sky.com/story/paris-votes-to-triple-parking-charges-for-some-suvs-13064477>

⁴⁸ <https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/emission-based-car-parking-charges>

⁴⁹ <https://www.connexionfrance.com/article/French-news/French-first-as-city-brings-in-parking-charges-linked-to-car-s-weight>

⁵⁰ <https://cities-today.com/more-uk-councils-adopt-emissions-based-parking-charges/>

4. While Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council work together to manage car parks, and residents parking is managed exclusively by County, a joint project between City and County to come up with a fairer and more equitable charging system that more accurately reflects the greater cost to the public purse generated by larger, higher emitting vehicles would be beneficial.

Council resolves:

- To request the Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities and the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice work closely with the County to investigate designing a more equitable system of parking charges.
- To request that these Cabinet Members report back to this Council within 6 months on any proposals they have developed with County colleagues.

e) The Cost-of-living crisis and local government funding (proposed by Cllr Ed Turner, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman)

Labour Group Motion

This Council believes that the English local government finance settlement proposed by the Tories for 24/25 is thoroughly inadequate and penalises our poorest citizens the most, who are least well equipped to face the continuing cost-of-living crisis.

Government pronouncements about increased funding are “smoke and mirrors” and do not reflect the reality that costs are rising faster than any increases in funding, and that increases in “core spending power” largely come from local residents, not government funding.

Council is very concerned that a one-year increase in local housing allowances (after years of freeze) will be eroded by the Government’s failure to increase the benefits cap and temporary accommodation housing benefit, thus offering support with one hand and then denying it with the other. That failure will be exacerbated by reintroducing the housing allowance freeze again in April 25. This will once again increase homelessness in areas like Oxford.

In addition, this Council is angry that the Conservative Government has abolished funding for the Household support grant from May 24 – denying poorer people a welcome source of cash support for household and fuel bills, and vital heating repairs. This comes in addition to the end of centrally provided fuel bill support for many who had been in receipt of it.

Overall, English local government faces a huge funding crisis and cannot close the gap without cutting front line services, especially those aimed at its poorest citizens. This is evidenced by the high-profile and very severe cuts forced upon councils in Birmingham and Nottingham.

More widely, Council believes households are feeling huge pressure because of substantial increases in taxes as well as, for many, higher mortgage costs and rents due to the chaos caused by Liz Truss’ mini-budget, and a sharp focus on the cost of living is urgently needed.

This Council calls upon the Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government demanding:

1. A sustainable long term funding settlement for councils like Oxford, facing a funding squeeze due to inflation and the rising costs of homelessness.
2. A commitment to increasing local housing allowances annually in line with local housing costs and scrapping the benefits cap.
3. The re-instatement of funding for the Household Support Grant which provides a flexible and rapid response to people with urgent needs.
4. Support for councils like Oxford which retains a Council Tax reduction scheme for people struggling to pay these costs, and encouragement that other councils should instigate such schemes.

It also asks the Leader of the Council to contact our two local MPs, for Oxford East and Oxford West and Abingdon respectively, and ask them to write with the same demands to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank