Council

www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

Briefing note and supplementary papers

Date: **Monday 24 November 2025**

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 602767 democraticservices@oxford.gov.uk

Briefing note

Information for councillors and additional papers to be considered.

		Pages
	Minute's silence and tributes	
	To hear tributes and observe a minute's silence in memory of former Lord Mayors or serving councillors or serving senior officers who have died. Former Councillor Roy Darke	
14	**Questions on Cabinet minutes** *This item has a time limit of 15 minutes.* Councillors may ask the Cabinet Members questions about matters in these minutes since the previous meeting of full Council. *The Minutes will be published within a supplement ahead of the meeting.*	7 - 36
15	**Questions on Notice from Members of Council** Questions on notice from councillors received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.11(b). Questions on notice may be asked of the Lord Mayor, a Member of the Cabinet or a Chair of a Committee. One supplementary question may be asked at the meeting. The full text of questions must have been received by the Director of Law, Governance and Strategy by no later than 1.00pm on 12 November 2025. These, and written responses where available, will be published in the briefing note.	37 - 64
16	**Public addresses that do not relate to matters for decision at this Council meeting** Public addresses to the Leader or other Cabinet member received in accordance with Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution and not relating to matters for decision in Part 1 of this agenda.	65 - 68

Up to five minutes is available for each public address.

The request to speak accompanied by the full text of the address must be received by the Director of Law, Governance and Strategy by 5.00 pm on 18 November 2025.

The briefing note will contain the text of addresses and questions submitted by the deadline, and written responses where available.

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

17 Scrutiny Committee update report

69 - 80

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

Council is invited to comment on and note the report.

The report will be published within a supplement ahead of the meeting.

18 Motions on notice November 2025

81 - 88

This item has a time limit of 60 minutes.

Motions received by the Director of Law, Governance and Strategy in accordance with the rules in Section 11 of the Constitution by the deadline of 1.00pm on 12 November 2025 are listed below.

Cross party motions are taken first. Motions will then be taken in turn from the Independent Oxford Alliance Group, Oxford Community Independents Group, Oxford Independent Group, Real Independent Group, Labour Group, Liberal Democrat Group, Green Group, in that order.

Substantive amendments to these motions must be sent by councillors to the Director of Law, Governance and Strategy by no later than 10.00am on 21 November 2025 so that they may be circulated with the briefing note.

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) Oppose a Work Place Parking Levy and planned Bus Gates in Oxford (proposed by Cllr Henwood, seconded Cllr Yeatman)

b) Bring Thames Water into public ownership (Proposed by Cllr

Mundy, Seconded by Cllr Djafari-Marbini)

c) Democracy and Freedom (proposed by Cllr Rehman, seconded by Cllr Latif)

d) Better use of Oxpens Bridge Funding (proposed by Cllr Jupp, seconded by Cllr Miles)

e) A World-Class Multi-Modal Transport Hub for Oxford Station (Proposed by Cllr. Lois Muddiman, Seconded by Cllr. Emily Kerr)

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

www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

To:	**Council**
Date:	**24 November 2025**
Report of:	**Director of Law, Governance and Strategy**
Title of Report:	**Questions on Cabinet Minutes**

Introduction

1. Council is invited to ask the Cabinet Member questions about the matters in the minutes from the meetings of Cabinet since the previous meeting of Council. The minutes are listed as appendices to this covering report.
2. As per part 11.11 (c) of the Council's Constitution, up to 15 minutes is reserved for this item.

Appendix 1 – Minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 22 October 2025

Appendix 2 – Minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 10 November 2025

Appendix 3 – Draft Minutes from the meeting of Cabinet held on 19 November 2025

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet on Wednesday 22 October 2025

www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

Committee members present:

Councillor Brown
Councillor Arshad
Councillor Hollingsworth
Councillor Railton
Councillor Turner
Councillor Chapman
Councillor Munkonge
Councillor Linda Smith

Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Caroline Green, Chief Executive
Nigel Kennedy, Group Director Finance
Tom Hook, Deputy Chief Executive - Citizen and City Services
Tom Bridgman, Deputy Chief Executive - Place
Rachel McKoy, Monitoring Officer (Interim)
Dave Scholes, Affordable Housing Supply Corporate Lead
Paula Redway, the Culture and Community Development Manager
Helen Bishop, Director of Communities and Citizens' Services
Megan McFarlane, Affordable Housing Supply Programme Officer
Pedro Abreu, Principal Air Quality Officer
Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager
Simon Manton, Community Response Team Manager
James Watkins, Housing Policy and Projects Officer
Nerys Parry, Director of Housing
James Barlow, Principal Flood Mitigation and Environmental Quality Team Leader
Courtney Bennett, Regulatory Services Manager
Liz Jones, ASBIT Manager and Domestic Abuse Lead
Ted Bowler, Corporate Asset Manager
Dr Brenda McCollum, Committee and Member Services

Also present:

Councillor Alex Powell, Chair of Scrutiny

Apologies:

Councillor Railton sent apologies for a late arrival.

63. Declarations of Interest

None.

64. Minutes of the previous meeting

Cabinet resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2025 as a true and accurate record.

65. Addresses by members of the public

Cabinet received two addresses from members of the public.

Address from Marta Lomza, former City Council employee.

My name is Marta Lomza, I am speaking tonight as a resident of Oxford and a former employee of the Oxford City Council (2018-2024), with some 15 years of experience working in the heritage industry. I was the Twinning Officer in charge of signing of the twinning agreement with Wroclaw, Poland; for 6 years after that I worked as the Community Engagement & Exhibitions Officer at the Museum of Oxford, and I had a secondment to act as deputy coordinator for a Central Oxford response hub during the first wave of the Covid-19 pandemic in early 2020. I'm saying this to stress my experience in culture & heritage and in working with the residents of our city, and my knowledge of and care for this council.

I'm here to present my serious concerns about the proposal regarding museum fees and to urge you to consider rejecting the proposal as it stands. I don't have time to present all my concerns so I will focus on four main points as submitted in my draft; I will illustrate each point with an example.

1) LACK OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Appendix 4, section 3, point 17 admits there has been no community consultation. As I said in my draft, this poses serious reputational and relational risks to the Council, as in the following example. One of the museum's key achievements is the strong partnerships it has built with incredibly diverse and often marginalised communities - East Timori, Iraqi, African families, LGBTQ+ groups and more. This has led to diversifying museum collections with objects generously donated or loaned by those communities. We now have a proposal which does not even list community partners on the concessions list, risking a situation where people will have to pay to see their own object on display. This **will** have a negative impact on the relationships between the museum staff and the community partners. The lack of consultation will also affect the staff morale when they'll have to communicate this to the people impacted by it. It might also affect your own Customer Service Excellence assessment, which the museum has made valuable contributions to over the years. Finally, at a time when there are strong community reactions regarding the County Council's congestion charge, there's an

increased risk this will add more arguments for those who think our local authorities ignore the opinions of the residents.

2) LACK OF EVIDENCE IN THE PROPOSAL

Except for the 2023 AIM (Association of Independent Museums) report from which it cherry picks quotes to support its recommendations, the proposal cites almost no evidence or research to back up its claims, with spurious points based on conjecture, such as in this sentence “it is *possible* that the free entry *may have had* a negative impact on visitors’ perception of the *potential* quality of the offer” - a sentence so vague it’s practically meaningless, and yet it’s used as the basis for an argument. This is just one example. It appears that you are being asked to vote on a draft of someone’s brainstormed ideas rather than research & evidence. Is this an example of ‘best practice’ that I know this Council prides itself on following?

3) POOR QUALITY OF THE ATTACHED Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendix 4).

The assessment’s own introduction says it needs to be based on “sufficient information and data” on impact, mitigations and justifications; this assessment evidently does not do that. Instead, it contains generic text copied and pasted across all fields, both for the risk and the proposed mitigations. As one example, this leads to proposing that “free access for people in receipt of state benefits” is an adequate measure to mitigate the impact on asylum seekers; as we know, asylum seekers have no recourse to public funds so they could not claim state benefits. This lack of giving the specific impact on asylum seekers due consideration alone makes a dent in the council’s recently confirmed status as a Local Authority of Sanctuary. But again, this is just one example. The Assessment lumping all people with protected characteristics together and treats them a homogenous whole with exactly the same needs, and so is against the Council’s own ethos and recommended practice, thus posing a risk to its desire to be seen as a council which is “passionate about equalities”. Both from personal experience as a resident who has several of the characteristics on this list, and from professional experience of working with many diverse communities in Oxford, I am confident that when this is shared more widely, people *will* feel *offended* by this treatment, which, again, poses risks to the reputation of the council, its relationship with our city’s most marginalised communities, and third sector agencies that work with these communities.

4) NOT INCLUDING A PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENT

In November 2024, an Income Generation Options Review, conducted by a reputable consultancy firm Revels, was published on commission from the City Council. That review used benchmarking, data from the museum, contextual evidence, and extensive research to make a set of recommendations, some of which go beyond this proposal and some of which contradict this proposal. For example, it makes it clear that any gains from introducing a charging model would be offset by the reduction in footfall, and that a preferable option in order to actually increase income would be to invest in staff training so the existing Pay as You Can model is used to its full potential. In other words, if you want to help the museum finances, this proposal is not the way to do it. The question is, why did the Council pay a professional, well informed consultancy firm to make a set of recommendations only to completely disregard it and replace it with a proposal based on hardly any research at all?

IN CONCLUSION

- This is a wholly inadequate proposal which includes little to no evidence, poor understanding of financial modelling, editorial errors and bad maths - the numbers

actually don't add up - and, most concerningly, displays an attitude towards Oxford's residents that can only be described as contemptuous.

- The decision you're facing tonight is this:

- Do you want to cause damage to both the finances and the reputation of the museum, the city council, and your own as individuals who are signing this off, as you will be tarnished by association to this exceptionally poor piece of work?

- Or do you want to make financially prudent decisions based on evidence, and support work which leads to more community cohesion, and a sense of belonging and pride in our city for all?

- If it's the latter, I kindly request, do not vote this through tonight; instead, follow best practice: read the Revels report, seek more advice, consult with the museum staff on the ground and museum audiences, and make your decisions based on evidence and informed, professional advice.

Address from David Juler, Chair of the Museum of Oxford Development Trust:

My name is David Juler, Chair of the Museum of Oxford Development Trust. I would like to speak to Item 9. Museum of Oxford Entry Fee. The Development Trust was established to support the Museum of Oxford and its educational activity - it was an incredibly important body in accessing funds for which the City Council is ineligible. During the redevelopment of the Museum spaces, philanthropy and grant fundraising was deemed essential for securing this important community asset. Although I am now a trustee and chair I was also a council employee for 10 years, working on the development of the current Museum of Oxford from inception to delivery. I understand the pressures on budgets and the aspiration for the Museum to be self-sustaining. However, I, and fellow trustees, believe the approach proposed is inadequate, does not take into account the unique context of Oxford and, more seriously in our view, is counter intuitive to the values and mission of not only the Museum but also Oxford city council. The Museum was not developed as a charged for attraction. This is not the Story Museum, this is not a space featuring large, show stopping exhibitions. This museum was designed to engage and represent communities. To welcome and open up the city's history to school children, families and all of the diversity this incredible city of ours has on offer. Early reports by the audience agency for the Museum demonstrated that visitor figures were more diverse than those for comparator sites - in fact, it directly reflected and represented the unique diversity of Oxford. Other museums can only dream of this type of engagement. The Museum was created and curated with those people. Have you used the object table interactive? Charging has the potential impact of creating a barrier to access and redirecting visitors to other, free to enter venues in the city who MOX must compete with for attention and patronage.

The AIM report used as evidence for the positive impact of charging should come with some caveats. The more detailed AIM admissions pricing policy research document highlights that on-site donations dropped, and around 45% (of a total of 17 museums surveyed in this category of going from Free admission to charged) saw an increase in visitor numbers, whilst a further 45% saw a decrease. The issue with these reports is that they include a small number of museums and provide no further context. One of the museums to introduce charging was the National Football Museum in Manchester which received between 400k and 450k visitors annually. Its initial pricing strategy at least gave free entry to local residents. Even with its greater appeal it reported "a reduction in the number of visitors, and a major reduction in donations". Context is

everything and in city with a small centre and several of the nation's largest, free to enter museums, MOX is in a considerably different setting.

Income via retail and on site donations has been on the rise, as has income through hiring spaces. MOX has also used consultancy firms to review developing income sources. One such report stated that visitor figures would drop by 50% and although we do not deny income would increase, the report states it does not fix the funding need and deficit and would impact other means of fundraising. The Development Trust is hoping to do more to raise funding support for the charitable activity of the Museum. We would ask all here to consider the greater impact of charging to Oxford's communities and to the staff of the Museum of Oxford. We believe that charging will not fulfil the stated ambitions and more negatively is setting the Museum up to fail.

Councillor Hollingsworth provided Cabinet's response to the two addresses from members of the public.

Thank you for the addresses to the Cabinet on this report in person and in writing; this response is to both.

The Museum of Oxford has been successful at the work that it has done as a place where the culture and history of this city's people, not just its buildings, can be celebrated. We should be proud of how ordinary lives of ordinary people have been made central to the Museum's work.

However we must not forget that the creation of the Museum in its new format was with an aspiration that it could be self-sustaining financially. That has never been achieved.

The Council has agreed to spend £152k a year on subsidising the Museum, but because costs have risen and hoped for sources of funding like the 'pay what you like' approach - which raised about £5k last year - have fallen far short of objectives. The last annual financial reports to Council show that the actual cost of the Museum is close to a quarter million pounds each year.

And it is important to be aware that does not take into account the potential revenue from this part of the Town Hall if it was used in a more commercial way.

This is therefore a very substantial sum of money that the Council could use on different services, or as grants to community organisations, but has chosen instead to use to support the Museum. But that support is not without limits.

It would be nice to imagine that a Museum that is free to enter and is subsidised by nearly £250k a year as a result is an option that is available.

It is not.

The choices available are to introduce a small charge alongside a wide range of ways in which visitors can reduce it, or not have to pay it all such as the 12 Free Days a year, and reduce the subsidy to the agreed level.

Or to close the Museum – as nearly 150 other local authority run museums have closed over the last two decades across the country because it is no longer possible to afford the subsidies to run them - and to use the money saved on supporting local community groups who are equally in need of it.

There are a great deal of places that attract visitors to our city, from all over the world. The Museum of Oxford will not be one of the best known of those, but it will have a clear attraction from the stories it tells to bring those visitors in as customers.

When charges were introduced some years ago for events in the Museum the same concerns were expressed that visitors would not come; in fact the opposite was true. Rather than have a free calendar invite which costs nothing to disregard, guests at paid for events and activities have attended, stayed longer, and are felt to have been better customers in the Museum shop.

As the Report sets out, the Arts Council has generously granted us a sum of £228k to spend on moving to a more financially sustainable approach to running the Museum. They – and other grant funding organisations – are quite clear that they have no interest in simply using their limited budgets to plug ongoing operational gaps in organisations not willing to do something to address those gaps. They instead want to work alongside forward facing organisations like the Museum of Oxford in making sure that they are managed in a way that is financially sustainable for the long term.

This is a change in the way in which the Museum will be run, and I am aware that change is challenging, not least when while we have the evidence from the charges for events there is no absolute certainty about what the outcomes of this new approach will be. The research and the evidence seems to point in a positive direction, but we will not know until is tried.

But what we do know is that the current overspending of an already generous subsidy is not sustainable, and cannot continue.

Councillor Railton arrived during this item, at 18:08.

66. Councillor addresses on any item for decision on the Cabinet agenda

None received.

67. Councillor addresses on Neighbourhood Issues

None received.

68. Items raised by Cabinet Members

None.

69. Reports from the Scrutiny Committee

The Scrutiny Committee met on 14 October 2025 and reviewed the following items:

- Project Approval and Delegations for Westlands Drive and Halliday Hill
- affordable housing scheme
- Anti-Social Behaviour Policy

- Annual Safeguarding Report

The Finance and Performance Working Group met on 11 September 2025 to consider a range of reports:

- Optimism bias on sizeable commercial properties in the city centre
- Performance Integrated Report Q4 2024/25
- Performance Integrated Report Q1 2025/26

Councillor Alex Powell presented the Scrutiny Committee's discussions regarding the Project approvals and delegations for the Westlands Drive/Halliday Hill affordable housing development. He noted that no recommendations arose from the Committee's conversations about this report.

Councillor Alex Powell presented the Scrutiny Committee's discussions and recommendations regarding the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy. He noted that the Committee had discussed the need for there to be a clear line in accountability and that questions had been raised regarding how they would make the information and guidance about this policy accessible to a diverse range of communities.

- **Recommendation 1:** For Officers to explore the feasibility of gathering and analysis of data on protected characteristics of both: individuals complained about through the ASB service, and individuals making complaints through the ASB service. Recognising that some data may be limited in validity, that findings from the collected and analysed data be reported back to the Scrutiny Committee at an appropriate time within the next two years.
- **Recommendation 2:** That officers set out within the Policy the work the Council is currently undertaking and plans to undertake in relation to proactive prevention of ASB, including actions such as working with youth groups, redesigning areas, and improving coordination between council services.
- **Recommendation 3:** That there is a clear commitment within the ASB Policy to work collaboratively with Registered Providers in addressing anti-social behaviour, including requesting information from local RPs on levels and types of ASB reports received within their housing stock. This information can then be used to identify patterns, overlaps and gaps between council and RP data, and reporting back on the efficacy of this partnership working and health of relationships with RPs as part of the Council' wider multi-agency approach to ASB management.

Councillor Arshad responded to the Committee's recommendations on the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy. She welcomed the Committee's engagement with the policy. She noted that Cabinet accepted all three recommendations relating to this report.

Councillor Alex Powell presented the Scrutiny Committee's discussions and recommendation regarding the Annual Safeguarding Report 2024/25. He noted concerns that were raised by the Committee regarding the multiple organisations working in this area and how they could most efficiently work in a cooperative manner.

- That future Safeguarding reports provide comparisons with previous years data to allow monitoring of trends and assessment progress, particularly data in relation to modern slavery and exploitation, and severe weather emergency protocol (SWEP). Where the data allows for trend analysis, that previous statistics be included to enable a year-on-year comparison and evaluation of changes overtime.

Councillor Arshad responded to the Committee's recommendation on the Annual Safeguarding Report 2024/25. She stated that Cabinet had accepted the recommendation on this report.

Councillor Alex Powell presented the Working Group's discussions and recommendations regarding the Optimism Bias on sizeable commercial properties in the City Centre, the Quarterly Performance Integrated Report - Q4 2024/25, and the Quarterly Performance Integrated Report – Q1 2025/26. He noted that no recommendations arose from the Working Group's discussions of these reports.

70. Museum of Oxford entry fee

The Director of Communities and Citizens had submitted a report to Cabinet to consider options for charging a small entry fee to visit the museum and consider options for eligibility for concessionary and free entry.

Councillor Hollingsworth presented the report. He noted the positive work of the museum, as well as the difficulties it has faced to meet the necessary income levels. He said that the report in part emanated from a need for them to think more creatively about how they fund the museum. The report proposes an approach which is used by nearly a quarter of local authority run museums, and there are reductions in this fee and opportunities for free entry to support continued access to the museum for individuals from all backgrounds. The report will also allow the managers of the museum to make minor changes to fees, as it becomes necessary. Councillor Hollingsworth noted the challenges that are faced whenever change is made but also stated their optimism that this approach will be tenable.

Paula Redway, the Culture and Community Development Manager, reiterated the high quality of work and customer service provided by the museum's staff and the good work of the museum. Despite this, she noted that visitor numbers had not grown as needed since 2021. She noted the 'pay as you can' model that had been introduced to the museum, and although this did increase income over time, it did not meet the levels needed. In deciding on this approach, the Culture and Community Development Manager said that they drew information and research from across the sector to look at the impact of introducing a fee. She said that nationally, local authority run museums tend to be under threat, and they had been successful in securing a grant from the Arts Council to help them restructure the museum. This will help with their marketing, fundraising, and current deficit situation. She stated that the grant funding, combined with the fee, was the only option available for them to reach the financial position needed.

Councillor Brown expressed support for the proposals in the report and the work of the museum.

Councillor Munkonge said that the report could provide greater clarity to enhance assurances on the expected income. He asked if they had any benchmarking data to back up the projections in the report and asked what systems would manage the free and discounted entries to the museum.

Councillor Hollingsworth acknowledged that they did have limited data and one of the reasons for this was that they had not implemented a charging scheme. He noted the considerable amount of work they had done in the creation of the report and his confidence that this was the best way forward.

The Culture and Community Development Manager said that the charging model would help them to gather more data. She said that they would monitor the new charging model closely. The data that they gather through this model will allow them to better understand who does and does not visit the museum and help them to better engage with a broader range of communities in the city. The Culture and Community Development Manager highlighted the work of volunteers at the museum and their dedicated work to support the museum.

Councillor Turner noted the tight budget positions of the Council and that in this situation the Council had to make tough choices about funding things they wanted to fund and things they had to fund. He asked how individuals with no recourse to public funds would receive support to access the museum. Additionally, he asked if people who had contributed to a temporary exhibition would be able to receive a concession to visit the museum. Finally, Councillor Turner asked what timescale they would need to gain a sense of whether or not the approach was working.

The Culture and Community Development Manager said that they have partners they work with to provide support for individuals who have no access to public funds and their free access has already been considered and included.

Councillor Brown asked if the current recommendation was sufficient to cover the delegation to make minor changes to the charging model as needed.

Councillor Hollingsworth responded that in the event of an acute problem, they could reconsider the approach early on. However, with the funding they're receiving and the partnerships they intend to form, it would likely take at least twelve months in a normal year and ideally twenty-four or even thirty-six months to test to see if they'll be successful. Councillor Hollingsworth noted the pending changes that would be introduced by Local Government Reorganisation and the impacts these would have.

Councillor Chapman asked if they had needed to raise extra funds to help them win the Arts Council grant.

The Culture and Community Development Manager said that they had not been required to provide match funding. The Arts Council required them to provide a plan for how they would implement necessary changes to the museum's management.

Councillor Chapman said that the plan was reassuring. He asked that the team clarify what they mean by state benefits in their communications with the public about the new fee for the museum. He commended the officers for their work on the plan and report.

Councillor Linda Smith agreed that they needed to be explicit about what they mean by state benefits and suggested that they work with the Leisure Service team to ensure that their messaging and approach is clear, consistent, and fair.

Councillor Brown proposed a small addition to the final recommendation, to include the authority to make minor changes to the charging model for the museum, as needed.

With the change in the final recommendation:

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Charge** an entry fee for entry to the Museum of Oxford
2. **Approve** the standard entry fee charges as proposed in Appendix 1

3. **Approve** the concessions eligibility and concessionary charges as proposed in Appendix 1
4. **Approve** the eligibility for free access as proposed in Appendix 1
5. **Delegate** the implementation of charging from January 2026 and the authority to make minor changes to the charging model for the museum to the Director of Citizens and Community Services.

71. Anti-Social Behaviour Policy

The Deputy Chief Executive for City and Citizens had submitted a report to Cabinet to request that Cabinet approves the Anti-social Behaviour Policy 2026-29.

Councillor Arshad presented the report. She said that the Council is committed to tackling all forms of Anti-Social Behaviour. She said that this policy fulfils their duty to tackle Anti-Social Behaviour, requiring the Council to formulate and publish these types of procedures. She said that they would work with local partners to ensure that people feel safe and secure in their homes and that they are delivering their standard of care. Councillor Arshad said that the policy is reviewed every three years, with the existing policy expiring in 2025. This policy sets out the Council's responsibility as a landlord and sets out the Council's service standards. Councillor Arshad said that the policy outlines the Council's commitment to tackling Anti-Social Behaviour and the Council's principles in approaching this matter.

Richard Adams, the Community Safety Service Manager, thanked the Scrutiny Committee for their engagement and thanked their tenant panel for their views on the policy.

Councillor Brown asked how they connected with registered providers on this issue, as tenants often move between Council properties and properties owned by other providers.

The Community Safety Service Manager said that on a case-by-case basis they were good at working in partnership with registered providers. However, on the strategic level they were working to explore and develop this area further.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Approve** the Anti-social Behaviour Policy 2026-29; and
2. **Delegate** authority to the Community Safety Service Manager to publish the Anti-social Behaviour Policy and to make any typographical amendments as may be required, before publication. To make minor changes in the future to reflect any relevant changes in legislation, guidance or practice.

72. Draft Air Quality Action Plan

The Director of Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability had submitted a report to Cabinet to seek approval of the draft Air Quality Action Plan 2026-2030 for public consultation.

Councillor Railton presented the report. She said that the report was a statutory document, due to historic and current levels of air pollution. She said that the current plan had a lower level than the national limit of nitrous oxide and that they had achieved this lower target. Councillor Railton said that the new plan builds on this progress, and lines up with the WHO's goals and EU's legal standards. The report lays out an action plan to achieve these goals. She said that the recommendation was to approve the action plan for public consultation, not to approve the plan itself.

Pedro Abreu, the Principal Air Quality Officer, said that this draft plan and commitment to pursue the new air quality target would continue their dedication to go above and beyond to deliver cleaner air and healthier lives for the people of Oxford.

Councillor Chapman congratulated the team on their achievements, including the level of particulates and level of nitrous oxide.

Councillor Hollingsworth asked what their reflections were on the impact that heavier private cars, and electric vehicles, were likely to have on particulate pollution.

Councillor Railton noted that there was an irony in the drive towards electric vehicles, as the anti-pollution benefits were undermined as cars got bigger. She said that some cities in the UK had considered different levels of parking charges, depending on car size and weight. However, she stated that these policy interventions were beyond the scope of the current action plan.

Councillor Brown noted the impact that Local Government Reorganisation would have on their approach to air quality improvement.

The Principal Air Quality Officer discussed the different factors which contribute to air pollution in the city. Notably, he presented a figure that helped contextualise the issue for Councillor Hollingsworth: while it is evident that we are witnessing a shift in particulate matter (PM2.5) emissions from tailpipe sources to road surface abrasion and tyre wear—largely due to the increased weight of electric vehicles: transport-related emissions as a whole account for no more than 17% of the total PM2.5 levels measured in Oxford. The largest contributor by far is the domestic sector, particularly the burning of solid fuels from open fires and wood-burning stoves.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Approve** the Air Quality Action Plan 2026-2030 for Public Consultation

73. HRA Policies

The Director of Housing had submitted a report to Cabinet to seek the approval of the following policies: fire safety, damp and mould, asbestos and disrepair to ensure the maintenance of the housing stock.

Councillor Linda Smtih presented the report. She said that these policies were an important step to ensure they meet their obligations under the social housing act and make sure that they deliver a high quality of service to their tenants. She said that the policies had all had tenant engagement, which is a point of pride, and that their input was reflected in the policies.

Nerys Parry, the Director of Housing, said that the damp and mould policies were in line with their responsibilities as a landlord. For assurance, she noted that the policy included a series of procedures between OCC and ODS that are well understood by both organizations.

James Watkins, the Housing Policy and Projects Officer, said that these sets of policies were to ensure that they follow the lessons learned approach, following tragedies such as Grenfell. He said that the asbestos policy was very robust to ensure the safety of residents first and foremost. He said that the disrepair policy sets out the standards for residents and that there should be every step taken to ensure no property is ever in disrepair. He said that residents and tenants worked very hard to engage with these policies and give their feedback on these policies.

Councillor Hollingsworth asked if the policies covered empty properties with no current tenants. He also asked if communal areas in properties were covered by the policies. Finally, he asked if communal areas, accessible to HRA and private tenants, were covered by these policies.

The Housing Policy and Projects Officer confirmed that the policies covered empty properties and communal areas.

Councillor Brown thanked the tenants who participated in the review of the policies and officers for their work.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Approve** the Damp and Mould Policy
2. **Approve** the Fire Safety Policy
3. **Approve** the Asbestos Policy
4. **Approve** the Disrepair Policy

74. Review of the Additional HMO Licensing Scheme - Approval to Consult

The Director of Planning and Regulation had submitted a report to Cabinet to seek approval from members to conduct a statutory consultation to renew the Additional HMO Licensing Scheme in 2026.

Councillor Linda Smith presented the report. She said that they should be proud of the fact that every privately let home needs a license in Oxford. She discussed the variety of schemes for different types of homes. She said that the scheme helps to drive up the standard of privately rented homes in the city. Councillor Smith noted that this was seeking approval to take the policy out for consultation, not to approve the policy itself.

Courtney Bennett, Regulatory Services Manager, said that this report was to approve the policy to go out to consultation, not to approve the policy itself. She said that the scheme had room for improvement as there were consistent issues that they would like to address through the consultation. She said that the consultation would involve a range of engagement approaches with tenant groups. She said that the outcome of the consultation would be back before Cabinet in the spring.

Councillor Hollingsworth expressed his support for the scheme, as it had delivered a much better stock of HMOs across the city. He said that he would be interested to know if they had a sense of how many properties had switched from HMOS to short term lets to avoid complying with the scheme.

The Regulatory Services Manager said that they did not have specific data. She noted that the short term lets were a priority for their planning enforcement team and last

months they issued 26 notices. She said that in September they'd had a successful case where they took a short let back to the private rental sector and would look for more data on that issue.

Cabinet discussed that a national policy limiting the number of short let properties in a city would be useful and Councillor Linda Smith said that they would continue to argue for that.

Cabinet also discussed the possibility that the scheme became so successful to the point where it was no longer necessary. Given the structural challenges facing housing in Oxford, Cabinet agreed that this was an unlikely outcome in the near future.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Agree** to proceed with a statutory 10-week consultation on the basis that it is necessary to renew the licensing scheme in its entirety for a further 5 years.

75. Local Nature Recovery Strategy

The Director of Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability had submitted a report to Cabinet to request that Cabinet agree that approval be given to the Oxfordshire County Council to publish the Oxfordshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

Councillor Railton presented the report. She said that the Environment Act of 2021 requires all local authorities to produce such a strategy. She said that the County Council, with other partners, worked to develop the strategy they were considering. She said that the strategy had already been endorsed by the county and other authorities in Oxfordshire. She outlined the key objectives of the report and noted that this is a non-binding strategy, but the Council was encouraged to meet the strategy where possible. Councillor Railton emphasised that the strategy did not preclude or restrict development.

James Barlow, the Principal Flood Mitigation and Environmental Quality Team Leader, said that the strategy sought to encourage opportunities that already existed, rather than restricting anything.

Cabinet agreed to alter the recommendation to remove the final word 'by' and fix this typo.

With this slight alteration:

Cabinet resolved to:

1. That Cabinet agrees to give approval to the Oxfordshire County Council to publish the Oxfordshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

76. Domestic Abuse Policy for Council Staff

The ASBIT Manager and Domestic Abuse Lead had submitted a report to Cabinet to request that Cabinet approve the Domestic Abuse Policy for Staff.

Councillor Arshad presented the report. She said that the report sets out the Council's commitment to employees, particularly those impacted by Domestic Abuse. She said

that the policy looks at how issues can be raised so that support can be provided to staff impacted by domestic abuse. She noted that several different stakeholders engaged with the policy and provided their feedback.

Liz Jones, The ASBIT Manager and Domestic Abuse Lead, said that this policy complimented the Domestic Abuse Policy for service users as well.

Councillor Turner asked how the recruiting and training of champions was progressing.

The ASBIT Manager and Domestic Abuse Lead said that they had 24 champions across the Council, mainly in frontline teams. She said that when someone wants to do the training to become a champion they put them into the course after they receive managerial approval.

Councillor Brown welcomed the policy and congratulated them on their training of champions.

Councillor Arshad noted that the Domestic Abuse Champions had access to contact details of champions in other local authorities and have access to further specialised trainings.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Approve** the Domestic Abuse Policy for Staff (Appendix 1)
2. **Delegate** authority to the Domestic Abuse Lead, to make minor changes in the future to reflect any relevant changes in legislation, guidance or practice.

77. Project Approval and Delegations for Westlands Drive/ Halliday Hill affordable housing scheme

The Director of Economy, Regeneration and Sustainability had submitted a report to Cabinet to seek project approval and delegations to progress the development of affordable homes at Westlands Drive/ Halliday Hill. This includes delegated authority to enter into build contracts and other necessary agreements and associated development costs, and the virement of capital funds in the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

Councillor Linda Smith presented the report. She said that Oxford needed homes and encouraged Cabinet to vote to support the building of 15 more affordable homes.

Councillor Chapman expressed his support for the scheme and noted the importance of the development.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Grant project approval** to finalise agreement to enter into build contracts and any other necessary agreements or contracts and incur associated development cost spends, as set out in this report, and within the allocated HRA capital budgets and business plan, for the purpose of delivering more affordable housing in Oxford;
2. **Delegate authority to the Director of Housing,** in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Affordable Housing; the Head of Financial Services/Section 151 Officer; and the Council's Monitoring Officer, to enter into build contracts and any

other necessary agreements or contracts to facilitate the development within the identified budget, for the provision of additional affordable housing;

3. **Grant approval** for a virement within the HRA capital budget for scheme costs of £5,693,000. The virement will be from the "Properties purchased from OCHL" (Oxford City Housing Limited) purchase line into a new scheme line to be profiled to match the build programme across the four years from 2025/26 to 2028/29.

78. Contract for Annual Real Estate Asset Valuations

The Group Finance Director had submitted a report to Cabinet to request that Cabinet provide Project Approval and delegate authority to officers to enter into a new contract or contracts with suitably qualified firms to undertake real estate valuations.

Councillor Turner presented the report. He said that Oxford needs accurate real estate valuations for accounting purposes. As they do not have that expertise in house, he said that they need to go out and procure the services.

Councillor Hollingsworth asked if the valuations would include things which are difficult to value, such as things like heritage properties or the museum.

Ted Bowler, the Corporate Asset Manager, confirmed that difficult to value items would be included in the programme.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Give Project Approval** to approve the procurement of a suitably qualified firm of real estate valuers to undertake valuations of council-owned properties recorded within the General Fund and Housing Revenue Accounts

2. **Delegate** authority to the Deputy Chief Executive – Place in consultation with the Group Director of Finance, the Director of Law, Governance and Strategy (Monitoring Officer), and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Assets to determine the form of the procurement, contract, and award and enter into the final contract with the preferred supplier

79. Dates of future meetings

Cabinet noted the dates of future meetings.

Matters Exempt from Publication

If Cabinet wishes to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of any of the items on the exempt from publication part of the agenda, it will be necessary for Cabinet to pass a resolution in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 4(2)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 on the grounds that their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Cabinet may maintain the exemption if and so long as, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

The meeting started at 18:00 and ended at 19:53.

Chair …….. **Date: Monday 10 November 2025**

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.

Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet on Monday 10 November 2025

www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

Committee members present:

Councillor Brown
Councillor Chapman
Councillor Hollingsworth
Councillor Munkonge
Councillor Railton
Councillor Linda Smith

Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Caroline Green, Chief Executive

Mish Tullar, Transition Director

Emma Jackman, Director of Law, Governance, and Strategy

Jonathan Malton, Committee and Member Services Manager

Lucy Cherry, Policy and Partnerships Officer

Dr Brenda McCollum, Committee and Member Services

Also present:

Councillor Alex Powell, Chair of Scrutiny

Apologies:

Councillor(s) Turner and Arshad sent apologies.

80. Declarations of Interest

None.

81. Addresses by members of the public

None received.

82. Councillor addresses on any item for decision on the Cabinet agenda

None.

83. Reports from the Scrutiny Committee

The Scrutiny Committee met on 5 November 2025 at a Special Meeting to consider the Council's Local Government Reorganisation Proposal. Councillor Alex Powell presented Scrutiny Committee's discussions and consideration of the proposal and their recommendation.

- The Scrutiny Committee recommends that the Three Unitary Authorities proposal be formally endorsed and submitted as Oxford City Council's preferred model for local government reorganisation to Government.

Councillor Brown thanked Councillor Powell for the discussions from Scrutiny and welcomed the engagement that they had received on the proposals.

84. Local Government Reorganisation

The Chief Executive had submitted a report to agree a preferred option for the creation of three unitary councils in Oxfordshire and West Berkshire as a proposal to Government for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR); and to submit the proposal to Government by the 28 November 2025.

All Oxfordshire Councils have been invited to submit proposals for Local Government Reorganisation, replacing existing two-tier councils with a single 'unitary' layer of local government. Oxford City Council has been developing a proposal for the creation of three unitary councils across Oxfordshire and West Berkshire. Proposals for two unitaries (covering Oxon & W Berks), and a single unitary (covering Oxon) being developed by other councils in Oxfordshire and West Berkshire.

Councillor Brown presented the report. She noted the great deal of work that Council officers had put into the report and thanked officers from across the Council for their contributions. She noted that three proposals had been included in the agenda pack for their consideration, but that they were being asked to approve the Council's preferred Local Government Reorganisation proposal. Councillor Brown emphasised the importance of this moment and the opportunity they had to reorganise local government in a way that works best for the future of the city and its residents. Councillor Brown said that they believed their preferred proposal was the best option to ensure adequate representation of all three areas and to ensure that the city continued to thrive. Councillor Brown said that the Council's preferred proposal sought to ensure adequate democratic representation for all those impacted by the reorganisation.

Caroline Green, the Chief Executive, said that the three unitary option which they were proposing would address the necessary criteria from government, including the city's delivery of high-quality services. She noted the significant work which officers and consultants had invested into the proposal under consideration. The Chief Executive said that she believed their proposal made a strong case for how they would meet the needs of their residents, their economy, and deliver the housing that the city needs. She noted that the reorganisation presented an important opportunity for them to shift the dial towards a more preventative approach to social services.

Mish Tullar, Transition Director, said that the proposal should be seen in the context of devolution. He said that their proposal gave them an opportunity to form a local authority which was place based, promoted the voice of the city, and promoted growth. He commended the work that colleagues and members had done to ensure that the proposal had received a high level of engagement from a broad range of stakeholders.

Councillor Brown thanked the Transition Director and Chief Executive for their work on the proposal and their work to engage a variegated group of stakeholders.

Councillor Linda Smith said that she welcomed the government initiative to move towards unitary councils. She said that his would help residents to know who is responsible for what and who to hold responsible for their concerns. She agreed that the three unitary proposal was the best way to go to ensure that Oxford's voice in the future authority was ensured. Councillor Smith noted the differences between Oxford and rural areas of Oxfordshire and West Berkshire and stated that their preferred proposal would ensure adequate representation for the city and its residents.

Councillor Turner said that their proposal recognised the opportunities for growth in and around Oxford. He added that their proposal's focus on housing and addressing the housing crisis set it apart from the other proposals under consideration. He thanked the Council's senior leadership team for their work on this report and thanked Councillor Brown for her work to engage this proposal with as many people as possible.

Councillor Railton agreed that this proposal was the only one which ensured that the city maintained control over its future. She added that this proposal was also the only one which would address the city's housing needs. For these reasons, she agreed that the three unitary proposal was the best option for the city and its future.

Councillor Hollingsworth thanked the officers for their work on the proposal. He said that voters want councils and councillors to be as close to them as possible. He noted that their proposal had the three smallest authorities of those under consideration. He emphasised the importance of small authorities and quoted a study which showed that large organisations are usually less efficient than smaller ones. Councillor Hollingsworth noted the differences between the city and rural areas of the county and said that this was why they needed smaller, representative authorities. He added that their proposal was the only one which would allow the city to address their housing crisis. He noted that when he had met members of the public at an engagement event in Banbury, they had expressed a view that decisions about their area should equally be made locally to them.

Councillor Brown added that the three unitary proposal was commendable, as it would allow each area and authority to address their own challenges, removed from the challenges of the city of Oxford.

Councillor Chapman agreed that small organisations were more effective and that smaller authorities inspired greater confidence in government. He noted ongoing challenges with democratic deficit and said that he worried a larger authority would further democratic deficit. He stated the particular issues facing the city, which give them a different set of issues from rural areas in the county. He said that the three unitary proposal was the best option to support the prosperity of both the city and the country and he expressed his support for this proposal.

Councillor Munkonge thanked the Chief Executive, Transition Director, Councillor Brown, and the officers for their work on the proposal. He said that this proposal would allow the city to address its distinct challenges and to deliver the needed high quality services to the people of the city.

Councillor Brown said that she was confident that their proposal was the best option to meet the Council's corporate priorities.

Cabinet thanked the Council's senior officers and Lucy Cherry, Policy and Partnerships Officer, for their work on the proposal.

Councillor Brown thanked all the officers who had kept business running, while this proposal was worked on. She thanked the officers and members from across different councils for working well together through this process and for maintaining collegial partnerships and relationships, even while presenting differing proposals. She agreed that this proposal was an opportunity for growth, ambition, and to focus on the particular challenges of the city. She added that this proposal would also ensure that local government worked for all of the county and would ensure that everyone was able to meet their own local challenges.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Note and consider** all three LGR proposals that have been developed by Oxfordshire and West Berkshire councils for the creation of unitary local government across Oxfordshire, which are presented in the appendices:
    a. Three unitary authorities (Greater Oxford, Northern Oxfordshire and Ridgeway) developed by Oxford City Council
    b. Two unitary authorities (Oxford and Shires and Ridgeway) developed by West Oxfordshire District Council, Cherwell District Council, South Oxfordshire District Council, Vale of White Horse District Council and West Berkshire Council
    c. One unitary authority (Oxfordshire Council) developed by Oxfordshire County Council.
2. **Agree** that Oxford City Council's preferred LGR proposal is for the creation of three new unitary councils covering Oxfordshire and West Berkshire, as set out in Appendix One;
3. **Delegate authority** to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Council Leader, to make any further minor amendments to the LGR proposal before its submission to Government in accordance with its prescribed process and requirements to ensure a fully compliant proposal, provided that such amendments do not materially affect the substance of the proposal. This may include the addition of explanatory graphics and case studies, and the design layout of the proposal.

85. Dates of future meetings

Cabinet noted the dates of future meetings.

Matters Exempt from Publication

If Cabinet wishes to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of any of the items on the exempt from publication part of the agenda, it will be necessary for Cabinet to pass a resolution in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 4(2)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to

Information) (England) Regulations 2012 on the grounds that their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Cabinet may maintain the exemption if and so long as, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

The meeting started at 18:00 and ended at 18:45.

Chair …….. Date: Wednesday 19 November 2025

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

Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet on Wednesday 19 November 2025

www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

Committee members present:

Councillor Brown
Councillor Arshad
Councillor Hollingsworth
Councillor Railton
Councillor Turner
Councillor Chapman
Councillor Munkonge
Councillor Linda Smith

Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Caroline Green, Chief Executive

Tom Hook, Deputy Chief Executive – City and Citizens' Services

Emma Jackman, Director of Law, Governance, and Strategy

Nigel Kennedy, Group Finance Director

Joshua Curnow, Supervising Senior Licensing Officer

Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager

Dr Brenda McCollum, Committee and Member Services

Also present:

Councillor Alex Powell, Chair of Scrutiny

Apologies:

No apologies were received

86. Declarations of Interest

None.

87. Minutes of the previous meeting

Cabinet resolved to **approve** the minutes of the meetings held on 22 October 2025 and 10 November 2025 as true and accurate records.

88. Addresses by members of the public

Cabinet received one address from a member of the public.

Address from Bashir Ahmed to Cabinet.

Delay to the emissions standard policy

When the Oxford taxi trade was presented with the proposals on 10th January 2019 to change from diesel taxis to electric taxis, 6 years seemed a reasonable time for the transition but unfortunately then came COVID-19. The Taxi trade lost four years because of the coronavirus

Along came the new trend of people working from home which has continued as people are still working from home

To make matters worse the closure of Botley Road.

We have lost all our work to Botley and beyond. There is no guarantee when the Botley Road will reopen. As if this wasn't bad enough, last summer the summer of 2024, the nightclubs in Oxford permanently shut their doors and closed down. There are no night revellers during the week nor the weekends. The city centre has become a ghost town.

With licensing of Uber in Oxford in December 2024

We have witnessed private hires from Southampton, Portsmouth, Wolverhampton and further away operating in Oxford.

Uber is a £53 billion international company. It's subsidises fares during the promotional periods which no other private hire operator or the Hackney carriage trade can match. But once established, they have peak and off-peak crazy prices.

LEVC cost

The price of the electric taxi has gone up again. Now from £75,000-£82,000, that is if bought on cash, but on interest it is £105,000. It's a lot of money.

The 40 Proprietor is in Oxford who have changed to electric taxis, most of them but not all of them took advantage of the £7000 government grant which at that time reduced the price of the electric taxi down to £55,000 cash price and of course, the price of the new electric taxi was significantly less then to what it is now.

£5000 local council grant was also granted to drivers who had purchased the electric taxi. This also included three years of Taxi License fee relief. Plus the cheaper electricity making it a very viable package to run the electric taxi.

But in current times, the cost of electric to charge the electric taxi has gone up from 18p per kw/h to 74p per kw/h. And the grants are no longer available from our council and the government has reduced its plug in grant if purchasing a new taxi.

Zero emissions zone and other licensing authorities giving extension to their licence holder to change to more greener vehicles

Initially the expanded ZEZ in oxford was planned for 2025, but it has now been delayed. We have been informed that the implementation will not take place until at least 2028, following a public consultation.

Given the new timeline, we think it's very reasonable that we are given more time so we can prepare for this better.

Other licensing authorities have their own strategies for tackling high levels of emissions. Given the difficult financial climate that taxi drivers are facing across the country, various licensing authorities have granted extra time for drivers to switch their vehicles to low emission or zero emission ones. This is a significant consideration.

Such authorities are:

1) south Cambridgeshire who are expected to give their drivers to 2030 to change over.

2) Coventry licensing authority are seriously considering pushing back their policy to 2030

3) Both Rochdale and Manchester strategies are matched and delayed their emission standards till 2030

4) Reading's policy has set a target of 2028 where all vehicles must be a minimum of ULEZ.

Conclusion

We have demonstrated our intent that we want to work with the city council and 40% of our proprietors have changed over to the electric taxis.

Any concerns about air pollution in the city is more than mitigated in the context of the introduction of 159 electric buses on the city bus routes in 2024 as well as 40 new London style taxis. We are doing our bit for the environment.

We would like to thank the city council but feel that additional latitude is required for the transition given all of the circumstances explained.

Councillor Brown explained the legal advice that Cabinet had received, which caused this decision to move from the Licensing Committee to Cabinet. She said that in future, they would take these types of decisions at Licensing Committee, following changes to the constitution to allow this later in the month.

Councillor Railton provided Cabinet's response to the address from the member of the public.

Councillor Railton noted that they would address the key concerns of the member of the public in their discussion of the report.

89. Councillor addresses on any item for decision on the Cabinet agenda

None received.

90. Councillor addresses on Neighbourhood Issues

None received.

91. Items raised by Cabinet Members

None.

92. Reports from the Scrutiny Committee

The Scrutiny Committee met on 11 November 2025 to consider the following item.

- Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emission Standards Amendment

Councillor Alex Powell presented the Committee's conversations and recommendations regarding the report. He noted that the discussion was extensive and outlined the concerns of members of the Scrutiny Committee regarding the correct governance route for this decision. Councillor Powell said that the Committee considered the impact of Local Government Reorganisation and how this should influence the decision.

- **Recommendation 1**: To have consistency with emissions standards policies for both Private Hire Vehicles and Hackney Carriage Vehicles.
- **Recommendation 2:** In the event that Cabinet approves the delay to the implementation of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emission Standards Amendment to align with Local Government Reorganisation, they will review this once the timescale been defined.

Councillor Railton responded to the recommendations from Scrutiny Committee. She said that Cabinet was not accepting the first recommendation but were accepting the second one. She noted that it would not be feasible to accept the first recommendation, due to the implications of Local Government Reorganisation. She also noted that the Cabinet response to the first recommendation in the Scrutiny supplement should be replaced with the following wording:

Given the wider context of the recommendation for Hackneys, the same uncertainty lies with LGR for decisions around harmonising PHV standards with those of Hackneys. It would therefore not be a good use of a (large amount) of officer time to undertake this work at this time.

93. Deferral of the commencement of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emission Standards

The Deputy Chief Executive, Citizen and City Services, had submitted a report to Cabinet to consider a delay to the final phase of emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles licensed by this Authority.

Councillor Railton presented the report. She explained that in January of 2026, there was an existing requirement for Hackney Carriages to become fully electric. She outlined the three options detailed in the report, and noted their preferred

recommendation, to delay the implementation of the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle Standards for hackney carriage vehicles, to be revisited by such successor organisation that results from Local Government Reorganisation. She also noted the challenges facing the trade and drivers, which influenced their approach to the recommendation before Cabinet. Councillor Railton said that they did not want to disadvantage local taxis, as compared to other taxi drivers that may come into the area due to Local Government Reorganisation. She said that this recommendation was supportive of the opinions of taxi drivers and the relevant economic data.

Councillor Turner spoke in support of the recommendation. He emphasised the importance of the taxi trade in Oxford and acknowledged that they were an authority which regulates more closely than others. He recognized the challenges faced by the trade and drivers, including the lack of people out during the night and the closure of the Botley road. He noted the high quality and important work of the taxi drivers in Oxford and stated the importance of members using their positions to voice concerns to central government.

Councillor Brown agreed with Councillor Turner on the importance of local authorities being the organisations which regulate the local taxi trade.

Councillor Hollingsworth agreed with the points made by Councillors Turner and Railton. He agreed that it had been quieter in nighttime hours in the city centre. He asked for clarity regarding the legal position and governance route being taken by Cabinet. Councillor Hollingsworth asked about the legal advice they had received and why it was necessary for Cabinet to take this decision, instead of the Licensing Committee.

Emma Jackman, the Director of Law, Governance, and Strategy, responded to the question from Councillor Hollingsworth. She said that the advice was based on a limited case which looked particularly at taxi licensing. In line with general practice, she would agree with Councillor Hollingsworth and said that she did not have concerns that this was a wider issue. However, due to a particular case on taxi licensing, the Council was advised to take this governance route.

Councillor Brown agreed that this was a one off, particular case. She noted that if they'd had more time, they would have amended the constitution first and then taken this decision at Licensing Committee. However, she said that they did not want to leave the trade in limbo, and they wanted to give the trade and drivers certainty as soon as possible. She noted that the report and recommendations before them were the same as those presented to the Licensing Committee.

Cabinet resolved to:

- **Approve** the delay to the implementation on the 1 January 2026 of the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle Standards for hackney carriage vehicles, to be revisited by such successor organisation that results from Local Government Reorganisation.

94. Dates of future meetings

Cabinet noted the dates of future meetings.

Matters Exempt from Publication

If Cabinet wishes to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of any of the items on the exempt from publication part of the agenda, it will be necessary for Cabinet to pass a resolution in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 4(2)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 on the grounds that their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Cabinet may maintain the exemption if and so long as, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

The meeting started at 18:00 and ended at 18:28.

Chair …….. **Date: 10 December 2025**

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.

www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

To:	**Council**
Date:	**24 November 2025**
Report of:	**Director of Law, Governance and Strategy**
Title of Report:	**Questions on Notice from members of Council and responses from the Cabinet Members and Leader**

Introduction

Questions submitted by members of Council to the Cabinet members and Leader of the Council, by the deadline in the Constitution are listed below in the order they will be taken at the meeting.

Responses are included where available.

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

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

Unfamiliar terms may be briefly explained in footnotes.

Questions and responses

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

SB1: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Brown	
Question	**Written Response**
Why does the "Media Roundup" email not include stats on Twitter/ X? Is the Council getting meaningful engagement on X, and is a review of the use of the platform being considered?	The Media Roundup is an internal document shared with managers and councillors at Oxford City Council. Through the weekly social media data, the Communications Team aims to provide insight into what is working on our channels. Due to capacity, the data currently focuses on our main platforms: Facebook, Instagram and TikTok. We could also provide data for LinkedIn, YouTube and NextDoor. We continually review our use of social media, including through consultations with Oxford residents via the Residents' Panel and engagement on the platforms themselves. Recent consultations show a preference among younger residents for short-form video, so over the past year we have prioritised Instagram, TikTok and YouTube. Mainly due to capacity, we have deprioritised more text-based platforms like X, Bluesky and NextDoor. This may change in the future.

SB2: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Brown	
Question Should the congestion charge show no reduction in the cities overall air quality would you commit to oppose traffic filters?	**Written Response** There needs to be a thorough review of the impact of the county's various traffic schemes, including their interaction with each other. The priorities should be reducing congestion, making public transport flow more freely, improving air quality and improving the experiences of cyclists and pedestrians. We also need to rebuild confidence in our communities in an overall transport plan which means engagement with residents and businesses.

SB3: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Brown	
Question Congestion charged routes are essentially traffic filters. I value your principal on the charge which discriminates against the least well off in our city. Given the burden and fines of the filters will essentially be felt by oxford residents. Do you have any proposals you are pushing for which will at least allow the city to benefit financially from filter fines, especially as we have seen with the congestion charge free park and ride buses which on the whole have no benefit to oxford residents? For example, free bus travel for school children	**Written Response** We specifically asked the County Council if they insisted on going ahead with the congestion charge to use some of the money they raised to subsidise bus fares for those in our city. They have chosen to do that only for residents outside the city and then only for a few months.

SB4: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Brown	
Question Have the usual processes of sending decisions made by the General Purposes Licensing Committee (GPL)	LGA:

and the Licensing and Gambling Acts Committee (LGA) to Full Council for approval, recently changed - and if so how and why?	We have had advice which confirms that there is a distinction between policy that needs to come to Full Council and the saturation / cumulative impact assessment and policy. The latter is a decision to be taken by Committee but has previously been sent to Full Council for approval due to an ambiguity in the Licensing Act 2003 as to what constitutes licensing policy. Amendments to the Constitution to reflect this are part of the agenda for this Council meeting. GPL: Advice to the Council is that there needs to be a clear decision of full Council to keep taxi licensing as a responsibility of Full Council as a result of case law. This has never been done and advice is approval of the provisions as part of the constitution is insufficient. This has led to a report on the Council agenda to reaffirm this but, in the meantime, a report went to Cabinet to ensure that a decision on Taxi Licensing was ratified, following recommendation of the GPL to Council which had to be withdrawn from the last Council agenda. This is a belt and braces approach to ensure that the original intention of both our constitution and the licensing committee's decision are respected.

SB5: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Brown	
Question	**Written Response**
Can the portfolio holder give full details of the interim scheme which Thames Water will introduce in 2027 to provide wastewater capacity which was agreed by Oxford City Council, the Environment Agency and Thames Water in March?	Thames Water publish a quarterly report on their website detailing their progress so far, as well as holding regular updates with the Local Planning Authorities and developers. Works are reported by Thames Water to be on track to deliver both the short term and long-term improvements needed. The full report can be found here: Performance and annual results | About us | Thames Water

SB6: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Brown	
Question	**Written Response**
Can the portfolio holder provide full details of the latest advice from the Environment Agency regarding the capacity of the Oxford Sewage Treatment works, following the scheme agreed in March 2025?	No further advice has been issued to us by the EA since they wrote to the LPA providing revised guidance on this matter.

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

ET1: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr Turner	
Question	**Written Response**
The "Greater Oxford" Proposal for Local Government Reorganisation has been prepared by the Cabinet and Council Officers. Can the Cabinet Member inform the Council: 1. What funding has been provided by national Government? 2. How much has been spent from Council funds and from which budget? How much has been spent in total (including officer time, all forms of advertising, and consultancy) from all sources of funding?	Government provided £90,000 in funding to support the development of LGR proposals. It has been clear that the main costs of implementation of proposals should be borne by existing and new councils themselves and recouped through the delivery of efficiencies from the creation of new unitary structures. In the period since April 2025 the Council has spent £288,000 on the LGR work, from its General Fund budget. Subject to Cabinet decision, Oxford City Council will consult on a proposed £2m provision in its 2026/27 Budget as its contribution towards the costs of LGR and devolution. Oxfordshire County Council has already made a provision of £10m to contribute towards these costs, and the other district councils are expected similarly to make Budget provisions.

ET2: From Cllr R Smith to Cllr Turner	
Question	**Written Response**
Regarding the BDO audit report given at the Audit & Governance meeting on 21st October, which evaluated the quality of Fire Risk Assessments conducted by contractors: BDO reported the contractor BrightHeat subcontracted 217 fire risk assessments to Guardian Consultancy Services, who further subcontracted to Hawk Fire Safety Services and VM Fire Safety Services. Is the practice of multi-layer subcontracting common in City Council contracts, and are you satisfied that we have sufficient accountability from our direct contractor?	In terms of the contract with BrightHeat, I can confirm that all contracts relating to Fire Risk Assessments have been terminated, and the activity has been brought in-house via a specialist fire safety team. This gives the Council the necessary control and assurance required. More broadly, all specifications should stipulate that there should be no sub-contracting of work without the explicit consent of the client.

ET3: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Turner	
Question	**Written Response**
Can the portfolio holder give details as to how the £16,000 assigned to flowers in Frideswide Square in the 2024 budget has been spent?	Due to the construction works currently taking place to replace the Botley Road Bridge, works to improve the planters at Frideswide Square has been deferred. There are however discussions taking place around improvements to the planters and responsibility for long term maintenance so they are improved for when the works in the area are complete.

Cabinet Member for a Zero Carbon Oxford; Deputy Leader of the Council

AR1: From Cllr Sandelson to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
Is the Council willing to provide a bench for visitors to the Jewish section of the Wolvercote cemetery?	We are often asked for benches in all the cemeteries, including the Jewish section at Wolvercote, but haven't installed any for several years due to the intense pressure on the limited remaining burial space. The Jewish section at Wolvercote is the only area in all the cemeteries with any significant burial space left, so a bench could be installed there if someone was prepared to fund it. However, we are already having to remove existing benches from other areas of the cemetery to make space for burials (a bench is about the size of a grave), so installing a bench in one area at a time of removing them from other areas doesn't seem sensible.

AR2: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
Does the administration of this city council support the traffic filters policy agreed by the county council in November 2022?	Does the administration of the County Council support the traffic filters policy THEY agreed in 2022? They have just implemented a different policy that wasn't advertised in the Lib Dem manifesto and nor were the residents, businesses nor even the City Council consulted on it.

AR3: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton

Question	Written Response
When the administration of this council chose to oppose the congestion charge, what account did you take of the well-publicised synergies between congestion reduction and the deployment of 159 zero-emission buses, as set out in the Bus Service Improvement Plan's accompanying delivery plan?	We have been asking the County Council for several years now to take measures to reduce congestion and improve bus times during the period that the Botley Road has remained closed. We have suggested a number of different measures from more school streets, working with Oxford's many private schools to reduce traffic to schools, other bus priority measures and subsidising bus travel. The county council chose instead to introduce a measure without even discussing it with the City Council.

AR4: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
Do you welcome the significant gains in bus services delivered by the newly-implemented congestion charge, including those from rural parts of the county into Oxford? Similarly, do you welcome the delivery of free bus travel from the Park and Rides for three months?	When we responded to the county council's surprise announcement of a congestion charge, we specifically said that revenue from the scheme should be used in the city to subsidise bus services. That is the opposite of the decision you took as cabinet member on the county council, which is to use some of the money raised to subsidise people from outside the city. I am not aware that any data has yet been published on the impact of the congestion charge. While increased use of bus services would be one measure to look at, air quality across the whole city, congestion moving and the impact on different communities would also be important to look at too.

AR5: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
	The question misunderstands the Air Quality Annual Report.

Does this administration stand by its previously-expressed belief that traffic filters, a Zero Emission Zone and a Workplace Parking Levy contribute towards improving air quality, as set out on the 2025 Air Quality Annual Status Report's Table 3, "Progress on Measures to Improve Air Quality"?. Does this extend to your welcoming overall improvements to air quality predicted to be delivered by the congestion charge?	The measures are in the report because they are the solutions offered by the County Council as the transport authority and we have a statutory duty to measure air quality. This council would welcome an opportunity for the residents of this city to have an input into transport policy that impacts them.

AR6: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
Oxford City Council will receive additional revenue from increased parking at the Park and Ride sites after bus services were made free of charge following introduction of the congestion charge, if this change results in enhanced uptake. The administration obviously considered this when deciding to oppose the charge, and concluded that it neither wanted nor needed this income. What, therefore, will happen to it?	I am not aware of any data yet that shows the impact of the congestion charge on car park income at the Park & Ride sites, nor our city centre car parks. If there is increased income at the park and ride car parks that may well offset loss of income from city centre car parks.

AR7: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
Are there any plans being looked into for an East Oxford Park and Ride?	Any new Park & Ride provision is for the County Council to consider as part of its wider transport strategy. The site allocation for land south of

	Grenoble Road within South Oxfordshire's Local Plan currently includes an area safeguarded for a Park & Ride on this site. There are no plans for a new park and ride within the current city boundary.

AR8: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
If the Cabinet decides to give Hackney Carriage drivers an indefinite extension to the date by which they must make the switch to electric vehicles, does the portfolio holder believe that the Council would be becoming less ambitious in its drive to reduce CO2 emissions in the city?"	No. The main CO2 emissions sector for the City is buildings emissions. The cost of requiring all Hackney carriages to migrate to electric would be a minimum of £2.5M investment for the trade (assuming second hand outright purchase, higher if leased or new), for a saving of a fraction of a percentage in carbon emissions.

AR9: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
Are we monitoring the impact of the congestion charge on air quality on the roads with the congestion charge and the roads where traffic been displaced to?	The city council has a statutory duty to measure air pollution annually. Currently, it measures NO_2 at three locations using automatic continuous monitors and at 77 locations using passive diffusion tubes. Since 2023, an additional 44 diffusion tubes have been installed to strengthen the network and help assess (at the time) the impacts of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and also to establish the baseline air quality levels for the future traffic filter trials. These locations were chosen based on specific air quality modelling commissioned by County, targeting areas with the greatest potential for impact and traffic displacement. The selection process was the result of a collaborative effort between the City's air quality officer and the County's traffic filter planning team.

	Because the congestion charge has been introduced in the same areas where traffic filter trials are expected, the expanded monitoring network is currently well positioned to evaluate its effects, and no extra monitoring is required. However, analysing changes in air quality is complex, as many factors influence pollutant concentrations. Since the congestion charge was only recently implemented, a minimum of one year of monitoring is required to accurately assess the magnitude of any changes. There will only be two months of data covering the introduction of the congestion charge in the 2025 air quality report that will come out in June 2026; the rest will be in June 2027.

AR10: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
An update on the burial site at Horspath Village adjacent to the athletics club please	City officers are working to find resolution to a county highways objection to the scheme. It will then go to South Oxfordshire planning committee.

AR11: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Railton	
Question	**Written Response**
Recently, and repeatedly, a number of works vehicles have been parked on the grass at Manzil Way Gardens causing damage to the grass. Can the portfolio holder please confirm whether any permission has been given for this?	These were contractor's vehicles connected to works at the St Hilda's College Annex. No permission was sought or given for them to bring vehicles onto the site. The college has been contacted and concerns raised, and they have offered to undertake restoration of the grass area disturbed.

Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies

NC1: From Cllr Sandelson to Cllr Chapman	
Question	**Written Response**
Given the uneven and poor quality of pavement repairs in parts of Oxford by Oxford Direct Services, (notably in the Cutteslowe part of Wolvercote Ward), as well as their generally high and unchallenged costs, can the city council in future put similar works out to tender to other contractors?	ODS on behalf of the City Council undertakes a range of works of repair and maintenance on minor streets in the city under an arrangement under S42 of the Highways Act. The type of works and the location of the works to be undertaken are agreed at the beginning of the year with Oxfordshire County Council, who provide funding for them. In Wolvercote Ward, some slurry surfacing has been undertaken. This is designed to prolong the life of existing surfacing rather than a full resurfacing arrangement and therefore a different finish is achieved. If there are any areas of concern, it would be helpful if they could be reported on Fix My Street so they can be inspected by ODS and addressed as appropriate. The cost of the works to be undertaken by ODS is agreed by the County Council when they confirm the schedule of works. ODS engage the same specialist sub-contractor as the County Council for works of this nature, ensuring significant economies of scale and delivering best value alongside consistent quality standards. Furthermore, all costs are subject to rigorous review by the County Council, providing assurance that ODS and the City Council are securing the most competitive and fair pricing available. If works were to be tendered separately, additional resource would be required within the City Council to undertake the procurement and supervise the work. Given the benchmarking that has taken place it is considered that ODS are delivering value for money for the City Council.

NC2: From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Chapman	
Question	**Written Response**
I note the recent submission of updated plans for the Bertie Park development's bridge connecting sites A and B following a pause of over a year in that application's progress. Do you have an estimate of the cost increase due to raising the standard of the bridge proposed, or due to above-inflation construction cost increases in the interim? What lessons are taken from this in terms of feedback to government regarding statutory consultees, or how this council and its companies deliver housing sites?	There is currently no proposed increase in the overall cost of this scheme to the Council over the past year, with any cost implications expected from proposed changes all currently contained with scheme contingencies. As this is still a live planning application, no lessons learned have been developed at this time with a view to sharing with the Government.

NC3: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Chapman	
Question	**Written Response**
Since the regeneration plans, the area that used to be called Spindelberry Nature Park has been neglected with lots of overgrown areas. When will the Park be tended to?	There are currently some works connected with the new development to be undertaken in the area. These were delayed whilst the drainage strategy was revised but this development is nearing completion with occupations due to take place next year. The remainder of the Nature Park is being maintained to the normal schedule but if there are specific concerns can they be raised directly with the Parks team so they can be investigated and allayed.

NC4: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Chapman	
Question	**Written Response**
Can the portfolio holder please outline what work is being undertaken to improve response rates on the	I agree that response times are not where we would want them to be. Interestingly, this is not linked directly to volume, as high volume areas are

members enquiry form in light of members experiencing some enquiries receiving no responses and others enduring lengthy delays?	often doing well. It is low volume and niche technical areas, which seem to be struggling on response times, and plans are being developed for these teams to improve. Officers responsible for answering enquiries receive reminders to respond by the correct dates. Directors also now receive a weekly update email showing outstanding cases for their areas of responsibility. This is also discussed at the Corporate Leadership Team weekly meeting. We are looking at introducing a simple way for Members to be able to follow-up on late enquiries, as well as introducing a clearer drop down set of options to choose from. I shall be monitoring the data at my portfolio meetings, in addition to updates on performance coming to the Leaders Meeting. I would add this is the first time we have been able to record, and monitor Members Enquiries where as before, we had no collective knowledge of them. The system also offers less experienced members a way to submit their case work rather than expecting them to know how to do this on a one-to-one basis with officers.

NC5: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Chapman	
Question	**Written Response**
Can the portfolio holder list all of the different herbicides used by Oxford City Council, ODS or any contractors and give the amounts of each used in each of the past three years; and in which types of locations, each of the different herbicides is used?	Volumes have not changed significantly for the last few years and therefore you can assume that these volumes are consistent from year to year: Treatment to Pavements, garage areas, HRA areas, car parks Trustee Amenity, 3 applications totalling 168 litres in all. Treatment to garden paths, patios etc for the HRA garden scheme (where residents are happy for us to apply) Nomix Duel 5 litres per year total

	To Sheltered schemes, paths and paved areas Nomix Duel approx. 20 litres per year total To ODS depot hardstandings Nomix Dual 5L per year Treatment at schools (for private contracts) and around pavilion buildings Nomix Dual 15L per year Playground hardstandings Nomix Dual 15L per year Treatment of Japanese Knotweed on Countryside sites Roundup Bioactive 1L Treatment of fine turf areas (sports pitches) Football pitches Depitox 500 45L, T2 Green Pro 135L Bowls greens/ tennis Roundup Pro 5L

NC6: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Chapman	
Question	**Written Response**
Can the portfolio holder set out how the council ensures human rights and environmental standards are upheld in the supply chain of textile recycling undertaken by and on behalf of the council?	We request suppliers to provide details of their downstream supply chains and the end market of the materials when we set up our textile recycling service. They must evidence TRUST (Trader Recycling Universal Standard) Certification and/or ISO 9001. TRUST accreditation standard requires independent auditors to verify recyclers meet high standards in health and safety, business practices, labour, environment, and transport. This gives charities confidence when selling their goods to certified traders.

	ISO 9001 accreditation incorporates sustainability, ethics and corporate responsibility into business operations. The contractor had to go through audits as part of the accreditations for TRUST and are working towards ISO 9001 (TRUST not renewed for 2025) which looks at the supply chain. The contractor also has commitments with Charity Partners that is contractual and subsequent membership with the Fundraising Regulator. They also have contracts with sorting partners (copies provided as part of the tender process) which states our expectations and are validated during audits. (last audit Nov 2025 on site in the Ukraine) The ODS Procurement and waste team met with the contractor before awarding the contract to discuss the exportation of textiles as we were unable to get information on the international customers from desk research and wanted assurance and commitment before establishing the service. References were also sought from other councils working with the Contractor to ask what due diligence they had done on the end destination and customers.

NC7: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Chapman	
Question Can the portfolio holder provide the data for the most recent month on where each category of textiles is going – especially unusable ‘rag’ textiles?	**Written Response** We do not collect unusable RAG’s. The contractor dealing with textile collections has confirmed the following supply chain for materials they do collect: • Usable clothing from this contract is sent to our Ukrainian customer. The stock is retained in the country of shipment and resold in a network of second hand and vintage clothing shops

	• Duvets and Pillows are sent to Pakistan for sorting and reforming into stuffings and industrial textile products. • Those 'End of life' garments that maybe collected are recycled into industrial wipers and cloths, mattress filling, insulation and new fibres. The Contractor's systems provide records of end market data, recycling and reuse rates and all associated documentation. More information on the company can be found here About us | Recycling Solutions North West they are members of the Textile recycling association **Collections from Oxford City households and donation banks for Oct 2025** -Duvet/pillows- 5,213kg -Textiles from doorstep collection and banks – 27,404kg

Cabinet Member for Planning and Culture

AH1: From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question	**Written Response**
Re: plans to begin charging for Museum entry: do you know the proportion of Oxford vs. Oxfordshire vs. further-afield visitors? Will you consider City or County residents retaining free or discounted entry, and if so	No. Under the previous system no data about visitors was formally collected, so information isn't available. One of the purposes of ticketed entry is to enable us to collect the relevant data.

what are the relative financial impacts of these options?	Data will be monitored to assist with financial planning and enable access. This data would allow the financial impacts of future plans to be accurately predicted rather than estimated. City and County residents will be able to access the museum for free for at least 12 days per year under the new system, more so for residents with particular circumstances.

AH2: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question	**Written Response**
Oxford has a competitive market for free museums or galleries. EG: The Ashmolean, Pitt Rivers, MAO and The History of Science Museum. Is there a risk that introducing the MOX entry fee will reduce footfall and fail to make a big enough difference to the budget spend on the museum?	These museums have collections of historic or current materials with a specific national and international attraction, as well paid for exhibitions and events. These materials and events drew in visitors from across the UK and beyond. The offer in MOX is different. MOX is the only museum in Oxford which tells the story of Oxford not just as a collection of historic buildings but of the people who have made this city what it is. Marketing this across the city, in partnership with other attractions where relevant, will attract those who want to learn more about the city and its people. Evidence suggests that where people have paid to get in – such as the events in MOX which are already subject to a charge – visitors are both more likely to attend and are also more likely to spend more time engaging with the museum and are therefore more likely to spend money at the museum shop.

AH3: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Hollingsworth

Question	Written Response
Could the cabinet member explain why "the free entry [at MOX] may have had a negative impact on visitor's perception of the potential quality of the offer" (point 7. Cabinet Agenda item 9.) When point 6. above names 2 "world renowned" museums; The Ashmolean and Natural History Museum Oxford which are both free and presumably don't have a negative perception due to being free.	Evidence from MOX and from museums more widely confirms that if entry is free then visitors are less likely to perceive the offer as positive, less likely to make a visit even after accepting an invitation to an event and less likely to spend time in the location and therefore money in the museum shop. This was confirmed by the impact of introducing charging for events at MOX, where attendance rates increased, not decreased. The offer at both the Ashmolean and the Natural History Museum is significantly larger than that at MOX, which makes them not comparable. The Ashmolean does charge entry for exhibitions, which are some of its most significant attractions. The standard ticket entry for the current exhibition for example is £16.20.

AH4: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question	**Written Response**
Planning application for the Ozone: when will the application go before the planning committee to be decided and considering the target date for the determination date was 23/09/25, what has caused the delay in it going to committee?	All live planning applications are subject to a range of issues that impact on the decision-making process, such as requirements for evidence from the applicant, third parties with a statutory consultation right such as the Environment Agency, or where planning officers need to seek clarification on a particular element of that evidence. It is not possible to answer about a specific live planning application. There is currently no fixed proposed date for the application to reach the Planning Committee.

AH5: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Hollingsworth

Question	Written Response
The following questions relate to the Ozone area planning which is of much concern to many residents. There are currently two applications: Planning Ref No: 25/01588/FUL but also another for the Bingo Hall (AKA Unit 1) Planning Ref No: 23/01198/FUL (for demolishing the Bingo Hall and replacement with life sciences labs etc). Why are there 2 applications when it would appear more logical to have only one which covers the entire site that will be developed? And why isn't The Bingo Hall application listed under related cases on the planning portal for 25/01588/FUL?	It is up to an applicant to decide how and when to submit planning applications, and it is up the Local Planning Authority to meet their legal requirement to decide on the applications it has received. In this case one application is for the whole site, and one is for part of the site. As they have both been submitted by the applicant the law requires the City Council as the planning authority to consider both applications and arrive at a decision on both. The planning portal is software outside the control of the Council, but related applications are linked by having an identical address/site definition, which these do not, as one only applies to part of the site.

AH6: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question What has delayed the decision on The Bingo Hall application more than 2 years?	**Written Response** The applicant has not completed the s106 agreement, and therefore the decision cannot be issued by the City Council

AH7: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question Can the Portfolio holder explain whether Oxford City Council supports the inclusion of a multi-modal transport hub in the new masterplan for Oxford Train Station?	**Written Response** The West End and Osney SPD was approved by this Council as part of the Development Plan was adopted by the City Council in November 2022. This document provides additional guidance to the existing Local Plan 2036, which has specific policies covering Oxford Station. The West End and Osney SPD makes clear that one of the four core objectives for the Station Gateway site is "To provide a multi-modal hub". This is based on the language used in paragraph 128 of the SPD which

	says that a critical outcome is “Establishing Oxford Station as a world-class multi-modal transport hub”.

AH8: From Cllr Rawle to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question The council is about to embark on a new pitch strategy, which will outline the current need for sports pitches across the city. The current pitch strategy draws on data from 2018-19 and is therefore likely to be largely out of date. Can the portfolio holder confirm whether the design of a new pitch strategy will conclude prior to the final draft of the local plan? If it will not, can the portfolio holder explain how the new local plan, relevant site allocations and policies, might be developed in a way that makes it possible for the changing demand for sports pitches to be taken into account? Is it possible for the plan to ensure that planning officers and committees are able to take into account new data on demand when reviewing applications?	**Written Response** The current Play Pitch Strategy covers the period from 2022 to 2036, so it is sufficient for sport and physical activity operations. However, it was considered sensible, given the work being carried out on a new Local Plan, to begin work on a new Playing Pitch Strategy. While the Strategy will not be fully completed by the time the Local Plan is submitted for Inspection, the work on the evidence base required for the new Strategy will be largely complete, and this evidence base will be used to inform the policies in the new Local Plan as they are submitted to the Inspector. The intention is to publish this emerging evidence base alongside the Draft Local Plan. Officers in both Planning and Leisure are working alongside one another to ensure that both the Draft Local Plan and the emerging Strategy effectively incorporate the emerging evidence. When reviewing a planning application, decision makers, whether officers or the Planning Committee, have to give weight to the Local Plan that is extant at the time of the decision.

AH9: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question Does the portfolio holder agree that a multi-storey car-park should not be included in the plans for the new development at Oxford Train Station?	**Written Response** The new development at Oxford Station, which could include a new track and bridge on the east side of the station to match the new track on the west side, and then the new platform and entirely new station building that would be required as a result, is an exciting and transformational opportunity to deliver the kind of Oxford Station that we can be proud of.

	The vision of this new station “as a world-class multi-modal transport hub” is integral in the West End and Osney Mead SPD, which is part of this Council’s Development Plan along with the Local Plan 2036. All of this requires space, and it requires a very substantial amount of money to pay for it. This will only come from taking the site that is currently the Becket Street car park, and replacing it with developments that deliver the increase in capital values necessary to pay for the new railway bridge, new track, new platforms, and new station building The City Council has long expressed its desire for a no or low customer car parking solution as part of any redeveloped train station. We will continue to push for this as part of the development of the latest masterplan. It is proposed that the Network Rail-led masterplan about to start at the station will inform a planning application. This will need to be supported by a robust Transport Assessment and this, alongside all other planning and transport policies, will help inform the eventual application.

AH10: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question	**Written Response**
Can the portfolio holder set out how many alcohol licences within the two Special Saturation areas of Cowley Road and the city centre have been refused in the past three years as a result of the Special Saturation Policy?	In the past three years, there has been one alcohol licence refusal within the Special Saturation areas of Cowley Road and the city centre, where an objection related to the Special Saturation Policy.

AH11: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question	**Written Response**
Can the portfolio holder set out how many new licensing applications there have been within the	Between April and November 2025, when the Special Saturation Policy was not in place, there were 17 new licensing applications within the

previously designated Special Saturation Policy areas since the Special Saturation Policy has not been in place; and how many new licensing applications, within these were there in the same time period the previous year?	previously designated SSP areas. During the same period in 2024, when the policy was in effect, there were 8 applications.

AH12: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Hollingsworth	
Question	**Written Response**
In light of the £10 billion proposed investment by Larry Ellison in research, science and development, can the portfolio holder please reaffirm that the central priority of this council will remain firmly focused on housing delivery over and above employment space?	The significant investment into Oxford by the Ellison Institute of Technology is testimony to the scientific and academic draw of the city. This investment will be focused on the Oxford Science Park, a site which is allocated employment land. As the Local Plan 2036 makes clear, every employment site in Oxford – including sites such as the major hospitals, academic institutes, BMW and the various science and business parks – can be used for housing development, as long as relevant national and local planning policies are met. No new employment sites were allocated in the Local Plan 2036. The City Council continues to leave no stone unturned to find sites suitable for housing, and as part of the Local Plan 2036 and the emerging new Local Plan has already reached out to neighbouring Councils regarding accommodating housing need that cannot be met in the city because sufficient sites are not available.

Cabinet Member for a Healthy, Fairer Oxford and Small Business Champion

CM1: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr Munkonge

Question	Written Response
Many basketball courts in Council run parks in Oxford still have damaged or missing nets on the basketball hoops. Can the Cabinet Member make sure that all sports nets in the Parks are checked on a regular basis and repaired or replaced when needed?	The ODS Parks teams undertake regular checks of parks facilities. New replacement basketball nets are on order and will be replaced shortly.

CM2: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Munkonge	
Question	**Written Response**
Wolvercote Cricket Club has been waiting far too long for this council to sign off the lease on the cricket nets in Cutteslowe Park. Will the cabinet member please give me a binding guarantee of a date by which this will be done?	The Council is sorry for any inconvenience caused whilst the lease is going through the necessary process. A new officer is in post and will pick up and make contact with the club to help progress this. The Council is only in control of 50% of the transaction and the timescale is dependent on the responses from both parties. However, in the meantime this does not impact the clubs' ability to use the site.

CM3: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Munkonge	
Question	**Written Response**
Where will the Sandy Lane replacement like for like pitches be located, and what is the timeline for their availability?	Officers from OCC are currently working with officers from OxPlace to explore options for the relocation of pitches from Sandy Lane. At this stage we are not in a position to confirm exactly where the relocation sites will be. We will be working in collaboration with local members as well as the users of Sandy Lane to fully explore options for the relocation of the pitches and can provide a further update once sites have been confirmed.

	The replacement sports pitches will be planned to be in place before any such operations at Sandy Lane cease. As such we do not anticipate there being any temporary loss of pitches.

CM4: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Munkonge	
Question I am aware you have been engaging local businesses concerning the congestion charge which has been helpful and some hope that one council at least takes the time to listen. Given local businesses have already stated loss of business due to congestion charges, what additional processes or plans have we in place to monitor trade and the ramifications of the congestion charge.	**Written Response** We are always happy to engage with businesses and would encourage them to raise concerns with the relevant agencies. There has not yet been sufficient time to draw any conclusions on the implications of the congestion charge on businesses, but we will work with them to ensure that where they have issues of concern we are helping direct them to the right place.

Cabinet Member for Housing and Communities

LS1: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr L Smith	
Question 1. Can the Cabinet Member inform the Council how many complaints have been received this	**Written Response**

year from tenants of Housing Associations in the city? 2. Is this an increase over previous years? 3. Is any one Housing Association generating more complaints than expected?	There were 12 complaints in 2024/25 and 10 so far in 2025/26 (to 17 November). GreenSquareAccord has the highest number this year with four. A detailed breakdown is provided below.

	24/25	25/26 to 17 Nov
A2 Dominion	2	1
GreenSquareAccord	3	4
Home Group	1	1
Legal and General Affordable Homes	1	1
Orbit	0	1
Peabody	4	2
Stonewater	1	0

LS2: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr L Smith

Question	**Written Response**
Section 42 Social Housing (Regulation) Act 2023, often known as Awaab's Law, came into effect in England from 27 October 2025. Can the Cabinet Member outline what steps the Council has taken to ensure that all Council housing properties are compliant with the provisions of this legislation?	A new Damp and Mould Policy was approved by Cabinet in October which sets out the Council's full approach to ensuring compliance with Awaab's Law. Procedures are in place between ODS and OCC with additional capacity built into both organisations to support the delivery of the legislation, with dedicated damp and mould teams in both organisations.

LS3: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr L Smith

Question	**Written Response**

When will Knights road re open for access to residents?	The road is due to reopen before Christmas.

LS4: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr L Smith	
Question Regarding the residents in Windale House and Northbrook House - the letter to residents implied that legal action would be taken against elderly residents if they refused to leave their homes and the options offered to them. Could the cabinet member clarify whether legal action is a possibility if the residents turned down accommodation being offered to them by next spring?	**Written Response** The Council has been actively working with tenants in Windale House and Northbrook House since the start of the year when we shared our plans for the future of both blocks, supporting them to move to alternative suitable accommodation. We have so far successfully rehoused 32 tenants, and are working with the remaining 20 tenants to find them accommodation, 13 of which have offers of alternative accommodation and are waiting for a moving date. We continue to aim to rehouse all tenants into an alternative home of their choice, and are providing support with finding alternative accommodation, support with the moving process, and providing financial compensation. As with any programme of moving tenants ahead of future reuse and demolition of a building we have the ability to serve relevant legal orders, and as a last resort apply to court to ensure the building becomes vacant. We will only take this final step if all attempts to engage and support the final tenants are not successful, enabling us to ensure the wider plans to first reuse and then redevelop the sites can proceed without significant delay, helping us meet the housing needs of Oxford citizens.

This page is intentionally left blank

www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

To:	**Council**
Date:	**24 November 2025**
Report of:	**Director of Law, Governance and Strategy**
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 put to the Cabinet members or Leader, registered by the deadline in the Constitution, are 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 to be taken in Part 2 of the agenda

Addresses to be taken in Part 2 of the agenda

1. Robin Tucker

Oxon4Buses has launched a petition calling on Network Rail to provide a proper bus hub at Oxford Rail Station, in line with **Oxford City Council's vision for the new Oxford train station area and Oxford Station Masterplan**.

The petition is in response to the absence of any mention of provision for buses (eg bus stops/ bus station/ interchange) from Network Rail's recent tender for development of the train station site. Network Rail's tender requires 'station entrances, public realm, multi-storey car park, cycle hub, offices, life sciences, hotel and residential elements' – but it omits provision for buses.

The omission of access and parking for buses conflicts with **Oxford City Council's Oxford Station Master Plan** documents. These refer in various forms to a comprehensive transport interchange including proper bus parking eg a 'new interchange for walking, cycling and bus'.

The Network Rail contract was allocated in October. The petition aims to give voice to public concern about proper provision for buses and a joined-up public transport system in Oxford. **The lack of any plans for buses requires urgent attention – this**

petition calls on Network Rail, Oxford City Council, Oxfordshire County Council and relevant stakeholders to act now to reverse this omission.

Why do we need provision for buses at the new train station?

Better public transport, and seamless connection between different forms of transport, will be key to reducing congestion in and around Oxford. As the petition says, the redesign of the Oxford train station is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to transform Oxford's transport system, and buses are an integral part of this.

The **planned increase in train services** amplifies the need for a station design that includes a proper bus hub to accommodate those travelling to and from the station.

A combined bus/rail interchange would bring more people to the station area, increasing the value and development opportunities of everything around that site, whether part of Network Rails development or others nearby, and increasing the potential number of rail passengers – a win-win.

Why is this urgent?

Network Rail allocated the contract for the design of the train station site in October 2025. A design that omits provision for buses would conflict with the Oxford Local Plan and Oxford Station Masterplan, so decision-makers need to rectify this omission now, before the design work gets underway.

Why have Network Rail omitted a bus hub from the tender?

We don't know. Previous plans have included provision for bus access and comprehensive bus parking, including most recently the **West End and Osney Mead supplementary planning documents**.

Oxon4Buses has contacted Network Rail, Oxford City Council, Oxford Bus Company and other stakeholders. A first reply on behalf of Network Rail states "buses are always going to be an important part of the future of Oxford station'" but does not explain why buses have been omitted from the tender document.

How to help pedestrians?

Relatively few bus services come to the present station, partly because of limited space. This means most people have to trundle their cases and buggies along narrow, uneven pavements (such as Hythe Bridge Street) to find the bus they need, whatever the weather and despite limited mobility in some cases. This is not the welcome we would like to give our visitors and fellow travellers.

Do we need a multi-storey car park?

Oxfordshire County Council are committed to reducing congestion from cars in the centre of Oxford, and have introduced a congestion charge which will be followed by traffic filters when Botley Road bridge is open. If these policies are successful, as we hope they will be, then there should be many less cars parking at the station.

Is a multi-storey car park a good economic choice?

It seems odd that Network Rail should prioritise a multi-storey car park over buses, when most parked cars have resulted in just one person coming to the station, once a day, whereas buses are continually delivering many passengers, throughout the day.

What about Gloucester Green?

The airport buses and other long-distance services use Gloucester Green on George Street as their terminus. This is an awkward and unattractive site, so we want consideration to be given to moving these services into the bus hub at the Oxford rail station. Let's have joined up thinking about joined up travel.

Why now?

Oxfordshire County Council are designing improvements to movement around the centre of Oxford and to creating a better sense of place for our historic city. The bus and cycle networks are already under consideration. These would be facilitated by new bus routes going to the station and freeing up space.

This page is intentionally left blank

www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

To:	**Council**
Date:	**24 November 2025**
Report of:	**Scrutiny Committee**
Title of Report:	**Update from the Scrutiny Committee**

Summary and recommendations	
Decision being taken:	To update Council on the work of the Scrutiny Committee and Working Groups.
Key decision:	No
Lead Member:	Councillor Alex Powell, Chair of the Scrutiny Committee
Corporate Priority:	A Well-Run Council
Policy Framework:	None

Recommendation(s): That Council resolves to:
1. **Note** the work of the Scrutiny Committee and the recommendations as set out in the report.

Information Exempt From Publication	
N/A	N/A

Appendix No.	Appendix Title	Exempt from Publication
Appendix 1	Scrutiny recommendations and Cabinet responses	No
Appendix 2	Exempt Scrutiny recommendations for SJVG	Yes

Introduction and Overview

1. This report provides an update on the activities of the Scrutiny Committee and its Working Groups since the last update to Council on 6 October 2025. It covers the period from 1 October 2025 to 19 November 2025.
2. Section 9F of the Local Government Act 2000 grants the power to the Scrutiny Committee to make reports or recommendations to the Cabinet with respect to the

discharge of any functions which are the responsibility of the Executive; and on matters which affect the authority's area or the inhabitants of that area.

Update on Scrutiny Activities

3. Since the last full Council meeting, the Scrutiny Committee held ordinary meetings on 14 October 2025 and 11 November 2025 to consider a rage of substantive items. In addition, a Special meeting was held on 5 November 2025 to review Oxford City Council's proposal for the local government reorganisation.

   14 October 2025

   - Project Approval and Delegations for Westlands Drive and Halliday Hill affordable housing scheme
   - Anti-Social Behaviour Policy
   - Annual Safeguarding Report

   5 November 2025 – Special

   - Local Government Reorganisation

   11 November 2025

   - Hackney Carriage Emissions Standards Report

4. The Committee also endorsed recommendations from the following Working Group meetings:

   Finance and Performance Working Group – 29 October 2025

   - OX Place - Annual Accounts and Dividends Declarations [SJVG]
   - OX Place - Options Review [SJVG]
   - Online Payments System Update

5. In reviewing the abovementioned reports, the Committee submitted 7 recommendations to Cabinet, of which 6 were agreed.
6. Cabinet considered these at its meetings on 22 October 2025, 10 November 2025 (Special) and 19 November 2025. Written commentaries were provided to inform Scrutiny of the rationale behind Cabinet's decision. There is a table summary setting out in detail the recommendations and responses, included as Appendix 1. No table was produced for items where no recommendations were made.
7. Recommendations concerning the Council's wholly-owned companies were endorsed under delegated authority by the Scrutiny and Governance Advisor, in consultation with the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee. These were submitted to the Shareholder and Joint Venture Group for consideration at their meeting on 6 November 2025. Further details are provided in the exempt Appendix 2.

Summary of discussions

Local Government Reorganisation

8. Scrutiny convened a Special meeting on 5 November 2025 to review Oxford City Council's Three Unitary Authorities proposal and discuss the local government reorganisation models. In discussion, the Committee focused on the importance of a model that protects local identity, keeps decision making close to communities, and can realistically support long-term service delivery. The Committee was clear that any future structure needs to be ambitious but still rooted in how people actually live and organise locally.

9. One of the key points raised related to Oxford's representation and how this could be maintained under the proposed arrangements, and within a wider Mayoral Strategic Authority framework. Noting that the adopted model must ensure both urban and rural influence are represented equitably, it was important to the Committee that Oxford's urban voice is preserved and not risk being diluted by predominantly rural structures. On this point, some members expressed concerns that the Single Unitary Authority model could blur local identity and accountability by overlooking regional differences, potentially weakening the ability to meet specific community needs and diverse demographics. They warned that this could result in missed opportunities to tailor policies and services to the differing contexts of Oxfordshire's urban and rural areas.

10. Another point raised was the pressures faced by voluntary organisations, particularly those outside Oxford and Banbury, with members exploring how the 3UA model could better support these groups. The Committee recognised that the 3UA's place-based approach would offer more local-level collaborations and also support county-level initiatives. They thought that this would help enable stronger partnerships between authorities and voluntary sector, helping to ensure smaller organisations are not left behind.

11. Touching on place-based identity, the Committee was curious how the proposed boundaries were drawn and whether thorough consideration had been given to existing community identities. To this, members were informed that boundaries had been chosen to preserve a sense of place, avoid destabilising established communities, and respect historic lines. The Committee noted that the proposed Greater Oxford boundaries broadly follow the current Green Belt which could allow local residents greater autonomy and more direct influence over how these areas develop.

12. Scrutiny examined further issues including staff transitions, job losses, and financial management associated with the reorganisation.

13. Throughout its consideration, the Committee raised points that reflected a strong desire for a model of local government that is both ambitious in scope and ground in local realities. On that basis, they agreed that the Three Unitary Authorities proposal offered the most workable, community-focused and balanced option available. Scrutiny Committee therefore agreed to recommend to Cabinet that the 3UA model be put forward as Oxford City council's preferred approach for local government reorganisation.

Hackney Carriage Emissions Standards Report

14. Scrutiny Committee considered the Hackney Carriage Emissions Standards report at their meeting on 11 November 2025.

15. Initial questions raised pertained to governance including the confusion about decision-making responsibilities, impact on the General Purposes Licensing Committee and future licensing arrangements. The Committee discussed the implications of delaying the policy, specifically the effects it would have on drivers in terms of feasibility, financially, and overall fairness. Air quality and environmental concerns were also discussed in length, including consistency of approach in alignment with the Council's Zero Carbon goals. Strong expression of interest was made in ensuring any delay is not only justified and time-bound, but also fair to those involved.
16. The Committee noted the various uncertainties surrounding the local government reorganisation, expressing that this should not prevent the Cabinet or Council from continuing to pursue strategies and policy direction already set.
17. In closing, the Committee reiterated that clear decision-making, fairness to the trade, and staying true to the Council's environmental aims must remain central to the decision on this issue.

Acknowledgements

18. The Scrutiny Committee would like to thank the Cabinet for the cross-party way in which the LGR proposals were developed and the opportunity benefitted to Council members to feed into the process at various points, and again discussions with Scrutiny members. With particular thanks to Councillor Susan Brown (Leader, Partnership Working), Caroline Green (Chief Executive), Mish Tullar (Transition Director), Nigel Kennedy (Group Finance Director), Bill Lewis (Financial Accounting Manager), Emma Jackman (Director of Law, Governance & Strategy) (Monitoring Officer), Lucy Cherry (Policy and Partnerships Officer), Clare Keen (Policy and Partnerships Officer), and Jonathan Malton (Committee and Member Services Manager) and all involved for their contributions in this process.
19. The Committee would also like to offer its thanks to all Council Officers, Members and Speakers who contributed to Scrutiny's work and meetings this reporting period.

Financial implications

20. Financial implications for the reports listed above were outlined within the reports presented at Scrutiny Committee or Working Group.
21. Where appropriate, any further financial implications were reviewed when considering the recommendations.

Legal issues

22. Legal implications for the reports listed above were outlined within the reports presented at Scrutiny Committee or Working Group.
23. Where appropriate, any further legal implications were reviewed when considering the recommendations.

Level of risk

24. Risk Registers, where appropriate, were linked to the reports presented at Scrutiny Committee or Working Groups.

25. Where appropriate, the risk register was reviewed when considering the recommendations.

Equalities impact

26. Equalities Impact Assessments, where appropriate, were linked to the reports presented at Scrutiny Committee or Working Groups.

27. Where appropriate, the Equalities Impact Assessments was reviewed when considering the recommendations.

Carbon and Environmental Considerations

28. Consideration for Carbon and Environmental impacts, where appropriate, were linked to the reports presented at Scrutiny Committee or Working Groups.

29. Where appropriate, the Carbon and Environmental impacts were reviewed when considering the recommendations.

Report author	Celeste Reyeslao
Job title	Scrutiny and Governance Advisor
Service area or department	Law, Governance and Strategy
Telephone	01865 252946
e-mail	creyeslao@oxford.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1: Scrutiny Recommendations and Cabinet Responses

Table 1 – Cabinet response to the list of Scrutiny recommendations in October 2025

The table below sets out the response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made or endorsed by the Scrutiny Committee during its meeting on 14 October 2025.

Anti-Social Behaviour

Recommendation	***Agree?***	***Comment***
1) For Officers to explore the feasibility of gathering and analysis of data on protected characteristics of both: individuals complained about through the ASB service, and individuals making complaints through the ASB service. Recognising that some data may be limited in validity, that findings from the collected and analysed data be reported back to the Scrutiny Committee at an appropriate time within the next two years.	Yes	We accept this recommendation.
2) That officers set out within the Policy the work the Council is currently undertaking and plans to undertake in relation to proactive prevention of ASB, including actions such as working with youth groups, redesigning areas, and improving coordination between council services.	Yes	The policy will include a broad policy statement on prevention activities, working in partnership to achieve these goals. It won't give details of specific interventions that could change during the life of policy.
3) That there is a clear commitment within the ASB Policy to work collaboratively with Registered Providers in addressing anti-social behaviour, including requesting information from local RPs on levels and types of ASB reports received within their housing stock. This information can then be used to identify patterns, overlaps and gaps between council and RP data, and	Yes	We accept this recommendation.

reporting back on the efficacy of this partnership working and health of relationships with RPs as part of the Council' wider multi-agency approach to ASB management.		

Annual Safeguarding Report

Recommendation	***Agree?***	***Comment***
1) That future Safeguarding reports provide comparisons with previous years data to allow monitoring of trends and assessment progress, particularly data in relation to modern slavery and exploitation, and severe weather emergency protocol (SWEP). Where the data allows for trend analysis, that previous statistics be included to enable a year-on-year comparison and evaluation of changes overtime.	Yes	Previous years' data to be included in future safeguarding reports to allow for year-on-year trend analysis.

Table 2 – Cabinet response to the list of Scrutiny recommendations in November 2025

The table below sets out the response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made or endorsed by the Scrutiny Committee during its Special meeting on 5 November 2025 and ordinary meeting on 11 November 2025.

Local Government Reorganisation

Recommendation	***Agree?***	***Comment***
1) The Scrutiny Committee recommends that the Three Unitary Authorities proposal be formally submitted as Oxford City Council's preferred model for local government reorganisation to Government.	Yes	This is line with officers' recommendation, that Cabinet submits the 3UA LGR proposal to Government.

Hackney Carriage Emissions Standards

Recommendation	***Agree?***	***Comment***
1) To have consistency with emissions standards policies for both Private Hire Vehicles and Hackney Carriage Vehicles.	No	Given the wider context of the recommendation for Hackneys, the same uncertainty lies with LGR for decisions around harmonising PHV standards with those of Hackneys. It would therefore not be a good use of a (large amount) of officer time to undertake this work at this time.
2) In the event that Cabinet approves the delay to the implementation of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emission Standards Amendment to align with Local Government Reorganisation, they will review this once the timescale been defined.	Yes	If no clear timetable for Local Government Reorganisation decision for Oxfordshire is made by Government by the end of 2026, the General Purposes Licensing Committee could review the policy ahead of the decision being taken by the appropriate decision making body at that time, either Cabinet or Council.

This page is intentionally left blank

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

www.oxford.gov.uk

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

To:	**Council**
Date:	**24 November 2025**
Report of:	**Director of Law, Governance and Strategy**
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 Director of Law, Governance and Strategy in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.18 by the deadline of 1.00pm on 12 November 2025, as amended by the proposers.

All substantive amendments sent by councillors to the Director of Law, Governance and Strategy 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 Oxford Alliance, Oxford Community Independents, Oxford Independent Group, Real Independent, Labour, Liberal Democrat, Green, groups in that order.

Introduction

a) Oppose a Work Place Parking Levy and planned Bus Gates in Oxford (proposed by Cllr Henwood, seconded Cllr Yeatman)

b) Bring Thames Water into public ownership (Proposed by Cllr Mundy, Seconded by Cllr Djafari-Marbini)

c) Democracy and Freedom (proposed by Cllr Rehman, seconded by Cllr Latif)

d) Better use of Oxpens Bridge Funding (proposed by Cllr Jupp, seconded by Cllr Miles)

e) A World-Class Multi-Modal Transport Hub for Oxford Station (Proposed by Cllr Lois Muddiman, Seconded by Cllr Emily Kerr)

a) Oppose a Work Place Parking Levy and planned Bus Gates in Oxford (proposed by Cllr Henwood, seconded Cllr Yeatman)

Independent Oxford Alliance Group Motion

Oxford City Council notes that Oxfordshire County Council has approved and expressed support for:

1. The proposed **Bus gate (filter) scheme**;
2. The proposed **Workplace Parking Levy (WPL)**;

Oxford City Council further notes significant public concern regarding the potential economic, social, and accessibility impacts of these measures on residents, businesses, and visitors.

Council therefore resolves to:

1. **Oppose** for the proposed Bus Gate (filter) Scheme, and the proposed Workplace Parking Levy.
2. Request the Leader of the Council to write to the Leader of Oxfordshire County Council and other relevant authorities as the local highways authority to communicate this resolution.
3. Continue to support sustainable, balanced approaches to improving air quality, public transport, and cycling/walking infrastructure that do not unduly penalise residents, workers, or businesses.

b) Bring Thames Water into public ownership (Proposed by Cllr Mundy, Seconded by Cllr Djafari-Marbini)

Oxford Community Independent Group

Thames Water has become known for poor performance for managing their vital infrastructure. Having managed to discharge raw sewage into the region's waterways for almost 300,000 hours in 2024[1], the company faced record breaking fines from Ofwat this year. In an ironic twist, Thames Water pleaded poverty when negotiating the fine downwards- committing to paying less than 20% of the £122.7 million fine within the next four and a half years. A fine made larger and of course less affordable by the £170 million in dividends paid out over the last two years.[2] The failure of water companies across the country is being rewarded with huge executive salaries: The average pay for water company CEOs in 2022 was £1.7 million.[3] A natural monopoly like water should be publicly owned. According to The People's Commission on the Water Sector, the environment secretary's claims that taking water back into public ownership is unaffordable, was backed by misleading figures with no basis in law.[4]

---

[1] https://www.theguardian.com/business/2025/mar/18/thames-water-data-reveals-raw-sewage-discharges-rivers-2024 **Thames Water data reveals raw sewage discharges in rivers rose 50% in 2024. The Guardian 18/03/2025**

[2] https://www.itv.com/news/meridian/2025-08-27/thames-water-negotiates-payment-plan-following-record-fine **Thames Water negotiates payment plan following record £122.7 million fine. ITV Meridian 27/08/2025**

[3] https://www.mirror.co.uk/money/fat-cat-water-firm-bosses-26229950 **EXCLUSIVE: 'Fat cat' water firm bosses earn £15m as amount of raw sewage dumped in rivers rockets. Daily Mirror 15/02/2022**

[4] https://www.theguardian.com/business/2025/aug/03/a-fair-price-to-the-public-for-water-nationalisation **A fair price to the public for water nationalisation**

People of Oxford are fed up of polluted waterways that used to be fit for leisure activities, fed up of aging burst water pipes flooding our streets[5], and dismayed at the daft plans for an enormous reservoir which tears up local landscape and is costly and un-necessary.[6]
Yes, we have been here before, our Council passed a motion pushing for the nationalisation of Thames Water back in January 2023. But the Labour government still chooses not to take bold action to take back control of our water supply, deciding instead that a new regulator will solve the problems. Our Council has the opportunity to push for a rethink, to urge the government to renationalise Thames Water.

This Council resolves to:

- Request that the Leader of the Council writes to Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Emma Reynolds, with Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Water and Flooding Emma Hardy, stating that water privatisation has failed the people of Oxford and that our water supplier needs to be brought in to public hands.
- Ask the Planning cabinet member to write to Thames Water CEO seeking:

1. An explanation for the deplorable state of our water infrastructure. Asking, why our city suffered so much disruption from burst water mains this summer, and what is being done to ensure that the same won't be repeated.
2. A resolution of when we will see an end to routine (outside of recognised extreme wet weather conditions) dumping of raw sewerage overflow in to Oxford's local waterways.
3. An urgent timetable of when sewage works in The Leys and Littlemore will be modernised and brought up to capacity to prevent the annual stench across these areas in the summer months.

- For Oxford City Council to engage with local groups such as Windrush Against Sewage Pollution and Boycott Thames Water, to push for better standards from our water supplier.

c) Democracy and Freedom (proposed by Cllr Rehman, seconded by Cllr Latif)

Oxford Independent Group Motion

As we prepare today to restructure our local government organisation to improve residents lives, for a better more inclusive and fair society.

To enable people and communities to have greater say in what matters to them most.

The government states it wants communities to decide their own futures in short to create a fairer more democratic inclusive society.

Unfortunately, across the world today we see countries being governed by people who have either taken power by force or rigged elections, denying civilians their mandate to the freedom to choose their leaders, in short their right to freedom.

---

[5] https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c79qr333jv4o and https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cwyj7ldw14eo and https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cr5v223epnlo and https://www.dailymail.co.uk/video/news/video-2750371/Video-Oxford-City-Centre-suffers-water-pipe-burst-UK-hosepipe-ban.html **BBC and Daily Mail Summer 2025**

[6] https://theconversation.com/the-uk-is-surprisingly-short-of-water-but-more-reservoirs-arent-the-answer-243440 **The UK is surprisingly short of water – but more reservoirs aren't the answer. The Conversation 01/13/2025**

This has led to mass migration, people not fleeing danger from natural disasters or persecution, but seeking freedom and hope to live freely.

This new wave of migration has placed a huge strain on countries giving sanctuary, such as ours.

The economic impact has been immense and the feeling of Britain being a soft touch and/or being taken for a ride has led to rise of division and animosity within communities.

The biggest tragedy of all has been the rise in anger against genuine refugees facing persecution. They are now feeling scared made feeling unwelcome at a time they desperately need sanctuary.

Our government has a responsibility to the British people both financially and as defenders of democracy to cut ties with such oppressive regimes. It cannot be simply brushed away or ignored any longer, when it is directly impacting lives of residents in our communities.

Our government should immediately halt aid and grants to such governments.

A government which has stolen mandate, cannot be trusted to distribute such monies, especially at a time when people in Britain are facing huge hardship.

I know such funds would make a huge difference to my ward and our city.

It is time our government stood up for the rule of law and democracy wherever it has been denied.

The government has a moral obligation to put the British people first and can do so by internationally taking a moral stance to protect Democracy and Rule of Law

Council calls upon the leader to write to our prime minister to:

- Ask him to confirm Britain's commitment to support the rule of law and democracy across the world, by reaffirming the overriding principal of democracy which is not to hold political prisoners.
- That regime stakeholders to be censored and banned from purchasing and investing in Britain.
- The Government introduce a more stringent vetting procedure which would stop the situation as we witness with the Russian oligarchs at the onset of the Ukraine invasion.
- Outlining that to make a reaffirmation to the country's commitment would send a clear message that Oxford and Britain welcome genuine refugees and upholds the principles of Law and democracy.

d) Better use of Oxpens Bridge Funding (proposed by Cllr Jupp, seconded by Cllr Miles)

Liberal Democrat Group Motion

Council notes:

- The cost of the Oxpens bridge has substantially increased since its original approval, and is running considerably behind other Growth Deal projects.
- That government has the option to repurpose the money for use in other active travel schemes and entrust the County Council to manage this.

- Government can and does vary the rules of the Deal from time to time. Thus far, government has rightly prioritised the spirit and objectives of the Deal above the letter of the agreement.
- Doubt remains that the Oxpens bridge will be able to provide a dry route to Osney Island and thereby unlock housing, due to the low-lying railway underpass in-between.
- The Growth Board (now Future Oxfordshire Partnership) was strongly urged against pursuing the Oxpens bridge project to begin with.

Council therefore believes it would be sensible to examine alternatives, and open a conversation with the County and/or the Ministry on options that deliver greater benefits for the residents of Oxford.

Council therefore resolves to ask the Leader to write to the relevant Minister, in full consultation with the accountable body for the Growth Deal funds, requesting that in the event of the bridge not going ahead:

- That the Growth Deal by varied as necessary to permit the funds to be used for other specified purposes in Oxford;
- That other options be explored to better employ the funds, including but not limited to:
    - Resurrecting the substantive scheme for Woodstock Road improvements to mitigate the effect of housing development to the north;
    - Revisiting the pedestrian bridge across the A40 at Barton Park which was dropped at planning stage, resulting in very real and significant safety concerns for residents;
    - Resurrecting the long-discussed plan for a foot/cycle bridge across the Thames at Jackdaw Lane, providing a safe and convenient alternative to the challenging Plain roundabout for residents of south and east Oxford.

Council notes that each of these schemes has been worked up in detail, and are thus available to re-visit, making any one of them attractive to a government which has the best interests of Oxford's residents at heart.

e) A World-Class Multi-Modal Transport Hub for Oxford Station (Proposed by Cllr Lois Muddiman, Seconded by Cllr Emily Kerr)

Green Group Motion

Council notes:

1. The redevelopment of **Oxford Railway Station**[7] offers a once-in-a-generation opportunity to create a **world-class gateway** to Oxford that reflects the city's status as a global centre for learning, innovation, and tourism.

[7] https://www.oxford.gov.uk/building-projects/oxford-station-masterplan

2. The **Oxon4Buses[8] campaign and petition** calls for the new station to be developed as a **multi-modal transport hub**—integrating local and regional buses, coaches, trains, cycling, walking, taxis, and shared mobility.

3. The Movement Strategy in OCC's adopted **Oxford West End and Osney Mead Supplementary Planning Document 2022[9]** states that vehicular dominance, particularly in the West End is to be reduced with car-free developments & reductions in car parking.

4. **Gloucester Green Bus Station** occupies a valuable central site that could potentially be better used for alternative city-centre purposes if coach and bus services are relocated to a fully integrated station hub.

Council believes:

1. Oxford should aspire to a **transport interchange of international quality**, providing seamless connections between rail, coach, bus, taxis, cycling and walking, and setting a new standard for sustainable urban mobility.

2. Expanding or maintaining the current car parking provision at the station would run counter to the objectives of OCCs **Zero Carbon Oxford's[10]**, **Air Quality Action Plan[11]**, and the **Oxford 2050 Transport and Connectivity Vision[12]** adding congestion and undermining the city's shift towards sustainable modes.

3. A new multi-modal transport hub at Oxford Train Station will support the development of the West End in the same way that the new **Cowley Branch Line[13]**, will support inclusive economic growth, reduce congestion, and improve access to jobs, education, and opportunity.

4. The **West End regeneration area[14]**, including Oxford Station, Oxpens[15], and Osney Mead, must be planned and delivered as a **coherent, sustainable district**, where high-quality transport infrastructure underpins inclusive economic and social growth.

5. The new **Cowley Branch Line** was recently described by the City Council as key to "supporting inclusive growth, connecting communities, and enabling a greener future." The same logic applies to the new Oxford Station development.

---

[8] https://lcon.org.uk/current-activities/oxfordshire-for-buses/
[9] https://www.oxford.gov.uk/downloads/file/1596/adopted-oxford-west-end-and-osney-mead-spd
[10] https://www.oxford.gov.uk/climate-emergency/zero-carbon-oxford
[11] https://www.oxford.gov.uk/air-quality-management/air-quality-action-plan
[12] https://www.oxford.gov.uk/oxfords-future/oxford2050/5
[13] https://www.oxford.gov.uk/news/article/1754/cowley-branch-line-to-be-reopened-with-two-new-train-stations-for-oxford
[14] https://oxfordwestend.co.uk/
[15] https://www.oxpensoxford.uk/

6. All options should be considered, including **the feasibility of relocating bus and coach services to the new station interchange** – thereby freeing up the Gloucester Green site for alternative civic uses.

Council therefore resolves to:

1. Request the Cabinet Member for a Zero Carbon Oxford to publicly support the Oxon4Buses campaign in its call for a multi-modal transport hub at Oxford Station, with minimal car parking and no multi-storey car park.

2. Request the Cabinet Member for a Zero Carbon Oxford to work with partners—including Oxfordshire County Council, Network Rail, Great Western Railway, and the Department for Transport—to ensure the final design of the train station places bus, coach, cycling, and walking facilities at its heart.

3. Request that officers produce a paper for cabinet to explore and bring forward proposals for alternative uses of the Gloucester Green site in the context of wider city-centre and West End regeneration priorities.

This page is intentionally left blank