

# MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

Wednesday 23 September 2015

www.oxford.gov.uk



**COUNCILLORS PRESENT:** Councillors Humberstone (Lord Mayor), Cook (Deputy Lord Mayor), Malik (Sheriff), Altaf-Khan, Benjamin, Brandt, Brown, Clack, Clarkson, Coulter, Darke, Fooks, Gant, Goddard, Gotch, Haines, Henwood, Hollick, Hollingsworth, Kennedy, Lloyd-Shogbesan, Lygo, Munkonge, Paule, Price, Rowley, Royce, Sanders, Simm, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Tanner, Tarver, Taylor, Thomas, Turner, Upton, Van Nooijen, Wade, Wilkinson and Wolff.

## 33. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Abbasi, Anwar, Fry and Pressel submitted apologies.

## 34. MINUTES

Council agreed to approve the minutes of the ordinary meetings held on 13 April 2015 and 20 July 2015 as a true and correct record.

## 35. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Malik declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the item dealing with hackney carriage and private hire vehicles- proposed amendments to licensing criteria (Minute 43) as a holder of a taxi licence.

## 36. APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Council noted:

- Councillor van Nooijen had resigned from West Area Planning Committee
- Councillor Paule had resigned from Planning Review Committee.

Council agreed to appoint:

- Councillor Paule to West Area Planning Committee
- Councillor Turner to Planning Review Committee

with immediate effect.

Council agreed to the suspension of its standing orders to allow Councillor van Nooijen to address councillors. He thanked members for their support; officers for their advice and support; and the public for their contributions.

### **37. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Lord Mayor announced:

- This would be the mace bearer's last attendance as he would be retiring before the next full council meeting, and the Lord Mayor thanked him for his service.
- He had opened a very successful St Giles Fair.
- He had attended the Oxford in Bloom awards ceremony
- a successful visit and concert by the Perm Balalaika quartet 'Karavai'

The Sheriff announced he had spent time helping with flood relief in Southern Punjab in Pakistan, and thanked those who had donated to this.

The Leader of the Council informed Council:

- About the multi-agency and multi-authority work to support Syrian refugees dispersed to Oxford and surrounding areas under the Home Office programme. It was understood that small numbers would be sent to the area each year. The nature and make-up of the households to be accommodated, and funding for this, was unclear: both in the short term when funds should be available, and in the longer term.
- A proposal for devolution to authorities in the county was sent in to central government by the close of the consultation deadline. The initial response is that these may be taken forward with detailed proposals by the year end. There are outstanding questions on governance structures. It would be useful for the scrutiny committee to review this.

The Head of Law and Governance announced on behalf of the Chief Executive that at the Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) Service Awards in September 2015 Oxford City Council was named Council of the Year; won the Best Housing, Regeneration or New Build Initiative Award for our innovative Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) licensing scheme; received a bronze award in the Gold Standard Challenge for its commitment to preventing homelessness from the National Practitioner Support Service; and was nominated in a further eight categories.

### **38. PUBLIC ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS THAT RELATE TO MATTERS FOR DECISION AT THIS MEETING**

Mr Bashir Ahmed addressed Council in respect of Minute 43. The text of his address is attached to the minutes.

### **39. HOMELESSNESS PROPERTY INVESTMENT**

Council had before it a report seeking approval for the Council to invest in a dedicated property fund in order to lever in additional funding to that provided by the Council, to procure accommodation that can be used to house homeless

households in the private rented sector and the recommendations of the City Executive Board meeting on 30 July 2015.

**Council resolved to:**

- 1. include this type of investment (*in a Directly Managed Property Fund*) in its Treasury Management Strategy as part of non-specified investments and amend the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy in line with the principles outlined in this report;**
- 2. approve the £2.197 million balance on the Homelessness Property Acquisitions capital scheme be transferred to this investment; and**
- 3. approve a supplementary estimate of £2.803m; financed from internal borrowing, as a revision to the Council's Capital Programme.**

#### **40. INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE REPORT QUARTER 1 2015/16**

Council had before it relevant sections of a report to the City Executive Board which updated Members on Finance, Risk and Performance as at the end of Quarter 1, 30 June 2015 and the recommendations of the City Executive Board meeting on 10 September 2015.

**Council resolved to approve the inclusion of an additional budget of £115,289 for parks works in the Capital Programme to be financed from external grant funding.**

#### **41. TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2014-2015**

Council had before it a report detailing the Council's treasury management activity and performance for 2014-2015 and recommending some changes to the Treasury Management Strategy for 2015-16 and the recommendations of the City Executive Board meeting on 10 September 2015.

**Council resolved to:**

- 1. approve the Revised MRP Policy as set out in Appendix 1; and**
- 2. approve the amendment to the Non-Specified Investments list attached at Appendix 2 of the report.**

#### **42. BMW DEVELOPMENT AND HORSPATH SPORTS PARK**

Council had before it relevant sections of a report to the City Executive Board seeking authority to agree a contract with BMW which would transfer their sports facilities at its Horspath Road, Cowley site to a new adjacent site enabling future development of their factory and the recommendations of the City Executive Board meeting on 10 September 2015.

**Council resolved to agree a new capital budget of £4.9 million funded by the capital receipt from the sale of the land to fund the replacement of the facilities.**

#### **43. HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES- PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO LICENSING CRITERIA**

As this item affected one of his disclosable pecuniary interests, Councillor Malik left the room at the start of this item and took no part in the debate or decision.

Council had before it a report detailing proposals for the implementation of a variety of criteria applicable to Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicles in the City in order to promote reductions in pollutants and to reduce the number of vehicles licensed by other Authorities from working within the City and the recommendations of the General Licensing Committee meeting on 14 September 2015.

Councillor Clarkson introduced the report and addressed the points raised by Mr Bashir Ahmed.

**Council resolved to:**

- 1. approve the proposed amendments to Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle “Conditions of Fitness” as detailed within this report at Appendix 5;**
- 2. revise the Vehicle Age Limits criteria due to come into force on 1 January 2016 as detailed in this report in paragraph 44; and**
- 3. approve the proposal to offer a discounted licence fee to be applicable to vehicles that fall with Vehicle Excise Bands A, B and C (deemed to be low emission vehicles).**

At the end of this item, Councillor Malik returned to the meeting and Councillor Altaf-Khan joined the meeting.

#### **44. AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE LIGHT OF THE SUCCESSFUL LEGAL CHALLENGE TO THE PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE**

Council had before it a report confirming how affordable housing contributions will be sought in the light of the successful legal challenge to parts of the Planning Practice Guidance on 31 July 2015.

**Council resolved to:**

- 1. acknowledge that the West Berkshire District Council and Reading Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 2222 (Admin) judgement of 31 July 2015 quashes paragraphs 012-023 from the Planning Practice Guidance: Planning Obligations and declares the related Ministerial Statement of 28 Nov 2014 to be immaterial for planning purposes; and**
- 2. note that from 31 July 2015 the Council is applying Sites and Housing Plan Policies HP3 and HP4 in their entirety and with full weight.**

## **45. CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES**

Council had before it the minutes of the City Executive Board meeting of 30 July 2015 and the draft minutes of the meeting of 10 September 2015.

On Minute 71, Councillor Fooks asked for updates on the award of contracts and the disposal of recyclates, and Councillor Tanner undertook to provide these when available.

On Minute 72, Councillor Fooks asked how much the council would lose from planned social housing. Councillors Hollingsworth and Price said that councils were re-evaluating their unmet need for social and market rate housing. There was some very welcome co-operation between councils, but more was needed.

On Minute 76, Councillor Fooks asked how the planning service incurred £200,000 of additional staff costs when there were staff shortages. Councillor Price said that the costs were for agency staff and consultancy work to provide the service.

## **46. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL**

Questions submitted by members of Council to the Board members, Leader of the Council, by the deadline in the Constitution; responses; and supplementary questions and responses are listed below.

### **Board member for Climate Change and Cleaner, Greener Oxford**

#### **1. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Tanner**

Now that the World Health Organisation has classified Glyphosate as 'probably carcinogenic to humans' will the City Council stop applying it to our streets?

*Note: See <http://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/apr/21/glyphosate-probably-carcinogenic-pesticide-why-cities-use-it>*

#### **Response**

Glyphosate is used in weed spraying across the City and this work is undertaken by a specialist contractor. Currently there is no intention to use an alternative based on the following information received from our contractor.

"It seems that it is not possible to rule out entirely that glyphosate could be carcinogenic, which seems to be the reason for the up-regulation by the IARC from 'unclassifiable'. However due to limited evidence of carcinogenicity in humans and other mammals in testing, it is also not possible to conclude that it does pose a cancer risk. Whilst glyphosate products are still deemed safe to use by the relevant UK and European authorities and are therefore still approved for use, not only in amenity but in many agricultural situations and on many crops found in our supermarkets, we will continue to use them throughout the course of our business."

## Supplementary

Given the dangers of glyphosphate and the need to protect health, would the council reconsider and ask its contractors to reconsider their use?

## Response

We will keep this under review and will ask our contractors to do the same: while noting the points, we need to follow the scientific evidence.

## **2. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Tanner**

Could the portfolio holder provide the latest figures on fly-tipping across the City over the last few months?

## Response

A detailed breakdown of the fly tipping figures from 1st March 2015 to 31st August 2015 is shown below.

Fly Tipping Input Data		
Land Type	Waste Type	Size / Cost
Waste Type	Count	
Animal Carcass	0	
Green	20	
Vehicle Parts	5	
White Goods	64	
Other Electrical	31	
Tyres	9	
Asbestos	1	
Clinical	0	
Construction/Demolition/Excavation	17	
Bags - Commercial	2	
Bags - Domestic	33	
Chemical Drums, Oil Or Fuel	3	
Other Domestic Waste	783	
Other Commercial Waste	48	
Other (undefined)	2	
<b>Total Number of Incidents Actioned</b>	<b>1018</b>	

Statistically this indicates a 20% increase from the same period last year but we believe this to be due to more comprehensive and accurate recording systems now being in place rather than fly-tipping being on the increase.

### **Supplementary**

Is there any way to reduce this further?

### **Response**

We need people to inform us, and will take action where we can identify the culprits.

### **3. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Tanner**

Air Quality Progress Reports for Oxford City were published by the Council in May 2013 and May 2014. Will a 2015 Report be produced?

### **Response**

An updating and screening report will be produced later in the year.

### **4. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Tanner**

When does Oxford City Council expect to be compliant with the EU air pollution limit on NOX within the City's Air Quality Management Area?

Can the Councillor set out the pathway how compliance will be achieved?

### **Response**

Air quality in Oxford is steadily improving over most the City is already compliant with the European Union air pollution limits. There remain some troubling hotspots despite the success of reducing pollution from buses. The City Council will continue to measure pollution levels and to press the County Council, as the highways authority, to take appropriate action to tackle the hotspots.

Defra's latest analysis shows that Oxford will be compliant with the EU air quality limit value for nitrogen dioxide by 2020. The City Council's Air Quality Action Plan 2013 – 2020 outlines the actions that the City Council will take to improve air quality in the city which is available on the Council's website:

<http://www.oxford.gov.uk/Library/Documents/Environmental%20Development/Air%20Quality%20Action%20Plan%202013.pdf>

### **Supplementary**

How can we encourage the County Council to act?

### **Response**

I will send a written response to this.

### **5. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Tanner**

The Portfolio Holder is quoted on the Friends of the Earth website saying "Flowers and herbs don't just look nice, they are key to our survival. We need everyone to do their bit to encourage our bees, whether it's with a window box, a garden or an allotment." Can you please therefore ensure that the window boxes and hanging baskets in the City for which the Council are responsible are planted with bee friendly flowers?

*Notes: 1. Many were planted this year with bee unfriendly petunias and pelargonium*

*2. This can be achieved by planting single flowering bulbs which provide a flowering succession from February through to mid-summer to be replaced by nasturtiums from mid-summer into Autumn. Such a planting would be low maintenance and has been proved to survive in hostile city centre locations.*

### **Response**

We are working with Dr Judy Webb (a local Ecological Consultant) to help to look at all our planting. In the recent Biodiversity Action plan the following two action points were agreed:-

Work in partnership with Friends of the Earth and other organisations to further improve our parks and open spaces for pollinating insects.

The council will consider the following priorities when choosing species for new planting schemes – native provenance, enhancing biodiversity, attracting pollinating insects, resilience and contributions to the environment.

To further assist us, Dr Webb has sent us a list of pollinator friendly plants and made a few recommendations for particular plants that are useful to pollinators for bedding displays, which we will look to incorporate into future displays.

### **6. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Tanner**

What steps will the City Council take to prevent the construction of a road and bridge, as suggested in the County Council's transport strategy, across the Lye Valley SSSI and Nature Reserve site?

### **Response**

Oxford City Council strongly opposed the construction of a bus route across the Lye Valley nature reserve in our response to the County Council's transport strategy for Oxford. On the County Council Labour and the other opposition parties opposed Local Transport Plan 4, which includes the Oxford transport strategy. However the Conservative majority approved LTP4 so the threat to Lye Valley remains.

Oxford City Council remains opposed to any construction of a bus route through the Lye Valley nature reserve. If and when a funded scheme is brought forward the City Council would be obliged to consider it on its merits.

However Natural England would take an active role in any application and ensure that no damage was caused to the SSSI. If approval was by means of application by the County Council under the Transport and Works Act the City Council would expect to be actively involved from the pre-application stage, as not only are we a planning authority, but also our Parks team manages the Lye Valley SSSI Nature Reserve.

## **Board member for Culture and Communities**

### **7. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Simm**

Can the portfolio holder tell us whether the longer-term proposal for East Oxford Community Centre is to return it to more local management?

#### **Response**

A return to local management is the Council's long term aim, but the priority at present is to achieve a well run Centre meeting the needs of local people. There will be a wide and full consultation about the future of the Centre, including its management.

### **8. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Simm**

Can the portfolio holder promise that room hire prices won't increase following the Council's takeover of the East Oxford Community Centre?

#### **Response**

We have committed to hold room hire charges for this financial year and the rents will remain stable except for increases reflecting inflation. We will need to review these charges on an annual basis in line with all other charges.

### **9. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Simm**

In the architect's brief for the East Oxford Community Centre, issued by the City Council, it states under Part B specification that "For the avoidance of doubt Oxford City Council will require the proceeds of the sale from the disposal of the Howard Street [Film Oxford] and Collins Street [East Oxford Games Hall] sites to fund the development of the re-developed East Oxford Community Centre on Princes Street."

Can the portfolio holder please say:

- How, or where, will the badminton, basketball and gymnastics facilities currently available at the East Oxford Games Hall be re-provided?
- How, or where, will the specialist audio-visual facilities currently provided at Film Oxford (an editing suite, training, exhibition and screening space and an office) be re-provided?
- Will the popular community garden that forms part of the Film Oxford site, outlined in the brief for development, be preserved?

#### **Response**

We are exploring possible ways to be able to improve the community centre and have let people know the options we feel are the most viable, but need to complete the study to have an informed view. The focus of the Feasibility study is to explore these very issues and that we are committed to retaining existing activities but looking to see how these could be incorporated into the development scheme for the EOCC site.

### **Supplementary**

Could there be a consistent response to questions about the brief and the specification to avoid confusion and upset?

### **Response**

The architects have been appointed and are talking to the relevant groups, looking at the whole of the site and the needs of the users in exploring options. There was no intention to remove the community garden.

### **10. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Simm**

Why did the City Council choose to put the rebuilt Rose Hill Community Centre under City Council management rather than allowing the existing Community Association to continue to manage it?

### **Response**

Rose Hill is a large, complex building with youth space, a gym, health services, a sports pavilion, community halls, social space, a café and a number of tenants such as the police and citizens advice. During conversations with the Association they agreed it would not be viable for them to manage such a complex building.

### **Supplementary**

What is the relationship between the council as owners and the community associations as managers, and what is the vision for that relationship and the role of the associations in the larger centres?

### **Response**

There is a cross-party group including the Oxfordshire Council for Voluntary Action and association representatives looking at this. The Executive Board would be considering a strategy paper setting out options for managing the centres. It was not the intention that the council should run the centres indefinitely but neither was an asset transfer an option: these were large complex centres which needed to be well-run for the benefit of the whole community. All councillors should be contributing to the debate and decision on community centres in the city.

### **Board member for Leisure, Parks and Sport**

### **11. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Rowley**

Why is participation at our leisure centres by target groups falling so dramatically? (Indicator LP106)

### **Response**

We have seen significant increase in visits to the city's leisure facilities by targeted groups ever since Fusion Lifestyle took over their running. The increase is from just over 800,000 visits in 2009 to 1.3 million last year.

The area where we have had the greatest increase is on our target groups. The increase in usage by our target groups since 2009 is 134%.

There will occasionally be blips in a general rising trend of participation and this is not the first. Officers are working with Fusion to work out what is responsible for failing to meet the target referred to and how this can be avoided in future. We are committed to continuous improvement of our leisure services in close partnership with Fusion.

## **12. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Rowley**

The Oxford half marathon is a well-established and successful event, which generates a wonderful atmosphere and raises large amounts of money for charity. This year's change of route was made for good reasons, and the new route has many advantages over the old.

However, the process of consulting and informing those affected by the new route has been inadequate. Residents, traders, churches, schools and other places have complained in large numbers that they were either presented with a fait accompli or not informed at all. In many cases, inadequate attention has been paid to their needs, for example access to schools by parents or to churches by less mobile parishioners.

Will the councillor agree with us that it is not acceptable for Church services to be cancelled and visits to school by parents prevented? Will he give us an absolute guarantee that even at this late stage he will do everything in his power to ensure that these things do not happen? Will he undertake to work with local councillors and that where expressions of concern are received, either he or the organisers will personally contact the organisations affected quickly, in order to reassure them and address their concerns? Will he guarantee that the area bounded by the High Street to the south, Saint Giles and Banbury Road to the west, Marston Ferry Road to the north, and the river Cherwell to the east, will remain accessible on foot and by bike, and for emergency services? Will he work with us to contact traders in Summertown and elsewhere to use the event to enhance their footfall, not the reverse? Will he agree with us that the success of an event like this depends on the goodwill of all stakeholders, that such goodwill is easily lost, and work closely with us to try and preserve it?

### **Response**

The Council will do everything consistent with public safety to ensure good access for residents and visitors, in consultation with the event organisers and the police. However, it must be expected that some disruption will occur, as it has in the past in other areas.

The Oxford Half Marathon takes place for a few hours once a year and is a great advertisement for our beautiful City. As the question acknowledges, the route is an improvement on the previous one and I hope that participants and non-participants alike will enjoy the spectacle and the friendly spirit of the event.

### **Supplementary**

Will the Board members undertake a comprehensive debrief and a comprehensive plan to manage information and minimise disruption next year?

## **Response**

Councillors, businesses, churches, and other groups were notified about the event in advance and meetings held to inform people. Road closures would be lifted as soon as possible. Some disruption was inevitable but this was minimised as far as possible and as much information provided as possible.

## **Board member for Planning, Transport and Regulatory Service**

### **13. From Councillor Hollick to Councillor Hollingsworth**

How many HMOs are there estimated to be in the City and what percentage of these have been registered under the City's HMO Scheme?

## **Response**

When the National Award Winning Additional Licensing Scheme for HMOs commenced in 2011 it was estimated that there were 5,000 HMOs and that the Council would have licensed 3544 HMOs by January 2017, i.e. 70%. To date the Council has licensed 3511 which is 69%.

## **Supplementary**

What measures were in place to bring the number and percentage of HMOs registered closer to the target?

## **Response**

We are aware that number of HMOS has increased since 2011 and are working to identify, register and improve the quality of these, and to continue the good progress we have made.

### **14. From Councillor Hollick to Councillor Hollingsworth**

Why did the portfolio holder refuse to accept Scrutiny Committee's reasonable request, as part of the review of the Oxford Growth Strategy, to look at how remote and mobile working could be more effectively used to alleviate Oxford's housing crisis given that this suggestion was made in addition to agreeing to the document's ambitious housing targets?

## **Response**

My response gave a clear explanation of my reasoning, as follows:

*For many years now the growth in technology-driven networked working, in particular fast broadband, has been used as an argument for reducing the absolute numbers of new homes that would be required, and for their dispersal over a wider geographic area, which appears to be the suggestion here. However the evidence that such dispersal is actually workable is no more compelling now that when the same arguments were produced to argue for reductions in housing numbers during debates over the emerging South East Plan in the early 2000s.*

*The City Council has been strongly of the view that the most sustainable and practical approach to the allocation of housing to meet Oxford's needs is by carefully designed urban extensions to the city itself, not dispersal to*

*Oxfordshire's towns and in particular not widespread dispersal to villages (villages will be planning for housing to meet their own needs, but the quantum of housing needed to meet the unmet need of Oxford would far exceed those figures, and would be highly detrimental to village communities without benefitting the city itself). In particular the proximity of existing services and networks, whether transport, data/technology or social/community, makes development adjacent to the current built-up area of the City the most environmentally, economically and socially sustainable approach.*

*The assumption that mobile working makes is that all members of a household will be equally able to work remotely, and that all activities carried out by that household are equally able to be done using remote working technology: neither assumption is tenable. While it is true to say that many people are now able to carry out their work remotely, it is far from true for all occupations. For example, it is not possible for nursing staff at the city's hospitals or skilled engineers at BMW to carry out their jobs remotely. Equally, children cannot go to school remotely, and while internet shopping in some retail sectors has grown exponentially in recent years, so have small scale markets and local shopping, and it is not possible for many other social activities to be done remotely.*

*Moreover, it is clear that the unequal access to high-speed broadband in urban and rural areas is a major constraint on existing rural communities being able to make full use of the opportunities for remote working, thus making a policy of dispersal of Oxford's unmet housing need based on universal access to high-speed data highly problematic.*

The Oxford Growth Strategy is directly concerned with working with partners to bring forward sustainable locations for the homes that Oxford needs but is unable to build within its own administrative boundaries, and demonstrating that the option of Green Belt review and urban extension would be sustainable and deliverable. Given the Corporate Plan direction and considerations explained above, it is reasonable and prudent to maintain this focus.

## **15. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Hollingsworth**

Given residents' justifiable concerns over air quality and noise issues at the Northern Gateway, will the Council be insisting on the development of a credible transport strategy and putting in place a comprehensive air and noise pollution monitoring programme taking any necessary mitigating actions?

### **Response**

The Northern Gateway Area Action Plan (NGAAP) makes it clear that planning permission will only be granted for proposals where it has been demonstrated that it is acceptable in terms of noise and air quality (NGAAP Policy NG7). In particular relation to transport, the AAP (para 6.4-6.5) advises that "at the early stages, a Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan will be required to accompany any outline planning application. Then as the scheme progresses, each detailed planning application/reserved matters application will need to demonstrate how the development will contribute to sustainable travel and the mitigation of any significant traffic impacts"... "every effort will be made to reduce the noise levels and air pollution effects of road traffic in the area... detailed assessment of air quality and noise implications will be required at

planning application stage; planning permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal is acceptable” (para 7.12).

#### **Policy NG7: Design and Amenity**

Planning applications will be required to demonstrate that new development has been designed with an understanding of the area’s heritage, setting and views. In particular, applications will be required to demonstrate how the Wolvercote with Godstow Conservation Area and how views of, into and out of the site have influenced proposals.

Planning permission will only be granted for developments that demonstrate compliance with the Design Code.

Planning permission will only be granted for developments that provide usable, well designed and good-quality publicly-accessible green open space. At least 15% of the total site area must be provided as green public open space; this must be distributed so that at least 15% of any parcel proposed for residential development is green public open space.

**Planning permission will only be granted for residential development where it has been demonstrated that it is acceptable in terms of noise and air quality.**

#### **Supplementary**

What is ‘acceptable’ in terms of air quality and noise?

#### **Response**

The definition of ‘acceptable’ is laid down in national and European legislation.

#### **16. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Hollingsworth**

What planning conditions are being imposed to safeguard the SSSI and Port Meadow SAC close to the proposed Northern Gateway development and protect them from water pollution and other forms of pollution?

#### **Response**

The AAP makes it clear that planning permission will only be granted for proposals where it has been demonstrated that it is acceptable in terms of noise and air quality (NG7). Also see quote from policy NG7.

A full Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) was carried out as part of the preparation of the NGAAP and concluded that “the policies of the AAP can be implemented without having an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC” (para 7.15). this was carried out in consultation with experts at Natural England. In addition there is a specific policy to address protection of the Oxford Meadows SAC, and the importance of the SSSI’s is also fully recognised in para 7.14.

#### **NG8: Oxford Meadows SAC**

Unless the applicant for planning permission can demonstrate that the development is not likely to have a significant effect on the Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation, the application will be subjected to appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations and permission will be granted only if it is ascertained that the development will not adversely affect the integrity of that Special Area of Conservation, in terms of the following conservation objectives:

- recreational pressure; and:
- the hydrological regime; and:
- air quality

### **Supplementary**

Are there any plans to carry out a new environmental impact analysis and a health impact analysis?

### **Response**

If the councillor can send written clarification of the question, a written answer will be supplied.

### **17. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Hollingsworth**

Can the Portfolio Holder say what, in his view, would be the minimum acceptable level of affordable and social housing at the proposed Northern Gateway development?

### **Response**

The policy on the Northern Gateway site is identical to those that apply throughout the city: affordable housing provision, including social rent units, will be subject to the normal planning policy requirements as set out in the Core Strategy and the Sites & Housing Plan in particular Policy HP3: Affordable homes from large housing sites. The City Council will therefore be seeking provision of 50% affordable housing (of which 80% will be social rent) in line with policy requirements. In the event that a developer were to claim that the policy requirements would make their proposal unviable, then there is a cascade approach set out in the Affordable Housing and Developer Contributions SDP, involving open-book evidence for the City Council to then make a judgement based on the evidence. Examples from elsewhere in the country show that developers of small and large sites are using viability arguments increasingly frequently to challenge Local Plan policies on affordable housing; the City Council will be robust in making clear from the earliest stage that we regard our affordable housing policies not as an optional extra for developers and landowners, but a fundamental part of meeting the needs of the city as a whole.

### **18. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Hollingsworth**

Has the City received any formal response from the County to its carefully-considered submission on the Oxford Transport Strategy?

### **Response**

The County Council Full Council has formally considered the LTP4 and Oxford Transport Strategy. The responses of the County Council were reported to Full County Council as part of their consideration, albeit in summary form. The response can be found on the County Council website (County Council 8th October, Item 14 Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015 – 2013, LTP – Annex 1 Consultation Summary and LTP Annex 2 <http://mycouncil.oxfordshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=116&MId=4398>)

### **19. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Hollingsworth**

Will the Council consider setting limits on the provision of new hotel accommodation in the City since existing provision is broadly in line with the

national average and that using the land for market, social and key worker housing is surely a higher priority?

*Note: There is 78.9% occupancy in hotels in Oxford in 2014 which is only slightly higher than the national average of 75.1%. London by comparison had 82.6% occupancy in 2014.*

## **Response**

The survey from which the figures cited come only assessed four hotels in the wider Oxford area, two of which are not actually in Oxford – they are in Wheatley and Milton Common - and two are on the edge of the city centre at Pear Tree. While interesting for the purposes of a press release, they do not form a comprehensive or robust study of hotel accommodation and demand in the city of Oxford, not do they make clear the difference between the city centre and broader regional hotel markets, which are quite different.

The tourist economy in its broadest is a critical part the Oxford economy. Oxford is the seventh most visited city in the UK by international visitors, and is a major regional hub and a gateway to the region's tourism offer. It attracts more than 6.8 million visitors a year, around half of them international, generates £770 million of income for local Oxford businesses, supporting 12,800 jobs. This includes the traditional 'holiday makers' and the business visitor as well. A key aim of our approach to tourism is to get tourists to stay longer and spend more. This requires sufficient supply of visitor accommodation in both quantity and quality terms.

The Oxford Hotel and Short Stay Accommodation Futures Study was last commissioned by Oxford City Council in March 2007. The research assessed the supply of hotel accommodation in Oxford and identified a total of 23 hotels in Oxford with 1,751 letting bedrooms, and 74 guest-house accommodation establishments with a total of 665 letting bedrooms. In terms of market segments, Oxford has been shown to have a limited supply of 3 star hotels and only a few 2 star hotels. Furthermore, the greatest proportion of the city's hotel stock is located outside the City centre. By comparison the City centre comprises mainly luxury / boutique hotels and a number of 3 star hotels. Hotels in this location are mainly small in size. Since the 2007 study there has been limited City Centre Hotel development and there are only a small number of outstanding planning permissions waiting to be implemented. There has been more development on the outskirts, where sites have been more available. The City Council has received 3 speculative hotel enquiries for sites in Oxford City Centre in the last few months, highlighting clear developer interest in Oxford as a location.

The Core Strategy identifies a projected need for up to 15 sites for hotel, hostel and serviced-apartment development in Oxford up to 2026, to fully meet the identified market potential for new provision. The Oxford Hotel and Short-Stay Accommodation study confirmed that there is 'a strong hotel market in Oxford', with 'all standards achieving high occupancies' and 'room rates' and evidence of business being denied both during the week and at weekends. The assessment of occupancy rates highlighted that 'hotel occupancies are very high in Oxford, well above national averages'. The research showed that there are distinct City centre and out-of-centre hotel markets in Oxford, with significant differences in hotel performance between these two locations, city centre performing best in terms of occupancy. Published in 2014, the Cambridge Model study on the

'Volume, Value and Impact' of Tourism in Oxford highlighted strong growth in Oxford from overseas visitors, with a 4.1% increase in overseas nights. The number of domestic staying nights actually decreased by 8%, suggesting the lack of supply is pricing domestic visitors out of the city centre market. Significant domestic growth is evident in neighbouring locations, backing this assumption further.

Both the Barton Area Action Plan and the Northern Gateway Area Action Plan make provision for additional hotel space. The need for additional hotel accommodation was considered by the Planning Inspectorate earlier this year as part of the examination for the Northern Gateway, and she found there was a need for additional hotel bed spaces.

The conclusion is that there is a significant undersupply of hotel accommodation in Oxford and a potentially significant latent demand, backed by the level of confirmed developer interest. Ultimately the answer to the question is that to have a sustainable city we need to support a broad range of uses for the well-being of the Oxford. It is a matter of setting and supporting the appropriate balance between the uses in a compact City, tight administrative boundary. This is what we have done in the range of documents which make up the Local Plan.

## **20. From Councillor Goddard to Councillor Hollingsworth**

Given the difficulties over the summer in the Planning department, with delays in handling applications, can you inform Council what steps have been taken to improve the service provided in this area?

### **Response**

Following from the restructure of the planning department earlier this year a number of individual officers chose to leave, and it took longer than hoped to replace them. As a result there was a dip in planning performance, as measured by the percentage of applications determined within specified time limits in April-May 2015.

To address this issue the planning service reallocated and refocused resources to address and rectify the situation by clearing the backlog of older cases. As well as determining cases that gone past the appropriate time limit, new applications were dealt with more quickly, increasing the proportion of major and minor applications concluded within the time limits.

The work to clear the backlog of older cases was completed two months ago, and since then performance has been well above targets and we are well placed to continue at this level. Measuring the total performance across the year, overall performance is gradually improving and is on target for major applications; while municipal year performance for minor applications is currently below the annual target as we recover from the issues in the first two months of the year, continuing the current level of performance will mean that the targets for both minor and major applications will be met or exceeded by the end of 2015/16.

### **Supplementary**

Is the planning service up to full strength to allow it to operate effectively?

### **Response**

We are filling vacancies and have new staff in post or due to start. Performance measured over the full year will reach its target.

### **Board member for Young People, Schools and Skills**

#### **21. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Brown**

What is the Administration doing to address the shortfall in apprenticeship numbers (18 as against a target of 26)? (Indicator BI002b)

### **Response**

The Council currently employs 18 apprentices towards its target of 26. The shortfall against the target is because of where we are in the cycle of apprentice succession planning and recruitment. A new group are starting in September which will bring the total number back up. Details of cohort numbers and conversion to employment with the Council are as follows:

<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Max. no of apprentices</b>	<b>No. converted to employees</b>
2013 - 15	25	17 (68%)
2015 - 17	23	0 (still too early in the programme)

### **Supplementary**

Is there a possibility of increasing the number of apprentices?

### **Response**

We are identifying areas which can take new apprentices and looking at all areas to see if we can expand the scheme.

#### **22. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Kennedy**

Following the changes to the teacher retention mortgage scheme, can you tell Council how many teachers have been supported in this way?

### **Response**

We have developed the scheme at the request of the schools as recruitment and retention of staff is a major challenge that they face. We have recently broadened out the scope of the scheme to enable more teachers to access it and we have met with all of the schools to promote it. This relaunch took place in early July. So far, no teachers have been supported under the scheme, but it is obviously very early in the school year.

### **Supplementary**

Is this a viable scheme or should we accelerate the provision of key worker housing instead?

### **Response**

If there was a way for a teacher on £40k pa to afford a £300k house, that would be welcome. Provision for key workers was being investigated.

## **Leader of the Council, Board Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development**

### **23. From Councillor Hollick to Councillor Price**

What is the Administration doing to address the slippage in the building of new social housing for rent and get back on track following the latest quarterly report which shows 20 new homes being built instead of the planned 60?

#### **Response**

I am very pleased to be able to confirm that we have this week taken handover of the remaining phases of Kenny Gardens (Minchery Gardens) thus completing the delivery of our programme of 113 new Council homes. This is a significant achievement for the Council in what has been a challenging time for the construction industry.

### **24. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Price:**

Will the leader of the council join me in noting that the city council has now succeeded in fitting mirrors and cameras to all its large vehicles, and made this part of its specification when purchasing such vehicles, and join me in thanking and congratulating the direct services team for their actions in this regard.

Will he also note that a number of applicants for planning permission have voluntarily added such a condition to construction management plans, and will he inform Council as to whether the council itself is willing to impose such a condition as standard when it acts as client?

Will he also note that the citywide ban on lorries which do not have up-to-date safety equipment has recently come into force in London, and will he brief council as to the progress of our request to the county council that they enact a traffic order making similar regulations within the city of Oxford.

#### **Response**

I think the whole Council will want to join with Councillor Gant in congratulating the Direct Service transport team on their rapid implementation of these safety measures that Council recommended some months ago. Officers are considering the legal aspects of the procurement changes implied by the imposition of a standard condition and will advise whether such changes may be judged to be anti-competitive. I am not aware of a response from the County Council so far.

### **25. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Price**

What progress has been made by the Mental Health Review Panel? To whom does it report?

#### **Response**

The City Council developed an Oxford City Council Mental Health Plan, in response to a Motion to Council on 3rd February 2014. The Action Plan was agreed by City Executive Board on 15th October 2014 and the Mental Health Member Review Panel was established to oversee its implementation.

The Plan sets out some specific proposals in relation to the Motion and embeds a wellbeing approach across key services and with partners. The Plan aims to:

- Enable all city councillors to become advocates for mental health and wellbeing. The Council has signed the Mindful Employer Charter and has become a member of the network. It has signed the Time to Change Pledge.
- Oversee implementation of the Council's support to employee's physical and mental health through the Employee Wellbeing Programme (which is in place).
- Work with partners, such as MIND, other mental health service providers and advice agencies and to ensure all city council services are accessible to people with mental health problems.

The Mental Health Member Review Panel, Operating Principles, state that:

"Individual Panel members will report back about specific areas of interest they may have taken on; for example the Chair will report about the national network of mental health champions. Updates about the Panel's work overall will also be made, with support by the Policy and Partnerships Team, for example through:

- the Council's internal Stronger Communities Programme Board to officers up to director level;
- inclusion of Panel updates in regular partnership reports presented to Council."

The Mental Health Action Plan is due for its annual review in October 2015. It is proposed that this is reported to Council, as a part of the regular partnership slot in December 2015.

### **Supplementary**

Could Council have a report as soon as possible, and could the Scrutiny Committee review this?

### **Response**

A report was due to come to council in December and it was open to the Scrutiny committee to examine this.

## **26. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Price**

Will the leader of the council brief members on the progress of its response to the current refugee crisis? Will he confirm if the city council has now taken up the existing offer for local councils to opt to take Syrian refugees made by central government at the time of the last Syrian refugee quota and if not, why not? If they have taken up the offer can he tell us how many Syrians we are offering to take and when they will arrive? Would he welcome the suggestion of a reception centre in Oxford, housed in a currently empty building, which could be offered to central government without adversely impacting on the city's own current need for housing and making use of the huge local expertise of our charities and widespread offers to help of our residents? Does he agree that this crisis is huge and unprecedented since the second world war and now needs clear and proactive action involving a large expansion of existing resources for asylum seekers and refugees and the need to urgently develop new resources.

## **Response**

The Council website is updated regularly on the refugee crisis and the Council's actions. We have indicated our wish to participate in the UNHCR sponsored government programme to resettle 20,000 vulnerable refugees from the camps in Lebanon and Jordan. We are clear that we cannot disadvantage the needs of existing refugees and those already in housing need locally so we need government to agree to fully fund the costs of refugees arriving. The Assistant Chief Executive is in contact with the Home Office and the regional coordinator, and is working closely with the County Council who would have lead responsibility for unaccompanied minors and health agencies who would need to provide services. I chaired a meeting with local community and voluntary groups to coordinate support that could be offered across Oxford and Oxfordshire.

The previous scheme launched in March was small scale with 216 Asylum Seekers arriving through existing reception centres.

It is not yet clear what number of refugees will be directed to Oxford/Oxfordshire so the need for a reception centre is as yet unknown.

The excellent support organisations in the city such as Asylum Welcome and Refugee Resource and organisations to tackle homelessness and rough sleeping need as much additional financial and human resource as can be offered, and our website seeks to encourage people to donate and to offer volunteering time.

## **27. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Price**

On 25 August, the Free Tibet campaign wrote to you asking Oxford City Council to extend an official welcome to the Dalai Lama (a Nobel Peace Prize laureate and leader of Tibetan Buddhism) during his visit to the City earlier this month. No response was received. Why?

Has Oxford City Council been approached by any representatives of the Chinese Government or any other Chinese representatives in regard to this recent visit of the Dalai Lama?

## **Response**

The letter from the Free Tibet Campaign asked us to resist any pressure from the Chinese government in relation to the visit of the Dalai Lama. It did not seek a civic welcome. There has been no contact from the Chinese Embassy or other Chinese representatives. The Dalai Lama's visit to Oxford was hosted by Dalai Lama Centre. The City Council was not involved in its organisation or invited by the organisers to take part.

Oxford is a city which has welcomed the representatives of many freedom movements and campaign groups over the years. We would respond robustly to any unwarranted intervention by a foreign government.

## **Supplementary**

Does the Leader recognise the text of a letter (read out) requesting the council's involvement?

## **Response**

No.

### **28. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Price**

Will the Leader join me in condemning the Trade Union Bill which has just passed its second reading in the House of Commons as a vicious and unfair attack on workers' rights? Will he also be supporting any subsequent strike action that may arise as a result in the City?

## **Response**

The Trade Union Bill is a vindictive piece of legislation which seeks to undermine the rights of employees under International Labour Conventions to withdraw their labour in pursuit of an industrial dispute, and to reduce the capacity of unions to campaign on a wide range of social and economic issues. It is also a direct attack on democracy by reducing the unions' capacity to fund political action and political parties. The CIPD has condemned it as unnecessary and outdated.

I will consider each individual instance of action against the Bill before taking a personal view on whether to support or not.

### **29. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Price**

Will the Leader join me in congratulating Jeremy Corbyn on his election as leader and welcome the clear signal that this sends to the political establishment just how many people support an alternative to austerity economics coupled with stronger social policies.

## **Response**

Of course. I look forward to the new Leader decimating the Green Party vote in future elections.

## **47. PUBLIC ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS THAT DO NOT RELATE TO MATTERS FOR DECISION AT THIS COUNCIL MEETING**

Mr Colin Aldridge, a trustee of East Oxford Community Centre, addressed Council about the running of the community centre. The text of his address is attached to the minutes.

Councillor Simm responded to Mr Aldridge as set out in the attached document.

Mr Nigel Gibson addressed Council. The text of his address is attached to the minutes.

Ms Judith Harley addressed Council. The text of her address is attached to the minutes.

Councillor Rowley responded to Ms Harley as set out in the attached document.

Mr Artwell addressed Council. The text of his address is attached to the minutes.

Councillor Simm responded to Mr Artwell as set out in the attached document.

Mr John Semple asked a question of the Leader of Council about the monitoring of air quality in Wolvercote and the setting of baseline levels for the vicinity of the Northern Gateway development. The text of his question is attached to the minutes.

Councillor Tanner responded to Mr Semple as set out in the attached document.

#### **48. OUTSIDE ORGANISATION/COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS AND QUESTIONS**

Council noted the proposed programme of reports.

#### **49. SCRUTINY COMMITTEE BRIEFING**

Council had before it the annual report of the Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Simmons moved the report, thanking those involved in scrutiny through the year, and thanked the scrutiny officer for his work. 143 (90%) of the committee's recommendations were accepted through the year, reflecting the quality of scrutiny and cross-party working and the many point of agreements between the parties.

Councillor Price thanked the committee and panels for their work on examining issues in depth.

Council noted the report without further comment.

#### **50. MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

Council had before it four motions on notice and amendments submitted in accordance with Council procedure rule 11.17 and reached decisions as set out below.

##### **1. Oxford as a City of Sanctuary**

Councillor Simmons proposed his submitted motion, accepting the amendment proposed by Councillor Price. Councillor Price seconded the motion as amended.

After debate and on being put to the vote, the motion was declared carried with all councillors voting in support

***Council resolved to adopt the motion set out below:***

***Oxford has a long tradition of welcoming immigrants and refugees from around the world. The cultural richness of the city is fundamental to its creativity, the excellence of our health services and the global reputation of our universities. Oxford is a truly global city, with one in three of our residents born overseas. 8000 students from 139 countries outside the UK are represented in the University of Oxford. Increasing numbers of refugees are fleeing bloody conflicts and oppressive regimes, deepening the global humanitarian crisis that has been developing over the last decade. Some of the most vulnerable people in the world are dying as they try to reach safety. The City Council welcomes the huge level of support shown by the Oxford and Oxfordshire communities for a local response to this crisis.***

***On 6 October 2008, the Council passed a motion declaring itself to be a City of Sanctuary with the words that “this Council wishes to promote the inclusion and welfare of those coming to Oxford to seek refuge and sanctuary.”***

***We recognise the strong support local communities, voluntary bodies, faith groups and others in Oxford already give to those seeking refuge and sanctuary. The strength of public feeling was well expressed in the ‘Oxford Welcomes Refugees’ March on 6 September that attracted more than 2,000 people.***

***The UN refugee agency has asked EU Member States to immediately take 200,000 additional refugees to lessen the humanitarian crisis. In response, the EU has adopted a quota system which the UK Government has refused to participate in.***

***Rather than the 18,000 that would represent the UK's share of refugees, the Prime Minister has announced that his government would make provision for 20,000 over the course of this Parliament. This would simply be an extension of the existing UNHCR scheme for resettlement of vulnerable people (with a strong emphasis on young people) from the camps in the Lebanon and Jordan. This fails entirely to deal with the refugees who have fled the war and the camps and have already reached an EU country in order to find safety and refuge.***

***Recognising the humanitarian crisis that has unfolded in recent months and our moral responsibility to respond to it, this Council asks the Executive to:***

- 1. Continue to coordinate the work of local charities, voluntary bodies and the public authorities in the Oxford area to ensure that there are effective procedures in place to welcome refugees of all ages and to offer appropriate housing and support.***
- 2. Continue to encourage people in Oxford and the wider county to make financial donations to support the charities and voluntary bodies involved***

- 3. Ensure that its policies and procedures are as effective as possible in supporting refugees and facilitating the accommodation of refugees in private homes.**
- 4. Work with the Home Office to implement the extended Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation scheme**
- 5. write to the City's Universities encouraging them to consider extending their funded studentships to include more places specifically for refugees**
- 6. write to the City's MPs expressing concern over the UK Government's weak response to the refugee crisis and asking them to lobby for the UK to welcome it's fair share of refugees**

## **2. Air quality and cleaner city**

Councillor Fooks proposed her submitted motion, seconded by Councillor Wilkinson:

*Council notes the recent reports that suggest that the health impact of excessive NOx and particulate emissions has been seriously underestimated. Recent research by the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants suggests that they may be responsible for as many as 60,000 premature deaths across the UK each year.*

*Council also notes that air quality in Oxford is relatively poor, breaching WHO and EU limits at times, and that diesel engines are a major contributor to this situation.*

*Council congratulates its own staff and others on the work done to prepare a bid to the Go Ultra Low City scheme run by the Office for Low Emissions Vehicles. If the bid is successful, funds would be available for financial incentives to promote uptake and for the installation of infrastructure across the city,*

*It also notes the work being done with taxi operators to obtain funds from this Office for ultra-low emission taxis. Funds would be available to support the rollout of ultra-low emission taxis, both to reduce the upfront cost and to install charging infrastructure for taxi and private hire use.*

*Council therefore asks the Executive Board:*

- to give consideration to developing a Delivery and Service Plan for city centre Council premises;*
- to accelerate work with the County Council to examine the business case for freight consolidation for Oxford;*
- to continue to work with neighbouring authorities to develop common standards for taxi emissions;*
- if the bids are not successful, to instruct officers to pursue all possible alternative sources of funding to enable the city to meet the target of a zero-emission zone in the centre and cleaner air throughout the city;*

- *as the plans for a cleaner city will require a big increase in the use of electric vehicles, needing extensive charging infrastructure, to investigate how this can be provided in all areas, including those without off-street parking.*

Councillor Tanner, seconded by Councillor Hollingsworth, proposed an amendment:

Delete paragraph 2 and replace with:

*Council also notes that the air quality across Oxford is steadily improving although there remain some hotspots which still breach WHO and EU limits. Council recognises that diesel engines are a major cause of this pollution*

Delete last paragraph and replace with:

*Council congratulates the Executive Board on:*

- *Developing a Delivery and Service Plan for the City Council's own premises*
- *Pressing the County Council to examine the business case for freight consolidation in Oxford*
- *Working with neighbouring authorities to develop a common standard for taxi emissions*
- *Seeking to develop a network of electric charging points to encourage the use of electric vehicles*
- *The City Council's growing use of its own electric vehicles.*

On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared carried.

On being put to the vote, the amended motion was declared carried.

**Council resolved to adopt the motion set out below:**

***Council notes the recent reports that suggest that the health impact of excessive NOx and particulate emissions has been seriously underestimated. Recent research by the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants suggests that they may be responsible for as many as 60,000 premature deaths across the UK each year.***

***Council also notes that the air quality across Oxford is steadily improving although there remain some hotspots which still breach WHO and EU limits. Council recognises that diesel engines are a major cause of this pollution.***

***Council congratulates its own staff and others on the work done to prepare a bid to the Go Ultra Low City scheme run by the Office for Low Emissions Vehicles. If the bid is successful, funds would be available for financial incentives to promote uptake and for the installation of infrastructure across the city,***

***It also notes the work being done with taxi operators to obtain funds from this Office for ultra-low emission taxis. Funds would be available to***

**support the rollout of ultra-low emission taxis, both to reduce the upfront cost and to install charging infrastructure for taxi and private hire use.**

**Council congratulates the Executive Board on:**

- **Developing a Delivery and Service Plan for the City Council's own premises**
- **Pressing the County Council to examine the business case for freight consolidation in Oxford**
- **Working with neighbouring authorities to develop a common standard for taxi emissions**
- **Seeking to develop a network of electric charging points to encourage the use of electric vehicles**
- **The City Council's growing use of its own electric vehicles.**

### **3. Encouraging Renewable Energy (proposed by Councillor Brandt)**

Councillor Brandt proposed her submitted motion, seconded by Councillor Wolff.

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

**Council resolved to adopt the motion set out below:**

***Oxford is proud home to many social enterprises, research bodies, community groups, businesses and other organisations focused on the development, promotion and delivery of renewable solar energy.***

***It is therefore disappointed at the Government's decision – published on 9 September – to remove pre-accreditation and pre-registration from the Feed In Tariff subsidy scheme (see Note 1). Even the Government admit that “this decision will introduce considerable uncertainty in the short term” and impact on the development of new schemes.***

***A second, related, consultation has now been launched (closing date: 23 October) that proposes reducing the FIT scheme subsidy itself (by up to 90%) even though the Government themselves admit that this will have a ‘negative impact’.***

***According the research by Friends of the Earth, such a cut will not only reduce the number of solar installations but also lead to 22,000 job cuts (a fact not even considered in the consultation). As home to many organisations in the sector, Oxford is likely to experience more than its proportionate share of these job losses.***

***Compared with fossil fuels, renewables continue to receive a lower subsidy. According to a recent report by the IMF (see Note 2) fossil fuels benefited to the tune of £400 per person in the UK each year, while renewables get £112.***

***Furthermore, the installation of solar on social housing has the potential for to significantly reduce poverty.***

***This Council therefore asks the Executive to work with local groups to prepare a response to the Government's consultation opposing drastic reductions to the FIT highlighting both the impact on jobs, the environment and poverty.***

*Note 1: This will have the effect of removing the link to the tariff guarantee for installations currently able to pre-accredit under the FIT such that installations will only receive the tariff rate as at the date they apply for full accreditation. This will mean that a developer will not be certain of the level of support they will receive under the scheme until the point at which their application for accreditation is received by Ofgem.*

*Note 2: <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/aug/04/g20-countries-pay-over-1000-per-citizen-in-fossil-fuel-subsidies-say-imf>*

#### **4. Save our Children's Centres**

Councillor Thomas proposed his submitted motion, seconded by Councillor Benjamin:

*This Council notes the public consultation launched by the County Council on options for the future of the Children's Centres and Early Intervention Service with the aim of cutting the budget by a staggering £8m.*

*This Council strongly opposes these cuts and the effects this will have on vulnerable people across the City.*

*It therefore asks the Executive to respond in the strongest terms to the County's consultation.*

Councillor Turner proposed an amendment, accepted by Councillor Thomas:

Replace text after paragraph 1 with that in italics:

*Council believes that these cuts are part of an ideologically motivated attack on local government pursued by this government and by its forerunners in the Coalition, which have imposed unacceptable reductions in government funding, leading to atrocious cutbacks in these services, and also in youth services, services for those with learning disabilities, support for the homeless, and cuts in adult social care. These cutbacks represent a comprehensive assault on the most vulnerable in our society.*

*This Council strongly opposes these cuts and the effects they will have on vulnerable people across the City.*

*It therefore asks the Executive to respond in the strongest terms to the County's consultation imploring the County Council to save as many of the vital services in children's centres as it can, and also asking the Executive to consider any ways in which the City Council (although it is also subject to similar government cutbacks) might support the retention of any services.*

On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared carried.

Councillor Fooks, supported by Councillor Wade, proposed an amendment:

Replace the second paragraph with

*“This Council finds the proposals to close all 44 children’s centres entirely unacceptable and asks the Executive to inform the County Council that this would have very serious impacts indeed, not only on the most vulnerable, but on all the users of the centres who find their support invaluable. While this Council acknowledges the appalling cuts in local government funding, it asks that proper consultation with the centres and the public is done to develop alternative ways to achieve the savings without taking away what is for many a lifeline.”*

On being put to the vote, the amendment proposed by Councillor Fooks was declared lost.

On being put to the vote, the motion as amended by Councillor Turner was declared carried.

**Council resolved to adopt the motion set out below:**

***This Council notes the public consultation launched by the County Council on options for the future of the Children’s Centres and Early Intervention Service with the aim of cutting the budget by a staggering £8m.***

***Council believes that these cuts are part of an ideologically motivated attack on local government pursued by this government and by its forerunners in the Coalition, which have imposed unacceptable reductions in government funding, leading to atrocious cutbacks in these services, and also in youth services, services for those with learning disabilities, support for the homeless, and cuts in adult social care. These cutbacks represent a comprehensive assault on the most vulnerable in our society.***

***This Council strongly opposes these cuts and the effects they will have on vulnerable people across the City.***

***It therefore asks the Executive to respond in the strongest terms to the County’s consultation imploring the County Council to save as many of the vital services in children’s centres as it can, and also asking the Executive to consider any ways in which the City Council (although it is also subject to similar government cutbacks) might support the retention of any services.***

## **51. MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION**

Council resolved to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration the following agenda items in accordance with the provisions of Section 100A(4) and paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

## **52. LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN REPORT AND RESPONSE (EXEMPT ITEM)**

Council had before it a report setting out the Ombudsman's findings and the council's response.

This report to Council including the appendix is exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority).

The Council agreed that it would not be in the public interest to publish the information contained in this report.

Council considered the report and the mechanism for reporting Ombudsman findings to elected members for decision and information.

### **Council resolved to:**

- 1. approve the proposed actions set out in the report;**
- 2. include oversight of Ombudsman findings reports in the remit of the Audit and Governance Committee;**
- 3. set up a cross-party working group, not held in public, to review general administrative arrangements relating to the matters in this report.**

**The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 9.40 pm**

**To:** Council  
**Date:** 23 September 2015  
**Title of Report:** Public addresses and questions that relate to matters for decision at the meeting

## Introduction

An address made by a member of the public to the Council, registered by the deadline in the Constitution, is summarised below. The response is also summarised. This is not a verbatim transcript.

### 1. Address as given to Council by Mr Bashir Ahmed in connection with Item 11

I would like to thank the Council for allowing me to speak. I would like to raise three points. While we welcome and endorse the majority of the recommendations in the report, I would strongly oppose three of these.

First, there is an objection to removal of door stickers from all private hire vehicles in Oxford. These reassure passengers that the vehicle is a legitimate private hire vehicle and in event of problems allows easy identification. Second, there is an objection to the removal of the badge stating 'no booking no ride' - it makes it abundantly clear the vehicle has to be pre-booked. Third, there is an objection to the permitting of black MPVs as private hire vehicles. These can be licensed as hackneys. The change will cause huge confusion about what is a hackney and what is a private hire. Please reinstate these for the security and safety of the travelling public.

### 2. Response by the Chair of the General Licensing Committee to Mr Bashir Ahmed.

As part of her introduction to the report Councillor Clarkson addressed these points:

There will be stickers (identifying the vehicle) inside the vehicle where passengers can clearly see these. Out of town private hire cars authorities do not require door stickers and it is difficult to justify making these a condition of our licences.

Removing the need for the 'no booking no ride' badge places responsibility fully and properly on the driver to refuse any hire without a booking, rather than expecting the passenger to check.

On the licensing of MPVs, in London there is no requirement for hackney carriages to be black, and not all our hackneys are black, and it seems to cause little confusion.

This page is intentionally left blank

**To:** Council  
**Date:** 23 September 2015  
**Title of Report:** Public addresses and questions that do not relate to matters for decision – as delivered at the meeting

### Introduction

Addresses made by members of the public to the Council, and questions put to the Board members or Leader, registered by the deadline in the Constitution, are summarised below. Any responses given are also summarised. These are not a verbatim transcript.

### Addresses in part 2

1. Address by Mr Colin Aldridge, East Oxford Community Centre
2. Address by Mr Nigel Gibson
3. Address by Judith Harley
4. Address by Mr Artwell

### Question in part 2

5. Question by Mr John Semple

#### 1. Address by Mr Colin Aldridge East Oxford Community Association Trustee to Oxford City Council

I joined the association about two and half years ago. If there was a time to take control of the centre that was it as the association was in an awful state.

The Trustees would ask the Council Officer of the time for help with different things such as metal no smoking signs as others were destroyed by users of the centre. This took months of asking with the end result of stick on signs, which were destroyed again. Before I was there the association was asking to have the lounge decorated - talks were taking place. Now the Council has taken over this is now taking place. Another instance was when we asked to put in showers upstairs to have visiting domino teams come to the Centre (visiting dominos teams brings lot of money and enjoyment to the centre or would have done) which the Council Officer told me at a later date they put a stop to. These are just a couple of the things which in the time I have been there have been asked for and refused. They have not allowed us to get on with the job of running and association and centre properly.

In June 2014 we were given a "Notice to Quit" after having a meeting to discuss the future of the Centre only later I found the Press were informed before us. This was notice for a month which after some extensive work we found it to be an illegal notice as in the licence we should have been given a year.

We were then given a correct Notice of a year from the beginning of September 2014. We decided we must start from scratch with EOCA creating a new constitution and going through almost 30 policies, which needed some serious work doing to them. This would form the foundation of EOCA then we could build on this. At the same time (as we did not agree with the consent form) we were then bullied into signing it with threats of going to Court which the Council knew we could not afford as we are a charity and could not justify possibly spending all reserves in this way. We took advice on this matter and were told this was the best we could hope for. While this was going on I was told by a Senior Officer we could not talk to each other as we were in litigation but when a different Trustee contacted the Council there was a conversation on EOCA topics.

We have only recently started talks with council officer again (2 months too late) to address some issues and hopefully talk of the future of EOCA taking true control of the management of EOCC again. The one person who has been the most helpful to us has been Councillor Clack who has been to every meeting she could and hopefully will continue. She has done all that we have asked if not more. Some of these things we were asked to be done have magically been started. This is only some of the grievances I have with the council.

Overall I feel that the East Oxford Community Association has been unfairly treated and misrepresented by a Council determined to take control, despite the way we have clearly run the Centre for the public in an inclusive and financially viable and stable way. I would like the Council to publicly acknowledge the good work that the Community Association has done and what we have achieved despite your lack of support up to this point. And I would like you to listen to what the people are telling you, to work with us to transfer East Oxford Community Centre back into the independent community control and operation through the Community Association. If you take nothing else away from this evening I hope you will look and scrutinise what the Council do.

### **Response by Councillor Simm**

Thank you for coming to talk to us today. It's always valuable to hear your views and I know we have had many conversations around these difficult issues I want to say two things at the start

I want to refute the accusation of bullying as that is a very serious thing to say about somebody, but I also do want to acknowledge the hard work of you and your fellow trustees' and I know you have had the best interests of EOCC in your heart. I do understand that and I do acknowledge that you have worked really hard and that's one of the reasons we wanted you to have a space on the site of the community centre and why we want you to be continue to be involved in this process which we are at the start of. I met the architects for the first time earlier this week, as I wasn't part of their appointment. I was very impressed by them - I looked at some of the work they have done in other cities and I have been very impressed with it. They have a good track record of working closely at the grassroots and with community association and community groups and that was one of the criteria that we were very keen to meet. I know that this evening they are down at the community centre talking to members of the reference group so I hope you will really get involved, tell them what it is you want to see, and encourage other people to do that as well because that is genuinely and

honestly what we want to happen. It is your opportunity to tell the architects what local people would like to see and I hope that you and your colleagues in the Association will continue to be active in East Oxford and will help with the processes of designing a new complex and make that a reality for Oxford. I think when you meet with them and see some of the ideas they have got I hope you and your colleagues will be impressed and that you will stay with us and work with us in partnership.

## **2. Address by Mr Nigel Gibson**

Freedom of Information and FOI requests was brought to mind recently: looking at the consultation review on the leisure strategy, there were only 100 responses to this consultation. This number wasn't questioned as unrepresentative and it brought to mind a FOI I made about consultations earlier this year. During the previous three year period did you know there were 119 consultations with amazingly low numbers of respondents? Two consultations had no responses, 80 had under 100 responses and only three had more than 500 responses. For a population of 150,000, it is to my mind extraordinary that in each case you have accepted such a low level of engagement, interpreted it as suitably representative of views as a whole, and kept going irrespective of feedback. You take little notice of anyone who bothers to engage, you don't report, unless asked, on what difference consultation has made. When I asked for the effect of these consultations I was told that you don't hold this information, and you weren't prepared to find it that because of the officer time it would take to check.

The recent consultation on your Leisure Strategy is an exemplar of how you show zero interest in properly listening to the public, and how you show no concern at the extremely low level of engagement with the public. In this consultation, just over 100 members of the public bothered to respond, and only one school was in direct contact, And you consider that level of engagement appropriate to support how you will affect people's quality of life and level of health over the next five years. According to your document, you provide a world class leisure service. I would remind you that one of your policies is that people should have access to leisure facilities mostly walking or cycling. As an appendix in the Leisure strategy there were maps showing access to swimming pools within 20 minutes' walk. Some interesting supporting evidence is provided. This is the result of an 'expert' system from Sport England. On these maps, you will see a pink area in North Oxford; this shows, apparently, that people living there are within a 20 minute walk of five swimming pools. Whilst technically correct, only one of those, Ferry, provides any sort of public access, and that is increasingly limited by classes and provision to the Swimming Club. No-one I've spoken to recognises the view that you are using to support your strategy, and nowhere in the strategy development do you comment on how wrong this interpretation is.

And down here in the East, or South, we have a finding that you have conveniently ignored for over five years. You can see an area coloured in blue, which shows where people have to walk more than 20 minutes to get to a swimming pool.

Our proposal to take over Temple Cowley Pools under a Community Asset Transfer also had an appendix with a map very much like this, although it was much, much closer to reality in that we focused on public health and fitness provision. And we highlighted, shown on our map, the people you were abandoning through the closure to a lower quality of life and lower health outcomes. Yes, it was a Blue Hole – maps pretty much to your independent research validating your strategy doesn't it? Of course, you have now invested £500,000 of our money in a part-time gym at Spires Academy, and you are trumpeting this as being adequate health and fitness provision in the area; well, you can't swim in a gym. And there are many people across all sorts of demographics

for whom swimming is the best, or the only, way they can exercise. Always good to have our research validated by your independent research.

The Ears theme you see in the public gallery this evening was devised by several campaign groups across the city, all frustrated at your arrogant attitude towards the public, where you simply tell us what you are going to do without listening properly to what services we want and need, where we want and need them. These groups felt that if you were presented with some additional ears you might listen more, and more attentively, to the people you are here to represent and deliver services to.

So, this evening I offer you the Blue Hole challenge – are you prepared to fill the void left by your decision to close Temple Cowley Pools, listen to and talk with the people of Oxford who are still ready, willing and able to take over the site, and bring it back into use at no cost to the Council? I await your reply.

### **3. Address by Ms Judith Harley**

Councillors, I wish to address you on two separate, but related, issues today.

The first is that Councillors CAN change their minds over local leisure facilities; the second is that there can be a conflict of information given out by Officers and Councillors. I will use the example of Cowley Marsh Park to illustrate these points.

In July the City Council's Cowley Marsh Depot submitted a planning application to expand their premises into the adjacent Cowley Marsh Park, a much-used local facility and protected open space. In the documentation accompanying this application, the applicant stated that they had consulted with the two ward Councillors, Cllrs Malik and Abbasi, who were happy for the Depot to proceed with this application. The Old Temple Cowley Residents' Association publicised this issue, resulting in over 60 letters of objection being lodged with the Planning Department. Subsequent correspondence with Cllr Rowley resulted in a statement from him that he, Cllr Tanner, and Cllrs Malik and Abbasi all agreed that this application should never have been submitted, and that it would be withdrawn. This illustrates that Cllrs Malik and Abbasi changed their minds, probably due to public pressure. Given the significantly more public pressure over two other local issues, the closure of the Temple Cowley Pools and Fitness Centre, against local wishes, and the management takeover of East Oxford Community Centre, against local wishes, I request that Councillors look again at both of these facilities, listen to public opinion – which is based on fact - and follow the examples of Cllrs Malik and Abbasi and have a change of mind.

Cllr Rowley's statement that the Cowley Marsh Depot Planning Application would be withdrawn was made to me, and to other local residents, several times between mid-August and early September. However, the Planning Department Officers tell a different story. On Monday this week this application was still not withdrawn despite assurance to the contrary from Councillor Rowley but active and pending. Today Planning confirmed that it was on hold but could be presented to a November Planning Committee with a report recommending approval. Here over quite a period of time we have two conflicting versions of what is happening with this application one from Councillors one from Officers – There are parallels to this situation with other local Community facilities – and again I think particularly of the underhand dealings over both East Oxford Community Centre and the Temple Cowley Pools and Fitness Centre. Who is the public to believe when there is a conflict between what the elected representatives – you, the Councillors – say, and what the employees of the City Council – the Officers - say?

Councillors – now that we know that you CAN change your minds, please change your minds over Temple Cowley Pools and Fitness Centre – which is still owned by you, not by Catalyst – and allow those interested in developing the site to include a broad range of Community facilities, including a Pool and Gym, as well as housing, to have the opportunity. Please change your minds over taking over the management of East Oxford Community Centre, and support and assist the Trustees of the East Oxford Community Association to improve their management skills, if necessary, to enable them to continue managing the Centre. This would all be in accord with local wishes.

Also, Councillors – as the Cowley Marsh Depot illustrates, do you know what your Officers are doing and saying on your behalf? Do you know how they are behaving on your behalf? This also applies to dealings between Officers and Tenants at East Oxford Community Centre. How are you going to check that the Officers, your employees, are dealing with the public in a true and honest manner?

#### **Response by Councillor Rowley**

I can confirm the application will be withdrawn.

It is not appropriate to criticize officers: restrict your comments to Councillors and the policy they pursue.

#### **4. Petition about East Oxford Community Centre to be handed in by Mr Artwell**

For the last six weeks we have been collecting signatures from the people of East Oxford. They have been pleased to sign our petition because they are so upset you have taken over the management of East Oxford Community Centre. We have almost 1000 and when we get the right number we will present it before you for a full debate.

When we present our petition we want you to look at how Labour has managed this and we want you to know the people of East Oxford do not support Labour and their plan to destroy our community centre.

#### **Response from Councillor Simm**

This is a misrepresentation of what we are trying to do. We are not destroying but restoring it to what it should be for the people – it is not our aim to destroy it but to maintain it for the people of East Oxford.

## 5. Question by Mr John Semple

Sir,

### **Sunderland Avenue/Northern Gateway Area Action Plan**

As a representative of the Wolvercote Action Group, I wish to exercise my right, under Section 11.11. a. of the Constitution of the Oxford City Council, to address the Full Council on Wednesday 23 September, 2015 and ask the following question:

Since the Council stopped monitoring air pollution in Sunderland Avenue and the Woodstock Road at the end of 2012 at a time when, according to the Council's own monitoring data, the NO<sub>2</sub> levels were already in breach of the limits set by Government legislation, could the Council please explain why they stopped monitoring in these areas and confirm what the baseline levels of pollutants will be for the city's Air Quality Management in Sunderland Avenue and in the vicinity of the proposed Northern Gateway development, in accordance with Core Planning Policy 23?

### **Response by Councillor Tanner**

Thank you for this

We removed the diffusion tubes because NO<sub>x</sub> levels were just above 40 PPM, just above legal limits, because we wanted our efforts focused on the areas with higher levels which needed it more – so we concentrated on those areas. When Sunderland Avenue resident contacted us we replaced the tubes. I don't have immediately to hand the results for 2015 as these have been delayed. They will be published by December and Mr Semple and Wolvercote Action Group will be able to see these. This will become the baseline to judge the air quality as a result of the housing development in the northern gateway. As soon as information is publically available it will be made available to the group.