

Minutes of a meeting of COUNCIL on Monday 28 January 2019

www.oxford.gov.uk



Council members:

Councillor Cook (Lord Mayor)	Councillor Malik (Deputy Lord Mayor)
Councillor Simmons (Sheriff)	Councillor Altaf-Khan
Councillor Arshad	Councillor Azad
Councillor Aziz	Councillor Bely-Summers
Councillor Brown	Councillor Chapman
Councillor Clarkson	Councillor Corais
Councillor Curran	Councillor Djafari-Marbini
Councillor Donnelly	Councillor Fry
Councillor Gant	Councillor Garden
Councillor Goddard	Councillor Gotch
Councillor Haines	Councillor Harris
Councillor Hayes	Councillor Henwood
Councillor Hollingsworth	Councillor Howlett
Councillor Iley-Williamson	Councillor Kennedy
Councillor Landell Mills	Councillor Lloyd-Shogbesan
Councillor Lygo	Councillor McManners
Councillor Munkonge	Councillor Pressel
Councillor Rush	Councillor Simm
Councillor Linda Smith	Councillor Roz Smith
Councillor Tanner	Councillor Tarver
Councillor Taylor	Councillor Tidball
Councillor Turner	Councillor Upton
Councillor Wade	Councillor Wolff

Apologies:

Councillors Humberstone and Rowley sent apologies.

Councillors Bely-Summers, Corais, Djafari-Marbini, Gotch, Goddard, Iley-Williamson, Turner arrived and Councillors Haines and McManners left during the meeting as shown in the minutes.

67. Declarations of interest

Councillor Gant declared that he was a trustee of Ark T, the owner of the Venue Community Rooms referred to in the public address by Artwell, but this was not a pecuniary interest.

68. Minutes

Council agreed to **approve** the minutes of both the special meeting and the ordinary meeting held on 26 November 2018 as true and correct records.

69. Appointment to Committees

Councillor Gant announced and Council noted appointments to the Liberal Democrat seats on:

- Investigation and Disciplinary Committee - Councillor Wade
- Licensing and Gambling Acts Committee - Councillor Wade

Councillor Brown announced the appointment of Cllr Wade as the third Oxford City Council representative on The Katherine Rawson Trust with effect from 17 December 2018.

70. Announcements

The Lord Mayor welcomed Councillor Liz Wade back to the Council following her election in the Wolvercote by-election on 6 December.

He welcomed the newly appointed City Rector and Vicar of St Michael at the North Gate, Rev Anthony Buckley.

The Lord Mayor announced:

- The annual Christmas Carol Concert had raised about £3000 for his charities.
- He had hosted a short service of reflection to commemorate Holocaust Memorial Day on 25 January
- The memorial service for Alderman Jean Fooks would be held on Saturday 2 February.
- The Lord Mayor's charity dinner would be on 9 March.

The Leader of the Council announced that the civic office holders for 2019/20, subject to confirmation at Annual Council, would be:

- Lord Mayor: Councillor Simmons
- Deputy Lord Mayor: Councillor Altaf-Khan
- Sheriff: Councillor Goddard

She announced a new Co-operatives champion, Councillor Howlett, to champion the expansion of the cooperative economy in the city.

She said she would be sending a letter to the Oxford University Union expressing disappointment on behalf of the Council at their decision to continue to invite speakers promoting controversial views, and ask the Union to consider its choices in light of the disruption to the city and costs to the police created by legitimate protests against these speakers.

71. Public addresses and questions that relate to matters for decision at this meeting

There were no addresses or questions.

72. Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2019/20

Councillors Bely-Summers, Corais, Djafari-Marbini, and Gotch arrived just prior to the start of this item.

Council considered a report of the Head of Financial Services submitted to the City Executive Board on 22 January 2019. The City Executive Board recommended the proposed changes to the Council Tax Reduction Scheme to Council.

Councillor Simm, Board Member for Supporting Local Communities, presented the report and moved the recommendations which were adopted on being seconded and put to the vote.

Council resolved to

1. agree the changes to the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2018/19 in the report to the City Executive Board and set out in the Appendix to the report; and
2. adopt as the new Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2019/20 the current Local [Council Tax Reduction scheme](#) for 2018/19 with the inclusion of the changes listed in the report; and
3. delegate authority to the Head of Financial Services to finalise and publish the new Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2019/20.

73. Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel and Draft Councillors' Allowances Scheme 2019-23

Councillor Goddard arrived at the start of this item.

Council considered a report of the Head of Law and Governance setting out the recommendations of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) and a Draft Councillors' Allowances Scheme for 2019-23, to come into effect on 1 April 2019

Councillor Brown, Leader of the Council, presented the report and moved the recommendations.

Councillor Gant proposed an amendment to remove the allowance for the second deputy leader at 2(c)(iii) and make consequential changes to the scheme. On being seconded and put to the vote, the amendment was not agreed.

The recommendations in the report were agreed without change on being seconded and put to the vote.

Council resolved to:

1. Thank the Independent Remuneration Panel for their work.
2. Agree to include in the Councillors' Allowances Scheme 2019-23 the following provisions from the Councillors' Allowances Scheme 2015-19, as recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel:
 - a) A basic allowance payable to all councillors of £5079 in 2019-20;
 - b) Indexation of the basic allowance in accordance with the annual percentage uplifts provided for in the local pay deal for council employees;
 - c) The following Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs):
 - i. Leader - 3 x basic allowance (£15,237)
 - ii. Deputy Leader – 1 x basic allowance (£5,079)
 - iii. Non-statutory Deputy Leader - 1 x basic allowance (£5,079)
 - iv. Lord Mayor –1 x Basic Allowance (£5,079)
 - v. Deputy Lord Mayor – 0.25 x basic allowance (£1,270)
 - vi. Sheriff - 0.25 x Basic Allowance (£1,270)
 - vii. Board Members with particular responsibilities – 1.5 x basic allowance (£7,619)
 - viii. Board Members without particular responsibilities – 0.5 x basic allowance (£2,540)
 - ix. Chair of Scrutiny Committee – 1x basic allowance (£5,079)
 - x. Chair of Audit & Governance Committee – 0.25 x basic allowance (£1,270)
 - xi. Chair of Scrutiny Panel – 0.25 x basic allowance (£1,270) (Panel must meet at least 5 times to qualify. A maximum of 2 SRAs will be available (£2,508) to be shared by the Chairs of the qualifying Standing Panels)
 - xii. Opposition Group Leader – 1 x basic allowance (£5,079) to be shared between the group leaders equally;
 - d) The rule that councillors will receive a maximum of two special responsibility allowances (excluding civic office holders);
 - e) The rule that where a member of the Council is also a member of another council, that councillor may not receive allowances from more than one council in respect of the same duties;
 - f) The rule that a 15% reduction to a special responsibility allowance will be applied for councillors who attend less than two thirds of the scheduled meetings required within a special responsibility, with the additional clarifications explained in paragraphs 14-16.
 - g) No allowances to be paid to co-opted members;
 - h) The ability for councillors to elect to forgo any part of their entitlement to an allowance;
 - i) The rule that where allowances have been paid in advance for a period during which a councillor is no longer a councillor, those allowances should be repaid;

- j) Allowances for maternity or adoption leave, with the additional clarifications explained in paragraph 17;
 - k) Allowances for child and other dependants' care subject to a maximum of £1,000 per councillor per year (which can be increased by the Head of Law and Governance in special circumstances), with the additional clause explained in paragraph 18;
 - l) Allowances for travel to be paid for travel outside the City of Oxford boundary with the prior agreement of the Head of Law and Governance;
 - m) Reasonable adjustments for councillors with a temporary or permanent disability;
 - n) The rule that all claims for repayment must be made on the forms provided and should be accompanied by receipts/invoices as appropriate before payment can be authorised;
3. Agree that the special responsibility allowance for chairs of planning committees will be reduced to 0.5x basic allowance (previously 1.0x basic allowance).
 4. Agree to include in the scheme an application process for members who are in receipt of working age benefits (excluding Child Benefit) to claim for up to a maximum of £1,000 per year for travel expenses incurred within the City of Oxford boundary whilst on Council business as an exception to the normal rule (which is that allowances cannot be claimed for journeys within the City of Oxford boundary) and to allocate additional funding of £3,000 to the budget for travel allowances.
 5. Agree to allocate funding of £1,500 to allow for the £35 data protection fee payable to the Information Commissioner's Office for members to register as a "data controller" to be reimbursed to members, as recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel (assuming this fee is retained for councillors following a government consultation).
 6. Agree that councillors will forgo part of their future allowance payments in the following circumstances:
 - a) A 15% reduction to the basic allowance will be applied for:
 - i. Members who fail to attend more than four meetings of Full Council in any municipal year except when a serious medical condition is the reason for absence;
 - ii. Members who fail to attend the induction training for newly elected councillors. A newly elected Councillor is any Councillor who was not holding City Council office before the election in question.
 - b) A 10% reduction to the basic allowance will be applied for:
 - i. Members who fail to attend compulsory planning and development control training (held every two years).
 - ii. Members who fail to attend compulsory code of conduct training (held annually).
 - iii. Members who are appointed to a Licensing Committee who fail to attend the compulsory licensing training (held annually).
 7. Adopt the Draft Councillors' Allowances Scheme 2019-23 the Councillors' Allowances Scheme 2019-23 attached as Appendix 2 to the report.

74. Pay Policy Statement 2019

Council considered a report of the Head of Business Improvement asking Council to approve the Annual Pay Policy Statement.

Councillor Nigel Chapman, Board Member for Customer Focused Services, presented the report and moved the recommendations which were agreed on being seconded and put to the vote.

Council resolved to approve the Annual Pay Policy Statement 2019/20 attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

75. City Executive Board Minutes

Council had before it the minutes of recent City Executive Board meetings.

a) Minutes of meeting Thursday 29 November 2018 of City Executive Board

There were no questions on these minutes.

b) Minutes of meeting Tuesday 18 December 2018 of City Executive Board

There were no questions on these minutes.

76. Questions on Notice from Members of Council

49 written questions were asked of the Board members and Leader, and written responses published. These, written responses, and summaries of the 18 supplementary questions and responses are set out [in the printed pack of these minutes](#).

77. Annual Report on Oxfordshire Partnerships

This item was taken before the public addresses.

Councillor Iley-Williamson arrived at the start of this item

Council had before it the report of Oxfordshire County Council summarising the work of the Oxfordshire-wide Partnerships.

Councillor Brown introduced the report.

Health and Well Being Board (HWB) sub group Integrated System Delivery Board (ISDB)

Councillor Djafari-Marbini asked whether the ISDB's operation would lead to crucial decisions on health care delivery being made in private and without the involvement of elected representatives, and be detrimental to the principles of open decision making and democratic involvement.

Councillor Upton replied that there was no intention for the work of the HWB and its subgroups to be opaque. While some meetings would be in private where there was

good reason, all formal proceedings of the HWB are held in public and formal reports from the subgroups would be taken in public.

Growth Board and OxLEP

Councillor Simmons noted

Councillor Brown said she would raise these points as appropriate for consideration in the Growth Board and OxLEP's work and in the developing Oxfordshire 2050 plan. In reply to a question from Councillor Wolff she said that the Growth Board was not taking forward plans for a strategic infrastructure tariff at this time.

Council noted the report.

78. Scrutiny Committee update report

This item was taken before the public addresses.

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

The Chair, Councillor Gant, introduced the report and thanked the scrutiny officer for his work for the committee and its panels and also for his work supporting the initial meetings of the Growth Board's Scrutiny Panel.

He asked councillors to contribute items for consideration for the Scrutiny Committee work plan for 2019/20.

Council noted the report.

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

Councillor Turner arrived at the start of this item and Councillor McManners left at the end of this item.

There were five addresses to Council and one question to a Board Member.

1. Dr Sheikh Ramzy gave an address in support of the motion (at 81c) on adopting a definition of Islamophobia
2. Joanna Gill gave an address in support of the motion (at 81b) on taking immediate action to prevent further climate change.
3. Linnet Drury gave an address in support of the motion (at 81b) to declare a climate emergency.
4. Artwell gave an address asking for the refurbishment of the Barton Royal British Legion building to create a community venue.

5. Judith Harley gave an address asking Council to reconsider the newly agreed road name for the Temple Cowley Pools slip road.
6. Artwell asked a question about the consultancy costs for preparation of the city centre Movement and Public Realm strategy.

The full text of these speeches and questions where these were read as submitted; responses from the Board Members in writing before the meeting; and summaries of the verbal responses given at the meeting are set out [in the printed pack of these minutes](#).

80. Motions on notice 2018/19

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

Council resolved to adopt the following motions as set out in these minutes:

- a. Retaining democratic rights for EU27 citizens
- b. Declaring a climate emergency.
- c. Adopting a definition of Islamophobia.
- d. To oppose the Oxford-Cambridge expressway as it is currently proposed, to continue to press national government for more investment in sustainable transport, and to ask the Department for Transport to urgently clarify its proposals around the Expressway.

The following motions were not taken as the time allocated for debate had elapsed:

- e. Protecting the Oxford name
- f. Opposing mental health funding cuts by the County Council

a) Retaining democratic rights for EU27 citizens

This item was taken before the public addresses.

Councillor Harris, seconded by Councillor Garden, proposed the submitted motion as set out in the agenda and briefing note.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Council resolved to adopt the following motion:

This Council, while continuing to oppose Brexit which it believes to be a disaster for the United Kingdom,

requests the leader of the Council to write to the Prime Minister asking for a pledge that whatever the ultimate outcome of the Brexit process, EU 27 Citizens currently entitled to vote and to stand for election to local government will continue to be able to do so, that existing local authority members who are EU 27 citizens will remain members of those authorities, and that the Government will not use its statutory power pursuant to the EU (Withdrawal) Act 2018 to alter existing arrangements in these respects.

b) Declaring a Climate Emergency

Councillor Simmons, seconded by Councillor Wolff, proposed the submitted motion as set out in the agenda and briefing note.

Councillor Simmons accepted the amendment from Councillor Hayes set out in the briefing note.

After debate and on being put to the vote the amended motion was agreed.

Council resolved to adopt the following motion, as amended:

Council notes that:

a) the recent 2018 IPCC report states that we have just 12 years to act on climate change if global temperature rises are to be kept within the recommended 1.5 degrees Celsius;

b) all governments (national, regional and local) have a duty to limit the negative impacts of climate breakdown, and local governments that recognise this should not wait for their national governments to change their policies. UK cities

need to commit to aggressive reduction targets and carbon neutrality as quickly as possible;

c) cities are well placed to lead the world in reducing carbon emissions, as their higher density opens up a range of sustainable transport, buildings and energy opportunities;

d) the 5% carbon reduction target – as defined by our Carbon Management Plan - is by our implemented measures (including control and influence of council), not the actual emissions reductions. The target has consistently been met on this basis;

e) the Council's absolute carbon emissions have reduced by just over 10% (10.17%) over the last five years – an average of 2% per year (Source: Oxford City Council 'Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Local Authority own estate and operations: Reporting year 2017-18' (August 2018));

f) although the Council's carbon emissions reduced in 2017/18 due to changes in the national grid, the Council's underlying energy and fossil fuel consumption actually went UP slightly - a 2.1% increase in electricity, a 0.8% increase in gas and a 5.4% increase in carbon from vehicle fuel. (Source: Oxford City Council 'Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Local Authority own estate and operations: Reporting year 2017- 18' (August 2018)).

The increasing commercial activities of the Council provides upward pressure on the carbon emissions, but in the main services are being offered locally and at a lower carbon intensity than other commercial concerns providing the service from outside the area would be operating at.

f) This Council is only responsible for 1% of the city's CO₂ emissions and works in partnership to achieve ambitious city-wide targets to reduce emissions by 40% by 2020. Although the City Council is managing to deliver absolute carbon reductions – despite the upward pressures on carbon emissions caused by changes in the structure of its operations and services and variability caused by factors such as the weather - it

is not delivering the necessary absolute carbon reductions fast enough to meet either the UK's 2050 80% reduction target or the 1.5 degree Celsius target.

In light of the above, the Council therefore agrees to:

1. Join other Councils in declaring a Climate Emergency;
2. Continue to call on Westminster to provide the necessary powers and resources to make local action on climate change easier;
3. Encourage this Council to establish a Citizens Assembly made up of a representative range of Oxford citizens to establish the facts and make recommendations for our city.
4. Continue to work with partners across the city and region to deliver widespread carbon reductions.
5. Note that this Council is a forward-looking council at tackling climate change with a very strong record. The Council has installed enough solar PV across its estate to generate the equivalent of 10% of our annual electricity from onsite generation, reducing CO₂ emissions by 380tonnes/year and reduces bills by over £100,000/year). We currently purchase accredited green electricity for practically all sites and have a policy to buy green if the price is not more than 2% above the price of standard electricity. This Council uses a **£1m revolving loan fund** to reduced energy costs by over £400k/year.
6. Note that this Council works heavily in partnership, including coordinating the [Low Carbon Oxford](#) network – a local collaborative of over 40 organisations that are responsible for the majority of Oxford's CO₂ emissions and which have committed to reduce their emissions by 3% each year. The Council is participating in [OxFutures II Growing Oxfordshire's Low Carbon Economy](#), a multi-stakeholder partnership to grow Oxfordshire's low carbon economy through assisting SMEs to reduce energy consumption and implement energy efficiency projects.

c) Adopting a definition of Islamophobia

Councillor Haines left during this item.

Councillor Arshad, seconded by Councillor Azad, proposed the submitted motion as set out in the agenda and briefing note.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

Council resolved to adopt the following motion:

Oxford City Council is proud of its diversity and has a huge asset and a source of great strength. A substantial proportion of its residents are Muslim, who are an integral part of its make-up, playing a huge role in all aspects of the Oxford City's life. Oxford City has a strong history of promoting cohesion and welcoming people from all over the world. Its residents have always united and supported each other in the fight against racism and discrimination in all its forms.

This Council therefore welcomes, endorses and adopts the working APPG (All-Party Parliamentary Group) definition of Islamophobia¹, including all of its examples in full cited as follows:

"ISLAMOPHOBIA IS ROOTED IN RACISM AND IS A TYPE OF RACISM THAT TARGETS EXPRESSIONS OF MUSLIMNESS OR PERCEIVED MUSLIMNESS."

Contemporary examples of Islamophobia in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in encounters between religions and non-religions in the public sphere could, considering the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- Calling for, aiding, instigating or justifying the killing or harming of Muslims in the name of a racist/fascist ideology, or an extremist view of religion.
- Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Muslims as such, or of Muslims as a collective group, such as, especially but not exclusively, conspiracies about Muslim entryism in politics, government or other societal institutions; the myth of Muslim identity having a unique propensity for terrorism and claims of a demographic 'threat' posed by Muslims or of a 'Muslim takeover'.
- Accusing Muslims as a group of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Muslim person or group of Muslim individuals, or even for acts committed by non-Muslims.
- Accusing Muslims as a group, or Muslim majority states, of inventing or exaggerating Islamophobia, ethnic cleansing or genocide perpetrated against Muslims.
- Accusing Muslim citizens of being more loyal to the 'Ummah' (transnational Muslim community) or to their countries of origin, or to the alleged priorities of Muslims worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.
- Denying Muslim populations, the right to self-determination e.g., by claiming that the existence of an independent Palestine or Kashmir is a terrorist endeavour.
- Applying double standards by requiring of Muslims behaviours that are not expected or demanded of any other groups in society, eg loyalty tests.
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic Islamophobia.
- Holding Muslims collectively responsible for the actions of any Muslim majority state, whether secular or constitutionally Islamic.

This Council asks the Executive Board Member for a Safer and Greener Environment to:

1. Write to government ministers asking them to listen to Muslim communities and the cross-party group of MPs and peers and to adopt this definition of Islamophobia which classifies discrimination against Muslims as a form of racism.
2. Continue to prioritise tackling hate crime and Islamophobia in partnership. Oxford City Council works with partners, especially Thames Valley Police, on a rolling basis, and will now coordinate future actions in line with this definition of Islamophobia for all Muslims.

¹ The report and full definition can be found [here](#)

- d) To oppose the Oxford-Cambridge expressway as it is currently proposed, to continue to press national government for more investment in sustainable transport, and to ask the Department for Transport to urgently clarify its proposals around the Expressway.**

Councillor Gant, seconded by Councillor Landell Mills, proposed the submitted motion as set out in the agenda and briefing note.

Councillor Gant accepted the amendments from both Councillor Hollingsworth and Councillor Simmons as set out in the briefing note.

After debate and on being put to the vote the amended motion was agreed.

Council resolved to adopt the following motion, as amended:

Council notes that the Leader of the Council noted the Government's announcement of the proposed corridor for the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway and then went on to say: "However, this opaque process - with the decision made by Highways England – does little to reduce uncertainty for people in Oxford and those that travel to work here. It remains wholly unclear which side of Oxford the final route will take, let alone how the Expressway might help reduce the congestion on the overstretched A34 and A40. "The interface between the proposed Expressway and the new East-West Rail is also key. We welcome the commitment to plan for and invest in major infrastructure to support housing and economic growth in Oxfordshire, but we want to see the development of integrated transport systems and the prioritisation of clean, green and public transport. These principles need to be central in determining the final detailed route. We will now look closely at the proposals and will want to make sure there is a meaningful public consultation conducted by Highways England."

In addition, council notes that through her position on the Growth Board, the Leader has ensured that the Growth Board has not endorsed proposals for an Expressway but has expressed concerns over the lack of clarity and emphasised that should such a proposal go ahead, the main priority needs to be integration with public transport.

Council regrets the lack of clarity from government on its proposals which contributes to considerable uncertainty both about how the Expressway is intended to deliver benefit, and about the possible impact on homes, lives, the environment, amenities and facilities, including in and adjacent to the greater Oxford area.

In particular, Council notes with regret that:

1. It is unclear what the word "Expressway" means in this context
2. Insufficient work has been done on the potential of enhanced rail links to deliver better outcomes for passengers, freight, and sustainable economic growth
3. Actual and proposed consultation is inadequate
4. It is unclear which of a range of possible justifications for the Expressway, which potentially contradict each other, are being used, including:
 - a) A 'strategic route' to carry freight traffic from the west and south to the east.
 - b) A route to make commuting between Oxford/Milton Keynes/Bedford/Cambridge easier and quicker.

c) A road that will enable significant housing growth of 1,000,000 extra houses along its length.

d) Relieving traffic on the A34, as one member of the Growth Board has stated publicly (which does not appear to be one of the stated aims, and current plans do not rule out using the A34 in part as the Expressway, which would of course add more traffic to it)

5. Increased road building will inevitably have a serious negative impact on air quality and make the achievement of climate change targets much more challenging at a time when all public bodies must seek to use every part of their planning, investment and delivery mechanisms to achieve air quality improvements and significant carbon reductions; and

Increased road building will inevitably have a serious negative impact on air quality at a time when all public bodies must seek to use every part of their planning, investment and delivery mechanisms to achieve the opposite and that the challenges we all face because of climate change require us to make important choices about our future.

Council therefore resolves to oppose the Expressway as it is currently proposed, to continue to press national government for more investment in sustainable transport, and to ask the Department for Transport to urgently clarify its proposals around the Expressway.

e) Protecting the Oxford Name

This motion was not taken as the time allowed for debate had finished.

f) Opposing mental health funding cuts by the County Council

This motion was not taken as the time allowed for debate had finished.

The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 8.25 pm

Chair

Date: Wednesday 13 February 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Council

Date: 28 January 2019

Title of Report: Questions on Notice from members of Council and responses from the Board Members and Leader, republished with supplementary questions and responses.

Introduction

1. Questions submitted by members of Council to the Board members and Leader of the Council, by the deadline in the Constitution are listed below in the order they will be taken at the meeting.
2. Responses are included where available.
3. Questioners can ask one supplementary question of the councillor answering the original question.
4. This report will be republished after the Council meeting to include supplementary questions and responses as part of the minutes pack.

Questions and responses

Board member for Culture and City Centre

1. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Clarkson – Tourist Tax

Question	Written Response
<p>A number of local authorities in areas popular with visitors are reported to be lobbying government to consider a “Tourist tax” to help improve the experience of both tourists and residents.</p> <p>Should Oxford be joining those calls?</p>	<p>In 2017, Council agreed to ask the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council to work with other local authorities representing cities with high rates of tourism to lobby jointly for the devolution of the above power. The progress of this debate continues to be monitored closely by officers. Bath, Edinburgh, Liverpool and the Highlands are among areas lobbying for £1-2 per night bed taxes, thus far without success. More authorities are publically stating their case with the aim of paying for infrastructure, street improvements or to fund culture.. Officers are also engaging with the LGA, but as things stand government legislation is required. Government has previously</p>

	<p>suggested any taxation will need to be advocated for separately to the Tourism Sector Deal process, currently underway, which proposes tourism zones.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are in a situation where we are prioritising delivery of the Housing and Growth Deal with government. As things progress on these fronts, the best timing to more pro-actively pursue this matter should become clearer. We would need to engage closely with the hotel sector and other partners on such an issue, to better understand their views. The forthcoming Tourism Scrutiny review process will no doubt provide further opportunity to more fully explore the evidence around the issue further.</p>
--	--

2. From Councillor Landell-Mills to Councillor Clarkson – Gloucester Green

Question	Written Response
Can the portfolio holder advise the City Council have any proposals to improve the character and quality of the Gloucester Green environment for use during the daytime and night-time?	Whilst Oxford City Council does not have the controlling interest in the area, some improvement works are due to be scheduled. These include the addition of new benches, a new bin store and removal of a poster drum. There is of course a long-term desire to see a wider improvement in this area.
Supplementary Question Could we have more information about the proposed improvement works?	Verbal Response Initial proposals require consultation with all landowners and are not finalised. We are however keen to make progress.

3. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Clarkson – Town Hall accessibility audit

Question	Written Response
Further to my question at the last council meeting, is the accessibility audit of the Town Hall complete?	<p>We have received the access audit and started some improvements such as procuring new door closures, improved lighting and an illustrated map of the Town Hall that have been funded from our current budgets. We are obtaining costs for the other changes that the audit has recommended.</p> <p>A report is due to go to the Corporate Management Team within the next month so it can be reviewed and it will then go to the City Executive Board.</p>

Board member for Customer Focused Services

4. From Councillor Goddard to Councillor Chapman – trees on highway

Question	Written Response
<p>The council has indicated that it is allocated about £18k from the County Council to manage (survey, maintain and replace) 6,000 trees on Section 42 land. This figure would appear to be inadequate even for the routine surveying and maintenance of that number of trees. The council has confirmed that there are no plans to replace 'missing' trees in Blenheim Drive, specifically; could it be confirmed whether removed trees on any Section 42 land are being or have been replaced in the last 3 years?</p>	<p>The total number of trees planted in the last 3 years on S42 land was 12.</p> <p>We do not replace trees on Section 42 land where there are high engineering costs involved to create suitable tree pits – this is the case at Blenheim Drive. The majority of the trees planted on Section 42 land will be in grass verges.</p> <p>If other parties wish to fund replacement trees on Section 42 land we are able to accommodate this. Any funding would need to cover costs of creating new tree pits if required. I understand that Oxford Direct Services are currently working with some Councillors who are considering raising funds for this in their ward.</p>
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>Have we made representations to the County Council to increase funding for replacing and maintaining trees on the highway as the current funding appears inadequate?</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>I will raise this with the County Council but do not expect to receive additional funding for this.</p>

5. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Chapman – Shotover

Question	Written Response
<p>Cycling in Shotover recently, I noticed that a significant amount of litter had collected at the lower end (adjacent to the ring road) and that the old second world war roadway which forms the cycle route is deteriorating badly in parts.</p> <p>How frequently is Shotover cleared of litter and are there any plans to patch up the old roadway?</p>	<p>The Streetscene Team litter picks the area. However, the area is split into two parts:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brasenose Wood which we attend twice a week – normally Monday and Wednesday. • Shotover Country Park / Car Park which we attend three times a week – Saturday, Sunday and Monday. <p>With regard to the road surface, there are no plans to carry out any work at present. However, we will continue to monitor the situation.</p>

Supplementary Question	Verbal Response
What sections of Shotover are included and excluded from the Council's cleaning rota?	Shotover Park lies in both Oxford City and South Oxfordshire District. Each council is responsible for cleaning and maintenance on its own part of the land. I have asked officers to work with their counterparts to put a suitable joint cleaning rota in place

Board member for Finance and Asset Management and non-statutory Deputy Leader

No questions

Board member for Healthy Oxford

6. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Upton - Oxford Half Marathon

Question	Written Response
Is the Board Member aware that a date has been fixed for the Oxford Half Marathon 2019 without any consultation with Residents in the affected Wards or with their City and County councillors?	<p>Cllr Wade has been advised about the process for Oxfordshire County Council's consultation process for events on the highway - the process is consulted upon with key stakeholders e.g. the emergency services and Oxford University's Conference of Colleges. It is not viable or conducive to undertake a consultation with residents on all aspects of events such as dates.</p> <p>Consultation has also taken place regarding the route - at the Cllr Briefing meeting held on the 17th Jan that Cllr Wade was invited to was unable to attend, Oxfordshire County Council confirmed the steps recently undertaken by the County, City and the organisers to look at a possible re-routing for the event.</p> <p>Alison Drummond (City Events Officer) held a pre Cllr Briefing meeting with Cllr Wade and all these points were explained. The proposed re-route was consulted upon with the Safety Advisory Group. Thames Valley Police, Oxfordshire Fire Brigade and both Bus Companies rejected the proposal to re-route the event because the only viable possible re-route would have a more negative and larger impact upon the city and its residents.</p> <p>It has been confirmed by the County Council that the current route has the least impact upon the highway network in Oxford. Through the evidence of the</p>

	<p>significantly reduced number of complaints received in 2018 (OCC only received 3 complaints about the event last year), it appears that the residents in the north of the city and Marston have now more collectively embraced the Half Marathon - this was also confirmed by the Ward Councillors yesterday at the Cllr Briefing. Furthermore both Board Members have agreed for the event to continue for the time being in its current route due to it having the least impact upon the city and residents.</p>
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>There has been no consultation with residents on the date and route for this years' event. Will residents be consulted?</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>No. It is impractical to consult such large numbers of people. The event (<i>on 13 October 2019</i>) relies on effective co-ordination with councillors and local groups.</p>

7. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Upton - Oxford Half Marathon 2

Question	Written Response
<p>Does the Board Member share our concern that Virgin Sport are using our 'Oxford' brand with little or no benefit to the city, and considerable inconvenience year after year to local residents and visitors? Will the Board Member ask for a cost benefit analysis, fundamental to any business decision, to be prepared as a matter of urgency?</p>	<p>All relevant events on OCC land that comply with our events booking process are able to use our Supported by OCC logo branding.</p> <p>All event organisers provide an economic and social impact report as part of their post event analysis. Alison Drummond explained this to Cllr Wade when she met with her on 11 January. This report is issued after the event through the Safety Advisory Group. It is recognised that the event now brings in approximately £1m of economic impact to the City which is an incredible figure and the benefits to the city are tremendous. A copy can be issued to Cllr Wade in due course.</p> <p>Both City and County Council are very supportive of this event as it also encourages more people to participate in being healthy and active.</p>
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>When will the report mentioned in your answer be available?</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>I do not know when we will receive the final report , but once officers have this they can share relevant information with you.</p>

8. From Councillor Roz Smith to Councillor Upton – Quarry Sports Building

Question	Written Response
<p>Could I please have a breakdown of the costs for the Quarry Sports Building, including costs for Architects, consultants, consultations, materials, removal of old building etc?</p>	<p>The total spend for the project was £1,257,495 in line with the final cost report for the project.</p> <p>We are currently in the process of checking with the consultants and contractor whether they are able to release details of their contract sums, which could be commercially sensitive for them. We will advise as soon as we know. The new pavilion has been well received by the local community and Quarry Rovers FC.</p>
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>Please can we have a full and transparent breakdown of costs?</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>I hope officers can provide a full breakdown of costs in due course but it may be that some information is still classified as commercially sensitive and cannot be released in detail.</p>

9. From Councillor Roz Smith to Councillor Upton – Quarry Rovers ground

Question	Written Response
<p>Who made the decision for allowing the installation of hoarding along a property border with City Council owned land at Margaret Road playing field area thereby denying the promised installation of an outside cage for Quarry Rovers football equipment?</p>	<p>The hoarding was installed as part of a building project on adjacent private land given planning permission last year. We are talking to the owner in the hope of expediting the building so that we can install the storage cage as soon as possible. The principle was authorised by the then Interim Assistant Chief Executive – Regeneration & Economy and the detail authorised by the Regeneration and major projects service manager</p>
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>The result is a blank hoarding in place of the previous hedge, with no progress with the work on the house and a large container awkwardly sited in the playing fields. Can anything be done to speed up removal of the hoarding and can you keep ward councillors updated?</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>It is frustrating and we have done what we can to encourage progress. There is nothing we can do to force private owners to speed up their building work.</p>

Board member for Housing (Building better homes)

10. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Rowley – council tenants

Question	Written Response
<p>Is it true that the Council is considering introducing a rule making it difficult for its tenants to take in lodgers under the age of 50?</p>	<p>Council tenants have a statutory right to take in lodgers. However, the question may be referring to the restrictions that are in place in accommodation designated for older people.</p> <p>The formal consultation on a replacement Secure Tenancy Agreement for Council Tenants has recently closed.</p> <p>During the consultation process, the issue was raised that currently, if you live in housing designated for older people, you can only take in a lodger who is 55 or older, which can be quite restrictive, particularly if a tenant is affected by the bedroom tax.</p> <p>The proposed agreement intends to clarify this and make it fairer so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • those living in designated over 60s accommodation should not have lodgers younger than 55 years old • those living in designated over 55s accommodation should not have lodgers younger than 50 years old <p>So in fact, the council has just been consulting on lessening the restrictions on people’s ability to take in lodgers whilst seeking to protect the nature of accommodation for older people.</p>
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>How does this change in the agreement help tenants affected by the bedroom tax, or fit with mutual support schemes pairing older and younger tenants together?</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>Thank you for the question. The rules around sheltered housing are complex and not easily explained here. I will ask for a written response.</p>

11. From Councillor Gotch to Councillor Rowley – Elsfield Way and Warren Crescent

Question	Written Response
<p>Elsfield Way, owned by the City, received planning consent for 17 dwellings 5 years ago,</p>	<p>The Elsfield Hall site was given permission for 17 dwellings. However, changes made by the Government in 2015 including the introduction of the 1% rent cut and the high value levy meant that the council felt unable to</p>

<p>yet construction has not started . Why the delay? And why will the finished flats and houses not be 100% affordable on a City owned site?</p> <p>Similarly, Warren Crescent received consent 4 years ago for 10 affordable houses on a City owned site, yet no start has been made.</p> <p>Do these inordinate delays explain why the City has built no affordable dwellings for the past 2 years?</p>	<p>proceed as it was no longer financially viable. The housing company has reviewed the site and is proposing a scheme capable of delivering 26 homes. This scheme will be delivered alongside Cumberlege Close for a total of 35 homes, 18 of which will be affordable housing, subject to planning permission being granted. It is not possible to produce a 100% affordable housing scheme here due to the build costs involved and the lower returns produced by social housing.</p> <p>Warren Crescent was granted permission in September 2016 and was initially delayed due to the same Government changes that affected Elsfield Hall. Following the establishment of the housing company and the appointment of the necessary professional consultants, a 12 month water monitoring process has been completed (as per a condition on the planning permission) and tenders received for the building work. These are being assessed for an expected start on site within the next 2-3 months.</p> <p>It is important to recognise that sites in the city tend to be complicated to develop.</p>
---	--

Board member for Planning and Transport

12. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Hollingsworth – planning consultees

Question	Written Response
<p>Does the Board Member agree with me that if members of this authority are being asked to rely on the advice of statutory consultees in making quasi-judicial decisions on planning committees, we need to be able to reassure ourselves that that advice has been professionally prepared and taken all relevant factors sufficiently into account?</p> <p>Could he confirm whether there is a format or protocol covering how such advice should be presented?</p> <p>If not, should there be?</p>	<p>Advice from statutory consultees on planning issues is presented as part of the report to the planning committee, prepared by our planning officers and checked by our legal officers, who are also on hand during the committees’ meetings. If our officers have concerns about any element of a response from a statutory consultee they can and do go back to that consultee to seek clarification. Members of planning committees should base their decision on the officer’s reports as well as the responses from statutory and non-statutory consultees alike which are all available on the website, and on the verbal advice given to members during the committee meeting.</p>

Supplementary Question	Verbal Response
As committee members are asked to rely on the accuracy of responses from statutory consultees, should there be a set format or protocol for presenting information to the council?	County Council highway team use standard headings for their responses. Officers will check the reliability and accuracy of statutory consultees' advice and recommendations . But it would not be appropriate and would be beyond our remit to insist responses must be sent in standard format.

13. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Hollingsworth – Barton footbridge

Question	Written Response
<p>The Annual Monitoring Report 2017/18 refers to a specific target for Barton: "Provision of a new footbridge across the A40..." in order to "Reduce the sense of isolation from the rest of the city", saying this benefit is "To be delivered as part of the Barton Park development".</p> <p>Why has it not been?</p>	<p>The AMR actually says "Provision of new footbridge across the A40 <i>and/or improvements to existing underpass...</i>" (my emphasis). The footbridge option was ruled out many years ago because of the excessive land-take required for the ramps and the ensuing costs.</p> <p>Improvements to the underpass were a section 106 requirement on the planning permission. A scheme was worked up by the developer and submitted, and approved, by the County Council's street lighting team.</p>

14. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Hollingsworth – Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

Question	Written Response
<p>The 2014 SHMA gives a figure for Oxford's housing need of 1400 dwellings per annum (dpa). The Government's new standard methodology gives a substantially lower figure of 746dpa. This council is continuing to use the SHMA figure in its calculations, for reasons which have been discussed before. However, the same consultants who</p>	<p>It is important to note that the standardised methodology for calculating Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing creates a <u>minimum</u> figure; this is made explicit in the NPPF 2018 and in the accompanying planning practice guidance.</p> <p><i>(The OAN is derived from housing projections from the Office of National Statistics. Councillors might find it interesting to note that a recent Government consultation including the following important statement from the Office of National Statistics, which is clearly highly relevant to Oxford's situation:</i></p> <p><i>"[The household projections] do not take account of how many people may want to form new households, but for whatever reason aren't able to, such as young adults wanting to move out of their parents' house, or people wanting to live on their own instead of in a house share.</i></p>

<p>prepared the 2014 SHMA undertook an update in 2018, which uses what they describe as a “more evolved understanding” of certain elements, and gives a figure of 776dpa.</p> <p>How is this council factoring the 2018 SHMA update, and the most recent government guidance on its methodology for calculating OAN, into its calculations?</p>	<p><i>Therefore, household projections are not a measure of how many houses would need to be built to meet housing demand; they show what would happen if past trends in actual household formation continue.”</i></p> <p><i>“Although the latest household projections are lower than the previously published projections, this does not directly mean that fewer houses are needed in the future than thought. This is because the projections are based on recent actual numbers of households and are not adjusted to take account of where homes have been needed in recent years but have not been available. Therefore, if more homes are built, the increased availability of homes may result in more households forming. The opposite is also true – if fewer homes are built then fewer households are able to form.”)</i></p> <p>There are 5 separate considerations in determining whether a figure above the minimum indicated by the standard methodology would be appropriate. These are summarised in the relevant Government Guidance on assessing housing need within the rules of the updated NPPF 2018, and at least three apply to Oxford. We can clearly demonstrate the case to go above the minimum figure.</p> <p>The comparable figure to the 2014 SHMA conclusions of 1,400 dwellings per annum (dpa) in the 2018 SHMA roll forward is calculated to be the 1,356dpa. The broad explanation is set out in the Local Plan text at paragraphs 3.5-3.7 and is explained further in the Assessing and Meeting Housing Need Background Paper available on our website. The roll forward is based on the assessed need for affordable housing, and the application of the Council’s current (and proposed) affordable housing policy, as set out in these documents.</p> <p>The 2018 report is not a jointly commissioned piece of work and it is not intended as a replacement of the 2014 SHMA. It was undertaken to ensure we appropriately rolled-forward our plan period to 2036, in order to provide a 15 year Local Plan as required by the NPPF. The 2018 update could not replace the 2014 SHMA as it only looks at Oxford City and has not been prepared collaboratively across the Housing Market Area. The Local Plan clearly states at paragraph 3.5 that the main evidence for housing need in Oxford continues to be the Oxfordshire SHMA 2014.</p>
---	---

15. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Hollingsworth – Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) numbers

Question	Written Response
<p>Which housing numbers will be used in the final local plan and why? Those originally derived from the SHMA or the more recent Objectively Assessed Needs numbers?</p>	<p>This Council has already approved the final draft of the Local Plan for consultation and submission, which includes the relevant housing numbers and the clear explanation as to why they were used. The answer to question 14 above provides some detail and references to the relevant documents and sections.</p>
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>The range of ‘required housing completions’ from different calculations is amazingly wide. Do we really know how many housing completions are required to meet our unmet housing need?</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>The difference results from the differing methodologies:</p> <p>OAN uses a straightforward extrapolation of current housebuilding rates and does not take account of other factors.</p> <p>SHMA uses a more complex system assessing many factors to predict the need for new households.</p> <p>I consider the SHMA methodology is more reliable and gives a better assessment..</p>

16. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Hollingsworth – Local Plan consultation

Question	Written Response
<p>The Regulation 19 consultation on Oxford’s Local Plan was extended to finish on December 28, 2018. Given that this was obviously directly after Christmas, meaning that several groups and individuals had difficulty meeting the deadline because they and their colleagues were away, does the Board Member think that in hindsight there might have been a case for extending the extension by a further week?</p>	<p>The Council replied recently to a letter from Hinde Law, written on behalf of a client who wished to make similar points. The reply, sent by our Monitoring Office, sets out the case well so I have decided to quote it the relevant paragraphs in response:</p> <p>“The original consultation period in respect of the Proposed Submission Local Plan was six weeks, which was extended subsequently to a total of eight weeks. This consultation period meets, indeed exceeds, the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 and the City Council’s usual consultation period as identified in its Statement of Community Involvement. It is considered therefore that consultation period provided was wholly reasonable and exceeds that which is normally provided for consultation on proposed submission versions of development plan documents.</p> <p>The consultation period for the Proposed Submission Local Plan comprised an eight-week period, between 1</p>

	<p>November 2018 and 28 December 2018. Only a very short part of that eight-week period included the Christmas holidays. As stated above, the consultation period exceeded that which is usual for consultation on proposed submission plans and, it is considered, provided an entirely reasonable opportunity for those who wished to engage in the process to prepare and submit representations. The Proposed Submission Plan and associated consultation documents were available on-line and therefore were readily accessible at all times during the consultation period.</p> <p>The consultation process accorded with the requirements of regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 and the City Council’s Statement of Community Involvement. Although the City Council was not required or obliged to do so, notice of the consultation was communicated by email on 1 November 2018 to all those on the City Council’s database, as was the further email sent on 16 November 2018. Notice of the consultation was also disseminated by other means, including by notice given in “Your Oxford”, in the edition published on 29 October 2018, by press release and through a widely reported interview with the Planning Portfolio Holder, through a launch event with the Civic Society to which local stakeholder groups were invited, through social media, through notices posted on community notice boards and through drop in events. The extension of the consultation period to 28 December 2018 was also widely publicised (as referred to below).</p> <p>It is considered that the notice of the consultation, and of the extension of the consultation period, was entirely reasonable and effective.”</p>
--	--

17. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Hollingsworth – Central Conservation Area

Question	Written Response
<p>The lodging of a planning application in respect of 4 Osney Lane, a Victorian end of terrace, has concentrated attention on the inexplicable omission of the Victorian streets east of Hollybush Row from the Central (City and University) Conservation Area. Can the Board Member confirm that the appraisal currently underway will include considering the incorporation of this important remaining area of Oxford’s industrial heritage?</p>	<p>Consideration of several potential expansions of the Central Conservation Area are being considered, including the area in which number 4 (which is not subject to a planning application – that’s the property next door) Osney Lane can be found. Officers are currently weighing up the arguments for and against the inclusion of these areas within the Conservation Area, and they will make their recommendations to CEB following further consultation specifically on the potential expansion of the Conservation Area.</p>

Supplementary Question Can local groups contribute to the consultation?	Verbal Response Yes – amenity group, local groups, landowners and councillors can contribute to the consultation which has already started.
---	---

18. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Hollingsworth - Oxford Dance Forum

Question	Written Response
<p>Is the Board Member aware that the Oxford Dance Forum, a collective of dance professionals, is having real difficulties in finding spaces suitable for dance in Oxford? Better spaces for dance would allow dance to reach a wider audience and increase the uptake of dance within the community.</p> <p>Will the Board Member confirm that the reconversion of premises (policies E1 and V2 in the draft Local Plan) in this case for dance spaces, will be encouraged by this Council?</p>	<p>Yes I am aware, and have been in touch with relevant organisations and individuals for some considerable time. It is precisely because of those contacts that the 2036 Local Plan draft submission document includes just such policies.</p>

19. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Hollingsworth - Oxford Flood Alleviation

Question	Written Response
<p>The current proposals for the Oxford Flood Alleviation Channel fail to include a dedicated cycle path or pedestrian footpath along the main flood relief channel. Our MP, Layla Moran, was advised that questions of land ownership complicated this issue.</p> <p>Can the Board Member advise whether the Environment Agency and City Council are in continuing negotiations to secure this strip of land, which will result in great health and leisure benefits to the City's residents?</p>	<p>Yes, efforts involving the Environment Agency, the City Council, the County Council, the University of Oxford and cycling groups have been ongoing for some time to provide such a facility, although the advice given to the MP is correct and may be a substantial obstacle.</p>
Supplementary Question When can we expect an update on the proposals and the timetable for work on the main scheme and cycle path?	Verbal Response I cannot give a firm date, but we are continuing to work with major landowners.

20. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Hollingsworth - Building work affecting Residents and Homes in Wolvercote

Question	Written Response
<p>Is the Board Member aware that residents along Godstow Road are being subjected to a constant stream of HGV traffic, often till 11pm, on what is already a busy bus route. Residents are reporting vibrations to their homes, particularly when lorries and buses cross the bridge to and from Lower Wolvercote?</p> <p>Can the Board Member advise what action the Council is taking to (a) fix the hours between which HGVs can access the Wolvercote Paper Mill construction site, and (b) liaise with Network Rail over the current condition and future monitoring of the bridge, and (c) advise residents through their local councillors of the City officer to whom they should report cracks/other deterioration to their properties?</p>	<p>The Wolvercote Paper Mill site has a Construction Management Travel Plan in place, which restricts hours of deliveries to the period between 9.30 and 16.30. If the Councillor or residents are aware of deliveries taking place outside these hours the Planning Enforcement team at the City Council should be notified immediately. The bridge over the railway between upper and lower Wolvercote is the responsibility of the County Council as the transport authority, and they will be in regular contact with Network Rail on matters relating to the bridge. Damage to property that may be caused by the actions or activities of another individual or institution are a matter of civil liability, and should be pursued through the appropriate legal avenue.</p>

21. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Hollingsworth – Gibbs Crescent

Question	Written Response
<p>A2 Dominion has said it wants to replace the Gibbs Crescent flats (where the explosion happened last year) and Simon House with blocks of new flats. Given that both these sites were originally providing social housing and hostel accommodation will the portfolio holder do what he can to ensure that any new housing on this site remains a mix of social and affordable housing?</p>	<p>These sites are subject to planning applications which have been received and are available for viewing on the Council’s website. Those planning applications will have to be judged against all relevant national and local planning policies, including those on affordable housing, which as defined by the City Council’s planning policies includes social housing as well intermediate housing. Members of the relevant planning committee(s) must make those judgements with the help of advice from planning officers as to whether the applications comply with the appropriate planning policies. I would advise any member who is likely to sit on a planning committee to avoid pre-determining a planning application.</p>

22. From Councillor Landell-Mills to Councillor Hollingsworth – Westgate traffic

Question	Written Response
<p>Can the portfolio holder advise whether the City Council is in discussion with Westgate operators as to how the tail back from the Westgate car park, which is blocking traffic on the Oxpens Road and resulting in increased congestion and pollution, might be addressed?</p>	<p>The County Council, as the Highways Authority, is in constant communication with both the City Council and the Westgate. The City Council position, which was embedded in the planning permission and based on the consensus position of the two Councils, is that visitors to the Westgate should be encouraged to use public transport, including the park and rides, as an alternative to the private car. To this end the County Council is providing live traffic information on the edges of the city directing drivers to the park and rides and away from the city centre, and the City Council is looking to increase capacity in the park and ride system by extending Seacourt and moving the Oxpens decking to Redbridge. The two Councils are working together on corridor studies that will shift priority on arterial roads away from the private car and towards public transport and cycling, and discussions are ongoing between the two Council to identify the most effective means of implementing demand management schemes to reduce the amount of traffic in Oxford.</p>

23. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Hollingsworth – Seacourt extension

Question	Written Response
<p>What is the current status of the Seacourt Park and Ride extension?</p>	<p>The scheme has planning permission, and preliminary works have been carried out to ensure that important conditions to that planning permission relating to environmental issues have been dealt with. Officers have been working to ensure that the interaction of the extension and the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme (OFAS) construction phases is as efficient as possible. A report will be coming to the CEB soon confirming the final timetable, costs and selection of a contractor.</p>

24. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Hollingsworth - Meadow Lane car park

Question	Written Response
<p>The Council recently re-surfaced Meadow Lane car park (in a flood area) in what appears to be a non-permeable surface.</p> <p>Can the portfolio holder confirm this?</p> <p>If so, it appears that our practices are at odds with our own planning policies. Could the portfolio holder offer any comment on this?</p>	<p>The previous surface of the car park was not permeable. To improve sustainable drainage the new surface includes positive drainage measures in the form of a gravel filled trench (one of the measures included in the definition of SUDS in the current Sites and Housing Plan). As such the approach is in line with our planning policies, though it is important to note that as a previously developed car park planning permission was not required for these works.</p>

25. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Hollingsworth – Oxpens Meadow

Question	Written Response
When will the temporary plastic surface on Oxpens Meadow be removed and when will the meadow be restored to its pre-existing condition?	The temporary surface will be removed within the next two weeks, in compliance with the conditions attached to the temporary planning permission and in advance of the deadline of June 2019 required by the terms of the transfer of the site to OXWED as part of the comprehensive redevelopment of the Oxpens area.

26. From Councillor Landell-Mills to Councillor Hollingsworth– park and ride

Question	Written Response
Can the portfolio holder advise what the City Council is doing directly and indirectly to encourage motorists to use the Park and Ride car parks and take the bus into the city centre?	The City and County Councils work closely together to promote the use of the park and ride system around Oxford (see Q22 above). As well as signage, the two councils have recently agreed to align the operating methods and terms and conditions at the five car parks, which will make it easier for customers to use the system – for example by allowing season ticket holders to use different car parks with the same tickets. The leaders of the two authorities agreed in 2017 a proposal to bring the back office operation of the two different parking operations together, and that has already led to significant efficiencies being identified, with further improvements likely to be confirmed in the next few weeks.

27. From Councillor Landell-Mills to Councillor Hollingsworth – train use

Question	Written Response
Can the portfolio holder advise what the City Council is doing directly and indirectly to encourage motorists to leave their cars at Oxford Parkway and take the train into the city centre?	As already noted in responses to questions 22 and 26, the City and County Councils work together to promote the use of all the Park and Rides around Oxford, including the County's Council facility at Oxford Parkway, which offers convenient bus and train services to the city centre as well as to Summertown, Headington and Kidlington. The Oxford Parkway park and ride facility is well used.

Board member for Safer, Greener Oxford

28. From Councillor Landell-Mills to Councillor Hayes – planting along highways

Question	Written Response
Can the portfolio holder advise on what if any tree, hedge and shrub planting is proposed by the City Council in the soft estate along the main highways into Oxford to mitigate the impact of NOx and other pollutants and beautify the main roads into town?	The main highway is managed by Oxfordshire County Council, therefore the City Council does not have any plans to plant trees alongside it.
Supplementary Question	Verbal Response
This seems an ‘easy win’ to reduce air pollution: why can this not be taken forward?	I am happy to make the case to the County Council. But we do not own the land alongside the highways and do not have a budget for planting.

29. From Councillor Landell-Mills to Councillor Hayes – planting to combat NOx

Question	Written Response
Has the portfolio holder considered offering to supply and plant, free of charge, trees and hedging to home-owners and businesses with land along Oxford’s main highways, which would help to tackle the impact of NOx and other pollutants, and beautify the city?	The City Council have assessed evidence on how planting can assist in reducing pollution in the city in detail. Unfortunately evidence shows that there is not a clear recommendation on the benefits. In some cases trees can in fact reduce air quality by trapping pollution below the canopy. Evidence also shows that while vegetation and trees can be regarded as beneficial for air quality in some circumstances, but they are not a solution to the air quality problems at a city scale. This is why we are concentrating our efforts on reducing pollution at sources through our proposals for a zero emission zone.
Supplementary Question	Verbal Response
Can we encourage residents to plant their own hedges?	This is covered above: we can discuss this in more detail outside this meeting.

30. From Councillor Landell-Mills to Councillor Hayes – Zero Emissions Zone

Question	Written Response
In light of the sensible changes to the ZEZ vehicle criteria is the term Zero Emissions Zone something of a misnomer and might Ultra Low Emissions Zone be a more accurate description?	Our journey towards the Zero Emission Zone is the correct term, as under current proposals only zero emission vehicles will be allowed in the zone during the day.

31. From Councillor Landell-Mills to Councillor Hayes – Westgate car park and Zero Emissions Zone

Question	Written Response
Does the portfolio holder think that allowing the Westgate car park to remain outside the ZEZ until the last stage in 2030 provides retailers within the Westgate an unfair competitive advantage over retailers elsewhere in the city centre?	The Westgate Centre is part of the green zone, for which proposals have been put forward from 2022.

32. From Councillor Landell-Mills to Councillor Hayes – St Clements

Question	Written Response
Can the portfolio holder advise if the City Council have any specific proposals to address low air quality in St Clements, which has the worst air quality in the city, but is outside the ZEZ?	<p>The City Council is working in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to identify proposal to reduce air pollution in St Clements. A steering group which comprises City and County Council’s members and officer have been established to lead the work.</p> <p>Myself and Councillor Jamila Azad (both as City and County Councillor for the people and businesses along St Clement's Street) sit on this steering group and feed in the practical concerns of people affected to develop solutions that are practical and effective.</p> <p>As transport is the main cause of pollution there, any changes needs the transport authority’s involvement.</p> <p>From 2016-2017 air pollution levels in St Clements was reduced by 23%. The proposed zone does not include St Clements as the zone has been designed to provide safe turn-around of non-complaint vehicles, but St Clements will benefit from the zero emission zone as buses and taxis using the road will be cleaner as a result of the proposals. The extension of the existing Low Emission Zone to require buses to be minimum Euro 6 standard from next year and the requirement that all Hackney carriages should be 100% zero emissions-capable by 2025 will benefit St Clements.</p> <p>In addition, the City Council has secured £50,000 of funding to invest in solutions which can reduce air pollution further in St Clements and we're in the process of progressing those solutions.</p>

33. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Hayes – Earth Day

Question	Written Response
<p>April 22nd 2020 will mark the 50th anniversary of Earth Day – which will be celebrated around the world. As the preparation for this event will fall within this forthcoming budget year, will the Portfolio Holder consider setting aside some funds so we can mark the occasion in Oxford?</p> <p><i>(Note: Council has previously celebrated Earth Day by flying the Earth Day flag from the Town Hall).</i></p>	<p>We've only got one planet, and Earth Day, the world's largest environmental event, is a crucial way for the City Council to raise awareness of the need to address global warming and switch to clean energy sources. It's also important to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the birth of an environmental movement (in 1970) which has made possible so much progress to securing a healthier environment for future generations.</p> <p>The Head of Law and Governance has received my request to fly the flag on Earth Day in 2019 (note: this falls on Easter Monday) and for the same event in 2020 and will this in consultation with the cross-party Flag Flying Panel, in accordance with the Protocol for Flag Flying on Civic Buildings agreed by the City Executive Board on 9 July 2015. The Birthday of the Queen and St. George's Day are a day either side of Earth Day (21 April & 23 April, respectively), which limits the availability of the flagpole, but there are no other flag flying commitments on 22 April. All flag flying commitments are subject to the weather and the availability of trained staff and we hope to bring an update to members soon.</p> <p>Earth Day 2020 falls in in Financial year 2020-21, so funding for fiftieth anniversary activities and events are currently being considered in that context. Officers are also developing ideas for Earth Day 2020 with due consideration to the fact that the day itself will fall in Oxford City Council's pre-election period or purdah.</p>

34. From Councillor Goddard to Councillor Hayes - on-street charging points

Question	Written Response
<p>Can the Councillor update Council on plans to supply more on-street charging points for electric vehicles? In particular, is it intended that surplus capacity from streetlight circuits (now that large numbers of streetlights have been changed to low-current-draining LED) might be put to this use?</p>	<p>The Council is currently trialling on-street residential chargers in its Go Ultra Low Oxford project. The trial evaluation is being carried out by the University of Oxford and the final report is due in June 2019. We have also published a joint report, with the Association for Public Sector Excellence aimed at other local authorities, which capturing the learning regarding the design and implementation of the trial (but not its evaluation). The Council will develop its strategy for rolling out around another 100 chargers in 2019 on the basis of the evaluation and with delivery to be completed by end March 2021.</p> <p>Charging from lampposts has been trialled in the GULO project and can be an effective solution. Extensive roll out to street lighting is dependent on the lighting column being</p>

	<p>located on the kerb-side of the pavement whereas the recent policy has been to move street lights to the far-side of the pavement to reduce street clutter. The county council hold the contracts for (most) street lighting in the city and so roll out is dependent on their contracting arrangements. Officers are working closely with partners at the county to take advantage and create opportunities for this kind of charging where possible.</p>
--	---

35. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Hayes – taxis and ZEZ

Question	Written Response
<p>Can the portfolio elaborate on the support available to taxi drivers, in advance of the Zero Emission Zone implementation, who are told that they need to invest in low or zero emission vehicles?</p>	<p>Officers are engaging closely with the hackney carriage owners, drivers and operators who will be affected by the Zero Emissions Zone. Supporting measures include:</p> <p>Information and awareness raising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing the manufacturers of ultra-low emissions taxis, London Electric Vehicle Company and Dynamo, to Oxford with vehicles for test drives/rides • Two workshops, and more planned to help build capacity and gain feedback from the trade on the policy development • Establishing an early adopters group – officers meet with those actively considering investment: a 121, confidential basis to understand individual challenges to adopting ultra-low emissions taxis in Oxford. <p>Financing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council commissioned a study by CENEX of the local duty-cycles for Oxford taxis, based on data capture from six taxis over three months, to model the return on investment on the purchase of ultra-low emissions taxis • Engaging with financing and leasing companies on the latest financial products that may help local owners to invest and sharing the latest information with the trade. These companies will be also invited to future workshops. • Officers are actively pursuing third party funding that may help local investors. <p>Charging infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing £370k of government funding to pay for 19 rapid chargers to be installed for priority or dedicated access for taxi drivers • We expect the first two chargers will be installed in

	<p>April 2019 in Manzil Way Gardens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the modelling of local duty-cycles to inform the impact that charge point operators' tariffs will have on the return on investment for drivers and ensuring that when we tender for the chargers that we negotiate the most affordable rates. <p>Local maintenance provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oxford Direct Services have secured the licence for local maintenance provision of London electric Vehicle Company taxis (including all older models from the London Taxi Company brand)
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>Have we considered making available (from reserves) interest-free loans for the purchase of ultra low emission or electric hackney carriages?</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>This suggestion was made by the taxi trade and is being considered.</p>

36. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Hayes – taxi drivers

Question	Written Response
<p>What options are there for licenced hackney carriage drivers who are not members of COLTA who wish to present alternative views to Council?</p>	<p>All drivers, whether hackney carriage or private hire can contact the Council at any time to discuss matters of concern. The Environmental Sustainability Team have run a number of workshops and engagement activities for hackney carriage drivers and owners to discuss proposals and help prepare for the ZEZ. The next workshop is planned for March 2019 and once confirmed the details will be communicated via the licensing team.</p>

Board member for Supporting Local Communities

37. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Simm – teachers’ mortgage scheme

Question	Written Response
<p>Could the Board Member give council an update on uptake of the council’s Mortgage scheme for teachers?</p>	<p>Since the report to Council in January 2018, two applications have been approved and one of the new applicants received an equity loan in August. This brings the total of approved applications to ten with three equity loans advanced.</p> <p>Catalyst are responsible for publicity as well as for the administration of the scheme and they are active in keeping up the profile of the scheme with the schools to try and improve uptake. They sent out publicity material to the schools in April and again in October, and they are planning a further round with newly designed material.</p>
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>Is the scheme kept under review to make sure it is used in the best possible way?</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>The scheme, although good, has quite poor take up and is perhaps not the best way to support teachers. It no longer provides sufficient incentive and does not cover the costs of a house. We are keeping the scheme and its effectiveness under review and will work to introduce other means of assisting key workers with housing.</p>

38. From Councillor Roz Smith to Councillor Simm – publication costs

Question	Written Response
<p>What was the cost of producing and printing ‘Oxford City Council’s Strategy for Children and Young People’ as a high-spec glossy publication, compared to a simpler text version adopted by many councils for similar documents?</p> <p>How many copies were produced?</p>	<p>The cost of producing the strategy was £700. This means we have a high quality version that is accessible on our website.</p> <p>We produced 200 copies so they could be sent to our key partners such as the city’s Head Teachers. The print cost for the colour version was £536.</p> <p>We can check what the cost would have been to have these printed in black and white, but we believe that a colour desk top published version is more likely to be read and used.</p>

39. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Linda Smith – Council letting agency

Question	Written Response
<p>In February 2016, Cllr Rowley will recall that Council passed a Green motion (as amended by Cllr Rowley) which included the following:</p> <p><i>Council asks the City Executive Board in the longer term to take into consideration:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Setting up a new letting agency owned and operated by the Council</i> 2. <i>Operating this letting agency according to best practice by:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <i>charging no fees to tenants</i> (b) <i>offering longer tenancies where appropriate</i> (c) <i>publishing and promoting fair rent levels</i> <p><i>This letting agency should look at the feasibility of voluntary agreements involving "third-generation" rent controls (inflation-related rent stabilisation) coupled with strong contractual rights (including first refusal rights on the next tenancy and flexibility for landlords wishing to occupy/sell and so on)</i></p> 3. <i>The Council may also consider offering accreditation to other agencies wishing to operate under this standard.</i> <p>Was Council's request ever carried out? If so, can the Portfolio Holder provide a copy of the feasibility work undertaken or the appropriate officer report?</p>	<p>The Council launched a Rent Guarantee Scheme in late 2016, as a two year pilot, following CEB approval in September 2016. This scheme enters into a new agency agreement with landlords, and seeks to increase access to private rented accommodation for persons at risk of homelessness. The Council charges no fees to tenants, and promotes the use of two-year tenancies where possible. In June 2018, CEB extended the pilot to April 2019, and a further report on this is due at February 2019 CEB, where the officer recommendation is to give approval to operating this scheme as 'business as usual'.</p> <p>Whilst this scheme is operating well and meeting lettings targets, to expand such an approach further in the highly buoyant private rented market in Oxford is considered unrealistic. A previous report on this topic went to Housing Panel in Jan 2014 which recommended that a new (direct access) letting agency approach is not pursued. A further report is going to Housing Scrutiny Panel on 4 March 2019.</p> <p>The changes in legislation mean that tenants will not be charged fees by letting agents from June this year, which will remove a major incentive for tenants to use such an agency.</p> <p>The government consulted on longer tenancies last year and we are still awaiting the response to their proposals, however, the Council's website links gives advice on private renting and links to the Government 'How to Let' and 'How to Rent' guides that give more detailed guidance on providing longer tenancy terms in tenancy agreements.</p>

<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>Many tenants would not be considered 'poor' and would pass a normal means test, but lack savings for a deposit and/or have erratic incomes. They can be at risk of homelessness and need support</p> <p>What are the criteria for being "at risk of homelessness" in relation to accessing rent guarantee or deposit schemes and the rest.</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>I will supply a written answer.</p>
--	--

40. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Linda Smith – private rentals

Question	Written Response
<p>Following an alert issued by the Mayday Trust concerning clauses in loan agreements which prevent renting to those in receipt of DSS payments, can the portfolio holder brief Members on what efforts the Council is making to tackle the unacceptable practice by some businesses and individuals in Oxford who refuse to rent to those in receipt of DSS payments?</p>	<p>For a number of reasons, some landlords and agents do not want to rent to households that rely on state benefits to sustain the tenancy. Many landlords and agents will seek employment and financial references from prospective tenants in Oxford City, before agreeing to the rental. The Council works hard to mitigate this issue, not least by securing access to private rented accommodation through the Home Choice; Rent Guarantee; and Lord Mayors Deposit Guarantee schemes.</p>

41. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Linda Smith - No Local Connection

Question	Written Response
<p>Following the recommendations made by the No Local Connection Scrutiny Review Group, can the portfolio holder update Council on the progress with amending the Operational Guidelines to incorporate, in particular, the recommendation that 6 months' rough sleeping in Oxford entitles you to a local connection?</p>	<p>Officers have tabled all recommendations for consideration at the next Joint Management Group, which oversees the Common Operational Protocol that governs the Adult Homeless Pathway, on 7 February 2019.</p>

42. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Linda Smith - Rough sleepers SWEP protocol

Question	Written Response
<p>Rough Sleepers are less resilient to severe weather because of health issues caused or made worse by homelessness.</p> <p>Would the Board Member agree that the SWEP requirement of a met forecast of 3 days at zero temperature (there is a discretion but it is not clear how or when it can be used) should be reduced to a met forecast of ONE night only at FOUR degrees Celsius?</p>	<p>The purpose of SWEP is to ensure that accommodation is available in adverse weather conditions - when required and at short notice – for all those who need it. The arrangements agreed with local homelessness organisations for winter 2018/19 will ensure that this is the case, including for rough sleepers who would not otherwise be eligible for the adult homeless pathway because they have no local connection or no right to claim benefits or housing in the UK, and for people who have not previously engaged with services and come inside.</p> <p>SWEP triggers on a forecast by the Met Office of 3 consecutive days at zero degrees Celsius or below, however as in previous years, the Council has discretion to open SWEP in other adverse weather conditions, e.g. snow on the ground, extreme wind chill, and together with our partners, will take a common sense approach on decisions as to whether or not to open / continue SWEP.</p> <p>SWEP is currently run on a model which relies on homelessness professionals who staff core services in the city working overtime to deliver SWEP provision. This model, using overtime and professionals volunteering, means that continued and extensive periods of opening places considerable pressure on staff and services.</p> <p>I would like to do more to ensure there is a safe and warm place available for all rough sleepers during periods of cold weather and I have asked council officers to use the discretion available to them to trigger SWEP during freezing conditions this winter if resources are available to do so. We are working on plans for next winter which will aim to provide more continuous night shelter provision throughout the season, and operate SWEP for every single freezing night - because opening and closing beds depending on the weather is never going to be an efficient way to run a service nor the best way to help people.</p> <p>Officers will be working together with local homelessness organisations to monitor the operation of SWEP this winter, including getting feedback from people on their experiences of using SWEP, and will report as requested to CEB on this.</p>
<p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>It is disappointing that the 4C minimum is not used and that people can only sign up for</p>	<p>Verbal Response</p> <p>Providers are aware of the difficulties the restricted times cause and can make some allowances. We know SWEP is not the best way to provide temporary beds for rough sleepers. So we are proposing making beds available every night between October and March and are planning</p>

<p>SWEP during a half hour period at one location. Can the sign up time be extended to eg 7.30pm to 9.30pm?</p>	<p>a new 60-bed emergency shelter in the city, removing the need for SWEP to operate at all.</p>
---	--

43. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Linda Smith - Rough sleepers accommodation

Question	Written Response
<p>Will the Board Member commit officer time and funding to the provision of safe, non-dormitory accommodation for especially vulnerable groups: women, LGBT+ and young (under 25) Rough Sleepers?</p>	<p>Yes. This winter we are providing 41 new beds and better services as a result of our successful bids to the government's temporary Rough Sleeper Initiative (RSI), which is targeted at areas with high levels of rough sleeping. We successfully bid for £503,000 in RSI funding for 2018/19, and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has provisionally awarded a further £511,000 for 2019/20. The following non-dormitory accommodation is funded by the RSI this winter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 beds in two winter night shelters, which are available to people with no recourse to public funds (i.e. not entitled to claim benefits or housing) and people without a local connection • five move on beds for people who are working or moving into work, let at local housing allowance rents • five beds in a women-only project • seven pre-recovery beds for people undertaking drug and alcohol rehabilitation <p>We are exploring options for providing winterlong accommodation for all rough sleepers from winter 2019/20.</p> <p>On 9 October 2018 we issued a press release detailing new beds and services delivered as part of the temporary Rough Sleeper Initiative funding.</p> <p>Young People's supported housing is commissioned by Oxfordshire County Council which provides a range of dispersed accommodation across the City, all of which is non-dormitory accommodation.</p> <p>Officers will raise the question regarding meeting the needs of LGBT+ at the next JMG.</p>

44. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Linda Smith - Rough Sleepers Initiative fund

Question	Written Response
<p>Will the Board Member ensure that the City Council makes an early bid to MHCLG for further funding from the Rough Sleepers Initiative fund, since the initial £1,014,000 was ear-marked only for the period 2018-20?</p>	<p>The Rough Sleeping Initiative (RSI) was a targeted fund available 2018-2020. There are no further rounds scheduled. We however continue to remain in contact with MHCLG regarding all other funding opportunities.</p>

Leader of the Council, Board Member for Economic Development and Partnerships

45. From Councillor Gotch to Councillor Brown – legal advice at meetings

Question	Written Response
<p>Is the presence of the monitoring officer at all City committee meetings a legal necessity — has the law changed?</p> <p>Could a substantial saving be made if monitoring officers were present only at selected meetings?</p>	<p>The presence of the monitoring officer at all City committee meetings is not a legal necessity and while the current monitoring officer, often by personal choice, attends a significant number of Committee meetings she does not attend them all.</p> <p>There is an expectation that the monitoring officer will be available to members at Council, City Executive Board and Shareholder, Audit and Governance and Standards Committee meetings.</p> <p>The monitoring officer is paid a salary for her role referred to in the Council’s Pay Policy Statement and by virtue of her position as a Head of Service (in common with all other Heads of Service) is not entitled to claim time off in lieu or flexi time or any additional payment for attending Committee meetings, Council meetings, Member briefings and training events or for any other aspect of their role as monitoring officer.</p> <p>In short there would be no financial saving to the Council if the monitoring officer did not attend Committee meetings at all or attended fewer Committee meetings.</p> <p>I welcome the monitoring officer’s interest and presence at our meetings.</p>

46. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Brown – OXWED and Oxpens

Question	Written Response
<p>What progress has been made in selecting an OxWed development partner?</p> <p>Can the Portfolio Holder indicate if the development partner is pushing for more parking on the site (as compared to the limited parking on the published outline scheme)?</p>	<p>Discussions in regard to the appointment of a development partner are ongoing. Once these have been progressed to a point at which both OxWED shareholders (the Council and Nuffield College) are content with the proposed arrangement, a formal appointment of the selected developer will be made.</p> <p>As Cllr Wolff will recall there have been two developments which have guided this work so far. In 2013 the Council adopted a Masterplan Supplementary Planning document for the entire Oxpens area. In 2017 OxWED issued a new masterplan which took account of progress in assembling the site through acquisition. These remain the formal documents which set out the Council's aspirations and which sets the framework for the development of a planning application over the next period. Questions about any individual aspect of the development are premature. At this stage we are seeking to find a development partner who shares the vision for Oxpens and can demonstrate the expertise to bring forward a scheme of this scale and complexity.</p>

47. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Brown - combined authority

Question	Written Response
<p>During the discussion on potential local government reorganisation some years ago, the City Executive Board promoted a Combined Authority as its preferred model. The emerging Cambs/Peterborough CA was regularly held up as an example.</p> <p>In 2017 estimates of the running costs of the Cambs/Peterborough CA were c.£850K p.a. The actual figure has turned out to be £7.6m, and the Mayor has apologised.</p> <p>Does the Board stand by its endorsement of the model?</p>	<p>At the time, the Combined Authority was Government's preferred partnership governance arrangement and a requirement of devolution deals which brought devolution of significant funding and functions to groups of councils. The principle behind our proposals was that building on our existing successful partnership governance arrangements was the best way to access opportunities to deliver on local priorities of economic and housing growth. Since then, government policy has changed and it is not currently pursuing new combined authorities or devolution deals. Instead the Oxfordshire authorities have focused on strengthening the Growth Board and have successfully secured the Housing and Growth Deal. The development of this collaborative model has already produced results and will continue to be our priority to ensure successful delivery of the deal and access to further opportunities for investment. Any need to consider alternative governance models in future would obviously be informed by experience and learning from elsewhere. We consider the current arrangements which we supported more recently to be working well, unlike some other models, and neither we nor government have any inclination to change them.</p>

48. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Brown - letters re People's Vote

Question	Written Response
<p>At its meeting on 23 July 2018, council asked the Leader to write on its behalf to Oxford's MPs with the adopted motion in support of a "People's Vote" on the Brexit deal. The Leader wrote to our MPs on 20 November 2018, and received a reply from Layla Moran MP on 7 December and from Anneliese Dodds MP on 18 December.</p> <p>The Leader circulated the reply from Ms Dodds to all members, but not the reply from Ms Moran.</p> <p>Why?</p>	<p>Thanks to your question Councillor Gant I became aware that Ms Moran must have kindly replied to my letter. Unfortunately it was only posted to me, and for reasons that are unclear this did not reach me until 18 January.</p> <p>There is no intention to withhold the reply from Council. I have made arrangements for this to be circulated to all members and you should now have received it.</p>

49. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Brown - "People's Vote"

Question	Written Response
<p>In her reply, Ms Moran warmly welcomed this council's endorsement of a "People's Vote", and asked you to clarify your own position given that you did not vote for the motion.</p> <p>What answer did she receive?</p>	<p>As I mentioned above, I did not receive the letter until 18 January. So I am afraid that I have not yet replied to her, but am drafting my reply.</p> <p>This will say that I was writing to her to pass on the views of the council.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Council

Date: 28 January 2018

Title of Report: Public addresses and questions that do not relate to matters for decision – as submitted by the speakers and with written responses from Board Members

Introduction

1. 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 below. Any written responses available are also below.
2. The text reproduces that sent in the speakers and represents the views of the speakers. This is not to be taken as statements by or on behalf of the Council
3. This report was republished after the Council meeting as part of the minutes pack. This lists the full text of speeches delivered as submitted, summaries of speeches delivered which differ significantly from those submitted, and summaries of any further responses.

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

Addresses in part 2

1. Address by Dr Sheikh Ramzy – defining Islamophobia
2. Address by Joanna Holmes - Climate Change - urgent action needed
3. Address by Linnet Drury - declaring a climate emergency
4. Address by Artwell - Barton Royal British Legion building
5. Address by Judith Harley - ROAD NAME FOR TEMPLE COWLEY POOLS SLIP ROAD

Questions in part 2

6. Question from Artwell – consultancy costs

Addresses in part 2

1. Address by Dr Sheikh Ramzy – defining Islamophobia

Respected and honourable members of the Oxford City Council

I greet you with Islamic greeting of peace, Asslamu Alaykum Wa Rahmatullah

May the peace and blessing of God be upon you all.

I am sure you are aware of the report on the new definition of Islamophobia by APPG All Party Parliamentary Group (Islamophobia). This definition has been well received by over 750 Islamic organisations and a number of local government organisations in London and other places and, God willing, by the Local government and further afield.

Honourable mayor, we are living in an excellent, just country that highly values and respects the rights of all individual or communities.

Unfortunately, however, there are still those who believe that insulting people for their way of life and beliefs is acceptable. They insult and abuse the weakest members of society.

Honourable friends, wrong is wrong no matter who says it or who does it.

In 2017, 1535 victims of Islamophobia were reported, and I, as founder of the Tell Mama (*campaign against Anti-Muslim hate*) in the Thames valley, believe this figure would have been much higher if all victims of islamophobia had reported incidents to the authorities.

Dear friends, we must realise that behind these numbers are Muslim woman who have been abused in the streets, old men and women who been harassed, or spat on, their scarves pull off, been victims of physical violence, hit, kicked and sometimes put in hospital.

There are people who are so scared that some do not come out of their houses.

When a well positioned member of society belittles the woman who chooses to wear full Hijab by calling her a bank robber or post box, that is islamophobia, when a community is dehumanized by describing as cockroaches and broadcast on media that's islamophobia.

We all have a responsibility to bring all members of all communities together and live as one large family, British family. We all should care about each other's wellbeing.

And the new definition of islamophobia is a step in this direction. We need to recognise this definition, and raise awareness of what constitutes Islamophobia, and that it is not welcome here.

We need to make sure all members of our society enjoy the rights that everyone is entitled to and that if anyone wants to abuse the rights of others, then the long arm of the British law will reach them anywhere they are.

Thank you for listening and God bless you all.

Verbal Response from Councillor Brown

Thank you for your speech. This Council takes all forms of discrimination extremely seriously and we will be supporting the motion recommending adopting a definition of Islamophobia this evening.

2. Address by Joanna Gill - Climate Change - urgent action needed

I first learned about Climate Change 30 years ago, when I was studying Geography for GCSE and A-levels. In those days it was called 'The Greenhouse Effect' and was just beginning to be a serious cause for concern outside of narrow scientific circles and there was still a lot of debate about how big a problem it really was and about the best way to tackle it.

In the 30 years since then, many things have changed:

Firstly, our scientific understanding has advanced, and is now backed up by evidence of climate change not in some hypothetical future, but actually happening now. The five hottest years on record have all been in the period since 2010. Ice sheets in Greenland and Antarctica are melting at unprecedented levels, and island nations such as Fiji are already having to evacuate villages as sea levels rise. All over the world we are seeing more severe droughts, wildfires and hurricanes, as predicted by scientific models of climate change. Since I moved to South Oxford in 2002, we have experienced five severe episodes of flooding in the city, more than in the whole of the last century.

More positively, huge progress has been made in the development of low carbon technologies. We are in the middle of a major transition to non-fossil fuel based energy generation, and similar changes are beginning to happen transport. Our houses and appliances are far more energy efficient than they were 30 years ago. We have the technology we need for a zero carbon future.

However, in spite of the optimism which followed the Paris agreement, political action to tackle climate change has consistently been too little and too slow. CO₂ levels in the atmosphere have continued to rise year on year and now stand at 405.5 parts per million, well above the 350ppm deemed safe by scientists. There is no sign of any slowing down in the upward trajectory. As the motion before you states, the 2018 IPCC report tells us that we have just twelve years to act if we are to keep temperature rise below 1.5 degrees Celsius. If we don't act now, there will be further temperature rises, with potentially catastrophic consequences for global food production, as well as further destruction of the natural world.

To put it simply, this is an emergency and we need to respond to it as such. That means, as stated in the motion, action immediately and at every level. Local governments should not wait for national governments to act, but should take action themselves and demand a national response. All local and national government policies need to be viewed in the light of the overwhelming priority of tackling climate change. In addition, leaders at all levels need to tell the truth about the scale of the problem in order to explain to people the lifestyle changes we all need to make.

I have two daughters, aged 10 and 14, and I worry hugely about the world they and their children will inherit. If we do not take immediate and drastic action to tackle the climate emergency, we are likely to see a really major impact during our lifetimes and even more during our children's. I want to ask you if you have children or grandchildren, and if you also worry about the world they will grow up in. I also want you to think about what you will tell them when they ask in the future what you did about the biggest threat facing us as a planet.

You are in a privileged position as councillors: you have more power than the average citizen to do something to confront the emergency facing us. That means, I believe, that you also have more responsibility to act. Please pass the motion before you, and please make that the beginning, not the end, of what you do.

Verbal Response from Councillor Hayes – see address 3

3. Address by Linnet Drury - declaring a climate emergency

I am a young person from Oxford and I am here today to tell you that young people in the city support the proposed Declaration of Climate Emergency.

All this Climate Change stuff can seem very daunting. We can't see it happening on the streets, but it impacts every one of our lives. It can sometimes seem a bit too "big", and as if nothing we can do will make any difference. But that is where we are wrong.

This declaration of climate emergency is a great opportunity for the city, and I can't exaggerate how much hope it gave other people in my classes when I told them about it; the consensus for positive action is massive. For many of us, this declaration is not just about the short-term action, but about affirming a mindset. Affirming that you acknowledge this to be a problem, to be a concern of young people, and that you will represent us. I want you to know the support that there is out there for you to be bold enough to affirm this now.

We have all seen the statistics as set out in Cllr Simmons proposal. There is not much to say, if not that they are daunting. But I'd like to say that there is faith in the action of declaring a climate emergency. The city is in a great place to convince the county to follow suit. If enough councils put in this effort the pressure on the government could have a global influence. We are supporting you to represent us by declaring the climate emergency and convincing the county to do so too.

Because it seems so big, each individual person can feel like they can't make the difference, so therefore nothing will happen. But if every person who would have done nothing because they felt they were insignificant *did* do something...well, then we will have responded to the urgency required to beat the statistics. Please let your small action today be to support the declaration of climate emergency.

One day, we want to be able to give our children a beautiful, sustainable world to live in. To be able to tell them what role we played in changing the fate of our planet. But the 2018 IPCC report has said we only have twelve years to make a difference. Twelve years? If you too want to give your children a beautiful, sustainable world to live in and tell us what role you played in changing the fate of our planet, it looks like you are going to have to act now. I hope that this vote will bring cross-party city unity, which one day may contribute to the national unity we need to tackle this emergency.

We have all seen the statistics. Why *wouldn't* you vote for the declaration?

Verbal Response from Councillor Hayes to both addresses 2 and 3

Thank you both for your well-presented and enthusiastic speeches. Local action is crucial. We will be supporting the motion to declare a climate change emergency on a cross-party basis and will be encouraging Oxfordshire County Council to do the same.

4. Address by Artwell - Barton Royal British Legion building

I call on the Mayor, the publicly paid Executive employees and Elected Councillors to prioritise Barton's working-class people's **community needs above corporate greed**.

Since 2014, Barton's Royal British Legion hall (RBL) has been closed and unused. When open, the RBL welcomed Youth celebrations, and its large function suite was hired continuously for milestone celebrations – for example eighteenth and twenty-first birthday celebrations, and Christenings, Wakes and Wedding celebrations.

The RBL was the principal Public Space for hire in Sandhills and Barton for such celebrations. The loss of the RBL site deprives people of Sandhills and Barton of Community Space in which to gather and celebrate and it is unforgivable that its Labour Councillors care little about restoring a public space where amplified musical celebration is positively welcomed.

The RBL's closure followed closely after the closure of the nearby St. Mary's Church and Community Hall. The people of Sandhills and Barton heavily hired these Public Spaces. For thirty years, until its closure in 2012, the Church Hall hosted Isis Dance Academy, where hundreds of Sandhills and Barton's youth have fond memories of being taught the principles of ballet dancing.

In addition, Barton is also home to the very popular and successful dance company Messy Jam. Dance troupes from both Messy Jam and Isis Dance Academy have suffered terribly from having insufficient community space for hire in Barton. I cannot stress enough just how popular these dance troupes were for boys and girls from ages six to sixteen. The closure of Barton's Community Spaces for hire has unacceptably deprived opportunities for Barton's youth.

Councillors are happy to describe Barton as 'deprived' in order to secure favourable government grants, but they are content to do little to practically assist the broadening of Youth and community facilities.

For this reason, I suggest that they support my call to refurbish the RBL into a Community-Managed facility for hire. In my view Barton's eight hundred youth under the age of eighteen and adults of all ages, would welcome a well-managed community facility with facilities such as a **sprung dance floor, a function hall capable of easily accommodating 200 people, a Bar with an Aunt Sally Ally, and a twelve-seater computer suite**. An imaginative Community facility of this type would be a treasure for the ward and for the Labour controlled Oxford City Council. It would set a gold standard for England's Community facilities.

In January 2019 the City Council posted a demolition notice on the RBL building. Alarming, the Oxford Mail of 11/1/2019 reports Councillor Rowley saying,

“I would like to see both a community facility and housing on the site – as has been done successfully in Barns Road, though **on a more modest scale.**”

Has the Board Member for Housing seen the tiny Barns Road facility? Has the Councillor not understood that combining a community facility beneath housing complexes severely restricts activities which “community rooms” can offer? Why should Oxford’s Labour have administered City Council dislike like purpose-built Community Centres managed by the residents?

Cowley’s newly built Venue bears no comparison to Cowley’s former Community Centre. Cowley’s former Community Centre had a huge ballroom, which was large enough to host the annual class of 1978’s **Barns Court** reunion celebration, and musical events could be held without fear of disturbing the residents living above.

Community Centres should be places of celebration. With Labour’s predilection for placing “community rooms” beneath housing association facilities; as at Barns Road, entertainment which includes music is forbidden. In addition, the Barns Road facility to which Councillor Rowley refers, is already on an incredibly ‘**modest**’ scale, and is too small to hold all but the tiniest public meeting.

Cowley’s Venue Community Rooms, with housing directly above, are proving to be inadequate and unfit to function as a traditional Community Centre. The Venue are no substitute for Cowley’s former Community Centre. Cowley would have benefited from having a large purpose-built facility; especially as I believe Cowley’s population increase is the largest in Oxford.

Council, please note that Northway’s Community Centre has also been reduced to “community rooms” within a housing complex, with similar limitations and constraints.

Sandhills and Barton urgently needs a decent, first-class, purpose-built, stand-alone Community Centre. As Government Benefits and Banking and Financial Services become accessible online only, a Computer suite within the Community facility will become of enormous assistance with a large function Hall: I believe a Bar, including an Aunt Sally Alley would attract a wide range of the ward population.

Such a community designed facility would help to promote a community spirit and challenge loneliness, which is increasing in today’s society.

This could all be realised with an imaginative refurbishment of the former RBL site into a first-class Community-managed community facility for hire. Please do not develop a token “community room” as an adjunct to a Housing Association facility as has been tried in other parts of Oxford. Will the Labour leadership of Oxford City Council recognise the need to develop a purpose-built Community facility or refurbish Barton’s RBL site?

Written response from Councillor Simm

The Royal British Legion building has unfortunately experienced several break-ins and is unusable in its current state. Due to the condition of the building, a demolition notice was served by the council 3 January 2019. The site will be redeveloped at a later date.

The City Council is improving community spaces across the city. In Barton we are investing just under a million pounds into the Neighbourhood Centre so it can better meet the needs of local people by increasing the capacity of the doctor's surgery and improving spaces for community activities and events. Activities currently running at the neighbourhood centre include an advice centre, breakfast and lunch clubs, community food cupboard, various exercise and dance classes, children's stay and play sessions, a youth club and a bingo night. The development at Barton Park also includes a pavilion and space at the new school which will also be available for use by community groups. This is on top of the hireable spaces at Barton Leisure Centre.

We note comparison is made to The Venue in Cowley as a community space. We understand The Venue to be a thriving community facility which also hosts a number of activities and events for the benefit of residents including adult learning classes, support for children with special educational needs, health and wellbeing sessions, a local history group, 'environmental boot camps' and yoga. Data supplied to us by The Venue shows that the facility is well used; for example in the week beginning 19 November 2018, 378 people attended activities, of whom 247 were under the age of 18 years and 264 from black and minority ethnic groups.

Verbal response from Councillor Simm

We are committed to improving and increasing community space in Barton centre - the redevelopment will include space for an advice centre and lots of activities. The Venue is independently run and in my opinion an excellent facility. I see no reason for the Council to provide more community facilities over those it currently makes available and has planned.

5. Address by Judith Harley - ROAD NAME FOR TEMPLE COWLEY POOLS SLIP ROAD

Lord Mayor, Councillors,

I am here on behalf of Old Temple Cowley Residents' Association (OTCRA) and residents of Temple Cowley to appeal the City Council's plans to name the slip road into the Temple Cowley Pools (TCP) development as "Sher Afzal Close". This decision was taken by December's CEB without our knowledge, and to our dismay, as this was not a name that we supported. Had we known that it was being discussed we would have attended to make strenuous opposition to this, and to promote our own choice of name.

This choice is controversial, and mistaken, because Sher Afzal has no known connection to our area. Temple Cowley residents are frustrated, angry, and insulted that we were asked to choose a name for this slip road, then our suggestions were completely ignored.

In the Oxford Mail of Monday 14th January, Cllr Brown is quoted saying:

"Mr. Sher Afzal's name has been suggested several times before because he was so highly regarded by many local people."

Not only has this name been suggested several times, it has been rejected several times, because he has had no known association with the areas concerned. He might be 'highly regarded' by Oxford's Pakistani community, but residents of Temple Cowley, including a resident who was a former City Councillor and former Deputy Lord Mayor, have never heard of him. Members of OTCRA's committee have e-mailed ward and other councillors, and the Pakistan Welfare Association, to ask who Sher Afzal is – and have received no, or inadequate, replies. I am awaiting a response to an FOI request on this. Internet searches have drawn mostly blanks, apart from Oxford Mail articles from June 2007 and July 2008, both of which report the rejection of Sher Afzal for road names on the grounds that he had nothing, or little, to do with the respective areas.

The Oxford Mail of 7th June 2007 reports the naming of William Morris Close and Beresford Place, both in Temple Cowley and very close to the TCP site, and records the rejection of the name Sher Afzal Place, after Mr Sher Afzal Khan:

"..... it was agreed [by the City Council's Cowley Area Committee] that, as Mr Khan had no direct links to the site, his name could be put forward for a planned development in North Way, Marston, near where his family live."

Presumably Sher Afzal was rejected as a name for the North Way development also.

The Oxford Mail of 11th July 2008, on naming three new roads in Rose Hill, reports the rejection of Sher Afzal Khan's name for this development:

"[The Rose Hill Residents' and Tenants'] Association chairman said ' I am sure [Sher Afzal] was a very honourable man, but he had little to do with Rose Hill. We wanted to acknowledge the work of stalwarts of Rose Hill who had worked hard for the community of the area.'"

Given these planning precedents, of rejecting Sher Afzal from both Temple Cowley and Rose Hill because he had no direct links with these areas, why should Temple Cowley now be subjected to having the same, unwanted, name foisted on us, for the same reasons. If Sher Afzal's name wasn't suitable in 2007 because he had no direct links to the area, it isn't any more suitable now, 12 years later. As Mr Khan died in 1999 it isn't as if he was able to generate any connection with this area in the intervening years.

This choice adds insult to injury. First you demolish our swimming pool and gym. Then you allow a bulky development to overshadow our library and detract from our Conservation Area. Now you name the slip road after someone we have never heard of, with no known connection to this area. Several of you were on the Area Committees that rejected Sher Afzal from Rose Hill and Temple Cowley in 2007 and 2008.

Residents of Temple Cowley, through OTCRA, were asked for a suitable name for the new TCP slip road. We wanted this name to acknowledge the area's connection with the Knights Templar, and following a meeting attended by some 30-40 residents, offered the name "Templars End". Not only was our

suggestion ignored, but a name on which we were not initially consulted, and which we rejected, was chosen instead, without any reference to our wishes. This makes complete mockery of any democratic consultation process, and we wish our voices objecting to this to be heard. Are you listening? Do you hear us?

The Committee of OTCRA, on behalf of Temple Cowley residents, wish you to rescind the current unacceptable choice. Rose Hill's Residents' Association made their choice, and the Oxford Mail ran a poll allowing residents to have their say on that decision. We have been afforded no such courtesy. Insultingly, our ward councillors supported this name with no discussion with OTCRA, or with Temple Cowley residents. As Sher Afzal's family are reported to live in Marston, then a development such as Barton Park would be more appropriate to honour his name. Sher Afzal had no connection to Temple Cowley, and if this slip road is to be named after a person, we wish to acknowledge the work of those who worked hard for the community of this area. We would have offered names of several hard-working community members had we known you wanted these. Many of you will remember Stan Taylor and Bob Hoyle, both popular and hard-working Temple Cowley ward councillors. Stan even lived close to the TCP site, and I suggested his name to the Street Naming Team, but this was inexplicably rejected.

This consultation had serious flaws:

- Communication from the Street Naming Team was poor;
- we didn't know about, or understand, any restrictions or rules;
- we didn't know that our ward councillors were offering their own choice without considering or consulting us;
- we were not informed that the decision was going to CEB;
- we were informed of the CEB decision too late to request a call-in.

Now that we know about the rules Had we can play your game, but we need a fair and level playing field, not one tilted to our disadvantage. our ward councillors been keen to represent fairly all communities in their ward, they would have discussed this with OTCRA and Temple Cowley residents, and considered local associations and requirements. I repeat, we wish you to rescind the current unacceptable name and allow us the courtesy and respect of presenting our choice – a local choice by local people.

If you have listened, and heard our request, and have a willingness to support us and fair play, then thank you on behalf of OTCRA and residents of Temple Cowley.

Verbal Response from Councillor Brown

The final decision is for the Executive Board to take. On this occasion names put forward were ruled out as either not meeting the guidelines for street names, or were not supported, and did not have a close connection to the area. The decision has been communicated to the developer and the Post Office and is final. I hope you will welcome naming the road after an outstanding local Oxford citizen.

Questions in part 2

6. Question from Artwell – consultancy costs

Question to the Board Member, Councillor Hollingsworth

What is the cost to Oxford City Council of hiring Phil Jones Consultancy?

Written Response from Councillor Hollingsworth

This question refers to work to develop the [Movement and Public Realm Strategy](#) carried out by Phil Jones Associates (land development consultants) to support the vision set out in the Oxford Local Plan 2036, published in July 2018.

The costs for the above study were.

- i. Total study £77,060 split equally between City and County Councils - the City Council paid 50% of this amount = £35,830
- ii. Origin destination study (as part of the work) additional cost £16,500 split unequally between City and County Councils – the City Council paid £4,983
- iii. Room bookings £385

Total paid - £41,198