

COUNCIL

Monday 8 October 2012

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillors Armitage (Lord Mayor), Abbasi (Deputy Lord Mayor), Sinclair (Sheriff), Benjamin, Fooks, Bance, Baxter, Brett, Campbell, Canning, Clack, Clarkson, Cook, Coulter, Curran, Darke, Fry, Goddard, Gotch, Haines, Hollick, Jones, Khan, Lloyd-Shogbesan, Lygo, Malik, McCready, Mills, O'Hara, Pressel, Price, Rowley, Royce, Rundle, Sanders, Seamons, Simmons, Tanner, Turner, Van Nooijen, Wilkinson, Williams and Wolff.

40. MINUTES

Council agreed to approve:

- (a) Minutes (previously circulated) of the ordinary meeting held on 16th July 2012;
- (b) Minutes (previously circulated) of the special meeting held on 20th September 2012.

41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

42. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mohammed Altaf-Khan, Rae Humberstone, Pat Kennedy, Joe McManners, Helen O'Hara and Val Smith.

43. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

No appointments to Committees were made.

44. LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Lord Mayor informed Council that officers had, following comments on the sound system in the Council Chamber, investigated the issue. He was advised that the system was working correctly, however he was also advised that Members when speaking, should speak directly into the microphone and refrain from moving around when speaking as this affected the audibility of their voice also consider sitting when speaking.

The Lord Mayor noted that it was Council procedure and tradition that Members should stand when speaking, but asked Council to agree to an experiment whereby Members chose whether to stand or remain seated when speaking.

Council agreed to the experiment.

45. SHERIFF'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Sheriff informed Council that the annual Sheriff's Drive on Port Meadow had taken place on 10th September 2012 and while the date was usually kept secret, it had somehow been disclosed. Despite this, Councillors and volunteers had rounded-up 300 cattle in difficult conditions due to the Meadow being extremely muddy leading to people and vehicles becoming stuck and the local Fire Service coming to the rescue of some vehicles.

46. STATEMENT BY THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR

Council agreed to suspend Council procedure rules to allow the Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Mohammed Niaz Abbasi, to make a statement to Council on behalf of the Muslim Community of Oxford, concerning the film "Innocence of Muslims"

The full text of the statement by Councillor Abbasi is amended to these minutes.

47. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE LEADER

The Leader made the following announcements:

(a) Innocence of Muslim's - film

He welcomed the comments made in the statement by Councillor Abbasi and the peaceful nature of the Muslims in Oxford and agreed to speak to Group Leaders to take forward the comments and wishes made in the statement.

(b) Shelter Campaign – Evict Rogue Landlords

Shelter had approached him requesting support from the Council for the campaign called "Evict Rogue Landlords". This had been passed to Group Leaders who had agreed to support the campaign.

(c) Manager of the BMW Plant Oxford

Jurgen Hendrich who was the Manager of the BMW Plant in Oxford was due to return to Munich and the Company's Headquarters. He wished to thank him for his support of Oxford and wished him well for the future.

(d) Oxford in Bloom

Oxford City Council had won a silver award in the 2012 Oxford In Bloom competition.

48. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE, THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER AND THE MONITORING OFFICER

No announcements were made by the Chief Executive, The Chief Finance Officer or the Monitoring Officer.

49. ADDRESSES BY THE PUBLIC

Council received and took four addresses to Council (text of the addresses are appended to these minutes).

- (1) William Clark – When will it end? The erosion of local facilities.
- (2) Nigel Gibson – Temple Cowley Pools, Judicial Review.
- (3) Sarah Santhosham – Vice President for Charities and Community at Oxford University Student Union.
- (4) Amanda Perry – Serving the Communities of East Oxford.

50. QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Two questions were submitted by members of the public as follows:

- (1) **Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Mark Pitt**

Asset Management Plan 2011-2014

The following question (slightly amended) was submitted on 12/09/12 before the deadline, for a response at the CEB, but was not presented; therefore I must ask the same question to the Full Council.

Agenda Item: Asset Management Plan 2011-2014

Under the Asset Management Plan, the precious Bury Knowle Barn and Stables with “*high local heritage significance*” has been granted planning permission at the East Area Planning Committee on 06/09/2012, (12/01605/CT3) for conversion into flats, destroying its heritage value, precluding any possibility of community use, and decreasing accessibility to Bury Knowle Park by increased parking pressure.

This is short sighted as a facility will be required in Bury Knowle in the coming years due to the additional 12,000 residents in Headington by 2026.

Can the Council please explain why this precious heritage asset with very strong community potential located in the busiest corner of BK Park has not been formally assessed prior to disposal as per stated in the AMP paragraph 3.2. “*b. Supplemental Policy Objectives and “Community Groups and Asset Transfer” and “d. Heritage and Environment”?*

Why isn't there an AMP option to dispose of assets in sensitive, targeted ways where appropriate when the community can benefit?

Why does the Council believe the community criteria only apply to “Community Centres and Pavilions” and not heritage agricultural buildings in parks such as Bury Knowle barn and stables, Cheney barn and Headington Hill dairy?

Would it be possible to review AMP, freeze the disposal process, and consider sale to, for example, a community business such as café or club for the benefit of the surrounding community and Bury Knowle Park that would retain its precious internal heritage space?

Appendix 1 - Asset Management Plan Extract

“b. Community Groups and Asset Transfer

The Council is supportive of the content the ‘Quirk Report’ (Department for Communities and Local Government 2007) and the government’s response ‘Opening the Transfer Window’ (Department for Communities and Local Government 2007), which sets out the principles of Community Asset Transfer.

The Council considers that this will be mainly relevant to its Community Centres and Pavilions and therefore the strategy for these asset classes will have due regard to these principles.”

And:

“d. Heritage and Environment

The Council has significant land and building holdings in key parts of the city centre and elsewhere in the city. In some cases this property not only supports the Council in delivering its services or supporting its budgets but also, incidentally, it contributes to the historic and/or environmental fabric of the city. In managing and reviewing its property holdings the Council will be mindful of this, and where it considers that the historic or environmental fabric of the city may be prejudiced unless it continues its ownership, it will retain ownership.”

Response: The buildings that make up the formal Bury Knowle Stables and Barn have been surplus to the Council’s operational requirements for some years now. As part of our strong focus on asset management within the Council over the last 3 years, we have sought to maximise the contribution that the Council’s land and buildings make to both the community and the financial resources of the Council.

Our review of Depot premises in 2009/2010 resulted in this asset being declared surplus to operational requirements as depot accommodation. This is due to both the location and nature of the accommodation not being fit for purpose.

The disposal of the property has subsequently been delayed whilst a planning permission has been sought to demonstrate the best value that could be achieved for the building in the possible alternative use for housing. A full and transparent marketing process will now be progressed which will draw out all potential uses for the buildings, which may include

use as community space or alternatively the provision of much needed homes for the local community.

Unfortunately it is not possible to freeze the disposal although any community groups which are interested in purchasing the property are able to make an offer which will be assessed.

In terms of the heritage value of the buildings a formal heritage assessment has taken place and has informed the planning application. Officers from Corporate Property have worked closely with the heritage team to ensure that the nature of the building and its location in a Conservation area, have been respected.

It is also worth noting that the buildings are currently in a very bad state of repair and their very existence in the future will depend upon their conversion to a sustainable and viable use.

(2) Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Sietske Boele

Constitutional changes regarding planning powers

At the last Full Council meeting a member of the public asked the Council to provide more details when and on what grounds the Council reached a decision to allow Members with executive powers to determine planning applications regarding land in which the council has an interest. The answer which was provided to this question was incomplete indicating that the process was somewhat flawed. Can you please provide me with the following information

- (1) Any documentation such as policy documents, minutes etc which recommend the reversal of the Council's policy from 2005 that Executive and Planning powers should be separated with regard to the determination of planning applications in which the Council has an interest
- (2) When was this decision taken and did this change in policy require an amendment to the Constitution if so when and on whose authority was the constitution amended.

Response: A question on this issue was asked at the July Council meeting by Diane Hutcheson. This is the answer given -

The Council's Constitution did earlier include,, a provision that members of the Executive could not sit on the SDCC. However, following clarification of the law in R (on the application of Lewis) V Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council in 2008 the restriction that was introduced in 2005 was, following that judgement, no longer necessary and the Constitution was accordingly amended.

The questioner asks for further details. The decision to remove the provision was taken by full Council on 25 January 2010 (minute 80) in the context of a periodic Constitution review. The reasons given for the

removal were that the wording was superfluous (*in the light of the Redcar case*) and over-prescriptive.

The *Redcar and Cleveland* case has since been applied in a number of cases including *Feeny v. Oxford City Council (2011) EWHC 2699* and this year by the Court of Appeal in *Berky v Newport City Council (2012) EWCA Civ 378*.

Council agreed to refer the question back to the Head of Law and Governance for confirmation.

51. BUDGET MONITORING AS AT 30TH JUNE 2012 (QUARTER 1)

Council had before it the report of the Head of Finance, together with a minute extract of the meeting of the City Executive Board held on 12th September 2012. (Both documents previously circulated, now appended).

Councillor Turner moved the report.

Councillor Simmons stated that the Green Group did not have a problem with the proposed additions. However it found it distasteful that in the budget there was provision for 2% pay inflation which was not used. He said that it was wrong not to spend the money, wrong not to give the inflation rise and wrong to give rewards for making cuts.

Councillor Turner in response said that there was a national bargaining framework in place, which the City Council was part of and that the pay freeze was part of this national framework. He said that the Council had reached a positive agreement with the Unions on the Partnership payment which had been a success. He added that the Green Group budget had not “stacked up” as there had been no provision for redundancies. He further added that Councillor Simmons comments were regrettable, but so was the fact that the employers wanted to continue with the pay freeze.

Councillor Williams in response said that the Green Group’s budget proposals had balanced out and asked why the Administration had added £500k to the budget for redundancies when there was none.

Councillor Simmons said that there was no need to leave the national bargaining framework to pay a bonus. The money was there to pay the inflation rise and should be used to support jobs and services

Councillor Fooks said that the Café was still not open and this did not show the Council in a good light.

Councillor Mills asked why there was an extra £2m of capital spend (Table 5, paragraph 41) and should Members be concerned on slippage due to the new competition pool which would put us in a poorer position.

Councillor Turner in response to questions said that the Capital Programme was healthy. He stated again that the Council was part of the national bargaining framework, but this did not prevent the Chief Executive from negotiating with the Unions. With regard to redundancies, he said that when voluntary redundancies

were sought, the staff that generally came forward where those that would cost more due for example to their length of service and this had to be budgeted for.

Council agreed to approve the addition of additional schemes to the Capital Programme as detailed in Table 5 of the report.

52. ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2011-14 - CONSULTATION OUTCOME

Council had before it the report of the Head of Corporate Assets together with a minute extract of the meeting of the City Executive Board held on 12th September 2012. (Both documents previously circulated, now appended).

Councillor Turner proposed an amendment to the fourth paragraph in section 4.5 – Community Centre as follows:

Deletion of the words – These leases will be between one and three years, but will not guarantee future security of tenure.

Insertion of the words – These short leases will be for an appropriate time-frame to be agreed with the Community Association, but will not guarantee future security of tenure.

Council following a debate voted and agreed to approve the adoption of the Asset Management Plan 2011-2014 subject to the inclusion of the further amendment.

53. CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD DECISIONS (MINUTES) AND SINGLE EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISIONS (MINUTES)

Council had before it minutes (previously circulation, now appended) of the City Executive Board and Single Executive Member meetings held since the last meeting of Full Council.

(a) City Executive Board decisions – 12 September 2012 (Minutes)

- (1) Minute 22 – Youth Ambition Programme for Oxford City – Councillor Fooks asked when this was going to be taken forward.
- (2) Minute 23 – The Oxford Challenge: Achieving world class teaching in Oxford City Schools serving disadvantaged people – Councillor Fooks said that this did not mention the Leadership Plan or which schools would be included.

Councillor Tanner said that a simple change to the schools funding formula would mean that Rose Hill Primary School would have a real term funding cut and would lose 2.5% in funding each year and would effectively cancel out the pupil premium.

Councillor Price said that a meeting would be held on 10th October 2012 and following this it would be known which Schools would be included.

- (3) Minute 24 – Community Grants Programme 2011/12 – Monitoring Feedback. Councillor Simmons said that the City Council was not providing funding for the Cowley Road Carnival and hoped the Council would change its mind on this.

Councillor Bance in response said that the organisers were not eligible to run the Carnival in the year that there was no carnival and that is why no funding was provided.

Councillor Price said that the document was for the Council and that the budget was as a supporter not a provider. He said regarding the Cowley Road Carnival, discussions had taken place with the 'Cowley Road Works' Group which would be organising the Carnival.

Councillor Wolff said that it was true that the Committee felt that a grant could not be given as there was no Carnival. However he said that the event was on-going as it was about building community capacity. He added that the timing of grant funding did not always match with the work that had to be done, for example issues of safety for the carnival started very early before the grants process, so early notification of any successful grant funding was vital. He further added that the Community and Partnerships Scrutiny Committee would be looking into how the Council supported these types of events.

- (4) Minute 30 – Culture Strategy – Consultation Outcome. Councillor Benjamin asked where was the plan for the inclusion of smaller groups and she was concerned that there was no mention of better access for studio space for artists.

Councillor Campbell commenting on Councillor Turner's response in the minutes, felt it was very important that there was a representative from the smaller groups on the Cultural Actions Group.

(b) Single Executive Member Decisions (Minutes)

- (1) Minutes of the Single Executive Member Decision meeting (Board Member – Corporate Governance and Strategic Partnerships) held on 30th July 2012).
- (2) Minutes of the Single Executive Member Decision meeting (Board Member – Customer Services and Regeneration) held on 16th August 2012.
- (3) Minutes of the Single Executive Member Decision meeting (Board Member – Cleaner, Greener Oxford) held on 23rd August 2012.

54. RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY AND OTHER COMMITTEES

None received.

55. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

(a) Question notified in time for replies to be provided before the Council meeting

(1) **Question to the Board Member, City Development (Councillor Colin Cook) from Councillor Craig Simmons**

Planning enforcement

What action are planning enforcement officers taking against cafes and restaurants (A3 use class) that are operating without change of use in A1 premises?

In the past year, how many warning or prosecutions have been issued to A3 businesses operating out of A1 premises?

How is the Portfolio Holder ensuring that the proportion of A1 units does not fall below 50% on the Cowley Road and what is the percentage now?

Response: Planning enforcement officers open an enforcement investigation and examine the need for planning permission in response to every complaint received, including where this relates to concern that an alleged café or restaurant (A3) that would appear to be operating without a change of use permission in A1 premises.

Where it is established that there is a need for planning permission then applicants would normally have the option of submitting a retrospective planning application to seek to regularise the unauthorised use / works, otherwise the case is closed. Where development, (use or works), remains unauthorised; if acceptable and not harmful, no further action is taken. If harm is identified then officers consider whether it is expedient to take enforcement action, and if the answer is yes, they proceed accordingly seeking to stop the breach of planning control.

No 'warnings' or prosecutions have been issued as unauthorised uses do not constitute a criminal offence. However officers have investigated or are investigating all allegations of unauthorised A3 uses in A1 premises. Over the last year there have been seven investigations of alleged unauthorised food and drink uses in Class A1 retail premises. Three of which have been closed and four are currently under investigation.

The Council's planning service determine planning applications in accordance with the Council's adopted planning policies and where development proposals do not comply with those policies and there are no material considerations that indicate otherwise, proposals are refused. Where unauthorised changes of use occur, planning

enforcement officers investigate, as above and, if expedient, take enforcement action.

The current proportion of Class A1 retail uses along the Cowley Road secondary shopping frontage is 50.34% based upon a very recent survey in August 2012, (which is just above the 50% Oxford Local Plan policy threshold).

Councillor Simmons in a supplementary question asked if the enforcement was proactive. In response Councillor Cook said no, this was not the case.

(2) Question to the Board Member, City Development (Councillor Colin Cook) from Councillor Elise Benjamin

Oxford Heritage Plan

Does the Portfolio Holder agree with the officers comment at the Inspectors Review of the Sites and Housing that Oxfords Heritage Plan was only a 'background consideration' when it came to planning applications.

Response: Council officers do not recall commenting at the Examination that the Heritage Plan was 'only a background consideration'. In their response to the Inspector officers confirmed that the Heritage Plan will be an important material consideration in all relevant Development Control decisions and given considerable weight.

A minor change has been agreed with the Inspector, as requested by the Oxford Preservation Trust, to confirm that development should respect and draw inspiration from Oxford's unique historic environment and that further evidence relating to the historic environment will be provided by the Heritage Plan. The changes are now included in the Inspector's Main Modifications that will be published later this month for public consultation for six weeks.

The Heritage Plan is made up of a suite of studies that examine particular aspects of Oxford's heritage - its historic areas and communities, archaeology, the historic skyline, historic buildings and it's tree stock for example. Through this work we are developing methodologies, (already nationally recognised as best practice), that help us to understand the heritage value of a place and to understand the nature of impacts that might arise from new development.

The need for a Heritage Plan was addressed in the Core Strategy and it is out of this that the current work is being undertaken in partnership with OPT and with funding from English Heritage. Whilst the Heritage Plan is not a policy document - it provides the evidence to inform policy. It must be remembered that there are already policies within the Core Strategy and Local Plan to inform heritage management.

A web site explaining the Heritage Plan, it's constituent parts, and it's relationship to planning policy, will be going live in November.

(3) Question to the Board Member, City Development (Councillor Colin Cook) from Councillor Mark Mills

Sites and Housing DPD

What will the administration change as a result of the planning inspector's negative comments about important sections of the Sites and Housing DPD?

Response: The Inspector has now closed the sitting part of the Examination into the Sites and Housing DPD. Overall the Inspector has been very positive about the Council's document. It is true that there were some important policies that attracted strong opposition but that was to be expected. On these policies the Inspector has been helpful in seeking further explanation and justification for the Council's policy approach. Officers have also agreed to make some changes to the policies in response to the Inspector's prompting, and also in response to comments from objectors. These 'Modification's' will be published later in the month for public consultation for six weeks. The Inspector will then consider any further written comments on these modifications, before sending the City Council her report by mid-January.

(4) Question to the Board Member, Leisure Services (Councillor Van Coulter) from Councillor David Williams

Pool Maintenance in Oxford

Would the Portfolio Holder agree with me that there seems to be some discrepancy between the public statements as to the cost of maintenance and repairs of Temple Cowley Pool (£97,000) and the official budget costings of £15,000?

Could the Portfolio holders give a breakdown of the repairs and maintenance costs (actual...not press release material) of the other pools in Oxford in 2010 and 2011?

Response: No, the £15,000 is just the capital element paid by the council. The additional amounts that make up the £97,746 are the council's revenue expenditure and costs paid directly by Fusion Lifestyle who have responsibility for the day to day repairs.

	Council Costs		Fusion Costs		Total Costs	
	2010-11	2011-12	2010-11	2011-12	2010-11	2011-12
Temple Cowley Pool	31,730	24,903	69,430	72,843	101,161	97,746
BBL Pool	55,796		10,036	10,529	65,832	10,529
Hinksey Pool	86,474	158,155	32,270	33,856	118,744	192,011
Ferry LC	78,942		76,229	79,976	155,171	79,976
Barton Pool	31,730		54,395	57,068	86,125	57,068

Notes

The 10/11 council expenditure at Ferry and Barton Leisure Centres was for backlog maintenance works. As this backlog has been completed the full responsibility for maintenance at these sites is held by Fusion Lifestyle. Over this period Hinksey Pool tank has been re lined.

Councillor Williams in a supplementary question asked if the Board Member would agree that despite the lack of investment the Temple Cowley Pool was doing well. In response Councillor Coulter did not agree and said that it was wrong to compare the Temple Cowley Pool with the Hinksey Pool which had recently been relined at a cost of £100k.

(5) Question to the Board Member, Customer Services and Regeneration (Councillor Val Smith) from Councillor Sam Hollick

Council Tax Reduction Scheme

While I'm sure all Councillors welcome the Council's intention to replace, for this year, the funding cut by central government in the Council Tax Reduction Scheme, I am concerned that the consultation on the scheme only seeks to gain support for cuts in the future. Does the Board Member recognise that any reduction in this benefit will affect people on low incomes, and will they pursue future funding for the scheme, including the option of increasing the council's revenue, to avoid a benefit cut?

Response: On the latter question - of course we realise this, which is exactly why - having failed to persuade the government to think again about this disastrous policy - not only have we committed to continuing to fund the scheme in full, but have been successful in persuading other districts to do likewise. I do not agree with the councillor's assessment of the consultation - it does what any consultation should do, and tries to elicit people's views. However, he can be reassured that, while future years' budgets will be set by Full Council at the appropriate time, the administration is entirely committed to mitigating the government's disastrous cut to this benefit as far as we can.

(6) Question to the Board Member, Customer Services and Regeneration (Councillor Val Smith) from Councillor Jean Fooks

Wi-fi connectivity in St. Aldates Chambers

The new Customer Services centre relies heavily on computers and systems all working together. I hear that wi-fi does not cover the whole ground floor – this makes it impossible for people to access online facilities at times. When will this be rectified?

Response: Council staff and customers accessing self service options within the Contact centre do not require WiFi access. Full access to all of the Council's online services is already available via the Council's network in the Customer Service centre.

WiFi is also being installed in St Aldates Chambers. It is expected that the equipment installations be completed by the end of October 2012.

Once live, the WiFi will allow access to the wider internet, with controls restricting inappropriate websites to allow the Council to comply with best practice.

The WiFi is not connected to the Councils Data Network.

Access for guests wishing to use the WiFi will be managed by the Facilities Management Team although regular users will be setup to automatically connect to their own secure link. Members and Officers will use the same account they use for the Town Hall WiFi

(7) Question to the Board Member, Customer Services (Councillor Val Smith) from Councillor Stuart McCready

Telephone delays

In September I experienced delays of up to 20 minutes (one of my constituents reported a delay of 40 minutes) in getting through to the Oxford City Homes repairs service by telephone. What is the explanation for this poor service?"

Response: We experienced a high number of repair calls during September, an increase of nearly 500 compared to August. The average wait time for customers was 5mins 44 seconds but obviously there are busier times of the day when customers experience a longer delay.

We are aware of some delays in reporting repairs and in response to this; we are currently training staff on this service and intend to continue to increase the number of staff available to handle repair calls.

In addition, we are currently undertaking work to improve the speed of the Customer Relationship Management system, Lagan and it is anticipated that this will increase the performance of the system. A procurement exercise is also being carried out to improve our telephony software to enable us to manage calls more effectively, for example through the use of voice recognition, messaging and workforce planning functionality.

Opportunities to promote 'channel shift' with customers, encouraging them to access the Council's website rather than calling the Contact Centre or visiting the office are also being considered. Appropriate publicity is being investigated and we are

using opportunities such as 'Your Oxford' to encourage customers to access the website where they can. This should also ease pressure on call waiting times.

(8) Question to the Board Member, Cleaner, Greener Oxford (Councillor John Tanner) from Councillor Jean Fooks

Workplace Travel Co-ordinator and travel plan

I see that the Council has just appointed a new Workplace Travel Coordinator. She is currently producing a workplace travel plan. How long ago is it that we were told that this was in production? Why has it taken so long for someone to be appointed to produce a Green travel plan for the City Council? When will we be given the figures for current travel to work modes? And when can we expect to see the long-awaited Plan?

Response: The Workplace Travel Co-ordinator has just begun her work. There has been no undue delay in producing a workplace travel plan. Oxford City Council quite rightly has focussed initially on reducing its own carbon footprint. But we estimate that at least half our staff already use means other than motor cars to get to work. As soon as we have more information about how our staff get to and from work the City Council will consider, in consultation with employees, what else might be done to promote walking, cycling and use of public transport. I will then report to Council on the outcome.

Councillor Fooks in a supplementary question asked the Board Member to give assurance that this would happen. In response Councillor Tanner said that he had responded to the question, but added that the Environment and Carbon Board had taken the view that it was important to reduce the Council's carbon by 5%.

(9) Question to the Board Member, Cleaner, Greener Oxford (Councillor John Tanner) from Councillor Graham Jones

Council electric vehicles

Will he please say how many vehicles the Council has now, how many are electric vehicles, what emission standard(s) the rest meet, and when the various components of the fleet are due for renewal.

Will he please set out in detail the medium- and long-term plans to re-equip the various parts of the fleet with (a) low-emission, and (b) electric vehicles, with cost comparisons as between (a), (b), and re-equipping with conventionally powered vehicles? Will he include infrastructure costs (e.g. charging points) as well as the capital and running (i.e. revenue) costs in each case?

Will he also say how many charging points are already installed and where, and how many are planned?

Response: A report on the 'Extension of Alternatively Fuelled Vehicles to the Council's Fleet' was submitted to the City Executive Board on 4th July 2012.

We currently have 278 road registered vehicles and plant of which 8 are electric. The emission standards vary within the fleet and are dependent upon the age of the vehicle. Our policy is to only purchase vehicles fitted with the highest Euro standard engines at the time of ordering whilst ensuring that they can efficiently carry out the task required.

We also look at the possibility of replacing conventionally fuelled vehicles with electric at the time of procurement.

We constantly monitor vehicle usage throughout the fleet and where appropriate discuss with the user department the possibility of changing to electric when their vehicle is due for replacement.

In the short term 2 electric cars joined the fleet earlier this year. We have also purchased a small electric tipper vehicle for litter collection within the city centre. It is planned to purchase 3 more electric cars/vans in this financial year's capital replacement programme and a further 3 in next year's Capital Replacement Programme. Also within this year's capital programme we have 2 hybrid 3.5 ton tippers scheduled for delivery in December.

In the medium term we intend to purchase 4 more electric cars/vans in the 2013-14 Capital Vehicle Replacement Programme. If the current trend of manufacturer support continues we may be able to increase this to 5 vehicles within the budget.

In the long term Direct Services will continue to assess all alternatively fuelled, hybrid and electric vehicles.

The major manufacturers of Large Goods Vehicles are working towards the production of commercially available hybrid chassis. As yet the choice is very limited and cost prohibitive. Industry sources suggest that viable and affordable chassis will be available in the near future.

We have a rolling 7 year Capital Programme. This is currently being updated but the draft can be made available to you should you require it.

We are unable to provide a comparison for low-emission vehicles but there is a comparison table within the report to CEB between an electric vehicle and conventionally fuelled vehicle (see page 6).

Charging Points:

In-house (exclusive use of OCC vehicles) 13 Amp trickle charge points are available at

Cowley Marsh Depot x 11

Horspath Road x 2
Cutteslowe Park x 2
Westgate Car Park x 1

Public accessible Quick Charge points are available at the Westgate Car Park and at 10 other public locations around the city (plugged in places). Details are available on the Council's website. Further charging points can be installed as necessary and when economically viable.

Our in-house charging points are standard all-weather 13amp outlets of minimal costs (as little as £70 per unit to fit dependent on distance from the mains)

I have no information on the costs of installation of fast charge public access charging points (plugged in places). Environmental Development may be able to supply this information.

Councillor Jones in a supplementary question asked the Board Member if he would accept that as presently planned even by 2017 the Council would still need to replace half of its vehicles. Would he support a more radical replacement programme and would he pass on the Council's thanks to the Team that achieved a ranking along with Birmingham City Council.

Councillor Tanner in response agreed to pass on the thanks to the Team, but stated that invest to save bids had to save money.

(10) Question to the Deputy Leader of the Council (Councillor Ed Turner) from Councillor Jean Fooks

St Clements Car Park planning application costs

Please could you tell Council how much the City Council has spent on preparing the planning applications for development at St Clements car park?

Response: The City Council has not spent any money on preparing the planning applications. The cost has been borne by the applicant, Watkins Jones.

(11) Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Mark Mills

Plain English awards

The council is listed on the website of the Plain English Campaign as being amongst the organisations which have been awarded at least one of its Crystal Marks. How many such awards does the Council have and what documents do they relate to?

Response: The Council has in the past been awarded five Crystal Marks for the following documents:

Tenancy Agreement
Tenants' Handbook
Housing Benefit application form
Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit application form

Staff manual of Tenants' Services (withdrawn August 2000)

Councillor Mills in a supplementary question asked if the Leader could see any advantages in making wider use of it. In response Councillor Price said no as that approach tended to take a long time and tended to change the meaning of the text.

(b) Questions notified by the deadline in the Constitution where no reply in advance of the meeting was given

(12) Question to the Board Member, City Development (Councillor Colin Cook) from Mike Gotch

City Executive Board Minutes 12 September 2012 Item 35 [page 105 main agenda] Monitoring of Parking adjacent to City Parks:

What are the proposals for the full and proper monitoring of displacement car parking adjacent to Cutteslowe Park?

Will the monitoring exercise include all affected roads east of Banbury Road?

Will local councillors be involved in the monitoring?

When will the results be presented to Council?

Response: Councillor Cook said that he would give a written response which would be appended to the minutes of this meeting.

(13) Question to the Deputy Leader of the Council (Councillor Ed Turner) from Councillor Mike Gotch

Asset Management Plan – Energy consumption

Asset Management Plan - Appendix 1 Page 37 [page 77 of the main agenda] Measure 5, states that Oxford's benchmarked energy consumption is 50% of the CIPFA average, yet our costs are 35% higher.

What is the explanation, and what research is being conducted to explain and then correct the discrepancy?

Response: Councillor Turner said that he and officers were aware of the anomalies and these were being investigated and once this was done, Members would be informed.

(14) Question to the Deputy Leader of the Council (Councillor Ed Turner) from Mike Gotch

Asset Management Plan – Water consumption

Asset Management Plan - Appendix 1 Page 37 [page 37 main agenda] Measure 6, states that Oxford's water consumption is 2.5 times higher than the benchmarked CIPFA average. We do not have 2.5 times the average benchmarked number of swimming pools in Oxford.

What is the explanation, and what is proposed to correct the excessive water consumption?

Response: Councillor Turner said that he and officers were aware of the anomalies and these were being investigated and once this was done, Members would be informed.

56. STATEMENTS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

There were no Member statements.

57. PETITION - LABOUR MUST LISTEN TO OXFORD

The Head of Law and Governance submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which advised on the procedure that Council needed to follow under the Council's Petitions Scheme in respect of large petitions and provided information specifically on the petition concerning "Labour must listen to Oxford".

Nigel Gibson the head petitioner presented the petition and spoke on its contents.

Councillor Coulter in response to the presentation of the petition said that the new pool would be more convenient to a wider population and that the carbon emissions would be greatly lower than that of the Temple Cowley Pools and that that the new pool was only 1.6 miles from the existing Temple Cowley Pool. He added that the priority was to provide facilities where people needed them.

Councillor Williams said that he had attended a public meeting and almost all those present had denounced the proposed closure of Temple Cowley Pool. He said that the largest petition presented to the Council had been ignored. The Green Group had put forward four Motions, all had been voted down. He said that this was not about the needs of Oxford or Blackbird Leys, but for Fusion and their profits. He said that all the way through there had been misleading information. Costs had been quoted at the start as being £6m, but where now £13m. He said that the truth should be told.

Councillor Price said that all opinions were listened to, but you needed to look at the evidence. What was lacking in the arguments against the closure was the attention that should be given to the vast amounts of data on the need to replace the pool.

Councillor Tanner said that Councillors had been democratically elected by the people of Oxford and he deplored the un-necessary use of the law to delay the democratic process.

Councillor Rowley said that everyone had the right to their opinion. However a decision had to be come to. He congratulated the Save Temple Cowley Pool Campaign for their efforts, but the results were unequivocal, the people have spoken the case is closed.

Councillor Malik said that what matters is what comes across of the ballot paper and twice the people of Oxford have felt that Oxford is safe in Labour's hands.

Councillor Rundle said that the Council Chamber was not the best venue for a serious debate and discussion and would have preferred it held somewhere where the public could be involved. He urged the Administration to sit down and talk with the public. The last local elections were not a referendum on the Temple Cowley Pool issue as there were other matters which concerned the voters, and he believed that the petition was wrong on this. The idea of a new pool in Blackbird Leys was exciting, but the Temple Cowley Pool was still a well loved facility and he did not see that this facility necessarily needed to be closed. He added that the Ice Rink was coming to the end of its natural life and this should be looked at. He concluded by stating that it was never too late to thing again.

Following the debate, Council voted and agreed to note the discussion of Council and that the Temple Cowley Pool would be closed at the appropriate time when the new pool at Blackbird Leys was fully open.

58. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

Council had before it 18 Motions on Notice and reached decisions as follows.

(1) Building Regulations – (Proposer – Councillor Mike Gotch, seconder Councillor Graham Jones)

Council notes that Building Regulations are due to be radically tightened in 2013 and 2016, when new dwellings must be constructed and run to have a carbon neutral footprint .

Council further notes the ambition to lead the country in reducing carbon emissions, and therefore asks the City Executive Board

- (i) to require the City Development department to adopt a strategy of requesting private and public sector planning and building regulations' applicants to begin to adopt those standards now, rather than delay that which will soon become compulsory, and,
- (ii) as an exemplar, ensure that all of the new Barton West is in full conformity with the 2016 standards, including a combined Heat and Power unit, to serve all new dwellings, but also existing Barton dwellings following a feasibility study to establish viability.

Councillor Craig Simmons moved an amendment as follows:

- (1) *To delete the first paragraph and replace with the following words:*

Council notes that the Government is proposing to tighten Building Regulations in 2013 and 2016 when new dwellings will need to meeting 'carbon neutral' standards either through on-site 'allowable solutions'.

- (2) *In the second bullet point to insert the words "or other 'allowable solution' after the words 'combined heat and power unit'.*

The mover of the substantive Motion, Councillor Michael Gotch accepted the amendment by Councillor Craig Simmons. Following a debate, Council voted and the amended Motion was adopted as follows:

Council notes that the Government is proposing to tighten Building Regulations in 2013 and 2016 when new dwellings will need to meeting 'carbon neutral' standards either through on-site or off-site 'allowable solutions'.

Council further notes the ambition to lead the country in reducing carbon emissions, and therefore asks the City Executive Board

- (i) to require the City Development department to adopt a strategy of requesting private and public sector planning and building regulations' applicants to begin to adopt those standards now, rather than delay that which will soon become compulsory, and,
- (ii) as an exemplar, ensure that all of the new Barton West is in full conformity with the 2016 standards, including a combined Heat and Power unit, or other 'allowable solution' to serve all new dwellings, but also existing Barton dwellings following a feasibility study to establish viability.

(2) Institutional investment in Private Rented Housing – (Proposer – Councillor Ed Turner)

Council notes the review commissioned by the Government into institutional investment into Private Rented Housing, Chaired by Sir Adrian Montague, of 3i.

Council further notes, with concern, proposals from the British Property Federation to this review, and associated media reports suggesting that the review will endorse these, which would allow developers freely to substitute institutionally-financed private rented housing for affordable housing provided through the planning process.

Council believes that there is a major shortage of genuinely affordable housing in Oxford. Council endorses the existing approach of requiring social rented housing through the planning system, and expresses strong concern that the "affordable rent" model promoted by the Tory-Lib Dem Government is not affordable in Oxford.

Council in particular resolves to resist any attempt to substitute private rented housing, at full rent, for affordable housing, as a result of the Montague Review.

Councillor Ed Turner, seconded by Councillor Sam Hollick, moved an amendment as follows:

To delete all of the words and replace with the following:

Council notes the review commissioned by the Government into institutional investment into Private Rented Housing, chaired by Sir Adrian Montague of 3i. Council notes with concern that as part of the response to this review, the government has undertaken to introduce primary legislation to allow developers to drop affordable housing contributions by way of appeal to the Planning Inspectorate.

Council believes there is a major shortage of genuinely affordable housing in Oxford. Council endorses the existing approach of requiring social rented housing through the planning system and expressed strong concern that the "affordable rent" model promoted by the government is not affordable in Oxford.

Council also expresses concern that a hiatus may result, with developers delaying construction of new homes until an appeal can be heard against the S106 requirement.

Council resolves to

- (i) ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State explaining how these reforms will undermine our attempts to meet housing need in Oxford*
- (ii) resist any attempt to substitute private rented housing, at full rent, for affordable housing, as a result of the Montague Review.*

The mover of the substantive Motion, Councillor Ed Turner accepted the amendment by himself and Councillor Sam Hollick. Following a debate, Council voted and the amended Motion was adopted as follows:

Council notes the review commissioned by the Government into institutional investment into Private Rented Housing, chaired by Sir Adrian Montague of 3i. Council notes with concern that as part of the response to this review, the government has undertaken to introduce primary legislation to allow developers to drop affordable housing contributions by way of appeal to the Planning Inspectorate.

Council believes there is a major shortage of genuinely affordable housing in Oxford. Council endorses the existing approach of requiring social rented housing through the planning system and expressed strong concern that the "affordable rent" model promoted by the government is not affordable in Oxford.

Council also expresses concern that a hiatus may result, with developers delaying construction of new homes until an appeal can be heard against the S106 requirement.

Council resolves to

- (i) ask the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State explaining how these reforms will undermine our attempts to meet housing need in Oxford
- (ii) resist any attempt to substitute private rented housing, at full rent, for affordable housing, as a result of the Montague Review.

(3) Potential impact of proposed developments - (Proposer Councillor Dick Wolff, seconder Councillor Craig Simmons)

Notwithstanding the general development permissions relating to particular sites in planning policies, this Council is concerned to consider in greater detail the potential impact of proposed developments which are subject to planning approval on:

- (a) sustainability,
- (b) vitality,
- (c) diversity and
- (d) ongoing development of local economies (both city-wide and at neighbourhood level).

Specific considerations include:

- (i) the financial viability of local businesses, particularly independents
- (ii) the number of people in paid employment in a neighbourhood
- (iii) the importance of maintaining economic diversity in neighbourhoods as a whole, in addition to concern about individual businesses.

Although the great majority of planning applications will not have significant implications for local economic sustainability, the Council deems it appropriate that where it is clear that a proposed development is worthy of concern with regard to the considerations described above, that an appropriate Local Economic Impact Assessment is made by Council officers and presented as an integral part of the officers' report when a planning application is considered, together with recommended conditions and mitigation measures where potential negative impacts are identified.

A Local Economic Impact Assessment will only be conducted when there is a clear potential impact on an area as a whole.

Following a debate, Council voted and the Motion was not adopted.

(4) Police Commission Elections - (Proposer Councillor Elise Benjamin, seconder Councillor David Williams)

This Council is concerned that the forthcoming Elections for a Police Commissioner are profoundly undemocratic. The election procedures make it virtually impossible for political groups that do not have the backing of wealthy sponsors to field a candidate.

With candidates having to pay a deposit of £5,000.00 and there being no freepost of literature over an area with more than half a million voters the election is effectively restricted to candidates sponsored by wealthy organisations.

Oxford City Council is concerned that political groups without access to great wealth by being excluded from the election are not able to forward their views on modern policing and by their exclusion deny voters a full spectrum of opinion and a real choice.

The only organisations likely to fight this election are the large wealthy political parties and affluent corporate organisations.

By restricting the type of candidate who may stand, the election is outside the British tradition that all elections should be open to all, pluralist in the arguments deployed and inclusive of all opinions.

The Council calls on the Electoral Commission to recognise the inequity of the present arrangements and to recommend that either the election be abandoned as undemocratic or dramatically reduce costs by introducing a free post system and reducing the candidate deposit to an affordable sum.

Councillor Dee Sinclair, seconded by Councillor John Tanner moved an amendment as follows:

To delete all of the words after the first sentence in the whole of the Motion and replace with the following:

The Electoral Commission has for some time expressed concerns over the Government's legislation regarding the new PCC elections, at an unfamiliar time of year, using the supplementary voting system most voters are unfamiliar with and will not have used.

This council questions how any Thames Valley PCC candidate can communicate effectively with a constituency of over 2 million when the Government is relying totally on its website for publicity and information for candidates, agents, returning officers and voters. Independent candidates could be be disadvantaged. This Council notes that the Electoral Commission is so concerned over the lack of accessible information that it will be sending out a booklet to every household in England (excluding London) and Wales.

This Council deplores the significant departure from procedure for other elections, for example mayoral and parliamentary, shares the Electoral Commission's concerns and will write to them expressing this view.

The mover of the substantive Motion, Councillor Elise Benjamin accepted the amendment by Councillor Dee Sinclair, but wished for it to be noted

that she did not think that it was strong enough. Following a debate, Council voted and the amended Motion was adopted as follows:

This Council is concerned that the forthcoming elections for a Police and Crime Commissioner are profoundly undemocratic.

The Electoral Commission has for some time expressed concerns over the Government's legislation regarding the new PCC elections, at an unfamiliar time of year, using the supplementary voting system most voters are unfamiliar with and will not have used.

This council questions how any Thames Valley PCC candidate can communicate effectively with a constituency of over 2 million when the Government is relying totally on its website for publicity and information for candidates, agents, returning officers and voters. Independent candidates could be disadvantaged. This Council notes that the Electoral Commission is so concerned over the lack of accessible information that it will be sending out a booklet to every household in England (excluding London) and Wales.

This Council deplores the significant departure from procedure for other elections, for example mayoral and parliamentary, shares the Electoral Commission's concerns and will write to them expressing this view.

(5) North West London Airport Proposal – (Proposer Councillor David Williams, seconder Councillor Craig Simmons)

This Council is alarmed by the proposal submitted to the Secretary of State for Transport by a business consortium, backed by Chinese financiers, for a fifth London Airport to be constructed in North West Oxfordshire alongside the agreed High Speed Rail link .

Oxford City Council is dismayed that a consultation and bids for greater airport capacity is now to be held in view of the stance taken in the General Election of 2010 that there would be no further expansion at Heathrow and the abandonment of the arguments accepted at the time that this was economically unnecessary and damaging to the environment.

The City Council believe that such an airport close to the landing systems of Brize Norton and the glide path of London Oxford Airport is unnecessary and would bring greater pollution and disturbance to the area.

Oxford City Council urges the Secretary of State to resist demands for ever more airport expansion and to recognise that air transport is having a major impact on global carbon emissions and hence climate change. The Council urges Patrick McLoughlin MP to consider that, other transport systems offer a lower carbon profile and can be just as effective in meeting demand and to recognise that air transport is adding significantly to global warming.

This Council asks that the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State outlining the Councils views on this matter.

Councillor David Williams, seconded by Councillor Craig Simmons, moved an amendment as follows:

To delete the first paragraph and replace with the following new paragraph:

This Council is alarmed by the proposal submitted to the Secretary of State for Transport by a private business consortium for a fifth London Airport to be constructed in North West Oxfordshire alongside the agreed London to Birmingham High Speed Rail Link. With no statutory bodies consulted as to their views on this Heathrow size airport proposal this Council would call into question the validity of any feasibility study drawn up in secret to support such as proposal.

The mover of the substantive Motion accepted the amendment and following a debate Council voted and the amended Motion was adopted as follows:

This Council is alarmed by the proposal submitted to the Secretary of State for Transport by a private business consortium for a fifth London Airport to be constructed in North West Oxfordshire alongside the agreed London to Birmingham High Speed Rail Link. With no statutory bodies consulted as to their views on this Heathrow size airport proposal this Council would call into question the validity of any feasibility study drawn up in secret to support such as proposal.

Oxford City Council is dismayed that a consultation and bids for greater airport capacity is now to be held in view of the stance taken in the General Election of 2010 that there would be no further expansion at Heathrow and the abandonment of the arguments accepted at the time that this was economically unnecessary and damaging to the environment.

The City Council believe that such an airport close to the landing systems of Brize Norton and the glide path of London Oxford Airport is unnecessary and would bring greater pollution and disturbance to the area.

Oxford City Council urges the Secretary of State to resist demands for ever more airport expansion and to recognise that air transport is having a major impact on global carbon emissions and hence climate change. The Council urges Patrick McLoughlin MP to consider that other transport systems offer a lower carbon profile and can be just as effective in meeting demand and to recognise that air transport is adding significantly to global warming.

This Council asks that the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State outlining the Councils views on this matter.

(6) Night Time Economy Levy – (Proposer Councillor Craig Simmons, seconder Councillor Elise Benjamin)

This Council recognises that areas of the City suffer badly from noise and nuisance caused by licensed premises serving alcohol; as evidenced by the introduction of a Special Saturation Policy.

The power to introduce a 'late night levy' has been granted to local authorities under new Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.

This Council therefore asks the City Executive Board to consult on the introduction of a local levy on late night premises to pay for mitigating measures such as better policing.

Councillor Colin Cook moved an amendment as follows:

Delete the whole of the third paragraph and replace with a new third paragraph as follows:

Given that further guidance is still needed from the Secretary of State on the implementation of any levy, Council asks officer to prepare a report for the General Purposes Licensing Committee on the sagacity of the introduction of such a policy in Oxford.

The mover of the substantive Motion accepted the amendment and following a debate, Council voted to adopt the amended Motion as follows:

This Council recognises that areas of the City suffer badly from noise and nuisance caused by licensed premises serving alcohol; as evidenced by the introduction of a Special Saturation Policy.

The power to introduce a 'late night levy' has been granted to local authorities under new Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011.

Given that further guidance is still needed from the Secretary of State on the implementation of any levy, Council asks officer to prepare a report for the General Purposes Licensing Committee on the sagacity of the introduction of such a policy in Oxford.

(7) Road Deaths of Cyclists – (Proposer Councillor David Williams, seconded by Councillor Craig Simmons)

Although there has been a decline in the number of deaths of cyclists over the last ten years on UK roads by 49% the figures for Oxfordshire are not so encouraging with a corresponding figure of only 27%? (Office of National Statistics). From the County Council's own figures the majority of the decline in the County was in the first 5 years with the numbers of those killed or seriously injured remaining essentially static for the following five.

There is no doubt a number of reasons as to why this figure is so out of line with the national average figure, especially 2011 when the annual figure increased dramatically, virtually doubling.

With this in view the City Council will work with the County Council with three clear objectives in the short, medium and long term and take into

consideration the Western European models of urban traffic management that generally see half the number of fatal injuries to cyclists .

The Council cycle plan will include:

In the short term, identification of accident black spots that keep occurring in the accident statistics and make recommendations for alterations in the traffic management that will improve safety for cyclists.

In the medium terms, recognise that a primary reason for deaths and serious injuries to cyclists is integrated urban traffic especially the mix of cyclists and very heavy vehicles and to move to limiting speed, weight restrictions and other planned traffic management proposals that will cut the number of fatalities in the City and surrounding towns.

In the long term, as renovation work progresses to adopt the European model of separation of cycle lanes and roads with a well planned three stage structure of pavement, distinct separate cycle ways and road surface.

Councillor David Williams Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

(8) Fair Pay – (Proposer Councillor Sam Hollick, seconder Councillor David Williams)

This Council understands that a more equal society is better for all.

We are proud, that Council staff, are now paid at least a living wage, setting a precedent as a major employer in Oxford that pay should meet the cost of living, rather than submitting to arguments about the market rate for labour.

This Council notes that between 2009 and 2010, senior executives received average pay rises of 23%, while the average pay rise given to staff taking into account the impact of inflation was effectively a pay cut.

In the interests of promoting greater equality, this Council resolves to:

- (1) Publish the highest-to-lowest pay ratio for directly employed Council staff, including all forms of remuneration in the calculation of pay.
- (2) Commit to distributing any further pay increases to all staff fairly, such that the highest-to-lowest pay ratio does not increase and sets as an aim to narrow that differential.
- (3) Request all organisations that hold contracts with the Council to publish their highest-to-lowest pay ratio.

Councillor Sam Hollicks Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

(9) Affordable Housing Requirements – (Proposer Councillor Sam Hollick, seconder Councillor Elise Benjamin)

This Council believes that building new social housing is the best way of meeting the housing needs of people on low pay. Consequently, we are seriously concerned about the Government's planning reforms (announced 6th September) that allow developers to renegotiate agreements to provide affordable housing via appeals to Planning Inspectors.

This Council is committed to providing enough social housing, and instructs the Leader to write to the Secretary of State explaining how these reforms will undermine our attempts to meet housing need in Oxford.

Councillor Sam Hollicks withdrew the Motion on Notice.

(10) Loan Sharks – (Proposer Councillor Mike Rowley)

1. This Council expresses its deep concern about the activities of "pay day loan" companies which target people suffering from significant day-to-day financial pressures.
2. This Council notes that "Wonga", the most prominent of these companies, recorded a 225% rise in profits last year while charging interest rates of up to 4,000%.
3. This Council believes that the activities of these companies can trap some of the poorest and most vulnerable people in our communities in a descending spiral of toxic debt. We strongly condemn "pay day loan companies" and believe the advertising produced by "Wonga" targetting pensioners and students to be particularly irresponsible.
4. This Council resolves:
 - (a) to support the campaign for caps on the costs of credit and a real time register to give consumers the protection they so desperately need;
 - (b) to request the Leader and the Chief Executive to write accordingly to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills; and
 - (c) to request the City Executive Board to ensure that sound advice on loans is incorporated into any money advice Council officers provide in the transition to Universal Credit.

Councillor Mike Rowley's Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

(11) Universal Credit – (Proposer Councillor Van Coulter, seconder Councillor Antonia Bance)

This Council calls upon the Government to act with caution and that it must postpone the introduction of its Universal Credit.

The risks are great, yet the Government refuses to publish the risk register for the programme.

The project has already been delayed owing to problems with information technology - and the IT industry declares that the timescales involved are unrealistic.

Should the Government persist with its current aim of introducing the Universal Credit in October 2013, it will be a disaster.

Whilst the trial to “prove” the fitness of Universal Credit is to run from April 2013, it is to be carried out in Tameside, Oldham, Wigan and Warrington – metropolitan areas with modest housing and living costs.

If pressed ahead, Universal Credit will be a disaster for people reliant on welfare. It will be a disaster for the district councils that the Government will expect to resolve the problems that arise, and it will be a disaster for the public as a whole, because they will have the burden of the cost for a failed programme of “reform”.

As it stands, Universal Credit has many predicted defects – as set out by more than seventy highly credible organisations.

There is reasonable certainty, that as it stands, Universal Credit will leave many single people and families worse off.

As it stands, people with disabilities and those who are currently unable to work because of illness face harsh fitness for work tests.

As it stands, the new benefit cap will badly hit larger families and people who live in places where the cost of housing is high.

As it stands, there are unrealistic expectations for lone parents with young children to go out to work.

As it stands, Universal credit will be paid in one monthly payment and normally to one person in each household.

As it stands, Universal Credit will disadvantage women – and by doing so, it will disadvantage children.

As it stands, the community action programme, or so called 'support for the very long-term unemployed', amounts to no more than an easy way for companies to get free labour and take advantage of people who have been unable to find work.

As it stands, people will be forced into low-paid jobs.

As it stands, poorer working people will be forced to leave their homes.

As it stands, the Universal Credit programme is, for all practices and purposes, unachievable.

This Council calls upon the Government to defer introduction of Universal Credit – less haste and give more thought for the consequences for this so called “reform”

Councillor Antonia Bance’s Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

(12) Day Centre Charges – (Proposer Councillor Gill Sanders)

This Council notes with concern the County Council’s plan to pass on a massive increase in fees for attendance at day centres from £10 to £25 per session - an increase of 150%. Many people attend day centres three times a week which would mean an increase from £30 to £75 and so they would not be able to attend the centres so frequently.

One of the biggest problems of getting older is isolation and this will only serve to increase the isolation of older people.

We recognise the need to make increases in the existing charges, and most older people would accept this. However the proposed increase would mean that fewer people would be able to attend the day centres and the fall in numbers attending would probably result in some centres closing, resulting in even more isolation for many older people.

At the moment the County is consulting on these proposed increases and we urge them to take careful note of the comments received during the consultation process and to consider very carefully the consequences of such an increase in charges and ask them only to make increases that would not have such a devastating effect on the older, most vulnerable and isolated people in our communities.

Councillor Gill Sanders Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

(13) Destabilisation of University finances – (Proposer Councillor Bob Price)

This Council regrets the destabilising of University finances caused by the Coalition Government's trebling of fees, attacks on the recruitment of international students, and the arbitrary capping of student numbers at individual universities.

Councillor Bob Price’s Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

(14) Educational Attainment – Key Stage 1 – (Proposer Councillor Jean Fooks, seconder Councillor Jim Campbell)

This Council

* regrets that too many Oxford City children have not been reaching their potential at Key Stage 1, and later, for far too long

- * supports the decision to provide intensive support to primary School's in disadvantaged areas, and
- * believes that it is essential that the City and County Councils work together for the benefit of Oxford's children.

Council therefore asks the Leader to invite the County Council to nominate members of its Children's Services Scrutiny Committee to join in the work being done by this Council's Community and Partnerships Scrutiny Committee through its Educational Attainment panel.

Councillor Jean Fooks Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

(15) Break the Bag Habit Campaign – (Proposer Councillor Graham Jones)

Council

- notes with dismay that in 2011 the staggering number of eight billion 'thin-gauge' bags were issued in the UK. (This equals 254 bags handed out per second and represents an increase of 5.4% over the number issued in 2010);
- notes with interest that in Ireland and Wales, where there is a 5p levy on bags, there was a drop of up to 90% in the use of such bags;
- and that the Campaign to Protect Rural England, Keep Britain Tidy, the Marine Conservation Society and Surfers Against Sewage have launched a the *Break the Bag Habit Campaign*, calling on the Government to introduce a levy on single-use plastic.

Council reaffirms its wish to reduce litter as well as to limit environmental damage, and therefore asks the Leader to write to the City's two MPs requesting them to support the campaign.

Councillor Graham Jones Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

(16) Relaxation of Planning Regulations – (Proposer Councillor Roy Darke)

The Council condemns the recently announced relaxation of planning regulations. The planning system has served Oxford and the country well over many decades by reducing sprawl and ad-hoc un-neighbourly development. The coalition delusion that less planning control will unlock pent up demand "for more affordable housing" (Nick Clegg) is wholly unrealistic and unlikely. Supply-side tinkering is not the answer. The main problem for new and expanding households is failure of the banks to lend money during the deep world-wide recession. Planning controls are not the principal blockage to home extension to family houses.

This is another example of the failure of the Coalition Government to understand that knee-jerk policies have unintended consequences when not properly thought through. In Oxford, and elsewhere, the proposed measures will open up opportunities for landlords and developers with capital to acquire and extend family homes for multi-occupation leading to poorly designed and overbearing extensions with loss of garden space and amenity.

Councillor Roy Darke's Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

(17) Erosion of affordable housing – (Proposer Councillor Ed Turner)

Council condemns the proposal to allow developers to appeal against Section 106 requirements for affordable housing and seek to have them reduced by the Planning Inspectorate. Council believes that with the dire shortage of affordable housing, coupled with the shortage of sites for development in Oxford, such a move will further compound Oxford's housing crisis. Council also expresses concern that a hiatus may result, with developers delaying construction of new homes until an appeal can be heard against the S106 requirement.

Council asks the Chief Executive and any group leaders willing to sign to write to the Secretary of State for Local Government, opposing this proposal which it believes is a further assault on affordable housing by the Coalition Government.

Councillor Ed Turner withdrew his Motion on Notice.

(18) Expansion of powers of the Planning Inspectorate – (Proposer Councillor Ed Turner)

Council opposes the proposal of September 2012 to remove from local authorities who fail to meet centrally set targets the ability to determine planning applications in their areas, and believes that such a move is an unwarranted assault on local democracy.

Councillor Ed Turner's Motion on Notice was not considered as the time allowed by the Constitution for Motions on Notice had lapsed.

59. REPORTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT ORGANISATIONS THE COUNCIL IS REPRESENTED ON

Councillor Graham Jones spoke on behalf of himself and Councillor Bev Clack, who had been appointed as the City Council representatives on the Asian Cultural Centre. He said that they had attended a recent meeting which he found very good and discovered that the Centre wants to be more than just a venue where rooms can be hired, but a real asset to the community. He said he was particularly pleased that four of the nine Management Committee Members were women and he would continue to report back on further developments and activities at the Centre.

60. NEW EMPLOYMENT POLICIES

The Head of Human Resources and Facilities submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which presented a revised Disciplinary Policy and Procedure, and Alcohol and Drug Misuse Policy for adoption.

Councillor Price said that these revised policies and procedure followed long and extensive discussions with the Unions.

Councillor Simmons welcomes the revised policies and procedures.

Councillor Fooks felt that the policies and procedures were sensible but highlighted that not all staff were members of a Union and she hoped that they had been consulted, In response Councillor Price said that the Unions were recognised bodies and the Council had consulted with them.

Council agreed:

- (a) To approve the adoption with immediate effect of the Disciplinary Policy and Procedure agreed with the Unions;
- (b) To approve the adoption with immediate effect of the Alcohol and Drug Misuse Policy agreed with the Unions;
- (c) To authorise the Head of Human Resources and Facilities to implement these policies and procedures within an appropriate time frame, making changes as required in accordance with best practice and relevant legal frameworks.

61. POLICY FRAMEWORK - RECONFIGURATION

The Head of Law and Governance submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which reviewed the composition of the Council's Policy Framework explaining that the Policy Framework had developed over time and had not been comprehensively reviewed. It reviewed the present Policy Framework and proposed a reconfiguration.

Council agreed to approve the reconfigured Policy Framework as set out in Annex 2 to the report.

The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 9.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Address to Council from Mohammed Niaz Abbasi

I am submitting this statement on behalf of the Muslim community of Oxford. I would like to highlight our concern regarding the film entitled 'Innocence of Muslims'. This film is intended to make a mockery of Islam and the prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). To hurt 1.5 billion believers around the world who hold this man Muhammad in the highest esteem is really quite shocking. What has this film actually achieved? What was it set out to achieve? Protests around the world have highlighted the deep hurt that this film has caused. Many protests have turned violence and in Libya it has cost the lives of American Diplomats, this entire scenario did not need to take place.

If your response to our complaint is that such films are allowed and encouraged under freedom of speech, and that a free press dictates the complete acceptability of such a film then my question to you is this, if a film was released mocking the Jewish or Christian tradition or any other sacred tradition at a time when relations between the tradition in question and the western world were already precarious, would the release of such a film be considered acceptable? Surely, it would be deemed irresponsible and inflammatory. Is this not the case?

Mainstream Muslims have deep respect and reverence for all of the prophets, including Jesus, Moses, Jacob, Ismail, Abraham. We consider the prophet Muhammad to be a closing seal in the line of prophet hood, throughout the Qur'an you will find deep respect for all of the prophets. Thus, an attack on the prophet Muhammad is in essence an attack on all of the prophets of the past. All of the prophets called human kind to return to their humanity and have respect for what binds us all together, our humanity. It is thus utterly unacceptable for people to mock the prophet Muhammad under the pretence of free speech and free press. The freedom to insult what others deem to be sacred is in no way beneficial to society.

The Muslim community of Oxford are eager to bridge gaps between different faiths and to promote social harmony. We hope to engender a better understanding of the various world religions. To achieve this goal, we need people working in the film and media industry as well as the politicians around the world to understand that the continuous mockery of Islam is a great hindrance to world peace. I urge the government through this council to ask the United Nations to write a code of conduct for those who try to exploit the idea of freedom of speech to further their own irresponsible agendas. The Muslims in Oxford do not tolerate disrespect towards the prophet Muhammad and I hope that we can all stand together against such disrespect.

The Muslims of Oxford also urge Muslims everywhere to behave in line with the teachings of the prophet Muhammad and to not resort to violence against civilians & ambassadors, this has been forbidden by the prophet Muhammad and will not benefit any one. I end with hope that you will read and respond to this plea with due

care and attention. We will await a response with eagerness. I close with a quote from Willam Montgomery Watt. Although, he highlighted this fact in 1953, sadly it holds true to this day. I hope we can take small step, together as a community, to change this:

“None of the great figures of history is so poorly appreciated in the West as Muhammad”

Thank you,

Cllr.M.N.Abbasi

When will it end? “The erosion of local facilities” – Address by William Clark

You the council have continually raided our community services, because it's an easy option to save money, but this latest venture is a step too far.

First you came for our youth services then you had a go at our parks then there was a venture into the greyhound stadium the latest sojourn is into our community centres. Can anyone see a pattern well for those of you who are unable to then let me give you a hint COMMUNITY RECREATION?

I know the council have a duty to provide facilities but why is it that you feel you have to destroy everything with one foul swoop and yet you still expect the local community to respond to your request of becoming more involved with their communities by volunteering to run differing events and facilities that you currently undertake. This smacks of Mr Cameron's "Big Society", a conservative doctorate.

At the last meeting here the lord mayor talked of respect for others within this chamber well I am sure if he had thought about this a little longer he could have extended it for you to encompass all residents of Oxford City after all said and done you are supposed to be working on their behalf so tell me where you think your actions are fair to them and what respect do you bestow on those who perpetually have to attend this place in order to defend their rights whether it be the Northway residents the St Clements residents or in my case the Blackbird Leys park residents.

On this subject of respect let me just ask you, if you had a problem that you couldn't resolve by your own devices, who would you turn too? I assume it would be a competent person who had the required skills to assist you with a satisfactory outcome. Let me also ask you why is it that when members of the public attend this place you do not assist them?

I have been here on several occasions and seen with my own eyes the deplorable behaviour you levy on these innocents who are only asking you to help them. It is daunting enough to stand before you and deliver our address without certain members disrespecting them by not paying attention to their requests. What gives you the right to behave in such a deplorable manner the very least you could do is listen to their concerns.

Because the Labour group sit in overall power here there are no democratic decisions made it is a done deal, an autocracy, whatever the Labour leader demands then he gets through the subservience of his underlings by block voting his will through the meetings. If I didn't know any better I would think you are just going through the motions of attending here tonight as all the important decisions have already been made, behind closed doors, and then for you to collect the fee you are due for attending such a meeting. Is that me just being cynical!!!

Why did the council reject the first proposed redevelopment of the Greyhound stadium for housing? There must have been a very good case against it and yet it

has been raised again with the Labour leader voicing his approval in the local paper for such a development. Does this mean it will be approved?

Also in the paper the local environmental agency expressed concerns of development within the City's flood defence scheme and the central area of Blackbird Leys. This must be referring to the council pet project as there was only one major construction yes the swimming pool. We have campaigned all along that this could be the case and yet you continue to forge ahead with this project with very little heed for our concerns.

When will you see sense and halt this white elephant and save the council the vast amount of time money and resources in continuing with this development. It's never too late to do the right thing, do it now while you can still earn some credibility not when you are forced to by the outcome of the upcoming judicial review.

Temple Cowley Pools – Judicial Review

My name is Nigel Gibson, and as most of you are aware I am a member of the Save Temple Cowley Pools Campaign. You will also be aware that there is an application for Judicial Review against the Council waiting to be heard. I am the person named in that application, along with the Queen.

In recent weeks this particular Judicial Review has been mentioned in the media a number of times. Usually it is in connection with the court action costing the Council money, and if you were listening to the Bill Heine programme on local radio a couple of Sundays ago you will have heard the Judicial Review described as ‘vexatious’ by a Labour councillor. As usual with information put out by the Council in relation to your wanting to close Temple Cowley Leisure Centre, it is a combination of misleading, inaccurate, incomplete and untrue, and I want to take this opportunity to set the record straight.

Let’s be clear first of all what a Judicial Review is. Basically, when a member of the public, or a group of people such as the Campaign to Save Temple Cowley Pools, wants to challenge a decision that has been made, in this case, by the Council, in the end the only recourse is to take the matter to Court, and Judicial Review is the only process open to us. There are two stages; the first is the application for permission to seek a Judicial Review, where a court considers whether the challenge is legally sound. If permission is granted then the next stage is the full Judicial Review. All this costs money, and it is shameful that justice in this country is limited by how deep your pockets are, particularly in relation to a local authority who should be acting on our behalf in the first place to provide what most people regard as the basic services that its citizens need.

The reason I am bringing this Judicial Review is to hold the Council to account for its decision making concerning Temple Cowley Pools. Remember that Temple Cowley Pools is not just a swimming pool, it is shorthand for a complete wet/dry leisure centre, the only one in Oxford with a diving pool and also a sauna/steam room suite, as well as a gym and exercise studio.

Temple Cowley Pools – Judicial Review

Holding the Council to account for its decision is something that the democratic processes have failed to do. The public across Oxford have spoken consistently, powerfully and repeatedly in favour of preserving a well-used and much-loved local facility - the latest petition that you are being forced to debate this evening, and the four preceding ones, including the largest in Oxford's history with over 12,000 signatures, clearly demonstrate what the people want. And overwhelming opinion is fully supported by evidence, which the Campaign has supplied to you all many times.

But the people have not been heard, or at least you have chosen not to hear them. Nor were they heard during the so-called consultation process that preceded the decision to build at considerable cost, a non-Olympic, only 25m swimming pool in an area where there is no evidence of demand and as a consequence force the closure of Temple Cowley Leisure Centre.

That is the first legal issue that the judicial review is focused on - defective consultation. The Council says it conducted a city-wide exercise to seek people's views, but you did not actually ask the most basic question - whether Temple Cowley Pools should be closed or not. And the so-called and gerrymandered 'Focus Groups', along with hastily arranged meetings later could not remedy that fundamental error - not least because what was said on those occasions was not properly reported to Members of the Council. If the Council truly believes a majority of local people support the closure of TCP and are happy and able to use the new pool, it should settle the Judicial Review now and agree to re-consult properly. **And I challenge you to do just that.**

If you will not meet this challenge, I will ask the Court to require a proper consultation process, through the Judicial Review.

Then there is the issue of equality and inclusion. The Council proudly promotes an inclusive Oxford, where all can use public facilities, not just an elite, and likes to think of itself as building a brand as World Class. And you are completely right to do this so that all its citizens, all of us, can be proud to live and work here.

Temple Cowley Pools – Judicial Review

But that sentiment was wholly absent from the decision making about the future of Temple Cowley Pools, which is a model for how public facilities in Oxford should be - inclusive, used by the whole local community, despite their differences. The Council, you, especially with a Labour majority, ought to have recognised that - and take the impact of closure on that into account in your decision making. But the Council did not; the equality impact assessment was a document produced behind closed doors, very late in the decision making process, by officers who spoke to no-one.

Unsurprisingly it does not reflect who uses Temple Cowley Pools or why. The impact of closure has not been measured. The Council's statutory duty to have due regard to this impact has not been discharged. This is the second basis for the judicial review.

If the Council genuinely thinks there is no negative impact in equalities terms from closing TCP, it should settle the Judicial Review immediately, undertake a proper assessment and diligently evaluate the outcome.

What I find interesting and highly instructive is that the main defence being put up by the Council has nothing to do with either of these issues, the services that a Council should properly provide to its citizens. The main defence is a technicality, that the Judicial Review has been brought too late.

As I mentioned earlier, I have been accused of bringing this Judicial Review vexatiously. But the decision the Council has made is about services that affect the health and quality of life of tens of thousands of its citizens. I have to ask, what is vexatious about asking that my local authority makes decisions openly transparently and fairly, and that it honours its statutory duties?

I am asking no more than that from the Court.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDRESS TO COUNCIL – By Sarah Santhosham

Dear Council,

My name is Sarah Santhosham and I have recently taken over as the Vice President for Charities and Community at Oxford University Student Union.

OUSU exists in part to represent students as a body to the University and to the wider community; we have six full time sabbatical officers and in my role I cover community liaison.

During the summer I have enjoyed getting to know several Councilors and members of the community in residents associations, voluntary groups, the City Council and the police. Like my predecessor I would like to work closely with the Council over the coming year on areas of mutual concern to make the relationship between students and the community better.

There are many positive benefits of students in our community, for example through volunteering and fundraising for local charities, such as Helen and Douglas House, Crisis Skylight Oxford and Jacari. Over the coming year I will be working on fostering relationships between students and the wider community through showcasing the voluntary work of both groups, working to make University space more accessible to community groups, and continuing to lobby for a Living Wage to be paid to all staff, who live and work in our community. I look forward to working with you over the coming year to achieve these goals and please do feel free to contact me at charities@ousu.org

This page is intentionally left blank

SERVING THE COMMUNITIES OF EAST OXFORD

Amanda Perry (RMN)

10/3/2012

I'm making this address today because I am disappointed at the Labour Council's proposal to close Temple Cowley Pool and Leisure Centre and Blackbird Leys Pool, and equally outraged at how the Council appears to be deliberately running down a much used facility, that is at the heart of so many communities.

I was brought up in Cowley using Temple Cowley Pool and leisure centre, and now that I am living in Blackbird Leys, I use both Blackbird Leys and Temple Cowley leisure centres.

I would note that I know absolutely no-one from either area that has been approached by the Council in relation to consultation on the Council's proposition to close Temple Cowley Leisure Centre. Also, those people I have spoken to, that use either or both centres', have not been consulted regarding the Council's propositions. I now question in relation to this, how truly democratic the Labour Council in Oxford City are?

In addition to being a local woman that uses both facilities, I am also a registered psychiatric nurse working at the Warneford Hospital.

In relation to my clients and the local communities, I am horrified at the proposed closure due to a number of reasons, but mainly what it will mean for many people who are already disadvantaged in terms of access to local facilities:

Temple Cowley is at a Hub – it is on many very good transport routes allowing those from Oxford City, Cowley Road, Cowley, Temple Cowley, Rose Hill, Iffley, Wood farm and Littlemore to access its facilities. Despite the Council's claims, in practice Blackbird Leys is not as accessible as Temple Cowley, and certainly not from all of these communities. Equally, despite an obvious lack of maintenance and what appears to be an active run down by the Council, Temple Cowley Leisure Centre remains an excellent facility.

Everyone is being stretched financially at the moment, but more so those who are already disadvantaged and on low incomes. How will those people affected by the closure of Temple Cowley Pools be able to afford to get to Blackbird Leys Leisure Centre?

Equally, many of the people I work with suffer with mood, anxiety or psychotic disorders. These people already struggle to access services close to them, but if these facilities are closed it could have a huge impact on their ability to socialise and to get exercise – which we know can positively impact on their mental health, which will equally impact on their ability to survive in the community, increasing a need for involvement from mental health services which are already greatly stretched.

The Labour Councillor on a recent radio show noted that Oxford had over and above the number of pools required for a City however, I am aware that he was including private leisure facilities in these numbers, which clearly cannot be accessed by the disadvantaged on low incomes.

Alongside this, building a new facility (which I gather will offer less not more, than what is currently/possibly available for example no diving pool, no larger pool and so on) will decrease one

**Concerns regarding the proposal to close Temple Cowley Pool and Leisure Centre
and Blackbird Leys Pool**

SERVING THE COMMUNITIES OF EAST OXFORD

of the only large green areas in Blackbird Leys, a community recognised as having moderate to severe deprivation. As we are equally aware having green areas to walk and spend time in is beneficial to mental health, and to decrease this availability will have a knock on effect on the health of some individuals.

I was led to believe by all political parties that they wanted individuals to take personal responsibility for their health and wellbeing and therefore to rely less on the state, I do not believe that the current plans bear this in mind.

As an aside, I gather that the Council has not approached any refurbishment specialists to look at the refurbishing costs for Temple Cowley and the current Blackbird Leys pool, choosing instead to use consultants without this expertise. This certainly makes no sense to me and I feel indicates poor practice, with a possible and very real consequence of a waste of tax payers' money. When I look at the impact of the cuts on my clients and others who are already disadvantaged, I am saddened that the Council would choose to follow through with these plans. If any money could be saved from refurbishing the already well utilised and loved facilities then surely this money could be used to help more disadvantaged groups in the local area?

Lastly, I am very concerned, given the recent approval given to Oxford Brookes to build flats at the St Clements car park, that if Oxford Brookes is sold the Temple Cowley site, this will also have direct effect on Temple Cowley Library... I must say I am concerned at who is truly benefitting from these propositions. If the closure of Temple Cowley Leisure Centre goes ahead, then I can inform you that many constituents like me, will feel unable to trust a Labour Council again. This is still a very real and live issue for the communities in East Oxford, and across Oxford as a whole.

So in conclusion, as the building costs of the proposed new pool escalate, I ask the Labour Council to reconsider what it is doing, and keep Temple Cowley open to serve the many communities who both want and need it.